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The subject of the following Thesis is "The General Assembly of 1610." The intention of the writer has been to conduct a detailed and thoroughgoing investigation of everything which had to do with that important and historic gathering. The plan of this work is as follows:

In the Introductory Chapter we have reviewed the history of the Scottish Episcopate from the year of Reformation in 1560 to the year 1587, when the temporalities of all benefices were annexed to the crown. Chapter One which follows has to do with the Moderate Reaction and the reestablishment of Episcopal government in the Church of Scotland. This brings us to the heart of our subject, which is the meeting of the Assembly itself. In Chapter Two we investigated the Calling of the Assembly, the personnel of its membership and the record of its proceedings. Chapter Three is concerned with the sequel to the Assembly, with certain general conclusions and with the bearing of the Assembly on the question of Church Reunion in our time.

In all of which we would now make the claim that the following Thesis is the most detailed and exhaustive study which has appeared on this subject up to the present time. In our treatment of the case we have endeavoured to be entirely impartial. How far we have succeeded in this design we of course must leave to the reader to determine.
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---Introduction---

---The Scottish Episcopate 1560-1587---

A. The First Phase: 1560-1572.
B. The Second Phase: The Tulchan Episcopacy. (1572-1575)
C. The Third Phase: To the Act of Annexation. (1575-1587)
The Glasgow Assembly of 1610 was responsible for the erection of a limited and constitutional Episcopacy within the Reformed Scottish Church. Clearly such a fact should be enough to place it among the outstanding and epoch-making Assemblies in the Kirk’s history. And what took place in the notable gathering which during the second week-end of June 1610 met within the walls of Saint Mungo’s Cathedral is now to be the subject of our detailed investigation and study. But in order clearly to understand what the Assembly of 1610 was endeavoring to do, as well as what it actually accomplished, it will be necessary for us to take as our starting point a date much earlier than that upon which the Assembly met. In fact we shall be forced to retrace our steps over a period of fifty years before we find the starting point we desire. For, as will become increasingly evident as we proceed, what happened in 1610 can only be understood and appreciated in the light of the accumulated experience gained by the Church during the preceding half century. Thus, for example, when we care to examine the “Heads and Articles concerning the Discipline of the Kirk” adopted in 1610, we shall discover that those members of the Assembly who drew up these legislative proposals were in point after point relying and falling back upon these legal and practical experiences which the previous years had so abundantly supplied. Without a clear knowledge of what took place during these earlier and formative days it will be quite impossible to understand either the proceedings or the significance of our Glasgow Assembly.

It is our intention in these pages of introduction which follow to make a rapid sketch of the history of the Scottish Episcopate from the date of Reformation in 1560 to the passing of the famous Act of Annexation in 1587. It was during these troubled years that Scottish Churchmen received their first impression of the part which a Protestant bishop might play in a Reformed Church. It was during these years also that they arrived at certain definite decisions as to the position which such a prelate might occupy in the ecclesiastical system and the relative amount of jurisdiction which might be left in his hands. Precedents of far-reaching importance were thus beaten out upon the anvil of experience during these years, and we shall see how the legislators of 1610 made use of as many of these precedents as they could.

Now at the outset of our study the first thing to be recognized is that in spite of the sweeping character of the religious revolution which they carried through, the Scottish Reformers by no means accomplished all that they set out to achieve. The Reformation for which they were responsible was by no means as thorough-going as they would have desired. It is true that in the Convention-Parliament of August 1560 they saw to their satisfaction the whole edifice of Roman religion and Papal power overthrown. First of all, their Confession of Faith had been accepted. (1) Then in succession three Acts had been passed. The first abolished the Papal jurisdiction in Scotland. (2) The second annulled all anti-Protestant legislation. (3) The third declared the hearing or saying of Mass to be a criminal offence. (4) But as a moment’s reflection will show this achievement had more of a negative than a positive character. The Roman ecclesiastical edifice had been demolished it is true, but “the true and holy Kirk” of the Reformers’ dreams still remained to be built. And it was just here on the constructive side of their work that the Reformers met with grave difficulty and sore disappointment.

(1) A.P.3. vol. II., pp. 526–534.
(2) A.P.3. II., pp. 534–535.
(3) A.P.3. II., p. 536.
(4) A.P.3. II., p. 538.
The story of what happened is so well known that the
darest sketch of events will suffice here. Shortly after parliament
dissolved a commission was given to the famous six Johns—Knox
and five companions, Wynram, Spottiswoode, "Tillok, Douglas and
Knox," to draw up a plan of the polity and discipline of the
Scottish Church as they desired to see it reconstituted. (5) The
six divines lost no time in doing what was required of them,
and in a short while the First Book of Discipline was ready to
be presented to the Great Council of Scotland. (5) The nobles
took charge of the Book, and perused it many days. Their main
impression of the work, however, appears to have been an
unfavorable one, for as a body the Secret Council refused to give
the Book its official approval. (7) And while in January 1561
a large number of the nobility did add their signatures to the
work, yet it never became law nor were many of its chief proposals
ever carried into effect. The main reason for this refusal to
establish the Reformed Church according to the plan of the Book
of Discipline was simply that whereas Knox and his fellow ministers
proposed to apply the rents and endowments of the ancient Church
to the schemes and purposes of the Reformed body, the nobles on
the other hand were determined to appropriate as much of this
wealth as possible for themselves. This, however, is not a
subject with which we are concerned here. That is necessary for
the purposes of this study is that we should remember that in 1560
the Church of Scotland was not established according to the plan
of the Book of Discipline. (6) Such an establishment would, we
believe, have proved a stubborn barrier to the re-introduction of
Episcopacy a decade later. But the Reformers failed to get their
chosen constitution adopted, and as a result in the field of
church government the way was left open for development and change.

The failure to secure official sanction for their
Book of Discipline was unquestionably a great disappointment to
Reformed Churchmen. But they did not spend their time in giving
voice to vain regrets. They set about without delay to put as
much as possible of their chosen polity into operation. They
had already done something towards this end. As early as the
summer (July) of 1560, when the Protestant victory had been secured,
arrangements had been made for the planting of Reformed ministers
in Edinburgh, Saint Andrews, Perth, Aberdeen and other principal
towns. At the same time the much debated office of Superintendent
made its initial appearance. Spottiswoode, Wynram, "Tillok, John
Erskine of Dun and John Carswell were nominated to the districts
or "dioceses" respectively of Lothian, Fife, Glasgow, Angus and
Argyll and the Isles. (9) Finally, on the 20th of December 1560
the first General Assembly of the Church of Scotland as Reformed
convened in the Magdalene Chapel, Edinburgh. (10) A remembrance
of these facts coupled with a knowledge of the contents of the
Book of Discipline makes it abundantly clear that the form of
church government which Knox and his friends desired to see
established in Scotland was to be something vastly different from
that of the displaced Church of Rome. In this connection it is
interesting to note that Spottiswoode declares that James
Hamilton, last Roman archbishop of Saint Andrews, sent a message
to Knox advising him to retain the old hierarchical polity. The
Reformer, so ran the message, "should do wisely to retain the old
policy which had been the work of many ages, or then put a better
in place thereof before he did shake off the other." (11)

a nationally-received creed, but not a nationally-received
government."
[9] Knox, Works II. p. 87. (Also Note I, same page.)
[10] B.U.K. I. p. 3; Calderwood II. p. 44.
Another matter in which the Scottish Reformation lacked the thorough-going completeness that its promoters would have liked in the fact that despite the Act of Parliament abolishing their ecclesiastical jurisdiction the members of the ancient hierarchy still maintained their old position as an integral part of the civil constitution of the land. The prelates of the old regime might be forbidden to hear or say mass, but they were still at liberty to sit and speak in Parliament. In the eyes of the law they still constituted the First or Spiritual Estate; they retained their titles of lordship over their respective sees, and they continued to exercise their right to sit in the governing councils of the kingdom. It will be recalled that the duties of a medieval prelate were of a two fold character. On one side he owed an allegiance to the Church; on the other he had certain duties to fulfill as regards the State. The Reformation had shut out the Scottish bishops, abbots and priors from all participation in the national religious life. But just because the Reformation was more of a religious than a political revolution it left the temporal position of the prelates unimpaired. Had the Reformation resulted in certain violent constitutional upheavals, such as an attack upon and an abolition of the Spiritual Estate accompanied by an immediate annexation of the property of the subverted order, the reintroduction of Episcopacy at a later date would in our opinion have been extremely difficult if not impossible. But no such sweeping constitutional alterations accompanied the consummation of the Reforming movement in 1560. The old hierarchical framework still remained in its accustomed place until at last the suggestion was made that it might be adapted to the use and service of the Reformed Church, and that this is to anticipate. Nothing was done then during the early years to unset the existing prelates or to do away with their order. On the contrary when legislation affecting them was passed it tended to make their position even more permanent and secure. Thus in 1561, to the immense disgust of the Reforming leaders, the Privy Council decided that the old clergy should retain two-thirds of the income of their benefices during their life-time, and that the remaining one-third should be divided between the Reformed ministry and the crown. The members of the old order were thus placed beyond the threat of want for life. Again, in 1567 under the Regent Moray the Protestant ascendency was finally secured beyond all peradventure. At the Good Regent's Parliament meeting in December of that year an act was passed confirming to the Spiritual Estate all its ancient privileges. Parliament "ratified and ratified all civil privileges granted and given by our Sovereign Lord's predecessors to the spiritual estates of this realm in all points after the form and tenor thereof." (14)

When one examines the Parliamentary records of this period one is certain to be impressed by the relatively large number of clerics who attended the Parliamentary sessions as the representatives of their estate. Thus in the Parliament held by Queen Mary in April 1567 there appeared no less than nine bishops besides a number of lesser clergy. (15) At the Good Regent's Parliament in December of the same year the Bishops of Moray, Candida Casa, Orkney and Brechin together with fourteen minor dignitaries were among the present. (16) It is only right to point out, however, that many of those who by virtue of their clerical titles possessed the right of being present in Parliament were really not clergy at all but laymen who under cover of the general confusion of the times had appropriated or received ecclesiastical titles and endowments. For example the so-called Bishop of Brechin, just mentioned above, had never been either ordained or consecrated. He was a young protestant layman, a Campbell of the house of Ard inlass who had received a gift of

(12) Cunningham, Church Hist. I. p. 34. "Strange that——driven from the Church and the altar, they should still be allowed to sit in the Senate.
(13) Privy Council Register, I. p. 201-202; Knox, oris II. pp. 279-310 for the details leading up to this decision.
(14) A.P.S. III. pp. 28-32.
(15) A.P.S. II. p. 146.
(16) A.P.S. III. p. 8.
this bishopric in 1666. (17) Nor was he the only layman present on this occasion under a clerical guise. The great majority of those like himself attended this Parliament as the representatives of the Spiritual Estate had in reality no connection at all with that aspect of national life they were supposed to represent. (18)

The above reference to Campbell of Brechin suggests to us the desirability of noting at this point the steps which were being taken to fill those Episcopal seats which from time to time became vacant. In 1564 William Chisholm (I.), Bishop of Dunblane, passed away, and his nephew William Chisholm (II.) who had been his uncle's coadjutor for several years succeeded to his place. (19) The next year 1565 witnessed another appointment when Queen Mary assigned to her friend and adviser, John Lesley, the vacant See of Ross. (20) Both Chisholm and Lesley were staunch Romanists. But in 1566, as we have seen, the Protestant Alexander Campbell was raised to the Bishopric of Brechin. During the same year another Protestant, the famous John Carswell, Reformed Superintendent of Argyll, was presented to the vacant See of the Isles. (21)

The raising of non-Romanists in this manner to the Episcopal dignity was a move which was destined to have far-reaching results. Towards a hierarchy, the members of which were a band of vehement Romanists, it was not to be expected that the Reformers would cherish feelings other than those of unremitting hostility. But what if the circumstances were somewhat changed? Suppose, for instance, that all the Romanists on the Episcopal bench were replaced by Protestants, what would be the attitude of the Reformers then? The probability was that their feelings towards the Episcopal order might change also. In time a concordat between the privileged hierarchy and the democratic Kirk might even result. As a matter of fact this is just what happened, as we shall see shortly.

But before we proceed any farther it may be well to notice at this point that at the time of the Reformation not all the Scottish bishops had remained attached to Romanism. Of the thirteen sees the occupants of five embraced the Reformation cause without delay. These were Adam Bothwell of Orkney, Robert Stewart of Caithness, Alexander Gordon of Galloway, James Hamilton of Argyll and John Campbell of the Isles. (22) With the last two of these prelates we need not concern ourselves here. Bishop Hamilton was evidently not greatly interested in church affairs, for from now on we have very little

(17) Keith, Catalogue, p. 166; Cooper, C.U.A.P. p. 41.
(19) Keith, Catalogue, p. 180; See also Ritchie, "Character and Career of William Chisholm II." Scottish Ecclesiological Transactions, 1924, for a sketch of Chisholm's career.
(20) Keith, Catalogue, p. 194.
(22) Only two of these five had been canonically consecrated. These were Bishops Bothwell of Orkney and Gordon of Galloway. See Dorden, "Bishops of Scotland," pp. 288 and 349. Cooper, C.U.A.P. pp. 35-36, inclines to believe that Stewart was a canonical bishop, but the weight of evidence is against such a conclusion.
notice of him, while John Campbell was dead before 1566. For
the purposes of this study, therefore, their careers are
unimportant. It is otherwise, however, with Stewart, Bothwell
and Gordon. Those men did take an active interest and part
in the affairs of the Reformed Church. And it was in the course
of her varied relationships with them that the Church learned
those lessons and reached those decisions which were to play
so important a part in the later development of Episcopacy in
Scotland. We must now examine the record of these relations
in some detail.

The first of those bishops with whom we have to do
was Alexander Gordon, Bishop of Galloway, known also to his
contemporaries by the titular distinction of Archbishop of
Athens. (26) He had been present at the Reformation Parliament
of 1560, where he was specially noted by Knox as one of those
"that had renounced Papistry and openly professed Jesus Christ
with us." (24) Some time then passed before he made an appearance
in the Assembly of the Church. During the Spring of 1562,
however, he appears to have asked to be appointed Superintendent
of his old Diocese of Galloway, for when the General Assembly
met in June of that year his application came up for its
consideration. In making reply the Assembly acted with much
care. The brethren informed the Bishop that they were unaware
he had been presented or nominated either by the Lords of
Secret Council or by the province of Galloway. Further, he
had not observed the order followed in the election of superin-
tendents. If, however, the churches of Galloway should make
suit for him, and the Lords present him they promised to do what
they could for him. He was required before leaving the Assembly
to subscribe the Book of Discipline. (26) Meanwhile, pending his
regular election, the following Assembly, that of December 1562,
gave him commission to admit members, exhorters and readers, and
in short to do all things necessary towards the "planting" of churches
in his Diocese. (26) His election appears to have been conducted
to the satisfaction of the Kirk's authorities, for in the
Assembly of June 1563 "Alexander Gordon, styled Bishop of Galloway"
went through the form of trial or examination to which all
superintendents were required regularly to submit. (27) The Roman
bishop had become a Reformed superintendent.

This same Assembly witnessed the appointment of a
number of ecclesiastical "Commissioners" of provinces. The office
of a commissioner resembled that of the superintendent with the
one important difference that the commissioner held office for
only one year at a time. (26) Among others, the Bishops of
Galloway, Orkney and Caithness were each given a commission to
plant churches within the bounds of their respective dioceses. (29)

A number of years passed before these prelates again
came prominently before the notice of the Church. When they did
appear it was in a distinctly unfavourable light. In the General
Assembly which met soon after the Regent's Parliament in 1567
their conduct during the past two or three years became the object
of some severe criticism. Adam Bothwell of Orkney was sharply
rebuked upon a number of points. He was criticised chiefly for
non-visitation and for having celebrated the marriage of Bothwell

(26) Keith, Catalogue, pp. 279 and 307.
(26) B.U.K. I. p. 28; Calderwood II. p. 207.
(27) B.U.K. I. p. 21; Calderwood II. p. 223.
(28) Scoot, A.H. p. 11.
and Queen Mary. He made a speech, but in spite of what he urged in his own defence the Assembly decided that he be suspended until he had made full satisfaction for his offence. Alexander Gordon of Galloway also received the Assembly's attention. It was charged against him that he had been grossly negligent in planting and visiting. In fact it was declared that he had not visited the kirk of his diocese for the space of three years. The Bishop confessed that what was laid to his charge was true, but for some reason which does not appear, the Assembly was content merely to admonish him and to continue his commission until its next meeting. All of which may be read in the records.

The Assembly's admonition does not appear to have had much effect, for at the next Assembly (July, 1568) Gordon's conduct again came up for discussion. He was finally summoned to appear at the time of the next Parliament. He was then to be required to show how diligent he had been in the charge committed to him and to state whether in the future he intended to devote his energies to matters of state or to his ministerial work. Meanwhile, John Row, minister of Perth, was given temporary commission to visit Galloway. In the same session Bishop Bothwell was restored to the ministry, but on the condition that he make a public confession of his fault (31) from the pulpit of Holyrood Church (32). The Bishop of Caithness whose conduct seems to have been more to the liking of the brethren received a commission for one year to visit and plant churches in his remote Diocese. This commission was renewed by the Assembly which followed. (33)

In the eyes of those who were now in control of the policy and government of the Reformed Church the Bishop of Galloway was rapidly becoming an offender of the first class. In the Assembly held at Edinburgh in July 1569 "Mr. Alexander Gordon sometime commissioner of Galloway" was summoned to appear before the next Assembly, and meanwhile was inhibited from exercising any function in the Church. (34) The next regular gathering of the Assembly was held, but there is nothing in the records to show that he paid any attention to the summons. (35) It was in July 1569 also that the Assembly took cognizance of the appointment of Superintendent JohnCarvell to the See of the Isles. The newly-raised prelate was formally rebuked for having accepted the Bishopric "without making the Assembly forsaken." (36) In the Assembly of February 1570 the Bishop of Orkney again became the target of some severe criticisms. Six charges were laid against him. He made a spirited defence of his behaviour, and a committee composed of Knox, John Craig and David Lindsay was appointed to consider his statements and to report to the next Assembly. (37) Orkney's position at this time was a most unenviable one. He had been forced into a simoniacal exchange of his Bishopric for the Abbacy of Holyrood by Robert Stewart afterwards Earl of Orkney. (38) Pastoral arrangements made at this time as regards the Galloway province show that the Assembly had decided to dispense altogether with the services of Alexander Gordon. John Row, now styled "Commissioner of Mithisdail and Galloway," was present in March 1571, and was among those whose commission was extended till the next Assembly. (39)

(31) His part in the marriage of Queen Mary and Bothwell.
(34) B.U.K. I. p. 150; Calderwood II. p. 491.
(35) Scott, A. N. pp. 15-17. Scott gives a valuable summary (pp. 15-17) of the relations of bishops and Assembly during these early years.
(38) Spottiswoode, II. p. 77.
As one reads one’s way through the above record two points became increasingly clear. (I.) In the first place it is evident that Scottish Churchmen were learning from experience that it would be quite possible to set a proselytised prelate to work upon the tasks of the National Church. Such a dignitary might in time become a very useful person, provided of course that his powers were not allowed to exceed those of the regular superintendent. In other words, Church leaders were coming to see that for an episcopate, trimmed and reduced to the dimensions of a superintendency, there might yet be found a place within the fabric of the Reformed Kirk. (40) We are far from minimising the amount of friction which the records reveal as existing between the Assembly on the one hand and the bishops on the other. And we certainly cannot agree with Prof. Cooper’s assertion that at this time—just before the date of the Leith Convention—"the Bishops of Caithness, Orkney and Galloway were giving regular and active service among the Reformed in their several dioceses." (41) Orkney’s suspension in 1567, the renewed attack upon him in 1570, and Galloway’s deprivation in 1669 are certain evidence that the Church regarded their service not as regular and active but as the reverse. Still even if only to a limited extent and in a somewhat unsatisfactory manner the Scottish Church had found a use for the bishops, and this fact was enough to establish a precedent for the future.

(II.) Secondly, it is clear from the record of its dealings with these prelates that the General Assembly was feeling its way towards a position of first-rate constitutional importance. It was beating out and establishing certain precedents in church government which were to have their imprint on all succeeding Scottish Church history. What we see happening when we read of one prelate being rebuked and of another being suspended is simply the Assembly asserting its claim to be supreme over all ecclesiastical persons and causes. It was becoming increasingly conscious of its own importance, and it was growing more and more determined that all Church officers should be responsible to its decrees.

There remains one small matter to be dealt with at this point. We are indebted to Prof. Cooper for calling attention to the fact that in 1567 there was assigned to the superintendent a function which before 1560 had been reserved to the bishop. Patrons of livings were now to present qualified persons to the superintendent of the district in which the benefice happened to lie. The superintendent was thus made more like a bishop than ever.

B. The Second Phase: The Tulchan Episcopacy. (1572-1575.)

We come now to consider an event which in the light of subsequent developments must be regarded as possessing first-rate significance and importance. We refer to the historic convention held at Leith in January 1572 which took upon itself the responsibility of reintroducing Episcopacy into the Scottish Church. As we are not engaged at present in writing a history of the Church of Scotland but merely in clearing the ground for a consideration of the 1610 Assembly, we do not feel required to give a detailed account of the causes which led up to this momentous step. Such an account will be found in an appendix which we have placed at the end of this introductory chapter. (43) Here we shall content ourselves with a bare enumeration of the chief motives leading to the change. They were roughly four in number, and may be described as:

(40) We are of course not forgetting that a number of Scottish Reformers—Knox, Willock and Spottiswoode—had had the experience of serving under Protestant bishops before 1560. These Reformers had all ministered in the Church of England under Edward VI. For a summary of the relevant facts see MacGregor, "Origins of Scottish Presbyterian Polity," pp. 22, 34 and 35.

(41) Cooper, C.U.A.P., p. 43.

(42) Cooper, Reunion, p. 11; also C.U.A.P., p. 42.

(43) See below, Appendix I, pp. 29-32.
I. The Constitutional Motive which was bound up in the determination to preserve the three ancient estates, clergy as well as noble and common, as being essential to the stability and well-being of the state.

II. The Political Motive which looking forward to an eventual union of Scotland with England desired that the two National Churches should be one in ecclesiastical polity as well as accord in the essentials of doctrinal confession.

III. The Financial Motive. The Reformers were willing to permit a revival of the old hierarchies, such as Episcopacy. Another point to be noticed was that they were determined that the practice of advancing unqualified laymen to ecclesiastical benefices must cease. To shut out laymen from preferment they were willing to go the length of allowing the return of the whole system of regularly called prelates. A number of regularly consecrated bishops owning obedience to the General Assembly were to be preferred to an irreligious collection of sacrilegious laymen eating up the Church's revenues and masquerading under ecclesiastical titles.

Such were the four motives which brought about the temporary return of the Episcopal office to the Scottish Church. This formal change was accomplished by a widely attended Convention-Assembly which met in Leith in January 1572. In the details of this gathering we are not required to enter here, but it might be wise to sketch the main outline of its proceedings. Moreover, we shall be required to devote some attention to the Convention's legislation, since as we shall see the Assembly of 1610 had the 1572 legislation in mind when it drew up its own articles.

The called the Leith Convention together we do not know, but as Sir John of Dun and the Regent Far were kinmen it is probable that their combined efforts had something to do with the matter. [44] The gathering was called together to endeavour to secure a peaceable arrangement of the differences between Church and State. The Convention assembled at Leith on the twelfth of January 1572. [45] There were present superintendents, ministers and commissioners from towns and churches, in all a very distinguished company. At the second session the assembled brethren concluded that the Convention should have the powers and effect of a regular General Assembly. [46] At the third session a committee including such leaders as Sir John of Dun, Superintendent John Wynram, John Craig of Edinburgh and Commissioner David Lindsay was appointed to meet and to confer with the Regent and certain members of his council. [47] On January the sixteen the Regent and the Privy Council did their part by naming a committee composed of the Earl of Morton, Lord Ruthven, the Bishop of Orkney and certain others to meet with the corresponding committee appointed by the Church. [48] This joint group of Commissioners to the King's Majesty and the Reformed Kirk of Scotland lost no time in falling to work, and in a short while its articles of agreement were made public. As certain of these

articles were to be of vital importance in the later Episcopal-
Presbyterian controversy we shall set down the chief of these
in order here.

Concerning archbishops and bishops the commissioners
ruled as follows:

I. "It is thought good, in consideration of the present
state, that the names and titles of archbishops and bishops are
not to be altered or innovated, nor yet the bounds of the dioceses
confounded; but to stand and continue in time coming, as they
did before the reformation of religion; at the least, to the king's
Majesty's majority, or consent of parliament.

II. "That persons promoted to archbishoprics and
bishops be (so far as may be) endued with the qualities
specified in the examples of Paul to Timothie and Titus.

III. "That there be a certain assembly or chapter of
learned ministers annexed to every metropolitan or cathedral
seats.

IV. "To all archbishoprics and bishoprics vacant, or
that shall happen to vaik hereafter, persons qualified to be
named within the space of a yeere and day after the vacancy;
and the persons nominated to be threeth yeere of age at the
least.

V. "The deane, or, falling the deane, the nixt in
dignity of the chapter during the time of the vacancy general,
and use the jurisdiction in spirituals, as the bishop
might have used.

VI. "All archbishops and bishops to be admitted hereafter
exercise no farther jurisdiction in spiritualun function nor the
superintendents have, and presentlie exercise, whilst the same be
agreed upon. And that all archbishops and bishops be subject to
the kirk and General Assembly therof in spiritualibus, as they
are to the king in temporalibus, and the advice of the best learned
of the chapter, of the number of six at least, in the admission
of such as shall have function in the kirk. As also, that it
be lawfull to as manie others of the chapter as please to be
present at the said admission, and to vote thereon."[49]

We shall not pause to consider the significance of the
above articles at this point for we shall have cause to return
to them when dealing with the legislation of the Assembly of
1610. We accordingly take note in passing of the next group
of proposals, those "Anent Abbacies, Priories and Nunneries."[50]
That Scottish Churchmen should have consented to the retention
of titles so abnoxlous and suggestive of the woman regime is
truly remarkable. But while of interest to the general historian
these articles have no importance from the viewpoint of this
study. Consequently they need not detain us here. No attempt
was made in 1610 to bring back the offices or titles of Abbot
and Prior. The reason for this should appear in due course. We
can also pass over the articles relating to the placing of
qualified ministers[51] and those referring to provestries,
deaneries and the like.[52]

But when we come to the proposals outlined for the
creating of future bishops we must again pause, for here we
have another matter of interest and importance. According to
these articles a letter under the great seal was to be issued to
the dean and chapter of the cathedral church concerned. This

is Calderwood's version. In Spottiswoode's summary of the articles,
he omits to mention the rule subjecting the bishop to the Assembly
"in spiritualibus," etc. See vol. II. p. 13.
missive would call attention to the fact that through the death of the late incumbent, the bishopric was now vacant. It would request the chapter to make choice of a successor, and it would close with the recommendation that a certain brother, "preacher of the word of God," was one fit to be elected. The members of the chapter were then to convene and to examine the person recommended to them. If they found that he was duly qualified they were then to proceed to his election. According to the articles, a Scottish cathedral chapter was to possess the right of asking the king for a further nomination in case they found the person recommended to them to be unqualified. The chapter, while bound to examine was not as in England bound to accept the nominee. The Chapter having certified that the election had taken place, a letter under the great seal was to be directed to the archbishop and other bishops informing them of the election, ratifying the same and commanding them to consecrate the newly elected bishop. If this prelate was a bishop already he would naturally not require consecration. In such a case his election was merely to be confirmed.

Following his consecration the new made bishop was to appear before the king or his regent, and to take the following oath:

"I, A.B., now elected Bishop of S., utterlie testifie and declare in my conscience, that your Majestie is the onlie lawfull and supreme governour of this realme, as well in things temporall as in the conservation and purgeation of religion; and that no forraine prince, prelat, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have anie jurisdiction, power, superioritie, pre-eminenoe, or authorite ecclesiasticall or spirituall, within this realme. And therefore I utterlie renounce and forsake all forraine jurisdictions, powers, superioritites, and authoritie, and promise, that from this farth I sail and will beare faith and true allegiance to your Majestie, your heyres and lawfull successours; and to my power sail assist and defend all Jurisdiction, priviledges, pre-emineoce, and auhorteis grant-ed and belonging to your Highness, your heyres and lawfull successors, or united and annexed to your royall crowne. And further, I acknowledge and confesse, to have and hold the said bishoprick and possession of the same, under God, onlie of your Majestie, and crowne royall of this your realme; and for the saids possessiones I doe my homage presentle unto your Majestie, and unto the same your heyres and lawfull successors sail be faithfull and true. So helpe me God." (59)

We may be permitted to pause for a little here in order to point out that this same oath with certain minor verbal differences appropriate to the circumstances was to be required of all persons presented "to any benefice with cure, the time of his admission by the ordinary." As such the oath becomes of great importance and in 1610 it was again brought into active use by our Glasgow Assembly. We mention this fact in passing as an example of the way in which the legislation of 1572 and that of 1610 are connected. But to return to the bishop-elect; when he had taken the oath a letter was to be issued under the privy-seal restoring to him the temporalities of his diocese.

(57) Cooper. C.U.A.P. p. 46.
When the commissioners decided to resuscitate the old machinery of deans and chapters they were confronted by the difficulty that a number of the deaneries, canonicats and prebends were still in the hands of Romanists, men who had "not made profession of the true religion nor yet had entered by lawful order of the true reformed kirk in the function of the ministry." It was finally concluded that those of the old chapter who were living and had embraced the Reformation should retain their places during their life-time. To them should be joined a number of "the learned and most godly ministers serving the kirks within that province." These together would constitute the new chapter. (63) Deans and chapters formed an integral part of the Episcopal form of church government. As was to have been expected, they were restored along with the bishops in the years immediately prior to 1610. But that is a matter to be discussed later.

The remaining articles agreed upon at this time, these having to do with the admission of abbots, priors and bursars (64) are unimportant, and consequently we will not spend time upon them here. The articles as a whole were approved by the Regent on February the first 1672. Parliamentary ratification was to follow. (65)

Such were the proposals of the Convention-Assembly of 1572. Their importance from our standpoint is very great. They were the outcome of the considered deliberations of the outstanding men in Church and State. They were destined to wield a far-reaching influence on the policy of the Kirk for many years to come. It is true that the new regime inaugurated by the Convention was to prove an unstable one. It was not long before it succumbed to the energetic and persevering assaults of the Presbyterian champion Andrew Melville. By 1697 the victory of the Presbyterians was almost complete, for in that year Parliament passed the famous Act of Annexation by which the temporalities of benefices including these of the bishoprics were annexed to the crown. (66) And so "Presbytery triumphed for a time." (67) Soon, however, the tables were turned, and when in 1606 Parliament restored Episcopacy it did so "according to the terms of the Leith Convention." (68) On this occasion Parliament enacted that the estate of bishops should be restored to its ancient and accustomed powers and privileges "as the same was in the Reformed Kirk most ample and free at anytime before the Act of Annexation foresaid." (69) In other words, the system which was set up in 1572 and which managed to survive until 1597, was regarded as having established a precedent. Later leaders decided that they could do no better than to revive the main points of the earlier legislation. We would like to make this point perfectly clear. The Leith Convention of 1572, the Eighteenth Parliament of James VI. in 1606 and the Glasgow Assembly of 1610 are all closely related to each other, and the historian who fails to note their mutual interdependence will be quite unable to come to a complete understanding of this subject.

(65) Grub, Ecclesiastical Hist Scotland II. p. 179.
(66) See below p. 28.
(68) Cooper, C.U.A.P. p. 56.
(69) A.F.S. IV. p. 282.
The joint committee of state and Churchmen had agreed upon the return of Episcopacy. The regent also had reinforced the agreement with his approval. The securing of the consent of the Church through its Assembly was the one thing that now remained to be done. But without waiting to see whether the Church would approve or not, Morton, in whose possession the Archbishopric of St. Andrews now lay, presented John Douglas, Rector of the University, to the vacant see. The forms agreed upon at Leith were followed out. Douglas was elected by the chapter, and duly consecrated by Bishop Robert Stewart of Caithness, Superintendent John Spottiswoode of Lothian and Superintendent David Lindsay of Ross. We are told that these three brethren "laid their hands on him and embraced him in sign of admission to the archbishopric." (70) In accordance with the requirement of the ancient canons three consecrators took part in the ceremony, but as the Bishop of Caithness was merely a titular prelate, and as the other two had never been bishops of any sort, Episcopalian precisians have always regarded this and similar consecrations as invalid and irregular. Thus, according to Dr. Grub, "the new polity however outwardly fair and regular" was "a mere empty form." (71) Stephen takes a similar view. "The men appointed to the office of bishop under the Leith Concordat -- were mere titular bishops devoid of any episcopal character." (72) The first General Assembly following the Convention met at St. Andrews in March 1572. (73) As regards the recent Concordat it does not appear to have taken any definite action. It was not until the Assembly at Perth in August that the proceedings of the Convention came up for review. Realizing the importance of the subject with which it had to deal, the Assembly appointed a strong committee to consider the articles, and at the same time ordered any brethren who had anything to urge against the various decisions to convene along with the committee and to state their objections. (74) In accordance with these instructions the committee set about its task, and finally brought in the following resolution to which the Assembly with one voice adhered:

"Forsameekle as, in the Assemblie holdin in Leith in Januar last, certain commissioners were appointed to travell with the nobilitie and their commissioners, to reason and conclude upon diverse articles and heads that thought good to be conferred upon; according to which commissioun, they proceeded, at diverse diets and conventions, and finally concluded, for that time, upon the saids heads and articles, as the same produced in this Assemblie proport: In the which, being considered and read, are found certaine names, suche as Archbishop, Deane, Archdeacon, Chancellor, Chapter; which names were thought slandering and offensive to the ears of manie of the brethreyn, appearing to sound to Papistrle: Therefore the whole Assemblie, in one voice, as well these that were in commissioun at Leith, as others, solemnlie protest, that they meane not, by using of anie suche names, to ratifie, consent, and agree to anie kinds of Papistrle or superstition, and wish rather the saids names to be changed into others that are not slandering nor offensive. And in like maner protest, that the saids heads and articles agreed upon be onlie receaved as an interim, till further and more perfite order may be obteaned at the hands of the king's Majestie's regent and nobilitie, for which they will preasse, as occasion sail serve." (75)

(70) Calderwood III. pp. 205-207; Spottiswoode II. p. 172.
(72) Stephen: Hist. Scottish Church. II. p. 90. Prof. Cooper takes another view as regards these consecrations. C.U.A.P. p. 52.
(74) B.U.K. I. p. 244; Calderwood III. p. 220.
The aim and purport of this resolution is in our opinion quite clear. We are consequently all the more surprised to find that among modern writers somewhat different views exist with regard to its meaning and significance. Thus in Cunningham's opinion the resolution shows that "the whole Church in General Assembly convened thus gave its consent to the concordat of Leith." This writer is careful to add that this was a reluctant consent and that the Assembly would regard the new arrangement as "merely temporary."(76) Miss MacGregor, on the other hand, appears to find the real significance of the resolution in the objection raised by some of the brethren to the old Romish titles. "The General Assembly," so runs her comment, "protested against the use of the titles desired by the Government."(77) If a choice has to be made between these two statements we would certainly be prepared to accept and to defend the opinion expressed by Cunningham. Miss MacGregor's treatment of the Assembly's action is altogether satisfactory. She appears to have been misled by the committee's use of the word "protest." The word of course is susceptible to several shades of meaning, and here it is used not in the sense of "giving a declaration of opinion against" something but rather as synonymous with the word "affirm." The Assembly did protest, it is true, but only in this latter sense. It is evident that certain brethren had been expressing dissatisfaction at the return of the obnoxious hierarchical titles. The Assembly did not join them in a merely negative protest against the old names. Rather it issued a positive protestation to the effect that by the use of the titles no Romanism or superstition was intended. It added that it would prefer to see the said names changed into others. But to return from this digression, we hold that the meaning and purport of the Assembly's resolution is not to be mistaken. It must be regarded as giving the Church's consent to the Leith agreement. This consent was doubtless qualified and reluctant, and given only in the hope of a change in the future. But as far as the immediate future was concerned the heads and articles agreed upon at Leith were to be put into effect. "If it is plain from the records that there were ministers in the Church who had no love to the Leith Convention, it is equally clear that the leading Reformers, Crakine, Craig and others, were determined to carry it into execution."(78) Prof. Cooper's words well express our own opinion on the subject.

In accordance with the will of the Church and the terms of the Concordat a fair beginning was made towards filling up the bishoprics made vacant by death or forfeiture. John St. Clair, Bishop of Dunkeld, James Paton was elected, and his consecration appears to have been effected in the Spring of 1573.(79) The archiepiscopal See of Glasgow was conferred on James Boyd of Trochrig.(80) George Douglas, the natural son of the Earl of Angus, received the Bishopric of Moray.(81) Alexander Hepburn got that of Ross,(82) and Andrew Graham that of Dunblane.(83) We have already noted the elevation of John Douglas to be Archbishop of St. Andrews.(84) The consecration of these prelates introduced a new element into the ecclesiastical life of Scotland. The Kirk once more had two archbishops and under each of them a number of diocesan bishops. Each of these prelates was clothed with an historic and high-sounding title. At first glance it might have appeared to an observer that the Scottish Church had once again become definitely Episcopal in the form of its government. A more careful study would have dispelled this illusion. For there remained several important points at which the new Episcopacy differed both from that of the contemporary Roman or Anglican brand. For the purposes of this study it is

(76) Cunningham "Church Hist." p. 344.
(77) MacGregor, "Origins." p. 100.
(78) Cooper, C.U.A.P. p. 49.
(80) Keith, Catalogue. p. 251; Calderwood III. p. 302.
(81) Keith, Catalogue. p. 151; Calderwood III. p. 302.
(84) See above p. 17.
necessary that we note the most outstanding difference here, namely, the subjection of the entire hierarchy to the control and censure of the democratic General Assembly. To the record of the relations of bishops and Assembly we must now turn.

The Leith agreement had declared that the archbishops and bishops were to possess no further jurisdiction in spiritual matters than the superintendents had enjoyed. It also stated that all prelates were to be subject to the Kirk and Assembly in spiritualibus as they were to the king in temporallibus. And without delay or delay the Assembly set itself to see that these agreements were honoured and these conditions fulfilled. The first Assembly after the Convention met in St. Andrews in March 1572. In the third session John Tyram, Superintendent of Fife, demitted his office. Life of course lay largely within the bounds of the Diocese of St. Andrews, and as John Douglas had just been elected Archbishop a month before, Tyram doubtless considered that the new primate should be required to visit his diocese himself. The Assembly, however, refused to accept Tyram's resignation. It ordained him to continue the exercise of his authority in those parts not subject to the archbishop. In like manner it directed the Superintendents of Angus and Lothian to remain on duty in the districts to which they had been appointed. A glance at an ecclesiastical and diocesan map of Scotland will show that the Diocese of St. Andrews extended across both Tay and Forth into Angus and Lothian. The following Assembly, that of August 1572, declared that the diocese of St. Andrews pertained in the matter of planting and visiting to the Archbishop. The Assembly was evidently determined to keep the new primate busy at his duties of superintending his diocese. It is, however, not the only one in an official position to have been criticised. At the highly esteemed Superintendent of Angus, John Frisken of Dun, and against certain commissioners of provences complaints were also made. The case of Alexander Gordon, Bishop of Galloway, also came up before the Assembly for its consideration. We have seen that in 1569 Gordon had been inhibited from exercising any function in the Kirk and that early in 1571 John Row had become responsible for the pastoral oversight of Galloway. And there had been no Covention of Leith. Gordon would probably have grown less and less interested in Church affairs, and in time would probably have been dropped from the notice of the Assembly. But the events of 1572 made this impossible. The ancient sees were to be filled again. What then of the See of Galloway? The Church leaders thus found themselves required to make a choice between two lines of action. Ought they adhere to their former position, that of 1569, and refuse to grant Gordon recognition or, in view of the Concordat of 1572, ought they rather to ignore the past and allow him a fresh start? With commendable firmness they determined to follow the former course. The Bishop was forbidden to exercise any function in the Kirk, and John Row was ordered to summon him to appear at the next Assembly.

In the Assembly of March 1573 complaint of failure to preach and visit was raised against the Archbishop. And yet it should be noticed that he was not the only one in an official position to have been criticised. Against the highly esteemed Superintendent of Angus, John Frisken of Dun, and against certain commissioners of provences complaints were also made. The case of Alexander Gordon, Bishop of Galloway, also came up before the Assembly for its consideration. We have seen that in 1569 Gordon had been inhibited from exercising any function in the Kirk and that early in 1571 John Row had become responsible for the pastoral oversight of Galloway. And there had been no Covention of Leith. Gordon would probably have grown less and less interested in Church affairs, and in time would probably have been dropped from the notice of the Assembly. But the events of 1572 made this impossible. The ancient sees were to be filled again. What then of the See of Galloway? The Church leaders thus found themselves required to make a choice between two lines of action. Ought they adhere to their former position, that of 1569, and refuse to grant Gordon recognition or, in view of the Concordat of 1572, ought they rather to ignore the past and allow him a fresh start? With commendable firmness they determined to follow the former course. The Bishop was forbidden to exercise any function in the Kirk, and John Row was ordered to summon him to appear at the next Assembly.
When the next Assembly convened the Archbishop of S. Andrews was criticised in the usual manner. (94) The newly created Bishop of Dunkeld now had his first experience of the Assembly's correcting rod. It was said of him that he had received the name but had not exercised the office of a bishop. Much graver was the charge that he had entered into a simoniacal pact with the Duke of Argyll. (95) In the fourth session the Bishop of Galloway was summoned to appear. He was accused on a long list of charges. The chief ground of complaint against him appears to have been that he had sided with Queen Mary's party during the late troubles, whereas the Church as a whole had steadily adhered to that of the regents of the young King James. (96) All Galloway's actions as a cleric in the following of the queen were charged against him. He made a speech in his own defense, but the Assembly was not satisfied, and it finally commanded him to make public repentance in sack-cloth under pain of excommunication. (97)

Five prelates were present at the Edinburgh Assembly in March 1574, namely, S. Andrews, Glasgow, Dunkeld, Moray and Caithness. (98) S. Andrews, Moray and Dunkeld were each subjected to severe criticism. Against Moray in particular a grave charge of immorality was raised. (99) The Assembly, however, was content not merely to rebuke and scandalize him. To give public exposure went further, and in the third session passed an act "Anent the Episcopal jurisdiction." The text of this important act is as follows: "Teaching the jurisdiction of bishops in their ecclesiastical functions, the Assembly hath concluded, that the same shall not exceed the jurisdiction which superintendents have heretofore had, and presentlie have; and that they shall be subject to the discipline of the General Assembly, as superintendents have been herefore in all sorts, as members thereof. That no superintendents or commissioners to plant kirkis shall give collation of benefices, or admit ministers, without the assistance of three qualified ministers of the province, and their testimonials subscribed with their hands, in signe of their consents. And, in like manner, that no bishop give collation of any benefice within the bounds of superintendents within his diocie, without their consent and testimonial subscribed with their hands; and that bishops within their owne diocies visit by themselves where no superintendents are; and give no collation ordinar upon benefices, without consent of three well qualified ministers, as said is of superintendents and commissioners to plant kirkis."

As will be seen at a glance this act falls into two main divisions, and thus both in form and subject matter it bears a strong resemblance to Article VI in the section "Anent Archbishops and Bishops" of the Leith agreement. (101) In the first half of the act the Assembly reaffirmed the position upon which the Church had taken its stand at Leith. The Episcopal jurisdiction was not to exceed that of the old superintendents, while like superintendents all bishops were to be subject to the discipline of the Assembly. The provisions in the second part of the act which state as necessary the assistance of three qualified ministers in the matter of collation of benefices are important. They recall the substance of the second part of Article VI, which was to the effect that the bishop was to follow the advice of at least six of the most learned members of the chapter in admitting "such as shall have function in the kirk." (102) The Church now possessed the Episcopate, but at the same time it was her...
intention to remove this order to a position of minor importance, and to hedge it about with strict constitutional limitations. (103) Thus she was determined in important matters such as the admission of ministers and the presentation to benefices the bishops and superintendents should be closely dependent on the advice and assistance of the ordinary ministry. In this determination Scottish Churchmen were all unwittingly beating out another precedent which was to play its part in 1610. (104)

The above enactment was followed by another of amore stringent character passed in the seventh session of the August Assembly of 1574. “The Assembly ordained, that bishops, superintendents, and commissioners, that shall be found negligent in their office, not to execute their debtful charge in their visitation and teaching, or culpable in life, shall be punished and corrected according to the quality of their offences, either by admonition, public repentance, deprivation for a time, or deprivation simpliciter, as the Assembly shall think good.” (105) In this piece of legislation it will be seen that the Assembly issued a forceful and uncompromising assertion of its sovereign authority over all Churchmen.

