ST GILES' LECTURES.

FIRST SERIES—THE SCOTTISH CHURCH.

LECTURE VII.

THE COVENANT, 1660 TO 1690 A.D.

By the Rev. ROBERT FLINT, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.

THE later, like the earlier, stages of the Covenanting period of Scottish Church History still awaken very different feelings in those who contemplate them from different party points of view. But, of course, the true point of view from which to contemplate them—the only properly historical point of view—is one higher and more general than any which can be appropriated by a party. To this point we must seek to rise. The views obtained from lower elevations will be comparatively narrow and perverted; and we may be assured that in so far as they do not include truth they cannot be useful, and that in so far as they contain error they must be hurtful. Few things are likely to injure a people more than the misinterpretation of any important chapter of its own history. How much humiliation and unhappiness has France suffered during the last fifty years because large classes of her citizens

would persist in looking back at her first Revolution and the career of her first Napoleon from the low levels of party prejudice, and through the distorting media of passion, exaggeration, and fiction. No social organisation is more dependent for its welfare on the recognition of historical truth than the Church, which, in so far as it truly lives at all, lives by the truth. Nothing but the truth in regard to its history will do any honest Church real good; and the whole truth, pure and simple, will be always more welcome and more profitable to such a Church than a part of the truth or a mixture of truth and error.

The partisan spirit in dealing with the period of history under consideration shews itself by deviation from the line of historical justice towards one or other of these extremes—a judgment wholly favourable to the Royalist and Episcopal side, or to the popular and Presbyterian side. It is, in consequence, apt to flatter itself that it is promoting the interests either of monarchy and Episcopacy or of popular freedom and Presbytery. In thus judging, however, it is mistaken. No great cause or party can at the present day be benefited by its advocacy. Monarchy and Episcopacy have certainly nothing to gain by defending the conduct of the last two Stuart kings and of Sharp and his coadjutors. The men who sought to force Episcopacy on Covenanting Scotland by physical constraint and pressure were the worst enemies Episcopacy has ever had in Scotland. No Episcopalian need feel specially concerned to defend their memories; and no fair-minded Presbyterian will hold Episcopacy responsible for their measures. On the other hand, it only tends to discredit Presbyterianism in the eyes of persons who care for truth and accuracy, to indulge in those indiscriminate and unqualified panegyrics on the Covenanters which conceal the fact that some of their principles and many of their proceedings were unjustifiable. Every Presbyterian denomination in this country now rejects doctrines which the Covenanters deemed of vital importance.

Few Presbyterian Christians, it is to be hoped, would now, under any circumstances, commit some of the actions which the Covenanters thought they were bound by the law of God to perform.

In order to follow intelligently the course of events in Scotland from 1660 to 1690, the state of the country at the Restoration must be clearly realised. At that date, then, Presbyterian Scotland had been held for nine years as a conquered province by Puritan England. The strong man armed, who humbled the military pride of the nation at Dunbar and Worcester, remained its absolute master to the day of his death, and left it in the power of his soldiers. The rule of the alien was as just and lenient, perhaps, as the circumstances allowed, but, of course, it was hated, although outwardly obeyed. The nation, notwithstanding its sharp controversies with its kings, was, on the whole, sincerely Royalist. Few of the people of Scotland did not wish to have their own hereditary monarch, although many of them wished to have him only if he would subscribe the Covenant and obey the Kirk. The soldiery maintained order in the land, so that life and property were perhaps safer than they had ever been before; the civil and judicial administrations were vigorous and impartial; but the statement of various historians that the condition of the country was one of physical prosperity, must be rejected. That trade and agriculture were in a most depressed state; that taxation was felt to be intolerably severe, although the revenue raised by it was only about half of what was required to meet the civil and military expenditure; that great poverty prevailed; that a gloomy despondency overspread the community—might be shewn by a mass of evidence. The nobility had suffered most. Its chief representatives had been slain or had fled the country, or were lying imprisoned in England, or were hiding in the Highlands. The rest were living in obscurity, afraid to make a movement which would remind their enemies of their existence. Most of them had been spoiled of their estates; hardly

any of them were not overwhelmed with debt. Argyll alone, perhaps, had been able to keep hold of what belonged to him; and even he was 'drowned in debt and obloquy.'

The religious condition of the country was less lamentable than the political, but it was utterly unlike the picture which Kirkton and other historians have drawn of it. Gross wickedness and great crimes were not rare. Cloaks of piety were worn by many whose ungodly passions they only partially concealed. Religious profession was general, and religious sincerity was, as the subsequent history fully proved, the rule and not the exception; but there was a terrible lack of that highest Christian grace, the charity so worthily eulogised by St Paul. Presbyterianism was dominant, but, as explained in the previous lecture, was broken up into parties which hated and reviled one another. The enthusiasm for Presbyterianism had greatly declined in consequence of its internal dissensions and the national misfortunes to which they had led. The clergy were, however, in general, notably faithful and earnest ministers of the Word; and their flocks were sincerely attached to them. The favourers of Episcopacy were numerous in the North, and increased among the upper classes as it became more and more obvious that their only hope of deliverance from worldly ruin lay in the success of a Royalist reaction. The 'sectaries,' as they were called, came in with, and were almost confined to, Cromwell's troopers; their doctrines made few converts. Religious toleration was enforced; but this was felt to be a sore grievance and a deadly sin.

The restoration in 1660 of Charles II. to the throne of his ancestors was hailed in Scotland as in England with enthusiastic joy. England welcomed it as a deliverance from the military despotism, the severe morality, and the religious peculiarities of Puritanism, all of which had gradually become hateful to the large majority of Englishmen. Scotland welcomed it as the recovery of national independence and the commencement of an era of peace and prosperity. In the month of June 1660,

Scotland was in great excitement. In the churches there were thanksgivings; in public halls there were banquets; at the market crosses there were crowds drinking claret to the health of the king and the Duke of York; bonfires blazed on the hill-tops, and the streets were gay with flags by day and brightly illuminated by night; over all the land there were piping and dancing and immoderate mirth; and on the roads to London there were numbers of Scotchmen of all ranks and degrees eager to congratulate his Majesty, and anxious to secure preferment and emolument. At the fireworks on the Castle-hill, an effigy of Cromwell chased by an effigy of the devil till the former was blown up, gave particular satisfaction. At a bonfire near the Tron Church, the Janet Geddes who in 1637 threw a stool at the head of a dean, now presided at the burning of her 'chair of state' and 'all her creels, baskets, creepies, and furms.' Times had changed, and men and women had changed with them. In the minds of the thoughtful, however, joy was not unmixed with disquietude. This question could not be evaded: What will be done as to religion? And the consideration of it could not fail to produce anxiety. Probably no person or party either in Scotland or in England anticipated what really and speedily happened, but every sincere and intelligent Presbyterian must have felt in some measure that the situation was a critical one.

