RICHARD CAMERON

BY JOHN HERKLESS

FAMOUS
·SCOTS·
·SERIES·

RICHARD CAMERON

RICHARD CAMERON

BY

JOHN : : HERKLESS

FAMOUS SCOTS: SERIES

PUBLISHED BY
OLIPHANT ANDERSON
& FERRIER·EDINBVRGH
AND LONDON

The designs and ornaments of this volume are by Mr Joseph Brown, and the printing from the press of Messrs Turnbull & Spears, Edinburgh.

PREFACE

I UNDERTOOK the present task from an interest in the Presbyterian rebellion, but soon found that the "Lion of the Covenant" was to the historian a lion in his den. I could hardly get at him, and it seemed impossible to catch more than a glimpse of him. In fact, the materials for a biography of Richard Cameron were so scanty that I grew alarmed, wondering how I was to make out my tale of bricks with so little straw. At length, from the registers of the University of St Andrews, and the Wodrow MSS. in the Advocates' Library, I got some pickings. I have been able to correct a few dates and fill up a gap or two in the meagre record. The hero is hardly vivid withal; but if the delineation does not amount to a portrait, there is, I trust, such a rending of the shadows as leaves the recognisable figure of a man. I have dispensed with foot notes; they would be of no value to the general reader, for whom the work is intended.

I have to thank the Rev. J. Barrack, M.A., minister of

Falkland, for giving me access to the session records, and Charles Gulland, Esq., Town-clerk of Falkland, for showing me a deed of sasine which throws some light on the family of Cameron. J. H.

THE UNIVERSITY, ST ANDREWS,
October 1896.

CONTENTS

RICHARD CAMERON

CHAPTER I

THE ECCLESIASTICAL POSITION

THE National Covenant was the bond of a people bent on having religious liberty. James VI. and Charles I., while tampering with the government of the Church, roused no open rebellion. A crisis, however, was reached when Charles touched the forms of public worship; and then the question of the relation of the sovereign to the Church was raised. Theory was set against theory; the divine right of the Church against the divine right of the king; and in 1638, by the National Covenant, Scotland decreed that her Church should be free from royal control. Fifty years passed before a sovereign came who willingly or unwillingly ratified this decree, fifty years of tragedy.

During the first generation of the 17th century there was no popular movement against Episcopacy. But resentment was felt, intense and widespread, when the English Archbishop, acting under Charles, controlled the Scottish bishops, making them his instruments to intrude a liturgy on a Church over which, by reason of national jealousy, he dared exercise no direct authority.

Was the English primate to rule the Scottish Church? Were the bishops of Scotland to obey an English prelate? The Scots turned against Episcopacy, and in the famous Glasgow Assembly Presbyterianism was restored; and the right of the Church to fix its own canons of government was claimed and exercised. The revolution of the National Covenant was, however, not merely a movement against Episcopacy. Greater issues were involved. The struggle was one for freedom, though the question of the Church was predominant; and, in the result, the theory of the divine right of kings to govern by absolute prerogative was destroyed for Scotland.

The Solemn League and Covenant marked a change in the ecclesiastical policy of the Scots, as its champions deemed Presbytery a divine institution, and Episcopacy an evil thing. It was formed for the purpose of securing unity among Christians in the three kingdoms; and to secure unity, Episcopacy must be destroyed. In due time Cromwell and the Independents became as zealous as the Scots in their attack on Episcopacy, and when they triumphed the cause of the Covenant was ruined in England. For a period, however, Presbyterianism spread as if divinely impelled; and London itself witnessed to the success of the Scottish preachers.

Toleration in the 17th century was not commonly counted among the virtues; and men in power determined that every Scot who held public office should accept the Covenant. Thus persecution without the name was practised, and was limited only because the nation as a whole was at first one with its actual leaders. But disunion was soon to come, and with it its evil. In 1645,

amidst the civil strifes, an endeavour was made to induce Charles to establish Presbyterianism everywhere in his kingdoms. He refused, after a disputation regarding the divine origin of the rival systems of church government; and had to suffer for his action, when the Commission of the General Assembly in 1646 protested that he should not enter Scotland till he had signed the Covenant. In 1647 Charles, reduced in fortune, and a prisoner in Carisbrook Castle, was willing to deal with the Scots. He would give, under sensible restrictions, a parliamentary sanction to the Covenant; and, by way of trial, would establish Presbytery in England for a period of three years. These and other terms were embodied in a treaty between him and the Scottish Estates. This treaty, known as the Engagement, did not commend itself to the General Assembly, and the policy of the Estates was condemned. What right had the civil powers to interfere with anything relating to the Covenant? The only possible engagement which the Supreme Court of the Church would acknowledge should be one in which the king, after accepting the Covenant and becoming a Presbyterian, would compel his English subjects to follow him. Scotland was now divided. At the head of the Covenanters or Church party was the Marquess of Argyll; at the head of the Engagers or Parliamentary party was the Duke of Hamilton. Cromwell had the Engagers among his opponents at Preston, and his triumph secured supremacy to Argyll and the Covenanters in their own national dispute. They in their excessive zeal passed the Act of Classes, by which every opponent of the Covenant and every Engager were excluded from places of trust and

honour. Immediately after the execution of Charles I., the Scottish Estates, reduced in membership by this Act, proclaimed his son king, and ordained that before his coronation, the new sovereign must accept the Covenant. The prince refused the conditions, as he thought the road to the crown was open without the aid of the Scots. He was mistaken; and requiring that aid he agreed to the Scottish demands. He would accept the Covenant for himself, for his family, for his kingdoms; and accept he did, before he set foot on Scottish soil. The prince had no thought to become a saint, but he would do much, and did much for the sake of a crown, even to the despicable action of signing a declaration, shamefully submitted to him, condemning his father's conduct, and branding his mother's religion as idolatry.

The defeat at Dunbar of the Scottish army, from which all Malignants or favourers of the Engagement had been excluded, created among a section of the Covenanters an intense desire for sanctity in their brotherhood. Cromwell had been victor because his enemies had trafficked with a prince who was not serious in religion. It was necessary, therefore, were the divine blessing to be secured, that the treaty with the prince should be annulled. A remonstrance was accordingly presented to the Committee of the Estates, setting forth the sin of the treaty, and of all dealings with Malignants. In the progress of events, Colonel Strachan, the military leader of the Remonstrants, was defeated by a division of the English army; but there still remained Remonstrants to witness to their desire for an exclusive sanctity, and to mark disunion among the Scots. In spite of some opposition Charles was crowned at Scone, after

he had sworn in the most solemn fashion to adhere to the Covenants.

Disunion meant weakness, and men of sense saw this. If all Malignants were to be kept out of the army there was no hope to check the Puritan soldiers. Amidst negotiations between the Parliament and the Church, it was determined that Malignants should be permitted to bear arms, after submission to ecclesiastical discipline; and the Act of Classes was formally rescinded. This new policy could not commend itself to men like the Remonstrants; and when in the Assembly of 1651 assent was demanded for resolutions embodying this policy, a protest was made by a minority of the members. These Protesters, among whom was Samuel Rutherfurd, were with the Resolutioners to divide the Church into opposing factions, and were to continue a bitter strife in years after Oliver Cromwell had tyrannously, but perhaps wisely, closed the General Assembly.

Moderation, with expediency as a basis, is a prosaic principle of conduct calculated to insure peace. Enthusiasm involves the danger of fanaticism shaped by an extreme logic, and guided by fitful passion. These two antagonisms, moderation and enthusiasm, guided each the Resolutioners and the Protesters; and, as a consequence, those who desired peace at almost any price, and those who were wearied by the fever of excessive zeal welcomed the prospect of the Restoration. The Resolutioners, a majority among the ministers, failed to gain a large popular support; and to their desire to have their vigorous opponents subdued may be attributed a share of that joy which hailed the return of Charles. Sharp, the future

archbishop, it has been alleged, tried to keep the parties separate, and secretly frustrated a scheme of union proposed by the Synod of Lothian, in order that the distractions of the Presbyterian Church might lead to the introduction of Episcopacy. After the closing of the General Assembly there was no great field for open strife, and religion suffered nothing by Cromwell's act. Both sections of the Presbyterians were marked by pious fervour. But it was the Protesters who most earnestly sought to change Scotland to a holy nation, strict in morals, severe in the simplicity of worship; and in their endeavours to make the Presbyterian Church an organisation for the establishment of such holiness they caused many to look on the country as priest-ridden, and to view the king's return as the sure hope of relief. Kirkton, the historian, tells us that he lived many years in a parish where he never heard an oath, that family-worship was practised in almost every house in the land, and that the tavern-keepers were loudest in complaints against the Church government, because 'their trade was broke.' Struck by the excellence of the times he wrote, 'Then was Scotland a heap of wheat set about with lilies, uniform, or a palace of silver beautifully proportioned.' Certain modern historians describe in very different terms this period in which ministers and elders, like their successors after the Revolution Settlement, not only investigated cases of gross immorality, but also dealt with amusements as if they were crimes, and with mild vices as if they were enormous sins; and at the same time acted as moral advisers and superintendents of manners. This supervision was irksome to many. They could not breathe

in 'that pure severity of perfect light.' But strict though the discipline of the Church was it helped to give Scotland that theological cast which has not left her, and to make her more intelligent, if not more pious.

Throughout the years of the Protectorate English soldiers were stationed in Scotland, who, by their presence, kept alive the old national jealousy. Even the friends of Cromwell could not calmly submit to the sight of English troops in their midst. During these same years the nobles, save the Marquess of Argyll and his friends, were of little count in the government of the land. They were poor after the turmoils of the Covenants; they were lords without a master to serve, expectants without a sovereign to give them place and honour; and they were kept, because of the clergy, and then of Cromwell's men, from the influence associated with their station. In a country with lively clerical factions, with ministers as dominant as busy priests, with soldiers from another land, with nobles having only the heritage of their names, there were so many men who looked with favour on the king's return that when the Restoration took place there was in truth a national rejoicing. Many of the ministers had long ceased to pray publicly for the prince who had sworn to uphold the Covenant, so little did they trust him; and yet at the Restoration there was everywhere in Scotland a lively hope that all things would be set right, simply because Charles was king, and had come back to his own again. The Protesters 'fear that the king come in,' wrote Douglas the Covenanter to Sharp; the 'new generation,' he told him, 'bear a heart-hatred to the Covenant.'

Charles the Second entered London on the 29th of May,

1660, and many of the Scottish nobles, with Argyll among them, hastened to England. On the 8th of July Argyll was a prisoner, the man who had placed the Scottish crown on the king's head. This arrest was the beginning of new trouble. Others were seized, among whom was Johnston of Warriston, who had helped to draft the National Covenant. James Guthrie and other Remonstrants were soon to be thrown into prison for resolving to congratulate the King on his restoration, and to remind him of the Covenant. On the last day of August Sharp arrived in Edinburgh, bearing a letter from the king to the local Presbytery. Charles wrote, 'We do resolve to protect and preserve the government of the Church of Scotland, as it is settled by law, without violation. . . . . We will also take care that the authority and acts of the General Assembly at St Andrews and Dundee, 1651, be owned and stand in force until we shall call another General Assembly.' By a miserable subterfuge he was soon to recede from the terms of this letter, but when it was read peace seemed, in spite of the arrests, as if it were settling upon Scotland. The Presbytery were delighted. They bought a silver box to hold the royal letter. But they were rash.

On the 1st of January, 1661, the Scottish Parliament met, with the Earl of Middleton as Commissioner, who from a Covenanter had become an ultra-royalist. This Parliament, distinguished by the vulgar manners of its leading members, and the tyranny of its acts, was styled the Drunken Parliament, by Welch, the minister of Irongray; and by this name it has been marked. It acknowledged the absolute power of the king over all persons and causes, and framed an oath of allegiance to him as supreme. It

resolved that the Covenant should not be renewed, that bond with which, to the anger of the Royalists, the king had been tied, with which, in the judgment of the Covenanters, he had bound himself when a prince without a throne.

Of its measures that which is known as the Rescissory Act is most noteworthy. By it was revoked the ecclesiastical legislation passed since the abolition of Episcopacy. But Episcopacy, thus made the legal form of government, was not to be reinstated in indirect fashion. Charles would deliberate, as he was 'sensible of the mercies of Almighty God toward him, and desirous to improve these mercies to the glory of God and honour of His great name.' This was the prince who had sworn to uphold the Covenants, and had written to the Edinburgh Presbytery that he would maintain the Church as by law established. The letter to the Presbytery, he was afterwards told, was one reason why little objection was made to the Rescissory Act. The moderate men had trusted him. Alarm soon spread, however, and in some of the local assemblies of the clergy protests were made against the abolition of Presbytery. But what was to be done with the Church, with that Church which, with its splendid traditions of the National Covenant was now at the mercy of the king? Charles met with some of his Scottish Council. He heard Middleton suggest that Episcopacy should forthwith be established, and Lauderdale reject this policy as rash. One told him there were six to one of the people for Episcopacy, another that there were six to one for Presbytery. Following the advice of the majority, who doubtless gauged his inclinations, Charles resolved that Episcopacy should henceforth be the constitutional form

of the Church of Scotland. He did not consult the Church itself through its ministers and elders. If Charles had possessed the moral or spiritual right to tamper with the constitution of a church; and if he had not deliberately by oath accepted the National Covenant, setting forth the Church's claim to govern itself, and the Solemn League and Covenant condemning Episcopacy; then charity might have found excuse for him, when amidst a conflict of advisers he resolved to thrust Episcopacy upon Scotland. But Charles with the instinct or habit of his race cast aside oaths and promises, and the law of his rule was his own inclination. The letter to the Presbytery of Edinburgh, however, could not easily be forgotten, and some plausible explanation had to be found. In this fashion the king explained his promise to maintain the Church by law established, and to summon a General Assembly before changing its constitution—'Whereas . . . we did . . . declare our purpose to maintain the government of the Church of Scotland settled by law; and our parliament having since that time not only rescinded all the acts since the troubles began referring to that government, but also declared all those pretended parliaments null and void, and left to us the settling and securing of Church government; therefore . . . we have, after mature deliberation declared . . . our firm resolution to interpose our royal authority for restoring of that Church to its right government by bishops, as it was by law before the late troubles, . . . and as it now stands settled by law.' When the king had interpreted the letter to his own purposes an Act was passed by the Privy Council establishing Episcopacy as the lawful government of the Church of Scotland. Parlia-

ment met in its second session in 1662 and required all men in public office to abjure the Covenant as seditious. Further, it decided that all ministers inducted into their charges after 1649, the date of the Parliamentary abolition of patronage, should obtain a new presentation from the patron and institution from a bishop. After this Act three hundred ministers left their manses, refusing to reject the Covenants and to deny their faith at the bidding of a king. In another century Scotland was again to show by a like secession that she had among her clergy those who knew how to obey, to their own suffering, an accepted spiritual law.

Other events, besides formal Acts of Parliament, showed the quality of the rule of Charles. Argyll and Guthrie, noble and preacher, leaders of the Covenanters, were put to death. The scattered remains of Montrose were gathered for decent burial, and this may be reckoned an act of grace by the man who intending dishonour to the body of Oliver Cromwell made war with the dead. The Solemn League and Covenant was burned by order of the English Parliament: the National Covenant was publicly torn by heralds at the Market Cross of Edinburgh. A reign of tyranny and mean vengeance had begun. But Scotland was not dead to its traditions and its love of liberty. For twenty-eight years, through the times of Charles and of James, the strife between freedom and tyranny was to last, a strife represented on the one side by men of the people like Richard Cameron, and on the other by king's men with their titles of nobility. A struggle with hardly a leader of social fame in the one faction, does not kindle the

imagination of those who love a garish show in strife and splendour in their heroes. The absence of almost all the nobles from ranks swelled by peasants and officered by preachers, seems to mark the later Covenanting movement, not as a struggle for national freedom, but as the hysteric of rude religious fanatics. Yet the cause was one in character with the earlier revolution of the National Covenant, which attracted Scotland's greatest nobles, and with them Montrose himself. Then, however, the privileges of the nobles were touched, for Charles I. had interfered with their hold over the teinds, had threatened to take from them the lands of the ancient Church, had sought to abolish their heritable jurisdictions, and was placing clerics in the offices of state. At the Restoration these same nobles, or their representatives, were poor; and instead of privileges to guard, had only favours to seek. These favours the king in England could alone bestow. They accepted, therefore, a tyranny which touched not themselves so much as the people who treasured religious freedom; and they refused to lose the royal smiles and rewards for the sake of the independence of the Church. Sycophants these nobles were, almost to a man. Some fawned and became tyrants under an autocrat, others sinned by not resisting. In bald and ugly form the royal supremacy was set forth from time to time, and these men were ever obedient, degrading themselves into tools of the king who held that "God would not damn a man for a little irregular pleasure"; and who had it declared by one of his parliaments that he derived his power from Almighty God alone. Few men of rank were Covenanters; and this fact has robbed the Presbyterian

struggle of the glamour derived from titles and of the splendour got from the noble names which carried the best traditions of the land; but it does not touch the justice of the cause or make it less a Scottish fight for freedom.

Among the Covenanters Richard Cameron was prominent, and for one year was the most conspicuous opponent of the king. There are but few facts of his life to record. History seems as if it had meant that not the man but only the actor in a tragedy should be seen. And yet this man, with but fragments of a recorded life, has had his name bestowed in popular speech on a religious sect, and granted by official authority to a regiment of the British army. Fame has thus given him the place, if history has refused him the reputation, of an illustrious Scotsman.

CHAPTER II

ST ANDREWS

THE royal burgh of Falkland in Fife, the birthplace of Richard Cameron, was like Edinburgh and Dunfermline associated with the kings of Scotland. One after another of the Stuarts resided in the castle, where the young Duke of Rothesay died or was murdered, or in the palace which was erected in more modern times. There Margaret of Anjou and her son were received by the queen-mother, Mary of Gueldres; and there Perkin Warbeck was the guest of James IV. Thither Mary of Guise was attracted by the woods and fields, and in the famed forest her daughter sought the excitement and pleasure of the hunt. James VI. loved the place, though it was the scene of the disputation when Andrew Melville styled him 'God's silly vassal.' In the exuberant days of his courtship he proposed to give his wife 'the Erldome of Fyff, with the palice and castell of Falkland,' and when he created Sir Henry Carey a peer, he named him Viscount Falkland in Fife. Charles I., Charles II., Cromwell by his soldiers, and, last of all, Rob Roy, in the Jacobite movement of 1715, enriched the associations of the burgh. The court life at Falkland was depicted by Dunbar in more than one of his comic poems; and

Sir David Lindsay sang the praises of its hunting fields :—

> 'Fair weill Falkland ! the fortrace of Fyfe,
> Thy polyte park, under the Lowmound Law !
> Sum tyme in thee I led ane lustye lyfe
> The fallow deir, to see thaime raik on raw.'

Under the shadow of what remains of this ancient house of the Stuarts stands the cottage where Richard Cameron was born. The palace and the cottage, without stretch of fancy, serve as symbols of the social positions of the king and the Covenanter, who had their places as opponents in the Presbyterian revolution. It was the cottage, for Cameron's sake, and not the palace with its Stuart memories, which excited the interest of Carlyle when he visited Falkland, and talked, as he had written, of the Covenanters with 'their indomitable pious constancy.' Within the burgh the Hackstons of Rathillet had a house, and there David Hackston and Richard Cameron may have begun their comradeship which ended in death.

Richard Cameron was the eldest son of Allan Cameron, burgess of Falkland and general merchant there, and his wife Margaret Paterson. Little is known of Allan Cameron beyond the few details connecting him with the cause for which his son died. He is named in the Falkland session records in a note of the case of two women residing in his house who had not presented to the minister and elders the 'testimonial' regarding their previous life. Among the title deeds of this house is an instrument of sasine which gives his name and that of his wife, and which describes Richard as the eldest son. It appears from this

instrument of sasine, of date 1700, granted in favour of three grand-daughters of one David Ferguson, that in 1670 Allan Cameron and 'Mr Richard Cameron his eldest lawful son,' with consent of Margaret Paterson, 'spouse to the said Allan, and mother to the said Mr Richard,' sold a property in Falkland to this David Ferguson for the sum of eleven hundred and seventy-five pounds, eight shillings and fivepence, Scots money; and further, that a bond of four hundred and ninety-three pounds, Scots money, was held over the property by George Bayn, merchant burgess of Edinburgh. Ferguson obtained right to the whole property under redemption; but apparently it was never redeemed, as his three grand-daughters were infeft, and ultimately disposed of it. The bond to George Bayn probably accounts for the assertion of a modern editor of 'A Cloud of Witnesses,' that the title deeds show that Allan Cameron borrowed money on the house in order to send his son to one of the universities.

The date of Richard Cameron's birth cannot be ascertained, as the register no longer exists which might have contained the note of his baptism. He was probably born about 1648, as he entered the University of St Andrews in 1662. In this latter year, it may be taken, he was thirteen or fourteen years of age, as, till a recent generation, boys who went to the universities enrolled while they were very young. Little has been recorded regarding the members of his family. One of the brothers, Michael, is known chiefly from his death at Ayrsmoss. In the Falkland session record, October 1674, there is the item, 'Michael Cameron and Rebecca Armour were contracted, James Carmichael became

surety for their pand, and they gave to the poor twelve shillings.' It was customary to register contracts of marriage, and to name a person acting as security for the parties; and it was usual to make a payment for the poor. There is nothing further regarding this marriage, though there are notes of marriages after contract, and therefore it is impossible to say that it took place. A second brother, Alexander, is also known by name. On the 24th of February, 1680, Allan Cameron wrote to M'Ward, a Scottish minister in Holland, telling him he desired to send his youngest son, Alexander, to study at the Dutch colleges. He described him as being over twenty-one years of age, as having been a weaver, and as possessing 'only some smack of humanity,' that is, of classical learning; and stated that he feared to send him to a Scottish university where he would be suspected on account of his relatives, and would be in danger of corruption. The universities at that time were under Episcopal domination, and hence Allan Cameron, who had joined the Covenanters, feared that his son might be led away from the cause to which the other members of the family were devoted. Alexander Cameron was in Utrecht about the time of the Revolution. In a letter, published in 'Faithful Contendings,' he is styled Reverend, and is blamed for joining with the 'Association Party,' some of whom are described as guilty of or accessory to his brother's murder. Among the traditions of the Covenanters there is a story of one Marion Cameron done to death by royalist troopers; and this woman or girl was said by some local report to be the sister of Richard Cameron.

Our information regarding the life of Cameron is meagre.

What has hitherto been published is mainly derived from Patrick Walker's *Biographia Presbyteriana*. Some of his facts he obtained from 'A Cloud of Witnesses,' and others he himself collected. Walker, who was born shortly before the Restoration, was a staunch Covenanter, and in social class, in education, and in habit was another Robert Paterson, the *Old Mortality* of Scott. He seems to have cared little for incidents throwing no light on the religious career of his heroes, as he described Cameron's early life in a few words, and devoted a long tract to a vindication of his name. For the heroes of his own sect, the most rigid Covenanters, he had the liveliest admiration; while for their opponents his hate was bitter. His fierce prejudice and his amusing simplicity are shown in his description of Archbishop Sharp. . . 'I have often wondered if ever the sun shined upon a man guilty of so many dreadful unheard-of acts of wickedness, attended with all aggravating circumstances to make them prodigiously heinous, except his dear brother Judas who murdered the young prince of Iscariot, and his own father, married his mother, and betrayed his Lord.' The writer of these words may fittingly be taken as an example of certain Covenanters who were as intolerant of Episcopacy as they were zealous for Presbytery. From him we learn that Richard Cameron 'was born in Falkland, in Fife; his father was a merchant there. After he had passed his courses of learning he was schoolmaster and precentor to the curate in Falkland, and sometimes heard the Indulged.' Howie of Lochgoin, the author of 'The Scots Worthies,' simply takes Walker's words without adding details to this brief notice.