It would be tedious to give a detailed account of the manner in which each succeeding Assembly brought up the bishops’ conduct for review and handed out rebukes according to the measure of their faults. In the matter of complaint and censure one Assembly was very much like another. But we may note that the famous Assembly of August 1576(106) restored to favour that old offender Bishop Alexander Gordon of Galloway. The brethren declared themselves satisfied with his repentance, and gave him permission to preach and to assist the Commissioner of Galloway in his work of visitation. (107) And yet while they were willing to restore one prelate the members of Assembly did not hesitate to order the deprivation of another. Exasperated by the simoniacal bargaining and procrastinating conduct of the Bishop of Dunkeld the Assembly of April 1576 resolved to deprive him of his office as far as lay in their power forever. (108) In the same Assembly the Archbishop of Glasgow and the Bishops of Dunblane and Moray were sharply criticised, while the Bishop of Ross was warned to be diligent in visitation. (109)

We need now trace the history of the relations of bishops and Assembly no farther, and that for two reasons. First of all, we believe that the facts narrated above make it abundantly clear that the Assembly by its firmness and persistence had won for itself a place of unrivalled supremacy in the government of the Church. Bishops, Superintendents and commissioners had all smarted under its correction, and bowed to its control. Certain deposition awaited them, they realized, if they failed to abide by its decrees. This was a fact of great consequence, and Scottish Churchmen as a whole have never forgotten it. They remembered it in the Glasgow Assembly of 1610, and incorporated a recognition of it in the Heads and Articles adapted then. (110) Secondly, it should be observed that by 1577 that the whole Leith Convention System was being rapidly undermined and discredited. A new party had arisen in the Kirk, bitterly opposed to Episcopacy, and prepared to carry on an unrelenting warfare against it. A time of confused and bitter controversy now set in, during which the Convention System had little opportunity of producing worth while results. Soon under the successful attacks of its opponents it collapsed altogether. Cooper. C. U.A.P. pp. 46-46.

(103) See Below pp. 111-113.
(104) Famous because of John Duni’s historic protest. See below p.12.
(109) Article IX. of the Glasgow Assembly. See below pp. 118-120.
The Third Phase—The Act of Annexation. (1575-1587.)

It would be of little real use or value for us to trace in detail the decline and fall of the Episcopacy of the Leith Convention. Nor are we required to enter here upon an examination of the causes which led to its unhappy failure and final disappearance. A discussion of this subject may be found in any Church History dealing with the period. But just as we have uncovered a number of valuable precedents of the 1610 legislation by reviewing the history of the Leith Episcopal system up to 1575, so we may be able to expose certain other facts of equal value if we continue to trace the story of the Episcopal order throughout the days of its discredit and decline. And so to a rapid review of the leading ecclesiastical events of the third group of years, 1575-1587, we now turn.

At the outset, we may add that we do not feel ourselves bound for the purposes of this study to enter upon a discussion of the character and influence of the great Presbyterian champion Andrew Melville. Still we may note that from the time of his return to Scotland in 1574 until the day of his departure for London in 1586 he easily filled the position of being Scotland's foremost ecclesiastic. In him, Scottish Churchmen "found a leader who by his vigor and ability was to prove no unworthy successor of Knox." His influence was enormous, and up to the time of his imprisonment in England the full strength of this power was exerted towards banishing Episcopacy from the Scottish Church. He got the name of "Episcoporum Exactor, the finger out of Bishops.*" Whether or not, as Spottiswoode asserts and M'Crie denies, it was he who upon the occasion of August 1575 stirred up John Durie to call in question the lawfulness of Episcopal government, it is at least clear that the raising of this question was contemporaneous with one of his earliest appearances in the Assembly. Moreover, it is perfectly certain that it was he who supplied much of the brains and energy in the controversy which was just about to begin. Both in public and in private he urged his Presbyterian views upon the other Church leaders. He did this "with a zeal and learning which they were unable or unwilling to resist, and in every successive Assembly he renewed the assault till the System established in 1572 was finally overthrown." We now turn to the two Assemblies of 1575 for this was the year when "began the innovations to break forth that to this day, have kept it (the Church) in a continual uneasiness." (118)

The first Assembly of 1575 met at Edinburgh in March. While not so important as the gathering of the following August, yet it is worthy of note and mention since its members gave evidence that they were becoming dissatisfied with the existing form of the Kirk's government. The Assembly appointed a strong committee to examine and to report upon the question of ecclesiastical polity. This committee on the Polity and Jurisdiction of the Kirk included Andrew Melville who was now present at the Assembly for the first time. Direction was also given to the members of the Committee to the effect that no one was to be elected to a bishopric until he had given proof of his

(111) M'Crie, Life of Melville I. p. 56; Melville, Diary p. 44.
(112) M'Crie, Life of Melville II. p. 156.
(113) Young, Hist. Scotland. II. pp. 163-164.
(114) Melville, Diary p. 52.
(115) Spottiswoode II. p. 200.
(118) Spottiswoode II. p. 200.
(120) B.U.K. I. pp. 325-326; Calderwood III. pp. 343-344.
qualifications before the Assembly. Meanwhile all elections by cathedral chapters were forbidden. (122) According to the order which had now become common the August Assembly of 1575 began its work with the examination of the lives, conversation and doctrine of bishops, superintendents and commissioners of provinces. (123) At this point John Durie, one of the Ministers of Edinburgh, rose and protested that acquiescence in the present trial of the bishops must not be regarded as prejudicing the reasons which he and certain of his brethren had against the Episcopal office and name. (124) This was the first shot in the century long Presbyterian- Episcopal warfare. The question raised by Durie came up before the Assembly at a later session. Formal inquiry was then made as to whether or not the existing estate of bishops had their functions grounded upon the Word of God. To this another question was appended: should the Chapters which elected them, be tolerated in a Reformed Kirk? (125).

In formulating a reply the Assembly acted with extreme caution. It appointed a committee on which were included a number of well known figures, such as Melville, John Craig, John Row and David Lindsay. These brethren eventually brought in an extremely important resolution. Its tone, to begin with, is somewhat evasive. It reads as follows: "They think it not expedient presently to answer directly to the first question; but if any bishop shall be found who hath not such qualifications as the Word of God requireth, that he be tried by the General Assembly de novo, and so deposed." These introductory remarks were followed by a clear statement of the Presbyterian theory of the ministerial office:

"The points wherein they agree concerning the office of a bishop or superintendent. First, the name of Bishop is common to all them who have a particular flock, over the which they have a peculiar charge, as well to preach the Word, as to minister the sacraments, and execute ecclesiastical discipline, with consent of their elders. And this is their chief function of the Word of God. At tour, out of this number may be chosen some, to have power to oversee and visit such reasonable bounds beside their own flocke, as the general Kirk shall appoint; and in these bounds to appoint ministers, with consent of the ministers of that province, and with consent of the flockes to whom they shall be appoint. Also, to appoint elders and deacons in everie particular congregation where there is none, with consent of the people thereof and to suspend ministers for reasonable causes, with consent of the ministers foresaid." (126)

This affirmation was also approved by the following (127) Assembly, that of April 1576. It was, however, given a sharper edge by the addition of the following clauses: "And to the effect the said articles, descended upon to the said Kirk, may be the better followed out, and ready execution ensue thereupon, as appertained, ordain the bishops who have not as yet received the charge of a particular congregation to condescend upon the morne, what particular flocke they will accept to take the cure of." (128)

The bishops present were then asked if they would accept the cure of some particular flock as the Assembly desired. Moray promised that he would do as the Assembly wished. Ross consented to accept the Chancellor of Ross, while Dunblane was assigned to minister in his Cathedral Church. (129) The Archbishop of Glasgow made reply in writing to the effect that he would make formal answer to the question at the next Assembly.

(121) B.U.K. I. p. 331; Calderwood III. p. 347.
(129) B.U.K. I. pp. 359-360; Calderwood III. p. 357.
When in due course this body convened the inquiry was accordingly renewed. Glasgow then produced a written answer. He reminded his brethren that the system established at Leith had behind it the authority of the State as well as that of the Church, and he protested that if he were to acquiesce in revolutionary ecclesiastical changes he would be failing in his duty to the king. He promised, however, that without prejudicing his episcopal position he would take charge of a particular congregation. In this offer the Assembly was forced to acquiesce, for as Calderwood points out the brethren "could not use their full authority because the regent bearing the rule for the time was earnestly set for the estate of bishops." When the government passed out of Morton's hands first in 1578 and finally in 1580 the dissolution of the episcopal authority was rapid.

The attention of the Assembly was also drawn to the fact that the scholarly and distinguished Patrick Adamson had been presented to the Archbishopric of St. Andrews which had recently become vacant through the death of the aged John Douglas. Certain members asked that in accordance with the act passed in March 1575 Adamson should be tried before the Assembly before being elected by the chapter. But the Bishop-designate declared that he could not submit to an examination. The chapter soon afterwards elected him, and he thus became Archbishop in defiance of the Assembly's decree. In consequence of this the Assembly of April 1577 appointed a committee to summon both Adamson and the disobedient chapter to answer for their conduct before them.

Meanwhile the committee on the polity of the Church had not been idle. Their labours were now so far advanced that in the Assembly last mentioned the "Heads" were in condition to be read over in public audience. In October 1577 report was made that the revised scheme of church government was now ready to be submitted to the regent. Finally this "Book of Policy" was presented to Parliament in June 1578. But the "Lords of the Articles" after some evasive quibbling refused to ratify it.

The Assembly of April 1578, of which Andrew Melville was Moderator, decreed that in future all bishops and other ecclesiastical personages should be addressed only by their Christian names or by the general term "brethren." All chapters were prohibited from making elections until the next Assembly. When this next gathering convened it enacted as follows: "Allowing the act made in the Assembly, the 28th of April 1578, concerning election of bishops and superintendents till this present Assembly, and further order reserved thereto, the General Assembly, all in one voice hath concluded and provided, that the said act shall be extended to all times to come; and that the corruption of the estate of bishops be allaterly taken away; and that all bishops already elected be required particularlie to submit themselves to the General Assembly of the Kirk, concerning the reformation of the corruption of the estate of bishops in their persons: Which, if they refuse, after due admonitoun, excommunication to proceed against them."

(132) Calderwood III. p. 271.
(134) See above pp. 271-273.
(139) Spottiswoode II. pp. 256-257; Calderwood III. pp. 429-430.
(140) B.U.K. II. p. 404; Calderwood III. p. 403.
(141) B.U.K. II. pp. 408-409; Calderwood III. pp. 403-404.
(142) B.U.K. II. p. 413; Calderwood III. p. 411.
Very few vestiges of episcopal power now survived, but it remained for the July Assembly of 1580 to see to it that "the last stone of the episcopal fabric was thrown down." (144) In the fourth session the Assembly "damned" the office of bishops in the following sweeping terms: "Forasmuche as the office of a bishop, as it is now used, and communie takin within this realme, hath no sure warrant, authoritive, nor good ground, out of the Booke and Scriptures of God, but brought in by the follie and corruption of men's inventions, to the great overthrow of the true kirk of God, the whole Assemblie of the kirk, in one voice, after libertie givin to all men to reason in the mater, none oppoyning themselves in defence of the said pretended office, findeth and deoaleth the samyn pretended office, used and termed as is above said, unlawfull in the self, as having nather fundament, ground, nor warrant in the Word of God; and ordeannah that all suche persons as bruike, or hereafter shall bruike, the said office, to be charged simpliciter to disnit, quite, and lave off the samyn, as an office wherunto they are not called by God: And siyleyske, to desist and cease from all preaching, ministraction of the sacraments, or using anie way the office of pastors, while they receive, denovo, admission from the Generall Assemblie of the kirk, uner the pains of excommunicacion to be used against them: wherin, if they be found disobedient, or controvene this act in anie point, the sentence of excommunicacion, after due admonition, to be executed against them." (145)

This as even a careless glance will show was a most drastic measure, but the victorious Presbyterian party having seen their cause triumphant did not retreat from their position, and the Glasgow Assembly of 1581 in terms even more severe and explicit ratified the action of the previous year. "As for the act made in the Assemblie holdin at Dundie, against bishops, becaus some difficultie appeared to some brethren to arise out of the word office, contenied in the said act, what sould be meant thereby, the Assemblie, to take away the said difficultie, and to cleare the true meaning of the said act, deoaleth, that they meant whoillie to condemne the whole estats of bishops, as they are now in Scotland, and that the samyn was the determinatyon and conclusion of the Assemblie at that time." (146)

As far as the Assembly could effect the days Episcopacy, both thing and name, were now at an end in the Church of Scotland. In the new Book of Poliole a full grown Presbyterian System had been elaborated. Presbyterianism was thus ready to take Episcopacy's place. This same Glasgow Assembly of 1581 accordingly resolved that "the Booke of Poliole, agreed to in diverse Assemblies before, sall be registred in the Acts of Assemblie, and remain therin ad perpetuum rei memoriam (147) and the oopels therof to be takin by everie presbyterie." (148) These last words remind us that that key court, the presbytery, was now in existence and functioning. The story of its origins and development, however, does not concern us here. (149)

(146) B.U.K. II. pp. 474-475; Calderwood III. p. 525.
(147) W. L. Mathieson suggests that the use of this phrase betrays the fact that at this time the Kirk had little real hope of having its claims recognised by the State. Mathieson, "Politics and Religion," I. p. 221.
(149) The relevant facts may be found in MacGreor's Origins, pp. 111-118.
As one reviews the above series of resolutions and enactments, it becomes clear that the Church, to use Mathieson's phrase, had definitely "receded from its compact with the state." (150) In 1572 it and the state had agreed to the return of the bishops; by 1586 it had formally condemned the Episcopal order, and as far as it was able had shaken off the Episcopal yoke. The important question, however, remained to be answered: What would the state now do? Would it give its assent to the changes introduced by the Church or, following the precedent of an earlier day, would it endeavor to preserve the clerical estate intact? An answer was not long in forthcoming, and once it was given a pitched battle between Church and State began. That happened was briefly this.

A certain nobleman, Es. D'Aubigne, generally known as Lord D'Aubigne, and a cousin of the king, arrived from France in 1579. Despite the fact that the Reformed ministers both feared and hated him, suspecting him and rightly for a disguised Papist, this accomplished and graceful courtier won an immediate influence over the young king. James soon created him Duke of Lennox from this high position he cast covetous eyes upon the now vacant Archdiocese of Glasgow. Archbishop Boyd had died in 1581, and Lennox now entered into a simoniacal compact with Robert Montgomery, the minister of Stirling. By this agreement Montgomery was to receive the Archdiocesan dignity plus a pension, while the great bulk of the revenue was to be handed over to the Duke. This unblushing simony, together with such a manifest disregard for its decrees, had the effect of thoroughly rousing the Church, and a sharp and determined struggle between the ecclesiastical and civil jurisdictions was the result. (151)

To the general historian this and the other events of this exciting period are of intense interest, but as they have little real importance from the viewpoint of our special studies, we must hasten over them in a few words. Lennox became a leading figure in a vast intrigue. From this grave danger both Church and Nation were delivered by the seizing of the royal person by the Ruthven raiders in 1582. (152) The Church openly welcomed the success of the raid, since it saw in it the frustration of the dread Popish Plot. But before it could greatly profit by what had happened young James had escaped from his custodians. The nobles made submission and were forgiven, but a group of extreme Churchmen, including Andrew Melville, remained defiantly unrepentant, and were eventually forced to seek asylum in England. (153)

A few sentences must now be devoted to the subject of the king. James was still in years but a boy, but he had already begun to manifest a decided preference for Episcopal rule in Church affairs. He had evidently come to realize that Presbyterianism, with its popular and representative assemblies, was an institution altogether inconsistent with his own pretensions towards absolute kingship. As regards Episcopacy he was more hopeful, and disastrously, so far as the future of this order in Scotland was concerned, the titular primate Patrick Adamson was only too ready to fall in with the royal designs. The result was of course that Episcopacy stood revealed as the ally of political despotism and as a mere "pendage of royalty." (154)

(154) These last words are E. C. Selwyn's, see his edition of "The Irenicum of John Forbes of Corie," p. 16.
The collapse of the Ruthven Raid and the flight of the Presbyterian leaders gave the king a splendid opportunity to humble the Church's power. In the Parliament of 1584 a group of acts were passed at the royal instigation "almost entirely subversive of the rights hitherto enjoyed by the Church."(155) To Presbyterian writers they have been known by the sinister title of "The Black Acts." They were four in number. The first declared the king to be supreme over all persons and all estates.(156) The second ratified the ancient jurisdiction of the three estates, and pronounced it treason to speak evil of any one of them.(157) The third required all assemblies to seek and to receive a royal license.(158) The fourth placed the chief ecclesiastical power in the hands of the bishops.(159) By these enactments the State, as now directed by the king, gave a clear and unmistakable answer to the challenge issued by the Church several years before. In 1580 the Assembly had declared that as far as it could decide, the bishops must go.(160) Parliament now gave answer by affirming that Episcopacy was to remain an integral part of the civil constitution. And the State was now in a position to see that its legislative affirmations were carried out. The immediate results of this collision between the ecclesiastical and civil powers are matters which we need not rehearse here. It will be sufficient to note that in 1686 Church and State again entered upon a compromise in their endeavor to find some common ground of agreement.(161)

There have been times when we have thought it strange that Prof. Cooper, who as a rule was so diligent in searching out the legal and experimental precedents of the 1610 legislation, should have neglected to draw attention to the compromise arrived at in 1536. It may have been that he considered the matter too unimportant to discuss, and it is true that the compromise which proved itself to be of a purely temporary character had little effect on the course of succeeding events. But at the same time the compromise had its interesting and enlightening aspects, for it indicated certain grooves into which the minds of Scotsmen now naturally fell, when they attempted to solve the Episcopal problem. That is to say, it showed clearly that the Church leaders had made up their minds that if the bishops were to be retained the resultant Episcopacy was to be of a severely limited and constitutional kind. Following a conference between a number of the royal council and certain brethren the Assembly of 1586 in Its 10th and 11th sessions made among others the following declarations: "that by the name of a Bishop, they onlie mean of suche a bishop as Is described by Paul. . . . It Is agreed, that the bishop may be appointed by the Generall Assemblie to visit certain bounds to be limited to him; and, in visitation therof, he sail proceed by advice of the synodall assemblie, and suche as they sail adjoyne unto him. . . . He sail be subject, in respect he is a pastor, as other pastors are, to be tryed and censured in his life and doctrine, by the presbyterie or the synodall assemblie; and becaus he hath commissione of the Generall Assemblie, in that respect to be tryed by them." (162)

An examination of these pronouncements will indicate that the Church with extreme reluctance had once more consented to a modified and constitutional Episcopacy. But how strict were the limitations now attached to the office. Now closely

(156)A.P.S. III. pp. 292-293.
(157)A.P.S. III. p. 293.
(158)A.P.S. III. p. 293.
(159)A.P.S. III. pp. 293-294.
(160)See above p. 25.
(162)Calderwood. IV. p. 559.
was the Assembly endeavoring to hedge about and to restrict any independent action on the part of the bishop himself. In fact, little more of Episcopal dignity than the name, now survived. And that could have gone also had the brethren been able to cast it aside. As one has remarked, "James could not yet erect bishops who were bishops indeed, but the horns of the mitre and the hated name of bishop were not removed from the fold."(163) We shall have cause to return to the compromise of 1586, when we deal with the 1610 enactments. (164)

Meanwhile we must hurry on to the year 1587. In the Parliament of this year was passed the famous Act annexing the temporalities of all benefices to the crown.(165) It was the poverty stricken condition of the royal revenues that prompted this step. James agreed to it in the hope that it would provide some financial relief.(166) The day came when he was to regret that he had anything to do with the matter. But that is another story. The importance of this act in Scottish Church History cannot be overestimated. "By this Act, as was fully understood at the time, Episcopacy as it had been established in England was once for all made impossible in Scotland."(167) From the Presbyterian side, the Act came to be regarded as a Parliamentary success. The Presbyterian leaders certainly did not like to see so much ecclesiastical property secularised, but if secularisation meant the passing of Episcopacy they were willing to pay the price. And so with the year 1587 we enter upon a ten year's period of Presbyterian ascendancy. We may note in closing that Patrick Adamson, Archbishop of St. Andrews, had made a modified submission to the Assembly in 1586 and that he ended his troubled career in poverty and neglect in 1591.(168) The following year Presbyterianism was established by law.(169)

(163) Lang, History of Scotland II. p. 319.
(164) See below p. 119.
(165) A.P.S. III. pp. 431-437.
(169) A.P.S. III. pp. 541-542.
Appendix I

I. The Constitutional Motive. In common with the members of their class throughout Europe, Scottish statesmen and politicians of that day had grown accustomed to think of society and the state as being bound up with the existence and perpetuation of three fundamental Estates: Clergy, Nobles and Commons. But as events had taken their course in Scotland, one of these Estates, the Clerical, was in danger of imminent disappearance. Legally and constitutionally the spiritual Estate still occupied its old and accustomed place, but practically, due to the death and removal of its members, it was rapidly ceasing to exist. Consider for example the depleted condition of the Scottish Episcopalate. James Hamilton, last Romanist archbishop of Saint Andrews, had been hanged at Stirling in April 1571.(1) Archbishop Beaton of Glasgow had been living in France since 1550. There was little likelihood of his ever returning to Scotland.(2) Upon Bishop William Chisholm of Dunkblane the hand of the victorious Protestant party had fallen heavily. In 1567 he had been forced to go into exile for his faith.(3) Bishop Lesley of Ross had been confined to an English prison by Queen Elizabeth on account of his active devotion to the interests of his own imprisoned queen.(4) The Bishops of Foray and Aberdeen were growing old, and they with Crichton of Dunkeld had been "forsaulted" by the Parliament of August 1571.(5) The so-called Archbishop of Brechin was in reality a Protestant layman. The majority of the vacant prelates were Protestants, and some of them were doing more or less effective service under the direction of the Reformed Church. It was not to be expected, however, that they would live forever. Clearly the Scottish Episcopalate was in no very healthy or flourishing condition, and it was becoming increasingly evident that something decisive must be done soon if it was not to vanish away. On such a possibility Scottish political leaders looked with grave apprehension. The prospect was plainly a most disturbing one. "Was it politic to allow the Spiritual Estate--the first estate in the realm--to come to naught? Would the throne be safe, would the aristocracy be safe, in presence of the rising power of the burghs, without the aid of the clergy?"(6) So thoughtful men reasoned, and the result was the determination that in some way or other the clerical estate should be preserved.

II. The Political Motive. The Earl of Moray became Regent of Scotland in September 1571.(7) Throughout his short regency, however, the real power behind the throne was the overbearing and rapacious Earl of Morton. The latter personage continued to follow what had now become the traditional Protestant policy of maintaining a close alliance with England "upon the basis of identity in religious opinion."(8) Moreover it is evident that he looked forward to the future, and planned for an eventual union of the two British kingdoms.(9) But before the two realms could be united politically it was necessary

(7) Calderwood III. p. 141.
that they should be agreed in matters of doctrinal belief and church government. Upon questions of doctrine the English and Scottish Churches of that day were essentially one. It was in the sphere of ecclesiastical polity that divergence appeared. The government of the English Church was Episcopal in form. That of the Church of Scotland might be described as an incipient Presbyterianism. Episcopacy was established by law in England. Presbyterianism had never received parliamentary recognition in Scotland. The course to be followed was thus clear. Scotland must be brought into line with England, and Episcopacy reintroduced into the Scottish Church.

III. The Financial Motive. It is a notorious fact that much of the zeal with which the Scottish Protestant nobility fell to the work of overthrowing Romanism was due to the hope and prospect of appropriating as much as possible of the great wealth of the ancient Church to their own private ends. During the years following the Reformation, despite the constant protest of Reformed Churchmen, a vast and wide spread spoliation of ecclesiastical property took place. As we have seen the Privy Council had refused to sanction the Book of Discipline because of the avowed purpose of the Reformed Church to take over and to administer the property of the old regime. The process of spoliation, however, was not accomplished all at once. In 1561 the Council possibly under the pressure of Romish and courtly influence came to the strange decision to leave the old clergy in possession of two-thirds of the revenues of their benefices during their life-time and to divide the remaining one-third between the Reformed ministers and the crown. This decision, however, meant merely the postponing of a vexed matter for the space of a decade or so. For as the remaining pre-Reformation clerics died off the question was certain to be asked again. "What is to become of the property of the ancient Church?" "Into whose hands is this wealth to pass?" Now by 1571 time had thinned the ranks of the old clergy to such an extent that some reply to the question could not longer be postponed. To this inquiry the different parties in the state who were contending for the prize each made their own answer. The Church was determined, as far as it was able, to secure ecclesiastical property for ecclesiastical purposes. It was ready to go to great lengths to bring this about. It was willing even to suffer the return of the whole prelatical system upon the understanding, however, that both the titled clerics and the substantial revenues which accompanied their office should be under its direction and control. The Church already possessed superintendents, who were exercising many Episcopal functions. They had learned, moreover, that it was even possible to employ men who possessed Episcopal titles in the superintendent's office. If then she could get her superintendents, still kept in their position of subordination to the Assembly, recognized as bishops in the eyes of the law, she would be able to draw into her coffers through them the revenues which went with their sees. On the other hand, Horton who in this connection may be taken as a representative of his class, had made up his mind that the wealth of the Church should pass into lay hands and be applied to secular purposes. He wanted money for two reasons. In the first place he was naturally avaricious. Secondly, at this time (1571) his party was in sore need of financial supplies with which to carry on its struggle against the surviving adherents

(10) Macewen, History of the Church in Scotland II. p. 159.
(11) See above p. 7.
(14) A compact survey of this question will be found in Birnie's Short History of the Scottish Teinds. pp. 28-38.
(16) Subjugation of the bishops to the Assembly was as Prof. Cooper remarks, now regarded as a sine qua non. C.U.A.P. p. 44.
of Queen Mary. (17) But even Morton, bold and domineering though he was, did not dare seize the coveted property by any outward act of confiscation. To have done this would have been to have drawn down upon his head the wrath and denunciation of the united Protestant Church. And as Cunningham remarks, "the Church had already shown itself strong enough to pull down and set up rulers." (18) In this predicament the following solution of the problem presented itself. The Church must somehow be persuaded to consent to the restoration of the old hierarchical system. To the vacant offices of bishop, abbot and prior, certain Protestant ministers of a weak and complacent type might then be appointed. With these obliging clerics, however, a certain agreement would first have to be come. They would promise to fulfill the law's demands in drawing the revenues and signing receipts. They would then hand over the revenues, minus a certain commission, to their powerful lay patron. And in return for this service they would be permitted to use certain titles of ecclesiastical lordship. Needless to say the Church as a whole was at first kept in complete ignorance of these simoniacal proposals.

IV. The Ecclesiastical Motive. It must be noted that not only was the Church united in her resolve to secure, if possible, what she regarded as her rightful patrimony, she was equally determined that laymen should not receive ecclesiastical appointments. From a financial viewpoint this arrangement meant that laymen cheerfully pocketed the Church rents, while considered ecclesiastically it was resulting in the creation of a class of pseudo-Churchmen who bore no responsible relation to the courts of the Church. Now it is clear that the leading Churchmen had no excessive fondness for the Episcopal office, but in cases of necessity they might consent to see the bishops restored. But for a privileged group of meritorious laymen masquerading under clerical titles the Church leaders had nothing but anathema. (19) To oust them from their position of unlawful privilege was accordingly the Church's professed aim. In the Parliament which met at Stirling in August 1671 she petitioned, though in vain, that benefices be bestowed only on qualified persons who had first of all been tried and approved by the Church. (20) At the same time the Church was likewise determined to subordinate to her sway those ministers who in accordance with Morton's simoniacal designs were now being advanced to the vacant bishoprics. Thus when one of the ministers, John Douglas, was presented to the vacant see of Saint Andrews, the Superintendent of Fife at once forbade him to vote in Parliament under pain of excommunication until he had first been admitted by the Church. In reply Morton commanded him to vote under pain of treason. It was plain that the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions were rapidly drifting into a state of open hostility. Unless some concordat could be agreed upon the result would be serious.

Finally it must be recognized that, in sharp contrast to the attitude they were to take up within a few year's time, the leaders of the Scottish Church in 1671 had as yet raised no doctrinal or theoretical objection to Episcopacy. Their Confession of Faith had declared in 1650 that no one form of Church "policy" or "order" can be appointed for all ages, times and places. (22) They would have shrunk from affirming that Presbyterianism was the only lawful form of ecclesiastical polity. If anything is clear it is that Knox while alive to the practical abuses and

(20) Calderwood, III. p. 157.
(22) Knox, Works II. p. 113.
dangers which he had seen in contemporary Episcopal government (23) had never formulated any objection to Episcopacy on doctrinal grounds. As Dr. Macewen has put it, "he had not yet raised polity to the rank of dogma."(24) Among the other outstanding Reformers one at least, Erskine of Angus, had if anything definite Episcopal leanings. A letter from this veteran Reformer has come down to us. It was penned on November 10th, 1571. It was written to the Regent Mar protesting against the appointment to vacant prelacies of persons bearing no responsibility to the Church. Throughout this interesting document Erskine assumes that of the offices of bishop and superintendent are identical. He writes that to take the power of admission and oversight from the bishop and superintendent, "is to take away the office of a bishop that no bishop be in the Kirk, which were to alter and abolish the order which God hath appointed in his Kirk." He adds, "I understand a bishop or superintendent to be but one office, and where the one is the other is."(25) A later Presbyterian historian mournfully remarks that Erskine "could not well distinguish betwixt a bishop and superintendent."(26) This may be true, but from the point of view of this study the significant thing is not that he tried to find differences between the two offices but that fundamentally he believed them to be but one. Nor was he alone in holding this belief. Thus John Wynram, Superintendent of Fife, was evidently regarded by his flock as holding an office of episcopal character and significance. For when he died in 1582 he was remembered on his tombstone by the title of "Bishop of the people of Fife."(27) Clearly many Scottish Churchmen believed that they possessed the fact of Episcopacy in their superintendents. They were in consequence not likely to quarrel over the return of the name.

These were the four motives which led to the reintroduction of Episcopacy in 1572.

(23) MacGregor, Origins Scottish Presbyterian Polity, p. 22.
(26) The historian was Calderwood. See III. p. 162.
(27) Cooper, C.U.A.P. p. 44.
CHAPTER I.

"The Reestablishment of Episcopacy."

A. The Moderate Reaction.
B. The Aberdeen Assembly of 1606.
C. Constant Moderators and the Courts of High Commission.
We begin with the year 1596, usually regarded by historians as a turning point in the fortunes of the Scottish Church. With this year James Melville begins his account of "The Decaying Age of the Kirk of Scotland," (1) while his friend and fellow-warrior, Scot of Cupar, in his "Apologetical Narration" uses the same date to introduce his "Fifth Course," or that of "The Episcopall Government which now holdeth by Usurpation and Violence." (2) "In a word," writes Calderwood in summing up the matter, "the end of this year began that doolefull decay and declyning of this kirk, which has continued to this hour, proceeding from worse to worse; so that now we see such corruption as we thought not to have seene in our daies." (3) With the year 1596, therefore, this chapter begins.

Four years earlier, as we have seen above, Presbyterianism had been established by act of the Scottish Parliament. (4) It is interesting to note that in this legislation the second Book of Polity is never mentioned. (5) Certain of its provisions were given civil sanction, but as a whole the book never received the approval of Parliament. (6) It is also important to observe that at the same time the Act of 1584 in favour of the bishops was expressly annulled. (7) All presentations to benefices were henceforth to be directed to presbyteries. (8) In this way the ecclesiastical authority of the bishops vanished. But at the same time it must be pointed out that their civil rights and position remained intact. (9) In this particular the triumph of Presbyterianism came short of completeness in a way very similar to that of the Protestant victory in 1560. Episcopacy was banished from the Church, but it could still find a refuge in the constitution of the state. Accordingly from the Presbyterian point of view the settlement of 1592 was regarded as "not without its defects." (10) The name and presence of the bishop still remained. An examination of the acts of the Scottish Parliament will show that in the very body which established Presbyterianism in 1592 there sat pro clericis the Bishops of Dunkeld and Orkney, five "abbes" and one "prior." (11) "The horns of the mitre" were still to be seen in the ecclesiastical background.

From 1592 to 1596 was a time of Presbyterian ascendency, but in the eyes of the kin, its counsellors and most Moderate minded Churchmen, these were not years in which Presbyterianism did much to commend itself. The state as represented by the king and the Church as led by the Melvilles and their friends were constantly coming into collision with each other. As someone has well said the two jurisdictions "seem to have had the habit of disagreeing on every possible occasion." (12)

(1) Melville, Diary, p. 505.
(2) Soot, A.H., p. 56.
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(4) See above p. 28.
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(7) A.P.S. III, p. 542.
(8) A.P.S. III, pp. 542-543.
(12) Reid, Hist. Scottish Episcopal Church, Scottish Ecclesiastical Transactions, 1924, p. 7.
A never-dying fear of Papish conspiracies lay at the root of the Church's activity, and it lost no opportunity of impressing on the King the necessity of taking the sternest measures against all Romanists. In the resulting disputes the members of the Presbyterian party alienated much sympathy. For one thing their language was anything but chaste and dignified. Again the freedom with which they approached the royal person could hardly be defended. The constant bickerings between Church and State took a more serious turn in 1696 when one of the ministers, the Rev. David Black of St. Andrews, was summoned before the Council to answer for a sermon in which he had denounced Queen Elizabeth as an assert and the Anglican worship as a mere empty show. (13) Evidence collected later showed that on various occasions he had spoken in most abusive language of the King, the Queen, the Lords of Session and the members of the Privy Council. (14) In answer to the summons Black presented a "deinition," that is, a document in which the Council's jurisdiction over him as a minister was repudiated and declined. (15) The members of a strong committee appointed by the Assembly to keep watch in Edinburgh also subscribed the deinition, and then sent it down to the presbyteries for further signatures. Open war between Church and State was the result. (16)

The climax in this noisy controversy was reached in a blind and disordered tumult in Edinburgh on December 17th. What happened on that exciting and momentous day it is not our duty to relate here. But the results of this day of crisis are more important, and we must pause to take some notice of them. The events of the 17th of December, in Spottiswoode's words, brought a great alteration in the minds of the people." (17) As far as the King was concerned it is clear that the riot both frightened and infuriated him. Judging the tumult from the accounts which have come down to us it would have been strange if it had not done so. While it is probably rather strong to say that James "was impressed with an indelible sense of the fanaticism and disloyalty of the extreme Presbyterians," (18) yet it is certain that he was now driven to conclude that Presbyterianism tended inevitably towards disorder and towards the subversion of royal power. That "Presbytery was essentially anarchical and foul mouthed," (19) is a fairly accurate description of the opinion to which he had now come. It was a false opinion no doubt, but there it was, and with it in mind James resolved to reintroduce Episcopacy into the Scottish Church.

His task was now much easier than it would have been before. The events of December 1696 had not merely effected a change in his own mind; they had also made a deep impression on the conscience of a large body of the moderate minded clergy. Many of these ministers like their ruler had become persuaded that Presbyterianism was an impossible system. Under the violent oratory of the Presbyterian champions many of them must have long been restive. A famous member of the Moderate Episcopal School, John Forbes of Corse, writing at a later date, makes reference to "the most unworthy abuses from Scottish ministers" suffered by the King, "such as might well have alienated the mind of any prince altogether from the form of religion we profess." (20) In 1696 there were many other Moderates who could have echoed these words. And the tumult

(13) Spottiswoode III. p. 13; Calderwood V. p. 452.
of December the 17th finally convinced them that continued disorder and strife were bound to be the accompaniment of a Presbyterian Church System. Consequently they were quite willing to fall in with the king's Episcopal designs.

While dealing with the events of an earlier year, 1590, Scot of Cupar pauses in his Narrative to draw up a list of those present in the Assembly of that year who afterwards became bishops. (21) The list is a formidable one, and the significance of which we may well pause to consider. To Scot these men were but apostates and traitors from the lawfully established Presbyterian discipline. We, however, are unable to dismiss the question so easily. For when a group of Churchmen, as influential as those presented to us in this list, see it as to shift their ecclesiastical allegiance there must be some good reason for making the change. Why did these men abandon Presbyterianism? Well, we have just made mention of the chief reason for the change above. But there remains one other still to be noticed. This was the widespread conviction that no one kind of church government was anywhere laid down or commanded in Holy Scripture. Ecclesiastical polity was something, therefore, which could be discussed "salva fide et religionis." (22) It was at most a matter of secondary importance, second to the weightier matters of the Gospel such as a union of hearts and minds based on purity of faith and soundness of doctrine. A great reconciler of the next generation gave happy expression to this attitude when he declared, "The mode of church government is immaterial, but peace and concord, kindness and good-will are indispensable." (23) With such a sentiment the Moderes of 1596 would have agreed.

The events of December 1596 then finally resolved King James, and at the same time deeply impressed many of the ministers. These latter were now prepared to follow any lead the State might give. That lead was not long in coming. Shortly after the New Year the king summoned a General Assembly to meet at Perth in February. (24) In preparation for this gathering he sent a certain Sir Patrick Murray, styled by James Melville, "the Apostle of the North," into the north country to make the clergy there acquainted with the royal will and pleasure. (25) The majority of these men did not often come south to the Assemblies, and James hoped that if they rallied in sufficient numbers they would be able to outvote the extreme Presbyterians from the south. This hope was not disappointed, for when the commissioners assembled Melville declares that the northern men were there "in such numbers as was not wont to be seen in our Assemblies, and every one a greater courtier than the other." These brethren were not long in affecting to find fault with what they called "the Poperie of Edinburgh." Melville states that on this occasion his "eyes saw a new sight and ears heard new voices; viz. flocks of ministers going in and out at the King's palace late at night, and betimes in the morning." (26) All of which naturally grieved those whom the Presbyterian historian regarded as "the sinicerer sort of the ministry." (27)

They were still more grieved, however, when James Nicholson, hitherto the younger Melville's "special fellow soldier and companion in Christ," after a long

---

(21) Scot, A.N., p. 58.
(22) Such was the opinion of the well-known Moderate Churchman, Patrick Galloway, in his answer to the first of a series of fifty-five questions prepared by order of the king. Calderwood V. p. 597.
(26) Melville Diary, p. 403.
(27) Calderwood V. p. 606.
private interview with the king deserted the Presbyterian for the royal side. (28) Due to Nicholson's exertions it was concluded by a majority vote that the present Assembly was a lawful though "extraordinary" one. (29) This decision was important since it involved the question of the relation of the royal prerogative to the calling of ecclesiastical assemblies. The king then placed twelve propositions before the brethren to all of which after some delay submissive answers were returned. The chief of these declared it to be lawful for the king to make suggestions in matters affecting the external government of the Church which he desired to see resolved or reformed. (30)

The proceedings of the Perth Assembly were so much to the liking of the king that he summoned another to meet at Dundee in May. (31) In the ninth session of this gathering James pointed out that there were many matters requiring consideration which on account of the shortness of the time would have to be postponed unless the Assembly would consent to appoint a commission from among its members to meet with him to advise upon these matters. This reference to the possibility of a fixed and certain income had a powerful effect on many minds. The result was that the Assembly acceded to the royal request, and appointed a commission of fourteen members the majority of whom were well known. (32) Power was given to the fourteen or to any seven of them to convene and to advise the king. Among the commissioners were James Nicholson, the younger Melville's old friend—Robert Pont, the honoured minister of St. Cuthbert's Edinburgh—Robert Rollock, the Principal of the College of Edinburgh—David Lindsay, an old companion of Knox and one of the veterans of 1560 and Patrick Galloway, a zealot reclaimed from the Presbyterian camp and one of the leading Scottish Churchmen of his time. To Spottiswoode these commissioners were a band of "the most wise and discreet brethren." (34) To Calderwood, on the other hand, they were but "some few court ministers seeking advancement and preferment."

(35) The high Presbyterians felt very keenly about the appearance of this commission. Chiefly perhaps because they had not hesitated at an earlier date to make use of a similar expedient themselves. (36) But now by James' astute move the very instrument which they had used to govern the Church was taken out of their hands, and used against them. The commissioners, complained Calderwood, "were the king's led horse, and usurped boldly the power of the General Assembly and government of the whole kirk——."

"So they were as a wedge taken out of the kirk, to rent her with her own forces, and the very needle which drew in the thread of bishops." (37)

If King James hoped that the newly appointed commissioners would prove tractable, where his desires were concerned, he was not disappointed. In December 1597 a Parliament was held at Edinburgh. To this body the recently appointed commission presented a petition of revolutionary importance, asking that the Church might now be granted a voice

(34) Spottiswoode III. p. 50.
(35) Calderwood V. p. 646.
(36) See above p. 35.
(37) Calderwood V. p. 644.
in Parliament. Missives were at the same time sent down to all the presbyteries, telling them what had been done. Parliament, however, gave reply by passing an act, the terms of which completely altered the original scope and intention of the petition. This act declared that certain ministers, chosen by the king, might be appointed to the vacant prelacies. Bishoprics were to be granted only to clergymen. Parliament thus insisted that the Church's representation in the governing councils of the nation should be on the old prelatic lines. This was certainly not what the Churchmen had asked.

It was of interest now to see how the Church at large would regard the rather forward action of its commissioners. The General Assembly had not declared its desire for representation in Parliament, and there remained the possibility that the next Assembly would both repudiate the commissioner's move and severely censure them. This dangerous contingency, however, did not mature, for in the Dundee Assembly of March 1698 the majority decided that it was "necessary and expedient for the welfare of the Church that the ministry as the third estate of the realm have a vote in Parliament." It was further concluded that the number of the Church's delegates should be fixed at 51, this being the strength of the old pre-Reformation representation.

In order to adjust the many intricate details which the proposed ecclesiastical representation involved, a Synodal convention was held at Falkland in July 1698. But now King James, who had been the leading spirit during all recent developments, no longer found his path so easy. He and his adherents "found not such advancement of their course as they expected." Thus the delegates present from the synods insisted on drawing up a long list of "caveats" or cautions to be imposed on the Church's representatives and designed to preserve them "from corruption." Strangely enough in so doing they completely ignored the provisions laid down in the recent act of Parliament. Parliament had then postulated Prelacy. But the Churchmen now following their own bent declared and planned for a limited and responsible representation.

If Spottiswoode has here given us an accurate account of James' secret hopes and intentions at this time, then we may say about the royal methods and conduct the better. Outwardly James was now busily endeavoring to persuade the ministers that he had not the slightest intention of introducing "Papistical or Anglican bishoping" but merely desired "to have the best and
wiset of the ministry appointed by the General Assembly, to have place in council and parliament, to sit upon their own matters, and see them done, and not to stand always at the door like poor suppliants, despised and nothing regarded." (49) Such was the royal assurance given to the second Dundee Assembly. It has been suggested that at this point, James in spite of his Episcopal leanings really proposed to try out the more or less popular form of representation proposed by the Church. (50) However, this may be, one thing is clear, namely, that the less popular and dependent upon the Assembly these representatives were, the better could he like them. His aim, therefore, was to see to it that as far as possible they were set free from the Assembly's control. But he had now to reckon with a rising tide of suspicion and distrust, and his schemes received a decided check in the Assembly which met at Montrose in March 1600. There despite such diligent intrigue the ministers who supported the king were narrowly defeated on a measure which would have given to the future delegate, the right to sit in Parliament for life. (51) At the same time all the caveats agreed upon at Falkland were confirmed by the Assembly. (52)

Soott of Cuper tells us that "the king's workmen" were so grieved at the result of this vote that they devised an ingenious gloss to the effect that the representatives should be required merely to submit an annual account of their conduct to the Assembly to be continued or deposed as the Assembly with the royal consent should decide. At the King's instigation this gloss was incorporated in the minutes of the Assembly. (53) Before the Assembly dissolved the General Commission was again renewed in the persons of the leading Moderates, now regarded by the Presbyterians as these "workmen for Episcopacy." (54)

The check with which his designs had met at Montrose appears to have deeply impressed the King. He had had two alternative schemes from which to choose: the prelatic proposed by Parliament in 1567 and the popular one sponsored by the Church. For several years now he had been endeavoring to make the best of the latter proposal. But after the defeat at Montrose he appears to have realized that even with the minutes revised at his direction and according to his taste, the Church's scheme would give him merely a body of delegates almost wholly responsible to the General Assembly. As a means of controlling the Church, such a representation would be practically useless. In this predicament, James suddenly turned his back on the Church's scheme and reverted to that set forth by Parliament in 1567. In a Synodal convention held at Holyrood in October 1600, James and the commissioners of Assembly secured the nomination of three well-known ministers: David Lindsay, Peter Blackburn and George Cledstanes to the vacant sees respectively of Ross, Aberdeen and Caithness. (56) A short while later, Alexander Douglas, minister of Elgin was quietly appointed to the vacant see.