The Resolutioners, who formed the largest and most moderate Presbyterian party, had, as soon as they perceived it to be likely that the monarchy would be restored, intrusted the representation of their interests with the king and his advisers, to one of their number who had acquired by his conduct in former difficult transactions a reputation among them as a trusty and skilful negotiator. This dexterous ecclesiastical diplomatist was the Rev. James Sharp of Crail; and his instructions were, in the main, these: 'To use his endeavours that the Church of Scotland should enjoy the freedom and privileges of its judicatories, as ratified by law; to represent by all prudent

and lawful means the sinfulness and offensiveness of the toleration then established; and to attempt to secure the right application and increase of the ministers' stipends.' From the middle of February to the end of August he was out of Scotland, and chiefly about the Court at Breda and London, professedly carrying out these instructions. According to the view given in the numerous letters which he wrote to the Rev. Robert Douglas and other leaders of the Resolutioners, he soon saw that the idea of getting Presbyterianism established in England was altogether chimerical, and that even its claims to establishment in Scotland must be urged with caution and moderation; found, as time went on, the gale always blowing stronger for Prelacy and Erastianism; was much thwarted by influential persons, lay and clerical, who wished to bring in Episcopacy into Scotland; much saddened and wearied out by what he heard and saw; but at length obtained from the king, who was personally averse to meddling with the Church government, a promise that Scottish Presbyterianism would not be disturbed.

With this promise in the form of a letter from the king, directed to Mr Douglas, to be communicated to the Presbytery of Edinburgh, Mr Sharp returned to Scotland, reaching Edinburgh on the last day of August. On the 3d of September the letter was read. In it the king said: 'We do resolve to protect and preserve the government of the Church of Scotland, *as it is settled by law*, without violation.' He also stated that he intended to call a General Assembly as soon as affairs permitted, and to consult with Mr Robert Douglas and some other ministers as to what might further concern the affairs of the Church. This letter, in accordance with a command which it contained, was transmitted by the Presbytery of Edinburgh to all the other Presbyteries in the kingdom, and was, of course, received by them with great satisfaction. It was a distinct pledge that the existing Church government would not be unsettled.

Just a week before Sharp reached Edinburgh, a few zealous Protesters—ten clergymen and two laymen—met in a private house in the city. Among them was Mr James Guthrie, the leader of the Protesters. They drew up a very characteristic document in the form of a supplication and address to the king. In it they implored his Majesty to 'extirpate Popery, Prelacy, superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and everything contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness;' to 'fill all places of trust, not only in Scotland but in England and Ireland, with those who had taken the Covenant and were of known affection to the cause of God;' and to 'remove the beginnings of stumbling that had already been given, by taking away the ceremonies and Service-book from his own chapel and family, and other places of his dominions.' This was still the Protesters' ideal of good government. But the general body of Presbyterians had not been so blind to the teaching of experience. If the king and his councillors had left the Presbyterian government of the Church undisturbed, and the petitions of the Protesters unnoticed, Protesters would have rapidly diminished. Unfortunately this was not the course they took.

It so happened that the Committee of Estates began to sit on the day on which the Supplication mentioned was being drawn up, and one of its first acts was to cause the assembled Protesters to be arrested and imprisoned. On the following day a proclamation was issued against meetings and conventions which had not been specially authorised by his Majesty, and against seditious petitions and remonstrances. Later, the Committee imprisoned various other Protesters, prohibited the owning or promoting the Remonstrance, ordered the *Lex Rex* of Rutherford and the *Causes of God's Wrath* of Guthrie to be called in and burned, and shewed in various ways that the spirit of the governing classes was now very different from what it had been on the day when the National Covenant was signed in the Greyfriars Churchyard.

The Scottish Parliament, with the Earl of Middleton, a rough, imperious, dissolute soldier, as Royal Commissioner, met on the 1st of January 1661. It shewed itself slavishly and madly Royalist. It proclaimed the supremacy of the king over all persons and causes. It forbade the renewing of the Covenant. It passed a marvellous Rescissory Act which expunged from the statute-book all legislation later than 1633. Thus at one stroke every law which the Presbyterians and Covenanters had passed was swept away. This Act was carried on the 28th of March, almost unanimously. As early as the 10th of January there had been eager Royalists to suggest this measure, but Middleton checked their zeal.

On the 16th of April, the Marquis of Argyll was brought before the bar of the House on the charge of high treason. The trial ended on the 25th of May with his condemnation to death. The sentence was executed two days thereafter. Argyll had played such a part in the history of his country that his trial and condemnation seemed to be the trial and condemnation of Covenanting Scotland. There may easily be different opinions as to various parts of his conduct. There can be but one as to the moral grandeur of his death. That death freed the king from the only man in Scotland whose intellect and power he had much reason to dread; and yet, perhaps, it injured him more than anything Argyll could have done against him. For years before the Restoration, Argyll was generally distrusted and disliked; his death gratified many personal enemies, but it caused multitudes to remember only his services and great qualities.

Four days after it, Mr James Guthrie was executed. He had done more, I think, than any man of his time to divide and weaken the Presbyterianism which he loved so well; he was a persecutor in principle, and ready to be so in fact; he had clamoured for the blood of conscientious men whom he called malignants; but he was a sincere and heroic man, and, according to the light he had, a most pious man. He was willing to

sacrifice everything, even to the laying down of his life, for every principle which he held. He had certainly been very troublesome to the Royalist cause in Scotland; but he had also been warmly attached to it, and had done much to keep affection for it alive when the hearts of less courageous men were failing them for fear of Cromwell. Nothing on earth could frighten James Guthrie. In London, four years before the Restoration, he had stood up in public debate against Hugh Peters, Cromwell's chaplain, and had, in the presence of Cromwell's officers, maintained the right of the king. That might have been remembered now. He died despising death; speaking for an hour on the ladder as calmly as if he had been preaching in the pulpit; reasserting the principles to which he had so often testified and from which he had never wavered; and declaring that 'the covenants could be loosed or dispensed with by no person or power on earth, but were still binding upon the three kingdoms, and would be so for ever hereafter.' His last words were: 'The Covenants, the Covenants, shall yet be Scotland's reviving.'