If Cameron spent his school-days in Falkland, as probably he did, he would receive religious instruction from Mr William Livingstone, who belonged to the moderate section of the Presbyterians. Livingstone was minister of the parish till 1663, and the fact that he was then translated to Burntisland indicates that he had conformed to Episcopacy. As early as 1651 he had broken away from the strictest Presbyterians. 'This day,' so runs a notice in the minutes of the Presbytery of Cupar, 'Mr Walter Greig informed the Presbyterie that he had received advertisement that there had been such doctrine preached by Mr William Livingstone in the kinges hearing, as required to be adverted, and that gave offence to some.' It is known that Cameron, after his university career, held office under the Episcopal minister of Falkland, and it may therefore be assumed that his family, influenced by Livingstone, belonged to the party of the Resolutioners, and conformed at the Restoration to the new ecclesiastical order.

Youths from Fife intending to enter one of the universities would almost certainly choose St Andrews. In the matriculation-register of the University of St Andrews, Martij 5, anno 1662, stands the name Richardus Cameron; and while there is no note to help identification, there is no other name with which to confuse that of the future Covenanter. In the college of St Salvator, of which he became a member, he studied under Mr William Campbell, the regent or tutor, who superintended throughout their course of four years the students who matriculated in 1662. This man had satisfied the Episcopal requirements of Sharp, though his early zeal had flowed

in another direction. In 1649 he was a regent, and did 'dedicate his thesis to David Leslie, L. Generall of the forces standing for the tyme in the kingdome.' Cameron pursued the regular studies of the college, and on July 22, 1665, graduated Master of Arts. These studies, as arranged by the General Assembly in 1642, included Latin, Greek, Hebrew, arithmetic, logic, rhetoric, ethics, geometry, metaphysics, astronomy, geography, anatomy. Students were required, in all places within and without the colleges, to speak Latin amongst themselves; and for recreation were allowed golf and archery, but were forbidden to use cards or dice. There is no incident or story to light up the record of Cameron's student days, nothing like the dining-room brawl, when Sharp, the future archbishop, gave a comrade 'a sharp box on the ear' for calling him a liar. The record is simply the dull prose of the items of the register.

The signature in the list of graduates is Richardus Camero. The new Master of Arts, perhaps in excitement or carelessness, perhaps with the desire to use something like a Latin form, failed to write the final letter of his name. The formidable list of college studies suggests a curriculum for an 'admirable Crichton,' and seems to mark a Scottish graduate of the 17th century as a paragon of learning. These studies, however, were more varied than exact, as in Cameron's case, at any rate, there was never sign or reputation of profound scholarship. Sir James Turner in his 'Memoirs' speaks with candour of the value of the degree which he gained in Glasgow University in the early part of that century. 'I was commanded,' he says, 'by my father and grandfather to

commence Master of Arts at Glasgow, much against my will, as never intending to make use of that title which undeservedlie was bestowed upon me, as it was on many others before me, and hath been on too many since.' The Commissioners of 1642, however, had raised the standard of the degree when they issued the recommendation—'It is both a disgrace to learning, and a hindrance to trades and other callings, that such as are grossly ignorant and unfit for any profession in letters be honoured with any degree or public testimony of learning; it is therefore earnestly recommended to the Faculty of Arts that such trial be taken of students especially of magistrands, before the time of laureation, so that those who are found altogether unworthy be not admitted to the degree and honour of Masters.'

St Andrews at this period was completely under the control of Archbishop Sharp, who had been Presbyterian minister of Crail, and for a year had been a professor in the college of St Mary. Nothing is known of Cameron's youthful experience in this centre of Episcopacy. Certainly there was no premature revolt from Established Church order, no early promise of coming heroism. Before he entered the University the change in the Church had taken place, and Presbyterian rulers were no longer set over the city. Samuel Rutherfurd, the Principal of St Mary's College, had died in 1661, and had thus probably escaped the penalty of execution or the glory of martyrdom. Shortly after the Restoration he was discharged from his office, and to the messengers who called him before the authorities in Edinburgh he is reported to have said, 'Tell them that sent you that I have got summons already

before a superior Judge and Judicatory, and I behove to answer to my first summons; and ere your day come, I will be where few kings and great folk come.' His book, 'Lex Rex,' was publicly burned by the common hangman. It was a tract subversive of the theory of unrestricted royal prerogative, and in the order for its destruction was described as withdrawing his Majesty's subjects 'from the duty of that loyal love and obedience which they owed to his sacred person and greatness.' The market-place where it was burned was not far distant from the house of George Buchanan, who in another reign had tried by a 'seditious pamphlet' to open the eyes of his countrymen to the actual foundation of the authority of their kings; and was in a city closely associated with Knox who had asked and answered many questions regarding the rights and duties of kings. Milton, in the sonnet 'On the new forcers of conscience,' made complaint against the tyranny of Rutherfurd's party: —

> 'Because you have thrown off your Prelate Lord,
> And with stiff vows renounc'd his Liturgy
> To seize the widow'd whore Plurality
> From them whose sin ye envied, not abhorr'd,
> Dare ye for this adjure the civil sword
> To force our consciences, that Christ set free;
> And ride us with a classic hierarchy
> Taught ye by mere A.S. and Rutherford?'

The 'Lex Rex,' in spite of its author's ecclesisatical policy, makes for constitutional liberty, and its doctrines helped to shape the mind of Richard Cameron, as he showed in the Vindication of the Sanquhar Declaration.

Robert Blair, the minister of the first charge of St

Andrews, was banished from the city shortly after Rutherfurd's death. Among the events of his varied life was his expulsion from the University of Glasgow, as stated in 'The King's Large Declaration,' for being disaffected to monarchical government. Rutherfurd and Blair for a time ruled St Andrews; and, according to Balfour's 'Annals,' had emissaries in every college, and sought to fill the university offices with men of their own opinions. In days of intolerant enthusiasm it was natural for leaders of a faction to seize the places within their grasp, and the Presbyterians did what was in turn done by the Episcopalians. Rutherfurd and Blair opposed Sharp in his candidature for the professorship, though he was a scholar fitted for the work of teaching. Their opposition was in vain, as their rule was coming to an end, and soon they had to yield to him.

Shortly after his appointment to the professorship Sharp received the degree of Doctor of Divinity and his design, Blair's biographer says, was not to continue any time in the college, but was 'to make the doctorate a stirrup to mount him to prelacy; for according to the canon law, none can ascend to prelacy except first he be a doctor of divinity.'

With or without the help of this degree he did become a prelate, Archbishop of St Andrews, primate of Scotland; and for nearly twenty years was the most powerful and most hated of the churchmen. Whether he betrayed or saved the Church of Scotland, when he passed from professor to prelate, is likely to continue an open question; but the malediction of the staunch Presbyterian, Douglas,

seemed to many to be fulfilled. 'James,' said Douglas, 'I see you will engage, I perceive you are clear, you will be bishop of St Andrews; take it and the curse of God with it.' Opposition of another kind, it is alleged, he met with from Lauderdale who, some years after Middleton, became the king's commissioner in the government of Scotland. Lauderdale assuredly opposed the sudden introduction of Episcopacy as dangerous to the public peace, and during the period of his power, while proving a tyrant to the Covenanters, was no friend to the prelates. 'Mr Sharp,' he is reported to have said, 'bishops you are to have in Scotland, and you, I hear, are to be Archbishop of St Andrews; but, whoever shall be the man, I will smite him and his order under the fifth rib.' Not unfittingly Cromwell had styled him Mr Sharp of that Ilk.

In the month of April, 1662, Sharp, now Archbishop, proceeded through Fife in his progress towards St Andrews. At various places, Falkland among these, he was met by 'divers persons and corporations.' A few noblemen and gentlemen accompanied him, and between the Earl of Rothes on the right hand, and the Earl of Kellie on the left, he entered St Andrews. At the entrance to the city he was met by Mr William Comry of St Leonard's, and Mr William Barclay, formerly of Falkland. On the Sunday he preached in the Town Church with 'a velvet cushion in the pulpit before him.' His text was, 'For I am determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified.' His sermon, we are told by Lamont, did not run much on these words, and leaving them he preached in vindication of himself and of the

utility of Episcopacy. At the end of April he returned to Edinburgh. There had been nothing to disquiet him; his opponents had been removed; and in the city with its memories of Knox, Melville, Henderson, and Rutherfurd there was Episcopal peace.

A youth at college was not likely to come into personal relationship with Sharp. Cameron, however, must have noted the high social style of the Archbishop which his countrymen have not loved in their clergy; and the spectacle of the man so largely responsible for the troubles of the land may have awakened in him that resentment against coercion and tyranny which was natural to a Scot, and which was felt by him in the days of his prominence.

Mr William Barclay, who met the Archbishop at St Andrews, was the minister under whom Cameron was to hold office in Falkland. He had been deposed from his charge in 1644 for taking the side of Montrose; and whatever he may have done during the Protectorate, he was found in 1661 acting the part of an informer to Sharp regarding Blair's preaching, and as a witness when Blair's case was tried before the Privy Council. It was natural that on the occurrence of a vacancy in Falkland the man who had been deposed for malignancy should be restored; and it was according to custom that an informer should receive a reward. The parish was fortunate after the Restoration in gaining an experienced clergyman, even though the grace of courtesy was absent from the conduct of Mr William Barclay. When the Presbyterian clergy were evicted, there was not a sufficient number of educated men to fill the charges. Patrons

yielded their right to the bishops, whose presentees were commonly known as curates. Bishop Burnet spoke of these men as ignorant to a reproach, and as the worst preachers he had ever heard. Kirkton describes them as taken almost wholly from the north of Scotland, and reports that a gentleman complained that it was impossible to get lads to keep the cows, 'they turn all ministers.' Kirkton is not slow to speak of their vices, and he is recording but a minor fault when he narrates, 'I've heard the curates upon Edinburgh streets swear as fast as ever I heard a debaucht red-coat.' It was a common belief among the Presbyterians that the bishops were guilty of scandalous deeds, and that the curates outdid the bishops. Stories were told which might have served as sequels to 'The Milleres Tale.' It is to be remembered, however, that the curates, while they did not gain the esteem of the people, succeeded men who, by their adherence to principle and their sacrifice of place, had won admiration. They had, moreover, mean work to do. In many places a roll of the parishioners was called on Sundays, that it might be known how they were affected to the Church; and it was the duty of the curates to report to some officer of the Government. Fines were levied from the non-conformists; and in the progress of coercion personal property was seized and estates were forfeited. The loyalty of the Scottish cavaliers in the times of the last Stuart kings was stimulated by the rewards of fines and estates. Sharp himself erected a High Commission Court to deal with the opponents of the Church; and its character was shown in the case of certain boys who, for throwing stones at a curate who had beaten a woman,

were scourged, burned in the face, and sold as slaves to Barbadoes.

Some of the evicted ministers continued to reside in their former parishes, drawing the people to field-meetings, until the Government forbade them to preach. The curates could inform regarding these meetings, but they were powerless to punish. Drastic measures were required to quell the silent but persistent revolution. Sir James Turner, author of 'Memoirs of his own Life and Times,' a soldier of fortune with the characteristic vices, was sent to the West with a body of troopers. He and his men acted with a vigour which a tyrannical Government could appreciate; and yet many of the people still clung to the evicted clergy, meeting with them secretly for worship, obtaining their services for marriages, and taking children to them to be baptized.

In 1666, in consequence of a fray roused by the cruelty of the soldiers, a number of Covenanters, banding together, went to Dumfries and made Turner prisoner. The open revolt against tyranny had begun. Continuing in arms they marched through Ayrshire to Lanark, and then towards Edinburgh. On the 28th of November they reached Rullion Green, where they were met by General Dalziel, the fiercest and most savage soldier of the time. They had been disappointed in their progress, as they looked for the persecuted everywhere to join them. Undrilled peasants, however, were not necessarily cowards because they would not meet the trained bands of the king; and Rullion Green proved how weak was enthusiasm before discipline. Dalziel was victor, slaying some forty-five men, and taking a

hundred prisoners; and these prisoners learned, through suffering, the enormity of the crime of seeking freedom. Many were cruelly treated and then sent to death. Among these was Hugh M'Kail, a youthful preacher who was tortured with the boot that he might reveal the secrets of his party; but he had nothing to hide, while he freely confessed his hatred of the oppression of pitiless tyrants.

After his victory Dalziel was sent among the Covenanters, and cruelty and oppression almost quelled them into obedience.

In 1667, thanks to the reviving patriotism of certain nobles, a milder character showed itself in the policy of the Government; and easy terms of submission were offered to many of those who had taken arms. This policy, though instituting the Indulgences for the Presbyterian clergy, did not long continue; and it may be that it was fanaticism, or it may be that it was independence and a sense of injury, which doomed it to failure. The difficulty which confronted the Government in their efforts for ecclesiastical unity came from the fact that in a country with traditions of liberty, where torture was now made use of, there were men who would not conform to a church without Scriptural basis, and would not obey a king who, intruding into spiritual things, was breaking the unwritten law of God. These Covenanters did not forget the men who had been evicted for conscience' sake; nor would they abandon them for the curates who, in the general opinion, far from being holy were not even decent.

The Indulgences, which mark a stage in the Covenanting strife, increased rather than diminished the conventicles. These meetings were common in Fife and were known

even in Falkland, where Livingstone had been a moderate Presbyterian and Barclay was an immoderate Episcopalian. Richard Cameron, who according to the record became schoolmaster and precentor to the curate of Falkland, in due time attended the conventicles, and in due time gave the most active opposition to the Indulgences and the Indulged.

CHAPTER III

SCHOOLMASTER AND CHAPLAIN

In the 17th century and till a much later period, the schoolmaster was closely associated with the minister in parochial work. He was generally the session-clerk, and frequently acted as reader in the church, when there was such a functionary. Cameron does not seem to have been either session-clerk or reader, and, therefore, may not have been first master in the school or schools of Falkland. He was, however, a teacher, and was also precentor 'to raise the tune' at the services of public worship. The date of his return to Falkland is unknown. After he graduated he may have attended the classes of Divinity in St Mary's College; but as students were not required to matriculate in each successive year of attendance, there is no way of discovering how long he remained in the University. It is not likely, however, that he went through the usual theological course after his graduation in 1665, as the Falkland record beginning 6th October, 1667, contains no note of his appointment as precentor. There is, indeed, no such note under an earlier year, but the record from 1st April, 1663, to 5th October, 1667, has not been preserved. Under the 29th of March, 1674, there is a minute which throws some

light on his career. A part of the fees for making graves was to be given to the precentor; 'but, in the meantime, it is ordained that this money which is ordained for the precentor shall be laid in the box.' Shortly afterwards a Robert Lindsay was elected, who by way of salary was to receive the rent of his chamber, and a share of the fees for baptism, marriage, and burial. Some such salary Cameron would receive; and it is of importance to note that in March, 1674, the office was vacant, which at some time he had held.

The session records contain nothing relative to his work as schoolmaster. Before he entered on his duties he must have received a certificate from the Archbishop of St Andrews. Sharp knew no toleration, and in neither church nor school would permit a Presbyterian to teach. Under his influence the Synod of Fife appointed 'that the Presbyteries put in execution that former Act relating to schoolmasters, chaplains, and paedagogues, that none be admittit to officiat within their bounds, bot those who are warranted be my Lord Archbishop's license.' Sharp's policy was thorough. All ministers, chaplains, and schoolmasters were to acknowledge Episcopacy; and Presbyterianism was to be cast out of the land. The Archbishop of St Andrews was an astute man, but in his vision of triumphant Episcopacy, unalterable facts were omitted. Neither Act of Parliament nor statute of a Lord Archbishop could transform in the mass the ministers, chaplains, and schoolmasters, and make them abjure the Presbyterian creed which was to so many a symbol of freedom; and the civil and ecclesiastical rulers were to learn that tyranny

was impotent to overturn the nation's prejudice or principle.

Cameron ceased to be schoolmaster when he ceased to be precentor, as his departure from Falkland did not depend on his competence to discharge the duties of either of his offices, but on his attitude to the government of the Church. The first indication of a change in his ecclesiastical position was the fact that 'he sometimes heard the Indulged.' In 1669, in accordance with a new principle introduced into the policy of the Government, an Indulgence was extended to certain Presbyterian ministers. Some of the ministers were to be permitted to preach, and were to receive stipends, provided they accepted collation from a bishop; others who would not thus acknowledge Episcopacy were to have the manses and glebes, subject to conditions. Leighton, bishop of Dunblane, almost the one tolerant man of his time, may have suggested these arrangements which were accepted by twelve, and then by thirty ministers. On the other hand, it has been asserted that Lauderdale, to annoy the prelates, devised this relief for their opponents. Whoever was the author, the scheme satisfied neither the one party nor the other. The strict Covenanters would accept no help from what to their thinking was an Erastian source. The Episcopalians objected to any interference with the jurisdiction of the bishops; but amidst their claims of independence they were forced to accept, and had not the courage to resist, an Act which made Charles supreme in all ecclesiastical affairs, giving him the sole right to determine and to administer the government of the Church. It has been suggested that the Act of Supremacy was passed

at the instigation of certain influential Presbyterians, in order that the Indulgence might be made legal as coming from one with authority to legislate for the Church. This suggestion is based on a misunderstanding. The Covenanters believed that no earthly power could give a king a spiritual jurisdiction within the Church, and in their judgment, therefore, no Act of Parliament could confer on Charles supremacy over the Church. Sharp and the other prelates objected to the Act. They had not, however, that courage to resist an encroachment of the royal prerogative which so many of the Presbyterians displayed at the Restoration.

The Indulged ministers whom Cameron heard were under Government supervision, and would certainly not touch the questions of ecclesiastical policy. By the zealous Covenanters they were styled dumb dogs for not denouncing Prelacy. Having conformed, they were committed to silence; and perhaps they were justified in their silence. Yet men who had left the National Church, on account of the tyranny which intruded Episcopacy, were not heroes when they took their licence to preach from the hands of the king, and returned to their parishes by the sanction of a prelate. In 1672, a second Indulgence was granted to some eighty ministers. Heroism was declining among the clergy. Many of them were reduced in their opposition to the Government through the Indulgence, on the one hand, and coercion on the other, but there were some who became more determined in their claim of freedom of worship. After the first Indulgence, extensive field-meetings were arranged, at which some of the worshippers appeared in arms for

protection against military attack. The Government were alarmed lest the conventicles should lead to civil war, and 'the tale of bricks was doubled.' In 1670, they passed an Act requiring anyone, if interrogated by an officer of the Crown, to give such information as he had regarding the field-meetings; and ordaining imprisonment or banishment for those who refused this information. For an offending minister a still harder fate was devised. If he preached in the fields he was to be punished by the confiscation of his goods and by death. The Government became mean in their tyranny, and offered rewards to informers bringing word of the field-preachers. Fines, imprisonment, and exile were reserved for such as had children baptized by these preachers, and for such as absented themselves from the churches. To make these laws effective, magistrates and land-owners were to be responsible for conventicles, house-holders were to answer for the conduct of their servants and children; and a crisis was reached in this miserable play of tyranny, when it was decreed that he who befriended suspects should be held guilty of their alleged crimes. When punishment was so freely threatened in this period of vigorous government, a prison was needed: and one was found on the Bass Rock, where many a Covenanter spent months and years within the sight of the land whose freedom he loved.

The true story of the Covenanters is to be found in the Statute-book of Scotland and in the minutes of her Privy Council. These men, in the judgment of not a few, were fanatics incensed against Episcopacy, and foolish in their

zeal for Presbytery; martyrs not for the truth of God, but for visionary schemes of freedom from control; false patriots seeking not the good of the land, but opposing a beneficent Government resolute for order. But the laws tell their own tale; and where else are such laws to be found? Men who have opposed tyranny shaped into laws do not deserve to be branded as fanatics to their shame. What is named fanaticism is oftentimes an excellent thing, the unwearied and uncompromising advocacy of a principle worthy to be fought for, the persistent striving of the few for a noble cause.

We do not know the circumstances under which Cameron was induced to risk punishment by attending the conventicles. The record in the *Biographia Presbyteriana* is: 'At length he went to hear the persecuted gospel in the fields'; and the pious reflection is added, 'In that sun-blink day of power, when the net of the Gospel let down at the right side of the ship, then a great draught of perishing souls was effectually caught.' Fife, at this period, was the scene of many conventicles, in connection with which Mr John Welch, the great-grandson of Knox, was conspicuous. Welch was minister of the parish of Irongray, in Dumfries, from which he was compelled to retire in 1662 for refusing to conform. He was afterwards to be associated in friendly relation with Cameron, who, very probably, was first attracted to him in Fife. Between 1670 and 1672 Welch preached at various times at Kinkel, near St Andrews, 'and had numerous hearers from that city, university, and neighbourhood.' In the

summer of 1674 he went through Fife, preaching from place to place, and drawing together congregations of eight or ten thousand people. In the *Scots Worthies*, from which the facts regarding Welch are gathered, it is narrated that 'another of Mr Welch's meetings was at Falkland Wood, on a day when a number of gentry were present. The curate of Falkland came forth on this occasion, and some with him, in a boasting, swaggering way, offering to debate with him, after preaching. But if Mr Welch had not, by his composed and calm words, restrained the people, they would have debated the curate at that which would have done his turn, before he could have begun.' The minister of Falkland in this year was Mr John Hay, the successor of Mr William Barclay. Before his appointment to Falkland, Hay had been a regent in St Leonard's College, St Andrews. His bigotry, or zealous consistency, was seen in the fact that he was deposed from his living, at the Revolution Settlement, for refusing to read a proclamation issued by the Estates.

Cameron was not the only schoolmaster in Fife who attended the conventicles. In the Synod of Fife, October 1672, attention was drawn to the disaffected chaplains and schoolmasters; and an instruction was issued to the Presbyteries: 'The Lord Archbishop and Synod, being informed that several chaplaines and scholemasters, disaffected to the government of the Church, doe, by their lecturing and conventicling, alienat several persons from that peaceable submission to their pastors, and the attendance on the public worship of God, as becometh them; therefor the Lord Archbishop and

Synod appoint that the several Presbitries take notice of such persons, and that they give in ther names at the next Synod, that none officiat in such stations without licence.' In a representation to the Privy Council, made by the same Synod in 1674, mention was made of 'the travelling of multituds of people on the Lord's day to conventicles at a great distance.' There is no information that Cameron was one of those referred to in the instruction to the presbyteries; but, in any case, men of his own profession, by whom he might be influenced, openly attended the field-meetings. In the *Scots Worthies* it is related that when the curates understood that he was frequenting these meetings, they endeavoured, by flattery and threats, and by direct persuasion, to make him abstain. He had, however, 'got a lively discovery of the sin of prelacy, and he deserted the curates altogether.' At this crisis he applied himself to the burning questions of the day, and convinced himself that the Indulgences were sinful because they came from the king, who had no jurisdiction in the Church, and that the honour of Christ was wronged by any admission of Erastianism. He longed for an opportunity, we are told, to testify against the Indulgences, and this opportunity was afforded when he left Falkland to become private chaplain to Sir William Scott of Harden, in Selkirkshire. We do not know at what date, or by whose recommendation, he gained this appointment. It was not uncommon at this time for Scottish gentlemen to engage domestic chaplains, and many were enabled to show kindness to evicted ministers by taking them into their employment. These chaplains were not overlooked by the vigilance of the Government.

