in the service of St Giles Cathedral, Edinburgh. For the most part a transcript of the English Prayer Book, it deviated slightly in the direction of the Roman ritual. Its use provoked an uproar, of which the stool flung at the dean by a woman, Jenny Geddes or Anne Mein, was the symbol, and brought the service to a close,—Lindsay, the bishop, being with difficulty saved from the violence of the mob. A similar riot took place in Greyfriars church, where the bishop of Argyll attempted to use the book. There had been no such tumult since the Reformation. The privy council arrested a few rioters, but suspended the use of the service book until the king’s pleasure was known, and when Laud at the king’s request wrote that its use should be continued no one dared to read it in Edinburgh or throughout Scotland except in a few cathedrals. Meantime numerous supplications against it and the *Canons,* joined with accusations against the bishops, were sent to Charles. His only answer was the removal of the courts and privy council to Linlithgow and an order to all ministers who signed the supplications to leave Edinburgh. There fol­lowed fresh supplications and protests, in which some of the nobility, especially Rothes, Balmerino, Loudon, Mon­trose, and a prominent lawyer, Johnston of Warriston, joined with the ministers. Hope, the king’s advocate, secretly favoured them. Traquair, a leading member of the privy council, went to London to press on Charles and Laud the gravity of the situation ; but, though ambiguous concessions were made, the king and his advisers were determined to insist on the service book. In a proclama­tion issued at Stirling (20th February 1638) the king as­sumed the responsibility of its introduction ; but the op­position was too powerful to be put down by words. Its organization, begun by commissioners headed by Rothes, continued in committees of the nobles, lesser barons, ministers, and burghs, was now called “ the Tables ” from those in the Parliament House, where they sat sometimes separately, sometimes collectively, and formed a standing assembly which defied the king’s council. The Covenant, prepared by Alexander Henderson, leader of the ministers, and Johnston of Warriston, was revised by Rothes, Loudon, and Balmerino, and accepted by upwards of two hundred ministers who had gathered in Edinburgh. It was signed at Greyfriars church on 1st March 1638, first by many of the nobles and gentry, then by three hundred ministers and a great multitude of the people. Copies were at once despatched throughout the country, and with few excep­tions, chiefly in St Andrews and Aberdeen, it was accepted by all ranks and classes. Its form was suggested by the bonds for material aid of which Mary’s reign had given so many examples, but the new name pointed to a Biblical origin, and the parties were not the nobles and their retainers but God and His people. While nominally professing respect for the royal office, it was entered into, as it anxiously reiterated, for “ the defence of the true religion (as reformed from Popery) and the liberties and laws of the kingdom.” The spirit in which it was signed was that of a religious revival. Many subscribed with tears on their cheeks, and it was commonly reported that some signed with their blood. Charles could not relish a movement which opposed his deepest convictions as to church government and under the form of respect repudi­ated his supremacy ; but, destitute of power to coerce the Covenanters, he was compelled to temporize. Hamilton as his commissioner offered to withdraw the service book and *Book of Canons,* to give up the Court of High Com­mission, and to allow the Articles of Perth to remain in abeyance. A new confession called the “ negative,” framed on that of 1580, and a new covenant called the “ king’s,” on the model of one drawn in 1590, which bound the signers only to stand by the king in suppressing Papists and

promoting the true religion, were devised, but failed to satisfy even the least zealous Covenanters.

An assembly at last met in Glasgow, over which Hamilton presided, with faint hope that matters might still be accom­modated. Hamilton had orders to dissolve it if it proved to be intractable. The members had been chosen by the influence of the Tables, according to a mode invented in 1597. Three ministers represented each presbytery and an elder the laity of the district. The burghs also sent re­presentatives. The Covenanters had declared their inten­tion of prosecuting the bishops, and a libel laid before the presbytery of Edinburgh was read in the churches. Charles on his side announced that he challenged the mode of election and would not allow the prosecutions. He was already preparing for war. At the first sitting Alexander Henderson was chosen moderator, and Johnston of Warri­ston clerk. In spite of the commissioner’s attempt to raise the question of the validity of elections, the assembly de­clared itself duly constituted. A letter from the bishops was read declining its jurisdiction, and the commissioner, while offering redress of grievances and that bishops should be responsible to future assemblies of clergy, declared that the present assembly was illegal in respect of the admission of lay representatives. Discussion was useless between a commissioner and an assembly whose power to act he denied. He accordingly dissolved it in the name of the king and left Glasgow ; but this only stimulated its mem­bers. It annulled the pretended assemblies between 1606 and 1628, condemned the service book, *Book of Canons, Book of Ordinances,* and the High Commission Court, de­posed the bishops on separate libels which set forth various acts of immorality or crime, many of which were false, declared Episcopacy to have been abjured in 1580, and con­demned the Five Articles of Perth. It concluded its month’s labours by restoring Presbyterian church government.

The distance from such an assembly to the field of arms was short, and on 7th June 1639 the army of the Cove­nanters under Alexander Leslie, a general trained in the service of Gustavus Adolphus, met the royal troops led by the king at Dunse Law. Charles, though slightly superior in numbers, had an undisciplined army and no money to maintain it, while Leslie had trained officers and troops animated by religious zeal. Their colours were stamped with the royal arms, and the motto “For Christ’s Crown and Covenant ” in golden letters. Councils of war as well as religious meetings were held daily, and the militant fervour of the Covenanting troops steadily rose. Charles declined to engage such an army and general, and by the Pacification of Berwick (18th June) both parties agreed to disband, and Charles to issue a declaration that all ecclesi­astical matters should be regulated by assemblies, and all civil by parliament and other legal courts. On 1st August a free general assembly was to be held at Edinburgh, and on the 20th a free parliament in which an Act of Oblivion was to be passed. The assembly met as appointed and, without explicitly conforming, re-enacted the principal re­solutions of that of Glasgow, and declared that the Covenant should be subscribed by every one in office and authority. Before it separated it condemned the *Large Declaration,* a pamphlet by Balcanquhal, dean of Durham, published in the king’s name, which gave an adverse narrative of recent events in Scotland. The parliament effected little legis­lation, but showed its disposition by abolishing Episcopacy and reforming the election of the Lords of the Articles, of whom eight were henceforth to be chosen by the nobles, lesser barons, and burghs respectively. The predominance of the king and the church was thus removed from the body which initiated all legislation. Charles had beforehand determined not to sanction the abolition of Episcopacy, and the parliament was prematurely adjourned (14th