The Synods of the Church met in April and May. The southern Synods protested, some more and some less decidedly, against the Rescissory Act, but even at this critical time there was bitter strife in them between Resolutioners and Protesters. Some of these Synods were forcibly dissolved by Royalist noblemen. The northern Synods were in favour of the restoration of Episcopacy, or, at least, not opposed to it. Presbyterianism had been forced upon the North, and had no claim to expect support from that quarter.

In the month of August Charles intimated to the Privy Council his intention to interpose his royal authority to establish government by bishops, as it was previous to the late troubles; and in doing so he actually referred to his letter of the previous August to the Presbytery of Edinburgh, as if he were now implementing the promise it contained, seeing that Parliament by its Rescissory Act had rendered the Presbyterian form of

Church government no longer that which was settled by law. The moral obtuseness and shamelessness thus displayed tended to confirm the opinion that his letter to the Presbytery had been a deliberate falsehood, never meant to be fulfilled in its plain literal sense, but craftily contrived to throw Presbyterians off their guard. This is the view generally held; but it cannot, I think, be said to have been proved, and, of course, we are not entitled to believe even the most despicable man more guilty than the evidence shews him to have been. Admitting, however, that his letter was probably not the treacherous lie commonly supposed, his conduct in regard to the promise which it contained was disgraceful.

The new system was rapidly set up and brought into operation. Long before the year 1662 was out, it was complete and vigorously at work. Bishops were selected, and consecrated, and seated in Parliament, and all the rights and powers of the judicatories of the Church were put into their hands, as being the agents and officers of the king; the royal supremacy in all matters spiritual was affirmed; and when that was done, the task of Charles and his councillors was accomplished. A simpler system than the new one there could not be. It needed no change in creed or liturgy, and little or no change in organisation. It needed only a king and bishops. The absolute obedience of the clergy and laity to the bishops, and of the bishops to the king—that was its sum and substance. Recognition of the royal supremacy in all religious and ecclesiastical questions—that was its life and soul. Erastianism, naked and not ashamed, was what the Church of Scotland now found itself confronted with.

Could the disastrous revolution which had been thus rapidly effected have been prevented? Not in the actual circumstances. To have prevented it, the Presbyterians of Scotland would have required to have been more united and better led, and at once more reasonable and more decided, than they were. The strife of Protesters and Resolutioners, the

demand of the Protesters to have the Covenants everywhere enforced in their entirety, and the mistake of the Resolutioners in trusting to negotiations with the king, instead of arousing by every means in their power the people to a sense of the seriousness of the situation, and to a recognition of their duties to the Church and nation, were ruinous errors. Had there been a Knox or a Henderson in the country, affairs would doubtless have been differently managed, but no man of their stamp was vouchsafed at this crisis. The fanaticism of the loyalist and irreligious reaction, instead of being restrained and counteracted, was allowed almost free course.

James Sharp was placed at the head of the new ecclesiastical establishment as Archbishop of St Andrews and Primate of Scotland. Soon after his return from London, on the occasion already mentioned, the rumour began to circulate that he had, while professing to act zealously on behalf of the Church of Scotland, been, in reality, selfishly undermining it and joining in a plot against its existence. This rumour continued to spread in spite of the many contradictions which he gave to it; and when he accepted the Archbishopric, few Presbyterians, at least, doubted its truth, and Protesters and Resolutioners alike looked on him with horror as a perjured traitor of the deepest dye. It is still the prevalent view taken of his conduct. My time does not allow me to discuss the question of its truth or falsity; but I have considered the evidence which bears on it with some care, and have only been able to come to the conclusion that the common opinion is not warranted; that Sharp's decision to abandon Presbyterianism was only made after Presbytery had been disestablished by the Scottish Parliament, and the strength of the royalist and anti-covenanting reaction had plainly declared itself; and that, consequently, perjury cannot, in this connection, be justly imputed to him. Scotland was, at this time, untrue to herself, and therefore disposed to believe that she had been betrayed by individuals. Sharp's desertion of the Presbyterian cause, however, cannot be excused. Self-

interest was obviously his chief inducement to the step. He must have foreseen that he would carry to the archiepiscopal throne a reputation for treachery, which would blacken and discredit it, and that, as the Primate of the new system, he would be required to labour for the destruction of the independence and liberty to which the Church was entitled. His own letters shew us that he believed the sphere of the Church to be an independent kingdom on which the State ought not to encroach, and he had no right to accept a position in which his practice could not fail to be in continual contradiction to this belief.

The other bishops were much inferior to Sharp in practical ability. Some of them were in every way unworthy of their positions. Only one of them was eminently endowed with ministerial gifts and graces. He was so pre-eminently. As far as I can judge, a purer, humbler, holier spirit than that of Robert Leighton never tabernacled in Scottish clay. He was 'like a star which dwelt apart,' while the storm raged below; or, like a fair flower of Paradise dropped amidst the thorns and thistles on some bleak mountain-side. His character was of an almost ideal excellence, and so divinely beautiful, that men, while attracted by it, were also awed by it, as beyond what imitation could hope to reach in the earthly state of being. His works, owing to the marvellous fullness and perfection of the spiritual life which pervades them, are worth many times over all the writings of all his Scottish contemporaries. There is nothing nearly equal to them in our devotional literature from its rise until now. Once minister of Newbattle, afterwards Principal of Edinburgh University, he was at this time persuaded, or rather constrained, to accept the bishopric of Dunblane. There is no room for doubt as to the purity or disinterestedness of his motives. He looked on his office not as an object of ambition, but as a heavy cross which Providence called him for a season to bear. He cared little for forms of ecclesiastical polity, but rather preferred the episcopal, and he believed that the bishops could, by humility, gentleness, moderation, and

the maintenance of the rights of the Christian people, unite all ranks and classes of men in Scotland in the acceptance of a mild and modified Episcopacy, whereas adherence to simple or strict Presbyterianism would keep them divided. He failed to understand the circumstances of the time and the characters of the men around him, but was not chargeable with any graver error.

