

# LADIES OF THE COVENANT

## LADY COLVILL

LADY COLVILL, whose maiden name was Margaret Wemyss, was the daughter of David Wemyss of Fingask, and wife of Robert, Lord Colvill, who succeeded his uncle, of the same name, in 1662, as second Lord Colvill of Ochiltree. In 1671 she became a widow, his lordship having died at Cleish on the 12th of February that year. She had issue to him a son, Robert, who succeeded his father as third Lord Colvill of Ochiltree; and two daughters, 1. The Honourable Margaret Colvill, who was married in 1701 to Sir John Ayton of Ayton, in Fife, being his second wife, and, 2. The Honourable - Colvill, who was married to the Rev. Mr. Logan, minister of Torry. [*Douglas's Peerage, vol. i., p. 361.*]

The severity with which Lady Colvill was treated by the government, may be regarded as an involuntary testimony to the fidelity and steadfastness with which she adhered to the persecuted cause of Presbytery. She was classed among that "desperate and implacable party who keep seditious and numerous field conventicles, and that in open contempt of our authority, as if it were to brave us and those that are in places of trust under us." [*Wodrow's History, vol. ii., p. 238.*] Other marks of the government's displeasure were fixed upon her, all which in fact were so many badges of honourable distinction.

She became early conspicuous as a frequenter of field conventicles; and her name appears among the ladies against whom the government first proceeded on that account, - an honour for which she was no doubt indebted to Archbishop Sharp, who, as he resided in Fife, was particularly zealous in his endeavours to arrest and put down the progress of "fanaticism" within his own borders, and who had a great abhorrence of fanatic ladies. About the close of the year 1672, and in the years 1673 and 1674, meetings in the open fields were frequently held in Kinross-shire, where Lady Colvill resided; and she was in the habit of attending these meetings, as well as of hospitably entertaining in her house the ministers who preached at them, among whom were Mr. John Welsh, Mr. Samuel Arnot, Mr. Gabriel Semple, Mr. Thomas Hog, minister at Larbert, and many others. [*Account of the Sufferings of the Covenanters in Kinross-shire, Wodrow MSS., vol. xxxiii., folio, no. 143.*] The zeal and liberality with which she countenanced the preaching of the gospel at field conventicles, and befriended the persecuted ministers, coming to the ears of the government, the storm of persecution began to gather around her. The more immediate cause of this was the following circumstance: A party of soldiers had been sent to disperse a field conventicle held in the Lomonds of Fife; they met with no resistance from the people; but Sharp, to excite the council to greater violence, falsely alleged that the people had made resistance. This fabricated story being communicated to the court, a letter came from the king to the council, dated June 23d, 1674, requiring the council to bring the ringleaders of that disorder to punishment, and promising to send for their assistance some forces from England and Ireland. [*Wodrow's History, vol. ii., p. 238.*] This letter occasioned a bitter persecution against all in Fife, both men and women, who attended conventicles. A long catalogue of names, including several ladies as well as gentlemen, and a number of the common people, was sent over to the agents of the government in Fife, who were required to summon them to appear before the privy council at Edinburgh. [*Row's Life of Robert Blair, p. 545.*] Lady Colvill's name was in this list; and she, with several other ladies and gentlemen, were summoned to appear before the lords of the privy council on the 9th of July; The charges for which they were summoned to answer, were their keeping and being present at house and field conventicles, at Dunfermline, Cleish, Orval, and other places; their inviting and countenancing outed ministers in their invasion and intrusion upon the kirks and pulpits of Forgan, Balmerinloch, Collessie, Monzie, and Auchtermuchty, and hearing them preach and pray therein; and their harbouring, resetting, and entertaining Mr. John Welsh, a declared and proclaimed traitor, in their houses and elsewhere. Lady Colvill and the others who were summoned, not being prepared to make any confessions of criminality, or to promise to abstain from attending

conventicles in future, deemed it prudent to disobey the summons, probably dreading imprisonment had they made their appearance. For this contempt of authority they were, upon the 15th and 16th of July that same year, denounced his majesty's rebels, and put to the horn at the market crosses of Cupar and Forfar, by virtue of letters of denunciation raised and executed at the instance of his majesty's advocate. [*Wodrow, in his History (vol. ii., p. 242) mentions a Lady Colvill who was summoned to appear before the privy council on the 9th of July, 1674, and who was acquitted, on her compearing before the council, in consequence of her bringing with her a testimonial in her favour from the minister of her parish, and promising not to go to any conventicles in future. But she was evidently a different person from the subject of this sketch. On consulting the Register of Acts of Privy Council we find that her maiden name was "Dame Euphan Mortoun."*] Lady Colvill was afterwards summoned to appear before a committee of the privy council, which was to meet at Cupar on the 15th of September. She did not compear, but was fined, and ordained to pay her fine before the 1st of November. To what amount she was fined we are not informed. [*Row's Life of Robert Blair, p. 551.*]