In 1675, Mr John King, chaplain to Lord Cardross, was seized by dragoons, from whom he was rescued by some country people. The Privy Council, to whom the case was reported, imprisoned and fined Lord Cardross, placed garrisons in certain private houses, and issued this order: 'Whereas the Council, by an Act of 28th July 1674, did ordain the archbishops and bishops in their respective dioceses to inquire what persons had taken upon them to be chaplains in families, or to teach any public schools, or to be pedagogues to the children of persons of quality, and to report; in regard the said report has not been made, we have renewed our former act.' The chaplains, in spite of the Episcopal supervision, continued to give trouble, and were again the cause of a special order. In the Register of the Synod of Dunblane, 1682, in reference to the 'Test,' there is this note: 'and as to chaplains refractioned herein, it is appointed that the minister of the parish, where such remained, shall give timeous advertisement to the master of the chaplain that he ought not to entertain such a chaplain, contrary to the Act of Parliament.' It was not necessary that the domestic chaplains should be in clerical orders. Some of them were, such as this Mr John King. Cameron, though not a licensed preacher when he went to Harden, was none the less subject to the supervision required by the order of the Council.

There is nothing to indicate what the duties were which Cameron performed at Harden; but from such sources as the autobiography of Thomas Boston, it may be gathered that the private chaplain conducted family

worship, catechized the servants, reproved and warned any that were vicious, and also, where there were children, acted as tutor.

Sir William Scott, whose house Cameron entered, was the grandson of 'Auld Wat of Harden,' and his wife 'The Flower of Yarrow,' celebrated in more than one ballad. His father had been fined by Cromwell for attachment to the cause of Charles II., and he himself had been knighted by that monarch shortly after the Restoration. At the date of Cameron's appointment, Scott and his wife, 'a daughter of the house of Kilmarnock,' had alienated themselves from the strictest royalists so far as to attend the Presbyterian services; and the fact that they took into their house one who had deserted the curates, indicates their dissatisfaction with the coercive policy of the Government. Another member of the Harden family, the knight's brother, Walter Scott of Raeburn, had made himself conspicuous by joining the sect of the Quakers, who were strongly opposed by Presbyterians and Episcopalians alike. In 1665 he was sent to prison, and the Council gave the custody of his children to Harden, that they might be 'educated in the true religion.' Raeburn was the Quaker ancestor of Sir Walter Scott, to whom reference is made in the Introduction to the 'Heart of Midlothian.'

Cameron, as has been noted, longed for an opportunity of testifying against Erastianism. This opportunity he found, in the first instance, at Harden, where a testimony implied no remarkable heroism, though the information is that there were 'many strong temptations to the contrary.' It was awkward for Scott to have one of his household

speaking openly against the action of the Government; and while he, or at least his wife, was soon to follow their chaplain in forsaking the Indulged, he was not yet willing to incur a penalty for harbouring an offender. On the other hand, it was the custom of the zealous Covenanters to bear witness to their beliefs, when occasion offered; and Cameron, with the newly found fervour of his sect, would have held it sin to be silent among those who recognised, however indirectly, the justice of the royal policy. A crisis was reached on the day when he refused to follow the lady of Harden into the church of one of the Indulged ministers. The young man would not bow down in the House of Rimmon,—would not even enter it. The incident is recounted in the *Scots Worthies*: ' . . . Particularly on Sabbath, when called to attend the lady to church, he returned from the entry refusing to go into it, and spent the day in his chamber. Here he met with much of the Lord's presence, as he himself afterwards testified, and got very clear discoveries of the nature of these temptations which were like to prevail with him before; and upon Monday, giving a reason to Sir Walter and his lady why he went not to church, he took occasion to be plain in testifying against the Indulgence, both in its origin and nature.' The sequel is not surprising: 'After this, finding his service would be no longer acceptable to them, he went to the South.'

This was the beginning of Cameron's active opposition to the Indulged, an opposition with which his name is associated in the annals of the Covenanters; and if this first transaction involved no serious sacrifice, it at least

meant material loss as he was deprived of his chaplaincy. The incident might indeed be reduced to an example of commonplace and unwarrantable interference on the part of a young man with the affairs and convictions of his employer. He was not compelled to intrude into Harden's doings. Yet, according to the moral ideas of his party, he was doing wrong if he did not witness against what in their judgment was error; and nothing in the eyes of the strictest Covenanters could justify them if they entered the churches of the Indulged and joined in the worship.

It is interesting to learn, in view of Cameron's association with them, that in 1683, Sir William Scott was fined in the sum of 46,125 pounds, Scots, on account of his wife's withdrawing from the Church. According to Fountainhall, the knight and his wife had been present at a conventicle, and it is stated that 'the King's Advocate, Sir George Mackenzie, got a previous gift of this fine for journeys to London.' The evidence for Harden's defection from the Church is doubtful, as he petitioned the Privy Council to free him from responsibility for his wife's conduct in consideration of his own loyalty. The petition was refused, as it was held that a husband is, *de jure*, master of his wife, whatever he may be *de facto*. Harden was sent to prison, as he was unable to pay the fine, which had been modified to fifteen hundred pounds sterling. His loyalty and his age, though he was about seventy years old, did not save him from the severity of the Government; and it is obvious that his loyalty was suspected. There is no reason to believe that Cameron had directly influenced either the knight or the lady, as the fine was imposed on

them after he had fallen at Ayrsmoss. It is of interest, however, to know that the lady, at any rate, was not disobedient at last to the teaching of the young chaplain, and that she was found guilty of that very fault of abstention from the Church, for which he had left her service.

Cameron's attitude to the Indulged, while he was at Harden, was afterwards examined when he was charged with causing disunion among the Presbyterians. At a meeting of Presbyterians, held in 1678, he was asked by the moderator or chairman, if he had heard an Indulged minister before he went to Harden, and if he had made any objection when warned that he must attend the lady who was in the habit of hearing the Indulged. Cameron replied that while there had been letters from the moderator to the lady and to himself, setting forth that once, in presence of a Mr James Douglas, he had declared that he had no scruples in hearing the Indulged, yet Douglas, when interrogated, had no knowledge of the affair. The moderator further inquired if, after leaving Harden, he had not asked him to beg the lady to take him back to her service. At this Cameron smiled and said he remembered no such thing.

It is of little importance whether Cameron or the moderator was correct in his evidence. Cameron perhaps wished to return to Harden and was willing to attend the lady. But as he had taken no prominent part in the ecclesiastical strife of the time, he was not guilty of any serious inconsistency. It was the policy of his Presbyterian opponents, when his

enthusiasm was extreme, to prove that his conduct had not been uniform. Whatever they proved, there was no grave weakness in a young man, not yet engaged in public affairs, desiring to recover a situation.

CHAPTER IV

THE INDULGENCE

THE disputes of factions seldom command interest beyond their own day, and are generally unworthy of an abiding place in history. The wrangling of the Covenanters over the Indulgence, which was the tedious warfare of men who had need for union in face of the serious injury inflicted on their Church and of the wrong done to their country's freedom, deserves attention only in so far as it helps to explain the failure of the opposition to the excesses of the royal prerogative. Cameron, though he may never have reached the greatness of 'a soldier in the liberation war of humanity,' had a better work to do than to spend his energy in a petty ecclesiastical strife. He was to stand forward for the nation's liberty, but in the first year of his public career he was at most a leader in a faction.

Cameron, when he left Harden, went to the South, 'where he was introduced to the famous John Welch of Irongray.' No definite date can be assigned to this event, as nothing is known of his career between his departure from Falkland in 1673 or 1674, and his licence as a preacher in 1678, save the incident of the chaplaincy at Harden and the occasional visits to Edinburgh, referred to in documents among the Wodrow MSS. He had held office

in Falkland under the Episcopal clergyman, and had incurred his wrath by attending the services of Presbyterian ministers. From the Indulged he had passed to the field-preachers, convinced that traffic with the Indulgence involved the guilt of Erastianism. Some time after his chaplaincy he became a preacher of the Gospel, and his short ministerial life was marked by an uncompromising advocacy of the spiritual independence or divine right of the Church, and the boldest opposition to the men who, receding from this principle, accepted favours from the Government.

Welch, the 'outed' minister of Irongray, was the most intrepid of the field-preachers, and Cameron's zeal was shown when he sought his company. In 1674 a reward was offered for Welch's seizure, but still another step was to be taken in the path of coercion. An old law of Catholic times, known as Letters of Intercommuning, was put in force against more than a hundred persons, among whom were 'many ladies gentlewomen married.' Letters of this kind, issued on the 6th of August, 1675, began as by irony with the words: 'Charles, by the grace of God, king of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith.' Command was given to the king's lieges 'that none of them presume nor take upon hand to reset, supply, or intercommune with any of the aforesaid persons or rebels, for the causes foresaid, nor furnish them with meat, drink, house, harbour, victual, nor no other thing useful or comfortable to them, nor have intelligence with them by word, writ, or message, or any other manner of way, under the pain to be reputed and esteemed art and part with them in the crimes foresaid, and pursued therefore

with all rigour, to the terror of others.' The persons named had already been declared rebels, but they had not answered the summons to appear before the Council; and hence this instrument of tyranny had been used. In July, 1674, at the market crosses of Cupar, Falkland, and Perth, certain men, among whom was John Geddie, of Falkland, father of the remarkable Emelia Geddie of the once popular tract, were declared rebels for attending conventicles, and for entertaining 'outed' ministers; and these men were now named in the Letters. Welch was several times mentioned, as when Lady Colville and others were charged with 'harbouring, resetting, and entertaining Mr John Welch, a declared and proclaimed traitor, in their houses and elsewhere, and conducting and conveying him through several places in Fife, in an hostile manner, and threatening those who should apprehend, molest, and interrupt the said Mr John Welch and others in his company.'

The conduct of Welch, and the acts of the Government directed against him, indicate clearly the character of the faction to which Cameron allied himself. He sought no easy life, and he found neither peace nor worldly honour by joining men who were persistently persecuted by the Government. Welch, in spite of the reward offered for his seizure, was not betrayed, as in February, 1676, Durham of Largo was fined for resetting him; nor did he desist from preaching, as a minute of the Privy Council, April, 1676, bears: 'Whereas the Privy Council is informed that there hath been a numerous conventicle lately held in the shire of Ayr, at Coilmnwood, at which Mr John Welch, a declared traitor, preached.' During the years in which

the field-preachers were hunted by the Government, the management of the country was in the hands of Lauderdale; and to him is largely to be accredited the tyranny which with royal sanction was so plentifully measured out to the Covenanters. His rule, however, was not allowed to pass unchallenged by some of the nobles, who had cast patriotism aside at the Restoration. At the beginning of 1676, the Duke of Hamilton, anxious to have Lauderdale removed from the office of Royal Commissioner, and touched by the hardships of his fellow-countrymen, represented to Charles that many of the people were cruelly handled in consequence of false accusations. Lauderdale in turn brought charges against Hamilton of unfriendliness to the king's cause; and Charles, approving the policy of his Commissioner, ordered Hamilton not to interfere in public affairs. Others besides Hamilton tried in vain to move the king against Lauderdale.

The Commissioner, having gained the royal assent to the rigorous treatment of offenders, increased his vigilance, and so ruthlessly pursued the rebels that their preachers were not safe to remain in the country. Some of these men found an asylum in the north of England, and the tyranny which exiled them increased the disaffection of the people, and left the Government powerless, with the ordinary means at their command, to check the growing rebellion. Welch and other preachers, seeing the mind of the people, returned in 1677, and, openly defying the law, continued their meetings in the fields. The Indulged ministers, as the conventicles indicated, had gained little of the popular favour; and, hoping to reduce the strength of their Presbyterian opponents, they determined to secure

a conference, for the ostensible purpose of promoting union. A meeting was accordingly held in Edinburgh, at which the main business was the discussion of a proposal that the ministers of the different parties should, on occasion, preach for one another. The plan was approved by a majority, and, as it involved a breach of the terms of the Indulgence, and also of the law against conventicles, it seems as if the intending law-breakers believed that they would not be pursued for their conduct. Anything which diminished the popularity of the conventicles was likely to be favoured by the Government, and the contrast between the ease of the Indulged and the hardships of the field-preachers, who had the esteem of the people, would become less prominent through intercourse and friendship. A debate was also raised on the question of ordination where there was no call or invitation to the charge of a congregation, and many declared themselves against the practice. After the conference, which was without good result, the disunion of the Covenanters became more pronounced, and the one party inveighed against the other. The character of the controversy is seen in the style of the author of 'Earnest Contendings for the Faith,' who wrote concerning 'that late meeting in Edinburgh calling itself a general meeting or assembly (though I hope never to look upon it otherwise than on an Erastian synagogue, nor to be hum'd or ha'd with, I know not what, out of this persuasion).' Walker, who had also the gift of forcible expression, spoke about 'an Erastian meeting of ministers, of actually-indulged and not-indulged, kept at Edinburgh, procured by the Indulged and their favourites, in order to get union made up and kept up,

or rather a conspiracy peace, without truth, unity, without verity; an holding evidence of false prophets and backsliders.' The opposition of the sections continued and showed itself with emphasis in the contentions before Bothwell Bridge, and this Edinburgh meeting, after the Indulgence itself, may be taken as the beginning of the cleavage of the Covenanters. The moderation of the one party became as marked as the excessive zeal or fanaticism of the other; and moderation meant neither more nor less than a surrender to an authority which, after the Restoration, had been denied by three or four hundred men to their loss of ecclesiastical station and social position. Cameron, according to Walker, was sometimes charged with being the first to advocate a separation from the Indulged and to hold up to popular contempt these men who, in their weariness of suffering, were glad to accept relief on terms dictated by the Government. But before Cameron became a minister Welwood and Kid, two young preachers, had helped to create the party with which he was afterwards associated. They are described in Walker's ecstatic style as having cried at a great conventicle: 'Treason, treason, treason, against King Christ in Scotland: They would have him a king without a kingdom, and a king without subjects: there is not a clean pulpit in all Scotland this day, curate nor indulged; wherefore come out among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not these unclean things, and I will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.' Welwood, eager and uncompromising, died in 1679, worn out with sickness, after he had won an honourable place in the reverence of the Covenanters. He

was associated with Cameron, and died but one year before him; but he was his forerunner rather than a leader with him in the attack against the conforming Presbyterians. Kid was afterwards executed in Edinburgh, and the fact that Welwood and he preached together led Walker to conjecture that these were the two who, with Cameron, were called before a meeting at Edinburgh to answer to a charge of schism. Walker was speaking from imperfect knowledge, as there is no record of Welwood and Cameron being charged together. A minute of the 'proceedings of the brethren' at Edinburgh, August 21st, 1678, shows that Mr John Kid and Mr Thomas Hog appeared along with Cameron, and were blamed for causing dispeace. In consequence of the divisions, the field-preachers became more conspicuous, and incurred greater danger. There were now few of these preachers, as the severity of the Government, while increasing the fervour of the people for liberty, lessened the number of those who were willing to suffer for it. Not many would endure privation for a spiritual theory. But when Richard Cameron became a minister in the strictest faction of the Covenanters he joined the ranks, not of those who loved ease and comfort for themselves, but of rebels whom the grateful memory of Scotland has styled heroes and martyrs.

The popular enthusiasm for liberty, genuine but implying as yet no great danger, in spite of coercive laws, continued to increase amidst the endeavours of the Government to stamp out the conventicles. Thousands of people attended field-meetings in the year 1677, and were strengthened by the sight of their own numbers. The Episcopal clergy, on the other hand, becoming alarmed

when they recognised this enthusiasm, made representations to the Privy Council, and on the 2nd of May an Act was passed declaring that no new Indulgence was to be granted. Lauderdale, who had been in London during the early part of the year, returned in the summer, when the Presbyterians approached him for help. They besought him to remove the sentences attached to the Letters of Intercommuning, and to release the prisoners of the Bass. Lauderdale would promise nothing, and instead of showing mercy threatened greater severity. When, however, it was represented that any new coercion would insure ruin to tenants and loss to landowners, he spoke of a third Indulgence. Again the Bishops were in alarm, but they soon learned that it was convenient to keep the Presbyterians in hope till the Government should be able to suppress them. Towards the close of this year, 1677, a new and surprising method was adopted for quelling the Covenanters. Orders were sent to the heritors of Ayr and Renfrew, where the conventicles were most numerous, to take steps to put down all field-meetings. The heritors replied that they were powerless, and recommended toleration. The Government, however, would have nothing to do with toleration, and forthwith collected troops in England and in Ireland, which were meant for Scotland. These troops were not used, as, for some reason it was resolved to employ the services of Highlanders, who exercised their commission as if the old feuds between the Highlands and the Lowlands had been revived. The Highland Host, as it is commonly styled, numbering six or eight thousand men, collected at Stirling early in 1678. 'A barbarous, savage people, accustomed to rapine and

spoil,' said Wodrow. 'An inhuman and barbarous crew,' said the gentlemen of Ayrshire, when they remonstrated. Some of these gentlemen desiring to go to London to make representations to the king, were forbidden by the Privy Council to cross the Border. The Highlanders, authorized to take free quarters, wherever they went, and to seize horses for their use, were promised indemnity against all civil and criminal proceedings for killing, wounding, apprehending, or imprisoning any who opposed them. They were commissioned to demand signatures to a bond, and to punish those who refused to sign it. The bond was an obligation by the heads of houses, for themselves, wives, children and servants, to abstain from going to conventicles, and to refuse help of any kind to intercommuned ministers or vagrant preachers. The Highlanders were ready to fulfil their commission, and they did not forget the promised indemnity. Their march meant riot and rapine wherever they went. Towards the end of February they were ordered home. Wodrow has described their going. 'One would have thought they had been at the sacking of some besieged town, by their baggage and luggage. They were loaded with spoil: they carried away a great many horses, and no small quantity of goods out of merchants' shops, whole webs of linen and woollen cloth, some silver plate bearing the names and arms of gentlemen. You would have seen them with loads of bedclothes, carpets, men and women's wearing clothes, pots, pans, gridirons, shoes, and other furniture, whereof they had pillaged the country; and two of their colonels, Airly and Strathmore, are said to have sent home great sums of money, which could not all be the produce of their pay.'

Having tried the experiment of the barbarity of the Highland Host the Government determined to raise a regular army for the repression of the Covenanters, and for this purpose they imposed a tax, the 'cess,' as it was popularly named. This 'cess' was another cause of contention among the Covenanters. Cameron and his friends maintained that payment of a tax to be used for putting down conventicles implied yielding to an Erastian Government.

Cameron, who had joined Welch after leaving Harden, as has been noted, was licensed as a preacher in the beginning of the year 1678, if we may trust a document which is to be found among the Wodrow papers. This document, which, though never printed, seems to have been written for circulation, is a characterisation of Cameron, and is signed Veridicus, a name taken, as is supposed, by Scot of Oxenham. Scot, writing while Cameron was still living, spoke of his shifts and prevarications, sneered at 'worthy Mr Cameron's humility,' and censuring his conduct, declared that he had been licensed but five months when he appeared at the Edinburgh meeting in August 1678. The record in the *Biographia Presbyteriana* is that after Cameron had been some time with the field-preachers in the South, 'Mr Welch perceived that he was not only exercised unto godliness, but had his own share of gifts and learning.' Mr Welch and others pressed him to undergo his trial before them, in order to get an act of licence to preach the Gospel. For some time he refused, but after much entreaty he was prevailed with. Accordingly, he got his licence from Mr Welch and Mr Gabriel Semple and others,

at Haugh-head in Teviotdale, at Henry Hall's house. He told them he would be a bone of contention among them, for if ever he preached against a national sin in Scotland, it should be against the Indulgence and separation from the Indulged.' Many of the "outed" ministers, in spite of constant oppression, had no thought of yielding, and consequently they maintained their irregular organisation by adding licensed preachers and ordained ministers. During their times of trouble the Covenanters followed the old regulations for the licence of students, as if Presbyterianism were still established. Candidates were required to undergo 'trials' before ordained ministers, who granted them licence if the examination proved satisfactory. A homily, an English exegesis, and a Latin thesis were prescribed to them, and they had to submit themselves for examination in various branches of theological study. Presbyterian students at this period had not the advantage of attending the Divinity classes in the universities, as the professors, being Episcopalians, taught the distinctive doctrines of their Church. Before the Revolution Settlement, Wodrow, the father of the historian, was appointed by the Presbyterians to superintend the studies of young men desirous of becoming preachers, and there may have been some such instructor in Edinburgh whom Cameron attended, when he made those visits to the city which have been noted. He may have been a student in St Mary's College before he left St Andrews, or he may have pursued his studies under some such teacher as Wodrow. It is certain, however, that he must have studied theology to some degree, otherwise the ministers, with their faithful adherence to the old Presbyterian forms, would not have granted him a licence

to preach. The truth of this statement is illustrated in the case of James Renwick, who was sent to the University of Groningen by the men who adhered to the testimony of Cameron and Cargill.

Mr Gabriel Semple, who assisted at the ceremony of licence, was the second son of Sir Bryce Semple, Sheriff-principal of Renfrew. He was minister of Kirkpatrick-Durham at the Restoration, and when he left his church he continued in the neighbourhood, drawing the parishioners to his services. Welch joined him, and continued the preaching after Semple had left the district. This, Wodrow informs us, was the beginning of the field-meetings. Semple lived through many hardships, to be chosen minister of Jedburgh after the Revolution Settlement. Henry Hall, in whose house the ceremony took place, was forced to leave Scotland for a time, as the curates pursued him for giving his ground for field-meetings. When he returned he was one of the leaders of the Presbyterians at Drumclog and Bothwell Bridge; and later was closely associated with Cameron and with Cargill, the famous preacher. The ruins of the house where Cameron was licensed are still to be seen. Cameron, according to Walker's record, warned the ministers that he would be a bone of contention among them. In the discussion at the Edinburgh meeting, when a charge of schism was preferred, he was asked if he had not been required at his licence not to deal with disputed points, and he answered that he had been charged not to foment divisions, and not to do or speak that which might cause offence. He was further pressed to say whether he had made any engagement not to preach against the Indulged.

He replied that he had refused to make such an engagement when it was proposed to him in private; and it is evident from the report of the meeting that he was convinced that he had made no promise which he had not kept.

As soon as he was licensed he was sent to preach in Annandale, after pleading that he knew not what sort of people were there. 'Go your way, Ritchie,' said Welch, 'set the fire of hell to their tail.' Cameron proceeded to Annandale, whatever may have been the spiritual function implied in Welch's charge. The people to whom he first ministered were popularly known as Annandale thieves, and he had therefore other duty than to discourse on ecclesiastical affairs. The text of the first sermon was the words from Jer. iii. 19: 'How shall I put thee among the children,' and with evident sarcasm, he cried: 'Put you among the children, the offspring of robbers and thieves.' The description of the first day's preaching is thus sententiously given by Walker: '. . . Many have heard of Annandale thieves. Some of them who got a merciful cast that day told it afterwards that it was the first field-preaching that ever they heard; and that they went out of curiosity to see how a minister would preach in a tent, and people sit on the ground. But if many of them went without an errand, they got one that day.' Though Cameron's sermon has not been preserved, it is evident he used no honeyed words, since he styled them thieves, a name which they and their forefathers had earned. Sir Walter Scott, in the introduction to the 'Minstrelsy,' remarks that we learn from the passage quoted from Walker that some of the Borderers retained to a late period their in-

difference to religion. Kirkton, with another story to tell regarding the effect of the field-meetings in which Cameron was engaged, records that in 1678 the Marquess of Athole and the Earl of Perth were proceeding through Annandale with a small retinue. Resting one night at a cottage, they 'professed they feared much their horses should be stolen, because they could not get them within a locked door; but the poor country people told them they need not, for there was now no thieving in the country since the field-preachings came among them.' Kirkpatrick Sharpe, the editor of Kirkton's History, doubts with his customary prejudice this reformation of the thieves, saying, that while the Whig preachers, from their doctrines of insubordination and their lawless lives, were fitted to become friends of these 'minions of the moon,' the new habits were not of long duration. Cameron's way of making friends of these minions was to call them the offspring of robbers and thieves.

