ST ANDREWS

IN 1645-46

BY

D. R. KERR

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS
EDINBURGH AND LONDON
MDCCCXCV

PREFACE.

THE following pages consist of the St Andrews University Rector's Prize Essay. The object of the Essay was the collection of facts regarding St Andrews during an interesting period of the city's history. The Essay was based on authorities dating not later than one hundred years subsequent to 1646, but in revision the liberty has been taken of adding one or two particulars, for the sake of completeness, from authorities somewhat more

recent. That the Essay should have merited the place given it was the most that the writer could have desired: that it should have received at the suggestion of Dr Williamson, the learned adjudicator, and through the generosity of Lord Bute, Rector of the University, its present permanent form, is an honour, the appreciation of which can be but partially expressed. The writer's hopes will be realised if in these pages is found some useful addition to the increasing historical literature of St Andrews.

August 1895.

CONTENTS.

I.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

ST ANDREWS IN 1645-46.

I.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

IN the first days of 1645 the affairs of Scotland, through a course of rapid and important events, had passed from a state of perplexing hesitancy into one of clear and determined issues. The Presbyterian party—the party undoubtedly in power, the party dominating Church and State—had ceased to look longer to the King for assistance in their anxious attempts to reconcile their spiritual loyalty with their loyalty temporal. In June 1643 the

Scottish Parliament, for the first time in the history of the country—if we except the precedent which its leaders claimed—met without the King's commission. Its transactions at the outset had been nominally loyal, but as the course of events in the South proceeded, open hostility to the King had been declared by the levying of an army for the aid of the forces of the English Parliament. In the following year both Parliament and General Assembly had met with commission from the King, and in perfect harmony had worked for the protection of Presbyterian interests against the King's hostility. Three Scottish armies were in the field. One was engaged in the suppression of the Irish Rebellion, another was in England under the veteran Earl of Leven, and a third was employed in the subjection of the Royalist districts at home. Compromise had been lost sight of,

and all hopes were set upon a victorious campaign.[1]

Clear and determined, however, as the issues before them had become, there was in the prospects of the two hostile parties in the State no small degree of dubiety. There was an evenness and balance in the position which, while affording to neither side a cause for victorious vaunting, was imbittering tenfold the rage of the partisans, presaging a conclusion to the struggle whose only price could be bloodshed and devastation. Both parties had had their successes. In the early part of 1644, Argyll had completely crushed the Royalist rising in the North under Lord Huntly.[2] In the south of Scotland the Marquis of Montrose, who with the Royalists of Westmoreland had captured Dumfries for the King, had been somewhat ignominiously driven

[1] Guthrie's Memoirs, pp. 130, 131, 142. [2] Ibid., pp. 150-152.

out of that town by a Presbyterian force under the Sheriff of Teviotdale. But later in the same year the receding tide of Royalist fortune had turned. Montrose, after his meagre success in the King's cause in the South, had suddenly appeared with a King's commission in the Highlands of Perthshire, and with a force gathered from the glens of Badenoch and Athole, and augmented by a newly landed band of Irish, had rapidly organised an army sufficiently strong to maintain for some time the King's interests in Scotland. With this army he had engaged and routed the rabble of raw burghers who had been sent out to meet him at Tibbermuir, had marched from Perthshire to Aberdeen, from Aberdeen to Perthshire, with such success and mastery of manœuvre as brightened awhile the declining fortunes of the King in England.[1]

[1] Guth. Mem., pp. 152-154, 161-163; Monteth's History of the Troubles, pp. 163, 164, 169-173.

To the Presbyterians the sudden triumphs of Montrose were alarming and disconcerting. Out of sullen dejection he had raised the Royalist party in Scotland to spirited and powerful opposition. His fleet-footed Celtic army had come to be feared. It is evident, from the tardy movements of the Presbyterian generals, that they could not trust their levies to withstand in open contest the fierce cateran who composed the Royalist force. But the triumph of the King's cause in Scotland was far from complete. The great mass of the people remained Presbyterian. Saving a few isolated cases of "malignancy," such as the censures of a presbytery could quell, we see almost nothing of rejoicing in the Lowlands at the King's success. The people of the Lowlands loved Presbyterianism, and looked with no kindliness on the triumph of its enemies. It was a further element of uncertainty added to the position that the Royal-

ists had yet to meet the flower of the Presbyterian forces. The Scottish Parliament had sent its veteran troops into Ireland and England. Among these troops were valour, experience, and skill unknown in the hastily levied forces in Scotland. In England also were the Parliament's best generals. Montrose, who had Marshal Leslie for his first tutor in war, and had so lately witnessed the triumph of the Scottish allies at Marston Moor, must have seen, in the Earl of Leven and his son, generalship equal, in point of adroitness at least, to his own, combined with experience the most thorough that Europe could then afford to the student of warfare. The King's cause, despite its late series of triumphs, ultimately rested on the result of some future day when Montrose should meet the Leslies, and the Highlanders of Badenoch and Athole engage the veterans of the Low Countries.

Such, then, was something like the position of the rival parties in Scotland,—the Royalists triumphing for the moment, the Presbyterians, on the other hand, by virtue of the sympathies of the common people and their strong reserve of military forces, still very powerful.

Under these critical circumstances the Scottish Parliament met at Edinburgh on January 2, 1645. December had seen Montrose's ravages of Argyleshire and the flight of his rival from Inverary. Accordingly, among the first enactments of the Parliament are the forfeiture of the titles of Montrose and the confiscation of his estates. These proceedings against Montrose can only be considered as a declaration that the Parliament meant to regard him as a traitor, and would treat him as such should he ever fall into its power. Otherwise they were perfectly futile. To confiscate the estates of a general who had half the kingdom under the

terror of his sword was merely to threaten where they had failed to hurt.[1]

A much more serious step taken by the Parliament was the imposition of an excise on certain goods for the purpose of raising the necessary moneys for the maintenance of the war. When this excise had first been proposed in the previous year, so great had been the resentment aroused that a serious rupture between the people and the Parliament had seemed almost at hand. Now, however, when the excise was ratified, the public by its silence evidently admitted its necessity. Doubtless the terror inspired by the Highland army accounted for this. The people must have learned by this time that the safety of their Church, and not less of their homes, depended on an efficient and regularly paid army.[2]

The Parliament's action, it must be said, was

[1] Guth. Mem., p. 175. [2] Ibid., pp. 144, 145, 176.

in certain directions for a time paralysed by the uncertainty of affairs in the South. Negotiations regarding peace were taking place between the English Parliament and the King, while at the same time Montrose, either with no belief in the sincerity of these negotiations, or with a view to strengthen the King's position whatever might be their outcome, was ravaging the west of Scotland. The inevitable disagreement between Cromwell and Manchester had at length arisen and was dividing the Parliament camp. But before the Parliament had risen the position in England had become clearer. The rupture between Cromwell and Manchester had resulted in the establishment of the New Model. The hopeless controversy at Uxbridge also had come to an end, and had left King and Parliament in opposition still more bitter and uncompromising. How the Presbyterians in Scotland exactly regarded these new developments it is

difficult to determine. With the Independency of Cromwell they could have had little sympathy, and yet they must have feared the apathy and monarchism of Manchester. With both these leaders they had principles in common, but only to a limited extent. In neither Cromwell nor Manchester did they find a leader. The Presbyterians sought only the ascendency of Presbyterianism. Cromwell and Manchester fought for something very different. With regard to the Treaty of Uxbridge, the Presbyterians doubtless desired peace, but not at any cost — certainly not at the expense of their longed-for uniformity of Presbyterian church government. Their Commissioners were received with no graciousness by the King at the time, and to them he afterwards attributed much of the failure of his negotiations for peace. But whether to the stubbornness of the Presbyterians or to the King's insincerity the failure

of the Uxbridge Treaty is to be attributed can scarcely be known. Burnet sees the cause of the failure of the negotiations in the untimely victories of Montrose and the King's secret hopes of finding the salvation of his cause in Scotland.[1]

The plain course open for the Scottish Parliament was a more vigorous prosecution of the war against Montrose. In order that the Presbyterian leaders and gentlemen of influence might be at leisure to engage themselves in the war, Parliament rose in the beginning of March. Committees had been appointed for the armies in Scotland and England, and these proceeded to the various seats of war. The next few months accordingly saw Montrose and his rival generals at closer quarters than they had been for some time.[2]

[1] Monteth's Hist., pp. 183-188; The Rushworth Collection, vol. v. pt. iii. ch. 19; Burnet's Hist. of His Own Time, bk. i. pp. 38-40; Baillie's Letters, ii. p. 362; Eikôn Basilikè.

[2] Guth. Mem., p. 183.

During the session of Parliament the General Assembly also met at Edinburgh. So far as its immediate business was concerned there was much satisfaction among the Presbyterians. Baillie and Gillespie, the Scots Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly of Divines, were present, and laid before the House the projected Directory of Worship with which the Westminster Assembly had for some time been engaged. The Directory, which was to be the main instrument in establishing that uniformity of public worship for which the Presbyterians were striving, gave satisfaction to all, and was duly approved by both Assembly and Parliament. The reports of the Commissioners regarding the cause in England were also reassuring, and served to encourage the Presbyterians in the midst of their anxieties.

In the meantime Montrose had fought and

won the battle of Inverlochy, and by the renown of that engagement had attracted many recruits to his standard. He was now in the North, and on news of the approaching Presbyterian army he put his forces on the march and commenced his campaign. The two armies soon came within sight of one another; but Baillie, the Presbyterian general, declined battle, retiring to await the body of disciplined troops from Ireland which had been called home to strengthen his untrustworthy forces. Montrose thereupon kept to the Highlands and carefully watched the movements of the enemy. Thus the two armies manœuvred for a while, till at length Montrose descended on the northern division of the Presbyterian forces under Sir John Hurry, and put it to flight at the village of Auldearn.[1]

[1] Guth. Mem., pp. 178, 179, 183, 187; Monteth's Hist., pp. 197-200, 204-207.