Against this lady the council proceeded still farther. On the 6th of August, 1675, they issued letters of intercommuning against her and upwards of 100 more individuals, among whom were several other ladies of rank. Intercommuning was a very severe sentence, making as it did, every man or woman who should harbour, entertain, or converse with the persons intercommuned equally guilty with them. By these letters, all sheriffs, stewards, bailies of regalities, and bailiaries, and their deputies, and magistrates of burghs, are required "to apprehend and commit to prison any of the persons above written, our rebels, whom you shall find within your respective jurisdictions, according to justice, as you shall answer to us thereupon." [*Wodrow's History, vol. ii., pp. 286-288. Mr. John Carstairs, in a letter to Mr. Robert M'Ward, then in Rotterdam, dated August 6, 1675, says, "This day the letters of intercommuning were passed. If we were in any tolerable frame for such a mercy, as alas! we are not, I would take this furious driving as a token for good, and some presage that their time would be but short."* - *Wodrow MSS., vol. lix., folio, no. 36.*] The letters were proclaimed in Cupar in the beginning of October, 1675. [*Row's Life of Robert Blair, p. 562.*] "Perhaps," says Wodrow, "it was every way without a parallel, that so many ladies and gentlewomen married, should be put in such circumstances; but this was to strike the greater terror on their husbands and other gentlewomen."

Kirkton, in narrating this case, says, "But though the council sisted [*viz. stopped*] in their persecutions upon denunciation and intercommuning, so did not our officers and soldiers, who rested not, but upon imprisoning, robbing, wounding, killing the poor fanatics and conventiclors, where they might find them; and truly, many of our soldiers made persecution not so much a duty of their office as an employment of gain." [*Kirkton's History, pp. 363, 364.*] The concluding part of this extract is perfectly correct; but Kirkton is mistaken when he says that the council "sisted in their persecutions upon denunciation and intercommuning." So far was this from being the case, that in a very severe proclamation against conventicles and other disorders, issued by the council on the 1st of March, 1676, the magistrates of the several burghs are required to seize upon any persons who were or should in future be intercommuned; all noblemen, gentlemen, magistrates, and all other subjects, are forbidden to intercommune with, harbour, or relieve any of the persons who were or should hereafter be intercommuned, under the pains due to intercommuners by law; and a reward of 500 merks is offered to such as should discover any person guilty of intercommuning with, harbouring or relieving any of the intercommuned.

[*Wodrow's History, vol. ii., p. 319.*] On the 27th of April, that same year, in prosecution of the same object, the following letter, signed by the Duke of Rothes in name of the council, was sent to the sheriffs of the several shires: -

"RIGHT HONOURABLE, - The lords of his majesty's privy council, at their last meeting, did order that the enclosed letters of intercommuning should be transmitted to you, that you may with all possible diligence, cause search for, apprehend and imprison, such of the said persons as are, or shall happen to come within the bounds of your shire, and have ordered that against the 22d day of June next, you report a particular account of your diligence to the council. This the council has appointed to be signified to you, by your humble servant, Rothes Cancell. I. P. D." [*Register of Acts of Privy Council. It is, however, true, as Kirkton observes, that at this time "intercommuning was not so stretched and improven as after Bothwell Bridge, when converse with a few rebels made almost all Scotland as guilty as if they had been in arms against the king at Bothwell Bridge."* - *Kirkton's History, p. 363.*]