The career on which Cameron had now entered was fraught with the greatest danger. He was deliberately acting as a rebel by setting himself against the law, and was incurring the penalty of an offender. We have no detailed narrative of his wanderings, no description of his hardships. The life of a field-preacher is, however, graphically shown in Kirkton's account of Welch,—'notwithstanding of all the threats of the State, the great price set upon his head, the spite of the bishops, the diligence of all bloodhounds, he maintained his difficult post of preaching upon the mountains of Scotland, many times to many thousands, for near twenty years' time. . . . I have known him ride three days and two nights without

sleep, and preach upon a mountain at midnight in one of the nights.'

After his mission to the Annandale thieves, Cameron preached several times in company with Welch, Semple, and others. It is also stated that he preached more than once at Maybole, 'where,' the record is, 'were many thousands of people, being the first time that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was dispensed in the open fields.' In 1677 the practice of dispensing the sacrament at conventicles was begun. There is no detailed account of the Maybole meeting at which Welch and other clergymen officiated; but Blackadder's description of a communion in Teviotdale may serve to show the solemn scenes in which Cameron engaged, and to illustrate the fashion in which the Covenanters worshipped God, and obeyed the injunction of their Lord. To the people gathered together in Teviotdale danger was expected from the Earl of Hume who, according to a report, had threatened to make his horses drink the communion wine, and to trample the sacred elements under foot. Some of the people appeared in arms, and from these, pickets of twelve or sixteen men were arranged, while single horsemen were sent to a distance to watch the approach of the enemy. Other horsemen were stationed round the congregation, within reach of the preacher's voice. When these military preparations were made, then, says Blackadder, 'We entered on the administration of the holy ordinance, committing it and ourselves to the invisible protection of the Lord of Hosts, in whose name we were met together. Our trust was in the arm of Jehovah. . . . The place where we convened was every way commodious,

and seemed to have been formed on purpose. It was a green and pleasant haugh, fast by the water side. On either hand there was a spacious brae, in form of a half round, covered with delightful pasture, and rising with a gentle slope to a goodly height. Above us was the clear blue sky, for it was a sweet and calm Sabbath morning, promising to be, indeed, one of the days of the Son of Man. The communion tables were spread on the green by the water, and around them the people had arranged themselves in decent order. But the far greater multitude sat on the brae-face, which was crowded from top to bottom, full as pleasant a sight as was ever seen of that sort. . . . And truly the spectacle of so many grave, composed, and devout faces must have struck the adversaries with awe, and been more formidable than any outward ability of fierce looks and warlike array. We desired not the countenance of earthly kings; there was a spiritual and divine majesty shining on the work, and sensible evidence that the great Master of Assemblies was present in the midst. . . . Though our vows were not offered within the courts of God's house, they wanted not sincerity of heart, which is better than the reverence of sanctuaries. Amidst the lonely mountains we remembered the words of our Lord, that true worship was not peculiar to Jerusalem or Samaria; that the beauty of holiness consisted not in consecrated buildings or material temples. . . . The ordinance of the last supper, that memorial of his dying love till his second coming, was signally countenanced, and backed with power and refreshing influence from above. Blessed be God for he hath visited and confirmed his heritage when it was weary. . . .

Few such days were seen in the desolate Church of Scotland, and few will ever witness the like. There was a rich and plentiful effusion of the spirit shed abroad on many hearts. Their souls, filled with heavenly transports, seemed to breathe in a divine element, and to burn upwards, as with the fire of a pure and holy devotion. The ministers were visibly assisted to speak home to the conscience of the hearers. It seemed as if God had touched their lips with a live coal from his altar, for they who witnessed declared they carried more like ambassadors from the court of heaven, than men cast in earthly mould.' Such is Blackadder's graphic description of a day of the desolate Church of Scotland, of God's visitation of his heritage when it was weary.

While there is no detailed record of the conventicle at Maybole, Welch's addresses have been preserved. The day seems to have been wet, as he began by rebuking his hearers for their want of patience during a shower of rain, and telling them that they should be thankful that fire and brimstone were not falling. The sermon, which was to be brief because of the rain, was divided and subdivided into sufficient paragraphs to satisfy any man of the seventeenth, and to perplex any man of the nineteenth century. The sermon and addresses show vigour of speech, but they are commonplace in thought, and are without the eloquence of Blackadder. It is to be remembered, however, that the addresses, which were not prepared for publication by the speaker, were printed from notes furnished by hearers, who may not have been skilful reporters.

Five months after his licence, Cameron was cited to answer to a charge of creating schism. There were now

three distinct parties among the Covenanters. One set of the clergy had accepted the Indulgence; another, while refusing it, had not cut themselves off from communion with the Indulged. The faction to which Cameron belonged stood alone, judging the others guilty of a betrayal of the Covenants. History may find the pleas by which these parties justified themselves, yet they were set against one another at a time when unity was necessary for their preservation as a Church. Blackadder asserts that the Indulged clergy endeavoured to create a prejudice against the field-meetings, and that among the non-Indulged there was irritation, on the one hand, on account of the laxity of the leaders, and annoyance, on the other, owing to the violent zeal of some of the younger preachers. These younger men were charged with walking disorderly, and with holding conventicles in parishes where Presbyterian services were being conducted in the churches. He tells us that he himself knew of no one save Richard Cameron who preached with contempt, or used strong language against the Indulged, or advised separation from them. Cameron, he adds, was often blamed for extravagant speaking.

Further illustration of the division of the factions is given in Blackadder's account of his own experience at a meeting of clergy, perhaps that one to which Cameron was cited. When he suggested that the old relation of the Indulged and the non-Indulged should continue in peace, and that the young men should be cautioned against extravagance of speech, he met with no interruption; but when he proposed that there should be serious consideration regarding the sin of being unfaithful to Christ,

through not bearing proper testimony against the usurping enemy, he was met with cries of 'Divisive, divisive,' and 'Come let us unite.'

The disunion of the Covenanters is no way better seen than in Cameron's preaching and in the charges preferred against him. Wodrow makes a passing reference to these troubles among the Presbyterians. When accounts of the sermons of some of the 'probationers' were carried to the ministers, it was resolved that action should be taken; and accordingly a meeting was held in Edinburgh, towards the end of August. An attempt was made with two of the 'probationers' to convince them of error, but a third declined to subject himself to authority. Wodrow does not name these 'probationers,' but he is referring to Mr John Kid and Mr Thomas Hog, and to Richard Cameron. Among the Wodrow MSS. are documents which throw further light on these proceedings. On the 21st of August, 1678, the three 'probationers' appeared before 'the brethren,' who were not able to constitute a presbytery, as they possessed no jurisdiction recognized by the State or deputed to them by an organized Church. None the less they claimed to exercise authority over the young preachers. On the 26th of August, a meeting was convened for trying the case of Cameron, and Mr Edward Jamison, who had been one of the 'intercommuned,' was chosen moderator. Among those present was Rodger, an Indulged minister. Formalities were observed, and Cameron was duly cited by Mr Robert Ross, who was soon to leave the hunting of schismatics to become a prisoner on the Bass for his love of Presbyterianism. Throughout the proceedings, Cameron showed no dread of the dignities, and the

conduct and appearance of the young man irritated his reverend superiors. He demanded to know who accused him of drawing the people away from the Indulged, and was told that his actions were the clamour of the country. He was advised that it was unbecoming for a 'probationer' to meddle with disputed matters, and he affirmed that he had a Scriptural warrant for all he said. He resolutely refused to change the style of his preaching, and when pressed cried, 'O dreadful, not for the world.' The ministers, failing to bend him to their will, appointed a committee to confer with him; and at another meeting, August 28th, at which Scot of Hawick was moderator, he agreed to subject himself to them in the Lord. His subjection, however, led to no promise of amendment; and baffled by him, the ministers solemnly charged him to abstain from railing against any of the Presbyterians, and required him to attend a future meeting. He expressed his willingness to attend, provided some of his friends were allowed to accompany him.

Cameron had yielded nothing. He was guilty, before his seniors, of youth and its rashness; but his resoluteness was for his principles, and it explains the prominence he had gained in the short space of five months. These principles he held to be the truths of God, to be guarded for Him; and he counted the honour of the Church of Christ the one thing needful for him to save from the touch of His enemies. Insignificant in station, youthful, and with little experience as a preacher, he steadfastly championed the freedom of the Church from civil control, as great men in other lands and other times had done. When Hildebrand again and again throughout his life, when

Richelieu in his speech before the States General, defended the spiritual rights of the Church, they were doing in conspicuous places that which Richard Cameron did, amidst the strife of factions, in the small country of Scotland. The clamour of the factions and his own bitter words may be left unheard, while he pleads for his Church as for the honour of Christ. A man has only to become old to become tolerant, Goethe said. Cameron was a young man, it may be urged; but it may also be said that, while tolerance may be the virtue of charity, it may also be the vice of indifference.

In spite of the solemn injunctions of 'the brethren,' Cameron preached in Monkland on the Sunday following their meeting, and was accompanied by Robert Hamilton and a band of armed men. This Robert Hamilton, a younger son of the Baronet of Preston, afterwards commanded the Covenanters at Drumclog and Bothwell Bridge. Whether or not the victory at Drumclog was won by him, the defeat at Bothwell Bridge was largely due to his fault. On this Sunday when Cameron preached, Mr Matthew Selkirk also went to Monkland, at the desire of the ministers in Glasgow; but he was not allowed to speak, as Hamilton and his party objected to him as a favourer of the Indulged. In a libel afterwards served, Cameron was charged with refusing to preach with Selkirk and with hindering him from joining in the service. In due time, however, he presented a document, known as the Monkland testimony, which bore that he had preached at the invitation of the parishioners who objected to Selkirk.

Cameron was not without encouragement in the course he had taken. Letters were sent to him approving his

conduct, among which was one from Brown, the 'outed' minister of Wamphray, who was a refugee in Holland. Brown advised him to proceed, and stated his opinion that the Edinburgh meeting possessed no jurisdiction. Strengthened by these letters, Cameron continued his labours till he stirred 'the brethren' to further action. A sermon at a conventicle in Kilmarnock, at which five or six ministers were present, brought matters to a crisis. A libel was prepared and duly served. It contained fifteen counts and was formidable chiefly for its array of details. Neither heresy nor immorality could be charged against him, and the tragedy was therefore commonplace. He had preached in parishes without the consent of the ministers, and had taken the leading place at conventicles when ordained ministers were present. At one of these conventicles, when Welch was there, he had spoken without his permission; he had organized a meeting in opposition to him: and had endeavoured to make strife between him and his former hearers in Irongray.

The Indulgence, of course, appeared in the libel. He had asked the people if they received any good from the ministers who had accepted it; had compared these ministers to Cain; and had declared that while they had received their commission from men, he had his from the Lord. It was asserted that he had declared that he would have preached even had he not been licensed; and that he had styled himself an ambassador of Christ, and had spoken as with the authority of an ordained minister. Further, he was accused of saying that the Lord hardly ever punished people for their

own fault but for the fault of the magistrates; and it was objected against him that he had refused to admit the jurisdiction of the Edinburgh meeting.

The libel was served, and he was cited to appear before the men who had licensed him. He would surely submit to them, though he had not yielded to 'the brethren' in Edinburgh. The meeting to which he was called was held at Sundaywell, in Dunscore, a parish in Nithsdale, on November 14th, 1678. Dunscore is associated with the infamous Grierson of Lag, who had a seat there, and who was buried in the graveyard of the old church. Ellisland, Burns' farm, and Craigenputtock, Carlyle's house, are both situated in the parish. Sundaywell was a square tower, built by John Kirk who befriended the Covenanters, and this house often afforded an asylum to Blackadder and other ministers. Welch presided over the meeting as moderator, and with him were Gabriel Semple, Thomas Douglas, and David Williamson, ministers, along with several elders. Henry Hall presented himself as a friend of the accused, but was ejected for interrupting the meeting and as not being a member. Cameron, when called, desired to know whether the members were met as a judicatory, who were the members, and did they hold the various articles of the libel as implying guilt. He was informed that the members constituted a judicatory, such as that which licensed him, and he was therefore forced to agree to their authority. In his answers to the libel he did not deny some of the charges, such as preaching without Welch's permission; he did not remember calling himself an ambassador of Christ, or saying that the guilt of magistrates brought plagues on

the people; and he admitted that he spoke against the Indulged, advising his hearers not to attend them, but he did not compare them to Cain.

On the following day when the meeting was resumed, with Gabriel Semple as moderator, Cameron handed in a protest against the treatment to which he was being subjected. This protest was signed by Robert Hamilton, Michael Cameron, Robert Gray, John Fowler, and others. He objected to Welch sitting as one of his judges, when he was involved in the charges; and plausible as this objection was, it was not sustained. Cameron accordingly refused to give answers or to declare his principles till Welch was removed; and as Welch was not removed, he walked out. Before he went he was advised to be circumspect in his conduct and inoffensive in his speech, and was informed that his sentence was to be delayed for five or six weeks. As after the Edinburgh meeting so after that at Dunscore, he preached on the first possible occasion against the opposite factions, and report was duly made to the ministers convened at Irongray, on the 21st of November. Walker's account of the proceedings at Dunscore is inaccurate. It bears that a proposition was made to deprive Cameron of his licence, and that, while he refused to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the meeting, he promised to abstain for a period from preaching on disputed subjects, and was constrained to do this for the sake of those who refused to take part against him. It has been seen, however, that immediately after the Dunscore meeting he preached against the Indulged. Walker also relates that Cameron was cited before the ministers assembled in Dundeugh in Galloway. Dundeugh is a lonely spot

half-way between Dalry and Carsphairn, where the Water of Deugh joins the Water of Ken. There is a note among the Wodrow MSS. of a meeting, December 26th, 1678, held in Dundeugh, the house of one Gordon, at which Welch, Semple, and Douglas were present, and at which Robert Hamilton declaimed against them for their Erastianism. Hamilton himself related that he was summoned to appear before the ministers, and that he obeyed only to disown them and to protest against their proceedings.

There is no record of the sentence passed on Cameron, though references to it are not wanting. Robert Hamilton spoke in one of his letters of the sentence pronounced on 'great Mr Cameron,' as if it were well-known. Direct reference was made to it in the dying words of Robert Gray, who joined in the protest at Dunscore. This man was hanged in the Grassmarket of Edinburgh, 1682, for writing in plain terms regarding the king. It was a custom among Covenanters who were executed to make a speech to the people assembled to witness their death, as did the Marquess of Argyle, or to read a formally prepared 'testimony.' Gray, among several references to events associated with Cameron's name, said: 'I leave my testimony against these ministers that sat in Presbytery against worthy Mr Richard Cameron, that highly honoured martyr of Jesus Christ, and thought to have deposed him from his ministry. I also leave my testimony against that meeting that sat at Sundewal, in Nithsdale, which I was a witness to.' So late as 1707, in the proceedings against Macmillan of Balmaghie, one disputant addressing another, said: 'Do you mind how you sat a member of that Presbytery which sat at Sunday-

well and Dundeugh upon Mr Richard Cameron, in order to depose him?'

The only punishment which could have been inflicted on Cameron was the loss, or the suspension for a period, of his licence to preach; and whatever it was, it was unheeded. The offended ministers were therefore constrained to publish among the Presbyterians a resolution forbidding anyone to preach without their consent in Galloway and neighbouring places. This resolution, intended to exclude 'great Cameron,' as Hamilton wrote, was of no avail to stop the mouth of the resolute enemy of Erastianism. In spite of ministers and elders with their sentence and their resolution, he continued to preach in his own fashion till he went to Holland in the spring of 1679. According to Walker's account he became melancholy, in consequence of the promise given at Dunscore, feeling precluded from preaching the whole counsel of God, and he determined therefore to spend in Holland the time during which he was not to preach against the Indulged. In 1678, we are told, he went to Holland, where he met among the refugees from Scotland the most pronounced advocates of the separation he was wont to advise. Walker's account is erroneous both as to the promise and as to the date of leaving the country. An occurrence in April, 1679, throws some light on Cameron's movements. A royalist trooper was shot dead at Loudon Hill, and another was seriously wounded who identified his assailant as John Scarlet, who for gross immorality had been dismissed from the service of Welch the preacher. According to rumour, Scarlet was one of an armed guard accompanying Cameron in his wanderings, though from certain

facts Wodrow concluded he was a Government spy. The blame of the murder was undoubtedly given to Cameron's party, and some of their enemies took steps to exonerate themselves. On the 28th of April, an address was presented to the Privy Council by noblemen and gentlemen of Ayr, expressing condemnation of the murder and detestation of some field-meetings of the common people 'occasioned by a few hot-headed preachers, most part whereof were never ministers of the Church of Scotland.' It was during one of these meetings that Robert Hamilton declared that none who heard the Indulged or paid the 'cess' should join his party. Some one cried 'we are almost all "cess" men,' and the confusion was only stilled when Cameron, who was the preacher, called out that it would be impossible to purge the meeting that day. Under Hamilton's guidance, the movement of the Covenanters associated with him was fast losing a distinctively religious character.

There is still another proof that Cameron was in Scotland during the early part of 1679, and was resolute in his work of preaching, in spite of the Government with their troops levied by means of the 'cess.' On the 6th of May, Claverhouse, dispatched a letter from Dumfries to the Earl of Linlithgow, and reported: 'On Saturday night last I ordered Captain Inglis . . . to be here on the Sunday morning. . . . I mounted the foot and marched with all towards those places where the conventicles had been the Sunday before; first to the head of Glenea . . . and then to the borders of Crawford Moor, where Cameron had preached the Sunday before, and did actually preach that very day, the matter of three miles from the place

where we were at, though we could see no appearance of them in any places we had seen, because of the thickness of the fog. . . . They took three tenant men coming from that meeting. I have not had the time to examine them strictly; but I hear it was really Cameron preached.'

Cameron, then, was in Scotland in 1679, and was known to the servants of the Government who were pursuing the policy of coercion, which led to the rising at Drumclog and the battle at Bothwell Bridge. He was not at Drumclog, as afterwards in his sermons he referred to the engagement, and did not speak of himself as having been in it; and there is evidence to show that he was in Holland before the date of Bothwell Bridge. It may be taken, therefore, that he left Scotland somewhere about May, 1679.

His enemies subsequently asserted that the object of his journey was to purchase arms and ammunition. It is much more likely that his first intention was to seek from the Scottish ministers in Rotterdam the ordination to the ministry which he could not expect to receive from the clergy whose jurisdiction he had denied, and whose injunctions he had scorned. It was necessary for him to be ordained if he was to continue to receive from the people that respect which they seldom gave to one not recognized as having the name and exercising the authority of an ambassador of Christ.

While Richard Cameron was advocating the doctrine of spiritual independence, his father was testifying in other fashion against the coercion of the Government. Allan Cameron, as appears from letters among the Wodrow MSS., was in the habit of holding conventicles in his

house in Falkland, and for this breach of the law he was seized by the town-major on the 25th of August, 1678. After a trial he was sentenced to pay a fine of a hundred merks. This fine he would not pay, in spite of the advice of his friends, preferring to remain a prisoner. He would not yield in the slightest point to the Government, and acknowledge the justice of their policy. The old man had the spirit of determination which his son exhibited through the course of his public career.

CHAPTER V

IN HOLLAND

It is an impossible task, as history shows, to mark out and fix permanently the relation of the State to the Church. In a dual control the question as to the predominant partner must arise, and the State and the Church have ever been changing their relationship. Hildebrand, on a memorable occasion, kept an emperor standing as a penitent at the gate of his castle; and Innocent III. was the political master of nations. A century after the Reformation, a king of Scotland imposed a set of canons on the National Church, through her bishops; and another, by an Act of his Parliament, changed her government without the consent of the clergy or the people. In an age when the connection of the civil and spiritual powers had not settled into custom, there was no unquestioned authority by which to judge the action of these kings. Charles II. might have the right, as he had the power, to grant an Indulgence; and when it was granted, who was to make it wrong to accept it? During his reign no one had hope of changing the government of the Church, and there was, therefore, the plausible argument that, for the sake of the weightier matters of religion, and also for the sake of national and domestic peace, the Presbyterians

should accept the proffered terms. These terms, it could be said, involved no acknowledgment of the divine origin or the expediency of Episcopacy; and they did not involve assent to the doctrine that the State had any right to make conditions for the Church. It could also be affirmed that the ministers evicted in 1662 entered no united protest against the action of the State, and that they simply refused to seek a new presentation from a patron. It was undoubtedly the contention of the Indulged that they had injured no principle of religion, and had done no harm to freedom by their compromise.

On the other hand, it was held by Cameron and his associates that this compromise meant a withdrawal of the Church's claim to autonomy, a claim to be asserted whatever the king might do, and however long Episcopacy might continue. It might be granted that the Presbyterians after the Restoration, through lack of opportunity, had made no united declaration against the wrong done to the Church; but it could be shown that there was the National Covenant, with its refusal of 'approbation of the corruptions of the public government of the Kirk till they be tried and allowed in Free Assemblies and in Parliament.' James VI. had not touched the constitution of the Church save through assemblies, lawful or 'pretended.' Charles I., when trying to impose the liturgy, had acted through bishops. Charles II. introduced Episcopacy without consulting the Church, and every man who had accepted the National Covenant denied the king's right to interfere in what, by usage, if not by divine appointment, was the prerogative of the Church. After this fashion the

strict Covenanters justified their position, and they could show that Charles, in his ruthless display of power, had not only crushed the Covenant, but had also cast aside the Westminster Confession of Faith, which had received Parliamentary as well as ecclesiastical sanction. In this Confession it was set forth that 'the Lord Jesus, as king and head of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church-officers, distinct from the civil magistrate,' and that 'it belongeth to Synods and Councils. . . . to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of His Church.'

Cameron and his associates, this at least may be said, were faithful to the National Covenant and to the Westminster Confession of Faith, to principles in these which were recognized in the Revolution Settlement. Apart from these documents, they were not without written apologies and vindications. Rutherfurd's 'Lex Rex,' Brown's 'Apologetical Relation,' Stirling's 'Naphtali,' Stuart's 'Jus Populi Vindicatum,' and the 'Apology for the persecuted ministers and professors of the Presbyterian Reformed Religion,' were in circulation among the Covenanters.

It is rash to condemn the men of former generations who entered on compromise, as they may have been guided by common-sense, and may have attained nearer to righteousness by freeing themselves from obedience to a formal principle. Those among the Covenanters who, acting on maxims of prudence, entered on a compromise, are likely to secure the approbation of cautious men.