This first result of their renewed attempt to suppress the Royalist rising was disheartening in the extreme to the Presbyterians. Their army in Scotland was daily giving evidence of its complete inability to cope with the skilfully marshalled Highlanders of Montrose. They longed, doubtless, for the Leslies, but these generals were too deeply engaged in the English war to be able to return north. The ineffectual operations in Scotland could only be continued, though faith both in army and generals was being daily shaken.

Still Fortune had favoured the Presbyterians in one instance. Shortly before the battle of Auldearn a disguised messenger on his way from the King to Montrose had been captured, and on his person had been found letters containing the King's designs on Scotland. These letters revealed that the King, hopeless of holding out much longer against his enemies

in England, purposed marching northwards to join Montrose. By this move the King hoped to force his enemies to some compromise by burdening Scotland with a war which it had not resources enough to bear. The discovery was a fortunate one for the Presbyterians, and furnished them with the further object in their operations of preventing the conjunction of the armies of the King and Montrose.[1]

About two months after the discovery of the King's letters came word of the battle of Naseby and the shattered state of the Royalist cause in the South. At this there was rejoicing throughout the Lowlands. The King's designs on Scotland were frustrated, and ere long Montrose would have to face the veterans of the Parliament army. Nevertheless Montrose continued to maintain his Sovereign's losing cause,

[1] Guth. Mem., pp. 185, 186.

and in July attacked and routed Baillie at Alford.[1]

During July and August the Parliament met twice for the management of the war. In the beginning of July a sitting was held at Stirling. The choice of Stirling instead of Edinburgh was made necessary by the outbreak of the plague in the capital. The principal business was the appointment of a levy in order to meet the increasing power of Montrose. The Parliament, however, had sat for only ten days when the dreaded plague made its appearance in Stirling. The deliberations of Parliament were in consequence interrupted and the sitting was adjourned till the 24th of July, the meeting-place to be at Perth, whither also the levies were to proceed.[2]

When the Parliament had assembled at Perth

[1] Guth. Mem., pp. 188, 189; Monteth's Hist., pp. 209, 210.
[2] Ibid., pp. 189, 190; Monteth's Hist., pp. 210, 211.

and the new army had been mustered, Montrose, who had been encamped in central Perthshire, marched upon the city with the hope of drawing the Presbyterians into battle. But the leaders of the army in the city wisely declined to trust their levies in battle so soon after the muster. Montrose thereupon marched into the counties of Kinross and Clackmannan. Here he was for some time engaged in ravaging the possessions which Argyll held in these counties. The Marquis never forgot his personal resentment in his service for his King. Having avenged himself as far as possible, he led his army in the direction of Glasgow.[1]

The army at Perth now followed in pursuit of the Royalists under the leadership of Argyll, Crawford, and Baillie. At Kilsyth the two armies came within sight of each other, and on the 15th of August the memorable engagement

[1] Guth. Mem., p. 191; Monteth's Hist., pp. 210-214, 217.

took place. The battle was pretty much a repetition of Tibbermuir. The Presbyterian forces proved themselves utterly incapable of withstanding the onslaught of the Highlanders, and their ranks broke in terrible confusion. Their losses were great, especially among the foot-soldiers, while the number of Royalists slain was comparatively trifling. The Presbyterian generals escaped, Argyll betaking himself to Edinburgh.[1]

By this engagement Montrose completely disarmed the Presbyterians and crushed for a while the spirit of resistance. He now received the open adherence of noblemen and gentlemen of influence. Glasgow, along with one or two counties and burghs, submitted to him and professed its loyalty. He could now order the liberation of his friends who had been imprisoned, and assume in reality all the

[1] Guth. Mem., pp. 192, 194; Monteth's Hist., pp. 217, 218.

powers given him by the King. At this time also came Sir Robert Spottiswood, the King's Secretary for Scotland, bringing with him a commission constituting Montrose Captain-General and Deputy-Governor of Scotland, with powers to make knights and summon parliaments.[1]

Having in accordance with his newly acquired powers issued a proclamation throughout the country, of a parliament to be held at Glasgow on October 20, Montrose marched southwards in the hope of finding the Lowlands ready to rise for the King. But nothing save disappointment and failure attended this new move. The expected rising did not take place. The Highlanders now began to desert and return to their homes, glutted, doubtless, with the plunder of Kilsyth. Lastly, Lord Aboyne and his Gordons left the army and returned to Aberdeenshire.

[1] Guth. Mem., pp. 195-197; Monteth's Hist., pp. 218-220.

If Montrose had ever studied the nature of his soldiers, he probably feared these defections from the first. His soldiers were for the greater part robbers, and hopes of booty were their chief incentives to the undertaking of a campaign of any length. Plunder was the best, if not the only, pay the Royalist general could offer them, and when this was secured, like hounds that have tasted the game, their energy in the pursuit of the war was blunted and turned to selfish inaction.[1]

Hopeless of raising in Scotland any effectual resistance to Montrose, the Presbyterians now sent entreaties to the Scots army in England to send them aid. David Leslie at once complied by marching speedily into Scotland with a strong body of horse. He marched first of all into the Lothians and there held council of war. Having acquired information as to the move-

[1] Monteth's Hist., pp. 200-203.

ments of the enemy and formed his plans, he proceeded in direct pursuit of Montrose. On the morning of the 13th of September he completely took the Royalists by surprise at Philiphaugh, about one mile from the town of Selkirk. Here Montrose had arrived on the 12th, with the intention of leading his diminished army straight to the Highlands on the following day. The Royalists did not long withstand the sudden onslaught of their enemies, and were soon overcome. To many of them quarter was promised, but victory seems to have been tarnished by a dishonourable and cruel massacre of prisoners, notwithstanding the pledges given. The more important prisoners were reserved for trial, among whom were Lords Hartfell and Ogilvy, Sir Robert Spottiswood, William Murray, brother of the Earl of Tullibardine, and Colonel Nathaniel Gordon. Montrose with several of his officers escaped and con-

trived to reach the Highlands, where with his tireless energy the defeated general at once commenced to organise a new army.[1]

Soon after the battle the gratitude of the Presbyterians was expressed in a vote to Leslie of 50,000 merks and a chain of gold. The bold and confident stroke of the Presbyterian general was indeed the deliverance of the Presbyterian cause. In a day the power of Montrose south of the Tay was shattered. That year did again see Montrose at the gates of Glasgow, but the leader of the Royalists soon returned north to disband his troops and seek retirement in the Royalist districts of the Highlands. The return of Leslie to Scotland had brought with it all the triumph that had been so long prayed for.[2]

[1] Guth. Mem., pp. 197, 201-204; Monteth's Hist., pp. 223-224.

[2] Guth. Mem., pp. 204, 205, 207-209; Monteth's Hist., pp. 226, 227.

Having remained for some time at Glasgow, while the Committee of Estates were sitting there, superintending the trial and execution of several of the prisoners taken at Philiphaugh, Leslie returned to the north of England and joined the Parliament army. The country had now opportunity of restoring itself to the conditions of peace. The remainder of the year was occupied in diplomacy and legislation.[1]

[1] Guth. Mem., pp. 209, 210.

II.

THE CITY

II.

THE CITY.

TO write a history of St Andrews continuously parallel to the important events just sketched is impossible to the present-day historian. For the greater part, the available records, with the exception of those dealing directly with the treaty held in the later months of 1645 and the Parliament of the following winter, give us very little information as to the position of St Andrews during the Civil War, or the extent to which the life and affairs of the city were influenced by the many rapid vicissitudes of that struggle. There are, however, some interesting memorials left to

us in the records of the Presbytery and in some contemporary literature which enable us to see something of the ecclesiastical, municipal, and ordinary life of the city. This is perhaps all that it is natural to expect. St Andrews, unlike its sister cities of Perth and Stirling, which constantly became important centres in all the wars of Scotland, was, from the peninsular situation of Fifeshire, out of the lines of the marchings and counter-marchings of the contending armies. All the important movements of the war, save when Montrose took the opportunity of winter to descend on Argyleshire, were mainly confined to the more northern of the midland counties and to the plains bordering on the Highlands. The only time at which the war in any seriousness drew near to St Andrews was in April 1645, when Montrose besieged Dundee; but it is very

doubtful, had that attempt been successful, if the Royalists would have crossed the Tay at that time. Perhaps no county in Scotland has so few traditions of warfare or so many memorials of peace as Fifeshire.