(49) Calderwood VI. p. 694.
(50) Matheson, Politics and Religion I. p. 278.
(53) Scot. A.M. p. 114. As is to be expected there is nothing in Spottiswoode's History about this secret revision of the Assembly's minutes. Spottiswoode III. pp. 82-83. The resultant minutes may be seen in the B.U.K. III. pp. 954-956.
(55) Scot. A.M. pp. 115-117; Calderwood VI. pp. 96-98.
One might have expected that the royal action in casting aside the approved proposal of the Church and reverting to that of Parliament would have raised a storm of anger in the following General Assemblies. But strangely enough when these courts convened no such angry manifestations were seen. Whatever be the cause of her inaction at this time, the Church as a whole appears to have accepted the change without much ado. And in the Holyrood Assembly of 1602, royal and moderate influences were again so dominant that two of the new titular bishops, Lindsay of Ross and Gladstanes of Caithness, were given commission to visit within the bounds of their respective dioceses. In this way the titular bishops were granted a measure of recognition by the Church. But the Assembly did not stop here. By what Calderwood calls "the votes of the evil advised multitude," it was concluded that ministers should be provided to all prelacies. It was likewise considered expedient "to adjoin and nominate others out of a number of brethren, to be joined to those who were nominated by the commissioners of provinces convened at Holyroodhouse, the fifteenth day of October, 1600 years. Out of which number, his Majesty should make choice of such as he should present to the benefices vacant." Provision was thus made for the filling up of all the bishoprics with duly qualified ministers. It should be observed at this point that unlike their predecessors under the system of the Leith Convention, none of the bishops of the first decade of the seventeenth century (1600-1609) underwent any form of canonical election or consecration. A means of remediying this irregular state of affairs was found later. Meanwhile, within the next few years, one after another of the vacant bishoprics were filled by royal appointment.

(57) Calderwood VI. pp. 99-100.
(58) Note on T. L. Mathieson's treatment of the alternative schemes. The writer is much indebted to T. L. Mathieson for his understanding of the two distinct schemes of Church and State. Some modern authorities (e.g., Grub, Stephen and Cunningham) completely ignore the fact that there were in existence two rival and competing proposals. Spottiswoode gives at length all the restrictions or cavets imposed (p. 82). The truth of the matter seems to be that these void. III. pp. 986-987. Calderwood VI. pp. 108-109.
When therefore in 1603 James succeeded Elizabeth on the English throne the political condition of the Scottish Church was briefly as follows: As far as its outward constitution was concerned the Church was still a Presbyterian body. The legislation of 1592 still remained on the statute books unrepealed, and this was the civil foundation upon which the Church was settled. The graded system of courts: General Assembly, provincial synods, presbyteries and Kirk sessions, still stood intact. The parity of the ministers had not yet been seriously disturbed. It was true that certain brethren had recently been placed in a somewhat privileged position. In addition to their clerical duties these men sat and voted in Parliament, and in this connection they bore the title of bishop. But as yet no special or separate ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been attached to the Episcopal name. Two of these titulars had been appointed visitors within the bounds of their respective dioceses, but just as one Assembly could set them up in this office so another Assembly could with equal right remove them from it. In short, the presence of these bishops did not seriously unsettle the prevailing parity. A far more dangerous menace to the existing constitution was to be found in the powerful General Commission of the Assembly. Appointed first, as we have seen, in 1597, and regularly reappointed ever since, this Commission had been steadily gathering into its hands the direction and administration of the chief affairs of the Church. A group of Churchmen more willing to follow his lead and to respond to his suggestions King James had not yet found. It was from among the ranks of these men that the majority of the new bishops were drawn. As a body the commissioners consistently supported James in his Episcopal and Tractarian designs. After the dissolving of the Holyrood Assembly of 1598, no other regular Assembly was held until the summer of 1608. During the long interval of six years between these two dates the administration of the Church's affairs was left almost entirely in the Commission's hands. It would have been strange if the power and position of the commissioners had not greatly angered the defeated Presbyterian party. They were to quote the complaint of the Presbyterian historian once again "the king's lead horse" and the "very needle which drew in the thread of bishops." But the grievous representations of Presbyterian writers must not blind us to the fact that the attitude of the commissioners was thoroughly in accord with the mind of the now dominant Moderate party. And Mathleson is on sound ground when he asserts that "with the exception of the two Kelvilles, Davidson and Bruce, the moderate party now included all the leading men in the Church." (64)

King James had been successful in his attempt to secure a General Commission of the Assembly. But he seemed soon to have realized that unless he was eternally vigilant his Presbyterian opponents might someday obtain a majority, and do away with all that he had secured. His policy, therefore, for the next few years was to obtain Assemblies submissive to his mind and will. He began to interfere with the dates on which the bodies were to meet. Thus the Assembly which was to have gathered at Aberdeen in July 1599 was appointed by royal proclamation to meet at Montrose in March 1600, while

(62) See below p. 57.
(63) See above p. 37.
(64) Mathleson, Politics and Religion, I p. 302.
(65) B.U.K. III. p. 948.
that which was appointed for Saint Andrews in July 1601 was
anticipated by another held at Burntisland (66) in May of
the same year. By interference of this sort King James, to
say the least, was seriously interfering with the Act of
1592 which had ruled that Assemblies should be held every
year or oftener at the time and place appointed at the last
Assembly by the king or his commissioner, or in their
absence by the moderator himself. (67)

The ecclesiastical situation took a more definite
turn when King James went to England in 1603. The famous
Hampton Court Conference left no doubt in anyone's mind as
to what the king's religious ideals and intentions were.
Episcopal government depending for its civil sanction on the
crown was the ideal for the realization of which he was now
prepared to work. As Dr. Hume Brown has remarked, "Now
1612 his governing aim was the establishment of diocesan
Episcopacy in the Scottish Church." (68) And despite his
recent successes he appears to have concluded the accomplishment
of such an aim could only be made possible by the holding
of muzzled Assemblies and by suspending the Act of 1592.

But to resume our narrative. In the Holyrood
Assembly of 1602 it had been decided that the next Assembly
should meet at Aberdeen in July 1604. (69) But in a letter
from Straiton of Lauriston, the royal commissioner, and the
commissioners of Assembly to the presbyteries this Aberdeen
Assembly was postponed until the first Tuesday of July 1605.
The letter declared it to be the king's will that no Assembly
should meet while the union of the kingdoms was being
negotiated. (70) Notwithstanding this, the presbytery of
Saint Andrews determined that its three commissioners should
go to Aberdeen to "keep the diet." This they did, and arrived
in Saint Nicholas Church, Aberdeen, on the last day of July
1604. Finding no other delegates present they entered a
formal protest declaring that if "skeith, hurt or damage"
should befall the Kingdom of Christ in Scotland it must not
be laid to their charge. The three commissioners were James
Melville, William Erskine and William Murray. (71)

This protest evidently had the effect of stirring
some of the Northland ministers into action, for in their
Synod at Aberdeen in August they resolved to suggest to the
other synods that representatives be sent to the Synod of
Fife which was called to meet in September. This suggestion
was acted upon, and a number of visiting commissioners were
present when the Synod of Fife convened. But Straiton of
Lauriston was also on hand. He managed to divert the brethren
from their intention of petitioning for a General Assembly.
He asked them rather to suggest to their respective courts the
advisability of sending representatives to Perth next month
to consult with him and the commissioners of the General
Assembly. (72) At this Perth convention there was much discussion
and complaint, (73) but in the end a petition containing among
other things a clause with regard to an Assembly was drawn up
And Lauriston promised to lay it before the king. (74)

(67) A.P.S. III. pp. 541-542.
(69) B.U.K. III. p. 1008.
pp. 565-566. "James Melville as retiring Moderator of Synod
preached the opening sermon. Calderwood VI. p. 268 and
pp. 270-271.
(74) Scot A.N. p. 131. Calderwood VI. p. 278.
In the following Spring John Forbes, Minister of Alford, having been commissioned by some of the northern ministers to visit King James in London, journeyed thither and laid before him the grievances of his brethren. Forces appears to have been graciously received by His Majesty, and sent back home with the fair promise that it was not the royal intention to make any changes in the government of the Kirk. (76) How worthless these fair words were appeared very soon.

The Synod of Fife met at Burntisland in April. Mention was made of the need of an early Assembly. But now Lauriston "withstood it with all his might. He showed that he had an express article in commission not to permit it." (77) Spottiswoode tells us that King James had been informed that the clergy intended, as soon as an Assembly met, to overthrow all the pro-synodal legislation of the last four years. Hence the royal alarm and determination that no Assembly should be allowed to meet at present. (78)

Meanwhile the first Tuesday of July 1605 was approaching. This, it will be recalled, was the date to which the Assembly which was to meet in July 1604 had been postponed. (79) But on the 7th of June there came a letter from Lauriston and the commissioners of the General Assembly. In this missive it was set forth that the King had been requested to allow an Assembly to meet but that he had declared such a request to be impossible until after the time of Parliament. The presbyteries were accordingly requested to keep all their commissioners at home. No mention was made of another Assembly. The letter was signed by Lauriston and Patrick Galloway, Moderator of the last Assembly. (80) By this time, however, some of the presbyteries, having elected their representatives, decided that at all costs the Kirk's right to convene in General Assemblies must be asserted and maintained. It became known that a number of the commissioners intended to go to Aberdeen and to constitute an Assembly. But now the Privy Council suddenly realizing the dangerous possibilities of the situation decided to take action. On the 20th of June it issued two proclamations. (81) The first prohibited the clergy from holding an Assembly under pain of hanging, and further commanded the Aberdeen bailies to suffer no kind of an Assembly to be held. (82) The second was couched in milder language. It was to be placed in Lauriston's hands and was to be conveyed by him to the ministers. It declared the council's will to the brethren that they dissolve at once and return home. (83)

(75) See the letter of the Synod of Aberdeen to King James in Botfield's "Original Letters" I. pp. 14-15.
(76) Forbes Records pp. 331-332.
(77) Soot. A.N. p. 131. Calderwood is evidently quite wrong (VI. p. 278) when he says that Lauriston "promised to deal earnestly with the King for license to hold the next ensuing General Assembly." Soot. Forbes (pp. 360-361) and James Melville (p. 592) agree that Lauriston strongly withheld the suggestion of an early Assembly. Soot was present, and preached the opening sermon for the Synod. Calderwood VI. p. 276.
(79) See above p. 42.
(81) Privy Council Register VII. Introduction pp. XLVII-LXVIII.
(82) Privy Council Register VII. p. 62.
(83) Privy Council Register VII. p. 471.
The second day of July at length arrived. The good people of Aberdeen would learn that nineteen representatives of the Church had arrived within their city walls. A few days later another band of ministers reached the city. They had been delayed by bad weather, and arrived too late to take any part in the proceedings of the Assembly.(84)

Here, however, we must retreat our steps a short space to take knowledge of a matter which should throw some light on the determination of the ministers to convene in spite of the letter of the 7th of June from Lauriston and the Assembly's commissioners. It would appear that the brethren believed that in their contemplated action they would be able to rely upon the full support of certain persons of great influence in the state. The details of this interesting matter are as follows:

John Forbes of Alford, whom we have met above, was in Edinburgh about the middle of June. Here he learned that Lauriston, beginning to doubt the efficacy of his letter of June 7th, was contemplating the issuing of certain direct orders forbidding the brethren to meet.(85) The reference here is doubtless to the two proclamations which were prepared by the Privy Council on the 20th of June.(86) Forbes thereupon entered into consultation with James, Earl of Dunfermline, and Lauriston, or rather John Forbes himself, according to Forbes' personal account the Chancellor promised to stay the threatened orders upon receiving from Forbes a promise that the brethren would do nothing in Assembly save continue the meeting to some future date.(87) Granting for the moment that Forbes' account is correct, then the Chancellor's action is to say the least very surprising. For in this way the ministers were given a foothold for whatever design they had in mind.(88) In a letter to the king dated May 25th, 1606, Seaton protested that when Forbes charged him with consenting to the holding of the Assembly he was guilty of "a manifest lie."(89) The fact of the matter, however, would appear to have been that it was the Chancellor and not the minister who was guilty of an untruth. We know that among the nobles there was a party strongly opposed to the Episcopal advance. (90) For example, Spottiswoode, who knew quite well what was going on at this time, tells us that Lord Balmerino, President of the Session, was opposed to the restoration of Episcopacy, and for this reason drew down the royal displeasure on his head.(91) Spottiswoode also plainly states that Forbes and his friend John "eluch of Ayr had "encouragement given them in private by some principally in the state."(92) It is quite reasonable to suppose that the Chancellor was one of those to whom reference was here made.(93) This, however, is a question into which we are not required to enter further at present.

And now we resume our narrative. On the second day of July nineteen ministers from various presbyteries convened at Aberdeen. The customary sermon was preached by James Koss, one of the ministers of the city. In the hope of being joined by others who might have been delayed by inclement weather the brethren remained in informal session until two o'clock in the afternoon. At that hour they met formally in the session house, and there they were "sanctified their meeting by prayer."(94) At this point Lauriston, the king's Commissioner, came into the gathering, and produced a letter from the Privy Council addressed "To our trusty Friends, the brethren of the Ministrie convened at their Assemblie in Aberdeen." The brethren scanned the letter's form of address. They concluded that its wording was implied a body of ministers convened in
regular Assembly. They thereupon resolved formally to constitute themselves a General Assembly before they opened and read it. This they did, and elected Forbes of Alford as Moderator. "This election," says Forbes himself, was carried out, "by consent of Lauriston," the royal commissioner "first naming him to that effect." At the same time it is clear that Lauriston was not in the room during the formal act of election. Scott says that "he had made his own accord last, as he himself alleged he should be challenged for seeming to approve the said election by his presence in case it should happen that he and they should not agree." Spottiswoode in his account would have us to believe that the brethren got the commissioner out of the room in order that as soon as he was gone they might proceed with the election. One thing at least is clear. As we have mentioned above Lauriston was not in the room when the election took place. His conduct throughout this whole situation, his coming in and going out, is very perplexing. The only reasonable explanation of his actions which we have found is that advanced by Dr. Masson who suggests that Lauriston "lost his head on the occasion, distracted between unwillingness to be very violent and anxiety to carry out his instructions effectively." Such an explanation appears to be in harmony with the facts of the case.

Following the election the Council's letter was read and considered. In it the ministers listened to the command "that ye dissolve yourselves, repair everyone to his own house and calling, and suffer this meeting to desert; and before ye appoint any new meeting or assembly that ye acquaint his majesty therewith." Having heard the missive read the assembled ministers decided to dissolve without transacting any business. But as regards a future gathering of Assembly they firmly resolved to appoint a new date of meeting. Both Forbes and Scott next narrate that it was suggested to Lauriston that he set or nominate some future day upon which the Assembly might convene. But this the commissioner, realizing no doubt that matters were rapidly slipping from beneath his control, refused to do. Whereupon it was decided to adjourn the Assembly until the last Tuesday of the following September.

The ministers were now about to disperse when once again Lauriston appeared upon the scene. He had just learned to his chagrin that a future date of meeting had been agreed upon. He now protested that he had never acknowledged this meeting to be a regular or lawful General Assembly. He pointed out that neither the Moderator of the last Assembly nor the regular clerk had been present. Speaking in the name of his fellow ministers, Forbes at once began to protest. He declared that he believed the Assembly to be a lawful one, and he quoted the Word of God, the custom of the Kirk and the laws of the land to substantiate his position. And here Lauriston appears to have lost either his head or his temper for he saw to it that a command was issued to the ministers ordering them to disperse at once on pain of treason. This move of authority was, however, quite needless, for as Scott remarks the brethren had made ready to disperse as soon as they read the Council's letter. Accordingly, the Moderator offered prayer and the Assembly

[97] Scot. A. p. 124
[98] Spottiswoode III. p. 158.
[99] Privy Council Register. VII. Introduction. XLIX.
dispersed. The members went at once to the office of the Common Clerk, and there subscribed a formal document declaring their willingness to disband and to return home. (105) As we have pointed out above certain other delegates arrived in Aberdeen too late to take part in the events of the 2nd of July. These brethren, however, publicly identified themselves with the stand their friends had made. They both ratified and approved their action. (106)

Lauriston now found himself in a most unhappy predicament. If it could be shown that through his negligence a regular Assembly had been allowed to meet, then his position would be a most unenviable one. For if a regular General Assembly had convened, it would be possible to infer from such a fact that the General Commission granted by the last Assembly was now automatically extinguished. (107) And let us not forget that it was through this Commission that the king was now directing the affairs of the Kirk. "What would the commissioners themselves say, the aspiring bishops and most of all the king? Now according to all the Presbyterian writers, Lauriston at this point made use of an extreme subterfuge. He concocted what Melville has called "a manifest forgit lie and untruth." (108) namely, that by open proclamation at the mercat cross of Aberdeen on the day before the meeting he had forbidden the ministers to hold any Assembly. (109) And the Council in spite of the letter which they had sent to the ministers "convened at their assembly in Aberdeen," that is to say an Assembly in regular session, were easily persuaded to accept Lauriston's view of the matter. (110)

Such was the famous Assembly of Aberdeen which our Glasgow Assembly of 1510 repudiated in the first of its articles. Into a detailed account of the painful sequel to the Aberdeen gathering we are not required to enter here. Concise and careful accounts of the matter can be found in the pages of Cunningham, Mathieson, Hume Brown and others. Very briefly what happened was as follows: Acting under instructions from the king the Privy Council imprisoned six ministers in Blackness, and in October summoned fourteen to appear before it. A declinatur in the old style did the prisoners no good, and they were sent back to prison. Then came an order from King James to the effect that Forbes, Welsh and four others were to be tried for High Treason, their crime being that they had denied the competency and jurisdiction of the Council. The Earl of Dunbar, whom we shall have cause to note later, was sent down from London to manage the trial. The case was packed, coaxed, and threatened. The judges were overawed. And as a result the six confessors were found guilty, the vote in the Jury being nine to six. "Most people will agree with Dr. Hume Brown that the proceedings had been scandalous throughout." (111) After some months imprisonment, the six ministers were exiled to the Continent for life. The remaining eight who had adhered to their position were banished to remote parts of the king's dominions. (112)

(110) The official view of the Council will be found set forth in Calderwood VI. pp. 419-437. Following the Council's version of what happened Spottiswoode declares that Lauriston "caused discharge the Assembly at the Market Cross of Aberdeen." Spottiswoode III. p. 186.
(111) Hume Brown, History of Scotland II. p. 246.
By the determined manner in which he had handled the matter of the Aberdeen Assembly and its sequel, James had managed to secure the exiling of six high Presbytery men for life and the banishing of eight more to remote corners of his dominions. He next entered upon a cunning move which was destined to silence another group of opponents of his episcopal designs. But before we proceed to examine this royal stratagem we must pause to consider the action of the famous "Red" Parliament of Perth (1606) which as far as the civil power was able reestablished and reintegrated the Episcopal Estate in Scotland.

In approaching this subject we must recall the important Act of Annexation which had become law in 1537. (113) By this measure all that remained of the temporalities of the ancient benefices had been annexed to the crown. The teinds alone remained sacred. (114) In result of this act of confiscation Episcopacy had become a practical impossibility in Scotland, for bluntly there was now left to it no visible means of financial support. Obstructing the pathway then of the king's desires for the reestablishing of the Estate of Bishops lay the fatal enactment of 1587. Before the bishops could be restored to their ancient rights and privileges the Act of Annexation would have to be repealed. But this was by no means an easy task. Following the annexing of the benefices in 1537 James in his easy-going way had given over a large part of this Church property to favoured friends and servants. (115) It was not to be expected that these people enriched as they were with the spoil of the Church would willingly consent to have their newly gotten lands and rents torn from them and restored to ecclesiastics. The question was finally settled by a "pactum" between lords and bishops. The lords were finally brought to consent to the recreation and reendowment of the bishoprics, but only after an agreement had been reached to the effect that from the remaining prelacies seventeen temporal lordships should be created. By this compromise the old diocesan lands and revenues again became the possession of the Church, but at the same time the control of the remaining benefices passed from her hands forever. As a result the number of the Church's representatives in Parliament dropped from fifty-one to thirteen.

The legislation in 1606 affecting the Church was contained in three acts. The first had to do with the royal prerogatives. It unreservedly acknowledged his Majesty's sovereign authority over all estates, persons and causes whatsoever within his said kingdom. (117) The second act was that which repealed the measure of 1587 and made restitution of the Estate of Bishops. As it is of first rate importance we quote from Calderwood's abridgment of it as follows: "The second act conatineth the constitution of the Estate of bishops. It is first recited, that in his Majestie's young yeares and unsettled estate, the ancient andfundamental policie, consisting in the maintenance of the three estates of Parliament, has beene greatly impaired, and almost subverted, by the indirect abolishing of the state of bishops; by the act of annexation of the temporalities of benefices to the crown, made in this Hencese Parliament holden at Edinburgh, in the moneth of July 1587, whereby albeit it was never meneed by his Majestie, nor by his estate, that the said estate of bishops,

(113) See above p. 28.
(114) Arthur Birnie: A Short Hist. of the Scottish Teinds p. 57.
Stephen, Hist. Scottish Church II. p. 147.
(117) A.P.S. IV. p. 281.
consisting of benefices of cure, and being a necessary estat
of the Parliament, could on no wise be suppressed; yit his
Majestie, by experience of the subsequent tyme, has cleerelle
seen, that the disembring the abstracting from them of their
lives, has brought them into suche contempt and povertie, that
they are not able to furnishe necessaries to their privat familie,
muche leesse to bare the charges of their mounted ranke in
Parliament and generall counsels, and after the example of their
counsell and goods, in tyme of peace and warre: The remed
whereof properlie perteane to his Majestie, whom the whole estats,
of their bounden dutie, with most heartlie and faithfull
affection, humble and trueelie acknowledge to be soverane
monarch, absolute prince, judge and governour over all persons,
estats, and causes, both spiritual and temporall, within the
said realms. Therefore his Majestie, with expresse advice and
consent of the said whole estats of Parliament, being carefull
to repone, and restore, and redintegrat the said estat of
bishops to their ancient and accustomed honour, dignities,
prerogatives, priviledges, livings, lands, tithes, rents, thrids,
and estat, as the samelie was in the reformed kirk, most
ample and free at anie tymes before the act of annexatioun
foresaied, by the tenour heerof,retreats, rescinds, reduses,
causes, abrogats, and annulis the foresaid act of annexatioun of
the temporall estat of beneficia to the crowne of God 1687, as said is,
in so farre as the samelie may in anie wise comprehend or be extended to the authoritie, digniteit,
prerogative, priviledge, tories, castella, fortalices, lands,
kirks, tithes, thrids, or rents of the said bishopricks,
and anie part thereof; with all other acts of Parliament made in
prejudice of the said bishops in the premises, or anie of
them, with all that has followed or may follow therupon;
and all acts of disembring of particular kirk to common
kirk, the said bishopricks from the samelie, or for separating
the thrids of the said bishopricks from the bodie, title,
and two part of the same: To the effect, the persons presentlie
provided to the bishopricks of Scotland, or anie of them, or
that hereafter sail be provided to the same, may freeelie, quietlie,
and peaceably enjoy, bruike, and possess the honour dignites,
priviledges, and prerogatives competent unto them or their
estat since the reformatioun of religioun; and all towres,
fortalices, lands, kirks, tithes, rents, two part, thrids,
patronages, and rights whatsoever belonging to the bishoprics,
or anie of them, to use and exercoe the same, and freeelie
dispose upon the whole two part, and thrid, temporallie and
spiritualiteit of the said bishopricks, and all the premises
belonging to the said bishopricks, as the said acts of annexatioun,
and remanent acts made in anie wise to their prejudice in the
premises, and overie one of them, and all that follow therupon,
had never beene made nor done, the alwise inteeranneing the
ministers serving at the cure of the kirks of their said
bishopricks upon the readiest of their said thrids, accoring to the
ordinarie assignations made, or reasonable to be made therannet.

The whole of the aboe act is of course important
from the view point of this study. As far as Parliament could
effect Episcopacy was once more an integral part of the social
and political fabric of the Scottish nation. There is, however,
one sentence in the act which calls for special attention and
we must examine it before passing on to review Act Three.
Consider the following words, "Therefore his Majesty, with
expressadvice and consent of the said whole estats of
Parliament, being carefull to repone and restore and redintegrat
the said estat of bishops to their ancient and accustomed honour
... and estate, as the samelie was in the reformed kirk,
most ample and free, at anie time before the act of annexatioun
foresaied." In other words the intention of this act apart from

its supreme purpose of abrogating the Act of Annexation was to give back to the bishops that place and status "as the same was in the reformed kirk" before 1537. That is to say, the Episcopal Estate was to be restored in accordance with the familiar terms of the Concordat of Leith. The only bishops existing in Protestant Scotland prior to 1537 were those of the Leith Convention type. And it was upon the decisions of the Concordat of 1572 as a foundation that the 17th century Episcopacy was to be built. (119)

It may be wise to point out here that at this date circumstances made it difficult if not impossible for the system of 1572 to be followed out in detail. The Leith Convention had provided that all bishops should be elected by their respective cathedral chapters. But in 1606 there were no chapters in existence. In fact, as we shall see directly, the next Act—number Three—was concerned with their resection. In 1606 each of the recently erected bishops owed his position to the mere appointment of the king. Further, none of them had as yet undergone the formal ceremony of consecration which had been required of their predecessors under the Leith agreement. This was probably due to the fact that since taking up his residence in England the king had learned that consecrations on the 1572 model would not be regarded as satisfactory by Anglican Churchmen. For after 1672 superintendents who had never been episcopally consecrated had been called in to assist in the creation of bishops. (119) In the eyes of the English Church such consecrations would be looked upon as invalid and irregular. We may also observe here that when in 1610 this question came to have a first-rate importance there remained only one survivor of the Leith Episcopacy left in Scotland. This was Neil Campbell, Bishop of Argyll. (120) Not only were his orders of a very doubtful character, but more, he was but a single individual and at least three bishops were required by the Catholic Canons in order to effect a regular consecration. We shall, however, return to this subject later. Meanwhile we must remember that in 1606 circumstances stood in the way of an immediate and complete revival of the whole of the Leith Convention System. Parliament might legislate in general terms in this direction, but certain missing details of the earlier system could only be restored gradually.

In Act Three (121) the main point to be observed is that, as we have noted above, provision is here made for the restoration and continuance of the ancient cathedral chapters. This measure opens with a few clauses concerning the delapidation of benefices. It then passes on to speak of the chapters. "Which chapters," so run the terms of the enactment, "discern and declare to remain now, and in all times coming according to the foundations of the said bishoprics, and as has been in times bygone, without any kind of alteration to be made therein." (122) In one case an exception was made. This was the Chapter of Saint Andrews which on account of local conditions was not recreated until the following year. (123)

Such was the work of the famous Perth Parliament of 1606. Practically everything that could be done on the civil side to bring back Episcopacy had now been accomplished. But the task of bringing the Church into line with the State in

(120) See below pp. 122-123.
(121) A.P.S. IV. pp. 224-226.
(123) A.P.S. IV. p. 372.
the matter promised to be a difficult one. For while it is
certain that the Moderate and Royalist Churchmen now comprised
the larger and dominant party it is equally true that there
still remained in the Church a compact and determined
Presbyterian minority. King James now had the group of those
Presbyterians safely locked up in London awaiting exile,
but many others were still at large. When the members
of Parliament had been assembling, a forced petition had been
presented to them by the remaining Presbyterian leaders and
their supporters protesting against the restoration of the
Episcopal Estate. (124) Over forty names were affixed to
this document of which the first was that of Andrew Melville. (125)
The protest had been unavailing; it is true, but the fact
that it had been made showed clearly that even with the broad
example of the Blackness prisoners before them there still
remained a group of undaunted Churchmen willing and eager
to oppose the designs of the king. Before the Church could
be persuaded to accept the bishops which the State had set
up it was clear that the leaders of this group would have
to be either removed or silenced. And now the king availed
himself of that coming stratagem of which we have already
hinted above.

Early in 1606 before Parliament had met royal
letters had already been directed to eight of the most
outstanding of the Presbyterian leaders commanding them "all
exceeds set aside" to repair to the English court before the 15th
of the following September in order to treat with and to
advise the king on all matters concerning the welfare of the
Church. (126) Andrew Melville, his nephew James, William Scott
of Cupar and James Salfour of Edinburgh were among those
called up to London by these missives. George Cladius, who was
now Archbishop of St. Andrews and John Spottiswoode who had
been created Archbishop of Glasgow, together with certain
other members of the Moderate party were summoned to England
at the same time. (127) That he called the eight Presbyterian
ministers when they arrived in the royal presence is an
extremely interesting story, but we are not required to enter
upon it here. Interested persons will find first hand and
graphic descriptions in the relevant pages of the
Scott. It is pertinent to our purpose, however, here to note
that neither Andrew nor James Melville ever set foot in
Scotland again. Four years imprisonment in the Tower of London
(1598-1602) and an old age in Sedan, such as to be Andrew
Melville's fate. His nephew was to spend his remaining years
an exile in the north of England. (128) After some delay the
other six ministers were allowed to return to Scotland but
only under severe restrictions. (129) It is of course quite
impossible to defend King James' behaviour in this matter.
Even Episcopal writers who naturally sympathise with his
efforts to restore Episcopal Church were not shut the royal
actions were both "illegal and unjust" and "supremely foolish
and tyrannical." (126) It was through deeds like these that
there grew up in Scotland that wide-spread, deep-rooted
conviction that Episcopal Church Government, absolute monarchy
and the exercise of arbitrary power were somehow all bound up
together and that where the one was the others were bound to
appear.

(126) One of these letters, that to Mr. Scott, has been preserved
for us and may be seen in Hotfield's Collection of
(128) W'Carle, Life of Melville: Chap. VIII.
Reid, Divinity Principals. pp. 55-60. (University of Glasgow.)
When the month of December arrived the Presbyterian party found itself in a sorely stricken condition. The six Blackness prisoners had been banished for life; the other eight connected with the Aberdeen Assembly had been exiled to remote ends of the kingdom. Still another group of eight, including the great champion Andrew Melville, were being safely detained in London. So many of the leading Presbyterian confessors being thus accounted for, James and his advisors decided that the way was now safely open for a new advance. Consequently, about the beginning of December letters came from the king to all the presbyteries. These royal missives commanded each presbytery to send to Linlithgow for the 10th of the month such men as were named in the letters in order to consult with some noblemen on matters such as the suppressing of Tarists and the removing of jars from the Church. One of these communications, that to the Presbytery of Dunfermline has been preserved for us. In connection with the letters two things should be pointed out. First of all, observe that the commissioners to the Linlithgow gathering were not really elected by the presbyteries but were nominated from above. In the royal letters the appearance is given that the king was responsible for the nominations, but as Sco of Jogar declares the nominees were very likely chosen by the bishops, it being impossible for the king to know all or even one third of the persons named or to that presbytery they belonged. Secondly, note that the king's letters the Linlithgow gathering is now styled as a "General Assembly." We reach the Dunfermline document in vain for such a designation. It is important to realize this since at a later date the Linlithgow convention came to be called and regarded as an Assembly. Spottiswoode taking as usual the official view of events tells us that "the king did call a General Assembly to meet at Linlithgow the tenth of December." We submit, however, that the directions issued to the presbyteries are conclusive proof that at the first there was no hint that this extraordinary convocation gathering would later be given the status of a regular Assembly of the Church. Dr. Mason speaks of the "ingenious idea of a substitute meanwhile for a regular General Assembly, in the shape of a Clerical Convention of deputies from all or most of the presbyteries of Scotland." Dr. Manson is clear that the Linlithgow gathering was a convention. We may also add here that certain moderate brethren were commanded by special letter to keep the appointed time and place whether their presbytery gave them a commission or no. In some cases king and bishops wished to be doubly sure. And so on the 10th of December there assembled in Linlithgow about one hundred and thirty ministers and a little over a hundred and thirty elders.

After an introductory sermon by James Law, Bishop of Orkney, and several speeches by persons of importance, James Nicholson the younger Melville's old friend was chosen Moderator of the convention. His name was one of a list of four submitted to the brethren by Patrick Callymy from the king. The first business considered by the convention concerned a subject always popular in the Reformed Kirk in these days namely the repression of Popery. Four of Romanism and hope of increase of soundness were two means constantly employed by the Moderate and episcopal leaders to advance their cause. And at Linlithgow in 1566 as in

(133) Sco A.H. p. 179.
(134) Spottiswoode. III. p. 183.
1608 both these favourite devices were given full play. (140)
As we have said the uprooting of Romanism first occupied attention. In this connection it was concluded that every presbytery should have an "agent" whose special duty should be the searching out and the repressing of all Papists within its bounds. To each agent was to be paid a subsidy of 1100 Scots yearly to help him in the good work. If he should happen to be a bishop he was to bear the burden of expense himself. (141)

This piece of business having been so satisfactorily attended to, the brethren were naturally in a very good humour, and they appear to have listened with good natured tolerance to certain protestations from the bishops and the royal commissioners. (142) The commissioners declared "that it was not in any ways His Majesty's purpose and intention to subvert and overthrow the present discipline of the Kirk of Scotland, but rather to augment and strengthen the same." Likewise the bishops present disclaimed any desire to usurp "any tyrannous and unlawful jurisdiction and power over the brethren." (143) A form of words which called forth spot's rejoinder that "the Pope himself could profess as much that he would usurp no tyrannous nor unlawful jurisdiction." (144) But the time had now arrived to hear the royal will. This was contained in an overture which was read to the convention. His Majesty's desire was briefly "that until the time that Papists were repressed and jars removed out of the Kirk, a "Constant Moderator" might be appointed for every presbytery, since in the changing of the moderator the diligence of executing the process failed, because the new moderator was unacquainted with the former proceedings." (145)

Anyone who knows anything of Presbyterian Church Government or has seen the same in operation well recognize at once that the reasons here supplied will deserve the description of "frivolous" which was at once fastened upon them. (146) Diligence in religious duty does not languish through the regular changing of the moderator, nor can jealousies and jars among brethren be traced to this as a cause. But those who were guiding the Episcopal advance evidently thought that a poor excuse was better than none. And so to cut a long matter short, the convention finally agreed to fall in with the king's desire. (147) In passing the measure, however, the convention insisted in appending to it about a dozen restrictions or cautions. (148) The following are the most important: Number Three declared that the constant moderator was to have no jurisdiction or power other than that which the elected moderator had hitherto enjoyed. (149) Numbers Seven and Eight were to this effect: that the presbytery's moderator was to be subject to the trial and censure of the provincial synod, and that if remiss in duty or presuming to usurp unlawful authority they were to be deprived of their office. (150) The finishing stroke now alone remained to be given. It was agreed that he who before had been nominated agent for the repression of Romanism should also be the constant moderator. (151) In this way constant moderators subsidized to the amount of 1100 Scots a year were set up over each presbytery, and colour was given to the bitter complaint that "the pension assigned to the agent was designed to corrupt the moderator who was to be the agent." (152)

Spot A.N. pp. 181-182.
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Before dissolving the convention nominated a constant moderator-agent for every presbytery in Scotland. The Bishops of Orkney, Caithness, Moray, Aberdeen, Saint Andrews, Glasgow, Galloway and Argyll were appointed constant moderators of the presbyteries which met at their Cathedral seats. A few of these were allowed deputies to take their place in their absence. (153) Writing of the voting in the convention Calderwood relates that two were non liquet: four refused to vote as wanting hope, fear, honor, money. (154) The convention had struck a severe blow at the practice and principle of Presbyterian parity. (155)

Before leaving Linlithgow the Earls of Cassils and Eglinton had asked that a copy of the minutes of the gathering might be given to them. In reply it had been stated that this would be impossible for some time but that copies printed in Edinburgh would soon be issued to all. (156) But these copies did not appear until six months had elapsed. (157) At the end of December two Churchmen, one of whom was the Bishop of Orkney, were sent up to court with a written account of the proceedings at Linlithgow. But far from being gratified at what had been accomplished we are told that the king had been much annoyed to learn that the bishops had failed to assert their right to moderate the provincial synods. (158) And then about six months later the official record of the convention appeared. (159) It was signed by James Nicholson, the Moderator, and Henry Philip, the clerk. (160) At once the Presbyterians or what now remained of them raised the cry that the minutes had undergone secret and serious alteration. They claimed that due to royal influence the act concerning the constant moderator had been “corrected, altered and augmented” before being sent back to Scotland again. (161) It was urged in particular that the clause regarding the constant moderation of provincial synods by bishops, which of course “virtually meant diocesan episcopacy,” (162) had been illegally inserted in the body of the act. (163)

It was also pointed out that the official record now styled the convention an “Assembly.” (164) As we ourselves study the record we notice how explicit is the language as regards the bishops’ rights in the presbyteries “where they are resident in one of the kirks of the bishopric.” The Bishop is henceforth to have the care and burden of the constant moderation within that presbytery committed to him. (165)

(153) Two lists of the constant moderators may be found in B.U.K. III. pp. 1025-1026. Calderwood VI. pp. 622-624.
(154) Calderwood VI. p. 608.
(155) “the future of Scottish Episcopacy seemed to have been secured by the distribution through the country, in the dignity of constant moderatorships of presbyteries, of a number of picked clergymen who might hope to succeed to the bishoprics, when they became vacant, and had therefore an interest in maintaining the episcopal system of things.” Privy Council Register VIII. Introduction p. XVIII.
(157) See below p. 54.
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(164) Calderwood VI. p. 625. That James had made up his mind to regard the convention as an “Assembly” is clear from two letters from him to the Privy Council, dated at Whitehall as early as January 3rd, 1607. In these letters he speaks of the “general assembly lately holden in that our kingdom” and gives directions for enforcing the act concerning the constant moderators. Privy Council Register VII. pp. 297-299 and 299-300.
Similarly, one discovers that in spite of the list of appended cautions the loop-hole of escape for the bishops and constant moderators was provided in the following clause: "That if the General Assembly can be moved to grant them a relaxation of any of the cautions which upon good reason might appear to the said assembly to be overstrict, that this their promise shall make no derogation to the liberty which the Assembly shall be moved to grant them." (166) In other words the holders of these offices of power and privilege let it be known that they considered themselves bound by the cautions only for the present. From now on it was their express intention to get Assemblies called which would relax the restrictions, and grant them that place of preeminence and authority to which they aspired.

Immediately upon the dissolving of the convention-Assembly—for such is the name by which we will now refer to it—the work of installing the constant moderators began. A beginning was effected in Edinburgh where Walter Balloquhal, a member of the Presbyterian party and Moderator of the Presbytery, made way for John Hall the Moderator-designate, and even "desired the brethren to accept Mr. John." This they did, not, however, without certain reservations. (167) Meanwhile the Privy Council having received a letter from the king issued a charge to all presbyteries to accept their constant moderators and to do so within twenty-three hours after receiving the charge under pain of rebellion. (168) The members of each presbytery were ordered to accept their new moderator, while at the same time the moderator-designate was himself charged to accept the office without delay. (169) Both constant moderators and presbyteries were commanded to obey under pain of outlawry. This vigorous action had its desired effect, and before long each presbytery had a permanent presiding officer. (170)

Spring came round, and with it the time for the meeting of the provincial synods. The Synod of Perth convened at Perth in April. (171) Sir David Yu-ray, better known as Lord Soone, was present with a commission from the king to the effect that one of the constant moderators of the four presbyteries within the bounds of the province should be chosen permanent moderator of the synod. (172) It now appeared that his Majesty meant to institute constant moderators in all the provincial synods. (173) Now as one of these men had just died, and another was "deadly diseased," while the third had refused the office, it was evident that if the brethren bowed to the royal will, then Alexander Lindsay, Constant Moderator of the Presbytery of Perth and Bishop of Dunkeld, would become permanent Moderator of the Synod. (174) But to acquiesce in the King's wishes in this matter the members of Synod resolutely refused to do, and in spite of the blustering violence of Lord Soone they elected Henry Livingstone as Moderator in the regular and accustomed way. (175)

The Synod of Lothian met in August. (176) At last the king's commissioners produced an official copy of the Act anent constant moderators. James Nicholson, Moderator of the convention-Assembly died on the 17th of August. As he was one of the best authorities on what took place at Linlithgow, it has been suggested that his decease removed the chief obstacle.

(169) A specimen letter to one of the presbyteries charging them to accept their constant moderator has been preserved by Calderwood, VI, pp. 621-622. See also Row. Historie p. 244. Calderwood VI, p. 644. B.U.K. III. pp. 1039-1040.
(171) Calderwood VI, p. 645.
(172) Calderwood VI, p. 647.
(173) Privy Council Register VII. Introduction p. LIX.
(176) Calderwood VI, p. 672.
to the production of the act. (177) But some of the brethren who had been present at the convention-Assembly solemnly declared that the question of the permanent moderation of synods had never been proposed or concluded at Linlithgow, but that the clause relating to the matter had somehow been "foisted" into the Act. A resolution embodying these facts was inserted in the synod's minutes. (178) The synod finally dissolved without appointing a new moderator or even fixing the date for next meeting. (179) A parallel occurrence occurred in the Synod of Fife. (180) In Act with the single exception of Angus all the provincial assemblies strenuously and for a time successfully resisted the constant moderators who would have been imposed upon them. (181)

We come now to consider the General Assembly which met at Linlithgow in July 1605, with the advice of the royal commissioner the convention-Assembly of 1606 had appointed the next Assembly to meet on the last Tuesday of July 1607, (182) but this gathering had been postponed a number of times by royal proclamation. (183) However, as we have pointed out above, the bishops and commissioners of Assembly were strongly in favour of the calling of such Assemblies as would grant them a relaxation of the hampering caveats and a further increase of jurisdiction and power. (184) For strangely enough when one considers their abject subservience this group of clerics hesitated to assume full Episcopal functions merely on the strength of Parliamentary enactments and royal decrees. It is probable that there still remained in their minds a strong regard for the inherent spiritual rights of the rank and file of the Church and a wholesome respect for the supreme authority of the General Assembly. At any rate it is clear that in all that they did they desired to be supported and sanctioned by the approbation of their brethren. Especially when their approbation was officially expressed in the supreme court of the Church. But was it not extremely doubtful as to whether or not an ordinary General Assembly could be moved to give the desired approval? The attempt to force constant moderators upon presbyteries and synods had roused widespread suspicion and alarm. It was necessary, therefore, if the next Assembly was to be from the royal and Episcopal viewpoint a complete success, to have its business and personnel all thoroughly planned and prepared beforehand. With this end in view the bishops and commissioners did not hesitate to use a number of drastic means "to effectuate their purpose." The historian of the Kirk declares these instruments of preparation with which they worked to have been: "(1) by modification of ministers stipends, (2) by visitation of presbyteries, (3) by pretext of a conference." (185) Scott of Cupar adds a fourth: "The imprisoning of so many brethren." (186) A few words with regard to this Episcopal preparation will not be out of place here.

(I) A great power was placed in the bishops' hands when for this year (1606) the control and modification of ministerial stipends was granted to their care. A minister's

(177) Privy Council register. VII. Note at foot of pp. 432-433.
(178) Calderwood VI. p. 672.
(181) Scott A.K. p. 188. Calderwood VI. p. 677. Spottiswoode III. p. 189. "There was no matter that so troubled the council as that of the constant moderators." Spottiswoode thus bears witness to the resistance of the synods.
(183) B.U.K. III. pp. 1046-1044. Here may be found several proclamations proroguing the Assembly.
(184) See above p. 54.
(185) Calderwood VI. pp. 704-706 and 732-734.
attitude to the bishops was a bound to be immediately altered when it became known that these officials had the power of raising or lowering his income. But this matter is so obvious that we need not pause over it. (187) (III) We pass on to consider the question of visitation. The last regular Assembly, that held at Holyrood in 1602, had appointed a long list of visitors. (188) Two of these had been bishops, (189) and had been commissioned to visit within their respective dioceses. But some of those who had been out visitors in 1602 had now also been raised to the Episcopal estate. These men now took a different visitation of the bounds to which the Holyrood Assembly years before had appointed them. Their aim was to see that commissioners either favouring or willing to tolerate the Episcopal ascendancy were sent forward by the presbyteries to the next Assembly. On the whole these visitations seem to have succeeded in their object, although there was stout opposition in some quarters. For example, the Presbytery of Jedburgh was the scene of a lively clash when James Ure, Bishop of Orkney and Visitor of Berse and Tweddale, insisted upon exercising his powers of visitation. (190)

(III) But probably the best move the bishops and commissioners made at this time was their arrangement of the Fullland Conference in the month of June 1608. This was a convention of two groups of Churchmen: a large group of ministers on the one hand and the Episcopal leaders on the other. From the bishops' point of view the conference was a great success. It was so discreetly handled that before it dissolved unanimous agreement had been reached on five important points. We need note only three of them here. It was resolved:

(1) That in the meantime there should be no public or private speaking or preaching either for or against the present government of the Kirk, but that all sermons should be directed against Papists, their faith and their practices. (191)

(2) That the General Assembly should be held at the time appointed which was the last Tuesday of July, and that his Majesty be most humbly entreated to that effect. (192)

(4) That no controversial or strife-making subject should be debated in the said Assembly, but that all such troublesome matters should be discussed in a private conference of those specially appointed by the Assembly to find a way of compassing these difficulties. (193) Scott and James Melville inform us that a number of ministers were frightened into this agreement by a report, circulated so Scot adds by John Hall of Edinburgh. This rumour was to the effect that the Earl of Dunbar of whom we shall hear more later, together with some English divines and a great number of newly made earls, lords and knights were coming down to overthrow the present discipline of the Church at the next Assembly. (194) In their endeavor to stay off this

(187) Calderwood VI. p. 705.
(189) David Lindsay and George Glæstanes. See above p. 40.
(190) The same General Assembly of 1502 which had appointed 'Commissioners' of the Kirk with plenipotentiary authority till the next Assembly, had also appointed a body of 'Visitors' ....... with the special duty of visiting presbyteries and parishes............ In the long interval since 1502 ...... the 'Visitations' had been pretty much neglected. But, as the time approached for that new General Assembly ...... both ecclesiastical parties among the Scots .... were astir with 'preparations' for that event. Among the 'preparations' on the side of the bishops was that of reorganizing the 'Visitations.' "

danger, or as Melville has it, "to hold off evil as long as they could," some of the brethren would probably have been willing to promise anything and to agree to any sort of a truce. There were doubtless others with whom the prospect of Presbyterianism's destruction carried little weight, but who were ready to welcome peace for its own sake. There can be no doubt that there was a wide-spread longing for the restoration of peace and concord abroad in the Kirk at this time. For decades controversy and turmoil had occupied men's energies and attention until at last many were ready to accept any reasonable terms if only quiet and goodwill could be restored. The Episcopal leaders had grasped this fact thoroughly, and they did not neglect to make the most of it. We shall consequently hear an increasing amount of talk and discussion about peace from now on.