Lady Colvill, like her friends against whom these letters of intercommuning were issued, lay under this sentence till the king's proclamation, dated Whitehall, June 22, 1679, by which all letters of intercommuning were suspended, a measure which "relieved multitudes who were fugitive and intercommuned, and upon their hiding for many years." [*Wodrow's History, vol. iii., pp. 149, 151.*] But while lying under this sentence, her zeal was in no wise abated. She still continued to attend conventicles, and to entertain in her house the nonconforming ministers who came to preach in the part of the country where she lived. In the year 1677, when no public meetings were held in Kinross-shire for divine worship except during the night, because of the fury of the troopers, who lay more than a year and a half in Kinross, meetings for sermon were sometimes held in her house; and her character and principles being well known, she had her own share of the annoyances and severities inflicted by the troopers, who perambulated the country to put down house and field conventicles. From Captain William Carstairs [*Carstairs was "a wretch who earned a living in Scotland by going disguised to conventicles, and then informing against the preachers."* - *Macaulay's History of England, vol. i., p. 237.* *It was believed that at the time when the supposed popish plot in England in 1680 excited so great alarm, this infamous man, to get money, lent his aid by false testimony to the execution of several guiltless persons. "His end," says Macaulay, quoting from Bishop Burnet, "was all horror and despair, and with his last breath he had told his attendants to throw him into a ditch like a dog, for that he was not fit to sleep in a christian burial ground."* - *Ibid., vol. i., p. 482.*] in particular, she suffered no small degree of molestation and hardship. This man, who had no commission from the king, but who had been sent out by Archbishop Sharp, under pretence of searching for denounced and intercommuned persons, was at that time extremely active against the nonconformists in the East of Fife, on whom, with a party of about a dozen of soldiers, he committed many cruelties. Receiving information of a conventicle which had been kept in Lady Colvill's house, at Cleish, on a Sabbath day in the month of November, at which a preacher, named Mr. Robert Anderson, officiated, and learning that Mr. Anderson was lodged in her house, he came with his party to the house of Cleish early on the Monday morning, in order to make sure of apprehending his interceded prisoners, - so early indeed as about two or three hours before day, - and rapping at the gate of the house, surprised and alarmed all the inmates. Having made their way into the house, they apprehended Mr. Anderson, and William Sethrum, the chamberlain, and "broke Robert Steedman's head, who made his escape; and when the captain missed him, he fell into a fit of the convulsion, and continued two or three hours in it." This proved a very fortunate circumstance for Lady Colvill and her son, Lord Colvill, who was then a child, for during the time that Carstairs lay in the fit, they made their escape. On recovering, he carried Mr. Anderson and the chamberlain to the tolbooth of Falkland. [*Kirkton says, "William Sethrum he laid in prison, but the doors were opened and he set free."* - *History, p. 380.*] To escape the fury of this miscreant, whose severities towards others, and whose visits to her own house, gave her but too just ground for apprehension, Lady Colvill was obliged to remain for some time from her house, and, like hundreds more of the Covenanters, who were hunted like moor-fowl or wild beasts, to hide herself in the mountains and fields, by which her health was greatly impaired. [*Account of the Sufferings of the Covenanters in Kinross-shire, Wodrow MSS., vol. xxxiii. folio, no. 143.*]

As might be expected of so zealous a Covenanter, Lady Colvill preferred having in her family servants whose sentiments in religious matters corresponded with her own; nor in this preference could she be charged with illiberality, when it is considered that, in such trying and dangerous times, there was no inconsiderable risk that servants of opposite principles might, from their hatred of nonconformity, or from their love of filthy lucre, have become spies in the family, and betrayed their mistress, or have involved her in trouble. So early as 1670, before the death of her husband, some of her servants were prosecuted for attending a field conventicle. Margaret Morton, her gentlewoman, and Elizabeth Young, her servant maid, having been present at the field meeting held upon Beath Hill, in the west of Fife, on the 18th of June, 1670, which created much noise, and greatly exasperated the government, were, along with many others in the shire of Kinross, immediately summoned to answer before the privy council; and making their appearance, they, with the rest who appeared, were thrown into prison, where they were kept for a long time. [*Wodrow MSS., vol. xxxiii., folio, no. 143. Row's life of Robert Blair, pp. 536, 538.*] Thirteen or fourteen years later, several of her servants, - among whom was Margaret Morton, a highly valued domestic, judging from the lengthened period during which she had served her lady-

ship, - were again punished for their Presbyterian principles. From a note of a decret, dated December 26, 1683, and July 15, 1684, recorded in the sheriff court books of Fife, at the instance of Mr. John Malcolm, procurator fiscal, against several persons for withdrawing from the church, keeping house and field conventicles, &c., we learn that Margaret Morton, gentlewoman to Lady Colvill, William Morton and William Young, servants to the said lady, all in the parish of Cleish, were fined each in the sum of three hundred pounds Scots, and were reported to have fled. [*Wodrow MSS., vol. xxxiii., folio, no. 144.*]