Moderation, guided by right reason, is the excellent way of life: without right reason it is not. Enthusiasts like Richard Cameron, with their uncompromising adherence to principles, incur the guilt of fanaticism in the judgment of those who hate extremes in conduct; and yet, when they 'face fearful odds,' losing worldly goods, wrecking their comfort, courting death, they win the admiration of generous minds, and when they die in their fanaticism they are heroes even to many who would not have stood by their side. Cameron was an enthusiast. He would have no dealings with the Indulged, whom he classed with the curates as creatures of the Government, and whom he condemned as unfaithful to Christ, for their recognition of the king's authority in the Church. In this strong antagonism he had few of the field-preachers with him, as the hard experience of many years had begotten in the older men a tolerance which he in his youth deemed sinful. Their toleration, however, did not extend to him, and they sought, as appears, to deprive him of his licence to preach. Cameron, in his turn, answered them by paying no heed to their sentence, and resolved to seek ordination from Scottish Presbyterian ministers in Holland.

In the seventeenth century, there was a close alliance between Scotland and Holland, which had also had its struggles for liberty. Both countries were Protestant, and this bond of sympathy was strengthened by one of commerce. Some years before the date of the Restoration, the Scots residing in Rotterdam, with the consent of the Dutch authorities, established a church. In 1676, Robert M'Ward was appointed one of the ministers of

this church. He had been deposed from his living in Glasgow, imprisoned, and then ordered into banishment for treasonable preaching or, otherwise, for 'testimony against the glaring defections of the times.' Free to choose the place of his exile, he had proceeded to Holland. M'Ward was the author of books and tracts, one of which, 'Earnest Contendings for the Faith,' was an elaborate argument against union with the Indulged. Associated with him was Mr John Brown, at one time minister of Wamphray, author of 'The History of the Indulgence.' In the records of the Scottish Privy Council it is stated that 'Mr John Brown of Wamphray, being convened before the Council for abusing and reproaching some ministers for keeping the diocesan Synod with the Archbishop of Glasgow, calling them perjured knaves and villains, did acknowledge that he called them false knaves for so doing, because they had promised the contrary to him.' For his vigorous speech he was deposed and imprisoned; and being ordered into banishment, he found a home in Holland, where, however, he had no ministerial charge.

Even in Holland these men were not free from the power of Charles, who in 1670 applied for M'Ward's expulsion, for publishing tracts against the Government in Scotland. In consequence of the king's request, M'Ward and others were commanded to leave Holland, but the order was not strictly enforced. In 1677, Charles made another representation, demanding that M'Ward, Brown, and Colonel Wallace, who had commanded at Pentland, should be sent out of Holland, and asserting that the

matter affected his own personal safety and the peace of his realm. The Dutch authorities, while they were not strongly desirous of serving Charles, and were unwilling to show severity to the Scottish refugees, contrived a sentence of banishment which meant simply a withdrawal from Rotterdam. The punishment fell most severely on M'Ward, who lost his ministerial charge. As on the former occasion, the authorities passed their sentence and did no more, so that in 1678 M'Ward and Brown were back once more in Rotterdam, where, in the following year, Richard Cameron found them.

According to the *Biographia Presbyteriana*, Cameron, during his stay in Rotterdam, preached in private houses and in the Scots Church, and his services were appreciated. His favourite text was, 'Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest'; and it is stated that he did not touch on the Indulgence and cess-paying 'except in prayer, lamenting over the lamentable case of Scotland by tyranny and defections.' Representations had been made that he was incapable of preaching anything but denunciations, and M'Ward took occasion to give his own experience of him. In 'Earnest Contendings' he wrote: 'I crave leave to tell you, that the common report of poor Mr Cameron was, that not only he did preach nothing but Bable against the Indulgence; but that he could do no other thing. And this was so confidently and commonly talked, that I was not in case to contradict it upon knowledge. But, sir, by his coming hither, the reporters have lost their credit of being so easily believed for the future; and many who heard him were

convinced that prejudice, heightened to malice, had given men liberty to talk so: for here he was found a man of a savory gospel-spirit, the bias of his heart lying towards the *proposing of Christ*, and persuading to a closing with Him. And besides, I can tell you what a person said to myself, whom you esteem gracious and judicious, . . . having heard him preach after his ordination,—that they had not heard such a gospel-preaching since Mr Brown's banishment.' More than one correspondent sent M'Ward accounts of the Edinburgh meeting, which, whether written simply to give information or to make complaint regarding Cameron, were not all received. In one of his replies, M'Ward made a defence of Cameron, in which there is some indication of the charges against him. Writing to a correspondent on the 20th of January, 1679, he said: 'Dear Brother,—Yours of December 28th I received yesterday: To the first part whereof I can say but little, not having received yours, which you say was sent by sea, giving account of Mr Cameron's business. Neither have I received any of these, which I hear others beside yourself have written about that affair. But I judge I may safely say this much; I wish there may be more slow driving, than you insinuate in your letter. . . . You insinuate there will be no apology for his declining their authority. Dear Brother, I shall not answer the matter before I hear it; for that were folly and shame: Only let me put you in remembrance of what I have said about all meetings of that nature. . . . It will in my poor opinion, for anything I have ever yet heard, be a difficult task for them, to prove that meeting to have been a true presbytery, having the authority which they clamour was declined. And till they

do this, there needs little apology be made. . . . As to the 2nd thing you hint, that it was not so much the matter of the Indulgence he was quarrelled about, as &c. I see as little, for all that ever I heard said, or, I believe, shall ever hear, how this can be asserted; for that Et cætera, was but things which fell in, at the By, when quarrelled about this. And here give me leave, D. Brother, to be plain with you: I am from what past in that meeting, and what is like to follow upon it, the more confirm'd in my former apprehensions about what shall be the issue of all these meetings, be the constituent members what they will, till once we meet to mourn. O the shame! alas! will we not see it? will we not be sensible of it? that the first meeting, resuming Presbyterian power should begin at patronizing the Indulgence.'

In another of the letters of this period, that from Carstairs to Dickson, of date, February 17th, 1679, complaint was made of Brown's strictures on the Edinburgh meeting, and of his praise of Cameron, 'as if none such had been raised up in the Church of Scotland for many years before.' None of the letters injured Cameron in the eyes of M'Ward and Brown, who showed their approbation of his conduct by conferring ordination on him. It has been shown that many of the Presbyterians had declared against the ordination of anyone not called or invited to the charge of a particular congregation. Unaffected by this declaration, since it was made by men whom they judged guilty of Erastianism, these two ministers determined to ordain Cameron, and in order to constitute a Presbytery, called in a Dutchman, Mr James

Koelman. Koelman, who had been ejected from his charge at Sluis, in Flanders, for refusing to observe the festival days and formularies of the Dutch Church, was known as the author of several theological works, and as the translator of Rutherfurd's Letters. The ordination took place in the old Scots Church, Rotterdam, which is now no longer used as a church; and after the ceremony of laying on of hands, M'Ward, still touching the head of Cameron, cried: 'Behold, all ye beholders, here is the head of a faithful minister and servant of Jesus Christ, who shall lose the same for his Master's interest, and shall be set up before sun and moon in the public view of the world.' Another version of the prophecy is: 'The head on whom their hands are laid shall be soon and cruelly cut off.'

Cameron's ordination was as regular and genuine as his licence, but whether either was regular or genuine is likely to be disputed. Probably three ordained ministers had precisely the same power as a congregation of all the evicted clergy of Scotland. Law, in his *Memorials*, has shown the light in which the moderate Presbyterians viewed that ordination. Writing in condemnation of Brown and M'Ward for their attitude to the Indulgence, he said: 'And some young men expectants, such as Mr Cameron and Mr Hog and others, to whom the ministrie denied ordination here, because of their corrupt principles and practices, and the want of a call from the people to particular congregations, going over to Holland, received a lame ordination by them to the ministrie; and contrary to all discipline in our Church, were admitted ministers of the Church of Scotland, without assigning to any

particular congregation, or call of the people to any; and here they show themselves prelates, in following prelatick practices, who use, especially in England, to ordain men to the ministrie without designation of any particular charge and flock over which they are sett.' In the *Scots Worthies*, there is an account of a conversation between one Robert Garnock and an unknown Presbyterian minister, probably Mr John Law, minister at Edinburgh after the Revolution, in which there is this record: 'speaking anent Messrs Cameron and Cargill, this person then said to him that the former was no minister, and the latter was once one, but had quitted it; and that they received their doctrines from men, their hearers, who said, "you must preach such and such doctrines, and we will hear you."' These notices, while of no value in settling the question of the validity of Cameron's ordination, show the strength of the feeling entertained against him. He himself, however, had no doubt about his ministerial position, as on his return to Scotland he officiated as an ordained minister. 'Another old Christian sufferer told me,' says Walker, 'that he married him a little after he came home.'

M'Ward's words regarding the fate of Cameron are in keeping with the prophetic powers piously ascribed to some of the Presbyterian preachers. The stories which record supernatural powers and events point, not to fraud, but to the conviction of the Covenanters that their cause was the Lord's, and that their ministers were his chosen servants. Even if such stories are greatly to be suspected, there is still no need to doubt that M'Ward spoke as he

was reported. He had heard of the battle at Bothwell Bridge, and of the execution of two ministers at Edinburgh, and he was accordingly urging Cameron to return to Scotland in order to renew the opposition to the Stuart rule. M'Ward's own interpretation of his words, as Walker gives it, was equivalent to a claim to a prophetic vision. It was not foresight nor forethought which he had, yet when his hand was on Cameron's head he was as much persuaded of the approaching death as if he had been to Ayrsmoss to see his head and his hands cut off, or to the Netherbow to look at them. This was an explanation made after Cameron's death.

Before the ceremony of ordination, M'Ward addressed Cameron: 'Richard, the publick standard of the Gospel is fallen in Scotland; and if I know anything of the mind of the Lord, ye are called to undergo your trials before us, and go home and lift the fallen Standard, and display it publickly before the world; but before ye put your hand to it, ye shall go to as many of the field-ministers as ye can find, and give them your hearty invitation to go with you; and if they will not go, go your lone, and the Lord will go with you.' Cameron's hatred of Erastianism, his religious fervour, and his devotion to his ideal of duty, made him the man for a task which required courage and zeal. M'Ward and Brown were themselves too old to return to labour in Scotland. Besides, they were under sentence of banishment. It is unjust therefore, to think of them as guilty of cowardice, in proposing Cameron for a dangerous journey on which they themselves would not venture. He was young and

eager, and work assigned to him by men of high reputation, by men who had spoken, and written, and suffered for their religion, was exactly the commission which he desired. A new purpose was now given to his enthusiasm, and, conscious of it, he returned to Scotland in the autumn of 1679.

During his absence, events of grave importance had taken place. On the 3rd of May, 1679, Archbishop Sharp was murdered on Magus Muir, and with his death there passed away the most execrated man in the country. His sins have been multiplied by his enemies, and infamous names have been given to him; but it is the merest commonplace of morality to say that his murder was a crime, and that his assassins did no good to the Covenanting cause. When contrasted with Archbishop Leighton, the most tolerant and most pious of the Scottish prelates of the time, he remains an ecclesiastic rather than a religious man, a self seeker rather than a patriot; and his memory, in spite of his monument with its legend, is not that of a saint. Nor is it likely to be forgotten that his tyranny and meanness of many years were not overlooked by fate when he was killed by men waiting, as is generally believed, for Carmichael, the spy, whom he had appointed to hunt out the frequenters of the field-meetings in Fife.

Rightly and naturally, a search was made for the murderers, who hastened, most of them, to the West, where the Covenanters were strongest. These Covenanters of the West were not daunted by the uproar which Sharp's death had raised. On the contrary, they were excited to

new agitation; and a party of them resolved to celebrate the 29th of May, not by rendering thanks to heaven for the Restoration, as had been ordered, but by making a formal protest against the ecclesiastical policy of the Government. This protest, known as the Rutherglen Declaration, created no small stir, and the Council commissioned Graham of Claverhouse, to find the agitators of the petty rebellion. Claverhouse, learning that Douglas, one of Cameron's party, was to preach at Loudon Hill on the Sunday after the Rutherglen affair, determined to disperse the conventicle. On this Sunday, June 1st, 1679, many of the Covenanters appeared in arms. During the service, word was given that horsemen were approaching, and quickly the worship came to an end that the men might make ready to fight. At once they moved to the ground near Drumclog, where they met the enemy and gained the victory. Claverhouse fled, leaving thirty of his troopers dead. After Drumclog, the Covenanters, who had been led by Robert Hamilton, continued in arms, and soon their ranks were swelled. Eager though they were, and inspired by success, they were ill prepared to meet the army under the Duke of Monmouth, who was now in Scotland. On the 22nd of June, the battle of Bothwell Bridge was fought with dire disaster to the Covenanters, who prepared for the contest by bitter disputes.

Sir Walter Scott, in *Old Mortality*, has not neglected to show the absurd dissensions of the Presbyterians. Leaders and preachers quarrel. Among the preachers is Ephraim Macbriar, whose name and character are sug-

gestive of Hugh Mackail, but whose sermon is based on one of Cameron's. Wodrow's account, dull and tedious, does not contradict Scott's, and plainly sets forth the folly of the strife. Another document, 'Ure's Narrative of the rising at Bothwell Bridge,' refers to the rumour that Cameron was in Scotland at the time of the engagement, and that his supposed presence among the Covenanters increased the resentment of the moderate men. Ure himself would not accept the policy of Hamilton and Cameron, and he did not hesitate to speak with frankness. Fifty-two men were in company with him before Bothwell Bridge, and in one of the debates he declared that many more would have joined him had it not been thought that Cameron was with Hamilton. He was assured that Cameron was in Holland. 'And I prayed God,' wrote Ure, 'that all his faction were with him.'

In the 'Narrative,' there is light thrown on the disunion of the Covenanters. At one of the meetings of the military council both parties were so hot that they expected 'to have gone by the ears.' On the one hand, there was the sensible demand to fight the enemy, and to leave all debates till the time of a free parliament and a General Assembly. On the other, there was the accusation that those who made this demand were as bad as the Indulged. Hamilton and his friends declared that they would as soon sheathe their swords in the favourers of the Indulgence as in some of the Malignants. Amidst the wranglings, they professed to own Cameron's doctrines, and to be willing to act by his judgment. The associates of Ure offered to sign a denial of the

Indulgence, and he himself addressed Hamilton, telling him that he had a wife and five children, and a little bit of an estate, and that he had come to hazard his all and his life to get the yoke of prelacy and supremacy removed; but that it was evident that those who followed Cameron intended to tyrannize over their consciences and lead them into a worse snare than that in which they had been. In passionate words he declared that he was ready to fight till his last drop of blood was shed before he followed one step-length with his opponents. In his anger he told Cargill that 'he rendered himself odious by his naughty principles'; and very naturally, as is recorded, Cargill was much offended.

Donald Cargill, who was now to be closely associated with Cameron, was born about the year 1610. After the Act of 1662 he was evicted from the Barony Church, Glasgow, of which he was minister, and for seditious preaching was banished north of the Tay. The sentence was never rigidly enforced, and was, in fact, removed. After the period of his banishment he became an active field-preacher, and was often sought for by the Government. He was present at Bothwell Bridge, and was taken prisoner and then left by his captors, as his wounds seemed fatal. He lived, however, to join Cameron in open rebellion.

Cameron's party, as it may be called, was small before Bothwell Bridge, and was still smaller when the battle was over. Some of the men escaped, and some fell on the field, while others were among the banished who met a tragic death under the hatchways of the ship destined

for Barbadoes, when it was wrecked on one of the Orkney Islands. There were also others who remained prisoners till they were liberated on signing the 'bond,' as it was styled, by which they pledged themselves to keep the peace.

CHAPTER VI

PREACHER

After the battle of Bothwell Bridge, while the clemency of Monmouth influenced the government of Scotland, a third Indulgence was published permitting ministers in certain parts of the country, who had not been implicated in the late rebellion, to hold services in private houses and to dispense the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Conditions were annexed which made it an act of grace upon the part of the king; and which prevented it therefore from being largely accepted. A representation had been made to Monmouth by the Presbyterians who had not been under arms; and probably they expected freedom, rather than a restricted permission, for public worship. They asserted that the recent troubles would not have taken place had they had liberty to preach and to exercise discipline, and they pointed out that such liberty would not be inconsistent with prelacy. Monmouth was merciful, but he could not overrule Lauderdale with his pitiless policy, or extract toleration from the Episcopalians. The Indulgence and the liberation of some of the prisoners of the Bass were the utmost he could secure. While the Duke's influence in Scottish affairs continued, during what Wodrow styled the 'breathing time,' the Presbyterian ministers met in Edinburgh on the 8th of August; and it

is evident from their attempt to unite and to exercise discipline through a society, that they hoped in due time to have the liberty which Nonconformists of later times secured. The meeting was large, but the few ministers of Cameron's party were absent. It was agreed 'that all ministers should, in the first place, visit their own congregations where they were formerly settled, and try what access they can have to preach the gospel unto them. That they associate themselves into meetings, as their numbers, in particular bounds, and their circumstances will best allow, and take care to provide preaching to the people, in the bounds of their respective meetings, who are desirous of it. That every minister shall be a member of the meeting within whose bounds he resides. That indulged ministers, not indulged to the congregations they were in when laid aside, if their people, of whom they formerly had the charge, call them, return to them, and quit the places they are at present in. That all who are licensed to preach be particularly taken obliged unto subjection to the meeting which licensed them, and to submit themselves to their direction.' The scheme here drafted came to nothing, though Wodrow thought that but for the changes in the civil government the divisions among the Presbyterians might have been healed. These changes meant the going of the Duke of Monmouth and the coming of the Duke of York.

While the moderate Presbyterians were engaged in visionary schemes, the Government were hunting the rebels who had escaped from Bothwell Bridge, and who had refused the terms procured by Monmouth. The men who fought were rebels, however righteous was their

cause; and it was according to law and custom that the defeated should submit or be punished. So much may be said on behalf of the Government. But what is to be urged for the method taken to secure the rebels? Claverhouse with others was commissioned to seek them, and his doings in Ayr and Galloway have gained for him a reputation for abominable cruelty. It is told, and his apologists have not refuted all the stories, that the furnishings of houses were ruthlessly destroyed and the cattle and sheep seized; that women were outraged; that fines were extorted; and that torture was used to enforce confessions. Innocent men suffered with the guilty, and Claverhouse was enriched by the spoils and the fines. It was a time of anarchy under the guise of law, of cruelty under the pretence of constitutional government. There were worse days to come before the rule of the Stuarts should cease; the 'killing times' were to prepare Scotland for the Revolution. But the barbarities of Claverhouse and his troopers might well have roused milder men than Cameron, who was soon to repudiate allegiance to the king.

While no rising of the people checked the ravages of Claverhouse, some of the nobles, led by the Duke of Hamilton, endeavoured once more to obtain the dismissal of Lauderdale. Lauderdale added to the coarsest of manners unbounded ambition and profligacy; and to his need and greed of money many an act of persecution was due. It was galling to Hamilton, with his ancient lineage, to see this man in the seat of authority; and it may be granted that now, as in the former attempt, he had compassion on the people. A complaint was drawn up, charg-

ing Lauderdale with gross mismanagement of the affairs of Scotland, and was presented to the king. This document might have served as a justification of the revolt of the Presbyterians. Charles heard the complaint. He may have been jealous of Hamilton, who was not far from the crown. In any case he continued his confidence in Lauderdale, and almost all expectation of a milder government for Scotland was gone. There was still a lingering hope that concessions might be gained through the Duke of York. The Presbyterians seemed to think that as he was a Roman Catholic he might favour them as Nonconformists, while he was seeking toleration for the adherents of his own religion. But they were to learn that nothing was to be gained from the prince who, with the vices of the Stuarts, had the fierceness of a religious bigot. Amidst the political combinations and schemes in England, Monmouth was recalled, and York was sent in his place. On the 24th of November, 1679, York entered Edinburgh, where by royal command he was met and entertained by the magistrates of the city and by the chief noblemen of Scotland. Shortly afterwards he was admitted a member of the Privy Council, and by the instructions of Charles he was not required to take the oaths. The law was set aside to suit a Catholic.

The events connected with the Duke of York did not escape the attention of Cameron's friends in Holland, who acted as if the religious reputation of Scotland had been entrusted to their keeping. There is a letter from M'Ward, dealing with the Duke of York's reception in Edinburgh, which was addressed to Cargill or Cameron, or some leading man of their party. The 'no Popery' cry

is very distinctly sounded in it: the character of the prince is set forth in strong terms; and in impassioned words the question is asked: What will be thought of Scotland by the noble patriots of England? The nation, he writes, will be looked upon as a company of poor, base, degenerate souls, without regard to religion or respect to liberty. But to prevent this degradation of the nation's fame, M'Ward urges: 'I would have you forthwith, without any further demur, procrastination, or delay, speak to some of your more zealous and serious brethren, and awaken them unto the due and deep consideration of these things; that they and you may excite, and stir up the people to give such a present signification of their hatred at, and abhorrence of, this deed, as may let the world, which may be filled with the noise of this reception, hear also, that there are persons in that land, of that love and loyalty to Christ, and of that regard to liberty, as they dare adventure at all disadvantages, yea, in the sight of death, to give such significations of their abhorrence of that deed, as may keep a proportion with all the Council of Scotland hath decreed and done, to make his reception famous, and the decrees themselves infamous.' His suggestions are, that the preachers should tell the people that a breach of the Covenant had been made in the reception of the prince, a Catholic; and that a day of humiliation should be kept in various places. Eleven reasons, set forth with tedious fulness, are stated in favour of this course; and a warning is given in alliterative words: 'You will be buzzed in the ear with the old threadbare tattle of prudence, and words (vain words) will not be wanting, to blow up the bubble to a bigness of bulk and beautifulness of aspect.' This letter, whether directed

to Cameron or not, and Walker says there was such a letter to him, influenced his actions, as he arranged public fasts at which he preached on the guilt of the nation.

Cameron returned to Scotland in the autumn of 1679, and on the 30th of October sent M'Ward an account of himself. He had already written from Newcastle on his homeward journey. From Newcastle he proceeded to Annandale and Nithsdale, where he was received by the people with great joy. It was his fixed purpose, he said, to continue preaching, and he now asked advice on certain matters. Was he to agree to private intercourse with ministers of the moderate party; and what was he to do if asked to preach with them, or invited by them to speak in any place? How was he to behave if cited to a meeting of the clergy? He further desired to know if he should arrange field-meetings or, considering the danger, should he leave this matter in the hands of the people; and, also, what he should do if taken prisoner and he had no time for a 'testimony.' The paper with these questions, in Cameron's own writing, has been preserved. M'Ward's answers, if he gave them, are not known; but there is a letter from him, written in November, 1679, in which, for Brown and himself, he seriously advised Cameron to preach in the fields as a public testimony for freedom.

It was not now mainly the question of the Indulgence to which Cameron's zeal was to be directed. He had entered on a larger mission; and in times when the vigilance of the Government was keenest, and many in their fear were content to worship in secret, he came

forward, a rebel but a hero, to speak for freedom and the Presbyterian cause.

M'Ward, in his charge at the ordination ceremony, had advised him to seek the aid of the former field-preachers. Cameron obeyed, but the only co-operation he could obtain was from Cargill, and for a time from Douglas. These ministers did not forget the instructions of M'Ward's letter, and fasts were held in different parts of Clydesdale.

Commendation, if it be of any value, was given to their preaching by James Robertson, who was executed in 1682. It is difficult to understand why a dying man should make mention of small events. Robertson gave his 'testimony' in favour of fasts, 'particularly one holden at Auchengilloch by three ministers, two of them now glorified, viz., Mr Donald Cargill and Mr Richard Cameron, where the land's guilt was freely and faithfully discovered.' At the fasts there was mourning for the reception given to the Duke of York, whom Walker styled 'A sworn vassal of Antichrist,' 'The Devil's Lieutenant.'