The main result then of the Falkland conference was the temporary cessation of all controversy on the vexed questions of ecclesiastical polity. All danger of opposition being thus removed, the bishops and commissioners saw that the way was now clear for the holding of the General Assembly. The Assembly therefore convened at Linlithgow on the last Tuesday of July 1608.

It will not be necessary for us to give a detailed review of the proceedings of the 1606 Assembly and yet at the same time it is necessary to mention three important matters connected with it which we must notice in passing. First of all, it must be observed that besides the commissioners from presbyteries there were present in accordance with the royal command over forty nobles and gentlemen. We have seen above how that at Linlithgow in 1606 a similar band of nobles and barons had been among those summoned to take part in the deliberations of the Convention-Assembly, and we shall see that the same device of calling in a group of titled gentlemen was to be followed in 1610. By that date the policy of allowing the nobility to have a separate place and voice in the Assembly may be said to have become firmly established. In 1608 the right of these men to be present was once challenged. But Patrick Galloway, the Moderator of the General Assembly, "answered that if they cast off the noblemen their conclusions would want execution; for," he said "we must pray and preach but they must fight." And so the titled gentlemen were allowed to remain in the Assembly.

James Law, Bishop of Orkney, having been elected to the Moderator's Chair, the Assembly fell to work upon the ever popular business of suppressing Romanism. "Such also," writes Scot, "there was about Baptists and Papistry." The Marquis of Huntly who had lapsed from the Reformed Faith was solemnly excommunicated by the Moderator while the Earl of Dunbar, the King's Commissioner, gave promise that after forty days the civil sword would strike against him without mercy.

---

(195) B.U.K. III. p. 1046; Calderwood VI. p. 751.
(196) Calderwood VI. p. 751. The B.U.K. does not give a list of these nobles. B.U.K. III. p. 1048. Calderwood gives two accounts an unofficial version and an official copy of that in B.U.K.
(201) Scot Adm. p. 292.
(203) Calderwood VI. pp. 782-783.
Fresh proceedings were instituted against certain other
Romanist nobles such as the Earls of Angus and Errol. (204)
A number of vigorous measures were also passed including
resolutions against Popish books, the Jesuits and Seminary
Priests. (205) Presbyterian writers like Calderwood and Scot
complain that all this activity was mere pretence, intended
to put the ministers in a good humour and to divert their
attention from a more serious subject, namely, the subversion
of Presbyterian discipline. (206) But there can be no doubt
that the Anti-Popery campaign was far more seriously intended
and effectively prosecuted than these writers are willing to admit.
The rigour of repression did not cease when the Assembly dissolved,
rather it continued without abatement for many years until Romanism
was practically extinct in Scotland. (207) Popery being thus attended
to, the next piece of business to be considered was the trial of
the members of the General Commission of Assembly. This group of
administrators had been in office since 1602 when they had been
appointed by the Assembly which met at Holyrood. And here one
receives a revelation both of the strength of the Moderate and
Episcopal party and of the influence now exercised by its leading
men. For had the brethren wished to censure the commissioners for
their actions during the past six years; had they desired to abolish
the General Commission and to halt the Episcopal advance, here
surely was their opportunity. But it was an opportunity of
which no use was made. In this connection one must of
course remember the careful preparation which the bishops had made
before the Assembly met, but none the less what happened is really
remarkable. The commissioners including the Moderator
went forth, and William Cowper who had been placed temporarily in
the chair asked the members of Assembly if there was anything to
be laid to their charge. (208) Silence followed the question;
nothing worthy of censure or rebuke was revealed. And then when
the commissioners had returned the General Commission was renewed
in the same terms as in 1602 and to almost the same persons. Thirty
commissioners were appointed. Eleven of these were bishops, and
it is expressly stated that eleven was the number necessary in order
to constitute a quorum of the Commission. (209) In this way the
Assembly set the seal of its approval on the main drift of events
during the past six years. It did not censure or depose the
commissioners. On the contrary it commended and continued them.
But this action bishops and commissioners were encouraged to persevere
in their chosen course, and the way was left open for further
developments.

(204) B.U.K. III. pp. 1049-1051. (Including Lord Sempill.) 
Calderwood VI. p. 753.
(207) "The alleged persecution of Papists, when closely examined, is
found to consist chiefly in severe enactments on paper." Such is
opinion of Prof. H.M.B. Held. "Episcopacy in Scotland" in "The
Professor's "Tallet," p. 155. Compare, however, with Andrew Lang,
History of Scotland. II. p. 494. "The position of the Catholics
was practically desperate." And see also Introduction Privy Council
Register VIII. p. XXII. There had, in James's reign hitherto, been
remarkable fluctuations in his policy towards the Scottish Roman
Catholics. . . . there had been times when he had so far relaxed
this policy, and had so indulged the Roman Catholics, that the
kirkmen had assailed him with sharp criticism and called in question
the sincerity of his own Protestantism. Now, -- --, and no doubt
in consequence of that new attitude of antagonism to the Parasy
which James had assumed after his accession to the throne of England,
he and his Scottish Government are seen more persistently and
continuously engaged than ever before in efforts for the suppression
of Roman Catholicism in Scotland. Privy Council Register VIII.
p. XXX. See also the whole section VIII. pp. XXIX-XXXV.
There remains to be considered one more subject to which the Assembly devoted much attention. This was the matter of peace among the brethren and the removal of all causes of discord. It was pointed out that the unhappy divisions had a two fold root; that they were due partly to strained feelings and sundered affections and partly to a divided judgment on matters concerning the policy of the Kirk. In order to remedy the first cause an overture was devised suggesting "that the whole brethren in the ministry should present themselves in the fear of God, lay down all rancour and distraction of hearts and affections, which either of them have borne against others in any time past, and be reunited and reconciled with heartily affection in Christ, as becomes them who are ministers of the Lord of God, and preachers of peace, and Christian love, and charitie to his people: To the effect, that by this heartily reconciliations, their hearts and advice may be conjoinned, for disappointing of the onerous device of the common enemy." (210)

This overture was unanimously passed for the records of the Assembly declare that all present heartily embraced the above advice, "and ordained every one of them, as well commissioners present, as of the ministry that were absent, to obey the same, by laying down, and casting away all grudge or rancour, that anie of the brethren did bear at others. In whin whereof, and of an effald unioon of hearts and affections, they all held up their hands to God, testifying to His majesty the truth of their hearts in the said matter; and likewise, they ordained the same to be intimated to the rest of their brethren, at their returning to their presbyteries, to the effect that the same may be done in every presbytery, immediately after their returning, as said is. Inhibiting also and discharging anie suche distractions or remours to be amongst them other in affections, or in word, deid, or countenance, but that they would be proceeding in all meekness, and holie spirit, and God, as becomes the pastors of the kirk of Christ; and whosoeuer doeth in the contrary, that he be censured in his own presbytery or synod; and incase of their negligence, by the Commissioners of the General Assembly." (211) We are told that Patrick Simson, Minister of Stirling and a leading Presbyterian, was very eager to have this overture of reconciliation passed. "He related what paine he had undertakn in his journey to come to the Assemblie, being heavilie diseased in bodie, and desird that the brethren would not judge rashlie of their proceedings at Falkland." (212) Simson was one of those who remained loyally attached to Presbyterian principles to the end, but his spirit and attitude all through the long years of controversy were vastly different from those, say, of Andrew Melville.

But there still remained the difficult and thorny question of differences of opinion and distractions of judgment. This the Assembly resolved to hand over to the care of a special committee composed of five bishops, a number of Moderate leaders and a few Presbyterians including Patrick Simson and William Scott. This committee was instructed to investigate; to decide upon the best way of removing the distraction, and then to report to the next Assembly. (213)

And so concluded the General Assembly of 1608, the last gathering of its kind before the famous Assembly of 1610. As one reviews the record of its proceedings one is constrained to agree with Calderwood that here "the bishops got a great vantage. They were continued commissioners of the General Assembly and perpetual moderators of the presbyteries where they were resident. Under pretense of reconciliation, they insinuated themselves in the affections of the simpler sort; and under
protest of a conference appointed for removing differences of opinions, and abstinence from all controverted points till they were determined, the bishops thought they had stopped all the minister's mouths, and brought in suspense and question what discipline was most lawfull, as if it had never yitt beene decided amongst us. (214)

There now remain three matters to be touched upon before we conclude this chapter: (1) The second Falkland Conference at the beginning of May 1609, (2) the Parliament of June 1609, and (3) the erection of the Courts of High Commission in February 1610. A few sentences about each of these will be sufficient.

(1) The commissioners appointed by the Assembly to resolve all differences of opinion still remaining between the brethren assembled at Falkland on the 4th of May. The conference lasted two days. There was much debate, but it does not appear from the records that much constructive progress was made. (215) In the end an official "conclusion" was drawn up and agreed upon. This document begins by stating that two particular points had been selected for discussion: (a) the constant moderation of presbyteries and synods, and (b) the cavets imposed by the Assemblies at Montrose and Dundee. Due however to the brevity of the time at their disposal, so ran the report of this meeting, the brethren decided to postpone all treating of the subjects in question until the first Tuesday of the following August. In the meantime each commissioner is "to advise and consider gravely of the said questions." The document concluded with a call to ministers and presbyteries to be careful of Papists and an exhortation to the brethren to entertain peace, friendship and brotherly love. (216) An examination of the history of the conference will show that on this occasion the Episcopal leaders by no means gained all that they desired, but by the postponing of all controversy until August and by the emphasis laid on brotherly love and concord they had at least succeeded in silencing any opposition which might have been raised to their schemes in the coming Parliament. (217)

(2) Parliament assembled on the 17th of June. Few of the ancient nobility were present, but the bishops mustered in full force. (218) The attention of the members was first taken up with the consideration of measures for the suppression of Romanism, and a number of severe enactments were passed in order to prevent the spread of Papish opinions and influence. (219) But the most important business with which Parliament was concerned was that which was finally embodied in legislative form in Article No. VII. This was an act restoring to the bishops their ancient jurisdiction of commissions and their right to administer justice by commissioners and deputies "in all spiritual and ecclesiastical causes controverted between any person dwelling within the bounds and dioceses of their prelacies and bishoprics." (220) These were rights and privileges which their predecessors, the old Roman prelates, had enjoyed. (221) Disputes arising from such matters as marriage and divorce were placed within their care, while the right of deciding and confirming wills and testaments was also brought under their control. (222) It is important to observe that Parliament recognized that the causes over which the bishops were now placed as judges were spiritual and ecclesiastical in character. This being so one must protest that Parliament had no inherent right to grant such

(217) Calderwood VII. p. 37.
(218) Calderwood VII. p. 38.
(219) A.P.S. IV. pp. 428-430.
(220) A.P.S. IV. pp. 430-431.
(221) Cunningham, Church Hist. Scotland. II. p. 474.
(222) "jurisdiction in will cases, divorce cases, and the like, with the power of appointing judges and setting up Commissary Courts for the trial of such cases, which had for some time been vested in the Courts of Session, was transferred to the Archbishops and Bishops, the Archbishops in particular to have the power of nominating the four persons that should constitute the new Commissary Court in Edinburgh. Masson, Introduction. Privy Council Register VIII. p. XIX."
a jurisdiction. The General Assembly was the source from which such authority should have come. We believe that Parliament was acting within its province when it restored Episcopacy on its civil and financial side. But the granting of jurisdiction in spiritual and ecclesiastical causes should have been the work not of the State but of the Church. The approval of the General Assembly should at least have been first secured.

In February 1610 the King by royal proclamation erected two Courts of High Commission for the metropolitan provinces of Saint Andrews and Glasgow. This proclamation declares that in order "that the number of true professors may be known to increase, the antichristian enemie and his growth suppressed, and all sorts of vice and scandalous life punished," his Majesty, being "the nourish father" of the Kirk within his dominions, has "givin power and commissioun to the Reverend Father in God, and our trustie and wellbeloved counsellor, George Archbishop of St. Andrewes, primat and metropolitian of our kingdom....and to the Reverend Father in God, and our trustie and wellbeloved counsellor, Johne Archbishop of Glasgow," together with the lesser bishops, a number of the nobility certain judges and some of the ministers, "to call before them...anie person or persons dwelling and remaining within their provinces....or within anie diocesesis of the same, being offenders ather in life or religioun whom they hold anieway to be scandalous." They were empowered to place such offenders on trial. They could command excommunication against them if impenitent, and see it followed to rigorous results. They could fine and imprison, and at the same time suspend and deposite ministers. In conducting legal proceedings one archbishop and any four of those who had been commissioned were sufficient to constitute a quorum.(223)

By virtue of this act it will be seen that the bishops acquired extraordinarty wide powers. One archbishop and four authorized companions could at their own discretion summon anyone at the place and time they decided "whom they hold anieway to be scandalous." And let it be remembered that in the eyes of the Church the bishops were as yet little more than simple pastors. Yet this royal proclamation decreted that one archbishop and four coadjutors might suspend or deprive any minister. Truly as far as the State could effect Episcopacy both thing and name, had been restored to Scotland.(224)

(223) Calderwood VII. p. 57-62.
(224) Hume Brown speaks of the "arbitrary action, the vaguely defined power, the undue severity of these Courts," as making them "a by-word for tyrannous oppression with the scottish people." Stephen, however, points out that Hill Burton believes it possible to take an altogether and not nearly so unfavorable view of these Two Courts. Hume Brown, History of Scotland II, p. 250. Stephen, Hist. Scottich Church II. p. 136.
CHAPTER II.

"THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ASSEMBLY."

A. The Calling of the Assembly.
B. The Membership of the Assembly.
C. The Assembly Day by Day.
A voice and a vote in Parliament. Parliamentary reestablishment, constant moderation of synods and presbyteries and the erection of the two Courts of High Commission, these were the main steps by which Gladstones, Spottiswoode and their fellow prelates had left the ranks of Presbyterian party farther and farther behind, until at last they attained to a recognised position of national preeminence and importance. As King James contemplated the lofty heights to which his Episcopal nominees had by this time been exalted he must have realised that everything the State and the civil power could effect towards the restoration of a Scottish Episcopacy had now been accomplished, and that the future of their order depended upon the boldness and energy with which the bishops would exercise their newly-acquired powers. Consequently, we are not surprised to learn that "the king by his letters was now daily urging the bishops to take upon them the administration of all Church affairs."(1) But whatever be the cause, whether it was some memory or instinct inherited and surviving from their earlier Presbyterian days or else a wholesome fear and respect for the opinion of the Church at large, these prelates betrayed a keen reluctance to enter upon the high-handed and arbitrary courses which the king desired them to pursue. As Spottiswoode adds, they "were unwilling to make any change without the knowledge and approbation of the ministers."(2) That is to say, before they began to exercise the powers and privileges of their degree they desired that the Church should give her formal consent to this new departure. The civil erection of Episcopacy had been good enough as far as it went, but it alone was not sufficient. Something more was required, namely, its ecclesiastical sanction and establishment as well. The king finally fell in with this view, and directions were issued for the holding of a General Assembly in Glasgow early in the month of June.

Towards the end of March and the beginning of April missives were prepared at Court to be sent down to all the presbyteries notifying them that an Assembly was to be held in Glasgow on the eighth day of June next. Specimen copies of these letters are to be found in Calderwood's History, in the B.U.K. and in Botfield's collection of Original Letters.(3) The main points in the royal message to the presbyteries were as follows: "Trustie and wellbeloved, we greete you well. Having beene latelie advertised of great confusion arising in the church by reason of the loose and unsettled government which is therein, and being intreated by sundrie of our good subjects, bishops, ministers, and others, for licence to some general meeting of the church, wherin hope is given us that some good course, by common consent, shall be taken for redress of all disorders, and the division of minds that so long continued among the ministry, to the great scandal of their profession, shall cease and be extinguished, we have been pleased to yield to their requests, and granted liberty for a General Assembly to be held at Glasgow the eight day of June next." "And, therefore, we will and require you to make choice of the most wise, discreet, and peaceable-disposed ministers among you, to meet and convene the said assembly, instructed with sufficient commission from the rest, and in other assemblies you have been accustomed:" . . . . And beaus, by our letters, we have particularlie acquainted the Archbishop of St. Andrews of our purpose hereon, and sent unto him a speciall note of the names of suche as we desire to be at our said meeting, it is our pleasure that you conforme your selves thereto, and make choice of the persons that we take to be the fittest for giving advice in all matters; wherein yee shall doe us acceptable service. We bid you farewell."(4)

(1) Spottiswoode III. p. 205.
(2) Spottiswoode III. p. 205.
(4) Calderwood VII. pp. 92-93.
Calderwood and Soot insist, probably with truth, that the lists of names of those whom the king desired to be commissioned to the Assembly were prepared in the first instance not by the king but by the various bishops, "for," declares Calderwood, "there is no likelihood that the king was acquainted with the disposition of every particular person that was written to, or understood in what presbytery they made their residence." (5)

The bishops on the other hand would by this time have become well-informed as regards the episcopally minded clergy within the bounds of their dioceses. In some cases an accompanying letter from the bishop of the diocese seconded the royal communication. Neither the missives to presbyteries nor these from the bishops were sent out to the presbyteries until after Dunbar's arrival in Edinburgh in May -- scarce a fortnight before the Assembly convened. (6)

But not content with requesting the presbyteries to elect his nominees as their representatives, King James resolved to be doubly sure that these picked men appeared at the Glasgow gathering. Consequently to a number of them special letters were directed, a few specimen copies of which have been preserved for us, and may be consulted in Botfield's collection. (7) Of such a nature was one from the king to a layman, Sir John Skenes, the Clerk Registrar. In this missive his Majesty commands Sir John to be present at the Assembly "not doubting but upon this advertisement both you will address yourself thither and do no less good offices thereat than we do expect for at your hands." (8)

By reverting to the 1606 method of choosing commissioners both king and bishops rendered themselves open to the accusation that they were convening a packed and muzzled Assembly. This was certainly the view held by contemporary Presbyterians, and a generation later in the famous Assembly of 1638 this method of election was seized upon as one of the reasons for disqualifying the 1610 gathering. (9) In our own day when the bitterness of the 17th century conflicts have largely passed away it is admitted even by episcopalian writers that the initial good done by the king's consenting to the holding of Assembly was undone by the way in which its members were called together. Thus Stephen is quite definite in his opinion that the king's action in calling the Assembly "was greatly vitiated by his interference. . . . . In the choice of ministers to represent the different presbyteries in the Assembly "(10). It is our own opinion that those responsible for the calling of the Glasgow Assembly were guilty of an extremely false and foolish move. With the happy example of the Assembly of 1608 before them, the members of which had been elected in a more or less regular way, it is at first thought very surprising that a return should have been made to the doubtful tactics of the earlier Linlithgow gathering. In the choice of commissioners in 1608 royal and episcopal influence had been confined in its workings to certain private and unofficial channels; there had been no carefully prepared

---

(6) See the letter from Archbishop Gladstones to the Presbytery of Chirnside. Calderwood VII. pp. 91-92.
(8) Botfield Original Letters I. p. 239-240. Row is responsible for the statement that certain ministers not named in the royal letters to the presbyteries were privately ordered to be present at the Assembly. Row Historie, p. 274.
(10) Stephen Hist. Scottish Church II. p. 197.
lists of names sent down to the presbyteries over which these courts were required to perform the empty formality of a regular election. And yet both king and bishops had regarded the 1608 Assembly as an unqualified success. Why then in 1610 was there no attempt made to follow the successful methods of 1608? The answer to this question probably takes the following form: In King James' eyes the issues now involved were of too great importance to allow him to take any chances. Consider his position. He was planning and hoping for an Assembly which acting on behalf of the stubborn Scottish Kirk would consent to the reintroduction of a full-blown Episcopal government. If such an Assembly was to be a success then the strictest preliminary precautions would have to be taken to see that its personnel were almost without exception king's and bishop's men. But to understand the king's viewpoint is one thing; to approve of his schemes and actions is another. And this we cannot do. Even the strongest desire to be fair to James cannot prevent us from concluding that his churchmanship in this whole matter was grievously at fault. The means he employed to compass his designs were unworthy both of his high position and of the great ecclesiastical enterprise upon which he was embarked.

About the time that the first notification of the coming Assembly reached Scotland certain instructions with regard to the business of the gathering were despatched to the bishops through the Lord Secretary. This is clear from a letter which the bishops addressed to the king. The reply is interesting. "Most Graceful and Sacred Sovereign," it began. "We received your Majesties letter by the Lord Secretary, containing some directions for the better proceeding of your Highness service committed unto us. In all the particulars we have agreed to conform ourselves, and take such course as your Majesty may have full contentment and at last see the government established, which has been of your Highness long desired: . . . Of the means how to bring this about, or our present deliberations: we shall take, by God's help, the most safe and sure way, and what we undertake, we shall be answerable to your Majesty for performance. We have all our Ministers, even such as were most refractory, at the point of toleration: they will suffer things to proceed and be quiet, because they can no longer strive; but when they shall espy the fruits of a better government we do not doubt that they will be better minded. . . ." The missive is signed by the two Archbishops and the Bishops of Brechin, Lismore or Argyll, Dunblane, Caithness, Galloway, Orkney and Dunkeld.

Quite as informing is the letter from Gladstanes to the king, dated April 18th, 1610. "I can not disguise," writes the primate, "the good appearance of prosperous success that your Majesties services are to have in the government ecclesiastic and reformation there: for the wise sort are ready to embrace your Majesties determination simply. The great multitude of the Ministry are desirous that Presbyteries shall stand, but directed and governed by the Bishops, and so would refer great matter to be done only by the consent and authority of the Bishops." This last sentence is interesting as it contains more than a hint of the kind of religious settlement which the Assembly was to effect, a settlement which would give to Scotland.

(11) King James had been greatly pleased with the 1608 Assembly. Spottiswood declared that James had said, "That if he had been there in his own person he would neither have done more or less than he had been done." 3." . . . III. pp. 1055-1056.

a regular and working Episcopate and yet at the same time
would secure to the Kirk those representative ecclesiastical
courts which she had come to value so highly. The few
number of the contradicts to Episcopal jurisdiction,
continues the Archbishop, "are content to be silent; so that
your Majesty needs not to enter in any dishonorable conditions
. . . . " The letter contains a familiar reference to "your
own northern men" and a more sinister one to "your Majesty's
princely liberality." It concludes with the suggestion that
the "Moderatorship or Presidency of the Assembly might well be
conferred on himself as Archbishop and Primate.(13) As we
shall see, this suggestion, however, found little or no favour
in the royal eyes.

While the leading clergy were thus beginning to
turn over in their minds the problem as to who the Moderator
of the Assembly would be, the similar question relating to
the Lord High Commissioner was definitely settled when on the
24th of May Sir Geo. Hume, Earl of Dunbar, entered Edinburgh
bringing with him his commission from the King. We shall
devote a few sentences to the career of this nobleman directly.
Meanwhile note that he had been accompanied to Scotland on
this occasion by three prominent English divines, all of them
chaplains to King James.(14) These learned visitors were Dr.
George territon, later Dean and Canon of York,(15) Dr. Phineas
Hudson, afterwards Chancellor of York(16) and Dr. Christopher
Hampton who was destined to rise to a high position in the
Irish Church and to become Archbishop of Armagh.(17) We shall
meet Magellan dignitaries again when the Assembly convenes.
It was to be their duty then to deal with whatever Kirkmen
there were who still remained unconvinced and if possible to
persuade them of the lawfulness and expediency of Episcopal
Government. It was shortly after the arrival of these
important persons in the capital that the presbyteries received
the royal letters giving them official notice of the holding
of the Assembly.(18)

The Lord High Commissioner, Dunbar, had not long
been settled in Edinburgh when he received from Court the
following extremely important letter, "James R.--It is our
pleasure, will and express command that, agains this ensuing
Assembly to be kept at our city of Glasgow, you shall
be divydel and shall cause suche peraoniS as you shall see
fitting by the advice of the Archbishops of St. Androis
and Glasgow. And the same shal In your acct.
be divydel and s-lbe thankfully allowed to you
in your acct necessaries. And thir present Is s-lbe a sufficient
warrant unto you for that effect."(19) In other words, not
satisfied with having the commissioners to the Assembly all

(15) Alumni Cantabrigienses III. p. 176. part I.
(17) Dictionary National Biography pp.268-269. Alumni Cantab-
brigenses II. p. 296. Part I.
(18) Calderwood VII. p. 91.
contrary he is making reference to certain definite facts in the sphere of ecclesiastic finance of which he himself had first-hand knowledge. How this money was spent, and whether or not there was really such a thing as bribery in the Assembly are questions which we will consider later. (20)

The 8th of June, the date of the Assembly, as now rapidly approaching, and in final preparation for its opening we are told that Dunbar and the bishops sat down to a three days private conference "contriving how to order matters at the Assembly." (21) While we do not know what subjects were discussed or what conclusions were arrived at in this meeting, yet we may be certain that a programme of events was prepared and the proposed legislation given a careful and final review. Then came Friday the 8th of June, one of the outstanding dates in the history of the Scottish Kirk. A stray remark from How contains the information that it was within the walls of Glasgow's ancient Cathedral Church that the brethren assembled. (22) And so early on the morning of Friday the 8th to St. Mungo's we take our way, there to find the King's Commissioner and a large and representative company of ministers, bishops, barons, burgesses and nobles in General Assembly convened. The fullest account which we possess of the opening proceedings is to be found in the pages of Calderwood's History and in an unsigned letter which happily turns up in the continuation of James Melville's Diary. (23)

The following are a few of the historian's sentences. "Upon Friday, the 8th of June, the first day of the Assembly a fast was kept; but like the fast that was indited when Naboth's vineyard was taken from him, Mr. John Spotswod, Bishop of Glasgow, taught in the morning upon these words of Jeremiel, "I would have cured Babel," etc. The main drift of his discourses was to aggrieve the sinne of sacrilegious persons. By the way, he hipped also the laick patrons. In end, he said this speech: "Yee looke that I would speake some thing of the purpose for wh ich this Assembly is convened. I will say no more but this, Religion must not be mainteained after the manner it was brought in this land. It was brought in by confusion; It must be mainteined by ordre. It was brought in against ordre; it must be mainteined by ordre." (24)

The next to mount the pulpit was that well known figure James Law, Bishop of Orkney, Moderator of the last Assembly. This prelate announced as his text the words of the Apostle in Romans XIV. 19: "Let us follow these things which concern peace." As he had preached from a somewhat similar text: "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem" at Linlithgow in 1606 we may conclude that with him the general matter of "Peace" was a favorite topic. (25) Calderwood has preserved an outline of this sermon, and as far as we can judge from it his remarks appear to have been logically ordered and clearly thought out. Introducing his subject he first of all pointed out that it was always necessary that peace be joined with verity, otherwise it were better to have no peace. He then proceeded to the heart of his address which appears to have been an able defense of the lawfulness of Episcopal government. It does not surprise us to learn that he "passed by jus divinum." In the early 17th century it was as a rule not Episcopalians but Presbyterians who claimed that their ecclesiastical policy was divinely instituted. (26) An assertion of the divine right of Episcopacy was not heard in the Scottish Church until the year 1631. (27) And so "passing by

(20) See Dr. Masson's comment. Introduction Privy Council Register VIII. p. XXV.
(21) Calderwood VII. p. 94.
(22) Row History p. 275.
(23) Calderwood VII. pp. 94-95. Melville Diary pp. 800-802.
(24) Calderwood VII. p. 94.
(26) "It is somewhat remarkable that the divine right of Episcopacy was never asserted in England till Bancroft preached his famous sermon at Paul's Cross in 1689, eleven years after the Scottish Church had affirmed the divine right of Presbytery in the Second Book of Discipline." Matheson Politics and Religion I. p. 300.
(27) Matheson, Politics and Religion I. p. 322.
just divinum" the bishop took his stand upon three points: Antiquity, Universality and Perpetuity. He was thus on easier ground when he based his case on the historic custom of the Church and the consent of the ancient Fathers. "Jus facti," we are told, he also passed over together with another question relating to the scope and extent of the bishop's powers. The sermon concluded "with a solemn oath and profession of his persuasion of the lawfulness of episcopal government."(28)

As it was the custom in the Assembly for the retiring Moderator to deliver a sermon before the new Moderator was elected, (29) and as Bishop Law, Moderator at Linlithgow in 1606, had now fulfilled his duty in this respect, it will be seen that the way was now clear for the election of a Moderator for the present Assembly. A list of four names was prepared. The nominees were Principal Patrick Sharpe of Glasgow University, Patrick Lindsay, minister of St. Vigean in Angus, John Mitchell, minister of Karkinach and Constant Moderator of Kirkaldy and John Spottiswoode, Archibishop of Glasgow. (30) It will be necessary for us to devote a few words to each of these important Churchmen.

Principal Patrick Sharpe had begun his career as a schoolmaster in Glasgow. (31) In these early days he had been an intimate friend of Andrew Melville, and James Melville quotes a remark of Sharpe's to the effect that he had learned more from "Andrew Melville reading and playing, for understanding of the authors quhilk he teached in the scholl, nor be all his comenteres." (22) He succeeded Smeaton as Divinity Principal of Glasgow University in 1586. (32) The controversial violence of the extreme Presbyterians appears to have alienated his sympathies, for after 1586 we find him one of the leading members of the Episcopal party. He was a member of the first of those General Commissions of Assembly with which King James achieved such important results. (34) He appears to have been a prominent figure in the subsequent Assemblies for we find his name on the moderatorial lists in 1600, 1601, 1602, 1606 and 1608. (25) In 1606 he was one of the group of episcopally minded ministers summoned to London along with the 22 Presbyterian leaders. While there he publicly condemned the Aberdeen Assembly as unhallowd. (37) In the same year he was appointed Archibishop Spottiswoode's substitute in the Constant Moderatorship of Glasgow. (37) He also became a member of the Court of High Commission (Glasgow) in 1610. (35) A contemporary writer once described Sharpe as "ane courtier." (38) So to us he appears to have been tolerant of Erastianism and quite willing and prepared to see Episcopacy established as the polity of the Scottish Church.

Patrick Lindsay was minister of St. Vigean in Angus, into which charge he had been inducted in 1592. (40) Twenty years earlier than the present date we find him a commissioner to the Assembly of 1590 (41) and from then on he appears to have

(29) Cooper C.U.A.P. p. 64.
(31) Held Divinity Principles p. 106. q
(32) Melville Diary p. 50
(33) Held Divinity Principles p. 106.
(36) Melville Diary p. 360.
(38) Calderwood VII. p. 69.
(39) Soot A.H. Introduction p. XV.
(40) Fasti V. p. 449.
(41) Soot A.H. p. 58.
been a fairly regular attender at such gatherings. He was one of those who swung round definitely to the Episcopal side. By 1610 his seal in the Episcopal cause had received some reward, for he was now one of the General Commission of Assembly and a member of the recently erected S. Andrews Court of High Commission. But his best days were yet to be. In 1615 he was to be preferred to the See of Ross, and in 1633 he was to become Archbishop of Glasgow. Lindsay's end, however, was an unhappy one, for he was fated to survive to see his order overthrown and he himself deposed and excommunicated by the Assembly of 1638.

In 1610 John Mitchelson or Michaelson was still minister of Markinch. It was not until 1616 that he was translated to Burntisland with which town his memory has been chiefly connected. He was a graduate of S. Andrews, and had been ordained in 1586. For a quarter of a century he was minister of Markinch, and sometimes during these years he adopted the Episcopal opinions to which he remained loyal until his death. He was appointed constant Moderator of Kirkaldy in 1606, which office he retained until 1638. In 1607 he was actively engaged in aiding Archbishop Gladstone to secure the Constant Moderatorship of the Synod of Fife. At Linlithgow his services to king and bishops were thus far recognized when he was one of those nominated for the Moderator's chair. Mitohelson was to have the misfortune to live to view the overthrow and abolition of the Episcopal regime. In 1639 he himself was deposed by the militant and triumphant Presbyterians.

But the most outstanding of the four nominees and indeed the most important ecclesiastic in the whole Assembly was John Spottiswoode, Archbishop of Glasgow. Wodrow's description of him is worth quoting: "He was a person of very considerable learning and great application to business, he was polite and much shaped out for a Court; a man of management and indeed, had the chief conduct of ecclesiastical affairs with no small influence on those of a civil nature for thirty-seven years in Scotland." Archbishop Spottiswoode was the son of John Spottiswoode, Reformer, Superintendent of Lothian and companion of Knox. He was born in 1565, and was educated at Glasgow where he studied under James and Andrew Melville. In 1583 at the early age of eighteen he succeeded his father in the parish of Calder. In these youthful days he appears to have been more or less definitely attached to the Presbyterian side. In 1586 he was one of those who refused to annul the sentence pronounced against Archbishop Adamson. Ten years later we find him actively engaged in procuring subscriptions to Black's deolinature. While as late as 1597 he revised Robert Bruce's apology, and in so doing gave it an even sharper edge. What actually caused him to abandon Presbyterian
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(46) Leishman. Dr. John Michaelson of Burntisland. Scottish Ecclesiological Transactions. 1924. An interesting sketch of Mitchelson’s career will be found here.
(48) Calderwood VI. pp. 574-576.
(49) B.U.K. III. p. 1046.
(50) Quoted by Cooper. John Spottiswood. Scottish Ecclesiological Transactions. 1925. p. 27.
(51) Calderwood IV. p. 553.
(52) Scott's B. p. 72.
principles for Erastianism and Episcopacy we cannot tell, but when this change of allegiance was made it was decisive and final. He became "an Erastian of the strictest type and in ecclesiastical matters acted simply as the king's servant." (54)

In 1601 he went abroad as chaplain to the Duke of Lennox, and two years later shortly after the king's departure for England he was raised to the Archepiscopal of Glasgow. (55)

In all that followed Spottiswoode played an increasingly important part. King James found him an able administrator and a loyal and devoted subject. Keith notes his diligence in the royal service when he states that "they say he made no less than fifty journeys from Scotland to London." (56) He was admitted to the Privy Council in 1605. (57) and was appointed Constant Moderator of Glasgow in 1605. (58) But it would be impossible here to give a detailed account of his many offices or a complete description of his career. We may note, however, that he was to become Archbishop of St. Andrews and Primate of Scotland upon Gladstones death in 1615. (59) He was destined to outlive his royal master King James and to witness the Episcopal edifice which had been erected at the cost of so much pain and trouble brought down in irretrievable ruin by the misguided and arbitrary notion of James' son. "All that we have been doing these thirty years," were his sorrowful and bitter words, "is now thrown down." (50) He died an exile in England, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. (61)

The four nominees having been removed the Archbishop of Glasgow was elected Moderator of the Assembly, all voting for him except five who cast their votes for Patrick Sharpe. (62) For the raising of a bishop to the Moderatorial chair there was by this time some precedent. Back in 1575 James Boyd, Tulohan Bishop of Glasgow, had been elected to preside over the Assembly which met in Edinburgh during the March of that year. (63) Moreover, at Linlithgow in 1608 Bishop Law had been chosen for the same high office and dignity. (64) As far as we can judge from the records the present election was carried through in the accustomed way and in a perfectly regular manner. There is nothing in the evidence to justify Row's bitter assertion that Spottiswoode "had (as said is) usurped the moderation, because they were convened at his cathedral." (65)

The Moderator having been thus elected the next item of business was to choose, "somewhat after the fashion observed in the Scottish Parliament," (66) a committee of assessors to meet privately with him for the treating of those matters which were to be concluded in the Assembly.

(54) Dictionary National Biography LIII. pp. 412-417
(56) Keith Catalogue p. 255.
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This committee was composed of (a) his Majesty's Commissioners of whom there were four: the Earl of Dunbar, the Archbishop of St. Andrews; Lord President Sir John Preston of the Court of Session; and Sir Alexander Hay, the Lord Secretary of State; (b) all the bishops of the realm with the exception of the aged David Lindsay of Ross; and (c) a representative group of the more important ministers. Calderwood declares that these ministerial assessors were "deemed by the simpler sort to be opposite to bishops howbeit they were not such in deid." (68) Decision was also arrived at with regard to the hours of meeting on the morrow. At the same time, a smaller committee headed by Henry Philip, minister of Arbroath, was appointed for the reading and answering of bills. (69) With this last appointment the Friday morning session appears to have concluded.

The brethren reassembled in the afternoon to hear one of the visiting divines Dr. Hudson "the little English chaplaine" preach from the beginning of the second chapter of Acts. His sermon like that of Bishop Law in the morning was concerned with the lawfulness and expediency of Episcopal government. He appears to have developed his theme in a novel fashion, since "for prove of the superioritie of bishops, he allledged Christ teaching his apostles, some at his head, some at his bosome, some at his feete." (70) Dr. Hudson's pulpit style also impressed the Scots as being somewhat peculiar; they described his manner of delivery as "sumit and outit." (71)

The official minutes in the Book of the Universal Kirk inform us that at the second or afternoon session the Earl of Dunbar also addressed the Assembly. He began by making an open declaration of King James' firm intention to establish "a good solid and perfect ordre in the discipline of the Kirk." He stated that there were a number of points in the existing polity which his Majesty desired to have redified and reformed. He then essayed a defense of the right of the Crown to initiate such ecclesiastical changes declaring that "the reformation thereof doth most properly appertain to his Highness, in respect of his royal authority and duty, wherein his Majesty is bound to God Almighty to provide that the state of the Kirk within his dominions should be settled as well in discipline as in Doctrine according to the Word of God." It is clear that the Earl had been devoting some thought and attention to the vexed subject of the relations of Church and State, and that from the royal viewpoint he had learned his lessons well. He concluded by setting forth the results which would accompany the modifications desired by his Majesty. The Word of God would then "be purely and sincerely preached," while the discipline of the Kirk, being once for all "wisely and discreetly settled" would "be inviolably observed in all times coming." All of which may be read in the Book of the Universal Kirk. (72) The Earl then produced, and began to read the regular letter to the Assembly from the King.

This royal letter forms a remarkable document. It begins with a double declaration of affection towards the Reformed religion and of opposition to the Anti-Christian or Roman enemy above all other foes. Following upon this introduction it continues in terms which are so interesting and important that we now quote from it at length. "And as it hath pleased God in his mercy to appoint us to be the nourish
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(71) Melville Diary p. 801

(72) B.U.K. III. pp. 1092-1093.
Father of His Church here on earth, within our Dominions, so do we intend ever to be most careful for setting forward all such things, which may advance his glory and breed quietness and peace in the Church; unto which nothing hath been so great an enemy as the want of order and government, without which no body or estate, either ecclesiastical or civil, can subsist. And howseover the singularity of some did, for a certain space, maintain, either by wilfulness or ignorance, a sort of headless government, yet ere long it did kyth what inconvenience and harm might ensue to the Church, and advancement of the Gospel, by any longer continuance therein: which moved Us during our stay there in our own person, to take so great pains for finding remedy for this. ...we thereupon not only assisted and counseled sundry Assemblies of that Church by our own presence; but have caused others be convened since our departure from thence, having to our great cost and charges procured also maintenance, sufficient in some reasonable sort, for the Fathers of the Church: ... So we did fully hope, that before this time, the Church thereupon, apprehending and perceiving errors past, ...should have resolved and concluded, and therewith have become suitors and solicitors unto us, for establishment of that government and rule, which is most fit and allowed of, in former times in the Primitive Church; so that things should not be left still in uncertainty, by reason of the division and distraction of minds among yourselves, by which to your own knowledge, both the common enemy hath increased, and sin and wickedness remain unpunished. But whether the default be in the Fathers of the Church, ...or in factions singularity of others of manner rank. ...We, holding Oxenase under bond, not to suffer this sort of lingering in a matter of such moment, have thereupon thought it expedient to call this present Assembly ... hoping, that your forwardness will remove all opinion, that may be conceived either of unwillingness, or of oppositions to our so godly intentions." The letter adds that "the particular imparting of our farther pleasure and mind herein" has been referred "to our right trusty and right well beloved Cousin and Counsellor the Earl of Dunbar and the right reverend Father our right trusty Counsellor the Archbishop of St. Andrews."(73)

This last sentence can evidently mean only one thing, namely, that Dunbar and Glads anea were in possession of the details of the intended legislation.

Truly as we have said above, a very remarkable document; not without its note of urgency and menace and skillfully phrased to permit no alternative but to obey. When we consider the trouble which had been taken to ensure a safe and certain membership for the Assembly, we may put forward the opinion that the peremptory and high sounding tone of the letter was hardly necessary. As has been remarked more than once, "The Assembly did not need to be threatened."(74) The brethren constituting it were quite willing and prepared to acquiesce in the royal designs. From a study of the records it appears that the letter was listened to without protest and received without disquisition. And when Dunbar had finished his reading the Assembly at once took action in the way of giving satisfaction to his Majesty. All legislative proposals would first of all have to come before the Privy Conference. And so the members of this committee were ordered to convene apart the next morning. The Assembly itself thereupon adjourned until the following day.

Here, however, we must pause in our record of proceedings in order to make an examination of the membership roll of the Assembly. We shall return to our review of the events of the Assembly at a later point in this chapter.

We come now to the consideration of a very interesting subject. The brethren have assembled, and we have followed them closely to the conclusion of their first business. And now arises the question: Just who is present in the Assembly? Of what names is the Roll of the Assembly composed? In beginning an investigation of this subject we are at once confronted with the complaints and objections of the Presbyterian annalists. Both Calderwood and Soot of Cupar declare that there were a number of ministers brought in from Orkney, Sutherland and Caithness "who had never seen the face of a General Assembly before." (76) After reading such a statement one would expect to find on hand an unusually large representation of his Majesty's "own northern men." Then again both these writers agree in protesting against the presence in the Assembly of some thirty noblemen who were present without commission from any presbytery but in obedience to a command received from the king. (77) The objection to these high born members was never forgotten by the Presbyterians, and in 1658 it was re-echoed as one of the reasons for disqualifying the 1650 Assembly. (78)

From our remembrance of the manner in which the members of Assembly were elected one might be led to imagine that the royal nominees would be found on examination to be an extremely mediocre lot, men without deep religious convictions, who possessed few outstanding qualities, and who had been won over to the royal and Episcopal side by the arts of fear and favour. From the danger of making rash and unguarded assumptions of this kind before the Roll has been adequately surveyed, we shall be saved by a few words from the pen of Prof. Cooper. Writing of the two copies of the Roll which have come down to us, Dr. Cooper states that "a study of them reveals the presence of most of the eminent ministers then in Scotland, with the exception of Patrick Simon." (79) "We shall be forced to recur to Prof. Cooper's words in order to test their accuracy directly. Meanwhile we shall do well to bear them in mind. They will save us from false and foolish generalizations, while at the same time they will furnish an added reason for endeavoring to discover just who were gathered together within the walls of Saint Andrews during these four momentous days."

We have just made mention of the two copies of the Assembly Roll. One of these will be found in the Book of Universal Kirk. (80) The other is in Calderwood's History. (81) In all important respects the two copies agree. The only important difference between them is to be seen in the order in which occur the names of the presbyteries according to which the ministers are grouped. This divergence is, however, of such minor importance that it need not detain us here. We shall now pass on to examine the Roll, following the order which we find in the "Book of Universal Kirk."

On turning to the Roll one observes at the head of the list, the four royal commissioners: the Earl of Dunbar, the Archbishop of St. Andrews, the Lord President of the Session and the Lord Secretary of State. We shall not pause over Archbishop Gladsaxes here as we shall consider his story when we come to deal with the bishops as a group. (82) But it will be in order here and now to say a few words with regard to the other three commissioners.