What, now, was to be done with the clergy of the disestablished Church? Three methods presented their competing claims. The first was Leighton's. Displace no one; coerce and oppress no one; enact and enforce no subscription which can offend any man's conscience; let the bishops renounce all pomp and pride of office, and confine themselves strictly to spiritual duties; let them be guided by the clergy in their deliberations, and by the people in their presentations; and let their great aim be to secure, by example and persuasion, that public worship be more beautiful, preaching simpler and less controversial, individual piety more diffused, and religious divisions gradually healed. This was the method which he sought to commend to his colleagues, as he and they journeyed from London to Scotland to take possession of their bishoprics; but he soon found that he would receive no help from them in carrying it out; and hearing that they intended to make a grand entry into Edinburgh, he quitted them at Morpeth, 'very weary of them, as he supposed them to be of him,' and went quietly to the sphere of work which had been assigned to him. There he practised his method, not without success; and to his dying day he believed that it might have succeeded over all Scotland, if it had been patiently and consistently tried. Possibly it might, if the other bishops had been Robert Leightons, or his equals; but being only what they were, this plan had no chance. The second method was Sharp's. Self-sacrifice was not one of its principles. He meant to take full advantage of his position, and to rise in the world as high as he could. So far from despising even pomp and parade, when

he rode from Leslie to St Andrews to take possession of his see, it was with an earl on each hand, and between seven and eight hundred mounted gentlemen in his train. But Sharp was a clear-headed, worldly-wise man, and he wished a cautious, temporising, step-by-step procedure, which would result in getting rid gradually of those most opposed to the new system, and supplying their places with those more compliant. The method actually adopted, however, was neither that of the saintly pastor nor that of the politic ecclesiastic, but a high-handed and reckless method which commended itself to the domineering and inebriated minds of Middleton and his boon-companions. They were under the delusion that by strongly asserting the Royal Supremacy in ecclesiastical causes, by enforcing the abjuration of the Covenants and adhesion to the new system, by making it apparent to the Presbyterian clergy that they were under the power of the civil rulers, and by passing stringent laws accompanied with formidable threats, they would prevent the rise of any serious opposition to the government, however arbitrarily it might choose to act. The whole legislation of the Parliament of 1662, and the whole course of procedure of the Privy Council in connection therewith, were expressions of this delusion.

That Parliament passed various laws which were insulting and unjust to the Presbyterian part of the nation. The most foolish of them was this Act: 'All ministers entering in or since the year 1649, at which time patronages were abolished, are declared to have no right to benefice, stipend, manse or glebe, for this year 1662, or hereafter; but their kirks to be vacant, unless they receive presentation from the patron, and collation from the bishop.' The clergy against whom this enactment was directed, at first took no notice of it; but the Privy Council decided to enforce compliance. The immediate result was one of those great incidents which nations remember with a legitimate pride. Upwards of three hundred of the ministers sacrificed their worldly all, rather than be untrue

to their principles. During the closing months of the year 1662, over large districts throughout all the Lowlands of Scotland, the parish churches were shut, and the sounds of public worship on the Lord's Day unheard. Edinburgh was left with a single minister, Mr Robert Lawrie of the Tron Church, who, on account of his conformity to Episcopacy, was nicknamed the 'Nest Egg.' The men thus driven out of their charges composed the great body of the younger and most energetic portion of the clergy, and had gained the respect and affection of their flocks. Their places had to be supplied; and this could only be done with men in all respects inferior to their predecessors.

These new incumbents, or curates, as they were termed, were, in fact, probably the worst set of clergymen which the Protestant Church in Scotland has ever had. They were, for the most part, needy, ignorant young lads, hurriedly drawn from the northern parts of the kingdom, and thrust into positions for which they had no intellectual, moral, or religious qualifications. More difficult positions to fill, however, than those assigned them can scarcely be conceived. Placed between hostile parishioners, despising and hating them, frequently insulting and occasionally assaulting them, and civil and ecclesiastical superiors, commanding and constraining them to act as informers against the disaffected and to aid in carrying out oppressive measures, they would have required the most angelic gentleness to gain the affections of the former, the most heroic courage to resist the tyranny of the latter, and to mediate between the parties a wisdom altogether superhuman. Being only what they were, they, of course, sided with their own supporters. Many of them, having probably no better society, consorted with 'the baser sort of the gentry,' and fell into the vicious habits so prevalent at this time.

The expulsion of the ministers and the intrusion of the curates led to the parish churches being almost deserted, and to multitudes attending religious services, conducted by the ejected

clergy in their own houses or in the open air. How was this fact to be dealt with? Middleton was not required to consider it, for he was supplanted by Lauderdale and replaced by one of Lauderdale's faction, the Earl of Rothes. Lauderdale had been a leading man among the Covenanters. Had he died before the Restoration, or even before 1663, his life would probably have been in *The Scots Worthies*, where it might have been a suitable companion picture to that of the Earl of Loudon. He lived too long, however, to have his name handed down to us as that of a saint. He is known to us instead as what he really was, a most unscrupulous and depraved man, hypocritical, avaricious, licentious, a mass of vices associated with the abilities most fitted to make them dangerous and disastrous—a man whose soul was far more repulsive than his body was uncouth. During the last twenty years of his life, he above all men was a shame and curse to Scotland. Rothes was the son of the celebrated Covenanting Earl. Both father and son were bad men. The former made great religious professions and kept on good terms with the clergy, but was a secret libertine. The latter was openly dissolute. He was a favourite with the king, and resembled him both in person and character. He had alike the genial qualities of Charles and his shameful vices. The fall of Middleton and the rise of Lauderdale and Rothes promised little good, and brought none.

The history which we have to consider is from this point onwards to the Revolution very easy to understand. It is, on the one side, a continuous series of attempts made by the government to force an ecclesiastical system of a kind inconsistent either with civil or religious liberty on a people to whom it was obnoxious; and, on the other side, the series of acts by which that people resisted the pressure so long, so uninterruptedly, and so heavily brought to bear on them. The government during the whole of this time treated the Presbyterian community as if it were a piece of iron which had to be beaten into a particular shape, and it transformed itself, as it

were, into a hammer and anvil for the purpose; and the question of questions for Scotland was just this: Will hammer and anvil shape the iron, or will the iron break the hammer and anvil? On a people so circumstanced the chief demand is that it be firm, tenacious, patient, or what the oppressor will call stubborn, *dour*. That the Covenanters were so, is their glory.

