this time to James’s death little occurred worthy of note in the history of Scotland. A parliament in 1621, held under the marquis of Hamilton as commissioner, confirmed the Five Articles, though by a majority that is narrow when the power of the king in a Scottish parliament is kept in view, and only on an assurance from the commissioner that no further ecclesiastical innovations would be proposed. It also introduced a new mode of electing the Lords of the Articles, which practically gave the whole influence to the bishops, the nominees of the crown. As this body prepared the entire business of a parliament in which there was no power of bringing in Bills by private members, this was a long step in the direction of absolute government. James, in fact, declared in one of his speeches to the English parlia­ment that, according to the Scottish constitution, he was master of its whole proceedings, with the absolute power of initiative as well as of veto. His declaration was an ex­aggeration, for there were well-known precedents of the estates passing laws without the royal assent ; but the Scottish constitution was in a fluid state without the guarantee of written charters or clearly defined rules as to the refusal of supplies, and above all without an independ­ent House of Commons to represent the wishes of the people and demand redress for their grievances. The only part of the policy of James on which it is possible to look back with satisfaction was that which concerned coloniza­tion, then called “ plantation.” This gave an outlet to the increasing population, while it advanced the civilization of the countries to which the settlers went. The earliest of these schemes, the “ plantation ” of the Hebrides by a number of gentlemen of Fife called “undertakers,” had comparatively little effect, but, apart from it, some progress was made in introducing order and law in the Highlands and islands, where the people were still in a semi-barbarous condition. More important was the plantation of Ulster, chiefly by Scottish farmers, whose descendants still retain a Scottish dialect and a Presbyterian church. But as an augury of the future the colonization of Nova Scotia, though attempted in an arbitrary manner, was of the greatest consequence. It was a commencement of the great migration to the New World across the Atlantic and to the other colonial possessions of Great Britain, in which, equally to their own profit and that of the empire, the Scottish nation in the two following centuries was to play so great a part. On 22d March 1625 James died, leaving to his son Charles a burden of government heavier than when he had himself undertaken it. His apparent success in carrying to a further point the absolute and arbitrary principles of the Tudor sovereigns scarcely concealed the real failure. Ireland, with difficulty kept down, was not really subdued. The parliament of England had given unmistakable signs that it was only waiting an opportunity to restore the constitution on the old basis. The religious and political instincts of the Scottish nation, suppressed by force, were gathering strength to reassert themselves if necessary by revolutionary methods. An exhausted ex­chequer, which James had attempted to fill by monopolies, and by the sale of offices and honours and so-called bene­volences, added to the other difficulties of carrying on the government, but was fortunately, as in the time of the Plantagenets, to afford the occasion for maintaining the constitutional struggle.

8. *Period of Civil Wars, Charles I. to Revolution.—* Eight years after his accession Charles I. revisited Scotland (1633). During these he had pursued his father’s policy. No Scottish parliament sat, though a nominal one was adjourned annually between 1628 and 1633. No general assembly met, but the restoration of Episcopacy and the uniformity of the churches were steadily prosecuted by royal influence and the exercise of the royal prerogative.

In spite of the opposition of a convention of the estates, which nearly ended in bloodshed, the king carried out the resumption of tithes for the benefit of the clergy from their lay impropriators. The revocation in 1625 of all grants in prejudice of the crown, whether before or after the Act of Annexation of 1587, was superseded by a new measure, ratified by parliament in 1633, declaring the terms on which the tithes might still be acquired and valued by the heritors. Few measures have been of greater importance in their bearing on Scottish history. The revocation alienated the nobles and landed gentry, who dreaded that when so much had been, still more might be, taken from their profits in the Reformation. The new valuation left the parochial clergy in the position of a poor class, with interests antagonistic to the gentry, whose income was diminished whenever the ministers attempted to raise their scanty stipends. The loyalty for which the Scots had been distinguished had received a shock by the removal of the court, and this was a second and more serious blow. Yet when Charles came to Edinburgh and received the crown at Holyrood (18th June 1633) he was well re­ceived. The disaffection still lay beneath the surface. Although the Five Articles of Perth were not rigidly en­forced, all the court could do was done to introduce the most obnoxious,—the practice of kneeling at the com­munion, which Presbyterians deemed a relic of the mass. The question of a liturgy was not allowed to rest. It was brought before the Scottish bishops in 1629 ; their draft was submitted to Laud, who, detecting in it Low Church doctrine as to baptism and traces of Knox’s *Book of Common Order,* refused his approval and advocated the introduction of the English Prayer Book, by which uni­formity would be secured. Though this was not yet at­tempted, Charles took the same view as the zealous and ambitious churchman who was now his guide in ecclesi­astical matters. When he came to Scotland Laud was in his suite, and the coronation was conducted with a ritual which “ had great fear of in bringing of Popery.” Edin­burgh was created a bishopric. The parliament over which Charles presided passed thirty-one Acts, “not three of which,” says a contemporary, but were most “ hurtful to the liberty of the subject.” One in particular declared in a large sense the royal prerogative, and by an ill-omened conjunction gave the king power to regulate the apparel of churchmen. It was disputed in parliament whether this Act was carried, but the presence of the king, who took notes of the votes, overawed opposition. About a year after Charles left Scotland the trial of Lord Balmerino, which grew out of the Acts of this parliament, gave the first impulse to the Scottish revolution. That nobleman, who had possessed a copy of a petition protesting against the Acts then carried, was tried under the old Acts against leasing-making or sedition and condemned by a majority of one upon a single charge,—that of not revealing the petition and its author (March 1635). Although Charles respited the capital sentence, the condemnation deeply stirred the people, who saw almost the only mode of con­stitutional redress, that by petition, declared illegal and an act capable of innocent interpretation treated as a heinous crime. Before the trial the appointment of Spot- tiswoode as chancellor, the first ecclesiastic who held the office since the Reformation, and the admission of nine bishops to the privy council, increased the disaffection. In 1636 the *Book of Canons,* ratified by the king the year before, was published at Aberdeen, containing the most distinct assertion of the royal supremacy and a complete Episcopal organization.

At last on Sunday, 23d July 1637, the much-dreaded liturgy, the use of which had been enjoined by the *Canons* and announced on the preceding Sunday, was introduced