A remarkable charge was made by Robert Hamilton in a letter addressed to the 'Societies.' He accused one Barclay, and certain other ministers, of underhand opposition to Cameron and Cargill at a time when they were 'in the fields, carrying Christ's standard over the mountains of Scotland.' These ministers, while refusing to join Cameron and Cargill, proceeded to Galloway, where they pretended they were associated with them. They inveighed against the Indulgence, and in this way induced the people to hear them; and having gained the people, they maligned the two Covenanting ministers and condemned their mis-

sion. The charge was gravely made, and, whether true or not, was an indication that Hamilton knew of the serious opposition directed against the ministers of his party.

From the sermons preached by Cameron which have been printed, it may be seen that he spoke fearlessly of the events of his day. He laments in passionate words that few are willing to attend the field-meetings: 'Are ye come to seek Jesus of Nazareth who was crucified? Last year about this time our Lord was, as it were, upon the Mount of Olives. He rode, as it were, triumphantly at the head of a small party to the market-cross of Rutherglen, and many cried, "Hosannah to the Son of David," for a few days after. But since the 22nd of June, 1679, how many have cried out, "Crucify Him, crucify Him, away with Him: we will have no more to do with Him. Christ is too dear a Lord for us. These field-meetings of His are too costly for us. We wish there never had been any of these field-meetings in Scotland."' The Presbyterian ministers who yielded to the Government, or who were afraid, are not spared: 'We were strong last year, two troops would not have terrified us; now we cannot get a meeting that dare engage with one troop. But be not dismayed, despond no more; "the day of your redemption draweth nigh: they spring like grass, it is that they may be cut off." Our Lord will make them cast away their arms as fast as the poor men did last year, upon the 22nd of June, at Bothwell Bridge. We had many gentlemen, and ministers that were not worthy to be called ministers. It was an ill omen.' Again, in more scathing words, he inveighs against these ministers: 'There are many

ministers in Scotland (it is true I am but a young man that says it) that shall not be any ministers if there were no ministers to be had in it. We must speak against ministers, and we must cry for the sins of the ministers of Scotland, that have betrayed the work of reformation, and even gone beyond curates and bishops in betraying and destroying of it. The Lord will lay that woe unto their charge.' His zeal found no excuse for his opponents: 'Those who have taken the Indulgences first or last,' he said; 'Those who have complied with them—let them be godly men, or be what they will—in this case they have not love to Christ in exercise.'

In another place he illustrates the difficulty of forsaking sin by a reference to those who paid the 'cess': 'Many a man that has even paid that wicked cess will acknowledge it an evil and a sin. Woe's me, says he, I would they had taken thrice as much. But say to them, will ye pay it again? They are at a stand there, and likewise they will acknowledge the Indulgence is a sin, but they must not leave it.' Cameron was not afraid, after the fashion of the Scottish preachers from the time of Knox, to speak openly of the king, and to denounce him. If he sinned in so doing, he sinned in notable company; and while the excellence of the company is no justification for a fault, it may be that Knox and Melville and other Scottish churchmen had the right, as they had the fearlessness, to denounce sin in high places even as in low. 'I will tell you where our help is,' cried Cameron, on one occasion; 'It is in Him who delivered our fathers from Popery in the days of Queen Mary and her tyranny. Our help is in Him who delivered them from the subtlety

and cruelty of that fox, James VI. Though dead we we may justly call him so. Christ called Herod a fox. He delivered us, too, from that yoke wreathed on our necks by Charles I. In Him is our help. And oh! that He would help us from the tyranny of this man upon the throne.' The treason in these words is mild, but a graver charge of speaking evil against dignities could be formed from other words of his: 'The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree. Here ye see it is best to be planted in the house of God, but I wot well there is no curate-plant in His house this day. And are not the Indulged worse? for they are also under the sign and badge of the beast. How is it that they hold their ministry? They hold it in dependence upon the devil's vicegerent, for if ever he had a vicegerent on earth, it must be Charles II., and preach as they will either in houses or churches they shall not flourish.' In another sermon he preached rebellion in the plainest and strongest terms, and probably he remembered that all rebellion was not condemned by the ancient prophet, but only the rebellion against a law that was just, and a law-giver who was good. And this is Cameron's incitement to political revolt which he gave before the day of the Sanquhar Declaration: 'But we set up kings and princes, but not by Him. If you would have Him be for you ye must cut off this king, and these princes, and make able men be your rulers, endued with suitable qualifications both of body and mind, that may employ their power for the cause and interest of God. What would we do with such powers as state themselves in opposition to God? If we had the zeal of God within us we would not call him our king, and even with regard

to the nobles and magistrates of this land, we would not acknowledge them to be magistrates. Ye read in the Acts of the General Assembly, where Montrose was called James Graham. But ye shall say, "There was an Act of Parliament that declared him a traitor, as one that had forfeited both life and fortune." But, say ye, ye will not look upon them in this light as the Assembly has not deposed them. Nay, but they have done what deserves deposition; and even our king and princes, the most part of them deserve deposition. . . . I know not if this generation will be honoured to cast off these rulers, but those that the Lord makes instruments to bring back Christ, and to recover our liberties, civil and ecclesiastic, shall be such as shall disown this king and these inferiors under him, and against whom our Lord is denouncing war. Let them take heed unto themselves, for though they should take us to scaffolds, or kill us in the fields, the Lord will yet raise up a party who will be avenged upon them. And are there none to execute justice and judgment upon these wicked men who are both treacherous and tyrannical? The Lord is calling men of all ranks and stations to execute judgment upon them. And if it be done we cannot but justify the deed, and such are to be commended for it, as Jael was. "Blessed above women shall Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, be."'

There is a suspicion, and perhaps a stronger word should be used, that Cameron was not simply preaching civil war, but was justifying anyone who should repeat the part of Jael. If this suspicion be correct then, if judged by the usual moral and religious standards of the

present day, he should be condemned for inciting to murder. But morality and religion in the seventeenth century were nearer than they now are to Judaism; and the difference between the Old Testament and the New was not wisely appreciated. Cameron's words are there, and they are likely to be differently interpreted and therefore differently judged; and it may be noted that, in an examination connected with the Rye House plot, a witness declared that Cameron and Hackston of Rathillet had meditated the assassination of the Duke of York. The roll of crimes committed by the Covenanters is singularly small when the cruelty to which they were subjected is observed, and when it is remembered that crowds of men who were banded under the name of religion were not likely to be each and all governed by the precepts of Christ. In view of the general character of the Covenanters, and of the fact that he was speaking openly to a congregation, it may be concluded that Cameron meant nothing more than a call to civil war, which men are wont to justify when it is successful. If he meant not assassination but war, he had many precedents for urging that tyranny in religion may be met by arms; and the purpose of his words can be justified, for, while an appeal to arms must be a last resort in a religious struggle, it is a resort for men who count truth more than life. Of Cameron it may be said that he did not point out a way he did not himself take, since he died fighting at Ayrsmoss. He was not, however, merely an agitator, loving war and inciting to it. He had the gentle spirit which became him as a preacher of the gospel; and this spirit was shown in his advice to his

hearers how to act when questioned by enemies: 'I confess folk are much to be pitied at this time who take a liberty to lie, especially when soldiers come to the house and ask if such a man was there? It is true ye are not bound at the very first (if ye can without sin shift it) to tell them, but beware of lying on any account. Rather tell them that such a one was there, though you and your house should be ruined by it; yea, though it should tend to the prejudice of the best ministers in Scotland. God will not give you thanks for saving one's life by a lie.'

The sermons of Cameron which have been published were printed from notes taken by hearers, and by this method of publication they have doubtless suffered. Howie of Lochgoin, when he acted as editor, changed many of the Scottish words found in the manuscript copies before him, and in in so doing debased them. The sermons are in places dull in style and commonplace in thought, and nowhere is there the eloquence with which Blackadder described the Communion scene. Yet he had the persuasive power of a great preacher, and the words which are now dull to a reader may have been kindled by the fervour and passion of the speaker. Walker describes the effect of a sermon based on the text: 'And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life' (John v. 40). Cameron fell into a 'rap of calm weeping,' and his hearers wept with him. He stopped during the delivery of the sermon, and prayed for the restoration of the Jews, for the fall of Antichrist, and for the hastening of the day when the Stuarts would be swept from the throne. The sermon has been printed, and the part which most deeply affected the people is

probably that containing these words: 'Now for you that are saying this—"It is true, it is not easy to bring folk to Christ. I have had a profession for many years," say ye, "and yet, I fear, I have never yet come to Christ." But I say our Lord is here this day, saying: "Will ye take me, ye that have a lie so long in your right hand?" . . . There may be some saying, "If I get or take Him, I shall get a cross also." Well, that is true, but ye will get a sweet cross. Thus we offer Him unto you in the parishes of Auchinleck, Douglas, Crawfordjohn, and all ye that live there about. And what say ye? Will ye take Him? Tell us what ye say, for we take instruments before these hills and mountains around us that we have offered Him unto you this day. . . . Angels are wondering at this offer: they stand beholding with admiration that our Lord is giving you such an offer this day. . . . The angels will go up to report at the throne what is everyone's choice this day.'

Sir Walter Scott, in chap. xvii. of 'Old Mortality,' has sketched a sermon by Kettledrummle on a text from the forty-ninth chapter of Isaiah. The text was used by Cameron, but there is nothing in his sermon about sweeping away Papists and Prelatists, and there is no laying bare of royal immoralities, as was done by Kettledrummle in reference to Charles II. Scott makes his preacher 'handle very pithily the doctrine of defensive arms and of resistance to Charles.' Cameron, in his sermon, justified resistance as set forth in the Sanquhar Declaration, and spoke freely of the use of arms: 'And indeed, suffering for the cause gives a noble dash to enemies. We never lost anything by dearly suffering,

but gained much by these who lost their lives on fields and scaffolds. But there are many that will say: Indeed, we should suffer. But, say they, we should not fight. But let me see the man that says he is not for fighting—it's true, if the Lord call not to it, it should be so. But for suffering, that man will confine in the breadth of a turnover (a small coin) that that he will suffer for. These that cry down defensive arms, when they see it comes to this: "You must do this or suffer," they will never suffer any loss as to their own matters. But they will suffer the Gospel to go away.' Scott had evidently read Cameron's sermon, which is not ridiculous, and from it sketched Kettledrummle's sermon, which is.

The best testimony to the power of Cameron's preaching is the fact that the tradition of that preaching has not died out among the people of the districts where he spoke. In Darmeid, a lonely spot in the parish of Cambusnethan, a monument has been raised to his memory; and in Auchengilloch, a glen in the parish of Lesmahagow, where also he held a conventicle, there is another monument bearing his name. It is remembered where he preached at Mungo Hill, to the south of Eaglesham, at Kirkmahoe, at the Shawhead, at Quarryholes on the Duneaton, at Kype Water in Evandale, at New Cumnock, and at Carluke.

Stories have been recorded, which are intended to show that Cameron possessed the prophetic powers so commonly ascribed to the Covenanting preachers. On one occasion, a certain Andrew Dalziel cried out: 'Sir, we neither know you nor your God.' Cameron mused a little, and replied that this man would know God in His

judgments, which would be sudden and surprising, and he warned him. Dalziel died a few days afterwards in a frightful manner. The story was true, so far as Dalziel's words are concerned, since Robert Hamilton repeated them in one of his letters. He, however, said nothing about the prophecy and the death. On another occasion the Laird of Logan and the Laird of Horsecleugh represented Cameron as a naughty person and a Jesuit. This charge is worthy of observation in view of the interpretation which may be put on Cameron's words already quoted, that they incited to the assassination of the Duke of York ; and also in view of the doctrine of the Jesuits, that in certain circumstances tyrannicide is a duty. The application of the word Jesuit to Cameron was probably more than the mere giving of a nickname, since there seems to have been a belief that the Jesuits were connected with the Covenanting movement. In a proclamation issued by the Government after Bothwell Bridge, the frequenters of conventicles were described as being exposed to their influence ; and in the printed narrative of Titus Oates there was more than one reference to Jesuits mixing among the people under the guise of Presbyterians. The two men who had called Cameron a Jesuit, and who had tried to dissuade people from hearing him, repented of their words, and sought his pardon. He showed caution in his reply. While for his own part he forgave them, he assured them that he was persuaded they would be punished for the wrongs done by them to the interests of Christ. The prophecy is said to have been fulfilled in the fact that for fifty years the family of the one man was childless, though its con-

tinuation was not explained; and in the fact that the house of the other was burned.

An incident of another kind has been recorded, evidently for the purpose of showing the supernatural care which attended Cameron's preaching. A certain Mr H. E. studied a sermon which he meant to deliver against him and Cargill. 'But on the Saturday night,' says Walker, 'there was a voice spoke aloud to him, saying *audi* two times. He answered *audi est*, I hear. The voice said again, "Beware of calling Cameron's words vain." This stopped him from preaching against them.' Stories such as this have unfortunately helped to cast ridicule on the Covenanters and their cause.

The aspersions cast on Cameron's good name are illustrated not only by the story of the two lairds, but also by the charge of assassination which was made after his death. In a work styled 'A true Account and Declaration of the horrid conspiracy against the late king, his present Majesty, and the Government,' there is included the evidence of a Robert Smith, who at one time resided in the parish of Dunscore. This book, which is said to have been written by Bishop Spratt, was printed in 1685, and Smith's evidence, which it contains, was given on the 24th of February, 1684. Smith asserted that, for two years before Bothwell Bridge, conventicles were numerous, at which contributions were levied which, while nominally for the support of the ministers and the poor, were largely spent in the purchase of arms and ammunition. Further, he said that, in 1679, Richard and Michael Cameron were in Holland, paying for arms which had been sent to Scotland, and purchasing a supply, which

was ready to be shipped, when they heard of Bothwell Bridge. On their return the Camerons, who were sheltered by Sir Hugh and Sir George Campbell of Cesnock, held conventicles for the purpose of seeing how many people would join them in opposition to the Government. Smith also related that on one occasion he was with the Camerons and Hackston of Rathillet, in a house where a conventicle had been held. Hackston proposed to kill the Duke of York, who was then in Scotland, and said he himself would do it if he could reach him. Before arranging a plan he wished to find out how many people passed into the room to see the Duke dining, and to discover whether it was possible for a man to enter with a long cloak and a sword, or a woman with a plaid. As he was well known, he could not risk discovery by going near the Duke's house, and he therefore desired someone of his less known companions to obtain the information for him. Michael Cameron offered his services, and he departed, taking Smith with him. As they were returning, they were recognized and had to flee, and so the plan of assassination came to nothing.

Smith's evidence was that of an informer, and it was given at a time when it could not be denied by the accused. Cameron may have purchased arms when he was in Holland. There is no proof that he did, and there is certainly none, beyond this 'Information,' that there was ever a plot among the Covenanters for the murder of the Duke of York. Cameron praised the deed of Jael, and possibly his fervour was interpreted as incitement to murder. There was, however, no mention of assassination in any of the charges brought by the Government against

Cameron and his associates; and the open warfare of Bothwell Bridge, on the one hand, and the public policy of the Rutherglen and Sanquhar Declarations, on the other, were methods of rebellion very different from assassination. At the worst, were Smith's evidence true, there was in the intended assassination no private malice, no sordid lust; there was simply the burning desire to gain the public good as conceived by fanaticism.

Besides the sermons, three letters written by Richard Cameron have been published. These letters are of no importance, as they throw little light on his doings and on his character. Two were addressed to Alexander Gordon of Earlston, who was in hiding for his part at Bothwell Bridge, and one was to his wife, the lady of Earlston, younger. Cameron referred to some secret undertaking,—that possibly which culminated in the Sanquhar Declaration; and spoke of his brother as going to Holland, and as being willing to carry any communication which Earlston or his wife might wish to send. The brother of whom he spoke was probably Alexander, mentioned in Allan Cameron's letter to M'Ward, of date February 24th, 1680. Allan Cameron wrote from the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, where he was still undergoing imprisonment for not paying the fine imposed for holding a conventicle in his house. He spoke of the faithful martyrs executed on Magus Muir, and of his own suffering in spirit since the disaster of Bothwell Bridge. He stated that his wife was near him in Edinburgh, and also that his son Richard, while he was being reproached for preaching in the fields, received little encouragement from his friends, who blamed him for endangering him-

self and the people. He himself spoke of his 'poor, foolish, ignorant son,' and though the words seem harsh, they were followed by others which show a father's love and a good man's piety. For his wife and himself he wrote, 'we, blessed be our merciful God, have desired freely to offer him up to his Lord and Master in whatsoever service He has for him.'

CHAPTER VII

THE SANQUHAR DECLARATION

The conventicles, with the protests against the reception given to the Duke of York, attracted the attention of the Government, who set a watch for the preachers. Cargill and Cameron accordingly separated, and the former took with him Henry Hall, who had been much with them in their wanderings. For some reason, probably that they might be ready for communication with Holland, Cargill and his friend proceeded towards the Firth of Forth, and continued in the district of Bo'ness and Carriden, till the curates of these places gave information against them to the governor of Blackness. On the 3rd of June, a company of soldiers was sent in search of them; and the governor learning, immediately after the soldiers had departed, that Cargill and Hall were in Queensferry, set out with a single servant and discovered them in an inn. Bidding his servant find his men, he entered the house and engaged in conversation with the two Covenanters, pretending great respect, and asking to drink wine with them. Some time passed without the arrival of the soldiers, and at last, weary of delay, and throwing off his mask, the governor declared the men his prisoners, and called on the people of the house to help him. One of

the attendants went to his aid. A struggle ensued, and while Hall closed with the governor, Cargill, who was an old man, fled. When his friend was safe, Hall endeavoured to escape, and making his way out, was struck on the head by the attendant. He had strength to reach the outside, and some women of the village tried to carry him to a place of safety; but General Dalziel, who was stationed in the district, coming on the spot, took him and hurried him away towards Edinburgh. There was no compassion for the wounded man, and he died on the road. On his body a document was found, now generally known as the Queensferry Paper.

The document, which is long and intricate, shows the labour of skilled hands, and could hardly have been the work of a clergyman like Cargill and a country gentleman like Hall. It has generally been ascribed to Cargill, though Cameron and Hackston of Rathillet, it was afterwards asserted, were implicated in its production. No signatures had been attached to it. In its form it was a bond or covenant, in which the supposed subscribers made solemn protestations of religious faith and resolutions regarding the doctrine, worship, and government of the Church. They attacked the character and rule of the king, and argued whether they were bound to continue allegiance to him in view of the long continuance of monarchy, of the principles of the National Covenant, and of any hope of reformation in him and the members of his family. Satisfied that they were not constrained to continue their allegiance, they declared in favour of a republican government. 'We then being made free by

God and their own doings . . . and being now loosed from all obligations both divine and civil to them, knowing also, that no society of men, having corruption in them, can be without laws and government, and withal desiring to be governed in the best way that is least liable to inconveniences, and least apt to degenerate into tyranny; we do declare that we shall set up over ourselves, and over what God shall give us power of, government and governors according to the word of God, and especially that word, Exodus xviii. 21. . . . That we shall no more commit the government of ourselves, and the making of laws for us, to any one single person, or lineal successor, we not being by God, as the Jews were, bound to one single family; and this kind of government by a single person being most liable to inconveniences, and aptest to degenerate into tyranny, as sad and long experience hath taught us.'

The Paper, not having been signed, cannot be classed as a publication of Cameron's party. There is no doubt, however, that it expressed their doctrines, and it was popularly styled 'The Cameron's Covenant.' Whatever objections may have been taken to some of its statements, and objections were taken by friends of Cameron's cause, the Paper was the forerunner of the famous Sanquhar Declaration, which was published a few days after Hall's death. The Privy Council at once passed an Act for the seizure of all who helped Hall to escape from the hands of the governor of Blackness; but the affair in itself was too insignificant to demand measures for the prevention of a rebellion. None the less the pre-

paration of this Paper pointed to the coming conflict between the Stuarts and their subjects. It was the witness that certain men, few in number, with meagre influence, meditated renouncing allegiance to Charles Stuart.

Hall, it is supposed, was endeavouring to pass from Queensferry, or some other place on the Firth of Forth, to Holland, where he intended to submit the Paper to the friends of his party. Cargill escaped, as has been noted, and pushed his way to the South to join Cameron, who was in hiding with some companions. These two were now left alone among the ministers to represent the extreme party of the Covenanters. The one was young and in his strength: the other was an old man who had suffered pain and endured privation for the cause to which he had devoted his courage and zeal. Douglas was said, in a Government proclamation, to be with them at this time, but Wodrow doubts the fact. He had, in any case, ceased to be active in the business of their party.

On the 22nd of June, 1680, the first anniversary of Bothwell Bridge, Richard Cameron with twenty men entered the burgh of Sanquhar; and marching in solemn procession, with drawn swords and pistols in their hands, went to the market-cross. When they had sung words from the psalms of David, Michael Cameron stepped forward and read aloud a Declaration, which he afterwards affixed to the market-cross. These men were disowning Charles Stuart as their king. The Declaration was framed in these words:—'It is not amongst the smallest of the Lord's mercies to this poor land, that

there have been always some who have given their testimony against every course of defection (that many are guilty of), which is a token for good, that He doth not as yet intend to cast us off altogether, but that He will leave a remnant in whom He will be glorious, if they, through His grace, keep themselves clean still, and walk in His way and method, as it has been walked in and owned by Him in our predecessors of truly worthy memory, in their carrying on of our noble work of reformation in the several steps thereof, from popery, prelacy, and likewise erastian supremacy, so much usurped by him, who (it is true so far as we know) is descended from the race of our kings, yet he hath so far deborded from what he ought to have been, by his perjury and usurpation in Church matters, and tyranny in matters civil, as is known by the whole land, that we have just reason to account it one of the Lord's great controversies against us, that we have not disowned him and the men of his practices (whether inferior magistrates or any other), as enemies to our Lord and His crown, and the true Protestant and Presbyterian interest in their lands, our Lord's espoused bride and Church. Therefore, although we be for government and governors, such as the Word of God and our Covenant allows, yet we for ourselves, and all that will adhere to us, as the representative of the true Presbyterian kirk, and covenanted nation of Scotland, considering the great hazard of lying under such a sin any longer, do by this present disown Charles Stuart, that has been reigning (or rather tyrannizing, as we may say) on the throne of Britain these years bygone, as having any right, title to, or

interest in the said crown of Scotland for government, as forfeited several years since, by his perjury and breach of covenant both to God and his Kirk, and usurpation of his crown and royal prerogatives therein, and many other breaches in matters ecclesiastic, and by his tyranny and breach of the very *leges regnandi* in matters civil. For which reason, we declare, that several years since, he should have been denuded of being king, ruler or magistrate, or of having any power to act, or to be obeyed as such. As also, we, being under the standard of our Lord Jesus Christ, Captain of Salvation, do declare war with such a tyrant and usurper, and all the men of his practices, as enemies to our Lord Jesus Christ, and His cause and covenants; and against all such as have strengthened him, sided with, or anywise acknowledged him in his tyranny, civil or ecclesiastic, yea, against all such as shall strengthen, side with, or anywise acknowledge any other in the like usurpation and tyranny, far more against such as would betray or deliver up our free reformed mother-kirk unto the bondage of Antichrist the pope of Rome. And by this we homologate that testimony given at Rutherglen, the 29th of May, 1679, and all the faithful testimonies of these who have gone before, as also of these who have suffered of late. And we do disclaim that declaration published at Hamilton, June, 1679, chiefly because it takes in the king's interest, which we are several years since loosed from, because of the foresaid reasons, and others, which may after this (if the Lord will) be published. As also, we disown, and by this resent the reception of the Duke of

York, that professed papist, as repugnant to our principles and vows to the most high God, and as that which is the great, though not alone, just reproach of our kirk and nation. We also, by this, protest against his succeeding to the crown; and whatever has been done, or any are essaying to do in this land (given to the Lord), in prejudice to our work of reformation. And to conclude, we hope after this none will blame us for, or offend at our rewarding these that are against us, as they have done to us, as the Lord gives opportunity. This is not to exclude any that have declined, if they be willing to give satisfaction according to the degree of their offence.'