(82) See below pp. 78-79.
Sir. George Hume, Earl of Dunbar, had begun his career as a "Cubicular" or Gentleman of the King's Bedchamber. After July 1605 when he was made an Earl he shared with Lord Dunfermline the chief management of Scottish affairs. To him King James entrusted the administration of an increasing number of ecclesiastical matters, and in this connection he found him a zealous and devoted servant. "He was so busale," is Calderwood's verdict, "and left nothing undone to overthrow the discipline of our church and speciallie at the Assembly holden. . . . in Glasgow."(85) The Earl figured prominently in the trial and conviction of the six confessors of the Aberdeen Assembly.(84) He was also a leading figure both at the Convention Assembly of 1606 and at the Assembly of 1608.(85)

At the Perth Parliament in 1605 he was placed in charge of arrangements, and as a result was largely instrumental in having those Acts passed which made that Parliament so outstanding. The oversight of the 1610 Assembly was, however, the last work of importance upon which he was employed. He died unexpectedly at Court in January 1611.(86) Scott and Row report that when the news of the Glasgow Assembly reached the imprisoned Andrew Melville his anger and dismay found expression in the following prophecy: "that man that hath overthrown that kirk and the liberties of Christ's kingdom there shall never have the grace to sett his foot in that kingdome againe."(87)

On reasonable grounds M'Crie doubts whether any such prophetic words were ever spoken.(88) At the same time, however, he is certain that Melville did not hesitate to denounce the Earl in strong and vehement language. Zealous Presbyterians like Melville never forgave Dunbar for his steady and successful activity in the royal and episcopal cause.(89)

The other two Commissioners need not detain us long. Sir John Preston, Lord President of the Court of Session had begun the practice of Law as an advocate back in the year 1575. He appears to have enjoyed an early and substantial success. In 1595 he was made an ordinary Judge of the Court of Session, and held in succession many other important posts. He became Vice-President of the Session in 1607 and attained the rank of President two years later. He too played his part in the King's ecclesiastical schemes. We find him an assessor at the ministers' trial in 1606 and a member of the Court of High Commission in 1610.(80) His fellow commissioner, Sir Alexander Hay of Newton had held his position of Lord Secretary of State since 1608. One meets his name frequently in the pages of Scott and Calderwood. He was to hold office until 1612.(91)

The group of members whose titles have next in order been recorded are the representatives of the greater nobility. We had that there were in attendance the Earls of Controse, Glencairn, Caithness, M'goun, Kinghorn, Abercorn, Lothian; Lords Lindsey, Scoone, Blantyre, Kintail, the Master of Tullibartine, the Lord Comptroller, and Lord Killyth.) We may also make mention here of the thirteen representatives of the Scottish baronage whose names occur separated from those of the miles by the long lists of ministers at the foot of the Assembly Roll.(92) It would be a vain and pedantic exercise to enter upon an investigation of the life history of each of these noblemen. With one or two exceptions their names have no significance as far as the history of the Kirk is concerned. They came to the Assembly not as regular commissioners with the authority of the presbyteries.
behind them, but rather as the representatives of their own
powerful estate acting in obedience to the wishes of the king.
They were thus in attendance at the Assembly not as the lawful
delegates of the Church, clothed with her authority and
empowered to speak on her behalf, but merely as representing
the extensive interests of their influential social class.
By the year 1610 there was some precedent for their presence
in the supreme court of the Church. It will be remembered that
similar companies of noblemen had been present at the Linlithgow
Assemblies both in 1606(92) and in 1608. As we have seen,
their presence had been challenged in the latter and more
regular of these two gatherings but after some words offered
in their defense by Patrick Galloway, they had been allowed to
remain.(94) Their appearance at Glasgow in 1610 could therefore
not have been unexpected. It was another of those things which
the strict Presbyterians never forgave or forgot.

We come now to consider the clergy in attendance at
the Assembly. They fall naturally into two groups, first the
bishops and secondly the ordinary pastors and teachers. We shall
take up the study of each of these groups in turn. We begin
with the bishops.

In considering the life histories and care< rs of the
bishops we quite naturally begin with the Primate George Gladstanes,
Archbishop of S. Andrews. We have already taken note of his
brother Archbishop of Glasgow above. Gladstanes was a native of
Dundee and a student at S. Andrews where it is probable that he
studied Theology under Andrew Melville. After having served the
parish of Arbirlot in Forfarshire from 1592, he was translated to
S. Andrews in 1607.(96) This new appointment was the work of
the Commissioners of the General Assembly and was one of those
significant events which let all men know that the days of the
Moderate ascendency had arrived.(96) Shortly after his arrival
in S. Andrews Gladstanes was made vice-Chancellor of the university.(97)
When in 1600 James decided to fill up the vacant bishoprics the
minister of S. Andrews was preferred to the see of Caithness.(98)
He doesn't appear, however, ever to have visited his northern
diocese.(99) Four years later he became Archbishop and Primate.(100)
This position he retained until his death in 1615.

Gladstanes does not appear to have been either a
strong or a pleasant figure. One notes, for example, a strong
undercurrent of subservience and sycophancy running through his
surviving letters. His brother, Archbishop while bearing witness
to his "god learning, ready utterance and great invention" also acknowledged his "easy nature" which was responsible
for his doing many things which were injurious to his see.(101)
Such traits as he possessed seem to have been wholly obscured and
rendered useless by the presence of a fiery temper which caused
him to fly into fits of rage and fury when he found his course
crossed or opposed.(102) On one occasion he made himself responsible
for a phrase which for the sake of his own reputation had been
better never coined. Writing to King James on September 11th, 1609
he speaks of himself as the "first of that dead estate which
your Majesty hath reor atef" and expresses his intention of reparing
to the royal presence "to less and thank my Earthly Creator."(103)
We may let the words stand alone. Comment surely is needless. In
spite, however, of the seeming devotion and subservience which the
words betoken it is evident that James was becoming increasingly
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[100] Calderwood VI. p. 568.
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dissatisfied with the way in which Gladstanes was guiding the course of Scottish ecclesiastical affairs. We have seen that his Majesty failed to respond to the suggestion put forward with regard to the Moderatorship of the Assembly.(104) Spottiswoode of Glasgow was now the prelate who stood highest in the royal estimation. Saint Andrews had been supplanted.(105)

The Bishop of Orkney: "Mr. James Law had been raised to the see of Orkney in 1605 when he was minister of the parish of Kirkliston.(106) In his earlier days we find him cooperating outwardly at least with men like John Davidson, the outspoken Presbyterian preacher, and Andrew Melville.(107) He became a member of that extremely important body the Commission of the General Assembly in 1600.(108) Two years later we find him appointed as one of a committee to interview the Papish Lords, his particular duty being to wait upon the Earl of Angus.(109) Throughout the years which witnessed the restoration of Episcopacy Bishop Law took an increasingly important part in ecclesiastical affairs. His services and eminence were recognized in 1608 when, as we have seen, he was elected Moderator.(110) In 1615 he was to be appointed Spottiswoode's successor in the See of Glasgow. He continued to be 'Rabbiship of the West until his death in 1632.(111) It was Masson's opinion that at this time (1610) Law with Spottiswoode and Andrew Knox of the Isles were the most prominent and statesmanlike of the ecclesiastics of Scotland.(112) Keith describes Law as "a man of good learning" and of "a grave and venerable aspect."(113)

The Bishop of Caithness: Alexander Forbes, minister of Fettercaim in the Mearns, was advanced to this bishopric as Gladstanes' successor in 1604.(114) He was a graduate of Saint Andrews, and had also studied at Heidelberg.(115) Since in 1594 his name appears on a committee along with the names of Andrew Melville, Davidson and Robert Bruce it is evident that he began his ecclesiastical career under Presbyterian leadership.(116) What is was that made him change his allegiance we do not know. Probably he was one of those who, as Matheson suggests, "cooperated formally with Melville" but "were far removed from him in spirit."(117) At any rate Forbes became a King's man, and in 1600 his name appears as one of the General Commission granted by the Controse Assembly.(118) He appears to have been a well known figure in the Assemblies, for between 1593 and 1602 we find him present at eight out of ten of these gatherings.(119) Calderwood declares that he was one of those who deserted their flocks, posted to court and came home Lord Bishops."(120) Forbes was to be transferred to Aberdeen in 1616.(121)

(104) See above pp. 66 and 70.
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The Bishop of Moray: Alexander Douglas, minister of Elgin, was made Bishop of Moray in 1602. (122) Like so many of his brethren he appears to have begun life as a Presbyterian, but later to have swung round to the Episcopal side. Thus we find his name upon the roll of the militant Kirk's Commission in 1596, (123) and also upon that of the first General Commission granted at the king's request by the Assembly at Dundee in 1597. (124) Like Forbes of Caithness he appears to have been fairly regular in his attendance at the General Assemblies since the twenty-four Assemblies from the time of his induction at Elgin to the date of his promotion to the bishopric he was a member of over a dozen. (125) As a result of the decisions of the Convention-Assembly of 1606 he became Constant Moderator of the Presbytery of Elgin. (126) In 1610 along with his brother bishops he was raised to the Court of High Commission. (127) He was to continue Bishop of Moray until his death in 1623. (127)

The Bishop of Aberdeen: Peter Blackburn came to Aberdeen from Glasgow of which latter city he was a native. In Glasgow he had taught in the University during Melville's Principalship. (128) He held the post of minister of the parish Church of Aberdeen--Saint Nicholas—for many years. In 1600 while minister there he was presented to the bishopric. (130) His name occurs frequently in the Assembly records and it is clear that he was one of the Church's leading men. He was chosen by the Assembly which met in Dundee during the March of 1598. (131) At the next Assembly, that of Montrose, 1600, Blackburn as retiring Moderator delivered the opening sermon. "I am told that he delivered "verie good doctrine before noone, but was brought in effect to recant it after noone, before the whole Assemblie." This is James Melville adds, was "to the great greiff of guid Brethren." (132) It is possible that although in the main sympathetic towards the attempts which were being made to establish Presbyterianism and to restore Episcopacy Blackburn did not approve of all the details of these efforts. Thus at the famous Perth Parliament of 1606 when all the bishops went riding in state two by two to the place of meeting, Blackburn thinking such display "not beseeming the simplicity of a minister. . . ; therefore, he went on foot to the parliament house." This exhibition of personal independence so angered his brother prelates that they "caused the Chancellor remove him out of the parliament house, because he would not ride as the rest did." (133) A foot note in Keith's "Bishops" contains the information that he attempted to placate the opponents of Episcopacy but that the only result of his labours was to alienate both parties in the quarrel. "He made himself unprecious to both, and so lost his authority." (134) He held his bishopric until his death in 1616.

The Bishop of Brechin: Of Andrew Lamb, first of Brechin and later of Galloway there is not a great deal to tell when all the bishops went riding in state two by two to the place of meeting, Blackburn thinking such display "not beseeming the simplicity of a minister. . . ; therefore, he went on foot to the parliament house." This exhibition of personal independence so angered his brother prelates that they "caused the Chancellor remove him out of the parliament house, because he would not ride as the rest did." (133) A foot note in Keith's "Bishops" contains the information that he attempted to placate the opponents of Episcopacy but that the only result of his labours was to alienate both parties in the quarrel. "He made himself unprecious to both, and so lost his authority." (134) He held his bishopric until his death in 1616.
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and the Chapel Royal. In 1601 he was made a royal chaplain, and in that capacity went to England with the Earl of Mar, Ambassador to the English Court. (135) Calderwood would have us believe that his pulpit gifts were not of a high order. He relates that an English gentleman having heard him preach declared "that a lamb had proved an old sheep." (136) But one must always remember the very decided viewpoint from which the historian of the Kirk writes. Lamb became Bishop of Brechin in 1607. (137) He will always be remembered there by the beautiful brass chandelier which he presented, and which still hangs in the Cathedral Church. He was one of the three bishops who went by the king's order to London Assembly where he received Episcopal consecration. (138) His connection with Brechin came to an end in 1619 when he was translated to Galloway. (139)

The Bishop of Dunkeld: Alexander Lindsay was the son of a house connected with the family of the Linlithgoes, Earls of Crawford. (140) He became minister of St. Mados in 1591. (141) In 1606 when Commissioners were appointed to wait on the Papist Lords, he was specially delegated to interview the Earl of Errol. (142) From the comparative uneventfulness of his earlier days he suddenly emerged into prominence during the events of the year 1607. The Convention Assembly of 1606 had appointed him Constant Moderator of the Presbytery of Perth. (143) and that body had accepted him under protest. (144) When, however, the Synod of Perth convened, and was ordered by Lord Scone also to accept a Constant Moderator, they with the single exception of Alexander Lindsay, resolutely refused to obey. When certain of the brethren who had been in attendance at Linlithgow declared that the constant moderation of synods had never been mentioned far less enacted there Lindsay replied that "it was cast in upon the end of another matter, he knew not how." At a later stage in the proceedings two other ministers gave some support in his contention. (145) Still his position in the Synod on this occasion must have been a most unenviable one. He became Bishop of Dunkeld during this same year. (146) He was rated to continue in possession of his see until the overthrow of Episcopacy in 1638. Having renounced his office and abjured Episcopacy he was allowed to return to his former parish of St. Mados by the victorious Presbyterians. (147)

The Bishop of Dunblane: The date of George Graham's promotion to the ancient See of Saint Blane is somewhat doubtful. In the fourth volume of the Fasti we read that Graham was "consecrated" Bishop of Dunblane in 1603.(148) When, however, we recall that the regular consecrating of bishops did not begin until 1610 we can see that such a statement doesn't help us much. Possibly the writer responsible for the above information really meant that Graham received his appointment in that year. Keith says that Graham became Bishop in 1606, but Keith is very often unreliable where dates are concerned. (149) Calderwood, in quoting certain words spoken by Graham at Perth in October 1604, supplies the fuller information that he "had entered in the bishoprick of Dunblane without acknowledging the Kirk." His preference would
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appear to have taken place before this date. Graham's words on this occasion are interesting. He had protested vigorously against the violation of the cautions imposed by the Assembly.

"I would," so he is reported to have said, "he were hanged above all theses that provoketh not to the uttermost to see these cautions keepe, to keepe out of the kirk the corruptions, pride, and tyranny of bisho[p]."(150) Fears of Episcopal pride and corruption may indeed have troubled Graham in his earlier years, but latterly they do not appear to have worried him much for he continued as a bishop of the Scottish Church until the great ecclesiastical upheaval of 1630. He was to remain at Dunblane until 1615 when he was to be translated to Orkney. He had been minister of Soone when raised to the Episcopalate.(151)

The Bishop of Galloway: According to Keith Gavin Hamilton was the son of an old soldier of Queen Mary who had fallen at the battle of Langside.(152) He was minister of Hamilton when appointed Bishop of Galloway in 1606. To Hamilton he had come from Bothwell only the year before.(153) We find him present at the Assembly in 1597,(154) and in 1608 he was made a member of the all important General Commission. In 1606, besides being appointed Constant Moderator of Kirkcudbright,(155) he was also created Dean of the Chapel Royal at Holyrood.(156) Calderwood has collected a number of unpleasant stories concerning him within the compass of one sentence.(157) Keith on the other hand declares that he was "an excellent good man."(158) The truth of the matter probably was that Hamilton was a man of average ability and devotion, not exceptionally wise or saintly but at the same time in no way inferior in piety and enterprize to the average Scottish cleric of his day. He died in 1613.

The Bishop of Argyll. Of John Campbell, Bishop of this Western see we know surprisingly little. He was the son of the saintly Neil Campbell of Allmarstin whom he had succeeded as chief pastor of Argyll in 1608. Bishop John was to hold possession of this see until his death in 1612 or 1613. (160)

The Bishop of the Isles. It must be admitted that many of these prelates whose careers we have been so briefly reviewing were far from being outstanding men. It is otherwise, however, when we come to consider the life history of Andrew Knox, Bishop of the Isles. This prelate is to be regarded as "one of the notable Scotsmen of his day."(161) He had studied under Andrew Melville at Glasgow.(153) He began his ministerial career at Lochwinnoch, whence he was later translated to Paisley.(163) It was while ministering at Paisley that in 1592 he captured the attention of all Scotland. In that year, aided by some Glasgow students he seized the person of George Ker who was lurking in the Cumberland Isles at the mouth of the Clyde. Ker was the agent of the Roman Catholic Earls, and equipped with the famous "Spanish Blanks" was preparing to sail for Spain.(164) In 1597 Knox received a commission to seek out and to apprehend all excommunicated Papists, Jesuits and Seminary priests and all those who were suspected of trafficking with the King of Spain. In the pursuit of these new duties he was indirectly responsible for the drowning of Hew Brolay who had intended to capture and to fortify Ailsa Craig against the coming of the Spaniards.(165)
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Bishop Knox also played his part in King James plans for reforming and civilizing the Western Isles. He became Bishop of the Isles in 1506. In 1509 he met the chiefs of these remote regions in Iona, and there both he and they agreed upon the famous Band and Statutes of Icolmkill, an agreement which marks an epoch in the progress of civilization in these parts. He was later to be transferred to the Bishopric of Daphoe in Ireland, and to end his strenuous career as a prelate of the Irish Church.

The bishops having been passed in review, our next task is to scan and to consider the status and background of the ordinary parish ministers in attendance at the Assembly. Here we are confronted with a difficult problem. Excluding the bishops there were present at the Assembly some one hundred and twenty-six clergymen. And the question at once arises, would it be possible within the limits of this thesis to enter into the careers of each one of these men? We think not. To embark upon such an undertaking would necessitate the writing of a small thesis upon the personnel of the Assembly alone. Moreover, even if we had time and space to undertake such an exhaustive investigation we should soon discover that we were being insufficiently repaid for our trouble. A fair proportion of the ministers present—If we may be permitted here to anticipate our conclusions—were men of brains, energy and devotion, but many others in the majority, were quite ordinary individuals with little or no claim upon the remembrance of posterity. To review the life histories of all the members of this latter class would be a barren and fruitless undertaking. That then are we to do? We have decided to pursue the following course. We shall select from the Roll, twenty-five of the most important and interesting clerics at the Assembly, and make a study of them. We shall inquire into the worth and status of these men with just what positions they held and what influence they wielded in the life of the whole Church. We may discover that these leading Assembly members were men of no position or influence in the Church at large, but on the contrary we may find that they were to be numbered among Scotland’s most outstanding ecclesiastics. The result either way will provide us with data sufficient to enable us to come to certain definite conclusions with regard to the Assembly’s personnel.

We shall now enter upon the task of selecting these twenty-five leading ministers. We shall begin at the top of the Roll as it has been preserved in the B.U.K., and follow it through to the end.

As one’s eye moves down over the long lists of clergymen, the first name to arrest the attention is that of David Rait. Rait was minister of the first charge of St. Machar Cathedral in Old Aberdeen. For a time he also held the post of Principal of King’s College in the same burgh. He does not appear to have played an important part in ecclesiastical affairs, as his name appears but seldom on the main committees of the Church. He was appointed an assessor in the Assembly of 1602. In his position of Moderator of the town of Aberdeen he constested with prayer the famous Assembly of 1603. The Moderator of the last regular Assembly was of course safely absent. Strangely enough Rait received no punishment for this act, a circumstance which Forbes ascribed to “the providence of God.”

---
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The name of importance which next meets the eye is that of George Hay, minister of Turriff. This cleric must not be confused with another George Hay, of Methven who had been a companion of Enoch, moderator of the Assembly of 1571, and who had died in 1588. Our George Hay belonged to the next generation. He was a graduate of Saint Andrews, and became minister of Turriff in 1590. He was made Visitor of Moray in 1600. In 1606 he was appointed Constant Moderator of Banff. According to Scott's "Fasti" Hay "was considered a very learned man, and much disposed to peace by maintaining unity among the brethren on the side of Episcopacy." In the present Assembly he was one of the Assessors appointed to convene with the Moderator.

Andrew Ramsay is the next commissioner against whose name we pause. He was a graduate of King's College Aberdeen. He became minister of Arbuthnot in 1606, and in the following year was appointed Constant Moderator of the Morres Presbytery. He was now just at the beginning of his career. He was later to be translated to Edinburgh where he was to take an active part in the troubles which the future had in store for the Scottish Church. Bishop Guthrie described Ramsay as a "guile, modest, learned, and godlie man, full of pietie and learning; who for eminence in learning, diligence in his calling, and strictness in his conversation, was an ornament to the Church of Scotland."

Author Futhie, minister of Inverkeiler in the Presbytery of Arbroath, also deserves our attention. Futhie was known to his contemporaries as a man of large stature. In James Melville's humorous phrase he was a person "of no small quantity." Futhie was a zealous and consistent Episcopalian. Calderwood declares that in 1599 he was one of those who instigated the king "to putt at Mr. Robert (Bruce) for his pension." He was present at a number of Assemblies. In 1606 he became Constant Moderator of Arbroath, and in 1610 a member of the Court of High Commission. In the present Assembly he was one of the Committee of Assessors.

Henry Philip, after 1616 to be known as Doctor Henry Philip, was minister of Arbroath. He was a graduate of Saint Andrews. His sympathies with Erastian Episcopalianism were well known. John Forbes tells us that when in the early Summer of 1606 King James commanded Andrew Melville and the other Presbyterian leaders to appear before him in London, special instructions were given to Henry Philip to travel with them. Forbes goes on to declare that Philip "was purposlie, as it was thought, sent through the polite of Mr. James Nicolson, to the end, that being in company with the others, he might be acquainted with their mind, and give intelligence therof to the King and to the Bishops and Commissioners."

(Those responsible for the compiling of the Index in the Wodrow Edition of Calderwood have been guilty of this sort of confusion. Same is also true of Wodrow Edition of Scott.)
With these fears in mind the Presbyterian leaders resolutely refused to have Philip travel in their company. \(190\) At the Convention-Assembly of 1606 M'gplson, the Moderator, "assumed Mr. Henry Phillip to be his scribe without the oath of fidelity." \(191\) Both Scribe and Moderator later signed the official account of the proceedings. \(192\) In the present Assembly Philip headed the Committee on Bills. \(193\) He had been a member of the same committee in the Assembly of 1608. \(194\) In 1610 he was raised to the Court of High Commission. \(195\) And as we have noted above, he was created a Doctor of Divinity of Saint Andrews in 1616.

The Presbytery of Arbroath sent five commissioners to Glasgow in 1610. Three of these we have already reviewed: Patrick Lindsay, Arthur Mathie and Henry Philip. But there was one other who also demands our consideration. This was the celebrated John Guthrie, minister of Arbirlot and later Bishop of Moray. At the date of our Assembly Guthrie was probably very little known. In the years to come, however, his brethren were to hear more and more of him. He was to be called to Perth, then translated to the capital, and finally to be raised to the See of Moray. \(196\) The prominent part which he took in the ceremonies connected with the coronation of Charles I. in 1633 made him a marked man. \(197\) A favourable account of Guthrie's career may be found in the seventh chapter of J. B. Craven's "History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Moray."

It is a pleasure to observe next before us the name of the famous William Cowper, minister of Perth. Cowper has been well described as "so distinguished a divine, one of the most eloquent preachers of that time in Britain." \(198\) He was a graduate of Saint Andrews. In his earlier years he had spent some time in England teaching school, but later he returned to Scotland. \(199\) He became minister of Perth in 1595. \(200\) At the beginning of the Moderate ascendancy he took his stand on the Presbyterian side. He was one of those who signed the protest to Parliament against Episcopacy in July 1606. \(201\) As late as November 1606 he appears still to have been opposed to bishops, since about this time he wrote to George Graham, newly created Bishop of Dunkblane, rebuking him for accepting such an appointment. \(202\) What moved him to change his ecclesiastical allegiance and to become an Episcopalian? We do not know. His Presbyterian detractors claimed that pride and ambition were the chief causes of his "apostasy." \(203\) It may be that he came eventually to regard Presbyterianism as a lost cause, and believed that the interests of true religion would best be served by adapting oneself to the new regime as quickly and as quietly as possible. At Linlithgow in 1608 we find him placed in the Moderator's chair during the trial of the Commissioners. \(204\) Evidently the bishops and others who were guiding the course of the Assembly
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had come to realize that he was no longer to be feared. Cowper was to become a bishop himself in the near future. He was to be raised to the see of Callo ay in 1615. (205) The Presbyterian stalwarts never forgave him for his adoption of the Episcopal cause. Both How and Calderwood make bitter attacks upon his actions and motives in their histories. (206) In the present Assembly of 1610 he was chosen one of the Assessors. (207)

Principal Robert Howie of Saint Andrews next attracts our attention. Howie was unquestionably one of the most noteworthy figures in the Assembly. He appears to have been the son of an Aberdeen burgess. He began his education at King's College, Aberdeen, and later studied upon the continent. Upon his return to his native land and city he was made one of the ministers of Saint Nicholas Parish Church. He became Principal of the newly erected Marischal College in 1604. (208) In 1608 his name appears in the Assembly records as one of the Church's Doctors or teachers of Divinity. (209) In this same year he was transferred to Dundee. Here he soon came into sharp conflict with the burgh authorities. (210) When Andrew Melville was imprisoned in London Tower Howie was brought to Saint Andrews, and installed in his place. (211) In his new position he displayed great energy as a champion of Episcopalay. He set out to defend the thesis that bishops are superior to presbyters. The Presbytery of Saint Andrews in reply subjected him to a sharp rebuke. (212) Howie's contemporaries appear to have regarded him as a man of exceptionally quick temper. Calderwood reports that he was "a man of sceditions and turbulent spirit," (213) while the Constable and Provost of Dundee with whom he differed described him as "of a hot and vehement humour and of a contentious disposition." (214) Wodrow's words with reference to him are interesting. According to the minisrter, he was a man of some learning, but "being put in very irregularly and contrary to the inclination of most part concerned in Mr. Andrew Melville's room, exceedingly lessened his character. . . . He was long in the chair at Saint Andrews, first as Provost and then as Professor of Divinity in the New College upwards of forty years." (215) Howie's zeal for Episcopalay was to cool considerably as he grew older. In fact he was destined to swing over definitely to the Presbyterian side, and in consequence he was to be allowed to remain at Saint Andrews for some years after the restoration of Presbyterianism. (216) As might have been expected from his general preeminence Howie was an important member of the Committee of Assessors in the present Assembly. (217)

James Martine, minister of Cults in the Presbytery of Cupar, was a native of Saint Andrews. His father was at one time Dean of Guild there. He himself rose to be Principal of Saint Salvator's College. (218) In the Assembly of 1598 the name of James Martine appears on a list of the "Doctors of the Universities." (219) He appears to have held the two offices of Principal of Saint Salvator's and minister of Cults conjointly. He was appointed a member of the Court of High Commission in...
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1610.(220) Martine's "literary attainments" have been described as "respectable"(221) and was to be honoured by being created a Doctor of Divinity of Saint Andrews in 1516.(222) In the present Assembly he was a member of the Committee of Assessors.(223)

John Caldoleugh became minister of Abdie or Old Lindsore in 1594. Before his induction to this charge he had been one of the Masters at Saint Andrews.(224) While a member of the University the paths of both him and Andrew Melville had crossed several times. Soon after Melville's arrival in Saint Andrews Caldoleugh had threatened him with physical violence, but a few straightforward words from the Presbyterian chieftain had brought him to his senses. James Melville says of Caldoleugh at this time that he was "a daft, wonsten man."(225) On another occasion Caldoleugh wounded a townsman while engaged in archery practice. This unfortunate mishap might have had very serious consequences for the archer had it not been for the cool and determined way in which Melville met the uprising of the townsfolk which followed.(226) Then in 1594 many determined Presbyterians sought safety outside the country. Caldoleugh was one of those who fled south to England.(227) In his later years he appears generally to have supported the royal programme. He became a commissioner of the General Assembly in 1596.(228) Later Assembly's several times reappointed him to this office.(229) He was chosen as Moderator of Cupar in 1606 as substitute for William Soot.(230) He was faced to get into trouble in 1611 for having assisted at the admission of a minister to the parish of Stroab miglo without having first acknowledged the archbishop.(231)

Thomas Douglas, also of the Presbytery of Cupar, was minister of Balmerino, in which charge he had been installed as early as in 1593.(232) His life had been a stormy and hectic one. Twice he was made the victim of violent assaults resulting in the loss of blood. The second of these attacks nearly ended in his death. "Dissolute persons,. . . . .whose corrupt lives could never abide ecclesiastical discipline" were responsible for at least one of these acts of violence.(233) In the business of Synod and Assembly Douglas seems often to have been busily employed. He was chosen delegate from the Synod of Fife in 1593 and in 1597.(234) In 1601 the Assembly appointed him visitor of Perth and Strutherme.(235) Latterly he became known as a supporter of the king and bishops. In 1607 he and John Caldoleugh were among the small minority of five or six ministers who declared themselves willing to accept Archbishop Gladstone's in the Constant Moderatorship of the Synod of Fife.(236)

Andrew Forrester was minister of the first charge of Dunfermline, to which post he was promoted after having served the second charge in the same town for some twelve years.(237) He had come originally to Dunfermline from Corstorphine across the Forth. He was not a pleasant or a praiseworthy character, and we mention him here merely to show that not all those present
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at Glasgow in 1610 were noted for their goodness and piety. Calderwood states that he was "both guiltless and graceless." (238) We are not required, however, to rely merely upon the opinions of the Kirk's historian since Forrester's actions are sufficient evidence in themselves. One Sunday morning he suddenly and publicly confessed "that which was knowne to noe man; to wit, that he had sundrie times stollen out of the kirk boxe the silver gathered for the poore." (239) This astonishing event did not take place until some years after 1610. The result of Forrester's confession was that he himself was deposed from the ministry.

The celebrated John Hall of Edinburgh is the subject of our next paragraph. He became minister of the second charge of Saint Giles in 1598. (240) In his earlier years he appears to have been an upholder of Theocratic Presbyterianism. For example, he was one of those who refused to subscribe the Black Acts in 1585. (241) In 1600 in company with his Edinburgh brethren he at the outset refused to give satisfaction to King James in the matter of the Gowrie conspiracy. An appearance before the Privy Council, however, induced him to change his mind. (242) From now on he seems to have more or less consistent support of the royal plans. He was elected Moderator of the General Assembly in 1601; (243) was chosen as Moderator of Edinburgh in 1606; (244) and was placed upon the Court of High Commission in 1610. (245) During the imprisonment and trial of the Aberdeen Confessors, (246) Hall took the ground "that through their wilful contention, they had justly deserved their affliction, and were the cause of trouble and disquieting the peace of the Church." (246) In this connection Calderwood charges Hall with being "a venomous adversary of the imprisoned brethren." (247) Other Presbyterians were equally bitter and severe. Thus Scot of Cupar declares of him and his fellow Churchman Patrick Galloway that they were "two principal instruments circumventing many of the ministers with their pretences." (248) Hall's name will occur later in this study in our account of the proceedings of the Assembly. He was one of the Assessors on the present occasion. (249)

Peter Hewat, also of Edinburgh, was one of the comparatively younger men at Glasgow in 1610. He came into prominence in 1598. In that year he was chosen by the Commissioners of Assembly as one of the junior colleagues of the Edinburgh ministers. (250) It was probably his youth and inexperience that saved him from temporary banishment in 1600. Janet of Forfar was exasperated by the Edinburgh clergy to satisfy him as regards the Gowrie plot, charged these brethren to depart from Edinburgh. Hewat and his young fellow minister, Robertson, were exempted from this order of banishment. (251) In 1601 the General Assembly put forward his name as one of those nominated for the position of minister of the royal household. (252) He was destined to live to take part in those troubles in worship and ritual which were to distract the Kirk in the days to come. By his part in these controversies he was to make himself obnoxious to the King's party. Spottiswoode later described him as one who "loved ever to be meddling and was always set to make trouble." (253) In the present Assembly
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he was elected one of the Committee of Assessors. (254)

Michael Cranston of Cramond was an exceptionally interesting figure. He was a son of the manse, and had already served the parishes of Selkirk and Liberton. (255) In these earlier days he had made himself notorious by preaching in Saint Giles where he had "involed against the King, lords and all estates and regrettred that some fatherlie men were discharg'd to teach." (256) Four years later he played a very prominent part in the famous Edinburgh Riot of the 17th of December. On that day of tumult it was he who read to the angry and excited gathering in the East Kirk the significant story of Haman and Mordecai and other similar passages of Scripture. (257) As a result of this exciting day's events a warrant was issued for the arrest of Cranston and the other responsible ministers. (258) One might have thought that so aggressive and outspoken a champion of Presbyterianism would have remained unshaken in his ecclesiastical allegiance until the end. But this was not to be. Later events seemed to prove that Cranston's earlier "fervor" was not "true zeal." "He can now swallow up camels," is the historian's lament, "where before he could not swallow a Matt." (259) He thus had the appearance of having been "a very forward minister" in his younger days, but now he was nothing but "key-cold." (260) In this our 1610 Assembly his name appears as one of the Assessors. (262)

James Carmichael of Haddington like so many other ministers of this time was a graduate of Saint Andrews. (233) At the beginning of this career he had been companion of Andrew Melville and a follower of the Ruthven Raiders, and during the troubles of 1584 he had been forced to fly to England. (264) He was a member of the militant Kirk's Commission in 1596, (265) while in the November of that year he was one of those who were ordered out of Edinburgh by royal command. (266) The days of the Moderate Ascendancy followed and Carmichael seems to have quietly and unobtrusively taken his place on the royal and Episcopal side. He was chosen Constant Moderator of Haddington in 1305. (267) He is chiefly to be remembered, however, for his great work in connection with the Records of the General Assembly. He was chosen an Assessor in the present Assembly. (268)

John Clapperton, minister of Coldstream, was still another one of those who beginning their ministerial life as upholders of Presbyterian principles some at least to embrace or at least to consent to both Erastianism and Episcopacy. During the troubles of 1584 he had been apprehended one Sunday after sermon by two archers of the guard, and conveyed to Edinburgh. (269) In 1585 he had entered
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his dissent against the annuling of the sentence of excommunication against Archbishop Adamson. (270) Ten years later we find him still identified with milita:

Presbyterianism. For in November 1596 he was one of the Commissioners of the Kirk who were ordered immediately to leave Edinburgh. (271) In spite of this, however, his name appears on the first General Commission granted to the king by the Dundee Assembly of 1597. (272) This Commission was renewed by the second Dundee Assembly in 1598. (273) Finally in 1606 he became Constant Moderator of the Presbytery of Chirnside. (274) Clapperton was a faithful and regular attendant at the Courts of the Church. He was present at no less than sixteen General Assemblies. (275) In the present gathering he was a member of the Committee of Assessors. Calderwood reports concerning him that he "was ambitious and ready to embrace any preferment." (276)

Thomas Storie was minister of Gordon in the Presbytery of Kelso. He became minister of Gordon in 1609 after having held a number of earlier charges. (277) During the troubles of 1584 when so many ministers had been forced to flee from Scotland Storie "also sought refuge in flight which took him as far as Berwick." (278) In 1586 while he was minister of Forliden his synod, that of Berse and Toviotdale, agreed upon the production of an open letter. This document stated that the ministry were agreed that Presbyterian government was in accord with Christ's institution, and that they repudiated the tyrannical superiority of bishops over all other ministers. Storie signed this letter in company with a large company of other clergyman. (279) During the same year he dissented from the proposal to remove the sentence of excommunication against Archbishop Adamson. (280) In later years he seems to have taken a much less active part in ecclesiastical affairs. His presence at Glasgow in 1610 would lead us to conclude that like so many others he had become latterly a king's and bishops' man. He was one of the Assessors in the present Assembly. (281)

Of John Bell, minister of the Tron Church of Glasgow, there is not much that we can say. He does not seem to have taken much part or interest in the game of ecclesiastical politics. At the same time, however, it is evident that he was a person of weight and influence. He had been the minister in succession of Kilbarchan and Cardross. He came to Glasgow in 1594. (282) He had been made Rector of Glasgow University the year before. Calderwood tells us that in 1607 he refused an Edinburgh appointment. (283) He was placed upon the Court of High Commission in 1610. (284) In later years Bell was to be made Rector of Glasgow University. We read in Row's Historie that when the more famous Glasgow Assembly convened on the 21th of November 1638 "Mr. John Bell, oldest minister there, did preach" and that there was "prayer made" by him on the same occasion. (285)
Dr. Archibald Hamilton, commissioner from the Presbytery of Paisley, became minister of the first charge of Paisley Abbey in this very month of June 1610. By this date he was also a Regent and a Doctor of Divinity of the University of Glasgow.(286) But all his Scottish achievements were to be surpassed by the events of his later career in the Irish Church. In 1623 Hamilton was to become Bishop of the joint sees of Killala and Achonry, and in 1630 he was to be promoted to the high rank of Archbishop of Cashel and Emly.(287)

In the life and career of John Howieson, minister of Cambuslang, we have a conspicuous case of one who beginning life as a High Presbyterian ended his days in apparent contentment under the Episcopal regime. Back in 1582 the Presbytery of Glasgow of which he was Moderator had been endeavouring to check the progress of Montgomery their Turolhan bishop. The Provost, Bailiff and a number of citizens appearing had commanded the Presbytery to disperse. And "because they refused, they put violent hand in the moderator, Mr. John Howesone, smote him on the face, pulled him by the beard, beat out one of his teeth and then putt him in the tolbooth."(288) Two years later Howieson had preached a defiant sermon in which he declared that he would never obey Montgomery "because it is against his conscience and the Ord of God; and because he is an infamous person, a monster and an idol."(289) For this outburst he was apprehended. In fact so obnoxious to the Court did Howieson become that his presentation to Cambuslang was annulled in 1587, and not until 1596 was he allowed to return thither.(290) Once settled again in his old parish, he appears to have left ecclesiastical politics severely alone. He now occupied his time with parish and educational work and with championing the cause of Reformed Christianity against the attacks of the able Romish controvertist Bellarmine.(291) An elaborate answer to Bellarmine from Howieson's pen was submitted by him to the General Assembly for its examination and approval.(292) In 1602 he was one of those nominated for the vacant bishoprics. He, however, never became a bishop.(293)

William Birnie, one of the commissioners from the Presbytery of Lanark, was minister of the town and parish of that name. He was an M.A. of Saint Andrews. After graduation he had become a merchant, but later he had abandoned this occupation and had returned to study and the Church. He had also studied at Leyden.(294) In 1606 he published a work at Tintern, currently entitled "The Name of the Kirk of Burial."(295) He became Constant Moderator of Lanark the same year.(296) In 1610 he was placed upon the Court of High Commission.(297) Birnie was soon to leave Lanark for Ayr, and to become Dean of the Chapel Royal.(298) In the present Assembly he was one of the Committee of Assessors.(299)

Peter Primrose was minister of Kinnauline in the Presbytery of Ayr. He became minister there in 1557.(300) There is practically nothing to report concerning him, and we would not have included him in this list had it not been that his name will occur again in our review of the proceedings of the Assembly.
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Thomas Ramsay was minister of Saint Michaels Parish Church, Dumfries. Unlike the vast majority of his contemporaries he could claim neither Glasgow nor Saint Andrews as his University home. He was a graduate of Edinburgh. He was presented to Saint Michaels by the king in 1605. The following year he was chosen Constant Moderator of Dumfries. He was present at Linlithgow in 1608 when he was appointed one of the Assessors to converse with the Moderator. He became a High Commissioner in 1610. He was to become well known throughout the country, on account of the diligent manner in which he conducted the pursuit of Papists in the district of Dumfries. He was one of the Assessors in the present Assembly.

The last name to come before us is that of the pious and devoted Nell Campbell, the retired Bishop of Argyll. Of him we know unfortunately very little. He became minister of Kilmartin in 1574, and was created Bishop of Argyll in 1606. But we must not forget that he had already been Bishop of Argyll back in the old Tulchan days. He was the father of two prelates: John, his successor in the See of Argyll and Neil, afterwards Bishop of the Isles. He was one of those to whom Mathieson refers when he writes that "their unobtrusive goodness was better known to their contemporaries than it can be to us." When in January 1609 twelve of the thirteen bishops were lampooned in scurrilous verses, the one prelate of whom no ill was spoken was Bishop Campbell who in 1608 had just resigned.

The references to him are as follows:

"For light in doctrine they may all resign it to Argile, So faith has left the lowland oleane, gone to the hills awhile." And again:

"Of thir, one truele preacheth Christ, the rest are devilish seed." (310)

So concludes our review of those whom we consider to have been the most important and outstanding ministers in the Assembly. Had we had the necessary space and time we would have made detailed mention of a number of other clergymen of weight and consequence who were present. There were, for example, the ambitious William Murray of Dysart who in 1616 was to make an unsuccessful bid for the Archbishopric of Glasgow, Robert Wilkie of Lanark, later Dean of the Faculty and Rector of the University of Glasgow and Andrew Boyd, commissioner from Glasgow Presbytery, who was to end his days as a bishop of saintly renown in the See of Argyll. But we must not delay over these men here. Rather we must hasten on, and, with the data which the foregoing pages have supplied, endeavour to come to some definite conclusions with regard to the personnel of the Assembly.

(I.) First of all, we must consider the complaint of the Presbyterian historians which we have noted above. It is true that there were a number of ministers brought in from the far northern shires. But why not? This was a General Assembly of the entire Scottish Church, and the northern part of the country had as good a right to be represented as had the south and the centre. Professor Cooper is quite in order when he seeks...
to vindicate the right of the northern men to be present in
the National Council of the Church. He writes: "But the
Northern Synods had as good a right to be represented in an
Assembly of the whole Church of Scotland as the Southern; and
the Northern clergy—from Angus and Aberdeen—and Moray
and Ross, as well as from Sutherland and Caithness—represented
very fairly the opinion and desire of the districts whence
they came. It should be remembered, too, that Caithness, Moray,
Aberdeen and Angus—the northern Lowlands—were inhabited in
the early seventeenth century by a population probably as large
and certainly as intelligent, well-educated, prosperous and
independent, as that of the southern shires. The city of
Aberdeen was in those days ahead of Glasgow, both in size and
enterprise: Dundee, Montrose, Inverness, and even Elgin had
few rivals among the burghs of the south. To this day it is
too frequently forgotten that Scotland includes more than
Lochian and Fife, Galloway and Lanark.
'There are hills beyond Pentland,
And streams beyond Forth." (315)

And here is another point which should be emphasized.
It is true that the northern counties were well represented in
the Assembly. But this does not mean that the southern and
central shires were but scantily or unequally represented. A
glance at the Roll will show that this was by no means the case.
If the student has a map of Scotland before him he might do
well to draw a line starting with Dundee strait west across
Perthshire. The Presbyteries of Dundee, Meigle, and Dunkeld
would lie roughly to the north of our line; those of Perth and Auchenifer
would be to the south of it. Now if we compare the number of
commissioners from presbyteries north both of this line and the
Firth of Tay with the number from south of it we will discover
the following facts and figures. From north of the line came,
including bishops, some fifty-seven clergymen; from south of it,
also including bishops, some seventy-two. In making this calculation
we have not included the two western Synods of Argyll and the
Iles which together sent nine commissioners. These figures
should finally dispose of the Presbyterian suggestion that from the
standpoint of numbers the northern brethren possessed an unfair
and disproportionate advantage in the Assembly. The truth of the
matter is simply that all sections of the kingdom were fairly
represented at Glasgow, and that the south in the numbers, as well
as in the native ability of its commissioners, could still wield
the preponderating influence.

(II) In the second place, we must return to a brief
consideration of that statement of Prof. Cooper's which we
quoted at the beginning of this section. It will be recalled
that Dr. Cooper declared that a study of the two extant copies
of the Assembly Roll "reveals the presence of most of the
eminent ministers then in Scotland, with the exception of
Patrick Simson." (316) In testing the accuracy of this statement
it will be well for us to take note of certain qualifying
words which it contains. Dr. Cooper speaks of "most" of the
eminent ministers. He also adds the words "then in Scotland." He therefore does not ask us to believe that with the exception of Simson "all the prominent Scots clergy were present at the
Assembly. As a matter of fact the single exception whom he
names can easily be expanded into a good half dozen or more.
The aged David Lindsay of Ross was not in attendance. Absent
also was the well-known Moderate Churchman, Patrick Calloway of
Edinburgh whose name appears so frequently in the history of
these times, and whom, as we have seen, Scott of Cupar described
as one of "two pernicious instruments of cummving many of the
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ministerie with their pretences."(317) Another absentee was Adam Bannatyne to be successively Bishop of Dunblane and Aberdeen.(318) He had begun life as a high Presbyterian, but later, as Row phrases it, had "plaid the apostat."(319) William Scott of Cupar, though a man of more than ordinary importance, was naturally not invited to take part in the deliberations of the Assembly. Nor was the famous preacher, Robert Bruce, who at this date was confined by Royal decree to the northern part of the Kingdom. Another person of eminence whose presence we miss was young David Lindsay. He is not to be confused with his older namesake of Roos. The younger Lindsay was to live to be in turn Bishop of Brechin and Edinburgh.(320) One might have expected to find the name of Patrick Forbes of Carse on the Roll. But it must be remembered that he was not yet an ordained minister.(321) These are a few outstanding clergymen whose presence we miss in the Assembly. They were on the whole men whose ability and influence were quite equal to that of Patrick Simson. We are of the opinion that it would have been better had Prof. Cooper mentioned their names as well as that of the minister of Stirling. We also pause for a moment over Dr. Cooper's words, "then in Scotland." These words are important, for remember there were a number of Scottish divines "forth of Scotland" who had they been at home would have thrown the entire weight of their influence against the decisions of the Assembly. We refer, of course, to the two Melvilles and to the six confessors of the Aberdeen Assembly. But the king and bishops no longer needed to worry about these dangerous dissenters. They were safely out of harm's way. What then in a word are the conclusions which we have reached with regard to the character of the Assembly's membership?