For the topography of St Andrews in 1645 our chief authority is James Gordon's "Plan of St Andrews in 1642." From this plan, which is a somewhat rough bird's-eye view of the town, we can see that St Andrews had all the customary characteristics of the walled town of the period. To the east, south, and west, the city was enclosed by its wall, while the natural barrier of the cliffs to the north was crowned by the Castle. The principal streets were, as now, South Street, Market Street, and North Street. Each of these streets, or ports as they were commonly called, terminated in a city gate which took its name from the

particular street to which it formed an entrance. Throughout the city, at right angles to the main streets, ran the narrow wynds and closes which divided the closely built houses into groups and formed passages from the one street to the other. Above the huddled rows of houses rose the towers of the Trinity Church and St Salvator's Chapel, indicating to the sailor as he rose above the horizon of the German Ocean, or the traveller on the distant braes of Angus, the city of the patron saint. To the east stood the dismantled towers of the Cathedral and St Regulus, in their desolation scarce a hundred years old. In the Market Street stood the little pyramid of stairs, crowned by the Market Cross, from which all public proclamations were made. Here also took place the public execution of criminals. A little to the west of the Cross, in the middle of the street, stood the Town-

house, or Tolbooth, in which were the Council-room and general prison.[1]

The boundaries of St Andrews parish were in 1645 the same as now, but only two years previously had included the entire parish of Cameron. It was only, however, in 1645 that Cameron was practically constituted as a separate parish, as it was not till the March of that year that the Presbytery received notice of the necessary Act of Parliament. The Act states that in 1641 an act had already been passed for the constitution of Cameron parish, but that the work had been several times interrupted. The Parliament accordingly deemed it necessary to ratify its former Act and urge forward the work of forming the parish. The necessity of this Act was declared to be the distance at which so many of the landward

[1] Acts of Parl., IV. p. 518. For a general plan of St Andrews during the period, see Gordon's Map, Bannatyne Miscellany, iii.

parishioners were from church. We can see that this new accommodation was highly reasonable. A still older division of the parish had taken place in 1633, when the barony of Kininmonth and certain other lands were detached from St Andrews and joined to the parish of Ceres. These divisions were wise and considerate, especially at a time when church attendance was stringently required of all parishioners.[1]

St Andrews as a burgh had existed from the time of Malcolm the Maiden, and from various subsequent Scottish kings had received charters and privileges. In 1612 it received special attention from Parliament, and the burgh as then constituted continued till 1645. The Council, according to this ratification of the burgh's constitution, was to consist of a pro-

[1] Acts of Parl., V. 1633, p. 109; Ibid., VI. 1645, p. 332; Records of Presbytery of St Andrews and Cupar, March 12, 1645.

vost, dean of Guild, four bailies, and a treasurer. In the election of magistrates the members of Council were themselves to draw up leets, from which the Archbishop of St Andrews, as overlord, was to make selection. It was further enacted that should the archbishopric be annexed to the Crown or erected into a temporalty, the right of selection was to fall to the members of the Council. We may conclude that since the abolition of Episcopacy in 1638 this right to select its own members had been exercised by the Council. The charter of 1612 also erected St Andrews into a free barony, and gave to the magistrates the right of appointing a master to the Grammar School. Twenty-nine years later, this charter, along with those of Malcolm the Maiden and several others, was ratified, and St Andrews erected anew into a Royal burgh.[1]

[1] Acts of Parl., IV. p. 518; Ibid., V. p. 523.

The University was the chief glory of the city. It was the last living remnant of the city's former greatness. It too, however, like the other ornaments of St Andrews, had felt the touch of those times of violent change. Since 1579 it had been the subject of consideration in Parliament, and several commissions had been appointed at different periods to visit the University and suggest remedies for its increasing decay. The projected reformation of 1579, principally on account of its association with Buchanan and Melville, is the most famous, and upon the lines suggested by the commissioners of that time it is evident the subsequent efforts at reformation were directed. We cannot be sure that the reformations suggested in 1579 were literally carried out,—the fact of the frequent visitations would incline us to think not,—but it is still probable that some reformation did take place,

and, as we shall see from the proceedings of a later commission, the University of 1645 must have been influenced by it.

The origin of the commission was of course the notorious decay and abuse into which the University had fallen. It would appear that men altogether unqualified held the professorships, and that the bursaries intended for the noble end of assisting needy students had passed into the hands of those who neither required nor deserved them. The University, it is evident, had fallen into ignoble decay under the rule of a vicious patronage. The recommendations of the commission were appropriately vigorous. All the professors were to be dismissed from their chairs as unqualified to teach, and new professors were to replace them after due examination before a committee of University officials. The course of study was also laid down. In St Mary's there

were to be five professors. These were to direct a course of study, to be completed in four years, which embraced studies in the Old and New Testaments, and the languages of Hebrew, Chaldaic, Syriac, and Greek. The proficiency of the students was to be tested during the four years by stated examinations. The reform was also meant to have its effect upon the Church, as it was recommended that none should be admitted to office in the Church but such as had completed the course of theological study and had passed through a strict examination by the faculty.

The reformation of the Colleges of St Leonard's and St Salvator's was recommended on the same principle. In each College there were to be a principal and four professors. The course of study was to extend over four years, and the subjects to be taught were Latin, Greek, "the precepts of Invention, Disposition,

and Elocution," the Logic of Aristotle, Ethics, Politics, and Physics. It was further recommended that every author be read in his own tongue. This accordingly required the student to study Philosophy in Greek and Latin, and Physics in Greek. For the cultivation of Eloquence and Debate, rhetorical contests were to be held in the Colleges, no doubt somewhat after the manner of the syllogistic contests at Oxford. The vacation of the Colleges was only to be during the month of September, the vacation under the then existing order being considered too long to be advantageous to the students. Special recommendations then followed. The Principal of St Salvator's was to be Professor of Medicine, and the Principal of St Leonard's Professor of the Philosophy of Plato. The studies of Law and Mathematics were to be conducted for the future in St Salvator's instead of in St Leonard's. The ordin-

ary life of the Colleges would seem to have been under the suspicion of disorderliness, as it is enjoined that the wives, children, and servants of the principals and professors shall live in the city outside of the College, exception being made in the case of such children and servants as were actual students.[1]

It would be too much, as remarked above, to say that these recommendations laid down the lines upon which the University for any length of time was subsequently conducted; but it is useful and suggestive to rehearse them in this connection, as their influence was doubtless evident in the University of 1645-46.

Since 1579 more than one commission had been appointed by Parliament to visit and report upon the state of the University. The latest of these commissions previous to 1645 was appointed in 1642. The principal members

[1] Acts of Parl., III. pp. 178-182.

of this Commission were Argyll, Lauderdale, Sir Thomas Hope of Craighall, and Robert Blair. The Commission was instructed to inspect the state of the University, to test the efficiency and doctrine of the professors, and to make arrangements for the establishment and maintenance of a library in St Mary's.

The recommendations which the Commissioners submitted to Parliament after their inspection of the University are various, and apply to the ordinary economy of the Colleges as well as to the routine of study. It was recommended that the curriculum of study be of four years. In the first year the student was to take up the studies of Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Arithmetic; in the second, Greek, Latin, and Logic; in the third, Logic, Geometry, and Aristotle's Ethics; and in the fourth, Astronomy, Geography, and Anatomy. The recommendations of the Commission of

1579, as Mr Hume Brown observes, "could only have produced a race of sciolists," and in this respect the recommendations of 1642, evidently modelled on the earlier scheme, show no improvement. The curriculum of study was, for the times, a somewhat ideal one, but crushed within the narrow limit of four years, its results could scarcely have been satisfactory. The scheme was an attempt to superimpose upon the University a line of study which its own inherent constitution and the state of education in Scotland rendered impracticable. All that we are permitted to infer is that in the few years following some effort was being made in the University to follow out the Commissioners' recommendations.

With regard to the Library, the Commissioners reported that a benefaction for this purpose had been bestowed upon the University by Alexander Henderson, at that time Rector

of Edinburgh University. The benefaction amounted to £1000,[1] and was bestowed for the purpose of increasing the existing collection and of providing suitable accommodation for the books. For the future maintenance of the Library it was recommended that a revenue be drawn from the students. The recommendations under this head are not such as to have been likely to commend the Commissioners to the esteem of the students. It was recommended that the money generally spent by students on certain "feasts" known as the "Bajan Act," "Veikes," &c., be given instead to the maintenance of the Library. Students of Divinity, with whom it had been customary to celebrate the passing of their "trials" by "feasts," suggestively named "Poculum" and "Bellaria," were to forego their celebrations and instead contribute £10.[1]

[1] Scots.

Other items of the report refer to the daily conduct of the students. They were to attend the Town Church, and after the services of the day had been concluded, to be examined in the discourse to which they had listened. The students of St Leonard's and St Salvator's were to speak "Latin at all times" on pain of censure. Gowns were to be worn both in college and in town. Recreations such as "gouffe" and archery were considered allowable, but "carding, dyceing," and the like were forbidden.[1]

Such were the recommendations of the Commission of 1642. How far they were carried out we have little or no means of knowing. It is only warrantable to suppose that the attempt to carry them out was made.

As a seat of learning, we have no evidence

[1] Documents presented to the University Commissioners, Scotland; St Andrews University.

that the University of 1645-46 had any real fame beyond Scotland. But in Scotland itself it had much of its ancient prestige as the seminary of the sons of the nobility and higher orders. The two most conspicuous men in Scotland at that time, Argyll and Montrose, had been students at St Andrews. Among the names of those attending the University at this time are those of Lord Lorn, afterwards Earl of Argyll, and Lord Ross, both of whom were to figure in the later and tragic years of the great struggle. The place which the University held in the life of the Scottish nobility gave it a position among the institutions of the country which was honourable, dignified, and influential. Judging from the roll of matriculated students, which indicates an attendance at the Colleges of considerably over two hundred, the University would appear to have been at this time, in point of number

of students, in a condition of prosperity which was never before or afterwards exceeded. The fact that Parliament so often took into consideration the affairs of the University, and so often made efforts to ensure its standing and efficiency, is a good indication of how deeply its welfare and vicissitudes affected the mind of the nation.

