

came also the faith of the feudal vassals. Indeed, the Protestantism of each section of the land depended much upon the acceptance or rejection, by the Chief of that section, of the doctrines of the Reformation. In the Western Counties, Argyll and Glencairn swayed the destiny of thousands. They proclaimed themselves in favour of Reform, and hence the Western Counties were, from the earliest period, the strongholds of the Reformation. The Earl of Rothes, Lord Lindsay and the Lord James Stewart had the feudal sway of Fife, and consequently Fife became Protestant. Lord Ruthven influenced Perth, and Erskine of Dun Montrose and Dundee, and so we find Perth, Montrose and Dundee conspicuous among the towns of Scotland for their decided Protestantism. On the other hand, Huntley was no Reformer, and consequently, within his domains, the Reformation made but little progress. The great house of Hamilton was undecided, and consequently Glasgow and Paisley vacillated—being at times more zealous for Reform than at other periods, just according to the movements of the House of Hamilton. Indeed, the Reformation of Scotland, although much more popular than that of England, yet had, by no means, its root and origin in the populace. In England, the Reformation was *monarchical*; the King changed his religion, and, by passing an Act, changed the religion of the country, and, by his great power, reformed the Church. In Scotland, the Reformation was *baronial*. Even when a vigorous King swayed the sceptre of Scotland, those great barons were a match for the throne; but when that sceptre fell into the hands of a child-king, the Monarch was only second to the Barons in power. And, humanly speaking, did not Knox secure the favor of those Barons and the cooperation of this Oligarchy, he would have preached in vain, if indeed he was permitted to preach at all. The duty which the people understood best, and which had been impressed upon them with the greatest care and earnestness, was the duty they owed to their feudal lord. We must remember how sadly they had been neglected by the Church—how incapable they were of forming an opinion upon the questions at issue, and consequently, how naturally they would adopt the opinions of those whom they feared, honored or respected. The nobility and gentry of Scotland were now, in a measure, educated men, who could understand the merits of the question, and who cordially welcomed the change from Romanism to Protestantism. The Church had neglected the education of the masses. She had allowed them to grow up in ignorance and indifference, and consequently, when the crisis came, she could exert no power or influence over them.

Much has been said about the *motives* which led the Barons and Clergy of Scotland to part with the Church of Rome. Some Protestant writers have regarded their motives as

one and all of the purest kind. Roman Catholic writers, on the contrary, have denounced them all as base, selfish, unworthy. History, however, would seem to say that the motives in this, as in all other great movements, were of a very mixed character. That avarice drove some of the Barons to forward the work of the Reformation, seems very evident from their after conduct in the matter. The Church had, through the liberality of former kings to the monasteries throughout the land, as well as through the various methods used by the Ecclesiastics to amass property, become extremely wealthy. At the time of the Reformation, it is estimated that one-half of the wealth of Scotland belonged to the Church. If the Church could be overthrown, those powerful Nobles thought that the property would naturally and necessarily fall into their own hands, or, at least, that they would add some portions of it to their own possessions. The Church had large portions of the land of Scotland, from which they received large rents. Soon after the commencement of the Reformation struggles, the Barons saved them the trouble of collecting those rents, by seizing upon them for their own purposes. When the victory was won, Knox saw that the new Church was in danger of being stripped wholly of its possessions, and we read that, in the Parliament of 1560, he raised his voice against the sin, by giving a course of lectures upon Haggai. The Barons attended the preaching in St. Giles', where the faithful Knox exposed their vices from the words, "Is it a time for you, oh ye, to dwell in your ceiled houses, and this house lie waste? Go up to the mountain, and bring wood, and build the house, and I will take pleasure in it, and I will be glorified, saith the Lord. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of Hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, and in this place will I give peace." But to such appeals, a leader among the Barons could say, with a sneer, "We may now forget ourselves, and bear the barrow to build the House of God." On another occasion, when the "Book of Discipline" was presented to the Privy Council for its approval, the Nobles did not relish it, and Maitland again could sneer, and pronounce it "a devout imagination." This was too much for the temper of Knox, and his wrath broke out against them. He said, "some are licentious, some have greedily griped the possessions of the Church, and others thought they would not lack their part of Christ's coat; yea, and that before that ever he was crucified, as by the preachers they were oft rebuked. The chief great man that had professed Christ Jesus, and refused to subscribe to the "Book of Discipline," was the Lord Erskine; and no wonder; for, besides that he had a very evil woman to his wife, if the poor, the schools, and the ministry of the Church had their own, his kitchen would lack two parts, and more, of that which