To give her son a sound religious education, was a special part of Lady Colvill's care. Besides instructing him in the common doctrines and precepts of Christianity, it was her endeavour to train him up in the principles of Presbytery and of the Covenant, which in her judgment were founded on the word of God, and connected with the honour of her Lord and Saviour. But the comfort and happiness of employing her widowhood in this laudable and delightful task, she was not permitted to enjoy. In violation of the laws of nature and society, as well as of the law of God, the privy council resolved to take her son from her, and place him under guardians and teachers who would instil into him such principles as would meet the approbation of the government. From the strength of the opposition which persecutors have often encountered in prosecuting their scheme for destroying the church, it has often suggested itself to them that one of the most important means of gaining their object is to prevent the young from being instructed in the persecuted principles. Julian the apostate, the more effectually to suppress and destroy Christianity, shut up the schools and colleges of the Christians, authorizing only pagans as the teachers of youth, in the confidence that the tender minds of the rising generation would receive at one and the same time the impressions of literature and idolatry. A similar policy was adopted by the rulers of France, who, on the revocation of the edict of Nantz, commanded the Huguenots, that those henceforward born of them should be baptized in the Roman Catholic religion, and be placed under instructors who were the enemies of their faith, to be educated in the superstition which they abhorred. The same cruel and tyrannical system was adopted against the Presbyterians of Scotland. To poison the springs and fountains of learning, it was ordained by Parliament, so early as 1662, that none should be principal, masters, regents, or other professors in universities or colleges, unless they owned the government of the church by archbishops and bishops, as then established by law, and that none should teach any public school, or be pedagogues to the children of persons of quality, without the license of the bishop of the diocese.\* But detestable as was the

\*Wodrow's History, vol. i., p. 267. Presbyterian teachers sometimes attempted to form schools for the education of the young but they did so at the risk of being imprisoned and otherwise punished, there being always individuals, who, from various motives, were sure to inform the government against them. The following quotation from Fountainhall's Historical Notices (p. 294) is a specimen of what frequently happened in cases of this nature: - "2 June, 1681. The private schoolmaster in Edinburgh being called, before the privy council and complained on by the Master of the High Grammar School (one school is far from being able to serve Edinburgh now); there are Mr. Strang, Mr. William Greenlaw, and two or three others of them imprisoned, till they find caution not to teach Latin till they be licensed by the bishop: for several of them were outed ministers, and others who were suspected to poison the young ones with disloyal principles so that the regents of the colleges defended themselves, that many of their youth were infected and leavened ere they came to them; and even when they are licensed, not to teach the grammar, but only the rudiments and vocables; for then the children may be come to that strength as to go to the High School."

tyranny of these enactments, the government went even still farther. The children of Presbyterians of quality were taken from their parents, and placed in the hands of such as would educate them in principles which they repudiated as contrary to the word of God, and to the solemn obligations under which the nation had been brought.

On learning the intention of the government to take her son from her and place him under prelatic teachers, Lady Colvill determined, as was natural enough, to keep her son, if possible, from falling into their hands, and with this view she removed him out of the way. By this the indignation of the government being excited, they immediately instituted proceedings against her. In the first place, they fined her in her absence in the sum of 5000 merks Scots; [*i. e. £277. 6s. 6d. sterling.*] and failing to pay this sum, she was apprehended and imprisoned in the tolbooth of Edinburgh. Lord Fountainhall gives the following account of the cause of her imprisonment:

“December 2, 1684. The Lady Colvill is imprisoned in Edinburgh tolbooth, by the privy council, for her irregularities, and particularly for breeding up her son, the Lord Colvill, in fanaticism and other disloyal principles, and abstracting and putting him out of the way, when the council was going to commit his education to others; for which we have acts of parliament as to the children of papists, which may be extended *a paritate* to others.” [Fountainhall's *Decisions of the Lords of Session*, vol. i., p. 316.] The reader is to observe, that this writer was an enemy to the Presbyterians, whom, though he was more moderate than the most of his kind in his day, he regarded as fanatics; and that his account of this lady is tinged with his party prejudices. His exaggerated and coloured statement, when translated into the simple language of truth, is that she was imprisoned for withdrawing from her parish church, attending house and field conventicles, and particularly for training up her son, Lord Colvill, in the principles of Presbytery and of the Covenant.