The most prominent name among the St Andrews professors is that of Samuel Rutherford. He had come in 1639 from his parish of Anwoth to the professorship of Divinity in St Mary's. The account of the origin of his coming to St Andrews, as given by Row the biographer of Robert Blair, is rather curious. In the previous year it appears that the General Assembly had appointed Blair to the charge of the Town Church of St Andrews. Blair, however, for reasons of his own, refused to leave his charge at Ayr, and when the As-

sembly next met he was still at Ayr in defiance of its order. He was challenged for this disobedience to the order of the Church, but to make the change more acceptable the Assembly appointed Rutherford to the vacant professorship in St Mary's. Rutherford agreed to accept the appointment, but only on condition that he was also appointed colleague to Blair in the Town Church. He further asked that he might only receive the stipend attached to his professorship. The request was granted, and Rutherford and Blair accepted their appointments.[1]

One important event in the life of Rutherford might exclude him from particular notice here. During 1645-46 he was in London. In 1643 he had been sent up with Henderson, Gillespie, Johnstone of Warriston, and others as one of the Scottish Commissioners to the Westmin-

[1] Row's Life of Robert Blair, pp. 156-159.

ster Assembly of Divines, and in connection with his duties there he remained till 1647. But his name is so associated with St Andrews from 1639 to 1662 that even during the interval of his absence in London it must be regarded as one of the most famous connected with the city. In many respects Rutherford was one of the most notable men of his time. His eloquence, courage, and sufferings for the cause of Presbyterianism had raised him to the position of a leader of the Church and, in some degree, of the people. His 'Lex Rex,' the treatise in which he attempted to state the true relations of a king and people, had become the recognised expression of the principles of the Scottish Presbyterians. As a preacher also he had become famous. His duties as professor being combined with those of an active minister, it is probable that he

was known to the people of St Andrews more as an eloquent preacher than as a teacher of theology. His preaching was passionate and vehement, evidently in keeping with his reputation as an uncompromising controversialist. Tullideph, a subsequent principal of St Leonard's, said he sometimes "thought Rutherford would have flown out of the pulpit. He had a kind of skreigh that he never heard the like."[1] With his earnestness and devotion he had the poet's sensuous imagination and subtle perception of analogies, and the gift of setting forth his strange conceits in language often beautiful and melodious. The peculiarity both of his ideas and language cannot at times be commended. This he would seem to have inherited from the generation of religious writers who preceded him. Still it is not

[1] Wodrow's Analecta, iii. p. 89.

necessary for the charitable to deny the reverence of these utterances though they may not trust them on their own lips. His language, startling and repellent as it often is, was perfectly reverent as it came from him. Rutherford's intense, subjective nature was not the one to produce an effect for effect's sake. It may be remarked that many have condemned Rutherford's imagery as unseemly and even blasphemous, who, it is more than probable, accepted the spiritual interpretation of the Song of Solomon. What has been condemned as the vice of Rutherford's religious writings was in many respects the vice of his time, and is as marked in the saintly author of 'The Temple' as in the Presbyterian divine. The life of Rutherford subsequent to 1647 was actively spent in the service of his Church. On his return from the Westminster Assembly of Divines he was raised to the Principalship

of St Mary's, which he retained till his death in 1662.[1]

The minister of the first charge in the Town Church was Robert Blair, who, after Rutherford, was probably the most notable man connected with the city. The peculiar circumstances of his coming to St Andrews we have already noticed. Blair was born in the town of Irvine in Ayrshire, and both through his father and mother was connected with the first families in the county. He studied at the University of Glasgow, and on being ordained to the ministry spent several years at Bangor in Ireland. His next charge was at Ayr, whence he removed to St Andrews. He was a man evidently of considerable power both as a scholar and preacher, and had risen

[1] Guth. Mem., pp. 63, 139, 140, 177; Row's Life of Blair, pp. 156-159; Rutherford's Letters, lx.-cclxxxvi., cccviii.-cccxxiv.; Wodrow's Analecta, iii. pp. 88-90.

rapidly to the position of a leader in the Church. He held, with strong conviction, the popular principles of his party, and entered openly into all the struggles of the Church. His autobiography, published along with his life, written by Row, his son-in-law, shows him to have been a man with much humility underlying his controversial tendencies. Like many of the religious men of his day, he was full of an emotional, introspective spirit, which sometimes went to excess in vagaries and strange beliefs. In private he seems to have been a man of kindly and gentlemanly bearing. His deference and moderation won for him the respect of the King and promotion to the office of chaplain in the Chapel Royal. When disaster afterwards came upon the Church, Blair had to endure much suffering and anxiety. He was deposed from his charge in 1661, but was allowed to live in retirement.

In great bodily sickness he died at Couston Castle, Aberdour, in 1666.[1]

An important event in the life of the city was the frequent meeting of the Presbytery of St Andrews, probably held in the Town Church. The deliberations of the Presbytery pertained to affairs within its boundaries of a character scarcely ever to be found in the proceedings of the modern Presbytery. Its business was to a great extent of an inquisitorial character. Besides the affairs connected with the management of the churches within its jurisdiction, it exercised a censorship over the morals and even the politics of the parishioners such as would in our time belong to courts much more secular. Its discussions related to everything connected in the slightest degree with the religious life of the people. It dealt authoritatively with the preaching of unsound

[1] Row's Life of Blair; Guth. Mem., pp. 37, 63, 233.

doctrine, non-attendance at church, profanity, immorality, witchcraft, and even with cases of suspected disloyalty to the Parliament. The obscurity of many of these cases shows how omnipresent was its censorship. A man drinks a health to Montrose in an inn, or sings a "malignant" song, or abuses the ministry in conversation, and the Presbytery is informed of it. The culprit is then summoned and tried, and is ordered to make public confession in the church of his parish, or is handed over to the civil magistrates. We have an indication of the methods of obtaining this kind of information in one minute of the Presbytery, where it is stated that three elders were appointed to be at the Cross on market-days to mark who among the crowd used profane language. These methods, however sincerely devised for the good of the people, cannot be praised. They are justly open to the charge of inducing

busybodyism, hypocrisy, and worse. Such methods, especially when applied to the suppression of witchcraft, must have placed in the power of the unscrupulous informer undue opportunities of defaming, and even depriving of life, those who had excited his malice or envy. The good faith in which almost all information brought against suspected persons was received, is appalling. The childish stories of the superstitious peasantry regarding the witchcraft of their neighbours were listened to and considered by men evidently of Christian character and learning with seriousness and respect. To a considerable extent the result of this must have been to inspire in many minds a slavish fear of the clergy, and a hypocritical conformity to the rule of the Church. At the same time, it must be remarked that there appears to have been little murmuring. This is accounted for, no doubt, by the belief, so strong

in the middle ages and far from being dead in the seventeenth century, in the absolute distributions of the classes. The lower orders asserted no strong claims to the right of thinking for themselves, and took the guidance of the higher as the one meant for them. From what we can gather from contemporary biography, the ministry seems to have been composed, in great part, of the less wealthy scions of landed families — men who had a social standing apart from that given them by virtue of their education and office. To be "gently born" was in those days enough to ensure for a man consideration and respect, but where gentle blood was allied with the responsibility and solemnity of the sacred office of the ministry, the Scottish people added reverence to obedience. Thus in all popular movements the clergy played the most conspicuous part, and no political leader ever

gained the people to his side except he had first won the approval of the clergy. The people believed in the clergy, and accepted their unspairing censorship as good and needful for the times. The strict observance of the Church's laws never became irksome to the general mass of the people, and when times of trouble came upon the ministers, the people suffered and died with them. Whatever exceptions may be taken to the tendency of much of the Church rule, it cannot be denied that the ministers were the trusted leaders of the commonalty.[1]

[1] Published Records of Presbytery of St Andrews and Cupar.

III.

THE TREATY AND THE PARLIAMENT

III.

THE TREATY AND THE PARLIAMENT.

HAVING thus sketched, as far as possible, the principal conditions of St Andrews during the period, we may now turn to the more important history of the city—*i.e.*, to its connection with the events which were affecting the entire kingdom. As remarked above, the history of the city, for the greater part of the years 1645-46, does not touch closely on the events of the civil war, and accordingly we have to pass over the first six months of 1645 before we find St Andrews entering into the common history of the country.

On the 12th of July 1645 the Parliament at Stirling, as already noticed, appointed the new levy to be made and the muster to be at Perth on the 24th. A large body of these troops was taken from Fifeshire, and St Andrews, as an important centre of population, had to provide its company. This company, according to Row, the biographer of Blair, left St Andrews a few days before the battle of Kilsyth. It is more probable that the levies from St Andrews left at least three weeks before the battle, as all the levies were strictly commanded to assemble at Perth on the 24th of July, while the battle of Kilsyth occurred on the 15th of August. With the departure of the company an incident occurred which, in the minds of the pious people of the city, occasioned much misgiving and fears for the welfare of their soldiers. It appears that Blair had arranged to

meet the men at the West Port on the morning of their setting out to join the main body of the army. His intention was to pray with them for the success of their undertaking. But when he arrived at the West Port on the appointed morning, the company were already on their way, regardless of their engagement with their minister. Row says that Blair "thought it was *malum omen.* Many of that regiment were killed with Cambo their commander."[1] The fears of the good minister were only too painfully confirmed. So great indeed had been the slaughter among the companies from St Andrews and the district, that we find the Parliament, in February 1646, granting to the presbyteries of St Andrews, Cupar, and Kirkcaldy exemption from further levies on account of the number from those

[1] Row's Life of Blair, p. 175.

presbyteries who had been killed in the battles of Tibbermuir and Kilsyth.[1]

The following months of August and September were for St Andrews, as for all the Lowlands, times of great anxiety. Many alarming rumours, doubtless, were brought to the city of the increasing power and confidence of the Royalists. On the 11th of August it is apparent that the affairs of the city were disturbed. The minute of that day in the Records of the Presbytery, while it contains a letter received from the Commission of the Kirk along with a particular list of "Remedies for Enormities and Corruptions in the Ministrie," states that "the Presbytery were interrupted of meeting by the great troubles of the country."[2] Of what was the particular cause

[1] Guth. Mem., pp. 191, 192; Acts of Parl., VI. i. p. 582. Baillie says that there were twenty-five householders of St Andrews slain at Tibbermuir (Letters, ii. p. 262).