In Sanquhar, more than one protestation was publicly made by rebels, but the reading of the Declaration at the market-cross in 1680 was greatest in historic interest, as being the first scene in the drama of the revolution in which the reign of the Stuarts was brought to an end. Twenty men raised the standard of rebellion and threw off allegiance to the king. Twenty men, out of a whole nation, with the forces of the crown to crush them, may appear ridiculous to the cynic smiling at the excesses of political zeal or laughing at the vagaries of religious bigotry. These men were traitors and rebels; but to what cause and to what person? They were traitors against the organized tyranny that styled itself the Government of Scotland, rebels against the king in whose name they had been persecuted for abiding by that freedom which he had solemnly sworn to preserve.

The scene at Sanquhar was the work of Richard

Cameron. His action was rash, if a deed be rash when a man must die for it. Not many were joined with him in it. The Covenanters were all but crushed under the weight of despotism; and there were few with strength and courage to resist. Yet twenty men in Scotland in 1680 threw off Charles Stuart, as the kingdoms threw off James Stuart in the year of the Revolution.

Many of the Presbyterian ministers openly condemned the Declaration, and none had the boldness to join Cameron after it was made. The king had him disowned, and the punishment of rebellion awaited anyone who should affirm the Declaration. Cameron himself, however, drew up a vindication, of which a manuscript copy still exists. He claimed that the Declaration was in accordance with Presbyterian principles, and asserted that his party acted in regard to Charles II. as the Church in 1648 acted in regard to Charles I. He referred to the teaching of Rutherfurd, of 'honest Lex Rex,' that people are free when a king breaks the covenant made between him and them. Pointing to what he styled the reformation from Prelacy, he said that as a company of women began it in 1637, so he and his friends might be the means of securing a new reformation. In the year 1685, when events were ripening for the Revolution, an apology for the Sanquhar Declaration appeared as part of the 'Vindication of the United Societies.' The attempt was made to show that Cameron was not declaring a hostile war under martial insurrection, but merely a war of contradiction and an opposition by testimonies. The twenty men at Sanquhar did certainly not challenge to battle the

regiments of the crown: they formally threw off allegiance to Charles Stuart.

In the sermon, used by Sir Walter Scott for Kettledrummle's harangue, which Cameron preached at Carluke on the 8th of July, he made direct reference to the Sanquhar Declaration, justifying it on religious grounds:— 'We often said in the fields that our king has been a traitor to God, and when we go to a town to declare it in paper the most part are offended in our Lord. At this time I'll tell you, I do not desire to say it to take the praise to myself, but I say it. If that testimony be adhered to, it shall give them a sore blow, even that paper that hath accidentally fallen into their hands and has been left at crosses. If that testimony given at Rutherglen, May 29th, 1679, had been adhered to, we had seen other things than we have seen. The Lord would have countenanced his people and owned their testimony. I say, set about giving of testimonies. Thus shall hasten God's coming to save His Church, and His coming out of this place to save His children.' In the same sermon he set forth his principles regarding the government of the country, and it may be seen that he had the idea of a Christian Commonwealth. 'I desire not,' he said, 'to reflect upon our fathers for bringing home Charles Stuart. . . . Yet his actions since, and the connivance of these who had his favour or any power under him, declare it to be impossible to manifest the royal prerogative of Christ Jesus, and manifestly avow so much as his civil rights. And since it is so declared, we must either quit him as king or else quit Christ, I am for this, to have no king but Christ since they will have none but Cæsar. And after Christ is

upon His throne, and His crown upon His head, let such magistrates be appointed as will employ their power for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ and destroying the kingdom of darkness in this land, and in every place where Christ shall reign.' If the Sanquhar Declaration be reduced to a political proclamation it loses its significance. Cameron, when he published it, was no mere political agitator, since he believed, as this sermon shows, that in throwing off allegiance to Charles Stuart he was owning the sovereignty of Christ. What he did, too, was more than the assertion of the spiritual right of the Church. It was a protestation on behalf of the headship of Christ over the nation, a declaration in favour of Christ's kingdom established in Scotland. Rightly or wrongly, the Covenanters were rebels to the king that they might be loyal to Christ as subjects in His kingdom. They lived in an age when the sovereign was not a man to draw forth the reverence of the people, and when the government of the land did not make for righteousness, and in refusing obedience to the sovereign and acceptance of his laws they did as their religion inspired them, and as their right to freedom entitled them.

Immediately after Cameron and his friends had left Sanquhar on the 22nd of June, one of the magistrates of the burgh carried the Declaration to the Privy Council and in legal fashion 'took instruments and protested against it.' The Council at once communicated with Lauderdale, who was in London with the king. They intimated that there was a party of 'villains' in arms, about seventy in number, most of them 'ruffians and the scum of the people'; and at the same time forwarded the draft of a proclamation they proposed to issue. Charles ap-

proved the proceedings of the Council and authorized the publication of the Queensferry Paper and the Sanquhar Declaration. On the 30th of June a warrant was issued for the apprehension of Richard and Michael Cameron, Cargill, Douglas and others, who were styled traitors and rebels. Five thousand merks were offered for Richard Cameron, dead or alive; three thousand for Michael Cameron, for Cargill and for Douglas; and a thousand merks for any other one of the traitors.

The Privy Council were continually devising methods of reaching the leaders of the Covenanters, and were continually failing because of the loyalty of the people to these leaders. On this occasion they demanded the aid of the heritors of a district embracing seventeen parishes. Many of these men were suspected of sympathy with the Covenanters, and the Government now sought to give them work which would try them. They were required to call on all men and women residing on their lands, from sixteen years of age upwards, to declare on oath if they had seen any of the rebels; and also, that there might be no pretence that the rebels could not be identified, if they had seen any 'skulking or lurking persons.' Death was the penalty for those who refused this oath. Active measures were taken to secure the rebels, as the Government could not afford to overlook the Sanquhar Declaration, which was of more significance than the Queensferry Paper. Troops were sent to Galloway and neighbouring places to search for Cameron and his associates, and these troops were placed under the command of Claverhouse and other officers who did not lack zeal for the Government service.

When Claverhouse and his troopers were on their track, it was little that Cameron and his party could do for their own safety; and it seems at this distance of time that a bond of defence could have been of no use to them in their danger. A bond, however, was prepared and was signed by some thirty men, but it could not save them from their fate. What was a mere handful of Covenanters, with or without a bond, against a company of the soldiers of the crown?

'We underscribers,' so ran the bond, 'bind and oblige ourselves to be faithful to God, and true to one another, and to all others that shall join with us in adhering to Rugland testimony, and disclaiming the Hamilton Declaration, chiefly because it takes in the king's interest, which we are loosed from by reason of his perfidy, and covenant breaking, both to the most high God, and the people over whom he was set, upon the terms of his propagating the main ends of the covenants, to wit, the reformation of religion, and instead of that, usurping to himself the royal prerogatives of Jesus Christ, and encroaching upon the liberties of the Church, and so stating himself both in opposition to Jesus Christ the Mediator, and the free government of his house; as also in disowning and protesting against the reception of the Duke of York, a professed papist, and whatsoever else hath been done in this land (given to the Lord), in prejudice of our covenanted, and universally sworn to reformation. And although as the Lord, who searcheth the heart, knows we be for government and governors both civil and ecclesiastic, such as the Word of God and our covenants allow, yet by this we disown the present magistrates, who openly and avowedly

are doing what in them lies, for destroying utterly our work of reformation from popery, prelacy, erastianism, and other heresies and errors; and by this we declare also that we are not any more to own ministers indulged, and such as drive a sinful union with them; nor are we to join any more in this public cause with ministers or professors of any rank, that are guilty of the defections of this time, until they give satisfaction proportioned to the scandal and offence they have given.'

Cameron, when he sent a list of queries to M'Ward, asked what he should do if he had no time for a dying testimony. While it has not appeared what answer was given, it is probable that when he framed this bond he intended it to be his last testimony. He knew that his enemies were gathering in upon him, and that, though he was safe from any betrayal, he could not escape the vigilance of Claverhouse and other officers of the king. To the last, then, he opposed the Indulged, but after Sanquhar there was not to be the wrangling over the Indulgence which helped to split the Presbyterians at Bothwell Bridge. Oppression had reduced the party of the strictest Covenanters to a mere handful of men, and there was no room and no cause for quarrel. The wonder is, however, that these men, hiding for their lives, should have taken time to testify to any cause or against any persons. The king, the source of all the troubles in the country and in the Church, was disowned as the enemy of Christ; and whether the men who signed the bond were fanatical or not they adhered with undivided loyalty to their Master in heaven, and acted towards Charles Stuart in just the same way as the whole country acted

toward his brother when a few more years of oppression had passed. It is true that Charles Stuart was not the religious bigot that his brother was, and it is true that he had manners as of a gentleman even while he had the vices of a profligate. None the less he was a tyrant who had broken the most sacred promises, and no one with sober mind and the vision for truth is able to gainsay one single specific charge made against the king by Cameron in this bond or in the Sanquhar Declaration. Voltaire, with a cynical frankness, declared that there is an indescribable pleasure in speaking evil of dead kings, because one cannot speak evil of them while they are alive for fear of one's ears. The king was not dead when Cameron uttered the evil against him which was the blunt truth; and what was uttered was spoken not in the temper which counts no costs, but in the calm and deep passion which can see consequences.

At the first 'General Meeting,' which was held on December 15, 1681, when Cameron and Cargill were both dead, the Sanquhar Declaration was avowed by the men who held their principles and continued their work; and when it was published by these men as one of their papers, it was styled: 'The Declaration and Testimony of the true Presbyterian, anti-Prelatic, anti-Erastian persecuted Party in Scotland, published at Sanquhar, June 22, 1680.' In the burgh of Sanquhar a granite obelisk, eighteen or twenty feet high, was erected in the year 1864. It bears the inscription: 'IN COMMEMORATION OF THE TWO FAMOUS SANQUHAR DECLARATIONS WHICH WERE PUBLISHED ON THIS SPOT, WHERE STOOD THE ANCIENT CROSS OF THE BURGH: THE ONE BY THE

Rev. Richard Cameron, on the 22nd of June, 1680: the other by the Rev. James Renwick, on the 25th of May, 1685. The Killing Time. If you would know the nature of their crime: Then read the story of that killing time.'

CHAPTER VIII

AYRSMOSS

Cameron's vindication of the Sanquhar Declaration throws light on the motive of actions which meant death to him. He was too brave to flee like one ashamed. What he did he did calmly and resolutely, sitting down first and counting the cost. M'Ward had told him that the standard of the Gospel had fallen in Scotland, and that it was for him to lift it. He returned from Holland with the bold purpose of testifying against the outrage done to freedom in Scotland, the land where victory had so often followed forlorn hope. The people in the South received him gladly, but their Presbyterian leaders kept apart. He held fasts, when it was treason to speak against the Duke of York; and assembling conventicles was a criminal breaking the law of the land. Constantly he faced danger, and his opponents blamed him for leading the people astray. Without fear he went on; and when fasts and conventicles failed to rouse the Presbyterian leaders to their lost liberty, when the preacher's protestations came to naught, and his prayers seemed to have no answer, he saw need for new action, and he and his twenty heroes marched into Sanquhar and there disowned the king. Women in the church of St Giles, when the stool

was thrown at the Dean, had begun in riot the revolution which overthrew Episcopacy; and might not therefore twenty men of strong will, ready for martyrdom, begin the downfall of the king who had worked disaster to the liberties of the land, and had wronged religion through the injury of the Church? After years of civil strife and battle, Charles I. had been put to death. War was the price to pay for freedom, and the plots and rebellions in England might yet swell into war; and Scotland should do her part. Cameron was no foolish schemer, plotting a revolution in which his name might be first. He compared himself not with the national heroes, but with the women of the St Giles fray; and he trusted that the goodness of the cause would triumph, without the aid of greatness in its martyrs. The twenty men who marched into Sanquhar had neither social place nor honoured name; but their deed could not have been more daring had the greatest done it. They had no superstitious fear that it was sinful to disown the king, when they thought of broken contracts and covenants. They made their declaration, offering themselves for the cause of freedom; and a few days after Sanquhar, Richard Cameron was to die. There is one picture of him in these days, of a man who longed for the inheritance of heaven, and yet prayed for patience. There is another, of a man who preached to the last, finishing the work given him to do.

Though rewards had been offered for their capture, Cameron and Cargill continued their meetings in the fields. Napier, in the 'Memoirs of Dundee,' styled them 'brandy-saints,' having with childish or wilful carelessness misread a record in 'Faithful Contendings' of certain

Covenanters who, to the sorrow of Cameron and Cargill, made their mission easy by the help of large flasks of brandy. Napier in his vulgarity tried to defame men who, in their political revolt, were seeking to be true to religion.

On the 4th of July, Cameron, preaching near Cumnock, foretold his death, and prophesied of things to come. According to Walker's account, he said: 'There are three or four things that I have to tell you this day which I must not omit, because I will be but a breakfast or four hours to the enemies some day shortly, and my work will be finished and my time both; and the first is this,—As for that unhappy man, Charles the II., who is now upon the throne of Britain, after him there shall not be a crowned king in Scotland of the name of Stuart. Secondly, there shall not be an old Covenanter's head above the ground, that swore these covenants with uplifted hands, ere ye get a right reformation in Scotland. Thirdly, a man may ride a summer-day in Galloway, the Shire of Air, and Clidsdale, and not see a reeking house, nor hear a cock crow; and several other shires shall be little better, ere ye get a right and thorow reformation in Scotland. Fourthly, the rod that the Lord will make use of shall be the French and other foreigners, together with a wicked party in this land joining with them; but ye that stand to the testimony in that day be not discouraged with the fewness of your number; for when Christ comes to raise up his work in Scotland, he will not want men enough to work for him; yea, he may chap upon the greatest man in Scotland, and he may be a great malignant, and say, Sir, let alone this Babel-building of yours, for I have

another piece of work to put in your hand; and he will gar him work for him, whether he will or not. It may be he'll convert the man, and give him his soul for a prey. And there are some of you that are hearing me may live for aye to see these things accomplished; and after these defections and judgments are over, ye may see the nettles grow out of the bed-chambers of noblemen and gentlemen, and their names, memorials, and posterity to perish from the earth.'

Without such prophecies the records of Cameron by the Covenanters could not have been made perfect. He was right about the Stuart king, at least, as James II. was never crowned in Scotland. Another time he spoke of his death; and in the report of the incident, Walker goes back to the promise alleged to have been made at Dunscore. Twelve days before his death he remained from morning to night in the chamber he was occupying. The mistress of the house tried again and again to enter, and at last forcing the door, found him very melancholy. It was the old promise, the 'weary' promise not to preach against the Indulged that troubled him; and for making it, he said, his carcass would be cast into the wilderness. Immediately afterwards he preached at Crawfordjohn that sermon in which he fell into the 'rap of calm weeping,' and moved his hearers to tears. The last Sunday of his life he preached along with Cargill at a place in Clydesdale, and his sermon was on the text, 'Be still and know that I am God.' Walker's brief account points to the preacher's fear of Roman Catholicism being established through the Duke of York:—'He was assured the Lord would lift up a standard against Antichrist, that

would go to the gates of Rome, and burn it with fire; and that blood should be their sign, and no quarter their word; and earnestly wished that it might first begin in Scotland.' On that Sunday, the last day of their joint-ministry, Cameron arranged with Cargill that they should preach together a fortnight later, but before a fortnight, his body was lying at Ayrsmoss. The night before he died he slept at the house of William Mitchell in Meadowhead, at the Water of Ayr. In the morning the daughter of the house took water to him, and when he had washed and dried his face and hands, he said: 'This is their last washing, I have need to make them clean, for there are many to see them.' To the girl's mother, who was weeping, he turned with the words, 'weep not for me, but for yourself and yours, and for the sins of a sinful land; for you have many melancholy, sorrowful, weary days before you.' Whatever may be the truth of this record, there must have been the certainty to Cameron that danger was near. He had men with him to guard him, but they were few, and the vigilance of the Government was great. His company numbered twenty-three horse and forty foot; and with him were his brother Michael, Hackston of Rathillet, and James Gray, younger of Christon. Hackston was at Magus Muir when the Archbishop was killed, and it was to him, according to one narrative, that Sharp cried: 'Sir, you are a gentleman, you will protect me.' Hackston replied, 'Sir, I shall never lay a hand on you;' and though he struck no blow, he was afterwards under the ban of the Government as if he had been one of the actual murderers. He had been at Bothwell Bridge; and now when he was in the company of Cameron, he was sought for as a murderer

and a rebel. He is the inscrutable figure whose part in the murder of the Archbishop, at which he sat in the saddle with his cloak about his mouth, 'revolving privately a case of conscience,' so fascinated the romancer Stevenson. Gray is described as a young man of good parts, of high courage and piety, with the fervour of Cameron and all his bravery.

Among the wild hills and lonely valleys of the west and south of Scotland, Cameron might have escaped for a time the detection even of Claverhouse, had he not chosen to preach and to move about with others. The reward on his head would have tempted hardly a single peasant, as the five thousand merks would have been the price of blood. There were strange stories afterwards circulated that Cameron and his friends were plotting murder; and Law, in his *Memorials*, noticed them, though he wrote as one who had taken rumour for truth. Murders were not uncommon in these lawless times, and bigotry, with its uncharitableness, laid some of them to the charge of Cameron. Row, the biographer of Blair, asserts that Cameron's party were determined to murder the Indulged ministers when opportunity occurred, and that they were specially enraged against Mr Robert Millar of Ochiltree and Mr James Veitch of Mauchline. Veitch had been in correspondence with Brown in Holland, and had given offence by his words about Cameron. He was often in trouble with the Government for breaking the terms of the Indulgence, and a few years before the Revolution, had to flee. Millar and Veitch, according to Row's story, lived in terror of being murdered; but one of Cameron's followers, in a mood of repentance, told Millar of an intended

attack on him, and revealed the place where his leader was hiding. Millar at once carried this information to Sir John Cochran of Ochiltree, who in turn sent a communication to General Dalziel. There is nothing to prove this story true. The fact that Cameron and his friends were armed, as they were for their own protection, accounts for the rise of such stories. Had Millar been involved in the betrayal of Cameron, Walker would have assaulted his name with the harshest words. One man, Robert Cameron of Mardrogat, earned the rewards and reputation of an informer by discovering the hiding-places of Covenanters. In Edinburgh, he took money for leading some of the royalists to Cameron, but he failed in his miserable search. This man afterwards boasted, apparently in untruth, that he had given the information which led to Cameron's death. Sir John Cochran, a Covenanter, seems to have been the informer; and at a later time he was charged by the 'Societies' with a share of the guilt of the blood shed at Ayrsmoss. The Covenanters believed that the Government rewarded him with 10,000 merks, and also that divine vengeance followed him when his house was burned, to the destruction of charters and plate. His son, it was rumoured among them, had declared, 'This is the vengeance of Cameron's blood.' The legend grew in graphic details. In the early morning, before the fire broke out, certain workmen saw a pillar of blood-red fire, two yards long and one yard broad, resting over the house, and one said: 'Yon's Cameron's blood, and those with him, crying for vengeance upon that house, which will fall down suddenly upon it.' Associated with Cochran in the reward by the Government was Bruce of Earlshall,

Fife, who commanded the men, Lord Airlie's troop and Strachan's dragoons, who were sent out by Dalziel to seek Cameron and his friends. Walker styled him that 'wicked and violent persecutor.' Whatever may have been the violence of his persecution, the unpublished register of the Presbytery of St Andrews has, under three different dates, another form of wickedness charged against his name. This man, licentious in his conduct, was the instrument chosen by the Government to kill or seize the rebel who had thrown off allegiance to Charles Stuart for touching the Church of Christ.

The farm of Meadowhead, where Cameron slept the last night of his life, lies some two miles to the north of the village of Sorn. From the farm he proceeded eastward up the valley of the Ayr towards Muirkirk; and four miles beyond this village he reached the spot on Ayrsmoss where he was to die. A green knoll on the farm of Lower Wellwood is shown as the place where he fell. Ayrsmoss, as the name so far shows, is a dreary, mossy stretch of moorland lying in the three parishes of Sorn, Auchinleck, and Muirkirk. Hackston, who had military charge of the small force, has left an account of the engagement at Ayrsmoss, written when he was a prisoner in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh. He does not relate the details of Cameron's last hours at Meadowhead, but describes his own movements. On Wednesday night, July 19th, according to this narrative, Hackston and his associates, hearing that a company of soldiers were seeking them, sent out two of their number to watch. Those who remained slept throughout the night on a slope of the moor, under the sky, and in the

morning sent other two to seek their companions. The four men returned in the afternoon to tell that the enemy were near at hand; and Hackston, under the direction of a countryman, chose a safe spot where he might place his horse. Eight of these were set on his right, and thirteen on his left; and in their midst stood the small band of forty foot. These men formed his regiment; and, though ill armed, they each answered yes when asked if they were willing and ready to meet the enemy. It was to be an unequal fight; but for them it must be a struggle as heroes, or seizure as rebels. The enemy were above an hundred and twelve, well armed and horsed, and drilled as soldiers of the crown. They marched rapidly, sending forward twenty dragoons, 'to take the wind of them.' Hackston despatched some of his foot to check the flank movement, and with his main body attacked the enemy. The Covenanters fired first, and some of the royalists fell. Soon the fight was with broken lines. Hackston rode in and out till his horse was trapped in a bog; and then springing to his feet he engaged with David Ramsay, a man he knew. Using their small swords they were finely matched; but even in this duel the victory was not for Hackston. He was struck down from behind by three of the mounted soldiers, and he fell to be saved from instant death by his opponent. He had been fighting as if alone with the enemy, and not as a commander, for no commanding was possible. The day was lost to the Covenanters; and Hackston, bleeding and almost lifeless, knew not which of his men had fallen. Nine of them lay dead, and one was Richard Cameron.

Wodrow's account of the fight is somewhat different from Hackston's. The Covenanters, having posted themselves at the entrance to a moss, charged the king's men. Their horsemen, breaking the royalist line, were immediately surrounded; and no quarter was asked or given. The foot soldiers, firing at the first attack, did not move. The battle was all with the horse, and when nine of these had fallen, and the day was done, the men on foot sought the safety of the moss. It was told that they fled like cowards. Richard Cameron, so says Walker, when he first saw the enemy advancing, gathered the men around him; and, as was the wont of the Roundheads and the Covenanters, they joined together in a prayer. Cameron was the one minister there, and it was for him to find the words. The prayer was brief: there was no time for a multitude of words. Three times he cried, 'Lord spare the green, and take the ripe'; and when the prayer was ended, he looked to his brother, saying: 'Michael, come let us fight it out to the last; for this is the day that I have longed for, and the death that I have prayed for, to die fighting against our Lord's enemies; and this is the day that we will get the crown.' Turning to the others, he cried: 'Be encouraged all of you, to fight it out valiantly; for all of you that shall fall this day I see heaven's gates cast wide open to receive them.' Then Cameron went to his death. He fought as in the battle of the Lord. And, rumour had it, there was the flashing of lightning and the rolling of thunder, as if the skies were breaking that the gate of heaven might be seen.

