border wars and English and French intrigues were at an end. This more than counterbalanced the loss of the court, a loss which probably favoured the independent develop­ment of the nation. For the present no change was made in its constitution, its church, or its laws. The Reforma­tion had continued the work of the War of Independence. Scotland no longer consisted only of the prelates, the nobles, and the landed gentry. The commons, imperfectly represented in parliament by the burghs, not yet wealthy enough to be powerful, had found a voice in the assemblies of the church and leaders in its ministers and elders.

Superstition did not fall with the fall of the church of Rome nor licence with the decline of the nobility. Rather, both took new forms of extreme virulence and threatened to impede the national progress ; but both were exposed to the light of public discussion and the growth of public opinion. The contact with the more cultured south was of immense value. Scotland, now beginning to use in the services of the church, in the proceedings of the courts, and in printed books the vulgar tongue, which differed only as a dialect from that of England, was admitted to the freedom of the noblest language and literature in Europe, then in its prime. The arts which increase the convenience and pleasure of daily life spread northward with the increase of wealth. Science, starting on a new method taught by the great English philosopher, was intro­duced and after a time eagerly prosecuted. Commerce, for which the Scots had a natural aptness, found new fields. And all these benefits were procured without any sacrifice of the independent spirit which had been derived from their forefathers. Even the separate intercourse with the Continent—with France, Germany, Holland, and Scandinavia—from which Scotland had already received so much advantage, though not quite so intimate with France as before, continued. But before the blessings of the union could be fully realized a century was to inter­vene, which at times seemed to hide if not to bury them, —a century of civil war and religious controversy. At the moment when James ascended the throne and pro­claimed the virtues of peace it required no far-sighted observer to discern elements of discord which might at any moment burst in storm. To hold Papal Ireland, Episcopal England, and Presbyterian Scotland united under one sceptre was a task of infinite difficulty, not lessened because in each there was a minority who dissented strongly from the prevailing opinion as to church government and doctrine. The sudden separation from Rome gave birth to every variety of religious opinion, and Scotland became even more than England a land of sects. The constitution of the civil government was a problem not yet solved. In England the Tudor sovereigns had sapped the principles of the parliamentary constitution established in the times of the Plantagenets, and fortunately recorded in writings which could not be forgotten. In Scotland such principles had never yet been practically adopted. Ireland was ruled as a dependency on the principle of subjection.

At this point in the treatment of some historians the history of Scotland ends. Juster views now prevail. Neither the union of crowns nor of parliaments really closes the separate record of a nation which retained sepa­rate laws, a separate church, a separate system of education, and a well-marked diversity of character. But a great part of the subsequent history of Scotland is necessarily included in that of Great Britain, and has been treated under England (*q.v*.). Considerations of space and pro­portion make it necessary that what remains should be told even more rapidly than the narrative of what preceded the accession of James to the English throne. James during the first half of his reign as sovereign of Great Britain allowed himself to be mainly guided by Robert

Cecil, Lord Salisbury, the son of Burghley, an hereditary statesman of great ability as an administrator. But on two subjects closely connected with Scotland the king had decided opinions of his own. He desired to see Scotland bound to England, not merely by the union of the crowns, but by a union of the parliaments and laws, and if not an immediate an ultimate union of the churches. He was equally determined that the church in both countries should combine a moderate Protestant doctrine—a *via media* be- tween Rome and Geneva—with Episcopal government. Both desires were founded on prudent policy and might possibly have been accomplished by a stronger and wiser monarch. But the former was opposed by the jealousy of England and the pride of Scotland. The latter could not be accomplished in Scotland without force, so deep were the roots which Presbyterianism had struck. James at­tempted to carry both measures in a manner calculated to raise rather than to overcome opposition. The union scheme was brought before his first English parliament, and commissioners were appointed to treat with the Scottish commissioners nominated somewhat reluctantly by the par­liament of Perth. The commissioners met, but differences at once emerged on the topics of freedom of trade between the two countries, to which the English were averse, and the acceptance of the laws of England, which the Scots objected to. Two important points were carried by a declaration of the law rather than agreement of the com­missioners,—that subjects born in either country after the accession *(post nati)* should have the full privileges of sub­jects and not be deemed aliens, and that those born before should be capable of denization and so of inheriting or acquiring land in England, though not of political rights or offices. The English parliament of 1607, however, refused to sustain the decision of the Exchequer Chamber in favour of the *post nati,* although it consented to abolish the laws which treated Scotland as an enemy’s country and made arrangements for the extradition of criminals. The reli­gious or ecclesiastical question was first brought to a point in England at the Hampton Court conference, which met on 14th January 1604, in which trifling concessions were made to the Puritans, chiefly as to the observance of Sunday and the removal of the Apocrypha from the Authorized Version. In Scotland Episcopacy was restored by a series of steps which were gradual only for the purpose of over­coming opposition, not because James hesitated as to the end in view. At length the parliament of 1612 repeated the Act of 1592, so that Episcopacy was now once more established in Scotland by law, but contrary to the wish of the majority of the nation and under circumstances which made it the symbol of absolute government. While thus resolute in favour of Episcopacy, James showed no sign of leaning to the Roman Church, although efforts to convert him had been made at an earlier period in Scot­land. The Armada, now followed by the Gunpowder Plot, convinced him that he had nothing to hope for from the Papists but open war or secret conspiracy.

After the death of Cecil James gave way to that influence of favourites to which he had shown himself prone in his younger years ; but in the affairs of Scotland, which pro­duced much trouble and little profit, Somerset and Buck­ingham took no interest and James was his own master. After an absence of fourteen years he visited his native country. He had promised to return every three years, but the business and pleasures of the English court detained him. His main object was to carry out still further the uniformity of the church, in which the bishops had not succeeded in establishing the same service as in England. This object was apparently attained in 1618 by the adop­tion of the Five Articles of Perth (see vol. xix. p. 682), but at the cost of sowing the seed of religious war. From