In reply we would say first of all, that the Assembly was a very representative one. Each section of the land from the Orkneys to the Hebrides and from Caithness to Galloway had its commissioners in attendance. It was a great pity that in the choosing of these representative ministers King James and the bishops followed the method they did. That, however, is another matter. One thing at least the king and his ecclesiastical advisers were able and careful to secure, namely, that no one section of Scotland was left without its delegates and spokesmen at Glasgow.

Secondly, it must be observed that as far as the natural ability and influence of its members were the level of the Assembly was comparatively high. It is true that a large percentage of the commissioners appear to have been the very reverse of important or influential, but is it not true that there is a similar percentage of men in the average ecclesiastical assembly? That is to say, is there not usually on hand a group of individuals who listen patiently while others do the talking and directing, and who vote with the majority when the time for decision comes? Still it must not be thought that all the ministers at the Glasgow gathering belonged to this class. On the contrary, as we have seen, there were in attendance on the present occasion men of whom any gathering would have been proud. Spottiswoode, Law and Knox with their proved administrative ability, Principals Forbes and Robert Howie with all the learning of the schools at their command, John Howieson of Cambuslang with so much devoted parish work to his credit, William Cowper with his ready and moving eloquence, Neil Campbell with his wide-spread reputation for piety and devotion--these brethren would have been an ornament and an asset at any one of the
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Kirk's Assemblies. And then surrounding the inner circle of the preeminent was another and larger group composed of men whose qualities, though not exceptionally outstanding, were yet of a solid and reliable order. In this group are to be included the Primate and the majority of the bishops and the greater number of the two dozen brethren whose careers we have briefly sketched. The majority of these men had had a long and valuable pastoral experience. Many of them had begun life as staunch upholders of Presbyterian principles, but had seen fit to change their allegiance. Nor must it be forgotten that the Assembly also included a number of younger men whose abilities were already giving promise of fruitful careers in later years. In this connection one need but mention the names of John Cuthrie, Dr. Archibald Hamilton and Andrew Braid. Thus we conclude that as far as the talents and enterprise of its members are concerned the Assembly of 1610 can compare very favorably with any other Assembly of the Kirk which had met up to this date. To dismiss the personnel of the Assembly, as does Soot of Cupar, with the words "that perfidious pack" is to be quite unjust and unfair. Such an expression tells us absolutely nothing about the composition of the Assembly. At the same time it tells us a great deal about the embittered state of the Presbyterian annalist's mind.
THE ASSEMBLY DAY BY DAY

'Through our review of the proceedings of the Assembly, this is a duty which will not take us very long. At the conclusion of the first section of this chapter, we saw the commissioners dispersing for the night. (322) We had followed them through the events of their first day (Friday 8th) in the Assembly. Thus we resume our narrative and investigation on the morning of Saturday the ninth.

Now it will be recalled that on Friday afternoon, after having listened to the king's letter, the Assembly had ordered the Committee of Assessors to convene apart the next morning. It was agreed that all legislative proposals would have to receive the committee's consideration before being approved by the Assembly. (322) Moreover, at its Friday morning session the Assembly had declared that seven o'clock in the morning should be the hour at which this privy conference should convene. (324) This arrangement appears to have been followed without any change or variation. The privy conference met in the morning presumably at seven o'clock. The remaining brethren convened at eight o'clock. These letters had nothing to do but to sit patiently, and wait until the assessors brought in a report. They "waited one to another till about eleven." (325) Meanwhile matters of great importance were being thrashed out in the conference.

Calderwood tells us that when the members of the committee had assembled the Earl of Dunbar produced the king's letter and caused it to be read twice. (326) It is just possible that the Kirk's historian becomes somewhat confused and unreliable at this point. The official minutes of the Book of Universal Kirk, as we have seen, declare that the king's letter was read by Dunbar to the Assembly on Friday afternoon. (327) Calderwood tells us nothing about this Friday reading. Rather he relates, as we have just said, that it was to the privy conference that this letter was read and that "twice." Of course, it may well be that in all the royal missive was read three times; that is, once to a plenary session of the Assembly and then twice to the committee in conference. This seems to be the most obvious way of reconciling the two accounts. Still an element of difficulty remains. As one reads Calderwood's account one receives the impression that he believed that the contents of the letter were new to the listeners. He writes, "Dunbar presented to the conference the king's letter and caused it to be read twice." (326) If he presented it first a declaration of his affection to religion..." and so on. It may be that he knew nothing of the Friday reading, but had trustworthy information so far as the Saturday session was concerned. It is not impossible to believe that Dunbar opened the proceedings of the conference with a double flourish of the royal missive. The Book of Universal Kirk unfortunately has nothing to say as regards the meetings of the conference.

Calderwood continues by saying that when the letter had been twice read, the Lord President of the Session, Sir John Preston, "made an harangue." (328) He knew nothing of the content of this address. The speech having been delivered, the brethren sat about to decide what matters were to be treated in the Assembly. An agenda containing several important subjects was submitted, and agreed upon: the suppression of excommunicated Papists.
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the provision of an adequate stipend for the ministry, the late erections and the means of securing peace and concord in the Church. The Earl of Dunbar rose and requested that they begin their discussion with the last of those. Paristry and stipends thus made way for a thorough-going discussion of Episcopal government. (329) For King James had made it clear that he at least was quite satisfied that only in Episcopal government would the means of peace be found.

The Assessors were now at the very heart of things. There was much discussion and reasoning. But progress was slow, and the morning hours were slipping quickly away. Eventually a sub-committee of twelve members was appointed to confer upon the whole matter in private. Six of the commission were bishops; six were ministers. The bishops were Gladstones of Saint Andrews; Spottiswoode of Glasgow, Law of Orkney; Blackburn of Aberdeen; Lamb of Brechin and one other whose identity has unfortunately been lost. The ministers were William Cooper, John Hall, Principal Patrick Sharpe, Andrew Leitch of Old Montrose, George Way of Turriff and John Strawton. It is to be supposed that in due course this sub-committee brought in a report to the Conference. Calderwood’s account unfortunately becomes very scratchy at this point. He narrates, however, that there “was some show of contrary confereuse between Mr. Hall and Mr. William Cooper, etc., about the negative voice of bishops in ecclesiastical meethings; and their oath made in the contrary was urged.” (330) But the Lord High Commissioner was ready and equal to the emergency. He at once produced a letter from the king—he appears to have had a whole store of these on hand—in which the bishops were ordered either to accept full powers or to quit their places. The prelates made answer that they were willing. He then closed anything to my upon the subject, and so the matter was concluded. The Assessors then went forth to report to the Assembly. (331)

The Assembly apart from its conference committee had been sitting as patiently as possible since the hour of eight o’clock. One wonders if they rejected the manner in which the privy conference uttered their power, and then announced to itself the function of deciding upon and settling the Assembly’s legislation. Moderator Spottiswoode and his committee appeared before their possibly worried and disgruntled brethren about eleven o’clock. The moderator made a short speech by way of apology for the long stay in conference. Peter Primrose, minister of Mauchline, Ayrshire, thereupon rose to his feet, and began to protest against the undemocratic way in which the Assembly’s business had been conducted. Some other ministers from the west country were also minded to protest on behalf of the liberties of the Kirk. James Kelville states that Primrose and his companions had been preparing for a considerable time to do this openly against any proposed changes. Here was their opportunity. (332)

But the alert and ready Spottiswoode would have none of it. He at once broke in upon Primrose’s harangue. He told him that if he had anything to say, to report it to the privy conference. Meanwhile, he concluded, the present occasion was not the time or the place for further harangue since it was now high noon and the hour had arrived for dinner! And so the only protest which the Assembly heard was raised before it was properly uttered. The brethren then trooped out to dinner. Some time either during the dinner hour, as Calderwood relates, (333) or in the afternoon session of the conference as Row seems to have it, (334) those in control of the movements of the Assembly coerced Primrose and his associates, and talked them out of their idea. “Partly by mincassing and partlie by flatterie and faire
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words" he and his friends were persuaded to change their minds. And so no "dine of protestation" was further heard. (335)

The commissioners reassembled in the afternoon. As in the morning session the privy conference again met privately apart. The legislative proposals were now cast into their final form. (336) This piece of work accomplished, the committee again came forth to the Assembly. The Moderator made a speech, and read the proposed articles. In his address he declared that the articles had passed the privy conference with practically unanimity, only two members of the conference finding fault with them. It was conjectured that he here referred to William Cooper and to John Hall. (337) He spent some time in defending Article I, which opened with an unqualified condemnation of the famous Aberdeen Assembly. It was expedient, said he that they formally condemn the holding of the Aberdeen Convocation since the banished brethren had promised to acknowledge their mistake if only a regular Assembly would lead the way by doing so first. Once this was done, and the banished brethren had acknowledged their mistake, they would be allowed to return to their parishes. (338) The articles agreed upon were now "diverse tymes read p. pilottle before the whole Assembly." (339)

It was now time to vote. Here again the astute and able Spottiswoode scored. The ten articles were not voted upon separately, but were grouped to either and treated as one. Thus there was no opportunity given to the Assembly to go into the merit of the different articles or to pass judgment upon them in detail. It was merely a question of "yea" or "nay" as regards the whole group. This says Row, "was a very wicked trick." (340) It was certainly anything but democratic. Then again, when the voting took place it was not the clergy who were first asked for the answer. The voting began at the other side of the Assembly with the Lord High Commissioner, and then proceeded to the lords, barons and entry. These notables could all be trusted to vote in the correct way. The ministers had the question put to them last of all. The tide was thus flowing almost irresistibly in favour of the articles when the clergy were asked for their reply. Few of the brethren had either the desire or the heart to make any opposition, and so the articles were agreed upon and ratified by an almost unanimous vote. (341) There appears to have been but five or six votes cast to the contrary. Seven other commissioners voted non liquet. (342) The business for which the Assembly had been convened being thus satisfactorily attended to the brethren then dispersed for the day. As they went each one to his lodgings many of them must have reflected on the great and momentous changes which the day's work had accomplished. When the day had begun the Kirk of Scotland was still in polity a Presbyterian Church. But now sometime during this June afternoon the step from Presbyterianism to constitutional Episcopacy had been taken.

The next day was Sunday. There were naturally no business sessions of the Assembly. There were, however, two periods of worship. The commissioners assembled in the forenoon to hear one of the English divines, Dr. Hampton, preach upon Psalm one hundred and twenty-two. We know little about his sermon save that in the course of it he attacked sacrilegious persons and the Presbyterian form of Church government. By "sacrilegious persons" we understand him to have meant those who had seized and were still holding the estates of the church. (343)
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In the afternoon another service was held. Dr. Territon, the third English Doctor, was the preacher. His text was found in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, the first charter and the twelfth verse. (344) His sermon was in substance an apology for Episcopal government. It is to be hoped, if there were those who had voted in the affirmative on the previous day against their conscience and better judgment, that they found in these two sermons some comfort and justification for what they had done. And so concluded the events of Sunday the 10th of June.

On Monday morning the Assembly convened in full strength. This morning session opened with not a little excitement. The Lord High Commissioner rose, and declared that he was "presently of intention" (345) to discharge all meeting of presbyteries by public proclamation at the Glasgow market cross. He added that he had received a special command from his Majesty to that effect which he dared not disobey. That effect of this intimation appears to have been like that of a bombshell. The Assembly in its Saturday legislation had indeed avoided all verbal references to presbyteries, but as we shall see later it had retained the invaluable courts in its scheme of constitutional Episcopal government. The presbyteries still stood in substance even though the name of "presbytery" had been either altered or ignored. (346) But now it seemed that the courts themselves were to be swept away. For a space grief and dismay reigned in the Assembly. There was "an outcry and noise... among the ministers." (347) Then formal suit was made to the Commissioner to stay the proclamation until his "Majesty had been informed of the happy results of Saturday's work. Certain of the noblemen present added their voices to the petition of the clergy. These gentlemen promised Dunbar that if the king should hold him blameworthy for the delay they personally would intercede on his behalf. M'Crie is of the opinion that this whole matter was nothing less than a "farce" in which the noblemen had been previously instructed "to act their part." (348) Calderwood describes Dunbar's threat as but "a skaroraw to putt them (the ministers) in fear." (349) However this may be, the suit and petition of the Assembly was acquiesced in by the Earl, and no order discharging or dissolving the presbyteries was heard. (350) But the ministers now found themselves much more closely bound to the decisions of the Assembly than before. They had been manoeuvred into a new position. The understanding now was that they should put the whole weight of their influence behind the legislative decisions in order that his Majesty beholding their good works might be moved to allow the presbyteries to remain. Such an understanding seems to have been held by many of any who might have attempted to criticise either the proceedings or the legislation of the Assembly once that gathering had dispersed. (351) At the same time it was ordained that a special letter should be directed to his Majesty informing him of the amount of good accomplished by the Assembly and beseeching him in consequence to abandon his intention of dissolving the presbyteries. (352)

The next piece of business concerned the Marquis of Huntly. It will be recalled that at the Linlithgow Assembly of 1608 this nobleman had been solemnly excommunicated by the Moderator. (353) He was at present being detained in Stirling Castle. A supplication was now presented to the Assembly from the Marquis.
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He declared that after the long conference and reasoning upon the points in dispute between Roman and Protestantism which he had had with certain ministers deputed to undertake that duty, he was at length fully resolved in all his doubts and difficulties. In token of his change of heart he had subscribed "the whole Heads and Articles of the religion presently professed within this realm." He now desired a commission to be sent to him from the Assembly with power to absolve him from the sentence of excommunication. In answer to this supplication the Assembly directed the Archbishops of Saint Andrews and Glasgow, the Bishops of Orkney, Galloway, and Brechin with John Hall, Patrick Simson, William Low and Andrew Sharp and others to proceed in company with his Majesty's commissioners and certain noblemen to Stirling Castle where Huntly was confined. There they were to interview the imprisoned Marquis and if satisfied that he was sincere and in earnest in his profession of the Reformed faith they were to absolve him from his sentence. (354)

Having disposed of the case of this particular ex-Romanist, the brethren next turned their attention to the matter of Popery in general. Their action here was definitely in line with what had been accomplished in previous Assemblies. The Assembly passed a resolution which included the following terms. The commissioners regretted that notwithstanding the many acts which had been passed for repressing the disorders and insolence of professed and excommunicated Papists, yet these people still remained obstinate and disobedient, and were suffered to make frequent forays and devastations through the country as though nothing was the matter. It was consequently ordained that every one of the commissioners should give in to the clerk of the Assembly the names of all excommunicated persons within their bounds. This list was then to be presented to the Lord High Commissioner. He in turn would bring it before the attention of the secret council. Order would then be taken with the excommunicated according to the law of the land.

It was further resolved that a supplication should be forwarded to the King, in order to call to his remembrance the great danger to his estate and person which was to be found in the cruel and seditious treason daily forged and contrived against his state and person, by the Papists, Jesuits, and Seminary Priests, enemies to God and the true Religion, and to his Majesty. It was their trust that his Majesty would in future debar both these plotters and their favourers from his presence. (355) This final resolution concluded the Monday morning's business.

The Assembly convened for its final session after midday. Two important resolutions were passed at the afternoon's meeting. The first had to do with the interim moderation of the Exercise. This was one of the names under which the presbytery was now to be known. (356) The resolution is as follows: "Forsameikle as in this present Assembly it is already statute, that the exercises shall be moderated by the Bishops in the meetings of the ministry, if they be present, or then by any other whom they shall appoint at the time of the Synod, and because the next Synod is not to be held before the month of October next to come, therefore it is ordained, that in absence of the Bishops, ane constant Moderator shall remain in their own places quhill the next Synod be held in October." (357) The other resolution of importance, we also give in full. "Item, Because it is uncivil and abusive, either civil or ecclesiastical, being once established, and in force by publick opinion and consent, should be controvertit and callit in question by any persone, therefore it is statute by uniforme consent of this Assembly, that none of the ministry, either in pulpit in his preaching, or in the publick exercise, speake and reason against the acts of this present Assembly, nor disobey the same under the paine of depriuation, being tryit and convict thereof; and specially that the question of equalitie and inequallitie in the kirk, be not treatit in the pulpit under the said paine, and that every one of the Commissioners present intitit this act in the first meeting.

(356) See below Part I.
at the first exercise." (358) It was not enough to set the Assembly to set up Episcopacy or to bind the brethren to the Episcopal interest by frightening them with threats of the dissolution of the presbyteries. Dunbar, Spottiswoode and their fellow-workers must needs take one step farther. By means of this act they managed to have it ordained that deprivation should be the punishment of ministers who preached against or disobeyed the acts of the Assembly. Everything that could be effected towards making the position of Episcopacy firm and secure had now been done. Time and changed circumstances, however, were fated to prove the unstability and transitory character of this work.

There were two other resolutions also passed at this time, but they are not important from the standpoint of this study. The first had to do with the question of marriage; the second was concerned with the matter of destitute kirkis. Both of these may be read in detail in the Book of the Universal Kirk. (359) We accordingly pass on to speak in conclusion of a subject of grave importance. We refer to the charges of bribery and corruption which were urged against the Assembly leaders by the defeated and embittered Presbyterians.

At an early point in this chapter we quoted the letter sent to Dunbar by the king in which the Earl was commanded to set aside "the sum of ten thousand marcs Scots, to be divydeit and dealt amonge suche personls as you sail holde fitting by the advise of the Archbishoppis of St. Andro's and Glasgow." (260) The time had now arrived for this royal bounty "to be divydeit and dealt" in accordance with his Majesty's decree. But this, as a moment's reflection will suggest, was a matter which would require much delicate and sagacious handling if it were to be carried through successfully. If money was to be handed out secretly to certain favoured ministers, the result would be equivalent to placing a really first-class weapon in the hands of the Presbyterians. These discontented people would then be able to fill the whole land with loud accusations of simony, bribery and corruption. As a matter of fact the distribution appears to have been handled in a very unsatisfactory manner, and as a result the Presbyterians were given the very weapon which they had been seeking. The bribery of ministers was one of the reasons given by the great Assembly of 1638 for annulling the work of its less exciting and famous predecessor of 1610. (361)

In his History, Spottiswoode quite frankly admits that after the conclusions with regard the Episcopacy had been agreed upon a distribution of funds took place. He insists, however, that this allotment was quite lawful and in order. He states that when the moderators who backed in 1605 had been promised a salary of one hundred pounds Scots a year made the following complaint: "That notwithstanding of the promise made at their acceptance of the charge, they had received no payment at all of the stipend allowed." The Earl of Dunbar rose to make reply. He declared that it must be remembered that he had been "forth of the country." He farther affirmed "that unto that time there was never any motion made thereof to him, and that before the dissolving of that Assembly he should cause satisfaction to be given to them for the time past." In fulfillment of this promise the treasurer's servants distributed some 5,000 pounds Scots among those ministers who had borne the moderatorial charge. Such is Spottiswoode's light and innocent version of what took place. (352) Unfortunately, as far as his straightforwardness and accuracy as a historian are concerned, the whole affair appears to have been much less simple and innocent than the Archbishop would have us to believe. In the first place he says nothing about the indisputable fact that fully one month before the Assembly met 10,000 Scots marks had been placed at the disposal and discretion of Dunbar, Archbishop Claudstanes and himself.

(360) See above p. 66.
(362) Spottiswoode III. p. 237.
If one had only his version of the story to guide one it would be natural to conclude that this disbursement of funds was, as far as the Lord High Commissioner and the two prelates were concerned, entirely unpremeditated. But this was not the case. Again, Spottiswoode suppresses all reference to the fact that, as the Presbyterian writers loudly protest, money was handed out on grounds other than that of the constant moderation of presbyteries. It is true that the constant moderators received their due. The Presbyterians admit that this debt was paid. (363) But many other who held no such position or title received a payment also. Calderwood (364), Melville (365), Soot (366), and Row (367) declare that much money was distributed under the guise of “travelling expenses.” And this distribution, they insist, was anything but an equal or proportionate one. They that “did the turn,” and “served the King” had large amounts distributed to them. They who had opposed the official motions were ignored in the distribution. “The self (gold) was distributed among those that voyoed affirmatively; and some got more, and some less, according as the Bishops thought they deserved their reward, or were able to hold forward the cause and purpose intended.” (368) A large contingent of Northern ministers whose presence in the Assembly had been due to Bishop Law’s foresight and management were well repaid for the long journey they had made. He, their captain, and the chief persuader and procurer of their coming and consent, was careful to see them well served. (369) On the other hand certain other brethren who had failed to give what the Commissioner and bishops considered adequate satisfaction were forced to return home empty handed. Calderwood has preserved one or two interesting details as regards this matter. He relates that John Salfour, one of the Southern ministers went to Archbishop Law and complained that he had received nothing. The Bishop replied, “Yee have done no service to his Majesty, for yee voted, ‘Kon liquet.’” Another brother, John Lawder of Cockburnspath, “coming too late, when there was nothing resting to be dealt but ten pund, fourtie pennels lesse, was content to take that small somme, and to dispense with the want of fourtie pennels.” (370) The historian adds that to some, such as Michael Cranstoun of Crammond, an augmentation of stipend was promised. John Hall of Edinburgh received a pension “for his previcatioun.” (371) “For his service,” is the more charitable way Soot puts it. (372) That these writers mean to imply by these last words is uncertain. Possibly they are thinking of the fact that Hall was reported to have made some opposition in the privy conference, but that he quietly acquiesced in all measures which were proposed in full Assembly.

What then are we to conclude with regard to all this "pelfe-deiilung” (373) Was bribery really practised in the Assembly? Modern investigators differ when they give us their final opinions. Professor Cooper considers that “the evidence as the bribery is in itself inadequate.” (374) W. L. Watieson shows himself to be somewhat undecided as regard the matter. He writes that “corruption, under color of money given for travelling expenses is said to have been practised on a large scale at Glasgow.” (375) Note his two qualifying words: “is said.” On the other hand M’Crie is quite definite in his conviction that “bribery as well as artifice was practised on the members of this Assembly.” (376) Cunningham first states Calderwood’s charges, and then gives Spottiswoode’s defence. He, however,
ventures no opinion or conclusion of his own. (377) Professor Hume Brown quotes the letter from King James to Dunbar placing at his disposal the ten thousand marks Scots money. He then adds that this and other inducements had their desired result. (378) Stephen follows Spottiswoode closely, and says nothing about the distribution of money for travelling expenses. He admits, however, that the distribution was "inopportune and open to not unnatural suspicion." (379)

The facts of the matter as we see them are briefly as follows. First of all, Dunbar and the two Archbishops had been prepared beforehand to disburse a large amount of money among such persons as they should "hold fit for this honor and attention. This is clear from the royal letter to the Earl of Dunbar. (380)

Secondly, towards the close of the Assembly a distribution of funds took place. Both Presbyterians and Episcopalians agree that a great deal of money changed hands. Spottiswoode insists, however, that this disbursement was perfectly in order; that is, was merely the legitimate payment of the salaries of the constant moderators. (381) Presbyterian writers admit that the moderators got their due, (382) but they protest that others besides these men received payment. The Presbyterian testimony here is firm and agreed. Further distributio., it is declared, was made to such as supported Dunbar and the bishops under pretence of paying their expenses. If bribery there was in the Assembly then we come upon it right here. What are we then to say?

In answer we would reply that we consider the Presbyterian testimony at this point too firmly established to be lightly overthrown. Consider in turn the statements of the different writers. Calderwood: "Money was distributed among them, and given largelie to such as served their turne, under pretence of bearing their charges." (383) A letter preserved for us in Melville's Diary. "Thair was large money distributit to the Ministerie that did the turne, under pretence of beiring the\r\n
their chaire. But without some malcontentement and contention in parting their pelfe-deelling." (384) Row: "After the votes given, and Assembly concluded, then the pelf (gold) was distributed among these that voyced affirmatively; and some got more, and some less, according as the Bishops thought they deserved their reward, or were able to hold forward the cause and purpose intended; whereby it came to passe, that some getting so little in comparison of others, were mal-content, and went home not content to that Assembly. This being known in the countrey, they made rumour passe, that the King's Majestie had onlie given moneys to such ministers as had their dwellings far fra Glasgow, to defray their great charges; but the contrare was well known; for both some near Glasgow, who voted the King's say, got the wags of Balaam, and some gracious ministers in the North, who voted negative, got no gold at all." (385) Scot: "Money was given largely to such as served the King and the Bishops, under pretence of bearing their charges." (386) Such is the Presbyterian testimony, differing in details of form and expression, but in the main, explicit, definite and agreed. As we read it through, we feel instinctively that it is true to actual fact.

It is therefore our conclusion that indeed funds were distributed among those who had voted affirmatively. This disbursement was made under a two-fold guise. First of all, payment was made to the constant moderators; secondly, a number of ministers received sums of money which were given out under the

(380) See above p. 66.
(381) See above p. 98.
(382) See above p. 99.
(383) Calderwood VII. p. 97.
(384) Melville Mary, p. 802.
(386) Scot A.N. p. 234.
designation of travelling expenses. But those commissioners belonging to the small minority who voted negatively and non liquet were passed over in the matter of payments. Only those who had served the king, secured the reward. Whether or not such a payment deserves to be known by the name of bribery is a nice question into which we will not enter. It is clear, we hold, that the payment was made, call it what one will.

It is interesting to note in conclusion that Calderwood hints of another means of persuasion employed by Dunbar in the Assembly. He writes that the Commissioner "professed plainlie, he would have no man there to give anie countenance of misliking; and had the king's guarde readie, to commit suche as would oppose stoultie to their proceedings." (387) Just what truth there is in the report we find it hard to say. Calderwood is the only one who says anything about the presence of the king's guard. Although both Soot (388) and How (389) agree with him that the clever use of threats and men using of some sort was not neglected. It is possible that the members of the guard were in attendance in the capacity of body guard to the Lord High Commissioner. Their presence may also have been used as a means of frightening Churchmen and undermining their resistance. If such tactics were really employed, we can only say that they were altogether unnecessary. There was no need to bully and terrify the commissioners in that manner. They were ready and docile enough as it was.

And now the Assembly had accomplished all its business, and was ready to dissolve. "So the Assemblie was dissolved," writes Calderwood, "no new Assemblie appointed and the 133 Psalm chanted." (390)

(387) Calderwood VII. p. 98.
(388) Soot A. N. p. 224.
(389) Row Historie pp. 274 and 281.
### APPENDIX II.

**The Roll of the Assembly.**

The King's Commissioners:
- The Earl of Dumbar
- The Archbishop of St. Andrews
- My Lord President
- My Lord Secretarie
- Lords:
- Lords:
- Of the Nobilitie:
- Earls:
- Montrose
- Glencarns
- Cattness
- Wigtoun
- Kinshorne
- Abercirth
- Lothian
- Lords:
- Lindsey
- Joone
- Blantyre
- Kintail
- Of the Nobilitie:
- Of the Nobilitie:
- Of the Ministry:
- Orknay:
- Bishop of Orknay
- Robert Stewart
- Mrs. Patrick Waterstoun
- William Hair
- Andrew Dishington
- Cattness:
- Bishop of Cattness
- Mrs. William Pope
- Thomas Paipe
- Andrew Ogseburie
- Ross:
- Mrs George McRcro
- Robert Hock
- Murray:
- Bishop of Murray
- Mrs. James Dundas
- Thomas Dundas
- Patrick Dundas
- William Coglie
- Alexander Hauser
- William Reid
- Aberdeen:
- Bishop of Aberdeen
- Mrs. David Halt
- Archibald Sleekburne
- Robert Burnet
- John Logie
- John Reid
- John Grieve
- Robert Merser
- Abraham Ibbald
- George Hay
- James Hay
- Robert Maitland
- John Strachan
- Robert Ross
- Robert Reid
- Alexander Guthrie

---

(1) The order in which the Presbyteries occur is that found in the Book of Universal Kirk; the spelling of the names of the individual ministers is that of Calderwood's History.
Mernes:-- Mrs Andrew Ramsay.  
James Rait.  
Adam Walker.

Brechin:-- Bishop of Brechin.  
Mrs Dugald Campbell.  
Andrew Leitch.  
Richard Merchiston.  
James Elliot.

Arbroath:-- Mrs Arthure Puthie.  
Patrick Lindsay.  
Andrew Drummond.  
Henrie Hillip.  
Johnie Guthrie.

Dundee:-- Mrs David Kinnier.  
Robert Hynid.

Meigle:-- Mrs Henrie Guthrie.  
Alexander Kinninmough.  
David Brown.

Perth:-- Mrs William Couper.  
Archibald Moncreife.

Dunkelden:-- Bishop of Dunkelden.  
Mrs Silvester Ratray.  
James Menzels.  
Alexander Ireland.

Auchterarder:-- Mr. James Burdoun.

Stirlin:-- Bishop of Dumblane.  
Mrs William Stirlin.  
William Horne.

Saint Andrews:-- Archbishop of St. Andrews.  
Mrs David Monpennie.  
William Murray.  
Simon Durie.

Universitie:-- Mr Robert Howie.

Coupér:-- Mrs James Martinez.  
Robert Buchanan.  
John Caldocleuch.  
Thomas Douglas.

Kirkaldie:-- Mrs John Mitchelson.  
William Murray.  
Alan Lawmounch.

Dumfermline:-- Mrs James Stewart.  
Andrew Forrester.  
William Paton.

Edinburgh:-- Mrs John Hall.  
Peter Howat.  
Michael Cranston.

Linlithgow:-- Mrs Robert Cornwal.  
Alexander Keith.  
Robert Gilmour.  
Thomas Peebles.

Dalkeith:-- Mr Patrick Tournour.

Haddington:-- Mr James Carmichael.

Dumbar:-- Mrs Edward Hepburne.  
John Lauder.  
Thomas Hepburne.

Peebles:-- Mrs James Logn.  
Robert Livingtoun.
Chirnside:— Mr John Clapperton.
Dunse:—) Mr James Knox.
(Also:—) Thomas Store.
Telso:—) John Balfour.
Glasgow:— Archibishop of Glasgow.
Mrs Patrick Sharpe.
John Neil of Glasgow.
Andrew Boyd.
Paisley:— Mrs John Hay.
Archibald Hamilton.
William Birstoun.
George Mackay.
Dumbarton:— Mr Walter Stewart.
Hamilton:— Mrs Thomas Fairheild.
James Hamilton.
David Sharpe.
John Howison.
Lanark:— Mrs William Airlie.
John Lindsay.
Robert Wilkie.
Air:— Mrs Peter Prymrose.
John Makourne.
William Wallace.
Irving:— Mrs Alexander Sorimgeour.
Michael Wallace.
Dunfreres:— Mrs Thomas Ramsey.
Robert Huntar.
Robert Hensson.
Simon Johnston.
Kirkcudbright:— Bishop of Galloway.
Mrs John Alksen.
William Hamilton.
Robert Glendinning.
James Donaldson.
Wigtown:— Mrs James Adamson.
John Watson.
George Hinnard.
Argyle:— Bishop of Argyle.
Mrs. John Cameron.
Donald Makilrorie.
Neil Campboul.
John Kakallum.
Nicol Makosalm.
Isles:— Bishop of the Isles.
Mrs Patrik Stewart.
Robert Stewart.

Of Barones.
Drumlanrig.
Glenurquhie, younger.
Teuchter.
Bombie.
Northberwrick.
Calderwood.
Balnamone.
Minto.
Balmains.
Cairntallie.
Duntrie.
Mr Samuel Cockburne.
Sir George Elphingstoun of Mlythwood.
Of Burrowes.

Edinburgh:-- Munjo Makcal.
        Edward Ker.
Perth:--    Gavin Delyel.
Dundie:--   Mr William Ferguson.
Aberdeen:-- Alexander Rutherfurde.
St Andrews:-- John Knox.
Glasgow:--  James Norfeit.
--CHAPTER III.--

"THE LEGISLATION OF THE ASSEMBLY."
It is now our duty to enter upon a careful examination of the legislative proposals which were passed into law by the Assembly. These "Heads and Articles"(1) are manifestly of great importance. They are the result of a skilled and painstaking endeavour to combine and to coordinate certain distinctive features of both the Episcopal and the Presbyteral forms of Church government. The groundwork of the new policy was to be found in the Presbyteral system of a series of graded ecclesiastical courts. Upon this Presbyteral foundation an Episcopal superstructure was erected. Thus on the one hand there was secured to the Kirk everyone of her Church courts the value and worth of which she had by this time abundantly proved.(2) On the other hand equal provision was made for the dignity and the authority of the bishops.(3) The scheme of polity which resulted from this combination was clearly that of a Constitutional Episcopacy. This will become increasingly evident as we proceed. In our investigation of the Heads and Articles we shall now enter without delay. We shall quote each article in full, and then attach our comments in exposition of its bearing and significance.

Article I:—"In the first, it is declarit that the allegit Assemblie haldin at Aberdeen is null in the self, speciall in respect it had not his Majestie's allowance, and was dischargit be his Majestie's Commissioner. And because necessitle of the Kirk craves that for order taken with the common enemie and other affaires touching the Kirk, there shall be yearly Generall Assemblies, the condition whereof the Assemblie acknowledges to appertayne to his Majestie be the prerogative of his royall owne; and, therefore, the Generall Assemblie must humbly requests his Majestie, that Generall Assemblies be halden ance in the year, or at the liest, in respect of the necessitle forsaid, that is Majestie wold appoynt ane certaine tyme at the quhilk the samen hall be halden precisely in all tyme coming."(4)

It will be observed that Article I. falls naturally into two sections. That which we designate section A. has to do with the famous and disputed Aberdeen Assembly. Section B. is concerned with the calling of annual General Assemblies. We pause over each of these sections in turn.

Section A:—It was doubtless because of its crucial importance that the question of "the allegit Assemblie halden at Aberdeen" was considered first. And in this first section of Article I. the Assembly made its decision. It would definitely repudiate the position taken up by the Aberdeen confessors, and would accept the version of the affair now officially held by the Privy Council and the ing.(5) We agree with Prof. Cooper that "it is impossible to excuse the pusillanimous abandonment of the noble confessors of the Aberdeen Assembly."(6) And yet at the same time it is possible that we may be a little too severe in our censures. We have taken note above of at least one of the ways in which the brethren were induced to condemn the Aberdeen gathering.(7) Very probably some of them believed that in recording this decision they were doing their banished friends a real service. And for this they certainly ought not to be condemned.

(2) Selwyn. Irenicum of John Forbes. Introduction p. 10. Dr. Selwyn although an Anglo-Catholic admits that much of the old Presbyterian order "had worked well."
(5) See above p. 46.
(7) See above p. 95. The reference is to Spottiswoode's cleverly put suggestion that if they admitted their fault the banished brethren would be allowed to return home.
The reference in the article to the discharging of the Assembly by His Majesty's Commissioner is interesting. Beyond doubt what is referred to here is Lauriston's assertion that he had discharged the Assembly at the market cross the day before the meeting. The Glasgow Assembly thus went on record as accepting the official version of the Aberdeen affair.

The version of this first half of Article I. which appears in Spottiswoode's History agrees in substance with the versions given in Calderwood and in the Book of the Universal Kirk. In the 1612 Parliamentary ratification of the Assembly's legislation, however, no reference to the Aberdeen Assembly is to be found. Parliament had nothing to say about that matter.

Section B--In reading through this second section one will discover that it is cast somewhat after the form of a petition to the king. His Majesty is here begged to allow the holding of annual General Assemblies. Early Assemblies should be summoned, so the brethren urge, in order that order may be taken against "the common enemie." The reference here is undoubtedly to the Church of Rome. There was at this time no other "common enemie" of the Reformed Church in Scotland. It is acknowledged quite openly that the calling of General Assemblies appertains to the king by his royal prerogative. A great deal was involved in this admission. In this way the Church formally surrendered the right into possession of which she had come in 15.2. According to the famous Act of that year Assemblies were to be held at least yearly at the time and place appointed by the king or the Lord High Commissioner at the last Assembly. If these two important personalities were absent the Moderator was empowered to set the date of the next meeting. But this double right of the Church to yearly Assemblies and of the Moderator to summon new gatherings was now abandoned. On behalf of annual Assemblies merely a humble petition was made and the calling of them was acknowledged to belong to the crown. As is well known the crown disregarded the substance of the petition. Very few General Assemblies were allowed to meet between 1610 and 1638.

Section B--In reading through this second section one will discover that it is cast somewhat after the form of a petition to the king. His Majesty is here begged to allow the holding of annual General Assemblies. Early Assemblies should be summoned, so the brethren urge, in order that order may be taken against "the common enemie." The reference here is undoubtedly to the Church of Rome. There was at this time no other "common enemie" of the Reformed Church in Scotland. It is acknowledged quite openly that the calling of General Assemblies appertains to the king by his royal prerogative. A great deal was involved in this admission. In this way the Church formally surrendered the right into possession of which she had come in 15.2. According to the famous Act of that year Assemblies were to be held at least yearly at the time and place appointed by the king or the Lord High Commissioner at the last Assembly. If these two important personalities were absent the Moderator was empowered to set the date of the next meeting. But this double right of the Church to yearly Assemblies and of the Moderator to summon new gatherings was now abandoned. On behalf of annual Assemblies merely a humble petition was made and the calling of them was acknowledged to belong to the crown. As is well known the crown disregarded the substance of the petition. Very few General Assemblies were allowed to meet between 1610 and 1638.

The section concludes with the suggestion that the king "would a point a certain time at which the same (Assemblies) shall be held in all time coming."

As it appeared in the above form Section 3. does not appear to have given much satisfaction to King James. A study of his later policy makes evident that he had no intention of permitting annual Assemblies. Consequently it is not surprising that when the Assembly's enactments were presented for Parliamentary ratification in 1612 this whole question of yearly Assemblies was completely ignored. The Church's acknowledgement of the royal right to call Assemblies may be read in the Statute Book, but not one word about annual Assemblies can one find there. In his summary of the Acts of the Assembly Spottiswoode, giving as usual the official version of things, omits all reference to the request for and the necessity of yearly Assemblies. Thus the Assembly's good intentions were frustrated and rendered of no effect by the action of the Court and Parliament.

(8) See above p. 46.
(9) Spottiswoode III. p. 206.
(12) These Assemblies met at Aberdeen in 1516, at St. Andrews in 1617, and at Perth in 1618. See Cooper's interesting words as regards these Assemblies, Cooper C.U.A.P. p. 81. Reunion, pp. 48-50.
(14) Spottiswoode III. p. 206.
Article II. — "It is thought expedient that the bishops shall be moderators in every diocesan synod, and the synods shall be held twice in the year, of the kirks of every diocese, viz. in April and October. And quher, as the dioceses are large, that there be two or three synods in convenient places for ease of the ministry." (16)

It will be seen that this second article is concerned with the position of the bishops in the diocesan synod. Our knowledge of the history of the synodal assemblies during the period from 1560 to 1610 will serve to prepare us for the substance of the article. It was decreed that the bishops should be moderators in every diocesan synod. The First Book of Discipline had made each superintendent the head of the council or synod of his diocese. (16) When Episcopacy was brought in after 1572, some synods met under the presidency of a bishop. Later when Presbyterianism triumphed under Melville, the permanent presiding officer was abolished, and a moderator chosen by the synod from among its own members for a limited period of time took his place. (17) The Second Book of Discipline declared that "in all ecclesiastical assemblies, one moderator should be chosen by common consent of the whole brethren convenit." (18) The custom of constantly changing moderators, having been introduced in this way, was continued without interruption until 1606. We need not go into the matter of the Linlithgow Convention Assembly again. It will be recalled, however, that after the Assembly had dispersed both king and bishops insisted that the gathering had decided that in future all the synods should be moderated uninterruptedly by the bishops. (19) It will also be recalled that this proposal every synod with the exception of Angus made a stout and determined resistance. (20) But this opposition was now seen to have been in vain. By the decree of the present Assembly each synod was required to accept a bishop as its constant moderator. The bishop would of course moderate that synod the name of which he bore in his title. Thus Spottiswoode would preside at Glasgow, Graham at Dunblane, Lamb at Brechin and so on.

It should be noted, however, that there was no attempt made to abolish or to supersede the synod as a court. Just as the brethren intended that General Assemblies should continue to be called, so they also agreed that the provincial synod should stand and function also. The district or province which went to make up the synod territorially was to be known as the "diocese." For this term there was some precedent in the Reformed Church. The provinces of the early Reformed Superintendents had been known by that name. (21) Moreover the synods were to meet at least twice a year, in April and October. For this there was also precedent. The superintendent's provincial council had met that oft'p. (22) And further the famous Act of 1592 had ratified the holding of provincial assemblies twice a year "as they half be ne and are presentlie in use to doe." (23) The holding of twice-yearly synods was thus an established custom. Finally it was agreed that where dioceses were inconveniently large two or more synods should be held "for the ease of the ministrie." Thus to take one example, the great diocese of St. Andrews was spread over Fife and the Lothians, and extended into the country north of the Tay. (24) It was of too great a size for its ministers

(18) Calderwood III. p. 539.
(19) See above p. 55.
(20) See above p. 56.
(21) See above p. 53.
(23) Calderwood V. p. 163.
(24) See the map of the old Scottish dioceses in MacEwen, History of Church in Scotland I. p. 194.
to be easily convened in one central synod. Notice was accord-

ingly given at a later date that a special synod would be held 

at Haddington for the ease of those ministers whose parishes 

lay south of the Forth. (26)

It should be noted in conclusion that in the 1612 

ratification of the Assembly's enactments a further clause 

was added to this article. This additional clause was to the 

effect that should the bishop of the diocese be unable to be 

present at the synod his place was to be taken by some worthy 

minister of the diocese whom he should appoint. (26) Spottiswoode 

includes this clause in his version of the acts of the Assembly. (27) 

We shall have cause to refer to this clause again in considering 

Article VII. (28)

Article III. — "That no sentence of excommunication 
or absolution be pronounced or in favor of any 

person without the knowledge and approbation of the Bishop of 

the diocese, who must be answerable to his Majesty for all 

formal and impartial proceedings therein; and the process being 

found formal, the sentence to be pronounced at the directions 
of the Bishop, be the minister of the parishes where the offender 
dwells and their process begun. And in case the Bishop shall be 

found unable to pronounce the sentence, the same being tried by 

any person that has merited the same, and against whom the process 

has been lawfully deducit, the same being tried, and he convicted 

by the General Assembly therefore, that advertisement shall be made 
to his Majesty to the effect one other may be placit in his 

room." (29)

In this article there are several important matters 
to be noted. The main subject of the article is the pronouncing 
of and the absolving from the sentence of excommunication. And 

by excommunication we believe is meant what is known technically 

as "the greater excommunication." This is Calderwood's opinion, (30) 

and with it Prof. Cooper appears to agree. (31) "The lesser 
excommunication" was not a matter of great importance. It merely 
cut a man off from the regular means of grace. The greater 
excommunication was a very serious affair. It cut a man off from fellowship with the whole body of Christians, and in 

the days this was accompanied by social ostracism and certain 
civil disabilities. (32) Article III. declares that in future 

no sentence of excommunication or of absolution therefrom shall be 
pronounced without the cognizance and consent of the bishop of 

the diocese. The bishop in turn is to be responsible to the 

king for "all formal and impartial proceedings therein." The 

serious civil pains and disabilities which accompanied the state 
of excommunication made reasonable the provision acquainting his 

Majesty of the details of the case. Should the process be "found 
formal" the sentence is to be pronounced by the offender's parish 

minister and in the parish where "the process began." Prof. 

Cooper was of the opinion that in these last words we have a 

reference to the Kirk Session. (33) Certain it is that the powers and 

functions of kirk sessions were left undisturbed by the Assembly. 

That being the case all matters of local ecclesiastical discipline 

would be considered first of all by this court.

It should also be noted that provision is made in this 

article for redress in case a bishop should fail to do his duty. 

A person may have merited sentence, and his bishop may have stayed 

its pronouncement. Appeal may then be made to the General Assembly. 

Should the bishop be found guilty his Majesty is to be informed 
to the effect that another may be placed in his room. The Assembly. 


(27) Spottiswoode III. p. 206. 

(28) See below pp. 115-117. 

of the Booke of Universall Kirk that very important clause in the second 

half of the article: "the same being tried and he convicted by the 

General Assembly therefor" is wanting. Calderwood VII. p. 100. 

(30) Calderwood VII. p. 113. 


(32) See the article on Discipline in the Reformed Churches. Hastings 


be it noticed, here asserts no inherent power or right to depose a bishop. All that it can do is to inform the king of his fault, and ask for his removal.