Lady Colvill in Prison.

The cell into which this lady was cast was one of the worst in the prison. It was a narrow dark room, where she required to burn candles during the whole day; and where she was without fire, though it was in the depth of winter. "It might be thought," says a MS. account of the sufferings of that period "that persons of quality and honour were not concerned in these sufferings; but the contrary is evident, as, besides other instances, in the case of my Lady Colvill, who, being fined in absence, at last was made prisoner in the tolbooth of Edinburgh, in a little room where she could not get the use of fire and the benefit of the light of day, and that for some months in the winter season." [*Wodrow MSS., vol. xl., folio, no. 6.*] And in another MS. of the same period, entitled "Grievances from Scotland, 1661-1688," the following is specified as a grievance: - "My Lady Colvill was put in the tolbooth of Edinburgh, in a strait dark fireless room, where, all day long she behoved to keep candles burning; and was thus kept for a long time, because she would not deliver up her son, my Lord Colvill. Their quarrel with her was her not countenancing the profane clergy." [*Wodrow MSS., vol. xl., folio, no. 3.*]

After lying for some weeks in this narrow, cold, and gloomy cell, than which a worse was not appropriated to robbers and murderers, Lady Colvill, from the privations and hardships she endured, was induced to petition the privy council that she might be removed to a more convenient room in the prison; and the council, at their meeting, on the 24th of December, 1684, "having considered her petition, gave order and warrant to the magistrates of Edinburgh, and keepers of the tolbooth thereof, to accommodate her with a more convenient room than that which she is now in, and to detain her prisoner therein till further order." [*Register of Acts of Privy Council.*]

In consequence of this order she appears to have been removed to "a more convenient room" in the prison; but, in those days, the best of the Scottish prisons were cheerless and unwholesome dungeons; and her health soon began to be affected. By the harsh treatment to which she had formerly been subjected, in being driven to the mountains, to shelter herself from a ruthless soldiery, her constitution had been greatly shaken; and it did not now possess vigour enough for the endurance of a rigorous and tedious imprisonment. After she had been shut up for nearly three months, her bodily indisposition became so great that her life was in danger. In these circumstances she presented a petition to the privy council, which was supported by the testimonial of a physician, praying that she might enjoy a temporary release for the recovery of her health, but containing no admission of the justice of her imprisonment, nor any engagement that, in matters of religion, she would in future live and act as the government were pleased to dictate. In answer to this petition, the council, at their meeting on the 17th of March, "gave order and warrant to the magistrates of Edinburgh to set her at liberty, upon her finding sufficient caution, under the penalty of the fine for which she is incarcerated, and to confine herself to a chamber in Edinburgh, and to re-enter the same prison upon the second of April next." [*Register of Acts of Privy Council.*]

At the time when Lady Colvill was apprehended and imprisoned in the tolbooth of Edinburgh, her son, Lord Colvill, was attending the college of Edinburgh. On learning what had befallen his mother, and hearing farther that orders had been given to apprehend and imprison him also, the youth, in great consternation, fled from the city; nor does it appear that he returned again to the college that session. To his mother this was a source of great uneasiness; and she was extremely anxious that he should be brought back to the college to prosecute his studies. This appears from a petition which she presented to the council, when the day appointed for her re-entering prison arrived, at which time she was still very unwell. After stating that the council had been pleased to grant her temporary liberty, in order to use means for the recovery of her health, but that her physicians had declared that it was impossible for them to enter on a course of medicinal treatment, with a view to her recovery in so short a time, she goes on to say, that what troubled her more (though she was brought very low by sickness,) was, that by her surprising imprisonment, her son did run away, hearing that a party was ordered to apprehend him likewise; and that now should she again enter prison, neither she herself, nor her friends, would be able to prevail upon him to return to the college to his studies, because he apprehended that so long as the council inclined to keep her prisoner, they would likewise keep him a prisoner. She engages that should the council allow her any competent time, she would, upon the word and honour of a gentlewoman, take pains and

concur with his friends to the utmost of her ability, to bring him back to the college; and after he is once settled there, she expresses her willingness to be disposed of as the council should think fit, and in the meantime offers to give sufficient security that she would present herself before the council when called. On these grounds, she humbly supplicates that the council would be pleased to allow her some competent time for the purpose specified, the state of her health being such, that she would require to be carried to prison on a bed, and she being fully resolved to employ the time which the council should allow her, in bringing back and settling her son. Having considered this petition at their meeting on the 3d of April, the council “continue the petitioner’s liberty forth of the prison until this day seven night, upon the terms and caution as formerly.”

