

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE II.

7  
ROBERT LEIGHTON: THE APOSTOLIC ANGLICAN  
PRELATE OF SCOTLAND.

BY REVEREND ALBERT H. CURRIER, D.D.,  
OBERLIN, OHIO.

## I.

WHY undertake another sketch of this man's life and character, when so many have already been made? For two hundred and fifty years he has shone in Scottish history as a person of extraordinary piety and moral excellence—a star of unrivaled brilliancy in its storied sky. It has justly attracted the attention of admirers of human greatness in every generation since he lived, and the number of those who have expressed their admiration of his character has not been small. This is right; and a proper regard for human welfare demands that the merit of such persons should not be lost sight of because of the obscuring effects of time. When hid from view on this account appreciative students of his life and character do well to attempt to rescue his name from temporary oblivion by restoring it to public notice, as Old Mortality in Scott's famous novel with his chisel and mallet did the names of the Scottish Covenanters whose memories he honored and whose virtues he thus sought to perpetuate.

An inspiring biography is an inestimable treasure to any one who reads it with any real appreciation and true insight of the character portrayed. "A good book," John Milton says, "is the precious life blood of a master spirit." It marks an epoch in the life of the reader, by kindling in the soul new

ambitions, and stimulating it to worthy endeavors, that issue in a career of worthy achievement and usefulness, that otherwise would not have been attempted. Many examples might be mentioned. Who can estimate, for example, the effect upon Lincoln of the life of Washington, which he read in his early manhood? "To believe in the heroic makes heroes," a distinguished English statesman has said.

The author's excuse for the following biographical sketch is the hope that it may bring a similar benefit to its readers.

Robert Leighton was born in Edinburgh, June 25, 1611. His father, Dr. Alexander Leighton, was a Presbyterian minister. On account of the offense given to Archbishop Laud, the Primate of the Anglican Church in the reign of Charles I., by his book, "*Zion's Plea against Prelacie*," in which he dared to question the divine right of Episcopacy in a virulent and intemperate style similar to that of John Milton's famous treatise, "*Reason of Church Government urged against Prelaty*," he was brought before the Star Chamber by Laud and sentenced for his temerity to have his ears cropped and his nose slit, to stand in the public pillory exposed to the rabble's scorn and insult, to endure a term of imprisonment, and to pay a heavy fine. "He was," says Bishop Burnet, "a man of violent and ungoverned heat." The heat broke out into an irrepressible blaze of wrath over the abuses and tyranny of the State Church under Laud's leadership.

Robert, however, did not inherit his father's inflammable disposition, or, if he did, he early learned to curb and subject it to control. "As a child," we are told, "he was remarkable for his quiet disposition. He was accounted a saint from his youth up." Perhaps this was an inheritance from his mother, and augmented by the influence of his two younger sisters,

whose gentleness, amiability, and refinement are alluded to in his family history. Besides these sisters there was also a younger brother, Sir Elisha Leighton, who was "very like Robert in face and in the vivacity of his parts," Bishop Burnet says,

"but the most unlike him in all other things that can be imagined, for . . . he was a very immoral man. He was a Papist, of a form of his own; but he had changed his religion to raise himself at court; for he was at that time Secretary to the Duke of York [afterwards King James II.], and was very intimate with the Lord Aubigny, a brother of the Duke of Richmond, who had changed his religion and was a priest. . . . He [Aubigny] maintained an outward decency, and he had more learning and better notions than men of quality, who enter into orders in that Church, generally have. Yet he was a very vicious man; and that perhaps made him the more considered by the King."

The Bishop Burnet above quoted, was Bishop Gilbert Burnet, an eminent Scotchman born in Edinburgh, September 6, 1643. He was a prolific writer and author of very interesting biographical and historic works, the most famous of which was a "History of His Own Time from the Restoration of King Charles II., in 1660, to the Revolution in 1688," one of the most fascinating books in our language. Made their domestic Chaplain, King William appointed him Bishop of Salisbury in 1689. "This distinction he owed," says Macaulay, "to the prominent place which he held in literature and politics, to the readiness of his tongue and pen, and above all to the frankness and boldness of his nature." He was odious for political and religious reasons to many of the Anglican priesthood, who resented it that he was chosen for the important diocese of Salisbury in preference to any Englishman and particularly because of his criticism. "He had formed," says Macaulay, "but a low estimate of the character of his clerical brethren, considered as a body, and with his usual in-

discretion, he frequently suffered his opinion to escape him. They hated him in return with a hatred which has descended to his successors, and which after the lapse of a century and a half, does not appear to languish." Macaulay, however, adds:—

"The utmost malevolence of faction could not venture to deny that he served his flock with a zeal and diligence and disinterestedness worthy of the purest ages of the Church. . . . The worst weather, the worst roads did not prevent him from discharging [his episcopal] duties. . . . The poverty of the inferior clergy was a constant cause of uneasiness to his kind and generous heart. . . . When he bestowed a poor benefice, and he had many such to bestow, his practice was to add out of his own purse twenty pounds a year to the income. . . . Such merits as these will, in the judgment of wise and candid men, appear fully to atone for every offence which can be justly imputed to him."

Bishop Burnet is our most trustworthy and competent witness in regard to Leighton because of his intimate acquaintance with him:— his testimony we shall repeatedly quote. Between the good Bishop and Robert Leighton there existed a strong, unflinching attachment for many years, and when Leighton died he expired in the arms of this intimate friend, his ardent and affectionate admirer. Years later he says, "I bear still the greatest veneration for the memory of that man that I do for any person, and reckon my early knowledge of him, that continued for twenty-three years, among the greatest blessings of my life."

#### LEIGHTON'S EDUCATIONAL ADVANTAGES.

In his sixteenth year he entered the University of Edinburgh and pursued his academic course of study with extraordinary success, gaining thereby the admiration of his fellow students for his talent, and winning by his good behavior the commendation of his teachers; one of whom, in a letter to his

father, congratulated him upon having such a son, in whom Providence had made him abundant compensation for his suffering from Ecclesiastical tyranny. Having taken his degree of A.M. in 1631, he was sent abroad by his father for further study and the advantage to be gained by foreign travel. He lived several years in France, a considerable part of the time at Douay, where he had family relatives, who had become Roman Catholics and with whom he formed an intimate friendship, so that he corresponded with them afterwards for many years. By his prolonged residence in France he acquired a complete mastery of the French language and a considerable acquaintance with its best literature. "It was his mature opinion," says Pearson, his biographer,

"that great advantages are to be reaped from a residence in foreign parts; inasmuch as a large acquaintance with the sentiments of strangers, and with the civil and religious institutions, the manners and usages of other countries, conduces to unshackle the mind of indigenious prejudices, to abate the self-sufficiency of partial knowledge and to produce a sober and charitable estimate of opinions that differ from our own."

His sojourn at Douay made a deep and lasting impression upon him. In the Catholic seminary there, he met with some religious people, Jansenists, whose characters and

"lives were framed on the strictest model of primitive piety. Though keenly alive to the faults of Popery, he did not consider the Romish Church to be utterly anti-Christian; but thought he discovered in it beautiful fragments of the original temple, however disfigured with barbarous additions and almost hid beneath the rampant growth of baleful superstition. Having learned from these better portions of that corrupt establishment that its constitutions were not altogether dross, he went on to discover that the frame of his own church was not entirely gold. . . . It was probably from this period that his veneration for the Presbyterian platform began to abate."

## ORDAINED A PRESBYTERIAN MINISTER.

Returning to Scotland he was invited to become the minister of Newbattle, a parish in the Presbytery of Dalkeith, near Edinburgh. He was ordained according to the Presbyterian mode, December 16, 1641, when thirty years of age. His delay in entering upon his sacred calling was due to his conviction — openly avowed — that “some men preach too soon, and some too long.” This was not true of himself.

Leighton’s ministry with this Presbyterian church in Newbattle covered the period of eleven years, his pastoral relation with it lasting until February, 1653. As a preacher and pastor he was, according to Burnet, an ideal minister.

“His preaching had a sublimity both of thought and expression. The grace and gravity of his pronounciation was such that few heard him without sensible emotion. . . . His style was rather too fine; but there was a majesty and beauty in it that left so deep an impression that I cannot forget the sermons I heard him preach thirty years ago.”

To great felicity and precision of language he joined a fertile imagination, whose illustrations were not only pleasing to the fancy, but helpful to the understanding, so that what was to the hearer before an unintelligible abstraction, or puzzle, “received through the magical power of this illuminating faculty,” as Dr. George Cheever says, in his admirable appreciation of Leighton’s genius, “an instantaneous creation, and became a *thing of sensible life and beauty.*” Though “he had great quickness of parts, a lively apprehension with a charming vivacity of thought and expression,” he did not trust to these to furnish him with suitable matter for his sermons. He was a diligent and tireless student, and when not engaged in study, “he seemed to be in a perpetual meditation.” “He had the greatest command of the purest Latin,” says Burnet,

“that ever I knew in any man. He was a master both of Greek and Hebrew, and of the whole compass of theological learning, chiefly in the study of the Scriptures. But that which excelled all the rest was, *he was possessed with the highest and noblest sense of divine things.* . . . His thoughts were lively, oft out of the way and surprising, yet just and genuine; and he had laid together in his memory the greatest treasure of the best and wisest of all the ancient sayings of the heathens, and he used them in the aptest manner possible.”

Notwithstanding his superiority of mind and great accomplishments, he gave no outward evidence of conceit or of conscious pride of intellect. “He seemed to have the lowest thoughts of himself possible, and to desire that all other persons should think as meanly of him.” But his modesty was a candle to his merit, glorifying it; and his unaffected humility made him a better pastor to his people. He was, we are told, “a discreet and tender counsellor to individuals distressed with religious doubts and perplexities; perfectly free from censoriousness, kind and gentle in weighing the faults of others, and patient toward the infirmities of his fellow Christians. He was indeed all tenderness to others, though severe to himself, giving life and reality to his own maxim. ‘He forgave himself little and others much.’”

He did not, however, find the co-presbyters of his Presbytery very congenial associates. He gradually found himself out of sympathy with their Divine Rights doctrines, and began to dislike their rabid exaltation of the “*Covenant*,” and their fury against all who differed from them. “He found they were not capable of large thoughts; theirs were narrow and their tempers were sour.” So he grew weary of mixing with them. He scarce ever went to their meetings, he lived in great retirement, minding only the care of his parish at Newbattle. Their intolerant spirit on political and theological questions disgusted him. They arrogantly asked him, “whether he preached to the times,” and censured him for



not doing this. "If all of my brethren preach to the times," he meekly answered, "may not one poor brother be suffered to preach on eternity?"

Notwithstanding the criticisms passed upon his preaching by his brethren of the Presbytery, his flock cordially approved of the work of their pastor. It showed him what he was proven to be—"a workman that needed not to be ashamed."

They thought him most assiduous in discharging the duties of his office. His preparation of his sermons they perceived was most careful and conscientious. What Pearson says of "his ministerial employments," in his declining years at Horsted Keynes, after disburdening himself of the episcopal dignity, implies that in those ministerial employments he returned to the pastoral habits of his earlier years at Newbattle:—

*"He again took to the vocation of a parish minister, and was constantly engaged . . . in reading prayers or in preaching. In the peasant's cottage, likewise,*

*'his tongue dropped manna,'*

*and long after his departure he was talked of by the poor of his village with affectionate reverence. With deep feeling would they recall his divine counsels and consolations; his tenderness in private converse; and the impressive sanctity which he carried into the solemnities of public worship."*

#### ELECTED PRINCIPAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

When he resigned his charge at Newbattle he went to Edinburgh for a brief stay. But the reputation he had gained for his piety and learning while at Newbattle pointed him out as a suitable person for the office of Principal of the University of Edinburgh, which he was induced to accept because, being the gift of the city, it was not subject to the control of the Presbyterian Church, of which he had become weary. His election, we are told, was "the homage paid to his uncommon merit" by all parties.

In this position of Principal of the University, he was very successful as administrator and educator. One of his earliest measures was to revive the obsolete practice of delivering once in the week a Latin Prelection, or lecture, on some theological subject. These lectures and the occasional sermons, which have been preserved, attracted such general admiration that "the public hall in which he gave them was thronged with hearers, who were enchanted with the purity of his style and his animated delivery. To the students under his care he was indefatigably attentive, instructing them singly and collectively; and to many youths of capacity and distinction his wise and affectionate exhortations were of lasting benefit."

For about ten years he presided over the University with distinction and increasing honor, when he resigned at the invitation of King Charles II. to assume the Episcopal office of a Scotch bishop in the Anglican Establishment, which the newly-restored monarch was desirous of establishing in Scotland as well as in England, that the two realms of England and Scotland might conjointly live under its religious government subject to his authority as civil ruler.

Leighton at this time was a little past fifty years of age and the epoch upon which he was now entering was the crowning and most memorable epoch of his life.

Before entering upon the story of his Episcopal work and the heroic endeavors he made to reconcile the Scotch people to this new policy of the King, let us review the work of the previous twenty years in Scotland, the work during his pastorate of Newbattle Presbyterian Church, and that of Principal of the Edinburgh University.

Burnet summarizes the whole period in this one sentence: "Thus he had lived above twenty years in Scotland in the highest reputation that any man in my time ever had in that kingdom."

## HIS MERIT AS A PREACHER.

The merit of his preaching far exceeded the estimate of it entertained by the most ardent admirers among his people and greatly surpassed that of the vociferous "Poundtexts" of his Presbytery, who prided themselves upon their superiority to him, because they "preached to the times." His ability as a preacher, like that of F. W. Robertson, of Brighton, England, did not become fully known until after he was dead. It was a *posthumous revelation*, which was disclosed to the world by the publication of his famous Commentary on the First Epistle of Peter, which, Pearson says, "is a crown of his posthumous glory in the Universal Church." It is a treasury of sound experimental divinity and argues an extraordinary ripeness of Christian attainments. It was probably delivered from the pulpit in the familiar form of expository discourses, the clauses and sometimes the emphatic words of each text being ordinarily explained in course. "This work," says Pearson, "will always be classed among the first of uninspired writings and can never cease to constitute the admiration and delight of the Christian and the scholar." "I bless the hour," says Coleridge, "that introduced me to the knowledge of the apostolic Leighton. Next to the inspired Scriptures stands his Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Peter."

Besides this, the largest one of his works, there were Expositions of "The Creed," of "The Lord's Prayer," of "The Ten Commandments," of portions of the Gospel of Matthew (the first eight chapters), and of the Psalms. Besides these Expositions, the formal sermons preached in Newbattle and in Edinburgh, the Theological Lectures treating of the principal doctrines of the Christian faith given to students of that University preparing for the ministry, and a series of "Prelections" addressed to the entire student body of the Univer-

sity. All of these works are characterized by "a subdued and meditative eloquence." "They bear the marks," says the author of the interesting sketch of him in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "of a deeply learned and accomplished mind fully saturated with both classical and patristic reading." Dr. Cheever aptly says: "He possessed the moral alchemy which turns all kinds of learning into Christian gold." All his writings belong to the Presbyterian portions of his life.

His style, clear, simple, natural, was as notable as the ample learning and profound thinking it clothed. "Purity of diction," Cheever further adds,

"seemed almost as natural in the movement of his intellect as purity of feeling in that of his heart. His thoughts shine through his language like green leaves in amber. With what a sweet sentence does his Commentary on Peter open? 'The grace of God in the heart of man is a tender plant in a strange, unkindly soil.' He seems not to have modeled his sentences by study, but like Richard Baxter, to have let them flow on at random as the shape of his thoughts might be; so that there never was a more correct picture of a writer's mind, nor one producing a deeper conviction of the richness of its stores."

It is not too much to say of Robert Leighton, then, that he was a *great* man; great in intellect, in scholarly attainments, and in personal charm.

#### HIS PERSONALITY.

He was of small stature and of spare habit. His intimate friends from this time on playfully denominated him, "the little bishop." "To judge from his portrait," says Pearson (which was taken clandestinely, as he was averse to sitting for it, but which his nephews said, "greatly resembled him"), "his countenance must have been a faithful interpreter of his mind; for it indicates sense in alliance with sanctity, sweetness dignified by strength, and vivacity shaded with pensiveness and tempered by devotion. Of his manners in private life, we have no

more exact information than that deducible from the narrative of his life, from which we may confidently pronounce . . . that religion combining so largely as it did in Leighton with a happy nature improved by travel, by multifarious and elegant learning, and by familiar intercourse with the politest men of the age, could not fail of forming a gentleman of a higher cast than worldly education alone can model."

He lived in an age preëminent in English history for the number of its great men. There is no better authority for this than the Rev. G. B. Cheever, above referred to, who was a graduate of Bowdoin College in its famous class of 1825 (the class of Nathaniel Hawthorne and Henry W. Longfellow), and afterwards distinguished himself in the ministry for his eloquence and successful work in Salem, Massachusetts, and in New York City, and for his notable achievements as an author. Among his writings, besides eloquent pamphlets against slavery and the liquor traffic (for a satirical allegory, "Deacon Giles' Distillery," written when a young minister, he was prosecuted for libel and sentenced to imprisonment for thirty days), there is one piece of his work as an author for which the writer is especially grateful, viz., "A Selection of the Most Valuable and Interesting Portions of Leighton's Complete Works with 'an Introductory View of the Life, Character and Writings of the Author.'"

From this "Introductory View" we take the liberty of freely quoting, with the assurance that we have in Dr. Cheever a trustworthy guide.

#### GREAT AMONG ILLUSTRIOUS CONTEMPORARIES.

"Archbishop Leighton had many worthy contemporaries, lights of preëminent luster in the Church. Men of powerful minds, deep learning and faithful devotedness to Christ. It was an age fruitfully productive of intellectual and moral greatness. A mere list of the names of some of the most eminent who then flourished leaves a vivid impression of intellect and religion on the mind:

Usher, Stillingfleet, Chillingworth, Joseph Hall, Taylor, Tillotson, Bates, Baxter, Howe, Calamy, Henry, Owen, Cudworth, Wilkins, Milton, Selden, Hale, Rutherford, . . . Boyle, Barrow, Newton, Lock. Their mingled talents, learning and piety made that age the brightest in English literature. Star rose after star in such beautiful succession, as to make one continuous galaxy of intellectual and moral light. . . . Yet Leighton outshone them all. Few men, even in the age of Usher, Selden and Milton, possessed such comprehensive erudition, and since the days of the apostles there has scarce been witnessed another so perfect imitation of the life of Christ. In this sense he was a finished Christian. There was a holy symmetry and proportion in the graces which adorned his life, so that we think of him as 'The Holy Leighton.' To denominate his piety from any peculiar grace would seem like designating the beauty of the rainbow by one of its primary colors. If any one of the Christian graces, however, did shine the brightest, it was that of humility. He would say: 'A self-searching Christian is made up of humility and meekness,—sweet, lowly graces that grow low and are of a dark hue, as the violets, but of a fragrant smell,—these are prime in the garland of a Christian.' He called humility the preserver of all the other graces, which without it—if they could be without it—were but as a box of precious powder carried in the wind without a cover, in danger of being blown away and scattered."

These similes and other figures of speech, which profusely illustrated his thought, prove that Leighton had the imagination of a great poet—though no writer of verse—as well as the heart of a great Christian, saint, and philanthropist, as we shall now try to show in the following pages that narrate his earnest endeavors to create generally a tolerant spirit among the Scotch people and bring about a settled policy of religious toleration in the government of the land.

It is no disproof of his greatness that his endeavors were futile. The truth is, that the time was not propitious, and probably never would be, for the accomplishment of what was then attempted in Scotland. Leighton's words to Burnet, "It seemed that God was against them, like fighting against God," imply a hopeless enterprise. The Scotch had a hereditary

prejudice against Episcopacy, and the attempt of the government to force it upon their acceptance while the memory of past oppressions and wrongs rankled in their bosoms, roused an intense, invincible repugnance to it.

INTRODUCED TO THE NOTICE OF CHARLES II.

He was introduced to the notice of the King as a most suitable instrument of religious concord by his brother, Sir Elisha, of whom we have given some account. His brother, for his own advancement at Court, contrived through Lord Aubigny (a favorite with the King) to introduce Robert to him upon the occasion of a visit to London made by Robert during the vacation of the University. The King at the interview offered him a Scotch bishopric. Leighton was at first averse to accepting it; but, urged to do so by his brother and the friendly courtiers, and receiving what amounted to the royal command to accept it, unless he conscientiously believed that the Episcopal office was unlawful, he yielded to the royal will. He acceded to the preferment from a pure sense of duty, contrary to his own desires and in the hope that by wise and gentle measures he could soften the prejudices of his countrymen and accomplish the union of the churches of England and Scotland. In a letter to a friend, Rev. James Aird, of Torry, whose disapproval of his action he deprecated, he wrote the following in self-defense:—

“One comfort I have, that in what is pressed on me there is the least of my own choice; yea, on the contrary, the strongest aversion that ever I had to anything in all my life. The difficulty lies in a necessity of either owning a scruple which I have not, or the rudest disobedience to authority that may be. Hope well of me and pray for me. This word I will add, that as there has been nothing of my choice in the thing, so I undergo it as a mortification, and that greater than a cell and haircloth.”

## THE FOUR MEN CHOSEN SCOTCH BISHOPS.

Four bishops were chosen to inaugurate the Episcopal Establishment, which the King and his Counsellors purposed to set up anew in Scotland. They were Sharp, designed for the See of St. Andrews; Fairfowl, designed for the See of Glasgow; Hamilton, for the See of Galloway, and Leighton, for the See of Dumblane — the smallest diocese with the smallest revenue. These associates of Leighton were entirely unsuitable for the high office to which they were appointed. Bishop Burnet has left a very unfavorable report of their moral characters; describing Sharp as “devoid of serious religion, an artful sycophant, whose integrity readily truckled to his worldly interests.” Fairfowl, “a pleasant and facetious man, insinuating and crafty; but his life was scarce free from scandal, and he was eminent in nothing that belonged to his own function.” “Hamilton was a good-natured man, but weak. He was always believed [to be] Episcopal; yet in the time of the ‘Covenant,’ to secure himself from suspicion, he affected a peculiar expression of his counterfeit zeal for their cause; when he gave the Sacrament he excommunicated all that were not true to the Covenant, using a form in the Old Testament of shaking out the lap of his gown, saying, ‘so did he cast out of the Church and Communion all that dealt falsely in the Covenant.’”

Of this group, Leighton was the only one fit to be a bishop. He, as we shall see, “was a true shepherd and bishop of souls.”

## THEIR CONSECRATION AS BISHOPS IN LONDON.

When the time came for their consecration as the Bishops of Scotland, which occurred in London, the English Bishops, especially Sheldon, Bishop of London, insisted that Sharp and



Leighton be reordained previous to the ceremony of consecration, on the plea that their Presbyterian ordination to the ministry in the beginning, was invalid, it having been conferred by "a Church in a state of schism." This insistence was required by the Act of Uniformity passed soon after the Restoration; and the requirement is still made down to the present day of all ministers who would enter the Episcopal ministry from other religious denominations. Sharp objected to the requirement, and justly, as discrediting the genuineness and value of his previous service in the ministry, and Leighton would have avoided the censure of the religious body he had similarly served if he had stood up with equal stoutness for the validity of his initial ordination to the ministry in the Presbyterian Church.

John Howe, the favorite Chaplain of Cromwell and one of the greatest of the Puritan divines, lost his living at Great Torrington after the Restoration on account of the Act of Uniformity, above referred to. But, if he had been willing to take a new ordination, he might have had his living restored to him, or had a better one given him; and he was strongly urged by some of his Royalist friends among the Episcopal Clergy to do this. "Pray Sir," said Dr. Seth Ward, Bishop of Exeter, "what hurt is there in being twice ordained?" "Hurt, my Lord," answered Howe, "it hurts my understanding! the thought is shocking, it is an absurdity, since nothing can have two beginnings." Rather than submit to such a "hurt" to his understanding and to his former ministry, Howe preferred to remain silent.

Leighton equally denied the soundness of the objection of the English bishops to the validity of his ordination, but yielded to their demand with a readiness which the repugnance to it shown by Sharp made the more observable. "The view

he took of the ceremony imposed upon them," says Pearson, his Episcopal biographer,

"was that 'the reordaining a priest ordained in another church imported no more, but that they received him into orders according to their own rules; and did not imply the annulling the orders he had formerly received.' Had the English bishops concurred in this explanation," says Pearson, "Leighton would have stood on solid ground in submitting to a new ordination. But, instead of concurring in it, their avowed meaning was to bestow that upon him of which in their judgment he was hitherto destitute, viz., a regular consecration to the ministry of the Gospel; and in this meaning Leighton did, to outward appearance, acquiesce. His private construction of the act, to which he submitted, could not change its public aspect and character. It seemed levelled at the foundations of Presbytery by impeaching the legitimacy of all Presbyterian ministers, and, of course, it exasperated the clergy, who were in that predicament, and also the laity, who thought the honor and interest of their church compromised by Leighton's concession."

Probably Leighton did not much consider the ill impression his compliance would produce on mankind, or how it might unfavorably affect their judgment of him. The important thing in his opinion was, to begin promptly the enterprise of composing the religious differences then existing in England and Scotland by establishing Episcopacy in Scotland. Had he or King Charles II. known, to a certainty, what we know from the testimony of Burnet, that the affirmation of Middleton and Sharp to the King "that the general bent of the nation was now turned against Presbytery and for bishops" was untrue; that Episcopacy was then, in fact, "very contrary to the bent and genius of the nation," Leighton would not have consented, probably, to be ordained as bishop with Sharp, nor assisted them in their nefarious efforts to delude the King into compliance with their scheme of establishing Episcopacy in Scotland by his engaging all the powers of government in its support.

“The religious differences of Scotland” instead of being thus “composed” were greatly aggravated, as they were to learn to their cost, by this enterprise which he was so eager to begin. So deceived, he and Sharp were privately ordained as deacons and priests, and then all the four were publicly consecrated to their several bishoprics in Westminster Abbey.

“Leighton told me,” says Burnet,

“he was much struck with the feasting and jollity of that day; it had not such an appearance of seriousness or piety as became the New Modeling of a Church. When that was over, he made some attempts to work up Sharp [who affected to have the reins of the Church wholly put into his hands, as the bishop of St. Andrews] to the two designs which possessed him most. The one was to try what could be done towards the uniting the Presbyterians and them. He offered Usher's ‘Reduction’ [i. e., a Modified Episcopacy, acceptable to the English Puritans] as the plan upon which they ought to form their schemes. The other was, to try how they could raise men to a truer and higher sense of piety, and bring the worship of that Church [the Presbyterian] out of their extempore methods into more order; and so to prepare them for a more regular way of worship, which he thought was of much more importance than a form of government.”

But, to his amazement,

“Sharp had neither formed any scheme, nor seemed so much as willing to talk of any . . . he did not care to lay down any scheme. Fairfowl, when he talked to him, . . . avoided all serious discourse, and indeed did not seem capable of any. So Leighton quickly lost all heart and hope and said often to me upon it, that in the whole progress of that affair there appeared such cross characters of an angry providence that how fully soever he was satisfied in his own mind as to Episcopacy itself, yet it seemed that God was against them and that they were not like to be the men that should build up His Church; *so that the struggling about it seemed to him like a fighting against God* [my italics]. And the rest of the order were so mean and so selfish, and the Earl of Middleton [the King's Commissioner] with other secular men that conducted it, were so openly impious and vicious that it cast a reproach on everything relating to religion to see it managed by such instruments.”

The bishops, soon after their consecration, went to Scot-

land, all in one coach. Leighton afterwards told Burnet, that "probably they were weary of him, for he was very weary of them." But he, finding that they intended to be received in Edinburgh with some pomp, left them at Morpeth, and proceeded to Edinburgh before them.

Burnet says:—

"The Lord Chancellor with all the Nobility and Privy Counsellors then in Edinburgh went out together with the Magistracy of the City and brought the bishops in, as in triumph. I looked on, and though I was thoroughly Episcopal, yet I thought there was somewhat in the pomp of that entry that did not look like the humility that became their function. Leighton hated all the appearances of vanity. He would not have the title of Lord given him by his friends, and was not easy when others forced it on him. In this I always thought him too stiff; it provoked the other bishops, and looked like singularity and affectation, and furnished those prejudiced against him with a specious ground to represent him as a man of odd notions and practices."

Shortly after their arrival in Edinburgh the bishops were formally invited to take their seats in the Scottish parliament. This was not necessary to authorize their attendance, but "it was considered a proper token of respect." All except the Bishop of Dumblane obeyed the invitation. He resolved at the outset never to mix in parliamentary business unless some matter concerning the interests of religion were up for consideration, and to this resolution he steadily adhered.

#### HIS FIRST APPEARANCE IN PARLIAMENT.

His first appearance in Parliament was upon the occasion of a debate regarding the Oath of Supremacy. "Some Presbyterian preachers," says Burnet,

"were summoned to answer before the Parliament for some reflections in their sermons against Episcopacy. But nothing could be made of it. For their words were general, and capable of different senses. So it was resolved for a proof of their loyalty to

tender them the oath of allegiance and supremacy, enacted in a former Parliament. . . . The ministers to whom it was tendered offered to take it if allowed to couple with it an explanation, 'such as was permitted in England at the time of its enactment, to bring it within the compass of the Presbyterian conscience.'"

The High Commissioner, Middleton, refused this demand. Leighton now stepped forward and pleaded for the concession.

"He pressed it with much zeal. The words of this oath were certainly capable of a bad sense. In compassion to Papists a limited sense had been put upon them in England, and he thought there should be a like tenderness showed to Protestants, especially when the scruple was just, and there was an oath in the case. To act otherwise looked like laying snares for people, and the making men offenders for a word."

This remonstrance was taken ill by the Earl of Middleton and all his party, especially Sharp, who replied upon him with great bitterness, and said, "it was below their dignity to make Acts to satisfy the weak scruples of peevish men." Leighton's arguments availed nothing.

Is it any wonder that Leighton, exposed to such a wolfish spirit in his encounters with them in Parliament, seldom joined his fellow bishops there in their business legislation?

"For several years," says Airman, "we do not meet with the bishop's name in any political transactions of the times, but we find from his charges to his clergy, and some few letters which have been preserved, that he was far more honorably employed in fulfilling the spiritual duties of his office."

#### HIS EXALTATION OF THE EPISCOPAL FUNCTION.

"Leighton thought, with St. Augustine," says Pearson, "that a bishopric is not intended for pastime and amusement. He therefore resided constantly on his See, and his holy ministrations watered the places about him with a blessing. Not content to repose in lazy state, he regarded himself as a Shepherd of

Souls, and went about the parish catechising and preaching. But his primary aim was to heal the fountains [i. e., to make the ministers of his diocese fit in character and attainments to be good pastors and preachers]; for he justly considered that if ministers were to become sound in doctrine, exemplary in personal conduct and sedulous in pastoral duties, the fruits of their spirituality and zeal would quickly appear in the amended state of their parishes. It would be difficult to do justice to the sense he entertained of the immense responsibility of Christian ministers. . . . 'Theirs,' he observed, 'is rightly called *cura animarum*,' a concern . . . full of anxiety and peril. 'Were I again,' he said in his old age, 'to be a parish minister, I must follow sinners to their houses, and even to their alehouses.' As one of the faults imputed to the Episcopal clergy was unskilfulness in preaching, he was solicitous to remove from his own diocese all color for this allegation."

The first requisite to pulpit effectiveness, he thought, was genuine piety in the preacher. He sought, therefore, to have the pulpits of his churches filled by godly men. "It is vain," he would say,

"for any one to speak of divine things without something of divine affections. An ungodly clergyman must feel uneasy when preaching godliness and will hardly preach it persuasively. He has not been able to prevail on himself to be holy, and no marvel if he fails to prevail on others. In truth he is in great danger of being hardened against religion by the frequent inculcation of it, if it falls of melting him."

Another important requisite to its effectiveness was that "discourses from the pulpit should be simple and perspicuous." "*The measure of speech*," he remarked, and it is a remark worthy to be preserved, "*ought to be the character of the audience, which is made up for the most part of illiterate persons*" [my ital.].

For a similar reason he discouraged the practice of reading sermons, being of opinion that it detracted much from the weight and authority of preaching. "I know," he said,

"that weakness of the memory is pleaded in excuse for this custom; but better minds would make better memories. Such an ex-

cuse is unworthy of a man, and much more of a father who may want vent indeed in addressing his children, but ought never to want matter. Like Elihu, he should be refreshed by speaking."

"It was among his pious plans to bring about a more frequent celebration of the Lord's Supper, which, in those days, was not in every place so much as an annual ceremony; and he wished the people to be carefully instructed in the spiritual import of this holy rite, and to be frequently exhorted to maintain a constant fitness for it by uniform blamelessness of conversation. He also made it incumbent on his clergy to promote the practice of family worship, and to exercise a watchful superintendence over their flocks, bearing the spiritual burdens of every member, and dealing out to each, as his case might require, instruction, or counsel, or reproof, or consolation. And he was careful to put his clergy in remembrance, that no substantial good could be expected from their ministrations unless they themselves were men of prayer, of study and meditation; of great contempt of this present world and inflamed affections towards heaven, whose pure and peaceable demeanor, full of mercy and good fruits, should stamp them as the sons of God and followers of the meek and lowly Jesus. Moreover, he considered a singular modesty and gravity, even in externals, such as their apparel, and the adjustment of their hair, to be highly becoming in ministers, whose profession it was to give themselves wholly to the care of immortal souls."

He was careful withal, in this instruction, to put them on their guard against the danger of cant, sanctimoniousness, and spurious counterfeits of piety. It must be genuine, convincingly genuine with the people to whom they ministered.

He furthermore gave no suggestion to his clergy of any imperiousness or domineering in the exercise of his Episcopal authority. He seems to have judged it expedient to treat them as on a level with himself so far as the indispensable dignity of his office allowed, and whatever corrections he thought necessary, were proposed privately in the shape of friendly suggestion, and not of overbearing dictation.

"Proceeding steadily upon these principles," says Pearson, "and exerting all his influence to impart to others the same fervency of spirit, he drew upon himself the eyes of all Scotland, which gazed with amazement at his bright and singular virtues as at a

star of unrivalled brilliancy newly added to the sky. Even the Presbyterians were softened by his Christian urbanity, and were constrained to admit that on him had descended a double portion of the apostolic spirit. Had his colleagues in office been kin to him in temper, it is not extravagant to believe that the attempt to restore Episcopacy would have had a more prosperous issue."

As there is no record of Leighton's having taken a prominent part in association with his colleagues in the settlement of the Church during the earlier part of his episcopacy, we may assume that he generally confined himself to private advice when they greatly differed, hoping that when the happy results of his own pacific proceedings should be visible, the other bishops would be induced to follow in his track. But Sharp, with his self-conceit and imperious disposition, so contrary to Leighton's, scorned to take his advice or walk in the same track. Fairfowl felt in a similar way. It, therefore, soon became apparent that the plans adopted by them and executed by the government through their influence were "plans conceived in a spirit of imprudence and harshness and carried into execution by irreligious men with irreligious fury." The result was a storm of indignant protest and stubborn resistance among the Presbyterian ministers and their churches in the dioceses where such plans were adopted.

They were stoutly loyal to the teaching of John Knox. This was the religious mold by which the national character had been largely shaped, and, as our narrative will show, no matter what pressure of external force might be used, it was not to be broken or dissolved. The Stuart kings employed every kind of persecution and torture that devilish ingenuity could devise, alternating with seductive promises and arts of cajolery, to shape their resolution, but in vain. Their "Sol-  
emn Covenant" with God made their hearts impregnable to assault. This religious mold, like a crucible of incombustible



material, was able to resist the hottest fires. One thing only could melt and soften it. This was love, patient, unwearied love, guided by the light of divine truth — something that intolerant men never know or learn, except they become converted like the apostle Paul.

Leighton had learned it by heart, and the small group of men who sympathized and were associated with him; but their light was so beclouded and obscured by the wickedness of Sharp, Middleton, Rothes, and Lauderdale, and of the kings whose behests they obeyed, that it could not irradiate the land.

THE FOLLY OF THE BISHOPS AND THEIR CIVIL SUPPORTERS;  
EFFECT OF IT UPON THE PRESBYTERIANS.

“When the Earl of Middleton came down to Scotland as the King’s Commissioner,” we are told,

“Fairfowl, the Archbishop of Glasgow, complained to him that none of the younger Presbyterian ministers of his diocese who had entered office since 1649 had attended his ecclesiastical courts or would recognize his episcopal authority, and he suggested that an ordinance should be made to the effect, that unless within a given time all who had begun their ministry subsequent to 1649 should obtain presentations to their parishes (from the patron) and should apply to the bishops for admission, they should be ejected from their homes, their pulpits and their livings.”

An ordinance such as this, suggested by Fairfowl, and denominated “The Glasgow Act” in the History of Scotland, was promptly passed by the Government Council. It was cruel and drastic in its provisions. Only one month’s time was allowed the ministers for their submission. Declaring that the incumbents were unlawful possessors of their churches and livings, it required them before Michaelmas (Sept. 29), to take presentations from the patrons and to get themselves to be instituted by the bishops. Otherwise, their churches were declared vacant on Michaelmas Day. Should they ven-

ture to disobey, they would be forcibly pulled from their pulpits by soldiers. "The Earl of Middleton was naturally fierce," says Burnet, "and that was heightened by the ill state of his affairs at Court [the King had become recently displeased with him]. He and all about him were at this time so constantly disordered by high entertainments, they were not cool nor calm enough to consider what they were doing." The King said, "Their actings were like madmen or like men that were perpetually drunk."

The Presbyterians had many meetings about it, in which all, except some few who had a mind to hold their benefices, resolved not to obey the Act. They reckoned the taking institution from a bishop was such an owning of his authority that it was a renouncing of all their former principles.

The Earl of Middleton went to Glasgow before Michaelmas. So when the time fixed by the Act was past and scarce any one in those counties of the western parts had paid any regard to it, he called a meeting of the Privy Council, that they might consider what was to be done. The Earl of Middleton would hear of nothing but the immediate execution of the law. So the proclamation was issued, and upon it above two hundred churches were shut up in one day. And two hundred pastors then took farewell of their flocks; and, later, more than two hundred more for not obeying and submitting to the bishops' summons to their synods. Rather than violate their consciences they gave up their livings.

"To fill their places," Burnet says,

"there was a sort of an invitation sent over the Kingdom, like a hue and cry, to all persons to accept of benefices in the West. Among others, I was much pressed by the Earl of Glencairn to go into any of the vacant churches that I liked. I was then but nineteen; but there was no law in Scotland limiting the age of a priest. But I had drunk in the principles of moderation so early

that, though I was entirely Episcopal, yet I would not engage with a body of men that seemed to have the principles and tempers of Inquisitors, and to have no regard to religion in any of their proceedings.

"The livings were generally well endowed, and the parsonage houses were well built and in good repair, and this drew many worthless persons thither who had little learning, less piety, and no sort of discretion. They were the worst preachers I ever heard; they were ignorant to a reproach, and many of them were openly vicious; they were a disgrace to their order and the sacred function and were indeed the dregs and refuse of the northern parts. Those of them who arose above contempt or scandal were men of such violent tempers that they were as much hated as the others were despised. This was the fatal beginning of restoring Episcopacy in Scotland, of which few of the bishops seemed to have any sense."

Leighton, from the very beginning, foresaw the disturbance and the mischief likely to arise from it, and strove with all his might to avert it. He knew well the religious conditions then existing in Scotland — conditions largely due to the diligent labors and conscientious fidelity of the ministers silenced by this "Glasgow Act." "It can hardly be imagined," says Burnet,

"to what a degree they were loved by their people. They deserved it by their devotion to their spiritual welfare. They used to visit their parishes much and were so full of the Scriptures and so ready at extempore prayer, that from that they grew to practice extempore sermons. And where they happened to come, if it was acceptable they on the sudden expounded a chapter. And they had brought the people to such a degree of knowledge that cottagers and servants could have prayed extempore. I have often overheard them at it, and I have been astonished to hear how copious and ready they were in it. Their ministers generally brought them about them on the Sunday nights, where the sermons were talked over, and every one, women as well as men, were desired to speak their sense and their experience. By these means they had a comprehension of matters of religion greater than I have seen among people of that sort anywhere."

Though Burnet offset this praise, to some extent, by men-

tioning some of "their faults and defects," "these were **not** so conspicuous." The most blameable were, that they were very apt to censure all who differed from them, and to believe and report whatsoever they heard to their prejudice; they were superstitious and arrogant, in their sermons they were apt to enlarge on the state of the times; to preach against the sins of princes and Courts; and so to proclaim their opinions about the independence of the Church and the Clergy of the Civil power as to stir up the people to tumults and resistance. This was what begot so ill an opinion of them at this time in men not deeply engaged with them in these conceits.

Their ministers had for some months before they were silenced been infusing the belief into the people, both in public and private, that all that was designed in this change of Church government was to destroy the power of godliness and to give an impunity to vice; that prelacy was a tyranny in the Church, set on by ambitious and covetous men, who aimed at nothing but authority and wealth, luxury and idleness; and that they intended to encourage vice, that they might procure to themselves a great party among the impious and immoral. The people thus prepossessed, seeing the Earl of Middleton and all the train that followed him through those counties running into excess of all sorts, and railing at the very appearance of virtue and sobriety, were confirmed in the belief of all that their ministers had told them. All of this was out of measure increased by the new incumbents who were put in the places of the ejected preachers, and were generally very mean and despicable in all respects.

#### THE CONVENTICLES.

The natural result was, as Dr. W. M. Taylor says, that "the people did not care to wait upon the ministry of these new incumbents, but sought the services of their old pastors in con-

venticles which assembled in retired spots on the moors or among the hills with no roof above them but the sky.

"The people came together, sometimes in the early morning, sometimes amid the stillness of the night, and many of the men were armed with muskets and short swords. Sentinels were posted at points of vantage to give timely warning of the coming of the enemy, and no one of them knew but what he might within a few hours seal his testimony with his blood. Occasionally the sacraments were administered, and little children were in a very true sense 'baptized for the dead,' and the table of the Lord was literally 'spread in the wilderness.' The sound of praise at such times was borne aloft and afar on the breeze, and it was from scenes like these that the old version of the Psalms of David in meter acquired their charm."

In the following lines of an Episcopalian poet those scenes are thus graphically described:—

"Long ere the dawn, by devious ways  
O'er hills, through woods, o'er dreary wastes they sought  
The upland woods, where rivers—there but brooks—  
Dispart to different seas. . . . In solitudes like these  
Thy persecuted children, Scotia, foiled  
A tyrant's and a bigot's bloody laws.

But years more gloomy followed, and no more  
The assembled people dared in face of day  
To worship God, or even at the dead  
Of night, save where the wintry storm raved fierce,  
And thunder peals compelled the men of blood  
To crouch within their dens. Then dauntlessly  
The scattered few would meet in some deep dell  
By rock o'er-canopied, to hear the voice—  
Their faithful pastor's voice."

This revolt of the Presbyterians was provoked by the Privy Council (in which Middleton and Sharp were the most powerful in their influence) by its prohibitive Acts against the Conventicles, and measures of coercion to compel the people to attend the Parish Churches. In Woodrow's Church History these Acts are described and their cruel operation is clearly

indicated. The "Conventicles," as described, were denounced and forbidden in the name of the King as "Seminaries of Separation and rendezvous of rebellion, tending to the alienation of his subjects' hearts and affections from his authority and government, ecclesiastical and civil, and ministering opportunities for infusing pernicious and poisonous principles; the consequences thereof threaten no less than the confusion and ruin of Church and Kingdom." Consequently, "those withdrawing from the ordinary meetings in the Church and participating in these conventicles as preachers or worshipers are to be punished as seditious persons." (Woodrow's History, vol. i. p. 430.) As to the punishment inflicted on offenders; "they were fined as heavily as their estates would bear, so that many of them were ruined." These fines were appropriated by Middleton and the other members of the Council for their own private enrichment.

"Soldiers were quartered upon suspected people in such numbers that they absolutely devoured their substance. . . .

"The presence of any one at a Conventicle, especially if he was a minister and had preached, was sufficient to warrant his arrest. This was followed by his imprisonment, or banishment from the country, or, sometimes, by his execution."

It is not strange that those thus oppressed were at length goaded to rebellion. "Oppression makes men mad" is a true proverb. Examples of the madness produced are depicted in Walter Scott's "Old Mortality," in the characters of John Balfour (of Burley), Ephraim Macbriar and Habakkock Mucklewrath. More than once, as at London Hill, Drumdog, and Bothwell Bridge, they bravely fought with their oppressors, but this only made matters worse for them by setting the fires of persecution to burning more fiercely against them.

Because of his activity in kindling these, Sharp became an object of universal hate. The bitterness of this hate is shown

by what happened in Edinburgh when an assassin attempted to shoot him as he was riding in his coach in full daylight, the Bishop of Orkney being with him. "Though this was done in full daylight," says Burnet,

"and on the High street, yet nobody offered to seize the assassin. So he walked off unarrested. . . . Proclamations were issued with great rewards for discovering the actor, but nothing followed on them.

"Sharp talked for awhile like a changed man, and went out of his way as he was going to Court (whither he had been called to receive some marks of the King's favor), to visit me at my parsonage and seemed resolved to turn to other methods. But he made no proposition to the King; only in general terms he approved of the methods of gentleness and moderation."

It seems as if the habit of intolerant religious persecution had become so strong in him and the love of his prelatical power so confirmed that he could not change to the better methods then suggested by Burnet, constantly urged by Leighton, and recommended for trial even by the King. So for ten years longer he pursued his unrelenting course until he was foully murdered on Magus Moor, May 3, 1679.

The following account is given of the tragical affair (one of the most tragical in the history of Scotland) by Bishop Burnet:—

"A party of furious men were riding through a moor near St. Andrews, when they saw the Archbishop's coach appear. He was coming from a Council day and was driving home [with his daughter]. He had sent some of his servants home before him to let them know of his coming; . . . so that there was no horseman about the coach. They, seeing this, concluded according to their frantic, enthusiastic notions, that God had now delivered up their greatest enemy into their hands. Seven of them made up to the coach, while the rest were riding as scouts all about the moor. One of them fired a pistol at him, which burnt his coat and gown, but did not go into his body. Upon this they fancied that he had a magical secret to secure him against a shot, and they drew him out of his coach, and murdered him barbarously, repeating their  
Vol. LXXIV. No. 293. 4

strokes till they were sure he was quite dead. And so they got clear off, nobody happening to go across the moor all the while. This was the dismal end of that unhappy man; it struck all people with horror, and softened his enemies into some tenderness."

Going back now to the year 1662-63, when what Burnet calls "the Earl of Middleton's heat and Sharp's vehemence," compelled four hundred Presbyterian ministers to bid farewell to their flocks and vacate their parsonages:

In a few months Middleton went up to London and was very coldly received by the King, who through the hostile influence of the Earl of Lauderdale was alienated from him. He was accused by Lauderdale of "many malversations in the great trust he had been in, which he censured severely." Among other things, the Earl of Lauderdale particularly condemned his unscrupulous extortion in the laying on of the fines, and he procured a letter from the King to the Privy Council of Scotland ordering them to issue a proclamation suspending the execution of the Act of fining till further orders. The friends of Middleton in the Council wrote to him, then in London, "to represent to the King that this would discredit the proceedings of their Parliament and would raise the spirits of a party that ought to be kept down." Middleton wrote back, that "he had laid the matter before the King, and that he, considering better of it, ordered that no proceeding should be made upon his former letter." This occasioned a hot debate in Council. It was said, "a letter under the King's hand could not be countermanded but by the same hand." So the Council wrote again to know the King's mind. "The King protested that Middleton had not spoken one word on the subject to him." Upon that he sent for Middleton and chid him so severely, that Middleton concluded that he was ruined. His forebodings were true. In a few days he was required to give up his commission.



“And so his ministry came to an end in 1664, after a sort of reign of much violence and injustice. He and his company were delivered up to so much excess and to such a madness of frolic and intemperance as Scotland had never seen; so, at his disgrace, there was a general joy over the kingdom. But that lasted not long, for those that came after him grew worse than even he was like to be.”

He was succeeded in the office of King's Commissioner by the Earl of Rothes, a favorite of the King, who, according to Burnet, “had a ready dexterity in the management of affairs, with a soft and insinuating address, and a clear judgment when not drunk, but was lacking in any feeling of responsibility and independence of character, so that he was easily controlled by Sharp in the performance of his official duties. Sharp governed Lord Rothes, who abandoned himself to pleasure.”

Fairfowl, Archbishop of Glasgow, died this year (1664), and was succeeded by Dr. Alexander Burnet, who was “inclined to moderate counsels, but was much in the power of others, and took any impression that was given him easily.”

The Western Counties of Scotland, his diocese, were especially fierce and intractable in regard to the ministers sent them by the Council. The people complained that they were “immoral, stupid and ignorant,” and generally forsook their churches. Those who went to church were little edified with their sermons, and treated the preachers with great contempt and an aversion that broke out often into violence and injustice. So many were brought before the Council and the Ecclesiastical Commission for pretended riots and for using their ministers ill, but chiefly for not coming to Church and for holding Conventicles. The proofs were often defective and lay rather in presumptions than in clear evidence, and the punishments proposed were often arbitrary and not warranted

by law. When the judges and lawyers endeavored to have the proceedings according to the forms of law, Sharp complained, that "favor was shown to the enemies of the Church," and often exclaimed, "Must the Church be ruined for punctilios of the law!" When he could not carry matters in Council by a vote, as he had a mind, he usually looked to the Earl of Rothes, who upon that was ready to say, "he would take it upon himself to order the matter as Sharp proposed, and would do it in the King's name." "The truth is," says Burnet, "the whole face of the government looked liker the proceedings of an inquisition, than of legal courts. And yet Sharp was never satisfied."

Sir James Turner was the "secular arm" who executed the Council's behests; and where great numbers were cast in prison by him they were kept long and ill used. Sometimes they were heavily fined and whipt about the streets. The natural result was that the people grew more sullen under all this ill usage. Many were undone by it and went over to the Scots in Ulster, where they were well received and had full liberty as to their way of religion.

At length these clerical oppressions became so intolerable that the people rose in rebellion, which was put down with great cruelty by General Dalziel, leader of the King's forces, who encountered and defeated the rebels on November 28, 1666, at Pentland Hill. The prisoners were put to the torture to make them disclose the whereabouts of their friends, and hanged if they refused to betray them. Every man of them could have saved his own life if he would accuse any other, but they were all true to their friends.

In Scott's "Old Mortality," the torture inflicted on the young preacher, Maccaill, with the boot, and the punishments of others are described without exaggeration.

“Dalziel acted the Muscovite too grossly,” says Burnet.

“He threatened to spit men and to roast them; and he killed some in cold blood; or, rather, in *hot* blood, for he was then drunk when he ordered one to be hanged because he would not tell where his father was. When he heard of any that did not go to church, he did not trouble himself to set a fine upon him, but he quartered as many soldiers upon him as should eat him up in a night.”

How did those performances of Sharp, Rothes, and Dalziel affect Leighton? The following passage from Burnet’s interesting History tells us:—

“At that time Leighton was prevailed on to go to Court and to give the King a true account of the proceedings in Scotland, ‘which,’ he said, ‘were so violent that he could not concur in the planting the Christian religion itself in such a manner, much less a form of government.’ He therefore begged leave to quit his bishopric, and to retire; for he thought he was in some sort accessory to the violence done by others, since he was one of them, and all was pretended to be done to establish them and their order.”

There were no violences committed in Leighton’s diocese. He went round it continually, every year, preaching and catechizing from parish to parish. He continued in his private ascetic course of life, and gave all his income, beyond the small expenses of his own person, to the poor. He studied to raise in his clergy a greater sense of spiritual matters and of the care of souls; and was in all respects a burning and shining light highly esteemed by the greater part of his diocese.

The King seemed touched with Leighton’s account of the state the country was in; he spoke very severely of Sharp, and assured Leighton that he would ‘quickly come to other measures, and put a stop to those violent methods.’ But he would by no means suffer him to quit his bishopric. So, the King gave orders that the Ecclesiastical Commission should be discontinued, and signified his pleasure that another way

of proceeding was necessary for his affairs. Now all was turned to a more sober, moderate management. Even Sharp grew meek and humble, and Lord Rothes' commission was taken from him.