In the Parliamentary version of the acts of the Assembly this whole second section of Article III. is omitted. (34) There is no provision made in the Statute Book for the correction or removal of a bishop who has failed to do his duty. Spottiswoode following the official account of what happened likewise omits this second half of the paragraph. (36)

Article IV.:—"That all presentations hereafter be direct to the Bishop; and upon any presentations given or otherwise made be any be admitted to the ministry, the Bishop is to require the ministry of these bounds where he is to serve, to certify by their testimonial unto him of the partie suiter, his conversation past, his abilitie and qualifications for the functions; and upon returne of their testimonial, the Bishop is to take harder tryall, and finding him qualified, and being assistit be such of the ministry of the bounds wher he is to serve as he will assume to himself, he is then to perfect the halfe act or ordinatons." (36)

The subject of this article is the matter of presentation to parishes. Included in the matter of presentations are the two other ecclesiastical processes, preliminary trials and ordination to the work and office of the Holy Ministry. The article begins by declaring that in future all presentations shall be directed to the bishop of the diocese. We recall that back in 1567 a step in this direction had been taken when patrons were required to present their ministerial candidates to the superintendent of that province wherein the benefice lay. (37) But all this had been swept away by the rise of Presbyterianism. According to the famous act of 1592 all presentations were henceforth to come before the presbytery. (39) But now according to the 1610 decision once more presentations are to be directed to one outstanding ecclesiastical official. But the process here is not to be something which concerns merely the bishop and the presentee. The presbytery is still to have a substantial though somewhat diminished share in the process. Most probably further it may be well to point out here that the general idea of making the bishop dependent on the advice and assistance of his presbyters was not a new thing in Scottish history. Precedent for the practice may be found back in the days of the Convention of Leith. We pointed this out in our Introduction. (39) Then a presentation has been given or when suit has been made to have a qualified person admitted to the ministry, the bishop is to ask the ministers of the bounds where he is to serve, that is, the clergy of the presbytery, to provide him with a certificate of the candidate's ability and character. A further trial conducted by the bishop himself is to follow the arrival of the certificate. The candidate having passed successfully through this period of probation is then to be ordained to the Holy Ministry by the bishop assisted by such presbyters "of the bounds...as he will assume unto himself." Ordination of ministers was in future to rest upon the presence and participation of the bishop. An Episcopally ordained ministry was thus guaranteed. It should not be forgotten, however, that the rights of the presbyters were not passed over or ignored. Presbyters are to be present and to assist at every ordination. The resemblance here to Anglican law and practice needs scarcely to be pointed out. (40) In these proposals there is no word about reordaining the ministers already in charge of parishes, that is, the men in Presbyterian orders.

(35) Spottiswoode III. p. 206.
(38) Calderwood VII. pp. 156-156.
(39) See for example the provision in Article VI. of the Convention of Leith. Above p. 14. See also the Act of Assembly of March 1574 and our comment. Above pp. 20-21.
(40) Selwyn, Irenicon of John Forbes. Introduction p. 10.
It will be observed that the word presbytery nowhere occurs in this article. Those who drafted these clauses omitted it purposely. King James, they said, could not bear to hear the word; it was "offensive" to him. But while the word thus disappeared the court which the word designated still remained. There can be no doubt about that. But the clause: "the ministry of these bounds where he is to serve" is meant the presbytery "engaged in its judicial function of examining candidates for the Holy Ministry." It should be noticed, however, that in the work of perfecting "the hail act of ordinations" the bishop is not required to call in all the clergy of the local presbytery. He is merely to be aided by those whom he will assume to himself.

We come here upon a very interesting and important question the following paragraph will clearly show.

In an article contributed to a recent number of The Review of the Churches, Canon Simpson of Saint Paul's, London, reviews the history of the Scottish Episcopacy in the 17th century. (43) This article is of great interest. And at one point he touches upon the subject of Article IV. He is much interested in the interpretation to be given to the clause concerning "the provision whereby the bishop is 'to perfect the hail act of ordinations' of those ministering in his diocese." (44) Canon Simpson is certain that the presbytery was to continue its existence and that the bishop was to be its moderator at the time of an ordination. He is of the further opinion—and this is most important—that an ordination would continue "to be regarded as an act of the presbytery rather than of the bishop." He continues, "I am not aware whether any evidence of the manner in which the bishops discharged their responsibility is in existence, analogy suggests that they would sometimes at least delegate the duty to another, ordination being considered as perfected by their commission and authority rather than by their actual presence." (45) Canon Simpson's position is thus clear. The presbytery was to remain as it was past. One of its duties was to be that of ordination. In normal circumstances the bishop would preside at this meeting of presbytery, and so take part in the ordination rite. If, however, he was unable to be present another clergyman would be able to act as his deputy. It is instructive to note in this connection an interesting piece of information which has been preserved for us by the historian John Row. He tells us that at the ordination of his nephew William Row, Bishop Alexander Lindsay of Dunkeld quite frankly admitted that he was present "not as a bishop but as a member of presbytery." (46) This would appear to bear out Canon Simpson's contention. Still Bishop Lindsay was present at the ordination.

But it appears to us that the weight of evidence inclines against this view. In Article VIII. it is expressly allowed that the presbytery when engaged in its weekly doctrinal exercise is to be moderated by the bishop when he is able to be present. Should he be unable to attend his place is to be taken by a deputy whom he shall appoint at the time of the synod. (47) But in Article IV. no permission is given to the bishop to allow him to provide a deputy to preside at ordinations. It is assumed throughout the article that he himself will be there and will take the leading part. Again, as we have pointed out above, it is not stated that all the clergy of the bounds are to take part in the ordination. Rather only those whom the bishop shall care to assume to himself are to participate in the ceremony with him.

(44) The same, p. 337.
(45) The same, p. 337.
(46) Row Historie pp. 325-327.
(47) See below p. 117.
This provision, we believe, disposes of Canon Simpson's contention. The bishop must be present and preside. He is to be assisted not by the whole college of the presbytery's clerical members, but only by such ministers as he shall select to join him. Further, both Calderwood and Soot are clear that in its legislation the Assembly "tied" ordination as well as jurisdiction to the bishops. This view is supported by the following interesting facts: Early in 1611 King James sent down certain instructions to his Scottish clergy. Among others was one to the effect that henceforth no minister was to be admitted to a parish without the trial and laying on of hands by the bishop and other ministers. Now, as we shall see, the further information that under the new regime ministers were "now admitted in a new and uncoutch form by a bishop and not by the presence of the whole college," in an ordinal entitled "A Forme and Manner of Ordaining Ministers: and Consecrating of Bishops and Archbishops used in the Church of Scotland" was published. In this ordination service the leading part is to be taken by the bishop. It is he who administers the oath of royal supremacy, and it is he also who officially addresses and interrogates the candidate. The crucial ordination rubric reads as follows: "The Prayer ended, the Bishop, with the Ministers that are present, shall lay their hands upon the head of him that is to be admitted, here in the mean while kneeling; humble upon his knees, and the Bishop shall say---" There is not one word in the service about the possibility or legality of anyone taking the bishop's place on the occasion of an ordination. Finally we have the testimony of Prof. Cooper and Dr. G.W. Sprott, both of whom knew this period in Scottish History so well. As is well known, Dr. Cooper was possibly the foremost authority on the subject of the Precedents of 1610. His words are as follows: "Throughout the twenty-eight years that followed, ordinances of ministers in Scotland (with the exception of a very few in thinly populated districts performed by presbyters alone) were by the laying on of hands of the bishops with the simultaneous "laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Dr. Sprott's testimony is to this same effect. His words are: "For the next twenty-seven years no one was admitted to the ministry without Episcopal ordination." And again, until 1638 "all who were admitted to the ministry were ordained by bishops of the Spottiswoode line with the assistance of other presbyters."

On turning to the Acts of the Scottish Parliament we find that Article IV. has been both altered and expanded. In the first place, all reference to the presbytery's part in certifying the candidate and in assisting at his ordination is omitted. That important clause "he (the bishop) is then to perfect the full act of ordination" has disappeared also. Secondly, an extensive paragraph has been added to the original article. Briefly this is concerned with the right of patrons. Provision has also been made for the settlement of disputes which may arise between patrons and bishops. It is ordained that when a bishop has refused to admit a qualified person, the patron is to be permitted to appeal to the Archbishop and from him to the Privy Council. A simulacral pact between patron and presentee will justify the bishop in refusing to proceed to the ceremony of admission. The Lords of Council and Session are to be the judges in disputes involving presented persons, patrons and prelates. All of which may be read in detail in the Acts of the Scottish Parliament. Spottiswoode's version of this important article is of the slightest. He records that in future all presentations are to be directed to the bishops and archbishops. All the important clauses which follow are ignored. Such omission is of course unpardonable in a serious historian.

(50) All of which may be read in Dr. G.W. Sprott's Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI. pp. 111-131.
(51) Cooper, Reunion p. 42.
(52) Sprott, Doctrine of Schism in Church of Scotland. p. 11.
Article V.:—"In depositione of ministers, the Bishope associating to himself the ministry of these bounds where the delinquent serves, he is then to take tryall of his fault, and upon just cause found, to deprive him."

Article V. is not one of outstanding importance. It is concerned with the unpleasant subject of the deposition of unworthy ministers. In the process of deposition the bishops is evidently to be assisted by all the ministers of these bounds where the delinquent serves. These brethren are to be associated with their ordinary during the trial and deposition. In this same article as revised by the Parliament of 1612 an additional clause was added to the effect that the like order was to be observed in the suspension of ministers from the exercise of their function. Spottiswoode likewise includes this additional clause.

Article VII.---"That every minister, in his admission, shall swear obedience to his Majestie and his ordinar, according to the forme sett downe in the conference kept in the year of God 1567, wherof the tenor followes:--"The Forme of the Oath to be given to the Persone provydis to any Benefice with Cure, the tyme of his Admission be the Ordinar. I, A.B., now nominat and admittit to the G. of K., utterly testifies and declares on my conscience, that the right excellent, right highe and mighty Prince James the Saxe, be the gr. ce of God King of Scots, is the only lawfull, suprume governour of this realme alswell in things temporall as in conservations and purgations of religione, and that no forraigne Prince, Prelat, nor Potentate, hes or oucht to have jurisdictiones, powers, superiorities, authoritie, and promises; that from this furth, I shall and will bear faith and trew allsedgeance to his Hienes, his aires, and lawful successors, and to my rower shall assist and defend all jurisdictiones, priviledges, preheminences, and authoritie grantit and belungand to his Hienes, his aires, and lawful successors, or united and annexed to his Royal Crowne: And farther, I acknowledge and confesse to have and hold the said G. possessions of the same (under God only) of his Majestie and Crowne Royall of this realme: and for the saids possessiones, I do homage presently unto his Hienes in your presence, and to his Majestie, his aires and lawful successors, shall be faithful and trew: Swa help me God."(56)

It may be recalled that at an early point in this essay, we pointed out that the decisions of the Leith Convention of 1572, the act of Parliament in 1606 reestablishing Episcopacy and the legislation of our Glasgow Assembly were all linked up, and closely interrelated. In this Article VI. we have clear and convincing evidence of this fact. It is here ordained that every minister at the time of his admission, "shall swear obedience to his Majesty and his Ordinary, according to the form set down in the Conference (at Leith) in the year of God 1572 wherof the tenor followeth," and then follows the form of Oath that was required of new made bishops and beneficed persons to be installed according to the Leith Agreement. This was after all something which one would have expected. For those responsible for the legislation of the Assembly undoubtedly had in mind the acts of the Parliament of 1605, and that Parliament had legislated then had been of the Leith Convention Model. Except for a few unimportant verbal changes, the two forms of Oath of 1572 and 1610 are identical. There is, of course, this one difference to be noted. In 1572 the oath was to be required of new made bishops and beneficed persons to be installed according to the Leith Agreement. This was after all something which one would have expected. For those responsible for the legislation of the Assembly undoubtedly had in mind the acts of the Parliament of 1605, and that Parliament had legislated then had been of the Leith Convention Model. Except for a few unimportant verbal changes, the two forms of Oath of 1572 and 1610 are identical. There is, of course, this one difference to be noted. In 1572 the oath was to be required of both bishops and ordinary beneficed persons. In 1610 it is to be required of persons belonging to the latter class only. Later, however, in 1620 the new Scottish Ordinal provided that the oath be administered to bishops and archbishops also.

It may be of interest to point out here that the writer inclines to the opinion that the exact reason for the introduction of this oath was not the same in 1610 as it had been in 1572. In the main the purpose of the oath is clear. It is to set forth in straightforward and unequivocal terms the doctrine of the royal supremacy "alswell in things temporall as in conservations and purgations of religione," and to require all beneficed persons to subscribe the same. Now in 1572 this doctrine of supremacy had been asserted against whom? Unquestionably against the ecclesiastical power and Jurisdiction claimed by the Pope. But by 1610 the danger of imminent Papal interference had for the most part disappeared. Against whom or what then was the royal supremacy asserted anew? Surely, it must have been against those who insisted with Andrew Melville that there were "two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland," and who would have rigidly excluded the civil power from interfering with the

(57) See above pp. 15, 16 and 48, 49.
(58) See above p. 15.
(59) See above pp. 16 and 49.
(61) See Andrew Melville's famous words. Melville Diary p. 370.
government of a powerful, autonomous and self-governing Kirk. Such is the view to which the writer increasingly inclines.

When in 1613 Parliament met and revised the Assembly's Articles, certain additions and changes of consequence were introduced into this form of oath. First of all, that important clause: "also in things temporal as in conservations and purgations of religions," disappeared. It was replaced by the shorter and less equivocal clause, "also in matters spiritual and temporal things temporal." The assertion of the royal supremacy was thus given a sharper and more effective edge. Secondly, provision for a special form of oath of obedience to the bishop was now introduced. It reads as follows: "And also that every minister in his admission shall swear obedience to his ordinaries, according to this form following: I A. B. now admitted to the kirk of G, promessand swear to E. F. Bishop of that diocese, obedience, and to his successors in all lawful things. So help me God." Not only was the minister who was being admitted required to swear allegiance to the king, he was also to be made to promise obedience to his bishop. The Assembly had said nothing about this special and additional oath. Nor did this exhaust the list of formal subscriptions. For, thirdly, whenever a minister was admitted to a benefice, the right of presentation to which belonged to a lay patron, a variation of the main oath of allegiance was to be required. This alternative form began like the other, and followed it word for word down to the words, "annexed to his Royal Crown." Here was omitted the sentence beginning: "And farther I acknowledge" and extending to the words: "shall be true, so help me God." In its place the following clause appeared: "And I do acknowledge and confess to have and hold the said benefice and possessions of the same, under God by his Majesty of E. F. lawfull patron of the same." The result of these changes was that the shape and sorope of the 1572 oath was considerably altered. All the changes introduced were in the direction of asserting the rights of king, prelates and patrons and of binding the clergy in solemn manner to support and maintain these rights.

In his usual brief and scanty way Spottiswoode merely records here that every minister is to be required to swear obedience to the king and the ordinary according to the form of 1571.

Article VII:—"The visitation of ilk diocese is to be done by the Bishop himselfe: and if the bounds shall be greater than he can overtake, he is then to make speciall choyce, and to appoynt some worthy men to be visitors in his place; and quhatever minister, without just cause and lawfull excuse made, shall absent himselfe from the visitation of the diocesian Assemblie, he shall be suspendit from his office and benefice, and if he amend not, he shall be depryvit." The subject of Article VII is seen to be the visitation of the diocese by the bishop. On the surface the article would seem to present no difficulties. The visitation is to be undertaken by the bishop himself. If the bounds are greater than he can overtake he is to be granted the aid of an assistant visitor. Difficulties begin to rise, however, as soon as the question is asked, what is meant by "Visitation?" At first thought one might assume that by the word is understood an itinerant progress through the diocese on the part of the bishop himself, during which all the particular parishes would be visited. This seems to be implied by the provision for a substitute visitor where the bounds are greater.

than the bishop alone could overtake. The very word "bands" suggests the idea of the bishop making a tour of his diocese. But with their usual care and precision both Scott and Calderwood point out that the word visitation is open to another interpretation. They point out that Sylvester in his "summa" distinguished between two sorts of visitation. These were "plena visitatio" where the bishop visited the particular churches of his diocese and "non plena visitatio" where the clergy assembled for visitation at the diocesan synod. (65) Both writers incline to the belief that it is the latter type of visitation that Article VII. refers. Calderwood points to the clause providing for the correction of that brother "without just cause and lawful excuse made shall absent himself from the visitations of the diocesan assembly," or as the Parliamentary version of 1612 has it, "from the visitations or the diocesan assembly." (66) Both these expressions, especially the latter, carry with them the suggestion that the formal act of visitation was to be carried out when all the ministers of the bounds were convened with their bishop in the diocesan synod. The Kirk's historian adds the following important sentence which Olarly rested for foundation upon what he had seen and heard. "See we not," he writes, "that they (the bishops) use no other visitation of the particular kirks of their dioces but upon rare occasions?" He has also preserved for us an enactment of the Synod of Lothian of March 1611 which appears to bear out his contention. (67) One fact of importance would thus appear to light. It was customary among the Scottish bishops to conduct but one kind of visitation and that was of the sort which Sylvester characterized as "non plena visitatio."

What then becomes of the clause relating to the appointment of a substitute visitor? If Calderwood's observations are correct, we ought to understand the word "substitute visitor" to mean nothing else than "substitute moderator." Furthermore, if the historian's point is well taken this clause should be considered in connection with the provision in Article II. for the holding of two or more synodal assemblies in dioceses of large and unwieldy size. We recall that Article II. had provided for the division of a diocese in order that such large bodies might be held within its bounds. (68) And now Article VII. makes provision for a somewhat similar division in order to facilitate the task of visitation. If the holding of diocesan synods and the visitation of the diocese are but one and the same thing, then the reason for this parallel division is clear. The bishop would normally moderate and visit, but in his absence a deputy appointed by him would take his place and perform his duties.

It may be objected, however, that in Article II. it is expressly stated that the bishops shall be moderators at every diocesan synod and that there is not one word about permitting a bishop to appoint a substitute to preside over synodal assemblies in his absence. To this objection we would reply that such undoubtedly are the terms of Article II. as agreed to by the Assembly. It is quite certain, however, that both king and bishops soon made up their minds that the article as the Assembly had passed it was quite unacceptable and would require to be changed. For altered it was by the legislation of the 1612 Parliament. As we have noted above an additional clause was then attached to the article providing for the appointment of a substitute moderator when such was required. (69) The bishops were thus empowered both to moderate and to visit by deputy. Articles II. and VII. were harmonized.

(66) Calderwood VII. p. 109. A.P.S. IV. p. 470. Some further words of Calderwood are interesting. "That which is set down heretofore, from the visitation of the dioceean assembly, in the act of parliament is set down excepted, from the visitation or diocesan assembly; exposing the one by the other; comprehending both in one clause."
(68) See above p. 109.
(69) See above p. 110.
It should be noted that Calderwood sees in this provision for a substitute visitor or moderator the beginning of an attempt to restore the old pre-Reformation office of archdeacon. His words are interesting. "To substitute a vice-gerent. And who is this but the archdeacon? Who in the canon law is called oucus episcopi, because he doth visite in the bishop's room." (70) The historian's suggestion is interesting, but not important enough to tempt us into a special digression here.

Modern investigators strangely enough have generally tended to ignore the problems raised by the one word "visitation." Thus Professor Cooper has not one word to say on the subject. On the other hand Calderwood devotes a whole section to the discussion of the form and quality of diocesan synods after 1610. This section should be read carefully by everyone who is interested in the subject. (71) Apart from the question of visitation there is not much else of interest in the article. Ministers who without good cause absent themselves from a regular visitation are to be suspended from their office, and in the event of their still remaining unconvinced and impenitent they are to be deprived. The intention of this enactment was clearly to force reluctant ministers to take their place and to play their part in the newly erected system of diocesan administration.

We have already made several references to the 1612 version of this article. In most particulars it agrees with the Assembly's version. The chief changes are (a) the substitution of the word "or" for the earlier "of" in the key phrase "the visitation of the diocesan assembly," and (b) the insertion of the words "within the diocese" to indicate more clearly the minister appointed by the bishop to visit in his place. (72) Spottiswoode's version of this Article need not detain us. It agrees as usual with the official version. (73)

Article VIII:—"Exercise of doctrine to be continuat weekly amongst the ministers at the ty mes of their accustomed meetings, and to be moderated by the Bishop, if he be present, or then by ane uther quhom he shall appoynt at the tyme of the Synod." (74)

In Article VIII, we pause to consider the mutual relations of bishops and presbyteries while engaged in the important task of furthering sacred learning and personal religion among the clergy. As in Articles IV. and V., the word presbytery nowhere occurs in this article, but there can be no doubt that the words "exercise of doctrine" refer exclusively to that court. As in the past the court is to continue to meet weekly upon the accustomed day, and then comes the clause relating to the moderation of the court. The act declares that the exercise is to be moderated by the bishop if he be present or by some other appointed by him at the synod. And here the following question at once arises: Was it the intention of the Assembly that the bishop should moderate every presbyterial exercise within the bounds of his diocese? Common sense seems to tell against such a conclusion. It would for one thing be physically impossible for a bishop to get round to all his presbyteries in time for the weekly meeting. If he were to attempt such a feat he would find himself on the high road most of the time. What the Assembly appears to have intended was that under normal circumstances the bishop should moderate

(70) Calderwood VII. p. 131.
(71) Calderwood VII. pp. 129-139.
(73) Spottiswoode III. p. 207.
the exercise of that presbytery within whose bounds he had his residence. This was Professor Cooper's opinion. As a matter of fact he was already constant moderator of this home court by virtue of the decisions of the Convention-Assembly of 1606. A substitute moderator appointed by him at synod time was to take his place during his absence, who then would moderate the other presbyteries of the diocese? In answering this question we would point to an act of the Assembly to which we drew attention in the last chapter, and which makes provision for this very contingency. (We speak of the act referred to on page 97.) According to this enactment the constant moderators of presbyteries were to remain in their places until the October synods should meet. Until then the doctrinal exercise was to remain under their supervision and presidency. The appointment of new moderators was to take place then in October. What seems to have happened when the autumn synods met was that the great majority of the constant moderators were continued in their places. This was certainly what took place at the Diocesan Synod of Lothian, held at Haddington in November 1610. And we know that John Mitchelson, Constant Moderator of the Presbytery of Kirkcaldy, remained in his office until the great ecclesiastical revolution of 1638. We might add that there is nothing in the article which would seem to prevent the bishop from presiding over the exercise of any presbytery within whose bounds he happened to discover himself on the accustomed day of meeting. Calderwood insists that, so far as the presbyteries are concerned, this "Act of Glasgow" has to do only with the exercise of doctrine. Consequently, he claims that when matters of discipline are being treated there is nothing in the act which forbids the presbytery to elect its own moderator. It is true that there are no explicit provisions in the Assembly's legislation for the moderation of the presbyteries when engaged in duties other than those connected with the elevation of men to and their deposition from the Holy Ministry and the cultivation of Theological study and personal religion. But the reason for this apparent failure to provide explicit directions for the moderation of presbyteries on other occasions would, in our opinion, appear to be that the legislators of 1603 assumed that the decisions of the Linlithgow Convention-Assembly of 1606 completely met and covered the present situation. There was no need to insert a clause dealing with the moderation of the ordinary sessions of presbytery, since the constant moderator would still be responsible for that as he had been during the past four years.

The version of this article as found in the Parliamentary Acts and in Spottiswoode is cast in a briefer form than the version by the Assembly. The Parliamentary version reads as follows: "That the conventions of ministers for exercise shall be moderated by the bishop being present, and in his absence, by any other minister whom he shall appoint at the synode." Spottiswoode as usual follows the Parliamentary lead.

Article IX: --"The Bischope shall be subject in all things concerning his life, conversation, office, and benefice, to the censure of the General Assembly, and being found culpable, with his Majestie's advyce and consent, to be depryvit."

(75) Cooper. C.U.A.P. p. 70.
(76) See above p. 53.
(77) See above p. 97.
(78) Calderwood VII. p. 129.
(79) See above p. 69.
(80) Calderwood VII. p. 113.
(81) See above pp. 52-55.
(83) Spottiswoode III. p. 207.
One of the most important pieces of work accomplished by the Assembly was the drafting of Article IX. As will be seen at a glance the form and purpose of the Article have a long history behind them. And as one runs one's mind back over that history one realizes that there was a great deal of justification for our policy of beginning this study with a review of the relations of Church and bishops during the formative years immediately following the Reformation. For it was during these early years that the Scottish Church had her first experience of the place and workings of a Reformed Episcopacy. In this interesting and educative experience we saw that the Church emerged with certain well-defined convictions in her mind. On the eve of the Leith Convention we discovered that she had arrived at the point where for her two things were becoming increasingly clear. First, that a place and use could be found for the bishops, but secondly, that these dignitaries must be responsible to the General Assembly and subject to its decrees. Then came the Leith Convention. When the decisions of the Convention were made public it was seen that clear provision was made for the subjugation of the bishops to the Assembly in all spiritual matters. The bishops were to exercise no more jurisdiction than the superintendents possessed, and further, all archbishops and bishops were to "be subject to the kirk and General Assembly thereof in spiritualibus." That the Assembly must be supreme was a point on which the vast majority of Scottish Churchmen now stood agreed.

We also saw something of the determined and efficient manner in which the members of the Assembly asserted the supremacy of that court. We reviewed the record of the reproofs and corrections they meted out to the new prelates. We drew attention to two acts passed by the Assembly: that "touching the jurisdiction of bishops in their ecclesiastical function" in March 1574 and the more stringent measure "anent bishops, superintendents and commissioners" which came into effect in August of the same year. And we saw at length how the Assembly ordered all bishops to make choice of a particular flock, prohibited the chapters from making any further elections, and concluded by denouncing the entire Episcopal estate in strong and sweeping terms. Moreover, we did not fail to point out that when after the period of the Rathven Raid and the Black Acts Church and State again entered on a compromise, the Church insisted that since a bishop was a pastor he must be subject to both presbytery and synod, and since he had received a commission from the Assembly he must also be responsible to that court. In short, we witnessed the Assembly asserting its rights with firmness and persistence and winning for itself a place of unrivalled supremacy in the government of the Church. Moreover, the cautions with which the Church endeavoured to restrict the powers of the constant moderators at Linlithgow in 1606 were in harmony with this essential principle.

All of which is equivalent to saying that when in 1610 the Glasgow Assembly consented to reestablish Episcopacy its members had behind them a long and interesting history to which to turn for guidance. During that important period from 1560 to 1587 the Church had had a highly instructive experience as far as bishops were concerned. Nor do we think that it is too much to say that at the close of that period one great lesson or idea had been burned into the minds of Scottish Churchmen. We refer to the central conviction that in life and doctrine the bishops must be subject to the jurisdiction of the Assembly. With these
facts in mind we would be prepared for the discovery that in any
future attempt to reintroduce Episcopacy the fundamental tenet of
the Assembly's supremacy would be insisted on. And this is just
what happened in 1510. Consider Article IX once more. In clear
and unambiguous language the article declares that "the bishops
shall be subject in all things concerning their life, conversation
office and benefice to the censures of the General Assembly.
This declaration, as we have indicated, was in line with all the
earlier history and decisions of the Reformed Kirk. Episcopacy
might be admitted, but it was to be of a strictly limited and
constitutional kind. It may be noted here that there is no provision
made in this or any other article for the bishops sitting as a
"house" by themselves.

The reference in this article to the culpability and
possible deprivation of a bishop is suggestive of several things.
First, it reminds us that there is nothing about deprivation to
be found in the articles of the Convention of Leith. Whether or
not those who drafted the 1572 articles had the thought of possible
deprivations in mind is a question into which we need not enter here.
But since 1572 the Church had had much experience in the way of
culpability and deprivation. Hence doubtless the concluding
clause of the article now before us. Secondly, it is clear from the
provisions of Article III, that in the judgment of the members of the
Assembly the negligence of a bishop in pronouncing a sentence of
excommunication was to be regarded as a fault of the first class.
Deprivation was to take place "with his Majesty's advice and consent." These last words are interesting. They indicate that while insisting
that the new Episcopacy be a constitutional one the Assembly realized
that it was impossible to get away from the line of royal
supremacy. Despite all attempts and assertions to the contrary there remained the
ever present possibility that the king would not consent to its decisions.

The Assembly might go on record as desiring yearly
meetings. It might also decide that the bishops were to be subject
to its censure and control. But is might conclude its session with
the satisfied feeling that it had not failed to perform its duty, but
that in all it had done the right and proper thing. But how about
King James? Would he be satisfied with the Assembly's conclusions?
Would he be content with the erection of a merely constitutional
Episcopacy? The answer to these questions was forthcoming when in
1612 Parliament ratified the Assembly's legislation. A glance at
the acts of the 1612 Parliament will show that Article IX, as agreed
upon by the Assembly was completely ignored in the action of the civil
body. The royal mind was thus made clear. The Church might have
desire to make the bishops its servants, but to such a departure King
James would not consent. The bishops were rather to be his servants,
the instruments through which he governed and controlled "that
stubborn kirk." The Parliament of 1612 then omitted Article IX. And
in his History, Spottiswoode, taking as usual the official view of
things, omits it also. In this way was rendered ineffective what
was beyond question the most important decision that the Glasgow
Assembly made.

Articke IX:--"That no Bishop be electit but who has
past the age of forty years compleat, and quha at lieuet has
been an actual teaching minister ten yeares."(99)

Article X need not detain us long. Its subject is the
Assembly's double decision regarding the age and pastoral
qualifications of one elected to the Episcopate. Newly created
prelates must be at least forty years of age, while they must have
at least ten years ministerial experience behind them. These
necessary qualifications mark an advance on what was considered
essential at the time of the Convention of Leith.

[98] Spottiswoode III. p. 207.
It may be recalled that Article IV. of the group of decisions "anent archbishops and bishops" had declared that any minister nominated as bishop must be thirty years of age at the least. (100) The age qualification was thus raised by ten years. Moreover, the definite insistence on ten years pastoral experience marks an advance, we would say, on the somewhat vague requirement of "qualitatem specificit in the examples of Paul to Timothy and Titus." (101) In short, the Assembly desired that only mature and experienced pastors should be elected to the Episcopate. But such a suggestion evidently proved unacceptable to the king, for neither in Spottiswoode's History nor in the Acts of the Scottish Parliament is any reference to this article to be found. (102)

We would note in conclusion that the bishops are to be "elected." This is as we would have expected. We recall that in all that it did the Assembly was acting in the light of the action of the Parliament of 1606. We recall also that the legislation of that year had restored Episcopacy according to the Convention of Leith model. (103) Now the bishops of this earlier regime had been "elected" by their respective chapters upon receipt of a presentation from the king. (104) Doubtless also, as Professor Cooper suggests, "the further provision contained in that Agreement would stand, viz. that in case of the Chapter finding the Crown's presentee 'not qualified,' it might 'crave' a new nomination." (105) Such at least might be the Assembly's intention and desire. The royal pleasure, however, was quite evidently otherwise. For in 1617 Parliament passed an Act "anent the Election of Archbishops and Bishops" and also one "anent the Restitution of Chapters." By this legislation the chapters were obliged to elect as bishops whatever person being an actual minister should be nominated by the Crown. (106) By these Acts no alternative nominations were permitted.

We have pointed out that in the Acts of the Scottish Parliament Articles IX. and XI. of the Assembly's legislation are not to be found. (107) In place of Articles IX. and XI. there occurs a general enactment ratifying the foregoing legislation and annuling both Act 114 of the 1592 Parliament and all other acts, laws and ordinances having a like nature and bearing. (108) Spottiswoode likewise has nothing to say about Articles IX. or XI. In place of them he gives us a short version of the Assembly's decree forbidding members to speak against the fore said conclusions. (109)

Such then were the legislative proposals on which our Glasgow Assembly stood agreed, and such also were the changes, omissions and additions insisted upon by King James and passed into effect by the 1612 Parliament. As the minds of later generations have reflected upon these proposals, and compared them with similar efforts before and since, they have remarked upon one important and curious omission. Briefly this: there is not one word in the Articles about the "consecration" of the newly empowered bishops. It will be recalled that the Articles of the Convention of Leith had had a lot to say about "consecration." Detailed provision had then been made for the action and

(100) See above p. 14.
(101) See above p. 14. (Article II.)
(103) See above pp. 46-49.
(105) See above p. 15. Cooper, Reunion, p. 29.
(107) See above pp. 120-121.
(109) Spottiswoode III. p. 207.
(109) Spottiswoode III. p. 207.
consecration of all bishops to be elected in the future. (111) Moreover, it is generally recognized that if proposals resembling those of 1610 were to be discussed in our day the question of consecration would be certain immediately to come to the fore. (112) How then are we to account for the omission of all reference to the matter by the 1610 Assembly? There are several possible explanations:

The first is that which is set forth by Professor Cooper. It is to the effect that since "the Assembly's whole procedure was taken in view of the Act of Parliament of 1606 which restored, as we have seen, 'the estate of Bishops as the same was in the Reformed Kirk,' by the decision of the Convention of Leith..." any explicit reference to consecration was unnecessary. And that because it was already implied beyond doubt or question in the fact that it was the precedent of the Convention of Leith which was now being revived. (113) Another explanation may be found in the possibility that King James and his "workmen" did not dare make any clear statement about the necessity of consecration at this point as such a reference would imply, in Soot of Cupar's words, "that there was a distinct office of a Bishop in the word of God different from that of a minister," which, as the same writer adds, was "contrary" to what had been determined before in the General Assembly. (114) That "there is no higher order of the Christian ministry than that of presbyters" is, of course, the theoretical corner stone of Presbyterian Church polity. (115) The Church of Scotland as we have seen had been willing to make use of a Superintendency. But under the strong influence of Andrew Melville she had come to hold that a superintendnt, bishop, or visitor was merely a presbyter specially and temporarily delegated to perform special duties. (116) Solemnly to consecrate in the Roman and Anglican manner a superintendent or a bishop would seem to imply that there was indeed a higher order in the Church than that of presbyters, and that by virtue of such consecration the bishop-designate would receive some commission, authority or grace which the presbyter alone did not possess.

Had the question of consecration come up before the Assembly royal and Episcopal influence would doubtless have secured its passing and adoption. On the other hand, however, it might have been the very thing which would have aroused serious opposition, and so made a wreck of His Majesty's schemes. If it was James' plan to have considered that diocesan was the better part of valor, for as we have seen there is nothing about consecration in the Assembly's Articles. But that did not mean that the matter was ended. Regular consecration would be necessary if the Scottish bishops were to be recognized as true shepherds by their Episcopal brethren across the border. From the viewpoint of English Church law they would not be recognized as regular bishops until they had been canonically consecrated. (117) Until that was accomplished they would be, in Dr. King Hewison's phrase, "merely Presbyterian pastors and civil servants." (118) And what was more, no union or intercommunion of the two national Churches would be possible. Moreover, suppose consecration had been decided on. As we have pointed out in an earlier chapter there was only one prelate living in Scotland at this time who had already undergone anything in the way of this essential rite. This was the aged Nell Campbell, the retired Bishop of Argyll and the last survivor of the Convention of Leith Episcopate. (119)
But there were two reasons against permitting him to celebrate the rite for the others. In the first place, his Episcopal orders, like those of his brethren of that early period, possessed a very doubtful character and validity. (120) Secondly, the practice of the Church Catholic required the participation of at least three consecrators. (121) Such were some of the obstacles which blocked the completion of the king's designs. How the astute and ready James overcame all these difficulties will be told in our next and concluding chapter.

(121) See above p. 17.
(122) See above p. 49. Also Cooper, Reunion, p. 39.
A Collation of the Legislative Articles as Passed by the 1610 Assembly with the Same as Revised by the 1612 Parliament.

Article I.—Assembly:—"In the first, it is declarit that the allie Assemblie holdin at Aberdeen is null in the self, speciall in respect it had not his Majestie's allowance, and was dischargit be his Majestie's Commissioner. And because necessitie of the Kirk craving that for order taken with the common enemie and other affaires of the Kir, there shall be yearly Generall Assemblies, the condition where of the Assemblie acknowledges to appertayne to his Majestie be the prerogative of his royall owne; and, therefore, the Generall Assemblie most humbly requests his Rajeatle, that Generall Assemblies be halden ance in the year, or at the liest, in respect of the necessitie formal, that his Rajeatle wold appoynt ane certaine tymes at the whilk the samem shall be halden precisely in all tymes coming."

Parliament:—"In the first the foresaid Assembly acknowledgeth the indiction of the General Assembly of the Kirk to appertein to his Majesty, by the prerogative of his Royal Crown."

Article II.—Assembly:—"It Is thooht expedient that the Bishops shall be Moderators in every diocesan Synod, and the Synods shall be halden twyse in the year, of the Kirks of every diocie, viz. in April and October. And that, as the diocies are large, that there be two or three Synods in convenient places for ease of the ministry."

Parliament:—"And forder Ordeineth that the bishops shall be moderators in every diocesan synode. And the synode shall hald twice in the yeare of the Kirks of every diocie, viz. in Aprile and October: And where the dioceses are large, that there be two or three synods in convenient places for ease of the ministry. And in case the bishop of the diocie be absent upon any necessary occasion, in that case his place shall be supplied be sic ane worthy minister (bearing charge within the bounds) as the arch-bishop or bishop shall appoint."

Article III.—Assembly:—"That no sentence of excommunicatlone or absolutione therefra be pronuncit againes or in favours of any poraone without the knowledge and approbations of the Bishop of the diocese, quho most be answerable to his "ajestle for all formall and impartiall proceedings therein; and the proces being found formall, the sentence to be pronounoit at the directions of the Bishop, be the minister of the paroche quhere the offender dwells and their proces began. And in caice the Bischop shall be found to have staged the pronunclng of the sentence against any persone that hea merite the same, and against quhom the proces has been lawfully deduot the same being tried, and he convicted by the General Assembly therfore that advertisement shall be made to his Majestie to the effect ane uther may be placit In his rowme."

Parliament:—"That no sentence of excommunication or absolution thereof be pronounced against or in favours of any person, without the knowledge and approbation of the bishop of the diocese, who must be answerable to God and his Majesty for all formal and impartial proceeding therein: And the process being found formal, the sentence to be pronounced at the direction of the bishop, be the minister of the paroche where the offender dwelle, and the processe began."
Article IV.---Assembly:---"That all presentations hereafter be direct to the Bishop; and upon any presentations given or otherwise made be any to be admitted to the ministry, the Bishop is to require the ministry of these bounds where he is to serve, to certify by their testifict unto him of the partie suiter, his conversations past, his abilities and qualifications for the function; and upon returne of their testifict, the Bishop is to take hard tryall, and finding him qualified, and being assistit be such of the ministry of the bounds wher he is to serve as he will assume to himself, he is then to perfect the hail act or ordinacione."

Parliament:---"That all presentations to benefices bee directed hereafter to the arch-bishop or bishop of the diocle, within the which the benefice vacant be dimission, deprivation, decease, or otherways, lyeth. Wit power also to the arch-bishop or bishop to dispone and confer sik benefices as fallis in his diocle, (jure devoluto.) Providing alwise, inas an archbishop or bishop should refuse to admit any qualified minister, (accepting the presentation granted to him, and who hath bene once received and admitted to the function of the ministry, being then still underyrved,) presented to them be the patron. In the case of any sik refuse, It shall be lawfull to the patron to retene the whole fruillts of the said benefice in his own hands. And ather hee or the paroche were by the reason of the not planting of the kirk thereunto, (in case the refusal thereof come be the bishop,) may complain thereof to his arch-bishop, and if ather the arch-bishop be the refuser, or else doth not give due redresse being complained unto, In that case the Lords of his Majesties Privy Counsell upon the parties complaint of the refuse, and no sufficient reason being given for the same, shall direct letters of hailing, charging the Ordinary to do his duty in the receiving and admitting of sik a person as the said patron has presented. It is alwise declared, that if any arch-bishop or bishop shall deprehend any sik person as is presented to him to have come within compass of a simoniacal action with his patron, in so far as he hath ather already hurt, or promised and bound himself to prejude and hurt the state of his benefice in not reserving a sufficient maintenance for him and his successors answerable to the estate of his benefice: And that the bishop or archbishop shall understand the same either by the parties oath, or other clear proof and evidence. In that case, they may lawfully refuse any sik person presented unto then. But if the party who is presented hath reserved to himself and his successors a sufficient maintenance, the settling of tracts or promise to do the same, or doing of any thing else to his patron, (being not prejudicial to the said maintenance,) shall not serve for any reason to the archbishop or bishop to refuse him. And in case any sik controversy or question shall occur betwixt the patron, the person presented and the arch-bishop or bishop, It is declared, that the Lords of Counsell and Session shall be Judges therunto, to deoyde upon the said simoniacal action and quality of the same, if any sik thing shall be objected against the party presented."

Article V.---Assembly:---"In depositione of ministers, the Bishop associating to himself the ministry of these bounds where the delinquent serves, he is then to take tryall of his fault, and upon just cause found, to deprive him."

Parliament:---"In deposition of the ministers, the bishop associating to himselfe the ministry of these bounds where the delinquent served, he is there to take tryall of the fact, and upon just cause found to depryve: And the lyke order to be observed in suspension of ministers from the exercise of the function."
Article VI.--Assembly:--"That every minister, in his admission, shall swear obedience to his Majestie and his ordinal, according to the forme sett downe in the conference keepit in the year of God 1567, whereof the tenor follows:-- The Forme of the Oath to be given to the Persones prwort to any Benefice with Cure, the tyme of his Admission be the Ordinar. I, A.B., now nominat and admissit to the G. of K., utterly testifie and declares on my conscience, that the richt excellent, richt high and mighty Prince James the Sixth, be the grace of God King of Scotta, is the only lawful, supreme governour of this realme, as well in matters spirittual as in conservallion and purgatione of religions and that no foraigne Prince, Prelat, nor Potentate, has or ought to have jurisdictions, power, superioritie, preheminence or authority, ecclesiastical and spirittual, within this realme; and therefore I utterly rennace and forsake all forraigne jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, auctoritie, and promises; that from this furth, I shall and will bear faith and true allegiance to this Hienes, his airs, and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, priviledges, preheminences, and auctoritales grantit and belongand to his Hienes, his airs, and lawfull successors, and to my ower shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, priviledges, preheminences, and auctoritales of the same (under God only) of his Majestie and Crowne Royall of this realme: And for the said possessions, I do homage presently unto his Hienes in your presence, and to his Majestie, his aiis, and lawful successors, shall be faithful and true: So help me God."

Barrlament:--"That every minister in his admission shall swear obedience to his Majestie, and to his ordinal, according to this forme following: I A.B. now nominat and admissit to the kirk of D. testifie and declare in my conscience, that the richt excellent, richt high, and mighty Prince, James the Sixth, be the grace of God King of Scotta, is the only lawful, supreme governour of this realme, as well in matters spirittual and ecclesiastical as in things temporal; and that no foreigne prince, state, nor potentat, has or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spirittual, with this realme. And therefore I utterly rennace and forsake all foreigne jurisdiction, power, superiority, and authorities; and promises that from this furth I shall and will bear faith and true allegiance to this Hienes, his airs, and lawfull successors; and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, priviledges, pre-eminences, and authorities granted and belonging to his Hienes, his airs, and lawfull successors, or united and annexed to his Royall Crowne. And forder, I acknowledge and conferfe to have and hold the said G. possessions of the same under God of his Majestie and Crowne Royall; and for the said possessions, I do homage presently unto his Hienes in your presence, and to his Majestie, his aiis, and lawful successors, shall be faithful and true: So help me God. And als that every minister in his admission shall swear obedience to his ordinal, according to this forme following: I A.B. now admissit to the kirk of C. promess and sweare to E. F. Bishop of that diooe, obedience, and to his successors in all lawfull things: So help me God. And if the said benefice be at the presentation of ane laik patron the person presented shall give his oath as follows: I G. H. now admissit to the foresaid benefice, testifie and declare in my conscience, that the right excellent, right high, and mighty Prince, James the Sixth, be the grace of God King of Scotland, England, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, etc. is the only lawful supreme governour of this realme, alswell in matters spirittual and ecclesiastick as in things temporal; and that no foreine prince, state, nor potentat, has or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminency, or authority ecclesiastical or spirittual, within this realme. And, therefore, I utterly renounce and forsake all foreine jurisdiction, power, superiorities and authorities; and promess that from this furth I shall and will bear faith and true allegiance to his Hienes, his heirs and lawfull successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, priviledges, pre-eminences, and authorities granted and belonging to his Hienes, his heirs, or lawfull successors, or united and annexed to his Royall Crowne. And I do acknowledge and confess to have and hould the said benefice and possessions of the same, under God be his Majestie, of E. F. lawfull patron of the same."
Article VII.--Assembly:--"The visitatione of ilk dioole is to be done be the Bishop himselfe; and if the bounds shall be greater than he can overtake, he is then to make speciall choyse, and to appoynt some worthy men to be visitors in his place; and quhatever minister, without just cause and lawfull excuse made, shall absent himselfe from the visitations of the dioecesan Assemblie, he shall be suspendit from his office and benefice, and if he amend not, he shall be depryvlt."

Parliament:--"That the visitatione of ilk dioole be done be the bishop himselfe; and if the bounds be greater than he can overtake, then hee make speciall choice of some worthy man of the ministris within the Dioole, to visit in his place. And what ever minister, without just cause of lawful excuse made, shall absent himselfe from the visitation or the dioecesan assembly, he shall be suspended from his office and benefice; and if he amend not, he shall be depryved."

Article VIII.--Assembly:--"Exercise of doctrine to be continewit weekly amongst the ministers at the tymes of their accustomed meettngs, and to be moderated by the Bischope, if he be present, or then be ane uther quam he shall appoynt at the tyme of the Synod."