*[Register of Acts of Privy Council.]*

On the 14th of March, 1685, the council “gave order for setting at liberty any women prisoners for receipt or harbouring of rebels, or on account of their wicked principles, upon their swearing the abjuration of the late traitorous paper, *[This was an oath abjuring a paper emitted by the Society People entitled, "The Apologetic Declaration and Admonitory Vindication of the True Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland, especially anent Intelligencers and Informers."* For a more particular account of this paper and of the oath abjuring it, see *Notices of Margaret M'Lauchlan and Margaret Wilson.*] and likewise giving their oaths that they shall not hereafter reset, harbour or keep intelligence with rebels and fugitives.” *[Register of Acts of Privy Council.]* But this act was intended to apply exclusively to such imprisoned women as belonged to the Society People or Cameronians; and as Lady Colvill did not belong to that party, this act brought her no relief. There is however another consideration, - the cupidity of the government, - which accounts for the greater leniency shown towards these Cameronian women, than towards this lady. Wherever these rapacious rulers found wealthy Presbyterians, their watchword, like that of one of Shakespeare’s characters, was “Down with them, fleece them,” and getting them once within their grasp, they did not quit their hold till they had stript them of all, or of much that they possessed. These Cameronian women being without exception poor, no money could be extracted from them; but Lady Colvill being a richer prey, the government had an eye upon her fine, and to squeeze from her the 5,000 merks, continued relentlessly to harass her. At their meeting on the 16th of April, the lords of his majesty’s privy council “grant warrant to his majesty’s advocate, to raise a process before the council, against the Lord Colvill and his mother for disorders;” and at the same meeting, they “grant warrant to the clerks of council to receive caution from the Lady Colvill for her re-entering prison within the tolbooth of Edinburgh when called, under the penalty of five thousand merks.” *[Register of Acts of Privy Council.]* She appears to have given bond for her appearance before the council on the 21st of April; and the council, at their meeting on that day, continue her liberty upon her again finding security, under the penalty contained in her former bond, to compear before his majesty’s high commissioner, upon the last Thursday of that month. Whether she appeared before the high commissioner on the day appointed, it is not said; but if she did, she does not appear to have given him the satisfaction which he required; for the council, at their meeting on the 30th of April, “gave order to Patrick Graham, captain of the town of Edinburgh’ company, to apprehend her, and to see her re-entered prisoner within the tolbooth of Edinburgh.” *[Register of Acts of Privy Council.]* This is the last notice of Lady Colvill which we meet with in the records of the privy council. Whether the order was executed, or, if it was, how long she continued in prison, we have not been able to ascertain.

In reviewing these notices of Lady Colvill’s history, it is pleasing and interesting to find that severe as was the treatment which she experienced, it had no effect in inducing her to make any unworthy compliance in order to be set at liberty, or in order to obtain a relaxation of the severity of her imprisonment. She repeatedly petitioned the privy council, on one occasion, for a better room; on another for a temporary release, on account of her bodily indisposition; on another for a further prorogation of the term of her liberty; but these favours she never asked on dishonourable terms. Rather than do this, she was prepared to suffer the slow and lingering torture of a prison - a proof how well established the principles of her faith were, and that she possessed no small degree of Christian resolution. This is the more worthy of commendation, when the weak and sickly state of body to which she was reduced is considered. But whatever were her sufferings at the hands of men, the reflection that these were endured in the cause of Christ - that it was for her stedfast adherence to him that she

was denounced a rebel, intercommuned, maligned as a fanatic, fined, and thrown into a dark and an unwholesome prison, would yield to her true satisfaction. She was honoured to suffer for Christ, and under whatever prettexts she was persecuted, she was doubtless, in the sight of Him who judgeth righteous judgment, found entitled to that benediction of the Saviour, "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."