[2] Published Records of the Presbytery.

of the interruption of the Presbytery's proceedings there is no indication. About this time, or shortly before, Montrose was in Clackmannanshire laying waste the lands of his rival. It is likely, therefore, that the fear lest his next move should be towards St Andrews had seized the inhabitants, and probably had caused many of them to leave the city.

When the disastrous defeat of the Presbyterian army at Kilsyth was known, much fear was felt for the safety of the county. A meeting of the principal gentlemen and ministers of Fifeshire was held near Kirkcaldy for the purpose of considering the defence of their districts. Blair, who was one of the chief counsellors, boldly advised that there should be no thought of treating with Montrose. He, as a zealous Churchman, looked upon Montrose as always a heretic and excommunicated person with whom it was both unlawful and sinful

to treat on equal terms. But the object of the meeting was somewhat unexpectedly frustrated by the sudden intimation that a party of the enemy were at Dunfermline. Before any plans could be agreed upon for the defence of the county the meeting was dispersed. Blair, with many of his brother ministers, betook himself to Dundee, and there had his family placed in safety. It must be said to Blair's credit that his flight to Dundee seems to have been taken for the sake of his wife and children. In a few days he returned to his people in St Andrews, and resolved to remain with them during their time of anxiety.[1]

That the enemy entered St Andrews sometime after the battle of Kilsyth we have some evidence. In the Parliament held at St Andrews a few months later, the provost of the city was tried by a commission with regard to

[1] Row's Life of Blair, p. 176.

his conduct subsequent to the battle. One of the charges is that before the enemy entered the city he had made no attempt to oppose them. But whether or not we are to assign the entrance of St Andrews by the Royalists to the time when Blair was in Dundee, we cannot say.[1]

At last, to the great joy of the people, came the news of the defeat of Montrose at Philiphaugh. At St Andrews, on Sabbath, the 21st of September, there was held a service preparatory to a public thanksgiving. The thanksgiving for the great victory was offered up on the Sabbath following.[2]

For the common people of Scotland there were now times of quiet and respite from the terror of the sword. What engaged the thoughts of the country at this time was more

[1] Balfour's Works (Annals), iii. p. 314.

[2] Presbytery Records, 17th September 1645.

the relations between England and Scotland. Both kingdoms were now in subjection to the arms of the English and Scottish Parliaments. It was a time for the squaring of accounts between the allies. Ever since the battle of Marston Moor differences had begun to arise between the English and Scottish parties as to the position of the Scots army in England, and now that the work of the English army was practically completed, the presence of the Scots soldiery became more and more a matter of dispute and irritation. Dissatisfaction would appear at first to have been caused by the apparent want of zeal which the Scots showed in the prosecution of the war. Some difference on this point was inevitable. In the motives by which each of the allies were led into the war there was great difference. The English were fighting for civil rights, and were, for the greater part, enraged against the King by his

duplicity. The Scots, on the other hand, had a different quarrel with the King. They made no disguise of the fact that their chief motive for entering on the war was the establishment of a Presbyterian Church government throughout the kingdoms. The Scots had not lost hope of the King, while the English thoroughly distrusted him, and believed that he had forfeited the sacredness of his person. Whether the lethargy of the Scottish army was part of the policy of the Presbyterians, or whether it arose from the private plans of the generals themselves, is difficult to determine. Probably both these causes were at work. The generals at least were, beyond doubt, considering above all the question as to how and where the army could best be quartered. At length the matter became of so great importance, and so threatened the whole relations between the two kingdoms, that in July 1645 a commission of six from the

English Lords and Commons was appointed to go to Scotland and treat with the Scots on the grave matters of the peace of the nation. The Commissioners were the Earl of Rutland, Lord Wharton, Sir H. Vane, Sir William Armyne, Thomas Hatcher, and Robert Goodwin. The Scottish Parliament in August accordingly appointed a commission to meet the English Commissioners and to treat with them.[1]

It was some considerable time before the Commissions met. The times were unfavourable for safe travelling, and in the interval between the battles of Kilsyth and Philiphaugh the country was practically at the mercy of the Royalists. On the 16th of August the English Commissioners arrived at Berwick, where they had been desired to await the Scots Commissioners. Here they remained for thirty days expecting

[1] Calendar of State Papers (Domestic), 1645-47, p. 178; Acts of Parl., VI. i. p. 457.

the Scots Commissioners, but no meeting could be effected. Much disappointed, they at length retired to Newcastle, writing to the Scots Commissioners that they would return to Scotland when the time and place for the meeting of the Commissions were definitely ascertained. Answer was returned that the meeting would be held at Berwick on 6th October, and thither the English Commissioners again repaired, some travelling a distance of "about eighty miles," as they afterwards grievously complained.[1]

Notwithstanding these new arrangements, the meeting of the Commissions was again frustrated. The Scots Commission did arrive, but without its full number, and without its authoritative papers, which had fallen into the hands of Montrose at Kilsyth. As the only course open to them, the Scots Commissioners presented to the English Commission a paper,

[1] Calendar of State Papers (Domestic), 1645-47, p. 177.

in which they explained that they were unable to treat, but proposed that another meeting should be arranged to be held at St Andrews. In reply the English Commissioners did not conceal their chagrin at having thus again to endure delay. The Scots had asked them to give in their propositions, but this they refused to do, deferring them till they should meet at St Andrews a commission fully empowered to treat. The Scots, in turn, apologised for their delays, pleading the unsettled state of their country now lying under the curse of the plague and the sword. That they might show how great had been their inconvenience in attending the meeting at Berwick, they point out that "some of us came above 100 miles, and all of us about 60 miles." The Scots Commissioners who sign the papers at Berwick are Argyll, Lauderdale, and Lanark.[1]

[1] Calend. of State Papers (Domestic), 1645-47, pp. 177, 182.

The movements of the English Commission were watched with considerable anxiety. The delays of the Scots Commission, though they now appear to have been unavoidable, doubtless occasioned much hostile imputation. Lord Northumberland, writing to Vane on October 7, speaks bitterly of the conduct of the Scots army in not attempting the siege of Newark, and has little hope of any amicable settlement of the differences which have arisen between the kingdoms. Of the result of the treaty on which Vane is engaged he speaks despondingly, and in fact believes that little will come of it.[1] A little later than this, Sir Robert Honeywood, writing to Vane, remarks: "Wiser men do not believe that ever the Scots will separate from the Parliament unless forced thereto by disobligation and neglect, or that the King should be brought to consent to

[1] Calend. of State Papers (Domestic), 1645-47, p. 178.

their Presbyterian Government, which the Scots of late seemed to intend as in effect the sole end of their taking up arms, which I can never believe his Majesty will do."[1] These letters appear to indicate that the English were now in turn afraid of losing the Scots as much as the Scots had previously feared the desertion of the English. The English, however, feared not so much that the Scots would merely desert them, as that they might desert them to espouse the cause of the King.

On the 14th of October, the Commissions of the two kingdoms met at St Andrews. The treaty was opened by the statement of the English propositions. These related chiefly to the differences which had arisen with regard to the occupation of Carlisle by a Scots garrison, the alleged disregard paid to the

[1] Calend. of State Papers (Domestic), 1645-47, p. 188.

treaties agreed upon at the opening of the war, and the delays in the payment of certain moneys due to the Scots for the maintenance of their army in England. In the case of Carlisle the contention of the English Commissioners was that the Scots, contrary to treaty, had reserved the town for a retreat for the Scots army, and had garrisoned it with Scots soldiers, while, according to the treaty, Berwick was the only stronghold in the north of England which had been placed in the hands of the Scots by the English Parliament. This the Scots admitted, but pointed out that the reason why Berwick was the only garrison placed at the disposal of their army was that, at the time of the treaty, it was the only town in the north of England in the power of the Parliament. Had there been, they urged, other towns in the north of England under the power of the English Parlia-

ment at the beginning of the war, these the Scottish Parliament would have demanded, along with Berwick, for the benefit of their army, and did not doubt that the English Parliament would have conceded them. They desired faithfully to keep all treaties, but demanded a just exception in the case of Carlisle, which was necessary to the safety of their army. They promised to withdraw their garrison whenever the troubles of the kingdoms should come to an end.[1]

From the subject of the garrison at Carlisle, upon which no agreement appeared likely, the Commissions proceeded to discuss the general question of the conduct of the Scots army in England. On this point the English Commissioners presented certain charges against the Scots officers of abusing their powers, and inflicting wrongs on the inhabitants, and of

[1] Calend. of State Papers (Domestic), 1645-47, pp. 194, 197.

instituting a levy on their own responsibility, apparently on the pretext that the moneys due to the Scots army from the English Parliament had not been paid. The English Commissioners promised that all money due to the Scots would be paid, but denied that the non-payment of the money was any justification of the levies imposed by the Scots officers on the people. In these matters the two Commissions were able to agree. The Scots Commissioners promised that all cases of wrong done to the inhabitants would be investigated. They admitted also that the course taken by the Scots officers in imposing levies because of non-payment of the money due to the army was unwarrantable. But on these points only were the demands of the English Commissioners acceded to. The affair of Carlisle still remained unsettled.[1]

[1] Calend. of State Papers (Domestic), 1645-47, pp. 195, 197, 199.