Parliament:--"That the Conventions of Minister for exercise shall be moderated by the bishop being present, and in his absence, by any uther minister whom he shall appoynt at the Synode."

Article IX.--Assembly:--"The Bischope shall be subject in all things concerning his life, conversation, office, and benefice, to the censure of the Generall Assemblie, and being found culpable, with his Majestie's advyse and consent, to be depryvit."

Parliament:-----------------------------

Article X.--Assembly:--"That no Bischope be electit but who hes past the age of fourty years compleat, and quha at liest hes been an actuall teaching minister ten years."

Parliament:-----------------------------

Parliament's concluding Article:--"Thilks acts, ordinances, declarations, and determinations above written, his Majesty finding to be very a reable to the true religion professed within this kingdom, and to the godly and decent government of the Kirk, ministry, and whole members thereof. Therefore his Heignes, with advice and consent of the Estates of Parliament, ratifies, approves, and confirms all and sundry the premises; and ordains them and every ane of them to be obeyed and observed, be all his Heignes subjects, as inviolable lawes in all tyme conming. Annulling and resedying the 114 act of his Majesties Parliament, holden in anno 1592, and all and whatsoemer others acts of Parliament, laws, ordinances, constitutions, sentences, and customs, in so farre as they or any of them, or any part of the same, are contrare or derogatory to any of the articol's above written, als essentially and effectually in all respects as if the saids acts and consuetudes he eby abrogate were at length herein express.\(^{(1)}\)"

--CHAPTER IV.--

--CONCLUSION.--

A. The Sequel to the Assembly.
B. Concluding Reflections.
C. The Glasgow Assembly and Christian Reunion.
A. The Sequel to the Assembly.

Shortly after the meeting of the Assembly, Archbishop Spottiswoode, accompanied by Bishop Lamb of Brechin and followed a short time later by Bishop Hamilton of Galloway, went up to court, "to make report to the king of the proceedings of the said Assembly, and to get the will." Upon their arrival in London the king informed them that it was his will that they accept regular canonical consecration by certain bishops of the English church. Spottiswoode has left us a detailed account of what was said and done on this occasion. His report is so interesting and valuable that we quote from it in detail. "At their first audience the King declared the business for which he had called them, speaking to this purpose: 'That he had to his great charge recovered the bishoprics forth of the hands of those (laymen) that possessed them, and bestowed them upon such as he hoped should prove worthy of their places; but since he could not make them bishops, nor could they assume that honour to themselves, and that in Scotland there was not a sufficient number to enter them to their charge by consecration, he had called them to England that being consecrated themselves they might at their return give ordination to those at home, and so the adversaries' mouths be stopped, who said that he did take upon himself to create bishops and bestow spiritual offices, which he never did, nor would he presume to do, acknowledging that authority to belong to Christ alone, and those he had authorized with His power.'

"The Archbishop answering in the name of the rest, 'That they were willing to obey his majesty's desire, and only feared that the Church of Scotland, because of old usurpations might take this for a sort of subjection to the Church of England'; the King said 'That he had provided sufficiently against this: for that neither should the Archbishop of Canterbury or York, who were the only pretenders, have hand in the business, but consecration should be used by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Bath.' The Scotch Bishops thanking his Majesty for the care he had of their Church, and professing their willingness to obey what he would command, the 21st of October was appointed to be the time, and the Chapel of London-house the place of the consecration.

"A question in the meantime was moved by the learned and pious Dr. Andrews—bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish Bishops, who, as he said, 'must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop.' The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained that thereof there is no necessity, seeing where Bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise it might be doubted if there was any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches. This applauded by the other Bishops, Ely acquiesced, and at the day and in the place appointed the three Scottish Bishops were consecrated."(2)

As one studies the above account, one sees no reason to doubt its substantial accuracy. Further, we believe that Prof. Cooper has amply vindicated the correctness of Spottiswoode's narrative. The reader is referred to Dr. Cooper's pages.(3) Moreover, as the result of his own special research into this subject Prof. Cooper has supplied us with some additional and interesting details. The first of these is to the effect that Spottiswoode and his two brother bishops declared themselves unwilling to be reordained as presbyters before being consecrated as bishops. And that because of their fear of the result which such an occurrence would have among their countrymen, who would be driven to decide that the three bishops 'ad virtually denied

(2) Spottiswoode, III. pp. 208-209.
(3) Cooper C.U.A.P. pp. 74-76.
the validity of their previous Scottish ordination. (4) The second
fact of interest which Prof. Cooper has turned up for us concerns
the names of the English bishops who conducted the solemn rite of
consecration. These were George Abbot, then Bishop of London and
later of Winchester; James Montague of Bath and Wells; Nicholas Hall of
Rochester and later of Durham; and Henry Parry of Worcester. (6)
Spottiswoode has already told us, of course, that at the first
audience the King suggested consecration by the Bishops of London
Ely and Bath. Two others thus appear to have been called in to
assist in the consecration. As the king had promised, the two
Archbishops of Canterbury and York took no part in the ceremony.

It may be interesting at this point to compare the
consecration of these three bishops with that which took place
in 1661 when under Charles II. Episcopacy was again introduced
into Scotland. In 1610 here had been no reordination of the
three Scottish presbyters. In 1661 four presbyters were summoned
to London to receive consecration. These were: Sharpe, Bishop-
designate of Saint Andrews; Leighton of Dumbane; Fairfoul of
Glasgow, and Hamilton of Galloway. The last two of these had
been ordained before the great ecclesiastical revolution of
1638, that is, they had been ordained by bishops of the Spottis-
woode regime. However, the first two, however, had been
ordained presbyters after 1638 in the days of the Presbyterian ascendancy.
The Anglican bishops acting under the influence of the teaching
of the Caroline divines questioned the validity of the ordination
of Sharpe and Leighton, and insisted that they be ordained after
the Anglican manner before being consecrated to the Episcopate.
Sharpe objected and pleaded the precedent of 1610. The Anglicans,
however, insisted, and as a result Sharpe and Leighton were
privately reordained after the Anglican fashion. This intro-
ductive step having been taken, the four Scots were consecrated
bishops in Westminster Abbey. (6) Attention should be drawn,
however, to a fact which has been pointed out both by Prof.
Cooper and by the late Dr. G. W. Sprott, namely, that this policy
of reordining the prospective bishops first as presbyters was
not followed "in the case of either of the men in Presbyterian orders,
whom they consecrated on their return to the North, or in that
of those so situated, who were consecrated later." (7) Facts such
as these have, of course, always been a matter of more or less
difficulty for precisians of the English Church. They have as
a rule, however, got round it by falling back on the idea of the consecration of a bishop per saltum, that is, the
including of the lesser order in the greater and the conveying
of the whole Episcopal character by a single act. Indeed Jeremy Collier records that this was one of the arguments
employed in 1610 in depreciating the necessity, first, of ordaining
Spottiswoode, Lamb and Hamilton before raising them to the
Episcopate. (9) As, however, we are not writing a thesis on the
question of ecclesiastical ordination, we are not required to
enter farther into this subject at the present time.

Being thus regularly consecrated themselves Spottiswoode
and his two companions soon set their faces northward, where the
remainder of the Scottish bishops still waited their Episcopal
touch. Upon their arrival in Scotland one of their first official
acts was to consecrate Archbishop Gladstone of Saint Andrews.
This ceremony took place at Saint Andrews in the month of
December, 1610. Remembering what they had seen and heard in
London, the three consecrators followed the English model "as
near as they could possibly invent." (10) Further consecrations
took place, on 23rd of January, to be followed by still
another group at Leith on February 24th. (11) A letter
from Archbishop Gladstone to the King dated at Edinburgh on March 16th,
1611, contains the information that the consecration of Bishop
Douglas of Moray had been solemnized the day before "very honorably
(4) Cooper C.U.A.P. p. 74. Cooper is here quoting from Dr. Næsle's,
"History of the Puritans."
(5) Cooper C.U.A.P. p. 74. Cooper is here relying on Holman, Biography
of Archbishop Laud.
Scotland II. p. 90.
(8) Selwyn, Irenicum of John Forbes, Introduction p. 5. Julian, The
Christian Tradition pp. 112-113.
(9) Cooper C.U.A.P. p. 74.
and countenanced by the Lord President and many other Lords of Secret Council whom he drew thither for authorising that Solemnity." The Archbishop adds, "Before this order came, it was odious; but in the usage thereof all the hearers thought it tolerable, and now the beholders and auditors are moved to praise and extole it as a holy, wise and grave policy."(12)

Finally at the beginning of May of this same year the Archbishop was able to write to King James that all the bishops of his province were now consecrated. This letter contains the interesting additional information that with the assistance of the Bishops of Dunkeld and Brechin, he had consecrated the Bishops of Aberdeen and Caithness in Brechin's Cathedral Kirk. "There were present," he states, "such a multitude of people as I never saw in such a bounds."(13) The presence, as Gladstone narrates, of distinguished officers of state and large numbers of people at these latter consecrations, is in harmony with Row's statement that the bishops conducted the consecrations "spirituastly---but afterward more and more solemnly as their estate grew, and as they were favoured by their prince."(14)

Before we pass from the matter of these consecrations, it will be necessary for us to subjoin a few sentences by way of comment. It is Kethleson's opinion that in receiving consecration under the circumstances which we have narrated above, both king and bishops were more of the spirit if not of the letter of Article IX of the Assembly's legislation.(15) This Article, it will be recalled, had declared the bishops to be subject in "life, conversation, office and benefice" to the censor of the General Assembly.(16) To go into another land and to receive consecration there, without first having intimated the intention of such a thing to the Assembly, far less without first having received permission from the Assembly to do so, certainly appears on the face of it to be most things altogether out of harmony with the Assembly's decree. A few moment's reflection, however, may suggest to us that it is possible that the matter was not quite so bad as Mr. Kethleson appears to make out. As we have pointed out a number of times above, the legislation of the Assembly must be considered in view of the Act of Parliament of 1606, which, at the risk of being wearisome, we repeat had restored Episcopalicy according to the form of the Leith Convention Model. The Convention of Leith had declared consecration, and any thorough revival of the Leith precedents would, therefore, imply a consecration of some sort. Such consecration may well have been in the minds of those who drafted the Assembly's Articles, even although they did not make explicit reference to it. There may well have been some sort of an informal agreement among the members of the Privy Conference as to the desirability and inevitability of securing consecration when the Assembly's work was done.

If any such informal agreement and intention was in existence, then we must criticise the ecclesiastical leaders of 1610 for not having made direct and explicit reference to it among the Assembly's Articles. Reference was made in this way to the "election" of new bishops, and here election carries with it the idea that in the future new bishops were to be elected as were their predecessors in the days of the Convention of Leith. And despite the fact that the reference to consecration might have precipitated a storm in the Assembly, yet this risk should have been taken in order that when the consecrations did take place they would have been carried out regularly and clearly in accordance with the Assembly's decree. The mouths of the Presbyterian adversaries would then have been stopped, and there would have been no ground for Calderwood's complaint, "that there was no mention made in the assembly of their (the bishops') consecration."(17) In a word, consecration may have been implied

(12) Botfield, Original Letters I. pp. 265-266.
(14) Row Historie, p. 283.
(16) See above, p.119.
(17) Calderwood VIII. p. 150.
in the Assembly's legislation. Good policy, however, should have gone to it that explicit reference was made to it in the Assembly's Articles. As it was, the consecrations of 1610—1611 were made to appear to rest merely upon the arbitrary wish and desire of the king.

It will be in order to indicate at this point that while, as we have just said, provision is made in the Articles for the election of all prelates, yet not one of those who were consecrated in 1610—1611 was required to undergo the formality of election to his see. All these bishops, it will be recalled, had been bishops-titular of their respective sees for some years and it was doubtless thought that to require these men to be reelected would be altogether too awkward and inconvenient a proceeding. (18) The late Bishop Wordsworth was, however, of the opinion that despite any possible inconvenience such election should have been carried out, were it only as a witness that the law had been observed. (19) But as we have been forced to observe upon a number of occasions, respect for the Church's rights and for the Church's law was something which gave King James much worry or concern. How different might the whole future of the Scottish Church have been had the king and his ecclesiastical advisers observed in letter and in spirit the Assembly's legislation; refrained from adding to and omitting from it in 1612, and made it their duty to see that all its intentions and implications were honestly carried out.

We have now to consider another subject, namely, the reception of the news of the Assembly and its legislation throughout Scotland. In its final session the Assembly had passed a resolution forbidding any of the ministers, either in the pulpit or at the exercise, to speak or reason against the legislation under pain of deprivation. (20) Shortly after the Assembly had dispersed the King followed up the resolution by a royal proclamation to the same effect. This proclamation is as follows:

"Our will is herefor^ and we charge you straitly and command, that Incontinent thir our letters scene, ye passe to t^e
Meroat Crosse of our burgи of Edinburgh, and all other places
needfull; and there, by opn proclamation in our name and
authoritie, that yee command, charge, and inhibit all our
subjects whatsover, and in speciall, all teaching and preaching
ministers, and lecturing readers within this our kingdome, that
none of them presume or tak upon hand, either in ther sermons
publittly, or in ther private conference, to impu^ne, deprave,
contradict, condemn, or utter their disallowance and dislyke in
anie point or article of these most grave and wyse conclusions
of that Assembly, endit with such harmonte, as they will answer
to the contrare, at their highest perell and charge. And that
yee command all our sherifs, stewsarta, bailiffs, and their
deputies, all provosts and bailiffs of our burrowes, and all
doctors and magistrates whatsover within our said
kingdome, that if they doe heare or understand of anie breach of
this present commandement, by anie preacher, minister, or
lecturing reader, or other subject whatsover, that they faille
not presentlie to commit the trespasser in this kynde in some
prison and ward, untill suche tyme as they, havinge advertised
the saids Lords of our Privie Counsell of the same, they shall
have their answers returned, what farth r shall be done by them.
And where anie magistrate shall be found and tryed to have beene
unwilling, remisse, or slouthfull in the execution of this
present direction, it is hereby declared, that their negligence
and complience at anie suche fault shall make them als culpable
herof as the principall offender, and they shall be accordinglie
with all rigour and severitie punished. And, herewith, that ye
command all others our subjects of whatsoev r qualitie, belrill
ning noe office or charge of magistrature, and so wanting pow r to
apprehend and commit the olln^uent, that upon their hearing of
anie one transgressing this present command and proclamatio
that they doe certifie that nixt magistrate, or some one of our
Privie Counsell, of the same; otherways, they shall be repoved,
holden, and accounted guiltie of the same offence, and shall be
punished as principall transgressers in this kynde. The which to
doe, we commit to you, conjunctlie and severallie, our full
power, by thiour letters, delivering them by you daelie
executed, and indorsed again© to the olrer.

"Givn under our Signet, at Edinburgh, the 19th day
of June, and of our reigne the eight, and fourtie-three yeeres.
1610."(21)

Calderwood describes the above proclamation as "terrific." It
was very likely procured by the fact that shortly after the
Assembly Patrick Simson, minister of Stirling, preaching before
certain of the bishops and nobility, had spoken with much freedom,
and had laid "their perjurie and defectioun so clearlie and
faile to their conscience." This, however, was Simson's last
opposing effort. From now on he was silent. Walter Balanuquall,
one of the ministers of Edinburgh also gave voice to his discontent
at the Assembly's proceedings.(22) No punishment of any kind,
however, was meted out to the

The time came round for the Autumn Synods, when the
bishops were to take their seats as constant moderators. It
remained to be seen if there would be any disturbence or protests
at the sessions. It will be recalled that when in 1606 the
attempt was made to place the bishops as constant moderators of
their respective synods this effort had been successfully resisted
in every province except Angus.(23) What happened in 1610 it is
now our business to relate.

(21) Calderwood VII. p. 116-118.
(22) Melville Diary p. 608 and Calderwood VII. p. 115.
(23) See above p. 55.
The Synod of Fife assembled at Saint Andrew's on the 9th day of October, 1610. (24) Fife, of course, had always been a stronghold of militant high Presbyterianism. It now remained to be seen if the Synod would again refuse to acknowledge Archbishop Gladstane's jurisdiction. But nothing of much importance happened. Some ministers did indeed give voice to their discontent demanding to know by what authority the Presbyterian order of the Church had been subverted and altered. The Archbishop was interrogated upon a number of points, the discussion finally degenerating into a noisy and undignified dispute between Gladstanes and the discontented Presbyterians. (26) Oil was thrown on troubled waters by William Cowper, minister of Firth, whose words, setting forth as they do the moderate Episcopal point of view most admirably, we report in detail. Mr. William Cowper said, "Be ye kind and brethren, I beseech you in Christ remember thir things are not so essential points as to rent the bowells of the Kirk for them. Are thir things such as cast your ministry in hazard for them? What joy can ye have for your suffering when ye suffer for a matter indifferent; as who sail be moderator; who sail have imposition of hands? Therefore serve it to fill the people's ears with contentious doctrine concerning the government of the Kirk? Were it not farre better to prach Christ sincerelly, and to await on and see what the Lord will work in thir matters?" (26)

More discussion followed, the final words being uttered by one of the unreconciled Presbyterians, David Mearns, who said, "We can doe no lesse nor testifie our discontent in thir things, and prot-es before God that in our hearts we are not satisfied, and, threfore, await whil the Lord grant a better day to come. Meanwhile, however, the defections in the Church, bad as they were, did not militate them with drawing from her communion, setting up a separatist body or indulging in schismatical practices. (28) Thus concluded Archbishop Gladstane's first Synod after the Assembly. It will be seen that at the end of the day the Bishop remained in secure possession of the field.

Gladstane now turned his attention to that part of his Archdiocese which lay south of the Forth. He convened the Synod of Lothian at Haddington on the first day of November. (29) In preparation for the meeting of Synod and by way of protest the remnant Presbyterians in the Presbytery of Haddington resolved to do three things: first, to pen a gentle protestation; secondly, to have the Moderator present the same either in writing or by word of mouth, and thirdly, if necessary, to deny the Archbishop's jurisdiction. (30) The Synod met on the day appointed. The Moderator of the Haddington Presbytery was James Carmichael whom we have already met as a Commissioner to the Assembly. (31) His position was certainly a most unpleasant one. He was definitely a king's and bishop's man, and yet the members of his Presbytery insisted that he act as their mouthpiece and protest against Gladstane's presence and jurisdiction. What happened may be read in detail in the pages of Soot and Calderwood. (32) The majority of the Presbytery appear to have acted in a defiant and undignified manner, but their resistance appears to have profited them little, since none of the other presbyteries of the Synod appear to have given them any encouragement in the matter. As it was the Archbishop saw to it that the business of the Synod was dispatched in good time. Almost all the constant moderators

(25) Calderwood VII. pp. 120-122.
(26) Calderwood VII. p. 122.
(27) Calderwood VII. p. 122.
(28) Sprott, Doctrine of Sohism in Church of Scotland p. 11.
(30) Calderwood VII. p. 125.
(31) See above p. 86.
were continued in their places. (33) One of the ministers, Archibald Simson, a brother of the more famous Patrick Simson of Stirling, produced a letter from his brother in which he advised the brethren to present themselves at the Synod and to tolerate its proceedings. "Sindrie were content to take hold of this advyoe and colored their obedience with it." (34)

When the Synods of Fife and Lothian met again in the Spring the powers of the Archbishop were still further confirmed. (35) Patrick Simson set an example to all his brethren in publicly acknowledging the authority of the diocesan Synod of Fife when he asked the advice of the Synod with regard to the celebration of the Holy Communion. Such an action, however, explains Calderwood, was due rather to Simson's "simplicitie" than "to ante due consideration or sufficient ground." (36)

What happened in detail in the other synods we do not know. That these synods were held is implied in Calderwood's complaint that all bishops deserted the flocks of which they had been originally ministers and "sumured thereafter jurisdiction over the ministers and people of their diocies." (37) Scot confesses that he did not inquire about the opposition in other places. Still he adds, "This in general, I know, that however there was great murmuring, there was weak resisting; ministers were become so faint-hearted, and careless of the liberties of Christ's kingdom; every man caring for himself, without regard to his oath and subscription." (38) Opposition to the bishops on the part of the clergy thus seems to be of the slightest. "It may be sure that the members of the Episcopal party everywhere welcomed the new regime. we may be certain, also, that in the Northern synods the new order was received with more satisfaction than opposition and regret. Yet there was, one recalcitrant Northern minister who came into the public eye at this time. This was John Stratton, minister of Forres, who had spoken against the estate of bishops, even with the Bishop of Moray in his audience. Being sighted before Archbishop Gladstanes and some of his Majesty's Council for this offence, Stratton refused to acknowledge the Archbishop's authority, and as a result was ward'd in the Castle of Inverness. (39)

But the case of Stratton was an exceptional one. Of opposition to the new regime there appears indeed to have been very little.

Up to this point we have been speaking more particularly of the clergy. We ought now to say a few words about the laity's attitude to the change. The presence and acquiescence in the Assembly of a large body of noblemen make it clear that as far as the landed aristocracy were concerned they were quite agreeable to the erection of Episcopacy. Into a detailed examination of the causes of their present approval we need not enter here. They may have thought, however, as many thoughtful men of their time as usually did think, that an Episcopal system of church government would work better in a society which in a number of important particulars was still feudal. (40) Again it must be remembered that the assent of most of these noblemen had practically been bought when in 1606 from the old Church lands so many temporal lordships had been erected. (41) If we pass from the nobles and gentry to men of humbler station we do not find anything in the way of active protest there. As a matter of fact it would have been rather surprising if there had been any opposition. The average layman, and this was doubtless true in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries as it is today, is not greatly concerned about questions of ecclesiastical polity. He finds it difficult to be much interested in the question, say, as to who shall, preside over the presbytery or who shall have the imposition of hands at ordinations. Come nearer home, however, and upset the order of Sunday worship to which all his life he has been accustomed and

(33) Calderwood VII. p. 129.
(34) Calderwood VII. p. 129.
(35) Calderwood VII. pp. 154-158.
(36) Calderwood VII. pp. 159-156.
(37) Calderwood VII. p. 160.
(38) Scot A.N. p. 234.
(40) Hume Brown, History of Scotland II. p. 262.
(41) See above p. 47.
you will immediately hear from him. In this connection some words of the late Dr. Thomas Leishman are worth listening to.

"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." (42)

The reference in this last sentence is to King James' attempt to impose the five articles for Perth on the Scottish Church. But in 1610-1611 this ill-advised effort was still something which the unknown future had to disclose. In the language of a contemporaneous Scot, there was at that time "little controversy in religion in the Kirk of Scotland, for though there were bishops they took little upon them, and so were very little opposed until the Perth Assembly." (43) In a word, so far as the average Scottish layman was concerned, the change from Presbytery to moderate Episcopacy was accomplished without opposition. And if it not been for the disastrous policy of King James and Charles I., his son, in attempting to force an alien worship on their Scottish subjects, the ecclesiastical system thus established might still have been standing today.

(42) The Church of Scotland, Past and Present. V. Leishman, The Ritual of the Church, pp. 266-267.

Prof. Terry's testimony is to the same effect, "The bishop sat there as an alien to his clerical colleagues, who resented the sacrifice of ministerial parity and the elevation of one above his fellows with monopoly of ecclesiastical direction. The laity as yet were not outraged on matters which excited passion or prejudice. The ritual of Presbyterian worship had not been called in question. The Fasts and Feasts of the ancient Church continued to pass unheeded; the Churches were appointed with a severity befitting an austere ceremonial; the 'white' or surplice were not recommended to replace black Genevan gowns as the minister's uniform; natural postures of reverence sanctioned by the habit of ages were disregarded, and the Lord's Supper was received in easy, seated attitudes; Knox's Book of Common Order and the colloquial oratory of impromptu prayer broken by the singing of Psalms and Paraphrase provided the apparatus of public worship. Had James and his son been wise to reflect that the forms of devotional ritual are the reflection of individual character, to be invaded only with the perturbation of opposition unattended by opposition Current or opposition to the law in ecclesiastical government and authority, the history of Scotland in the seventeenth century must have run another course." Terry, History of Scotland, pp. 301-302. Of course Prof. Terry's reference to the use of paraphrases in the worship of the seventeenth century Kirk ought not to be allowed to pass unchallenged.
B. Concluding Reflections.

It is now our duty by way of conclusion to sum up as briefly as possible our impression of the antecedents, calling and work of our Glasgow Assembly. In this concluding statement we desire to draw the attention of the reader to the following outstanding facts:

I. We should like once more to insist that it is quite impossible to understand the work and significance of the Assembly of 1610 unless it is first realized that behind the Assembly stretches a long and interesting history. The presence of bishops in the Reformed Church—men to whom was committed a certain degree of ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction—was no new thing in the life of Post-Reformation Scotland. Even prior to 1572 Kirkmen had learned from their experience that it would be possible to set a Protestant bishop to work on the tasks of the Reformed Church. Then followed the Convention of Leith in 1572. The importance of this gathering from the viewpoint of this study cannot be overestimated. For, as we have seen, in point after point it was regarded as having created precedents which later framers of Church polity could do no better than imitate. No, the leaders of the Church in the next generation did not forget what had happened in 1572. Witness a speech which was made by Spottiswoode before the Saint Andrew's Assembly in 1617. In the period which followed 1572 the Church's experience of a Reformed Episcopacy was enlarged and widened. The supremacy of the Assembly over the bishops which had been successfully asserted before 1572 was now made increasingly evident and effective. It was during this period that militant Presbyterianism under the vigorous leadership of Andrew Melville vanquished for a time its Episcopal rival. But when after 1597 King James set about with whole-hearted energy to restore Episcopacy it was upon the old foundation of 1572 that this new attempt was based. Thus we saw when in 1606 Parliament restored the estate of bishops it did so in accordance with the terms of the Concordat of Leith. Clearly it was with the ecclesiastical precedents of 1572 and with the Parliamentary Acts of 1606 in mind that in 1610 the ecclesiastical leaders endeavored to reestablish Episcopacy. This being so, we are not surprised to learn that Article after Article of the Assembly's legislation was colored and moulded by the anterior experience of Church. It is this experience extending back over the previous fifty years that gives point and significance to the various Articles. Thus Article I. is unintelligible without some knowledge both of the Aberdeen Assembly of 1605 and of the earlier practice of the Church in calling General Assemblies. Further consider for example, Articles II. and IV. Their significance will not be realized until one has become acquainted with the previous practice of the Church in moderating synodal assemblies and in presenting and ordaining ministers. Especially is this true of Article IX, which declares that the bishops shall be subject in life, conversation, office and benefice to the censures of the General Assembly, and that by the Assembly with his Majesty's consent they may be deprived. Behind the terms of this Article there lies a long and most interesting history, the details of which we have entered into fully above. A knowledge of that history is essential to the complete understanding of the Article.

(44) See above pp. 9-12.
(46) See in general our review of the legislation of the Assembly pp.107-123. And in particular r, for example, Article VI. pp.114-115. and Article IX. pp. 118-120.
(49) See above pp. 48-49.
(50) See above pp. 107-108.
(51) See above pp. 118-119 and pp. 111-115.
(52) See above pp. 118-120.
And consider finally Article VI. which gives in full the oath of royal supremacy. This oath was taken over unmodified from the legislation of the Convention of Lethen. It will thus be seen that the two long introductory chapters which preceded our account of the Assembly itself were entirely essential to a complete understanding of the work and legislation of the Assembly. The compiling of these introductory chapters was therefore not the pedantic and superfluous exercise that at first sight it may have seemed.

II. The second point on which as a result of our investigation we should like now to insist is that while the leading spirit in the reestablishment of episcopacy was King James, and while his harsh and arbitrary treatment of the leaders of the Presbyterian opposition cannot be other than condemned, yet we believe it to be a fact that he could never have succeeded in his design had it not been that he was supported by a large and influential party among the Scottish clergy. We have noted above the remarkable change which came over the minds of many Scottish ministers in 1596-1597. We have also indicated the origin and rise of the Moderate Episcopal party. It was this party which rallying in its strength to the support of the King outnumbered and outvoted the discredited Presbyterians, and from 1597 to 1610 enabled the royal will to be imposed upon successive General Assemblies. It will be recalled that in our study of the Roll of the Assembly we met some of these Moderates personally. Further, we noted that in many cases they had begun their ministerial life as High Presbyterians, but had seen fit to change over to the king's and bishop's side. And finally we observed that included in their ranks were men of brains, ability and devotion. Unfortunately we know no way of determining now the relative strength of these Moderate and Presbyterian parties. But from the fact that throughout the twelve or thirteen years prior to 1610 the royal designs marched steadily from success to success, that as a rule the Presbyterians were always defeated in the General Assembly, and that the consolidating settlement of 1610 was received so quietly throughout the land, we believe that we are justified in concluding that at this time the Moderate party numbered in its ranks more than half the clergy of Scotland. For in this connection are we forgetting the arts of fear and violence which were employed to silence and disarm the Presbyterians, with the punishment of the Aberdeen confessors and the clever enticing of other groups to London? The Presbyterian party was by this means practically robbed of all that it was able to accomplish. But all this does not detract from the fact that throughout this whole period a large and influential Moderate party stood for the king.

III. It is when one remembers the presence in Scotland of so many of the Moderate-minded Churchmen that one is driven most strongly to criticise the royal policy in calling together and directing the course of the Assembly. To require the presbyteries to elect as commissioners men who had already been designated solely by the King, but in reality by the bishops, was, as we have said above, an extremely false and foolish move. Even had there been a fair proportion of Presbyterian present it would have been better to have risked their bitter opposition than to have given the members of that party round

(54) See above pp. 36-36.
(55) See above pp. 34-41.
(56) See above pp. 73-92.
(57) This belief would appear to be amply supported by a remark of Samuel Rutherford to the effect that during the Spottiswoode regime the strict Presbyterians were not more than two or three against a whole Presbyterian party. Spottis. Doctrine of Justification in Church of Scotland, p. 12.
(58) See above p. 48.
(59) See above p. 50.
(60) See above pp. 60-65.
for complaining that what had been assembled was nothing less than a packed and muzzled convention. Similar criticism must be leveled at the policy of drawing up the legislative articles in a semi-privacy of a small committee. With the Assembly thus composed almost entirely of king's and bishops' men, why was there not provision made for some free and open discussion on the floor of the house? Even supposing there had been some criticism and grumbling, we may be certain that in the end Archbishop Spottiswoode and his associates would have carried the day. The presence of an outvoted minority in the Assembly might even have been a source of strength to the Episcopal side. The ecclesiastical leaders could then have pointed to the fact that after free and open discussion and careful reasoning the great majority of those present had decided to reestablish Episcopacy. (We are of course not forgetting that there was indeed a very small minority present in the Assembly. But we are thinking here of a possible minority of fairly large proportions.) And finally, we cannot do other than condemn the distribution of funds which took place as the Assembly closed. The constant moderators to whom indeed money was due should have been paid at some other time and place. And if travelling expenses were given to any members present they should have been given to all regardless of the way in which they had seen fit to vote. On these three points then: The nomination of members, the drawing up of the legislative proposals in committee, and the distribution of funds, we hold that the king and his ecclesiastical advisers are to be most severely criticized. Had the members of the Assembly been elected according to the 1608 model; had there been free and adequate discussion of the merits and demerits of the various legislative proposals, and had there been no distribution of funds as the members dispersed, much of the reproach which still attaches to the Assembly would never have been raised. Doubtless King James and his advisers greatly feared discontent and opposition. But for the sake of the good name of that high endeavour on which they were embarked they should have been willing to take this risk. We are forced to conclude that the Assembly of 1610 had little pretensions to be called a free Assembly.

IV. We are once more compelled to criticize the royal and episcopal policy when we remember the changes introduced into the Assembly's legislation when the same was revised by the Parliament of 1612. In permitting Parliament to alter, augment, and omit article after article without protest, the ecclesiastical leaders again laid themselves open to most serious criticism. For it will be recalled that Spottiswoode and his associates had been the most interested parties in the drawing up of the 1610 Articles. They were inextricably involved in all the Assembly had done; their names and reputations were bound up with all its decrees. But in 1612 they acquiesced when Parliament made changes to which we may be certain the Assembly would never have quietly agreed. For example, one cannot conceive of the Assembly consenting to the omission of Article I. which decrees that henceforth the bishops shall be subject to its censure and control. In a word, we condemn the cold and callous way in which the constitutional rights of the Church were over-ridden and ignored. The people of Scotland had much justification, as they thought over the details of the king's ecclesiastical policy, for concluding that they were "dealing with a trickster."
C. The Glasgow Assembly and Christian Reunion.

In the several paragraphs which follow it is our plan to say something about the significance of the Glasgow Assembly as regards present day endeavours in the sphere of Christian Reunion. It was in the hope, of course, that the precedents of 1610 might prove to be a basis of reconciliation between Anglicanism and Presbyterianism that Prof. Cooper wrote his "Reunion: A Voice from Scotland,"(65) and contributed his two Articles to the published Papers of the Christian Unity Association.(66) This examination of the 1610 legislation, with a view to possible reunion in the future is, however, a relatively new thing in the record of Christian Theology. As long as the seventeenth century's ecclesiastical feud persisted in men's minds, and as long as they were satisfied with the self-sufficient sectarianism of eighteenth and nineteenth century Protestantism, it was not to be expected that any worth or value would be discovered in the precedents of 1610. Consider for example the attitude of the biographer of Knox and Melville. He makes no attempt, as he writes of the Assembly, to conceal his disdain and scorn. "Constituted as this Assembly was," he writes, "it is altogether unnecessary to enter into any particular account of the way in which it was managed."(67) But today we are living in a different age. Movements toward Christian Unity are now reported from most Christian lands, Christendom seems to be tiring of her sectional and sectarian rivalries. The ideal of One Catholic Church of God has returned to the world, and is once more dwelling among men.

As there are roughly but three types of ecclesiastical polity: Independency, Presbyterianism and Episcopacy, it stands to reason that just as soon as Presbyterians and Episcopalians sit down to discuss the question of their mutual relations, they are bound to stumble across the very problems which Spottiswoode and his associates were forced to debate and resolve over three centuries ago. Just as soon as there is a prospect of co-ordinating the Episcopal and Presbyterian polities, the precedents of 1610 will be seen at once to assume a very high value. Thus in 1908 the Lambeth Conference in considering the question of Christian unity passed a resolution which included the following words. "In the welcome event of any project of Reunion between any Church of the Anglican Communion and any Presbyterian or other non-Episcopal Church which, while preserving the Faith in its integrity and purity, has also exhibited care as to the form and intention of ordination to the ministry, reaching the stage of responsible official negotiation, it might be possible to make an approach to reunion on the basis of consecrations to the Episcopate on lines suggested by the precedents of 1610."(68) This resolution brought our Glasgow Assembly back from the realm of distant memories, and made it once more a thing of living consequence in the world of today. Since that time the Assembly of 1610 has come to hold an increasingly important place in the thought of those who are interested in the cause of reconciliation among Christians. In 1911 the Christian Unity Association of Scotland appointed a committee to consider along what lines the relative claims of Episcopacy and Presbyterian might be most profitably reviewed.(69) An interesting group of papers on the subject was the result. Two years later these papers were collected, and published. As we have noted, two of them are from the pen of Prof. Cooper. The second of these deals specifically with the 1610 Assembly. We have made liberal use of both these papers above.

In 1918 there came from the pen of a dignitary of the Scottish Episcopal Church a memorandum which was unanimously accepted by a number of unofficial representatives of the Church of Scotland, the United Free Church and the Scottish Episcopal
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(67) M'Crie, Life of Melville II. p. 249.
(68) Cooper, Reunion p. 6.
(69) C.U.A.P. Preface p. III.
body. (70) This document is a most interesting one. It shows that its author has made a study of the precedents of 1610, and that it is upon this historic basis that he hopes for advance towards unity. In particular he suggests that the Episcopal Church adopt the entire system of Presbyterian Church Courts: kirk sessions, presbyteries, synods and General Assemblies. (71) He suggests at the same time, as was the case in the seventeenth century, that the Presbyterian Section of the Church to be set up a constant moderator over every synod, this moderator to receive Episcopal consecration. (72) Further, as was the case in 1610, nothing in the way of reordaining men in Presbyterian orders would be required. (73) In the future, of course, all ordinations would be by the hands of the constant moderator-bishop assisted by the ministers of the presbyteries within whose bounds the ordination was being held. (74) He adds, and although this was not expressly stated, it was certainly implied in 1610, that the new moderator-bishops would treat as having the same ecclesiastical status, those who had been ordained by presbyters only and those on whom they themselves together with the presbyters were now laying their hands. (75) All of which, in point after point, is, of course, a falling back upon the precedents of 1610. Curiously, there is in this memorandum no word as regards the relation of the moderator-bishops to the General Assembly. That they should be subject to its censure and control, or more accurately perhaps, that the Episcopal should be a strictly limited and constitutional one, would be regarded, we believe, by all Presbyterians as an essential part of any such union scheme.

In 1921 two union committees, one appointed by the Anglican Bishop of Montreal and the other by the Presbytery of Montreal of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, held a series of five conferences throughout the winter and spring of that year. (76) From the published report of these conferences it does not appear, however, that the precedents of 1610 played much part in the discussion. In fact, one of the most important factors in the precedents of 1610 is here either ignored or set aside. We refer to the fact that in 1610 there was no attempt made to reordain the men in Presbyterian orders. Now in the case of the Montreal proposals there are a number of clauses which would authorize the Anglican bishop together with his priests to lay hands on and to recommission the Presbyterian ministers, while the moderator of presbytery and other presbyters would lay their hands on and recommission the Anglicans. (77) As the Presbyterian Church in Canada—and we refer here to that body which entered the United Church of Canada in 1925—has never denied the regularity of Anglican orders, but as some Anglicans may have had doubts as to the validity of the Presbyterian ministry, these two recommissioning ceremonies amounted in fact to this. The Presbyterians consented to reordain in order to satisfy the conscience of certain Anglicans who believed that such reordination was necessary. On the other hand, the Anglicans agreed to be recommissioned by the Presbyterians who having no doubt as to the regularity of the Anglican orders clearly regarded such further commissioning as unnecessary. But how far removed such suggested agreement and practice would be from what actually occurred in 1610? Here then we have one case in which the precedents of 1610 were ignored.

It is, however, when we come to consider the Church union proposals which are at present emanating from South India that we discover how important a part the precedents of 1610 may yet play in preparing the ground for a larger unity. As the South India proposals have been drawn up and devised, attention has been called to them by those who advocate and those who
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In Church newspaper editorials and correspondence, in these articles the action of the Assembly at Glasgow in 1610 and the later consecration of Spottiswoode, Laban and Hamilton in London have all been critically examined and closely debated. (79) Again we find that in the course of the negotiations, when men of Presbyterian antecedents began seriously to think through the question of union with the Episcopalians, they were seen to take their stand on positions which curiously recalled those of their spiritual predecessors in seventeenth century Scotland. Thus in 1919 the General Assembly of the South India United Church councils to consider the desirability of adopting a constitutional Episcopacy. In such an Episcopacy the bishops would be responsible to the General Assembly. (79) This, of course, was a clear falling back upon Article IX. of the Glasgow Assembly. (80) The Assembly also insisted that there should be an absolute equality between the ministry and membership of the uniting Churches. (81) There was, it is true, no explicit reference to anything like this in 1610, but there can be no doubt that after 1610 the Churches of England and Scotland both looked upon each other as national branches of equal status in the Catholic Church. (82) The Assembly also insisted that the Church resulting from the union should be independent and autonomous. (82) Which is something that recalls Spottiswoode’s fear of a subordination to the English of the Scottish Church as the result of his receiving Episcopal consecration from Englishmen. (84) In 1610 the Scottish General Assembly looked on for which there was no precedent in 1610. They would require that the bishops be not merely subject to the Assembly but also be elected by that body. (86) As we have seen in Scotland in the seventeenth century the bishops were appointed by the crown and elected by the chapters of their respective dioceses. (86) Certainly no such connection with or dependence on the State appears to be contemplated in South India. (87)

And now in conclusion we should like briefly to consider the South India proposals as they have been finally drafted; issued for publication, and as they come before us today. (January 1930) We shall run rapidly over the more important articles of the scheme and compare them with their parallels from seventeenth century Scotland.

In the first place it should be noted that the proposed new Indian Church will possess a supreme judicatory to be called the Synod. This body is defined as the supreme governing and legislative body of the United Church. (86) It finds its seventeenth century parallel in the old General Assembly. In 1610 the Scottish Assembly petitioned for annual assemblies which it did not get. (89) The South India Synod, however, is to meet regularly once every two years. (90) The Anglican custom of voting by houses was unknown in the Scottish Church and is unknown in South India. As unknown in South India is the fact that on certain occasions the bishops there will sit and reason separately. (91) The chief officer of the Indian Church Synod will be the Moderator, suggestive name—elected among the bishops of the Church for a definite period of time. (92) There was nothing said in 1610 about who should
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moderate future Assemblies, but, as a matter of fact, when the
Assembly did meet, it was the Primate Spottiswoode who took the
chair. (93)

Again, it is proposed that the United Church shall
possess diocesan councils, (94) which find their Scottish precedent
and parallel in the thirteen old diocesan synods. As was likewise
the case in Scotland, in South India there shall be one bishop
exercising authority in each council area, and by virtue of his
office will be the constant moderator of this diocesan court. (95)
The South India Scheme further provides that while there will be
no reordination of non-Episcopally ordained ministers, yet in the
future all ordinations will be by the hands of the bishop, assisted
by other presbyters. (96) As a moment’s reflection will make evident,
we have in this proposal an almost complete parallel to the central
 provision of Article IV. of the Glasgow Assembly. (97) It would thus
be the intention both of the Old Scottish Church and of the uniting
Churches in South India that eventually all their ministers would
be Episcopally ordained. Exceptions to this rule which in South
India would be found in the case of the arrival of ministers of
other Churches, whose missions founded separate parts of the United
Church, (98) may be paralleled in Scottish History with rare cases
such as that of John Forbes, the great Aberdeen Doctor, who was
ordained by Presbyterian hands in Holland. (99) A provision
recalling that of Article VII. of the Glasgow Assembly which
permits a bishop to appoint a substitute in the matter of visitation
is found in the South India proposal allowing the bishops to
appoint a commissary for ordinary work not involving definitely
Episcopal functions. (100) The proposed scheme goes on to declare
that while the historic Episcopate is to be accepted as part of
the basis of union, yet it is only to be accepted in “a
constitutional form,” and further that no theory concerning
Episcopacy is to be taken as implied by its acceptance. (101) Here
in this insistence on the necessity of a limited or “constitutional”
Episcopacy, we have a genuine echo of the famous Article IX. of
the Glasgow Assembly’s legislation. That Article, as we have said
so often remarked, had declared the bishops to be subject to the
General Assembly and had threatened them with deprivation if they
were found culpable and his Majesty’s consent had been obtained. In
South India a bishop may also be removed on moral or physical
grounds. (102) Further, there was, of course, not a word said in 1610
about apostolic succession or any other theory concerning Episcopal
government. (103) Again, it is to be noted that in India the
bishop shall be elected, both the particular diocese and the whole
Church having a voice in their appointment. (104) Article X. of the
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(103) “To the virtues of the Apostolical Succession—communicated, it
is true, uncanonically and by a somewhat suspicious channel—the
Scottish episcopate woke only in its decline, and in all
but a few cases never discovered them at all. It was not till
July, 1631, that the jus divinum of Episcopacy was asserted from
the pulpit; and Maxwell, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, who
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not be proved.” Mathieson, Politics and Religion I. p. 322.
Glasgow Assembly also declares that the bishop shall be "elected," but we may be certain that the Erastian implications of such a word in seventeenth century Scotland will have no parallel in the Church life of modern India. It is also to be noticed that within the bounds of the diocesan council there will be a number of pastor committees for the local area. These clearly correspond to the kirk sessions never actually named, it is true, but evidently implied in the legislation of our Assembly.

Curiously, there appears to be nothing resembling the presbytery in the polity of the proposed South Indian Church.

And finally a word may be said as regards the perpetuation of the Episcopate and the consecration of the new bishops. The South India scheme is very definite and clear on all these important points. The Church of the future is to be an Episcopal Church. The act of union is to synchronise with the consecration of a number of new bishops by those already in the Episcopal succession. At the same time, however, it is provided that presbyters from the present Wesleyan and South India United Churches will participate in the rite of consecration and by the laying on of their hands convey in the name of their Churches the right of ordination to the new bishops. The United Church of the future will thus have a ministry which is thoroughly representative of all its uniting parts.

But the time has now come for us to bring this study to a close. "We do so in the following sentences. As one considers the many striking resemblances between modern proposals for Christian Reunion and the historic precedents of 1610, one is inclined to agree with Canon Simpson's conviction that "when the Churches, episcopal and non-episcopal are so united in spirit that an outward re-construction becomes inevitable, these, (that is, the Scottish precedents) and no other, are the lines on which it will proceed."
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Additional note: The official edition of the Proposed Scheme of Union as published by S.P.C.K. (1929) did not come into the writer's hands until the above paragraphs were written. He was thus forced to rely on Bishop Taller's exposition and on the papers contributed to the Review of the Church as—January 1930.
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