Michael Cameron died with his brother. Young Gray

of Christon was with them, and of him a royalist said, 'he was the person who mauled them most.' After the fight, one of the soldiers, Robert Murray, for a guinea from Earlshall, it was said, cut off Richard Cameron's head and hands, and also the head of John Fowler, mistaken for Michael Cameron. All the bodies were buried in the moss; and no ceremony of worship preceded the burial of men who in error or in truth had died for religion and liberty. Earlshall marched towards Edinburgh with his prisoners, and with him were carried the severed heads and hands in a sack. At Lanark, some of his men entered the house of John Arcle and enquired of his wife, so says a ghastly story, if she would buy calves' heads. They took the heads from the sacks and kicked them as if they were footballs; and when the woman fainted at the sight, one cried: 'Take up the old damned whig bitch.' The room is still shown where this incident occurred. Yet the details of this record of barbarity are hardly to be credited if the story is true that, at Edinburgh, one of the Covenanters recognized the head of Richard Cameron, and said that the face was little changed from what it was in life. The face was described as that of a man of fair complexion. That is our one note of description of Cameron's personal appearance. 'There's the head and hands that lived praying and preaching, and died praying and fighting,' Robert Murray is reported to have said, when he took them from the sack. Hackston, when he reached Edinburgh, was placed on a horse with his face to the tail, after the fashion for traitors; the head was bared, the hands were bound, and the feet were tied underneath the

horse. The other prisoners were dragged behind him. The hangman led the horse with the one hand, and with the other carried the head of Richard Cameron on a halberd. John Fowler's head was also exposed; and as the tragic procession, arranged by the order of the Privy Council, moved to the Tolbooth, the hangman shouted, 'There's the heads and hands of traitors, rebels.' At the Tolbooth, Allan Cameron, who was still a prisoner, was asked if he recognised the head and hands of his son, and taking them and kissing them, the old man cried: 'I know them, I know them, they are my son's, my dear son's. It is the Lord, good is the will of the Lord, who cannot wrong me nor mine, but has made goodness and mercy to follow us all our days.' Nothing is known of the ultimate fate of Allan Cameron. He had been willing to offer his son to the service of the Lord, and the old man, when he kissed the head and the hands, received them as the remains of a martyr who had died for Christ in that cause to which he himself was bearing witness in his prison. The remains of the traitor or of the martyr were placed on the Netherbow Port, with the fingers pointing upwards.

Some of the Covenanters who engaged at Ayrsmoss were instantly seized, and one or two were found after diligent search. William Manual and John Vallance died of wounds; John Malcolm, Archibald Alison, Archibald Stuart, and John Potter who had not borne arms, were executed. Malcolm, in his last testimony, declared: 'I shall be a dying witness against ministers and professors that made it their work to brand and clothe that faithful minister (Cameron) and martyr of Jesus Christ

with odious names and notorious lies, in calling him a Jesuit, and saying that he received the pope's gold, and that he was a great favourite of the Duke of York, a declared Papist; while I know, and many eminent Christians know, that he hated him as a limb of Satan; and also they said, that the troopers had commission to pass him by rather than any man, even after the declaration came out to give 5000 merks for him dead or alive.' Alison, in his testimony, while explaining his motive for taking arms, recounted a speech of Cameron's to his followers. 'My friends,' said Cameron, 'we are not to compare ourselves with a Gideon's three hundred men. No, not at all. Our design is to have you examined how ye are, and what ye are; to choose two or three of the foot, and two or three of the horse, that are found fittest qualified for elders; to try your principles, to try your life and conversation, and to have you being Christians. Our number was more the last day, and we gave them free leave to go home, and only but a few handful to stay; for we design not to fall upon any party of the forces, except they be few in number, and oppose us in keeping up the Gospel in the fields; for I am persuaded that one meeting in the fields has been more owned and countenanced by His presence with His people than twenty house-meetings, as they are now bought (by the Indulgences?); and therefore make no strife among yourselves about officers, because they are but men; yea, I think there is not a man amongst you all meet for it. We are not meet to be a minister to you; only we are to wait till the Lord provide better; and, ye that are not satisfied to stay in defence of the Gospel, good-morrow

to you, whatsoever ye be.' Potter, when dying, declared his adherence to all the doctrines he ever heard preached by Cargill and Cameron, and his soul blessed God that he ever heard either of these men, for it had been refreshed 'to hear the voice and shouting of a king among these field-meetings.'

The most tragic sentence was reserved for Hackston. The minutes of the Privy Council give exact information regarding it, and witness indirectly to the character of the Government which he and Cameron so steadfastly opposed. On the 29th of July, the day before his trial, the manner of his execution was arranged. The official record in the minutes is: 'That his body be drawn backward on a hurdle to the Cross of Edinburgh; that there be an high scaffold erected a little above the Cross, where, in the first place, his right hand is to be struck off, and after some time, his left hand; then he is to be hanged up, and cut down alive, his bowels to be taken out, and his heart shown to the people by the hangman; then his heart and his bowels to be burned in a fire prepared for that purpose on the scaffold; that afterwards his head be cut off, and his body divided into four quarters; his head to be fixed on the Netherbow, one of his quarters with both his hands to be affixed at St Andrews, another quarter at Glasgow, a third at Leith, a fourth at Burntisland; that none presume to be in mourning for him, or any coffin brought; that no person be suffered to be on the scaffold with him, save the two bailies, the executioner and his servants; that he be allowed to pray to God Almighty, but not to speak to the people; that the heads of Cameron and John Fowler

be affixed on the Netherbow; that Hackston's and Cameron's heads be fixed on higher poles than the rest.' The permission to pray to Almighty God was the one human thing in this devilish sentence, devised by the Privy Council that governed Scotland in the name of Charles Stuart, king by the grace of God, defender of the faith. On the 30th of July, the trial took place. Hackston was indicted for being at Bothwell Bridge, for drawing with Cameron and Cargill the Queensferry Paper and the Sanquhar Declaration, for fighting against his Majesty's forces at Ayrsmoss, and for murdering James, Archbishop of St Andrews. A form of examination of witnesses was gone through; the verdict was one of guilty; and the sentence of death was carried out on the day when the verdict was pronounced. The executioner, if Walker is to be believed, made additions of his own contriving to the hideous cruelties prescribed for Hackston by the ingenuity of the Privy Council.

The Sunday after Ayrsmoss, Cargill, preaching in the parish of Shotts, chose for his text, 'Know ye not that there is a great man and prince fallen this day in Israel?' It was Cameron's funeral sermon he preached, the lament for the friend he trusted, for the young man on whom he leant. 'As for Richard Cameron,' he wrote to the lady of Earlston, 'I never heard anything from him, in the Lord's truth, but I am both ready and willing to confirm it.' Another wanderer and old man, Peden the 'prophet' they called him, who suffered many things for his religion, sat one day by Cameron's grave, and in his weariness sighed 'O to be wi' Ritchie.' His body was soon to rest not far from Ritchie's, as he named Richard Cameron.

Over the remains of those who fell at Ayrsmoss, there was placed a large gravestone set upon four pillars. The names of the men were engraved upon it, and, as Robert Hamilton described it, 'The stone is curiously wrought on our Lord's servant at Airdsmoss, with a pleasant epitaph, the Bible open, a hand, arm, and shabble.' The epitaph is, 'Here lyes the corps of that famous and faithful preacher of the Gospell, Mr Richard Cameron, who with several others fell here in an encounter with the bloody enemies of truth and godliness, July 20, Anno 1680.' Besides these words there is the verse:

> 'Halt, curious passenger, come here and read,
> Our souls triumph with Christ our glorious head;
> In self-defence we murder'd here do ly,
> To witness against this nation's perjury.'

In 1832 the old gravestone was set upon a platform, three feet in height and ten feet square. From the centre of this platform rises a conspicuous obelisk, on which is a conventional inscription beginning, 'Sacred to the memory.'

A more enduring monument is the poem of Hyslop, the shepherd lad:

> 'In a dream of the night I was wafted away,
> To the muirlands of mist, where the martyrs lay;
> Where Cameron's sword and his Bible are seen,
> Engraved on the stone where the heather grows green.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The hills with the deep mournful music were ringing,
> The curlew and plover in concert were singing;
> But the melody died 'mid derision and laughter,
> As the host of ungodly rush'd on to the slaughter.
>
> . . . . . .

The muskets were flashing, the blue swords were gleaming,
The helmets were cleft, and the red blood was streaming;
The heavens grew dark, and the thunder was rolling,
When in Wellwood's dark muirlands the mighty were falling.

When the righteous had fallen, and the combat was ended,
A chariot of fire through the dark cloud descended;
Its drivers were angels, on horses of whiteness,
And its burning wheels turned on axles of brightness.

A seraph unfolded its doors bright and shining,
All dazzling like gold of the seventh refining;
And the souls that came forth out of great tribulation,
Have mounted the chariot and steeds of salvation.

On the arch of the rainbow the chariot is gliding,
Through the path of the thunder the horsemen are riding;
Glide swiftly, bright spirits! the prize is before you,
A crown never fading, a kingdom of glory.'

'The Vision' shows, by its subdued passion and mournful beauty, the awful impression which the testimony and the fate of Richard Cameron made upon the Scottish peasantry in the district where he fell. In graphic prose, the author of the modern romance, 'The Men of the Moss-Hags,' has shown us the death of the Lion of the Covenant: "'God of battles, receive my sinful soul,' he cried, and with that he joined his hands like a man that dives for swimming; and, unwounded, unhurt, yet fighting to the last, Richard Cameron sprang upon a hundred sword-points. Thus died the bravest man in broad Scotland, whom men called, and called well, the Lion of the Covenant."

Stevenson, from his exile in Vailima, wrote: 'If I could only be buried in the hills, under the heather, and a table tombstone like the martyrs, where the whaups and plovers

are crying.' Over the grave of Richard Cameron in the muirland the whaups and the plovers are crying.

The position of Richard Cameron in Scottish history is that of a man whose fame was born at his death. While he remains at Falkland he is but as a name; and not even the date of his birth can be determined. At Harden, and in years before and after, he is hardly more than a shadow. In clearer light, through a brief period, he is seen as a preacher with another gospel than unity and peace, turning friends into enemies, and getting their reproaches; and when he escapes from the petty domain of sectarianism to a larger world, and attacks almost single-handed a king and his Government, he is slain before age has given him a title to authority, and varied experience a reputation for wisdom. It is known that in his youth he assented to Episcopacy, and that later he accepted Presbyterianism with its burdens, listening first to the moderate men, and then following the persecuted. The stages of his career may be traced, but not the development of the man himself. What power turned him from Episcopacy, and what force moved the Presbyterian to renounce the ease of compromise with the Government for the hardship of their oppression? The Declaration which he made at Sanquhar, though only a score of men openly joined him, was the voice, if not of a nation at least of a multitude, who felt their degradation by the loss of freedom, and who in the coming years were resolutely though quietly to resent the tyranny of the king. His death touched their hearts; the fall of a brave man seeking freedom for his country. They treasured his name, as they honoured his cause; and, at the Revolution Settle-

ment, civil freedom and religious liberty, for which he had died, if he had not always lived, were established in Scotland. When Episcopacy ceased to be the national form of ecclesiastical government, a great majority of the Covenanters were found in the Church of Scotland; but through scrupulous regard for principles in the Covenants, especially the Solemn League and Covenant, many of those who had formed the United Societies, as the strictest Presbyterians had styled themselves, refused to acknowledge the arrangement which William III. effected in ecclesiastical affairs. Afterwards associated as the Reformed Presbyterian Church, these men have been widely known as Cameronians. This name they refused from the first; they would not have the name of any man, they who jealously cherished the idea of the Headship of Christ in His Church. Cameron himself has received but scant attention from our historians, and they have left unexplained this significant fact that he so touched the memory of the people of Scotland that they gave his name to a religious sect. It is of less import, though it is of historic interest, that the Cameronian regiment, the 26th regiment of British infantry, was called by his name. From among the Cameronians, after many words and the removing of many scruples, Colonel Cleland formed the company which made at Dunkeld a beginning of the many brave traditions of this regiment. It is of noteworthy significance, however, that for over two hundred years Cameron's name has been associated with a set of men marked by the strictest adherence to Calvinism, and by a genuine, even though severe, profession of piety. It was a remarkable testimony to their religious earnestness when

Norman Macleod, referring to the parish of Loudoun, wrote: 'I am eagerly desirous to get family worship established—of that there seems not to be a vestige, except among the Cameronians, and there every family has it.' In this testimony stands the name of Cameron, who, by the genuineness of his religion, his uncompromising devotion to principle, and the greatness of his cause, touched the nation and fixed himself in its memory. Right though he was when he opposed the Indulged, his was then but the warfare of a sectarian, the championship of logical strictness, without greatness to win admiration. But when he entered Sanquhar to make his Declaration, he was the advocate of the best cause; and at Ayrsmoss he died for freedom. When tyranny was rampant in Scotland, and courage had all but failed, Richard Cameron offered his life, hopeful that the oppressed people would take heart; and after his death, though tyranny abated none of its cruelties, the Covenanters struggled manfully till the fall of the Stuarts brought them peace.

> "The Solemn League and Covenant
> Now brings a smile, now brings a tear;
> But sacred Freedom, too, was theirs:
> If thou'rt a slave, indulge thy sneer."

A space of two hundred years has removed us from the thought and custom of the Covenanters. They ultimately gained their cause, and justified their rebellion, and to them is due the reverence of those who prize liberty. Claverhouse, with his clear-cut face, his beautiful hands, and his graceful manners, with his military splendour, and with his loyalty to the king, is the type of the cavaliers who take captive the hearts of those who love the things in

common life which are seemly and decorous. And Montrose and Claverhouse, by the fascination of their vivid careers, have won a glory for the cause for which they fought, and under their spell many have forgotten the better cause of patriotism, of civil freedom, and religious liberty, to which these men, as servants of the king, were enemies. But others remember the men who fought under the blue banner of the Covenant, and the martyrs who died as for Christ's sake. The glittering show of noble names did not give justice to the conduct of the royalists; nor did the oddities of the Covenanters detract from the high worth of their fight for freedom, or make Presbyterianism unfit for a gentleman. The Covenanters were rebels, but they were men good or bad, as one values allegiance to kings like Charles II., as one weighs the freedom of the people with loyalty to a sovereign who is the symbol of a government which may be the most barbarous cruelty.

> 'It little skills what faith men vaunt,
> If loyal men they be,
> To Christ's ain kirk and Covenant,
> Or the king that's over the sea.'

Some will accept the creed of this charming verse: others will set a value upon the faith men hold, and will praise those who take the noblest cause for their service. Unless the great Revolution was a mistake, the Covenanters chose the better part, which has not been taken away from their land.

Post 8vo, on antique laid paper, cloth extra. Price 2s. 6d.

The Life and Letters of James Renwick, the Last Scottish Martyr.

By the Rev. W. H. CARSLAW, M.A., Helensburgh.

With Facsimile of one of his Letters.

"Renwick was a strange and interesting figure in the annals of the Scottish Church, and this tribute to his memory will find many willing readers."—*Scottish Leader.*

"The first complete edition of Renwick's letters."—*North British Daily Mail.*

"The letters reveal a singularly religious and devout spirit, and give us a striking insight into the sweetness and light that existed in the rugged depths of these stern and uncompromising pillars of the Covenant."—*Scottish Weekly.*

"James Renwick's letters were greatly in need of re-editing, and Mr. Carslaw has proved himself the man to do it. He has spared no pains, for he is enthusiastic in the subject. And his pains have been well rewarded. An enormous number of disfiguring errors have been removed; and now the letters are offered to us in a shape and condition that is worthy. The story of the life is interwoven with them, so that one may read the history of time as well as the spiritual history of the man who lived in it. The volume is very handsomely produced, and there is an excellent facsimile of one of Renwick's letters."—*Expository Times.*

"The biographical portions are written in a perspicuous, energetic, and graceful style, and Mr. Carslaw has not allowed his enthusiasm for Renwick to interfere to any extent with the requirements of historical accuracy."—*Aberdeen Journal.*

"The most complete yet published of the correspondence of this noble and manly Scotchman."—*Govan Press.*

"The Rev. Mr. Carslaw has skilfully interweaved the martyr's letters with the details of his life, and produced a thrilling picture of bloody and bygone days."—*Dumfries Courier.*

EDINBURGH AND LONDON

OLIPHANT ANDERSON & FERRIER

And all Booksellers.

Post 8vo, on antique laid paper, cloth extra. Price 2s. 6d.

The Covenanters of the Merse, their History and Sufferings, as found in the Records of that Time.

By the Rev. J. WOOD BROWN, M.A.

"Mr. Brown has not been content to chronicle still surviving traditions of the Covenanting period. He has gone to the historical records of the time, and his researches have been abundantly rewarded; so much so that the volume he has written, modest though it be in size and scope, forms a not unimportant addition to the interesting Border literature of the period."—*Scotsman.*

"Wherever the heroic witness of the Covenanters is appreciated this book will be warmly welcomed."—*Sword and Trowel.*

"Mr. Wood Brown has gathered the scattered records of the district with a loving hand."—*British Weekly.*

"A book which treats of the Covenanters is always sure to gain a respectful hearing. When to the merits of its subject such a volume adds clearness of style and an orderly presentation of facts, it is safe of a fair popularity. Mr. Brown writes well and clearly, not without a certain picturesqueness, which should recommend his book."—*Glasgow Herald.*

"Mr. Brown has rendered a service to the student of history which deserves grateful acknowledgment."—*Aberdeen Journal.*

EDINBURGH AND LONDON
OLIPHANT ANDERSON & FERRIER
And all Booksellers.

A New Edition, Demy 8vo, Cloth Extra, with upwards of 150 Illustrations, Price 5s.

"*The Scots Worthies.*"

By JOHN HOWIE of Lochgoin.

Revised from the Author's Original Edition

BY THE REV. W. H. CARSLAW, M.A.

The Landscapes and Ornaments by various Artists, engraved under the superintendence of Mr. Williamson; the Historical Portraits by Mr. Hector Chalmers, engraved by Messrs. Schenck & M'Farlane.

"It has all the quaintness of the original volume in a condensed form. It abounds in illustrations of well-executed views of Covenanter localities, from the Communion stones of Irongray to Dunnottar; of Scottish palaces—Falkland, Holyrood, &c.; of Scottish abbeys and churches—indeed it might almost be called an Illustrated Gazetteer of Scotland. It likewise contains views of places in England, Ireland, and the Continent connected with Covenanting story, such as Westminster, Rotterdam, and Londonderry. It gives, moreover, a gallery of portraits, from George Wishart to Robert Traill; from Mary, Queen of Scots to William III.; and from Archbishop Sharpe to Claverhouse. It is in every way elegantly and quaintly got up, the illustrations having old-fashioned elaborately-decorated borders. We know of no book more calculated to quicken the pulse of modern Protestantism, or to give in an attractively biographical form the history of the Church of Scotland, through the lives, and doings, and deaths of her noblest sons. We therefore commend it to all who wish to remember the days of former generations, or to understand the glorious work done for Scotland in his chief book by the old farmer of Lochgoin."—*Christian Leader.*

EDINBURGH AND LONDON

OLIPHANT, ANDERSON & FERRIER.

AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

FAMOUS
·SCOTS·
·SERIES·

MESSRS OLIPHANT, ANDERSON & FERRIER have much pleasure in announcing the arrangements they have made for the continuation of this Series.

The very favourable reception given to the early volumes, not only at home but in America and the Colonies, has encouraged them to take advantage of valuable suggestions made by friends who have expressed a warm interest in their scheme, and as a result they have decided to considerably widen its scope. With help that has been promised to the Editors they foresee the possibility of a series of most valuable volumes on many men and women who have made their mark not only on the Literature, Religion, Science and Art of the country, but who have been famous in Politics, Arms, Commerce and Social Life.

Variety of interest and freshness of presentation, along with accuracy and finish of detail will be carefully studied, so that these little books may form a library in which the History of their Country will be available for the Scottish people, glowing with the personal interest which gathers round the biographies of those who have made that history.

PUBLISHED BY
OLIPHANT ANDERSON
& FERRIER·EDINBVRGH
AND LONDON

FAMOUS
·SCOTS·
·SERIES·

The following is a List of the volumes already published, and of those for which arrangements have been made:—

THOMAS CARLYLE.
By Hector C. Macpherson. [*Ready.*

ALLAN RAMSAY. By Oliphant Smeaton. [*Ready.*

HUGH MILLER. By W. Keith Leask. [*Ready.*

JOHN KNOX. By A. Taylor Innes. [*Ready.*

ROBERT BURNS. By Gabriel Setoun. [*Ready.*

THE BALLADISTS. By John Geddie. [*Ready.*

RICHARD CAMERON. By Professor Herkless. [*Ready.*

SIR JAMES Y. SIMPSON.
By Eve Blantyre Simpson.

SIR WALTER SCOTT.
By Professor Saintsbury.

NORMAN MACLEOD. By John Wellwood.

THE *BLACKWOOD* GROUP.
By Sir George Douglas.

SMOLLETT. By Oliphant Smeaton.

GEORGE BUCHANAN.
By Robert Wallace, M.P.

THOMAS CHALMERS.
By Professor W. Garden Blaikie.

JEFFREY AND THE EDINBURGH REVIEWERS. By Sir Hugh Gilzean Reid.

ADAM SMITH. By Hector C. Macpherson.

KIRKCALDY OF GRANGE. By Louis Barbé.

BOSWELL. By W. Keith Leask.

FLETCHER OF SALTOUN.
By George W. T. Omond.

MUNGO PARK. By T. Banks Maclachlan.

ROBERT FERGUSSON. By A. B. Grosart.

JAMES THOMSON. By William Bayne.

Edinburgh and London
Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier

Send your name as a Subscriber
to your Bookseller

Opinions of the Press on the "Famous Scots" Series.

Of THOMAS CARLYLE, by H. C. MACPHERSON, the *British Weekly* says :—

"We congratulate the Publishers on the in every way attractive appearance of the first volume of their new series. The typography is everything that could be wished, and the binding is most tasteful. . . . We heartily congratulate author and publishers on the happy commencement of this admirable enterprise."

Of ALLAN RAMSAY, by OLIPHANT SMEATON, the *Scotsman* says :—

"It is not a patchwork picture, but one in which the writer, taking genuine interest in his subject, and bestowing conscientious pains on his task, has his materials well in hand, and has used them to produce a portrait that is both lifelike and well balanced."

Of HUGH MILLER, by W. KEITH LEASK, the *Expository Times* says :—

"It is a right good book and a right true biography. . . . There is a very fine sense of Hugh Miller's greatness as a man and a Scotsman ; there is also a fine choice of language in making it ours."

Of JOHN KNOX, by A. TAYLOR INNES, Mr Hay Fleming, in the *Bookman*, says :—

"A masterly delineation of those stirring times in Scotland, and of that famous Scot who helped so much to shape them."

Of ROBERT BURNS, by GABRIEL SETOUN, the *New Age* says :—

"It is the best thing on Burns we have yet had, almost as good as Carlyle's Essay and the pamphlet published by Dr Nichol of Glasgow."

Of THE BALLADISTS, by JOHN GEDDIE, the *Birmingham Daily Gazette* says :—

"As a popular sketch of an intensely popular theme, Mr Geddie's contribution to the Famous Scots Series is most excellent."

OLIPHANT, ANDERSON & FERRIER
EDINBURGH & LONDON