Thus for several days the Commissions at St Andrews debated the terms of the Scottish army's occupation of the north of England. Northumberland's fears were pretty much confirmed. The meeting had perhaps been useful so far as it drew forth from both sides pledges of loyalty to the common cause, but it had been of no avail in attempting to settle a serious difference between the two Parliaments. The last paper submitted by the English Commission is dated the 18th of October. On the 21st of October a resolution was passed by the English Parliament, censuring the diffidence of the Scots army, its levying of taxes and plundering of the people, which hindered the payment of the monthly assessment. It is declared to the people that they are not compelled to pay any taxes not levied by authority of Parliament, and all goods taken from them by the Scots shall be paid to them from the

money appointed for the maintenance of the Scots army. The Parliament also gives warning that should the ravages of the Scots continue, the monthly assessment of £31,000 cannot be paid to them. With regard to the garrisons, it is declared that all those which have been put into places not named by authority of Parliament will be removed. It is hardly possible that the decisions of the Commission at St Andrews could have reached London by the 21st of October, and we cannot therefore attribute the declaration of the English Parliament to the reports from Scotland, but we have here an indication of the state of feeling between the Parliaments which the attempted treaty at St Andrews left practically unmodified.[1]

We now come to what was undoubtedly the most important event in the history of

[1] Calend. of State Papers (Domestic), 1645-47, p. 200.

St Andrews during the years 1645-46. The next meeting of the Parliament was held there on the 26th of November 1645. On that day the representatives of the nobility and the commissioners of the shires and burghs of Scotland assembled in the hall of the New College,[1] under the Chancellorship of the Earl of Loudon. St Andrews had apparently been chosen as the meeting-place of the Parliament on account of the plague still raging in Edinburgh and other parts. There appears to be no indication that during the plague of 1645 St Andrews had any serious visitation. This supposition is further supported by the prolonged sitting which the Parliament held here.[2]

The business which Parliament had now met to consider was of that miscellaneous character

[1] Acts of Parl., VI. i. 590.

[2] Ibid., p. 474; Row's Life of Blair, p. 178.

which engages a Parliament in time of peace. Parliament was now no mere council of war. Not only questions of levying, army supplies, and national policy engaged its attention, but consideration was also given to the social questions of education and the condition of the people. The times were full of anxiety, but they were nevertheless times of hope, and more peaceful than Scotland had known for many months. It is true the greater part of the Parliament's deliberations related to the unhappy affairs of the late war, but there is in its legislation practical expression of a belief in the near advent of a time of national peace and development.

Of the leaders of the Parliament something may be said.

Though the name of Lord Loudon has not come down to present generations with all the interest or historical importance which attaches

to the names of one or two others who were his contemporaries and fellow-partisans, he was nevertheless in his day one of the most conspicuous statesmen in Scottish politics. He was the son of Sir James Campbell of Lawers, and was thus the distant kinsman of Argyll. His career hitherto had been one of scarcely interrupted distinction. He had first taken his seat as the representative of his wife, the Baroness Loudon, but in 1633 he was raised to the peerage as Earl of Loudon by King Charles. From the first he had decisively ranked himself with the Covenanters. All through the critical years from 1633 to 1641 he had risked his fortunes with the Covenant. He had been among the foremost in the opposition to Episcopacy in 1637, and in consequence had his title superseded. He had also led the vanguard at Newburn and had attended the Treaty of Ripon. But the event

which was the most notable in his career, and with which his name will be longest associated, befell in 1640. In that year he was summoned by the King to London. Instead of being granted the usual audience, he was arrested and imprisoned on the charge of treason. The charge was founded on an intercepted letter from the Scottish Presbyterians to the King of France imploring the assistance of that sovereign against the King of England. The letter had been signed by Loudon along with several other leading Presbyterians. The English Court and Parliament were startled by the discovery. This revelation of the Scottish Presbyterians in the act of inviting the aid of a Roman Catholic Power in their opposition to Prelacy aroused the strong resentment of the English. Loudon when accused admitted that he had signed the letter, but declared that the letter had been

drawn up at a time when the King and the Scots were at war. No such plea was likely to lessen the treasonous transaction in the eyes of the King, and but for the intervention of the Marquis of Hamilton, Loudon would have forfeited his life. The year following that which had almost seen him degraded by a traitor's death saw Loudon raised to favour and office. In September of 1641 he was appointed High Chancellor of Scotland and First Commissioner of the Treasury with the restoration of his earldom. It is in this position that he comes before us in 1645. To the end of his life, amid the falls and rises of fortune, he served the cause of the Covenant. The sincerity of his adherence to Presbyterianism was attested by many sacrifices. He died at Edinburgh in 1662, when all that he had striven for during a lifetime seemed overthrown.[1]

[1] Douglas's Peerage; Scots Worthies; Baillie's Letters.

He who took first place as statesman in the Parliament of 1645-46 was undoubtedly the Marquis of Argyll. In those days when the popular leadership of the nation was placed with almost hereditary succession in the hands of certain families, whose histories in the past had been identified with the freedom and progress of the people, Argyll had been born heir to an almost kingly influence. His great estates in the Western Highlands, peopled with a race whose only will and conscience were their chieftain's, gave him a standing in the eyes of the nation that ranked close to Royalty itself. From his youth he had received consideration from politicians eager to bring the greatest influence to their side. As Lord Lorne he had received communications from the great Wentworth, then dealing with the earlier troubles of the King's reign. The heritage to which he was born was great, and the nature of the times

was such that for that hereditary influence he could not escape having to give an account, whatever may have been his powers to wield it to advantage. Whatever was in his genius and nature of diplomacy and statecraft, must have been called forth in the times into which he had been born. That he responded to the call of his time is evident from the first beginnings of his political life. He soon impressed his contemporaries, as he impressed Wentworth, as a man both of "blood and abilities."

It is true that in one respect Argyll fell short of the position to which he had succeeded—that of Highland Chieftain. Whether or not all is true that has been said of his lack of that martial spirit which the clans ever looked for in their hereditary leaders, it can still be said for Argyll that the circumstances of his time drew him aside from the petty glories of Inver-

ary to the broad concerns of the nation. What made him an acute statesman, the study of the intrigues of courts and parties, made him a bad chieftain, and raised between him and his simple people an alienation of interests that rendered their unfailing devotion supremely pathetic. The Marquis had long learned to love the ingenious triumphs of statecraft. His people dearly loved in their chieftains the palpable prowess of the arm. Thus his devoted clansmen ever found themselves in opposition to the generality of their Highland neighbours for reasons that they probably never quite understood, and led by a chieftain whom they deeply loved for his name, but of whom, as clansmen, they were doubtless somewhat ashamed.

But if Argyll had failed as the chieftain of a clan, he was now rising to the position of leader of a people. Burnet has accused him of aspiring to raise "his family to be a sort of

king in the Highlands," but there is evidence that he sought, before all, the confidence of the nation. To be the leader of a serious and religious nation he had many of the first qualifications. To win the people's hearts he had the ascetic countenance of a Genevan divine, the solemn bearing of a Puritan, and the reputation of a pure and pious life. To win their confidence he had, beyond his great family name and wealth, the statesman's "invincible calmness of temper." It may be admitted that he was lacking in the characteristics of the popular hero, in those features which make his great rival so captivating a figure. But the peculiarity of the troubles of the times, especially in Scotland, required more the sleepless watchfulness and subtle bargainings of a statesman than the knightly bravery of a soldier or the witching passion of an orator. The Thor-like methods of the Reformers of the previous century might

only have injured the country and its cause. The fight which Knox fought was for broad spiritual principles in which nationalism was to a great extent lost sight of. The management of the interests of the Scottish Presbyterian party was a matter of careful steering. The Scottish Presbyterians were fully involved in the Civil War, yet such were the principles on which they had taken up arms that they could not be justly called either Cavaliers or Roundheads. Their only common cause with their allies was that they had a quarrel with the King. The leader of such a party must needs have been a diplomatist. Argyll rose to the leadership of his party through his party's necessities.[1]

The member of Parliament who stood next

[1] Acts of Parl., VI. i. 474; Balfour's Works (Annals), iii. p. 319; Drummond's Memoirs of Locheil, p. 80; Baillie's Letters, ii. p. 35, 47, 64, 74, iii. p. 466; Burnet's Hist. of His Own Time, bk. i. p. 28.

to Argyll as active leader of the party was Sir Archibald Johnstone of Warriston. For about ten years he had been a conspicuous figure in Scottish affairs, and had received from the Presbyterians many recognitions of their confidence. In 1638 he had been appointed Clerk of Assembly; in 1641 he had received the honour of knighthood and a pension; and had been for some time acting as one of the Commissioners from Scotland both in the Westminster Assembly of Divines and in Parliament. This confidence was well merited. Whatever we may think of Johnstone as a man, it is impossible to overlook his learning and energy. He was undoubtedly one of the ablest lawyers of his time, and all his learning and ability were ungrudgingly spent in the service of the Presbyterians. In many respects he was the embodiment of the Presbyterian party spirit. His hatred of

"Malignants"—a designation which we could almost imagine him to have invented — was intense, and none the less bitter because it was religious. He was the unappeasable foe of the enemies of his party. With the history of the Presbyterian party almost every recorded incident of his life is exclusively connected. That he should die for the cause of Presbyterianism was the most consistent termination to his life that could have befallen. He was, further, a man of fervid religious character and deep convictions. For him the Westminster Assembly was a complete sphere of activity. There he found himself fighting both the battles of his religious faith and of Presbyterianism. He must have seen there the broad reflex of his own mind,—the principles of his party in the constant setting of a strong religious light. As a man of strong passions he is liable to be misunderstood, and perhaps till

something more is known of him it is better to look upon him most of all in his purely historical bearing on the events of his time. Burnet's picture of him, which we may quote, is perhaps as just a one as can be taken from the writings of his time: "Waristoun was my own uncle. He was a man of great application, could seldom sleep above 3 hours in the 24. He had studied the law carefully, and had a great quickness of thought with an extraordinary memory. He went into very high notions of devotions, in which he continued many hours a-day. He would often pray in his family 2 hours at a time, and had an unexhausted copiousness that way. What thought soever struck his fancy during those effusions, he looked on it as an answer of prayer, and was wholly determined by it. He looked on the Covenant as the setting