As the history of the period is so simple, the rapid glance along its course, which is all that my time permits me to give, may be sufficient to shew its general drift. It was resolved to compel attendance on the services of the Episcopal clergy. Accordingly, the parliament of 1663 decreed as follows: 'Hereby it is ordained, that such as ordinarily absent themselves from their parish kirks on the Lord's Day incur these penalties: each nobleman, gentleman, and heritor, the loss of a fourth of each year's rent; and each yeoman or tenant, the loss of such a part of their movables as the Lords of Council shall modify, not exceeding a fourth; and every burgess his liberty, and the fourth of his movables; and the Council is to execute this Act against all who, after admonition of the minister before two sufficient witnesses, and by him so attested, shall be given up to them, with power to them to inflict further corporal pains, as they shall judge necessary, and to do every other thing for procuring obedience to this Act, and for the executing thereof.' The Council was quite willing to try its utmost to execute the Act; indeed, thought it not comprehensive enough. It said nothing about women, who then as now formed the largest portion of most religious assemblies, and nothing about the ejected clergy, whose devotions and instructions were preferred to those of the 'curates.' The Council, therefore, supplemented it by resolving that husbands were to be held responsible for the church attendance of their wives, and by enacting that no recusant minister should reside within twenty miles of his old parish, six miles of Edinburgh or any cathedral town, or three miles of any royal burgh, on pain of being treated as a seditious person. With these appendices

of the Privy Council, the Act of Parliament was not badly entitled to its familiar designation of 'the Bishops' drag-net.'

The penal legislation needed by the new ecclesiastical establishment seemed now tolerably complete. The next problem was how to apply it so as to secure the end its authors desired. This was soon seen to be a most difficult problem. The Privy Council, Court of Justiciary, and lower tribunals were overburdened with the additional work the new legislation imposed upon them. The Court of High Commission was revived to deal with ecclesiastical offenders, but the powers given to it were so large and so indefinite, its proceedings were so harsh, and it was altogether so unpopular, that it had speedily to be suppressed. Recourse had to be taken to military law and military force. Troops of soldiers, under the command of a fierce and drunken officer, Sir James Turner, were sent to punish the disaffected Remonstrants of the south-west, and, as was admitted some years afterwards by the Privy Council itself, they conducted themselves in the most lawless and barbarous manner, fining and plundering promiscuously in whole parishes where there were no persons accused. Their severities occasioned the insurrection called the Western Rising, which broke out on the 12th of November 1666, at Dalry in Galloway, and was completely crushed down on the 28th of that month at Rullion Green. Sir Thomas Dalziel, with his three thousand 'well-appointed horse and foot,' took four or five hours of that 'fair frosty day' before he could break and scatter the nine hundred almost undisciplined and ill-armed men commanded by Colonel Wallace. The eagerness shewn by the peasants of the neighbourhood to capture or kill the fugitives was some evidence that the revolt was premature, and also that Mid-Lothian was far from as warmly Presbyterian in 1666 as it had been not very long before. The prisoners were mercilessly treated by the government. None shewed themselves more cruel and revengeful than the Archbishops of St Andrews and

Glasgow. None—it is right to add—shewed himself more humane than Dr Wishart, the Bishop of Edinburgh. He had been barbarously persecuted by the Covenanters in their day of power, and yet he not only urged that the prisoners should be forgiven, but daily supplied them with provisions.

The severities which had caused the insurrection were for a time continued, and even increased and extended. Sir Thomas Dalziel, a man of the sternest stamp, whose reputation as a soldier had been gained by fighting for the Czar against Turks and Tartars, and whose fanaticism for the royal cause almost amounted to frenzy, was sent into the west with his forces, in order to compel the people of Ayrshire and Dumfriesshire to attend their parish churches. He did his work of violence and extortion with zeal and thoroughness, and cut his mark so very deep on these counties that it is hardly yet effaced. It is admitted that he filled the churches.

The fall of Clarendon in England was followed by a change for the better in Scotland. Rothes was dismissed from office; Sharp had to confine himself to his diocese; the expostulations of Leighton and others had some effect on the king; worthy men like the Earl of Tweeddale and Sir Robert Murray acquired an influence in the conduct of affairs. About forty of the outed ministers who had lived peaceably were indulged, as it was termed, or allowed to go back to their charges, on condition of not discussing public questions. Many of them were among the most esteemed; two of them, Robert Douglas and George Hutcheson, were among the most eminent of the Presbyterian ministers; but by a large number of people their acceptance of the Indulgence was regarded as a base compliance with a sinful course of action. On the other hand, Archbishop Burnet of Glasgow and many of the Episcopal clergy were enraged because the Indulgence allowed benefices to be held without a direct acknowledgment of the authority of the bishops. Burnet pushed his opposition to the measure so far that he got ejected himself. Leighton was put in his place, with permission to

attempt to bring about an accommodation between the two conflicting parties.

Accordingly, in the year 1670, there was much negotiating between Leighton and the most considerate and reasonable of the Episcopalian clergy on the one side, and the Presbyterian ministers on the other, with a view to agreement on a scheme of comprehension. There was no difficulty as to the mode of worship, the bishops having in that respect introduced no innovations of consequence. The difficulty was as to bishops themselves. Leighton was willing that they should be little more than perpetual Moderators of the Church courts; that Presbyterians by conviction should not be required to renounce their opinion about Church government; that intrants should be ordained at the parish churches and not at the cathedrals; and at their admissions should not be engaged to any canonical oath. Leighton failed to bring about the result which he desired. The Presbyterian brethren were not prepared to concede even the requirements in his plan. Doubtless, they had little confidence that what was promised in it would be performed, even if they did accept. Leighton could be implicitly trusted so far as his power went, but to depend on the king's sanction being given merely because it had been pledged, was to trust to a reed very likely to break and wound the hand which leaned on it. Sharp and most of the bishops were keenly opposed to a scheme which implied their loss of so much power and dignity. Leighton was sorely disappointed. It was not long before he renewed a former request to the king to be allowed to resign. With much difficulty he obtained the royal permission; and with great thankfulness he retired to spend the rest of his years in study and devotion at Broadhurst in Sussex.

The lull in the storm was brief and partial. Lauderdale was the real master of the situation, and he had other ends in view than the peace of the Church or the good of the nation. Under his leading, the Parliament of 1670 passed several atrocious Acts

against conventicles. Death and confiscation of goods for whoever preached at them; ruinous fines for whoever attended them; imprisonment or banishment for all who refused to reveal what they knew regarding them; five hundred merks reward to any one who captured a conventicle preacher; and severe penalties for having a child baptised by an outed minister, or for being absent for three successive Sabbaths from the parish church, were the terrors now fulminated by law over the land. There was no slackness in the application of the law. Magistrates were held responsible for conventicles within their burghs. Heritors were punished for meetings on their grounds. Heads of households had to answer for the church attendance of their dependants. Arbitrary and enormous fines were laid upon offending individuals and districts accounted disaffected. They were a most lucrative source of revenue to Lauderdale and his associates, who fattened and rioted on the miseries of their country. Persons who failed to appear when cited by the Council were *intercommuned* or outlawed. In 1675, letters of intercommuning were issued against one hundred individuals. To give food, drink, or shelter to those thus excommunicated, or to hold intercourse with them by word or writing, was a criminal offence. Then, as if worthily to crown all this, Lauderdale, in 1678, actually let loose on the West some ten thousand soldiers, of whom six or seven thousand were Highland clansmen. For three months the Highlanders pillaged at pleasure. They might have done so longer had they not, fortunately perhaps, been unable not only to distinguish between *meum* and *tuum*, but between the friends and enemies of the government. The wonder is, considering the animosity which then existed between Highlanders and Lowlanders, that they did not murder as well as plunder.

And yet, notwithstanding all these devices and efforts of the government, conventicles were not put down. On the contrary, the very means employed to suppress them converted them into truly formidable assemblages. Small private meet-

ings, little local gatherings, had to be abandoned; but in their place sprang up large armed conventicles to which people came from great distances, at which many wore weapons and were ready to repel force with force, and which were addressed only by the most resolute of the Covenanting preachers—men who saw in King Charles and his ministers only the enemies of King Jesus—who would hear of no compromises, who regarded the indulged as traitors, and attendance on their ministry as a sin, and in whose discourses pathetic and fervent offers of the Gospel were mingled with stern denunciations of their rulers and the prelates. Conventicles of this sort were found to have strong attractions. A passion for their excitements grew up and spread. No government, of course, can be reasonably blamed for attempting to suppress armed conventicles. The condemnation of the government of Charles II. is that it so acted as to create them.

The tempers of the persecuted had by this time become embittered and dangerous. The Covenanters were from the first, on the whole, a stern and harsh race of religionists. They never acknowledged, either in theory or practice, the principle of toleration of others, although they perceived so clearly their own right to liberty. In the days of their ascendency they had slaughtered, imprisoned, and despoiled their opponents, on the ground that it was a plain dictate both of Scripture and of conscience that those who resisted the cause of Christ should be punished by the law. The Protesters, in particular, had always vehemently contended against leniency towards non-Covenanters. It was, accordingly, only too natural that many of the harassed field-conventiclers should come to the conclusion that their persecutors might righteously be cut off without law, and that no mercy ought to be shewn to the active enemies of the truth. It was by a band of men possessed with this conviction that Archbishop Sharp was murdered on Magus Moor, near St Andrews, on 3d May 1679.

No person was so abhorred by the Covenanters as the

Primate. They believed him to have basely betrayed the Presbyterian Church; to have been the chief instigator of the cruel measures taken against the faithful; to be a sorcerer and a man of flagitious life. In this belief there was much exaggeration. He meanly deserted the Presbyterian cause, but proof is wanting that he betrayed it. He took a prominent part in the enactment and execution of the laws passed against the Covenanters, but his influence in this connection was not nearly so great as that of several of the lay lords. The history of the period would probably have been little different if he had never been born. His private life was irreproachable; the statements to the contrary are plainly calumnious fabrications. He was not a moral monster; nor was he a man to be morally admired. He was self-seeking, scheming, unforgiving; he was too pliant where principle was concerned, and too persistent where mere interest was concerned; he fawned on the strong, and was unsympathetic towards the weak. His assassination had been attempted as early as 1668 by a fanatic named Mitchell; and one of the individuals who took part in his murder on Magus Moor confessed to have twice previously sought an opportunity to slay him. The circumstances connected with that murder are known in their minute details, but willingly we turn away from so foul a deed so foully done. The assassins—of whom Hackston of Rathillet and his brother-in-law, Balfour of Kinloch, better known as Burley, were the leaders—escaped to the West and joined themselves to those who approved of their action.

On the 29th of May—the anniversary of the Restoration—some eighty horsemen, headed by Robert Hamilton, brother of Sir William Hamilton of Preston, entered Rutherglen, extinguished the bonfires blazing in honour of the king, denounced and burned the Acts of Parliament in favour of Episcopacy, and affixed to the market-cross a document entitled 'The Declaration and Testimony of the true Presby-

terian Party in Scotland.' Three days afterwards—June 1—these and other armed men to the number of several hundreds, among whom some, such as Hackston, Balfour, Hall of Haughhead, and young William Cleland, possessed decided capacity for fighting, were at a large conventicle at Drumclog, when John Graham of Claverhouse with his dragoons came upon them. But, as he himself writes, his meeting with them was 'very little to his advantage.' Although a trained soldier, he was new to this kind of work—probably underrated the martial qualities of his opponents—certainly fought rashly and in ignorance of the nature of the ground—and was outgeneraled, and so badly beaten, that he had to flee on a wounded horse, hotly pursued, leaving thirty-six troopers dead, while the Covenanters lost only three of their number. Mr Robert Hamilton, who commanded the Covenanters, was of quite the same way of thinking as the murderers of Sharp. It appeared to him to be plainly the Divine will that 'Babel's brats' should be destroyed. He put to death with his own hand one of the prisoners, and was greatly grieved that, contrary to his express orders, five others were let go. The Covenanters, hopeful that the hour of deliverance was near, flocked from all sides to his standard. Ere a week elapsed, he had, according to his own account, 'betwixt five and six thousand horse and foot drawn up on the moor besouth Glasgow, all as one man and of one mind, to own the Rugland testimony against all opposers.' They were not long 'as one man, and of one mind.' Bitter dissensions broke out among them regarding the Indulgence, although none of the indulged ministers joined them. Their camp was a scene of ecclesiastical wrangling. They appear to have been on the point of breaking up into two parties and separating, when they learned that the Duke of Monmouth, with an army twice as strong as their own in numbers, and vastly superior in all military respects, was close at hand. No one among them, probably, was capable of handling with soldierly efficiency so large a body of men as

seven or eight thousand. Mr Hamilton, their nominal commander-in-chief, was certainly quite incompetent for such a task. Yet he must have had a strong expectation of victory, seeing that he allowed a banner to be carried which bore on it in scarlet letters the words, 'No quarter for the active enemies of the Covenant,' and had a large gibbet erected in the midst of his camp, with a cartful of new ropes at the foot of it. No opportunity, however, presented itself either for the refusal of quarter or the use of the gibbet and rope. The Covenanters acted at Bothwell with such a want of sense and vigour, that, had it not been for the brave fighting of the three hundred under Hackston at the bridge, the affair of June 22, 1679, might have been called a rout, but could not have been called a battle. Had the merciless Dalziel, and not the humane Monmouth, commanded the royal forces, it would in all probability have been a massacre. About four hundred persons were slain in flight; above a thousand were taken prisoners, of whom seven were executed, while the others were confined for months in the Greyfriars Churchyard; and then those who consented to acknowledge the rising in which they had been engaged as rebellion, and to promise to keep the peace in future, were released, while those who refused were shipped off to the plantations.

The schism which was on the point of breaking out at Bothwell, split altogether the Covenanting ranks soon afterwards, and was widened and aggravated by the grant of a new indulgence on terms which none of the extreme party could regard without abhorrence. This party now stood strictly and sternly apart from those of more moderate views, and uncompromisingly proclaimed and carried out its own principles. Donald Cargill was its oldest leader; Richard Cameron, his son in the faith, supported it with a fervent zeal and heroic courage which led to its being called *Cameronian;* young James Renwick caught up its banner when it dropped from Cameron's dying hand, and guided its Secret Societies with a rare genius for organisation and government.

Never did men cling more consistently and tenaciously to their creed, or suffer more for the sake of conscience than the members of this party—the Hillmen, the Wanderers, the Faithful Remnant, the Wild Whigs, the Cameronians, &c., as they were variously designated. Whatever may have been their faults, their fidelity to conviction has been seldom equalled in the history of the world. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt as to the chief source of their steadfastness and strength. It is impossible to read the reports of their sermons, or any of the writings which they penned, without being impressed by the obvious sincerity, thoroughness, and assuredness of their faith in God and Christ—by the directness, self-consciousness, and closeness of their sense of communion and personal relationship to Jehovah. There may be differences of opinion as to how far their piety was at various points enlightened, but a denial that their piety was singularly real and operative must be traceable either to ignorance or to religious unsusceptibility.

They were not content merely to resist certain measures and defy certain commands of the government. They entirely renounced allegiance to it. They held themselves to be bound by none of its laws. They declared war against it. They proclaimed that the king, by his covenant-breaking, vicious life, and tyrannical rule, had forfeited the throne. They taught that he and other persecutors might justly be put to death. Hackston of Rathillet, until his capture at Ayrsmoss, was a leading man among them, the honoured companion of Cameron and Cargill. Their preachers hesitated not to represent God as calling upon persons of all ranks and classes to imitate Jael and Ehud, by executing judgment on the wicked rulers of the time. Mr Forman expressed the same doctrine clearly and concisely by an inscription on his knife: 'This is to cut the throats of tyrants.' Most of the party were willing to die rather than acknowledge the killing of Sharp to have been murder, or that it would be a crime to kill the king and his brother.

These resolute men took the steps which they considered requisite to make known their position towards the government. When Hall of Haughhead was killed in a scuffle at Queensferry, 3d June 1680, there was found on his person an unsigned paper, the rough draft of a public declaration, in which the king and his associates in the government were solemnly rejected, monarchy repudiated, and an administration of God-fearing judges proposed. On the 21st of the same month, twenty men, amongst whom were Donald Cargill, Richard Cameron and his brother, and Hackston, entered the old burgh of Sanquhar on horseback, rode with drawn swords to the cross, and there proclaimed: 'We, for ourselves and all that will adhere to us, the representatives of the true Presbyterian Church and covenanted nation of Scotland, do, by these presents, disown Charles Stuart, who has been reigning, or rather tyrannising, on the throne of Britain these years bygone, as having any right, title to, or interest in the crown of Scotland, or government, as forfeited several years since, by his perjury and breach of Covenant with God and His Kirk, and by his tyranny and breach of the fundamental rules of government in matters civil. . . . Also we declare a war with such a tyrant and usurper, and all the men of these practices, as enemies to our Lord Jesus Christ and His cause and covenant. . . . And we hope, after this, none will blame us, or offend at our rewarding those that are against us as they have done to us, as the Lord gives opportunity.' Just a month afterwards—July 22—Cameron was slain and Hackston taken prisoner by the dragoons of Bruce of Earlshall at Ayrsmoss. Two months later, at Torwood in Stirlingshire, Cargill 'excommunicated, cast out of the true Church, and delivered up unto Satan,' King Charles, the Duke of York, the Duke of Monmouth, the Duke of Lauderdale, the Duke of Rothes, Sir George Mackenzie (King's Advocate), and Thomas Dalziel of Binns. In January 1682, a band of fifty armed Society men entered Lanark, burned the Test and Succession

Acts, and published a declaration of their principles. In November 1684, a celebrated Apologetic Declaration was affixed to several market-crosses and parish churches in Galloway, Dumfriesshire, Ayrshire, and Lanarkshire, in which warning was given that all who took part in the work of persecution would be regarded as enemies to God and His covenanted work, and punished as such. 'Let not any think that (our God assisting us) we will be so slack-handed in time coming to put matters in execution, as heretofore we have been.' 'Call to your remembrance, all that is in peril is not lost, and all that is delayed is not forgiven.'

The strict Covenanters looked upon those Presbyterians who were not prepared to go the same length as themselves as time-serving and hypocritical. They denounced the indulged ministers more frequently and more severely than the curates. They represented attendance at their meetings as a sin no less ruinous to the soul than theft or adultery. This was just what was to be expected from men with their convictions and in their circumstances. We ought, however, to beware of being misled, as many have been, by their denunciations of the more moderate brethren. The indulged ministers may have felt quite as conscientiously that the preachers who held armed conventicles and declared war against the government were going too far, as these preachers felt that the ministers did not go far enough. There was need for both parties. Just as the Italy of our own generation required, in order to obtain her unity and liberty, not only uncompromising and heroic enthusiasts like Mazzini and Garibaldi, not only martyrs like Ugo Bassi and the brothers Bandieri, but watchful, calculating, and prudent politicians like Cavour and his friends, so the Scotland of the Restoration period needed, in order that she might be prepared for and profited by the Revolution epoch, alike her idealists and her moderates. The wandering Hillmen rendered services which well deserve national gratitude; but if all the Presbyterians of Scotland had been as they, Scottish Presbyterianism

would have rashly taken up the sword, and might have perished by the sword. It is right to remember what we owe to them for having resisted unto death the encroachments of the Civil Power on the rights of the Church and the tyranny of the king over the community; but it is not right to forget that they also strove for much which was unjust and unattainable. Cargill, Cameron, Renwick, and their followers, entertained not a doubt that it was God's will that all in these lands, from the king to the peasant, should be made subject to the Covenants; they had no firmer conviction. Who can believe so now? If the course of Divine Providence, as traceable in the history of the last two hundred years, affords any indication of the Divine will, *that* was *not* the Divine will. To have imposed these Covenants on the nation at the Revolution, or at any period since the Revolution, could manifestly have only led to wrongs and cruelties as great as were those against which the Covenanters protested and struggled.

Charles II. died February 6, 1685. Few men have had such opportunities of conferring happiness on others, and leaving behind him a loved and honoured name, and few men have been more richly endowed with the qualities fitted to secure popularity and affection; but through yielding to self-indulgence, and allowing the lusts of the flesh to overrule the higher principles of the spirit, he so wasted his advantages, so misused his gifts, so degenerated in nature, so sank into the slough of vice, that it is hard to find in history a life more painful to contemplate, more ignoble, depraved, and mischievous than his. The last year of his reign was, perhaps, that during which the persecuted Presbyterians of Scotland suffered most. Things came to such a pass that the most awful of judicial functions, along with complete executive power, was intrusted to common soldiers. On mere suspicion, men could be arrested in the fields or on the highways by the humblest agents of the government, and, on refusal or failure to answer in a particular way certain questions, immediately shot. The transference of

the sceptre to the hands of his brother, James VII., brought little improvement. The three years of this monarch's reign were also 'killing times.' The Acts of indemnity and of toleration which he published did not prevent, and were not meant to prevent, the slaughter of Cameronians. Claverhouse, Grierson of Lagg, Bruce of Earlshall, and others, engaged in that work with an activity and rigour which caused them to be regarded as almost demons incarnate. That much which passes for history in regard both to the persecutors and the persecuted has no claim to the character must, I believe, be admitted. The loads of martyrological tradition collected by Wodrow and other writers require to be far more thoroughly and critically examined and weighed than they have yet been before historians can safely use them. The common estimate of their historical worth appears to me to be far too high. Leaving them altogether aside, however, there remains ample evidence in the official records of the government itself, and in the still extant letters of its agents and officers, that the violence inflicted and the suffering endured in this period of persecution were enormous.

The hour of deliverance came at length. With the Revolution, night fled and day appeared. The main cause of the Revolution was neither the sufferings nor the strivings of the Presbyterians in Scotland or the Nonconformists in England. It was fear of the spread and triumph of Romanism. The nation bore with strange equanimity the evils inflicted by the last two Stuart kings so long and in so far as they were wrought in support of the arbitrary personal power of the monarch and in favour of Episcopacy; but as soon as there appeared to be serious danger of the Royal Supremacy being applied to the establishment of Romanism, all classes of the people arose in determined antagonism, combining their powers and efforts with wonderful rapidity, and with a force so irresistible that William of Orange, instead of having to cut his way to the throne of Britain, had merely to march to it in

a triumphal procession. As soon as the Church of England, alarmed at the measures taken by James in favour of Romanism, turned suddenly and in its collective strength against him, his fate was sealed. The action then taken by the Church of England was what more than anything else insured the fall of Episcopacy and the rise of Presbytery a second time in Scotland. Even in Scotland, hatred of Romanism was a much stronger passion than love of Presbytery; immeasurably stronger than admiration of the Covenants. The most servile courtiers and cruel persecutors among the Scottish nobles and judges shewed an independence and sensitiveness in regard to Acts and measures constructively favouring Romanism which were little to have been anticipated. The example of Edinburgh itself is instructive. Throughout the whole period of the persecution it sided with the Anti-Covenanters, although the execution of a sufferer like young M'Kail might cause an evanescent and exceptional outburst of human sympathy. It turned out howling mobs to insult the prisoners brought into it after the battles of Rullion Green and Bothwell Bridge. At the same time, it was intensely Protestant, or, at least, intensely Anti-Romanist. Neither the presence of the Duke of York nor fear of the fury of General Dalziel could keep its students, aided by its apprentices, from burning an effigy of the Pope; its baker-boys would pelt with mud a pervert Countess of Perth, and a mild attempt of the authorities at punishment of the offence was followed by manifestations of resentment which might have been more usefully displayed in rescuing a martyr at the Grassmarket. Long noted as one of the most turbulent towns of Europe, it was exceptionally quiet from 1660 to 1690; but its one great riot during the time was on occasion of the sacking and demolition of the Chapel-Royal at Holyrood, into which James had introduced Roman Catholic worship. The nation was resolved not even to tolerate Romanism. James was resolved not only to tolerate but to favour it. Being the weaker party, he fell.

On the fall of James, the outraged Covenanters and oppressed peasantry of the west of Scotland rose in mobs and drove the Episcopal clergy from their parishes. This 'rabbling of the curates' began on Christmas Day, 1688, and lasted for some months. About two hundred persons were thus expelled. No lives were lost; but this must rather be ascribed to the curates having almost no support, and consequently making scarcely any resistance, than to the self-restraint of the rioters. In order not to judge too harshly the 'rabbling of the curates' in 1688, we must remember the ejection of the ministers in 1661; but in order not to judge of it too leniently, we must also remember that the ejection of the ministers had been itself preceded by the expulsion of the Episcopal clergy in 1639, and that one reason why there were so few Non-Covenanters in certain districts of the West was that the war-committees of the Covenanters in 1640 had driven so many of them away and left them nothing to which to return.

During the whole period which has been under our consideration, the economical resources of the country, as well as literature, science, and art, were almost entirely neglected. Yet we shall err, I believe, if we deem it to have been either an unnecessary or unfruitful period. Nations, like individuals, cannot live by bread alone, or by the truths of science and the comforts and charms of art alone. Nations, like individuals, if they will only look thoughtfully over their histories, will not fail to acknowledge that the times which they could least have spared have been their times of affliction.