Christ on His throne, and so was out of measure zealous in it. He had no regard to the raising himself or his family, tho' he had 13 children. But Presbytery was to him more than all the world. He had a readiness and vehemence of speaking that made him very considerable in publick assemblies; and he had a fruitful invention, so that he was at all times furnished with expedients."[1]

The first sitting of Parliament was characteristically solemnised by religious services, Robert Blair preaching to the members from the 101st Psalm. The conclusion of the services was followed by the calling of the Parliament Roll, which occasioned the inevitable contentions concerning precedency among the

[1] Guth. Mem., pp. 47, 104, 107, 125, 126, 139, 164; Baillie's Letters, vol. ii. pp. 128, 140, 171, 172; Wishart's Montrose, p. 330; Burnet's Hist. of His Own Time, bk. i. p. 28.

nobility, shires, and burghs. All preliminaries being at length concluded, Warriston rose to address the Parliament. His speech was one of almost fierce exhortation to improve the present opportunities by avenging the blood of their friends who had fallen in the late disasters. Dalliance, he declared, had brought God's curses of sword and plague upon the land. Let them be prompt and exact in dealing with their enemies. Let there be circumspection even in Parliament, which had become "like Noah's Ark, a harbourer of creatures foul and clean." He desired to see every member examined as to his tendencies, that those who were "eyes and ears to the enemies of the commonwealth" might be excluded. The speech was characteristic of the man. It was long, eloquent, and bitter.[1]

The proposal thus made to test the faithful-

[1] Balfour's Works (Annals), iii. p. 307.

ness of the members was adopted, and for this purpose Parliament was adjourned till the afternoon of the next day. It was three days, however, before Parliament met again. The consideration of the cases of suspected disaffection in their midst evidently employed the members during all this interval, and when Parliament assembled again on the 29th two of the members were remitted to a committee for examination. The members who were here supposed to be guilty of disaffection were the Provost of Jedburgh and the Provost of St Andrews, whose case is referred to above. At the afternoon sitting the Committee gave in its decision, in which the two members were acquitted of any charge that could disqualify their seat and vote in Parliament. The fears of Warriston were evidently imaginary, or the circumspection easily eluded.[1]

[1] Balfour's Works (Annals), iii. pp. 312-314.

The sitting of the 29th was devoted to the formation of the general committees through which the Scottish Parliament did its work. The three most important committees were the Committee of Despatches, the Committee for the Bills and Ratifications, and the Committee for the Process. The first of these was formed for the purpose of dealing with the condition of the country and the maintenance of the army. The second committee considered the numerous suits between parties who had referred their cases to Parliament. The Committee for the Process referred to the trial of the political prisoners who had been taken at Philiphaugh. By this committee the entire indictment and trial of the prisoners was conducted. The work, it will be seen, which the Parliament had before it was miscellaneous. But the Scottish Parliament was eminently a working parliament, and the

method of thus working by means of committees was the one by which business could be most thoroughly and directly accomplished.[1]

It is unnecessary here to deal with a great part of the business transacted by the Parliament at St Andrews. Much of it cannot be considered to be of national importance. It will be sufficient to consider the proceedings which more directly affected the national events and conditions of the times.

The matter which for many weeks after the opening of Parliament excited most interest was the trial of the prisoners taken at Philiphaugh. Three of the important prisoners taken at that battle had already been tried and executed at Glasgow. Those who were reserved for trial by the St Andrews Parliament were probably considered to be prisoners of greater eminence or whose cases demanded more de-

[1] Acts of Parl., VI. i. p. 476.

liberation. The details of the trial show that the legal conviction of the prisoners was a matter of considerable difficulty.

The prisoners brought to trial were Sir Robert Spottiswood, Secretary of State for Scotland; Lord Ogilvy, son of the Earl of Airlie; the Earl of Hartfell; William Murray, brother of the Earl of Tullibardine; Colonel Nathaniel Gordon, a gentleman of Aberdeenshire; and Andrew Guthrie, son of the Bishop of Moray. Spottiswood was undoubtedly the most important of the prisoners, and was regarded by the Presbyterians with special resentment. He had brought, as we saw, the King's commission to Montrose after the battle of Kilsyth, and was in consequence looked upon as the creature of the King in his designs upon Scotland. Neither was his previous history likely to favour him in the eyes of his captors. He was the son of Arch-

bishop Spottiswood of St Andrews, and had thus been brought up in traditions the reverse of Presbyterian. Already in 1641 he had come under the censure of the Presbyterians for his connection with the Irish Rebellion. His late conduct was therefore in the eyes of the Parliament an intolerable aggravation of his first offence. That this prejudiced his defence is plainly seen from the indictment. There was besides this other reasons why Spottiswood should have demanded more than ordinary attention. He was one of the most eminent lawyers in Scotland, and had been honoured by King James with knighthood and a Privy Counsellorship. By King James he had also been raised to the dignity of President of the Court of Session. He was in addition a man of great learning and a skilled linguist. The Parliament had thus in Spottiswood one who could contend with its

lawyers and be for himself and his fellow-prisoners an acute and powerful advocate. Of the other prisoners nothing very noteworthy can be said of their antecedents. Lord Ogilvy had already been imprisoned at Edinburgh by the Parliament, but had been liberated by Montrose after the battle of Kilsyth. The others had fallen into their enemies' hands for the first time.[1]

The indictment served against Spottiswood was that he had committed high treason in impugning "the dignity and authority of the Estates of Parliament." Having been reminded of his connection in 1641 with the Irish Rebellion, he was now accused of having purchased by his "pretended ways" the office of Secretary of Scotland, which had up till

[1] Drummond's Memoirs of Locheil, p. 74; Wishart's Montrose, p. 169; Balfour's Works (Annals), iii. p. 158; Guth. Mem., pp. 195, 196.

then been held by the Earl of Lanark. This offence was aggravated by the fact that the King had promised never to employ him in any office of Court or State, nor even to grant him access to the royal presence. In his capacity of Secretary of Scotland he had also insulted the authority of the Parliament by putting into the hands of Montrose a commission authorising the leader of the Royalists to call parliaments, thereby disannulling the present Parliament. He was further accused of having written at Kelso a letter in which he had expressed his intention to disperse all the rebels in the country. The other prisoners were simply accused of high treason, having been taken in arms against the Parliament.

To the indictments the prisoners at first replied by appealing to Parliament for the right of being tried either by the Parliament as a

body, or by the Judge Ordinary, and not by committee as had been appointed. The appeal was rejected, and the prisoners shortly afterwards presented their defences. These defences, which were drawn up by Spottiswood, were mainly based upon the law of quarter given in battle. It was held that this law was recognised among all nations, and had been observed throughout the late war. To the charges brought against himself in particular, Spottiswood replied that he had done nothing more than obey the commands of his sovereign.

That the prisoners had been granted quarter at Philiphaugh there was no denial. Their plea was repelled on the ground that the crimes of which they were accused had been committed before the battle. The Parliament was determined that the punishment of long-standing offences would not be avoided

by the accident of a battle. In the case of Spottiswood it was contended that he was not with the Royalist army as a soldier, and on that account could base no plea on the privileges of martial law.[1]

Two of the prisoners, however, were destined to escape the execution of their sentence. On the 7th of January 1646 Lord Ogilvy escaped from the Castle. On the following day, when the escape was announced in Parliament, a reward of £1000 was proclaimed to any who should recapture the fugitive dead or alive. Of this romantic incident there are several contemporary accounts, all agreeing in the main details. Monteth's is perhaps the most graphic: "After they had been sentenced to death, the Lord Ogilvy, pretending to be sick, got so much favour as to have his wife, his mother, and sisters allowed to visit him for

[1] State Trials, iv. pp. 767-818.

the last time in prison. These ladies having entered his chamber, the guards showed them some respect, and went out of the room; and the young Lord taking advantage of the opportunity, without loss of time put on his sister's gown, who was very like him. In the meantime she threw herself into her brother's bed, and put his night-cap upon her head. They acted their parts exceedingly well, for having several times embraced one another, in appearance, they bid farewell for ever to one another with abundance of tears. The guards having come in again with lights to reconduct them, Ogilvie went out with the company, without being discovered. He was no sooner got out than he mounted a good horse, and with two friends got to a place of safety before break of day. As soon as the news of this escape was carried to the Convention of Estates, rage so transported some of them that they had

a mind to be revenged upon the generous ladies; but the Earls of Lanrek and Lindsey maintained that it was an action of natural affection, worthy to be transmitted to posterity; so far were they from suffering them to be in the least troubled on that account."[1]

In contriving his escape Ogilvy was suspected of having received aid other than that given by his kinsfolk. At this time considerable friction existed between the rival factions of Argyll and Hamilton. These Houses were the most powerful in Scotland, rivalling one another in their distinctions and political influence. Their rivalries and differences had become so acute as to cause much anxiety to the other Presbyterian leaders. Accordingly, when it became known that Ogilvy had escaped, the Hamilton faction was accused, evidently

[1] Acts of Parl., VI. i. p. 503; Row's Life of Blair, p. 179; Monteth's Hist., p. 228.

by that of Argyll, of having assisted Ogilvy in his escape. Ogilvy was specially obnoxious to the Argyll faction on account of the bitter feud then existing between the Houses of Argyll and Airlie, and the fact that he whom the Argyll faction naturally deemed so worthy of punishment should escape evidently turned suspicion upon the party of Hamilton. The Argyll faction are said to have retaliated by accomplishing the reprieve of the Earl of Hartfell, who, on the other hand, was supposed to be the object of the enmity of the Hamiltons. Thus by the falling out of their enemies two of the prisoners escaped punishment.[1]

On the 17th of January the execution of Sir Robert Spottiswood, Nathaniel Gordon, and Andrew Guthrie took place at the Market

[1] Row's Life of Blair, p. 178; Drummond's Memoirs of Locheil, p. 76.

Cross.[1] The instrument of death was the "Maiden," which had been brought over from Dundee. The first to die was Nathaniel Gordon, who, before he laid his head on the block, signed an attestation of penitence for his share in the shedding of innocent blood, and for having joined Montrose. This act of repentance gave great satisfaction to Blair, who acted as the prisoners' chaplain, and to the general body of the Presbyterians. On his declaration of penitence Gordon was released from the bann of excommunication, which had lain upon him for several years, and admitted into the communion of the Church. Wishart, the biographer of Montrose, hints that Gordon was not aware of the nature of the attestation which he had signed. He states that Gordon,

[1] Acts of Parl., VI. i. 16th January 1646; Balfour's Works (Annals), iii. pp. 362, 363, 364; Row's Life of Blair, p. 179; Wishart's Montrose, p. 169.

before laying his head on the block, "called God and His angels and all who were present to witness that if there was anything in that document derogatory to the King and his authority, he utterly disowned it." It can hardly be said that Wishart does the memory of Gordon a good turn in giving this version of his conduct.[1]

The bearing of Spottiswood on the scaffold was resolute and unrepentant. To Montrose he had sent from prison the exhortation to proceed in the work which he had so "gloriously" begun. When he ascended the scaffold it had been his intention to address the people, but from this it appears he was prevented. This infringement of what was considered the prisoner's rights led to an altercation between

[1] Balfour's Works (Annals), pp. 362, 363, 364; Row's Life of Blair, p. 179; Wishart's Montrose, p. 169.

him and Blair. Spottiswood's protestation against this unjust domination of the clergy aroused the indignation of Blair, who declared that it was no wonder to hear the son of a false prophet speak so of the faithful and honest servants of Christ. Thus prevented from speaking, Spottiswood cast his intended address, which he had committed to writing, amongst the crowd. The address was mainly a vindication of his own conduct. His only motive in all his actions had been loyalty to his sovereign. The address concluded with a denunciation of the Presbyterian clergy, and the committal of his soul to the mercy of God.[1]

Of Andrew Guthrie the biographer of Blair says "he died stupidly and impenitently." He

[1] Memorials of Montrose, ii. lvi.; Row's Life of Blair, p. 179; Monteth's Hist. pp. 229-231.

adds, referring to Spottiswood and Guthrie, "These were two bishop's sons; *mali corvi, malum ovum.*"[1]

William Murray was executed a few days later. His brother, the Earl of Tullibardine, had petitioned Parliament for his pardon on the plea that he was not *compos mentis.* The plea was evidently considered, but was not sustained. Tullibardine thereupon petitioned for the postponement of the execution. This was granted, and Murray did not suffer till the 23d of January. This does much credit to the memory of Tullibardine, and the records of his petitions cast considerable doubt on the hearsay aspersion of Bishop Guthrie, that he declared at Perth that he would in no way attempt to intervene on his brother's behalf.[2]

These records of the trial at St Andrews

[1] Row's Life of Blair, p. 179.

[2] Balfour's Works (Annals), iii. pp. 362-364; Guth. Mem., 206.

serve at least to show the spirit of the times, and how consumed the country had become with party rage. Amidst all the proceedings there is nothing to be found that can be called generous. The prisoners are admittedly condemned before their trial. It is impossible not to feel that there still continues here the fierce spirit of revenge which overpowered the chivalry of the Presbyterians at Philiphaugh, and made them degrade their victory to the brutality of an unresisted massacre. The Lowlanders doubtless were driven to fierce resentment by the ravages of Montrose's Highlanders and Irishmen, men who were regarded as barbarians and outlaws; but something nobler was to be expected from the professed ambassadors of Christ than those calls for vengeance which the Kirk and its Synods addressed to Parliament.[1] What might be called a religious

[1] Memorials of Montrose, vol. iv. sect. liii. and liv.

militaryism had been aroused in the Church which sought warrant and expression in the denunciatory psalms. The last stage of party rage had been reached. Opposition had become no longer opposition to party but to Heaven itself.

Another important portion of the Parliament's proceedings related to the education of the people. On the 2d of February an Act was passed for the erection of a school in every parish with duly appointed and endowed schoolmasters. The schools were to be under the control of their particular Presbyteries in the matters of their foundation and appointment of masters. The burden of providing a good schoolhouse and a stipend for the master of not less than a hundred and not more than two hundred merks was imposed upon the heritors of the parish. Stringent conditions were also imposed upon the heritors in order

to ensure the thorough maintenance of the school. It was enacted that the heritors should contribute towards the maintenance of the school proportionately, but should a heritor fail to pay his proportion for three terms he would thereby entail the doubling of his proportion.[1]

This Act was evidently passed in the expectation of more peaceful times; but that the Scottish politicians should have turned aside from the maze of diplomacy which they were at this time attempting to thread, to the matters of the people's education, must add honour to their memory and vindicate their sympathy with the aspirations of the common people.

The last days of the Parliament's sitting were spent in drawing up the instructions to be given to the Scots Commissioners at London. The instructions contain a fairly good indica-

[1] Acts of Parl., VI. i. p. 554.

tion of the attitude taken up at this time by the Scots in their negotiations with the English Parliament. To estimate the entire significance of the many instructions given to the Scots Commissioners would be difficult. A slight summary of them will be sufficient here.

The primary instruction to be given to the Commissioners was to improve present opportunities "when both King and Parliament profess their desires of peace." The propositions debated at Uxbridge with regard to Religion, to the Militia, and to Ireland, were to be especially insisted on, and peace was to be promoted when "Religion and Church Government, which is our chief desire and hath been the cause of all our undertakings and sufferings," had been established.

The matters debated at the St Andrews Treaty then received consideration. The instructions on this point show that the Scots

had in no way since the treaty altered their interpretation of their rights. The Commissioners were instructed to reply to the English Parliament that Newcastle and the other garrisons occupied by the Scots must remain as they were so long as the Scots army should take part in the war in England. The Scots troops would be drawn whenever the war was at an end, and when all that was owing had been paid.

The times were also to be improved by promoting agreement between the two kingdoms, whereby the neglect which Scotland had experienced since the Union might be rectified. The Commissioners were to stipulate for the representation of Scotland at Court by a half, or at least a third, of the offices and trusts about the King and Queen. In the Council of England and Ireland a third were to be Scotsmen, and a like proportion of Englishmen

were to be in the Council of Scotland. Scotsmen also were to be eligible for any corporation or trade in England and Ireland, the same privileges to be extended to Englishmen and Irishmen in Scotland. Commerce was to be freely carried on between one kingdom and another, and all ports were to be held in common. For the preservation of the commerce and seaports of Scotland, certain of the King's ships were to be appointed to safeguard the harbours and convoy the trading ships. It was finally desired that all foreign negotiations which were of a national character should be conducted by councils consisting of an equal number of members from both kingdoms.[1]

The instructions to the Commissioners were agreed upon on the 3d of February, and on the following day Parliament closed. The reception of the proposals at London would

[1] Acts of Parl., VI. i. p. 575.

appear to have been unsatisfactory. Baillie remarks that the propositions were much altered, and adds, "I fear we shall not agree in haste."[1] The English Parliament was naturally unable to see eye to eye with the Scottish Presbyterians in their particular aspirations towards a uniform establishment of Presbyterian church government throughout the kingdoms. To any agreement with the Scots propositions the English declined to commit themselves. Thus the proposals of the St Andrews Parliament were rendered practically futile as far as concerned their primary object.[2]

The further developments of the national events of 1646, the coming of the King to the Scots, the disbandment of the Royalist army in Scotland, the departure of Montrose to the Continent, are not the province of these

[1] Baillie's Letters, ii. pp. 357, 361. [2] Ibid., pp. 366, 367.

pages. It may be noted that the vexed questions of the St Andrews Treaty were settled by the agreement of the Scots to accept £200,000 and public guarantee for as much more, and to withdraw their army from England. The occurrence of these transactions simultaneously with the committal of the King into the hands of the English Parliament forms the ground of the Royalist accusation against the Scots that they sold their King. But a short examination of the proceedings of the St Andrews Treaty will show that the £200,000 was due to the Scots and demanded by them long before the King had come to their army. At that time also the debt was acknowledged by the English, and payment promised. It was inevitable that all the questions which arose between the Scottish and English Parliaments should have come to affect one another, but it is something less than impartial judg-

ment that can admit the rough conclusion that the Scots bartered the person of their King for money.

With the close of the Parliament at St Andrews the national importance of the city during this period ceases. Nor with regard to events of merely local interest is there anything further to record. During the few months of the Parliament's sitting, St Andrews was the scene of transactions which had their influence on the future history of Scotland, but in the history of the city itself the period will always be memorable as the last in which St Andrews was the centre of the nation's life and affairs. In the winter of 1645-46 the refluent tide of national life was turned, as by chance, once more into the city which had but a few years since ceased to be the ecclesiastical capital of Scotland. But the occasion was accidental.

The work of the Reformation was drawing to completion, and the nation, spurning the old, was shaping new traditions. With the overthrow of Scottish Medievalism neglect and decay were to fall upon St Andrews. She had been the creation of an era that had closed, and to Scotland she was to remain, for nearly two centuries, little more than the night-long gleam of a departed day.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS.