

"JOHN CRAIG (1512 ?-1600) WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO
HIS CONTRIBUTION TO THE UPBUILDING OF THE REFORMED
CHURCH IN SCOTLAND."

.....

T. A. Kerr.

.....



John Craig the Scottish Reformer
(1512 ?- 1600)

.....

Summary of his life and work

"Master" John Craig, whose long and hono^urable life all but spanned the sixteenth century, was among the most versatile of the Scottish reformers. He was approaching early middle-age when he joined Knox in Edinburgh, becoming his trusted colleague in the onerous ministry at the High Kirk of St Giles. Prior to throwing in his lot with his country's religious reformers, Craig, the scion of gentry originally hailing from Buchan, had been educated at the University of St Andrews, attaching himself some four years after graduation to a House of the Dominican friars. Proceeding to Italy, he at length rose to a high position of trust and responsibility in the Dominican priory within the University city of Bologna. Around the year 1559 he broke with the Papacy, in consequence of which he narrowly escaped being burnt at the stake as a heretic.

Craig possessed choice gifts of mind and heart, and these being at once recognised by Knox and others, he quickly gained an ascendant position in all of the important counsels and work of the Scottish Reformed Church. From his busy pen came the first native Scottish Catechism and also a Communion preparation manual, not to mention his lengthy Treatise on Fasting (written in collaboration with Knox) and his labours shared with Andrew Melville in having a chief hand in the compilation of the Second Book of Discipline. But authorship was never really Craig's métier. He was essentially a man of affairs, moving in high places with an easy grace, and playing his part in the recurring political and religious crises of his generation with considerable and consistent determination and skill—though not always with universal acceptance. He made the disci-

T. A. Kerr.
.....

pline and worship of the Reformed Church of Scotland the field of his main contribution to the new society, and of commissioners to sixteenth century General Assemblies, he was, with few exceptions, the most indefatigable. Craig had the distinction of being thrice moderator of the General Assembly, and that within the short period of fourteen years. For upwards of forty years, he served with outstanding success on all their principal committees, being in constant demand there because of his expert knowledge of both civil and canon law. Forthright and unsparing in his denunciation of wrong-doing whether of princes or people, he was nevertheless not by nature a vehement man; he could on occasion temper judgment with mercy, even with grace. His courage was beyond dispute, this being revealed at its most sterling in the laudable stand which he took with regard to the marriage of Queen Mary and Bothwell. Although Craig was ever ready to fight on to the death on behalf of his religious principles, he was at heart a man of peace, no one deploring more than he the bitter and destructive civil war of 1570-72. Indeed, his pacific stand during this unhappy time made him very unpopular with not a few of his brethren, with the result that he was compelled to retire from the capital, serving as principal minister at Aberdeen for over six years. Becoming second chaplain to King James in 1580, Craig, during the next year was instrumental in drawing up the National Covenant or King's Confession, the most fiercely anti-Papist Confession ever written. Three years later, he was again accused of "leaning over-much to the sword hand," in not contesting as Andrew Melville and others had done, the right of the king to introduce diocesan bishops to the Reformed Church of Scotland and also to dictate her general policy. Yet here, as in 1570, Craig's conduct was guided throughout by motives of peace—he strove at all costs to avert fratricidal strife, and he succeeded. And the many Scottish ministers who followed his lead, were through his com-

promise with the royal authority, never forced to signify their obedience to bishops or to sign the king's bond. Yet, in his zeal for law and order, Craig probably erred here, in yielding overmuch to royal claims.

Like others among the reformers, Craig was married, the fruit of this union being four children, a boy and three girls. His son William, born in Aberdeen during 1575, became a regent in Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh. In John Craig we see some of the richest fruits of the Scottish Reformation, courage, austerity and love of freedom. Born about the same time as John Knox, Craig survived his great leader by almost thirty years, and, as Spottiswoode says, died on the 12th of December, 1600, "without any pain." Well has professor John Johnston, his one-time student, named him "man of rock," for such indeed Craig proved to be. It was due to such stalwart and enlightened men as John Craig, that the Reformation in Scotland became ere the close of the sixteenth century, the essential core of our national life and character.

.....

CONTENTS

.....

Chapters I and II

THE EARLY YEARS

page 1

Chapters III, IV and V

TUTOR AND DOMINICAN FRIAR

page 19

Chapters VI, VII and VIII

THE BUDDING REFORMER

page 40

Chapters IX, X, XI and XII

THE RESOLUTE MINISTER

page 73

Chapters XIII, XIV, XV and XVI

CHURCHMAN AND AUTHOR

page 108

Chapters XVII, XVIII, XIX and XX

THE KING'S CHAPLAIN

page 151

EPILOGUE

page 191

APPENDIX

page 196

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PAGE 205

Among the modest in number, but select company of determined men who rallied to the support of John Knox, that resolute champion of the Reformation in Scotland, was "Master" John Craig, the distinguished member of an ancient and honorable Aberdeenshire family. He was born towards the beginning of the sixteenth century, probably in or around the year 1512. We cannot be quite certain of his natal year for the simple reason that two separate dates are supplied by contemporary writers. Archbishop Spottiswoode, the seventeenth century Church historian, and son of John Spottiswoode who became Presbyterian Superintendent of Lothian, states that John Craig "died on the 12th December, 1600, without any pain, in the eighty-eighth year of his age." 1 John Johnston, professor of Theology at the University of St Andrews and a colleague of Andrew Melville, has left on record that Craig was eighty-nine years old at the time of his decease:

"Joannes Rupanus sive Cragius
 Ecclesiastes primum Abredonensis
 Deinde Regius. Cui S.P.Q.
 Abredonensis nomine hunc tumulum
 Inscripti-qui Doctor quondam meus
 Obiit, 12 Dec. Anno Christi. 1590(1600)
 Aetatis 89." 2

This unmistakable testimony by Johnston, is to be found in an autograph MS in the possession of the National Library of Scotland. 3 We have, therefore, two possible dates for the particular year in which John Craig was born-1511 and 1513, but as to which is correct, we have now no means

1. Spottiswoode's History, Vol. 3, p. 91 et seq. 2. LIFE OF SIR THOMAS CRAIG OF RICCARTON-TYTLER, p. 27 NOTE. 3. Prof. Johnston's Latin Poems, pp. 28-30, Ref. 19:3:24. Vide appendix, NOTE A, for translation of the complete epitaph on Craig.

2
of discovering.

The year 1513 was to prove tragic in the extreme to the people of Scotland; for on an early Autumn afternoon, their army sustained its greatest defeat ever, on English soil. "This battle was called the field of Flodden....and was fought on the ninth of September, 1513, at four o'clock in the afternoon." 1 By early evening the savage fight was over, and there lay dead on that fatal field the very flower of Scottish manhood, including King James iv of Scotland and hundreds of his gallant nobles and country gentlemen. Among the last mentioned, was the young father of John Craig. Craig was not alone amongst the future Reformers who had been rendered fatherless on that terrible day. The sire of John Spottiswoode, who was to become Superintendent of Lothian, also perished in the battle, as did the father of John Erskine of Dun. 2 Strange though it may appear, the complete defeat of the Scots at Flodden became an indirect means of preparing the way for the Reformation of Religion in their country. It greatly weakened Stuart despotic monarchy; it reduced the power of many of the chief baronial houses to almost complete impotence; and the Papacy in Scotland, losing at one fell blow so many of its zealous protectors, was placed in a more vulnerable position. Thus the new middle classes, for the most part landless, yet steadily growing in economic strength, and who were to prove stalwart supporters of the Reformers, were now able to advance by leaps and bounds in influence, wealth and independence.

We know nothing concerning the parents of John Craig beyond the fact that his father was killed in battle, and that he (the father) belonged to the paternal house of Craigfintray, and later called Craigston, a small

1. History of Scotland-Lesley, p.96. 2. Spottiswoode, Vol.2, p.336. (The future Superintendent, was but four years old at the time).

(Spottiswoode)

estate situated some six miles to the north-west of Turriff and some forty miles distant from the city of Aberdeen. The Craig lands lay within the present-day parish of King Edward, in the Presbytery of Turriff, and Synod of Aberdeen. A family named Urquhart succeeded to the Craigston estates towards the close of the sixteenth century. 1 "Sir Thomas Urquhart, the author of the "Jewel," was connected with the family of Craigston, and if he did not reside in the parish, seems to have taken an interest in it, for the inscription on the massive communion cups shows that they were the joint present from a Dr. Guild, Sir Thomas Urquhart, and John Urquhart of Craigfintrie, the former name of Craigston." 2 These facts, therefore, prove beyond all shadow of doubt, the locality of the ancient heritage of John Craig's ancestors.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the head of the Craig family went by the christian name of Andrew. During 1505 and in the year following, several of the local proprietors signed letters commending one Alexander Bannerman, to the good graces of the town authorities of Aberdeen, and among their signatures is that of "Andream Crag de Cragfintra." 3 How modest in size was the patrimony of the Craigs may be gaged from the following transaction. The laird of Craigfintray (it is spelt variously, like many other place names and proper names of the period), John Craig, was required to pay the civil authorities a certain land tax, in common with neighbouring landowners, during the year 1549. The Earl of Huntly was assessed for the sum of £205-13-4; Craig's dues amounted to 40/- . 4

During the course of the sixteenth century, these Craigfintray es-

1. Sir Thomas Craig-Tytler, p.435. 2. Statistical Account of Scotland, Vol.12, p.327, Aberdeen. 3. Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen & Banff, Vol.3, p.534. 4. Collections on the Shires of Aberdeen & Banff-Spalding Club, p.117.

tates changed their ownership within the Craig family on several occasions, and indeed by 1600 as we have duly noted, they had passed out of their possession forever. We learn that on the 20th of May, 1548, Alexander Craig executed a procuratory of resignation of the estate in favour of his nephew John, son of the aforesaid's brother Thomas Craig. 1 Later, the estate was owned by a certain William Craig, whose father's name was Andrew, 2 and William executed a procuratory of his lands of Craigfintray in favour of Mr. Thomas Craig, advocate, who on the 10th of April, 1576, obtained a crown charter for it for his heirs male, whom failing to his brothers John, James, Robert and Oliver, whom failing to the said William Craig bearing his name and arms. 3 The father of Thomas Craig, advocate, had been domiciled in Edinburgh for many years: "D. Thomas Cragius de Riccarton, eques, ex antiqua Cragiorum de Craigston, (quod praedium est Buchaniae, septentrionalis Scotiae regionis), gente oriundus, patrem habuit Robertum Cragium mercatorum Edinensem, illius quem diximus gentis principis filium natu secundum." 4 The above transaction indicates that there was a close connection between the Craigfintray owners and that branch of the family which had settled in the capital during the sixteenth century or even earlier; and, judging by the terms of this procuratory of 10th April, 1576, we may take it that Thomas Craig, advocate, and William Craig were either cousins or that William was the paternal uncle.

Craig the advocate eventually became proprietor of the Riccarton estate, and besides being a celebrated feudal lawyer, was held in high esteem by King James vi. According to Tytler (Life of Sir Thomas Craig)

1. Great Seal of Scotland, 1548-1580. 2. Ibid, 10th May, 1574. 3. Ibid, 10th April, 1576. 4. D. Thomae Cragii Vita-Baillie, Ap. Jus Feudale, Edinb. 1732, p. 16. Also Sir F. J. Grant-Faculty of Advocates in Scotland, 1532-1943: "Sir Thomas Craig, son of Robert Craig burgess of Edinburgh."

and to Dr.T.G.Law(Collected Essays and Reviews),the advocate was the near relation of John Craig the Reformer. A modern writer affirms that Sir Thomas was actually his nephew. 1 The kinship of both must have been of the closest,and as we shall see,John Craig had him under his superintendence around the year 1562. 2 It is possible,then,that John Craig had brothers;first Robert the merchant at Edinburgh,and also William the one-time laird of Craigfintray. It is surely of significant interest that when a son was born to the Reformer at Aberdeen during 1575,he was baptised on the ninth October of that year under the christian name of William. 3 We may be sure,that Craig when minister of Aberdeen,and acting for some time as unofficial Superintendent of Mar and Buchan, 4 would avail himself of the opportunity,whenever time permitted from his indefatigable labours,to visit his relatives at the family ancestral home,Craigfintray.

Sir Thomas Craig's father was a convinced Catholic,and seems to have continued so until late in life. "He had been educated in the Roman Catholic Religion. His son,superintended by John Craig had zealously embraced reformed opinions. The old man continued in the faith of the Church of Rome till at a late period of his life;but being at length convinced by unanswerable reasons,which were incessantly though reverently urged by his son,he became to his great joy,a convert to the true religion." 5 There exists a document that throws a measure of light on the character of Sir Thomas's father,and it reads as follows:"Charter of Provision by Robert Craig,burgess,sole survivor of the Masters of the fraternity of the Holy Blood,and patron of the chaplainry thereof,in favour

1.Scottish Historical Review,Vol.12,pp.278-9 & note. 2.Vide Appendix, NOTE B. 3.Aberdeen Register of Births,1575(Register House,Edinb.). 4.Fasti Eccles.Scot.Pt.6,p.462. 5.Baillie-D.Thomae Cragii Vita,p.17.

of Mr. John Craig of the said chaplainry, vacant by the death of Sir John Littlejohn. Dated, 11th July, 1567." 1 This John Craig was not the Reformer, but Robert's own son as the following "Bore Brieve" (testimonial) of the Town Council of Edinburgh would seem to indicate: "To the Academia Franco fordiana cis Vicedrum and its professors in favour of Mr. John Craig, son of Robert Craig, burgess, and Katherine Bellenden, who has studied at the college of St Andrews and desired to continue his studies in France or Germany. Being unsafe in France because of his religion, he betook himself to Germany five years since. Dated, 29th July, 1574."

2 This John Craig was to become a famous doctor of medicine, and later physician of King James: "Mr. John Craig, Dr. of Medicine, as heir to the late James Craig and of the late Robert Craig, merchant," 3 and "burgess and gild brother, one of H.M. physicians." 4

Mystery surrounds the whereabouts of the young John Craig (our future reformer) and his widowed mother during his early and formative years. At least part of his boyhood may well have been spent among the heaths and hills and the lovely valley of the river Deveron in Aberdeenshire; while, on the other hand, it is just possible that he was reared, under the care of relatives, within the rapidly growing city of Edinburgh. The early municipal records of this city bear the names of several respectable citizens in this trade or that profession, who went by the name of Craig. 5 The father of Craig the advocate, was, as we noted, for many years a city merchant, and it may well be that other members of the Craig family were resident in the capital at an even earlier period. 6 Certain authorities affirm that John Craig's father had resided in Lothian prior to his untimely death. 7 The interesting fact that the Craig-

1. Unpubl. Edinb. Burgh Records, "Moses Bundle," 270 No. 8457. 2. Ibid.
 3. Guthrie's Protocols, 11th April, 1601. 4. Burgess Roll of City of Edinburgh, 27th July, 1617. 5. Sixteenth century Burgh Records, Edinburgh.
 6. Sir Thomas Craig-Tytler, p. 1. 7. John Craig, D.D. - Prin. R.H. Story (privately printed), p. 4.

fintray lands had changed ownership on several occasions during the sixteenth century must be duly noted. This may well have arisen simply through local vicissitudes, but it may equally have been brought about by members of the family, through economic necessity, leaving the north to seek their fortunes elsewhere. John Craig the reformer, and Sir Thomas Craig, were certainly men of a progressive character, and there may well have been other members of the family gifted with a like ambitious nature. Certain it is, that the population of Scotland was on the move from the commencement of the sixteenth century as never before, and was gravitating steadily and increasingly from rural parts towards her cities, and in particular to Edinburgh the capital, and the only sizeable township among them all. According to Hume Brown

"Throughout the middle ages in Scotland, as elsewhere, country population exceeded towns, but by the reign of Queen Mary, these economic developments had already begun which have been increasingly operative to the present day. From fifteenth and sixteenth century Burgh Records, it appears that inhabitants of the country districts were already flocking to the towns for employment and security, and by Mary's reign that of the country and town population were equally divided. And yet towns were correspondingly small. Edinburgh's population at the Reformation was in the region of thirty thousand; and that of Aberdeen was only four thousand or so until the end of the sixteenth century; and with regard to Glasgow, its size may be gaged from the fact that when the call was made for its citizens to subscribe their names to the "National Covenant" of 1581, it was signed by two thousand two hundred and fifty persons (of both sexes) who may be taken to represent almost the whole adult population." ¹

His first schooling at an end, John Craig at a relatively early age

¹. Scotland in the Time of Queen Mary - Hume Brown, p.52.

was sent by his relatives to complete his education at the University of St Andrews. 1 Following the normal custom of the times, he was in all probability fourteen or fifteen years old at the year of his matriculation there, though this was by no means a junior age for these remarkable university students of the sixteenth century. 2 At Oxford, for example, between 1567 and 1579, there were enrolled among others, the following students: one at eight years old, two at nine, eleven at ten, nine at eleven, forty at twelve, fifty-six at thirteen, and one hundred and fifteen at fourteen. 3 "After he (Craig) had gained an entrance in letters, and passed his cause in philosophy in St Andrews, he went to England..." thus, with the minimum of brevity, are his four years of study at Scotland's oldest university summed up. 4 That John Craig was a graduate in Arts of St Andrews' University is beyond any question of doubt. In the contemporary documents of the second half of the sixteenth century, Edinburgh Burgh Records, General Assembly Minutes, State Papers, Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, and even in the writings of his Papist enemies and protagonists, the Reformer is invariably referred to as "Maister John Craig," an indisputable proof of his possessing the degree of Master of Arts. N. Yet no university record exists to prove that he was ever a student at St Andrews. The reason for this regrettable circumstance is perfectly simple. The University Records of St Andrews, particularly during the early part of the Reformation century, were sometimes ill-kept, and on occasion these were completely lost through the sheer carelessness of clerks and registrars who ought to have been more meticulous in their work. 5 For example, the matriculation roll for 1526 is wholly missing, no trace of it having ever been found. If, then, we remember that John

1. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, p. 91. 2. Early Records, University of St Andrews-Anderson, p. 24. 3. Register of the University of Oxford, Ed. by A. Clark, 1887, Vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 461. 4. Vide Spottiswoode as above. 5. Vide Anderson as above, p. 28 (Introd.). NOTE: Vide, Church and Ministry-Henderson, p. 158.
 IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT OF THE NATIONAL COVENANT OR KING'S CONFESSON OF 1581 (VIDE P. 122 OF THESIS), CRAIG HAS APPENDED HIS SIGNATURE THUS: "MR (MAGISTER) IOHNE CRAG."

Craig was born around 1512, and that he probably proceeded to St Andrews at the age of fourteen or so, his name in all likelihood would appear on the missing matriculation roll. Even the graduation rolls for this given period of the University's history are in parts most defective, and for the same reasons as those already stated. 1

Craig, then, passed four years in the study of Philosophy at St Andrews, and while no authentic notes survive concerning the events which befell him whilst lodging in that venerable royal burgh by the North Sea, at least one important and heart-searching incident took place within its environs, most certainly during his period of residence. This happening was, in the main, the direct result of that tremendous event which shook christendom to its very foundations, at the same time heralding a new and better day for the Universal Church of God. Nine years before Craig had commenced his university studies, the German monk, Martin Luther, had dared to burn the Papal Bull, "Ex^surge Domine," in the open space outside the Elster Gate between the walls and the river Elbe at Wittemberg. Up in flames also, at nine o'clock in the morning, went the papal Constitutions and the books of Scholastic Theology. 2 "The thrill of it," as Lindsay rightly says, "went through Germany," and it wasn't very long before the inspired act touched the hearts and kindled the imagination of deep-thinking and freedom-loving Scotsmen. A prince amon^gt these was Master Patrick Hamilton, nephew of the Earl of Arran and nearly allied to the royal family. Being engaged in study abroad, in the year 1520 he took his degree of Master of Arts at the University of Paris, and proceeding thereafter to Louvain he there enjoyed personal intercourse with Erasmus, the patron of the new learning. 3

1. Early Records, Univ. of St Andrews-Anderson, p.28(Introd.). 2. History of the Reformation Lindsay, Vol.1, p.251. 3. Scottish Reformation-Mitchell, p.21.

He returned to his native Scotland, and on the 9th of June, 1523, three years or so before John Craig matriculated, he was incorporated into the University of St Andrews. 1 Hamilton was in all probability on its teaching staff during the subsequent year, and seems to have lost no time in advocating unorthodox religious opinions within the circle of his friends and colleagues. What he taught was not so much Lutheran doctrine as Eras- mian (he had met Luther and Melancthon both of whom had been highly pleas- ed with his zeal); 2 but Patrick Hamilton's teaching was sufficiently heretical to stir up the Papist authorities to encompass his death. "For his obstinacy and wickedness committed, he is burnt at the command of the King, himself the great Catholic protector.... to whom (the said Pat- rick Hamilton the abbot of) Ferne also was near of kin and blood." 3 Hamilton was martyred at St Andrews on Friday, 28th of February, 1527-28, and it is highly probable that among the great crowd who witnessed in si- lence and in horror, the foul deed, was an inconspicuous second or third year university student, John Craig, the future Reformer. What effect this tragedy had on the youthful mind of Craig, we have no means of know- ing (Hamilton himself, was a young man of only twenty-four), but he could not possibly have stood there and been unmoved. If John Craig did not catch the dying accents of Patrick Hamilton among the flames, he would quickly learn of them; for the martyr was heard distinctly to say: "How long, O Lord, shall darkness cover this realm? How long wilt Thou suf- fer this tyranny of men? Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." 4

1. Register of the University of St Andrews (1523 entries). 2. Life of John Knox-M' Crie, p. 17. 3. Lesley's "De Origine," 1578, p. 427; 1675, p. 407. 4. Story of the Scottish Church-M' Crie, p. 11.

In his writings, John Knox the Reformer has made it abundantly clear, that the cruel and unnecessary death at the stake of Patrick Hamilton, gave rise to serious misgivings among some of the St Andrews savants. "And so within a short space, many began to call in doubt that which before they had held for certain verity, in so much that the University of St Andrews, and St Leonard's College principally, by the labours of Master Gavin Logie, and the novices of the abbey, by the superior, began to smell somewhat of the verity, and to espy the vanity of the received superstition. Yea, within a few years after, began both Black and Grey Friars publicly to preach against pride and the idle lives of bishops, and against the abuses of the whole ecclesiastical estate." ¹ *As ARCHBISHOP BEATON WAS TOLD* "The reek of Master Patrick Hamilton has infected as many as it blew upon." ² *N.* John Craig had most probably witnessed the burning, and would remember. It is just possible that he may also have been present at the martyrdom of Henry Forrest an associate with Hamilton at St Andrews; for various dates, ranging between 1529 and 1533 have been assigned for the burning of Forrest at the stake close by where Hamilton had perished. ³ Several of the teaching staff at St Andrews were not unaffected by Reformation doctrine, among whom was Gavin Logie mentioned above. "Logie instilled into his scholars the truth secretly, which they, in process of time, spread through the whole country, whereupon did arise a proverb. When any savoured of true religion, it was said of him, 'You have drunk of St Leonard's well.'" ⁴ Opinions, heretical in the eyes of the ecclesiastical authorities, therefore, were already coming to the surface in St Andrews University, this ancient seat of Catholic medieval learning. Doubtless too, Lutheran books had

1. Laing's-Knox, Vol. 1, p. 36. 2. Ibid, p. 42. 3. Story of the Scottish Church-M' Crie, p. 35. 4. Calderwood, Vol. 1, p. 83. NOTE: VIDE, HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND TO THE REFORMATION - DUKE, P. 146. ALSO, HISTORY OF SCOTLAND - RAIT, P. 131.

found their way, clandestinely, into the rooms and "studies" of both masters and students alike. There was, in fact, an Act of Parliament, as early as 17th July, 1525, prohibiting ships from bringing any books of Luther or his disciples into Scotland, which "had always been clean from all such filth and vice." 1 *THE LATE DR. A. R. MACLEEN HAS SHOWN* that such books ~~WERE~~ *BEING* introduced into this country, and where would they be received with greater interest than at St Andrews? *A.* The intellectual atmosphere, then, when John Craig was a student of the university, was that of tension, of quickening interest in new religious ideas, and of serious and sustained heart-searching. Craig would not remain unimpressed; for he proved to be a scholar born, possessed of a keen and logical mind, though he was ever cautious, especially where any shade of doubt in a proposition remained. That the new learning had made its due mark on his fertile and powerful mind, may be judged from the following events.

John Craig probably left the University of St Andrews after he had graduated Master of Arts (with "applause," says Wodrow), around 1530. N. In what manner he was employed between the years 1530-32 we do not know. He may simply have returned home to be with his widowed mother (if she were yet alive), or he may have engaged in teaching private pupils, possibly in or around Edinburgh. The Rev. James Scott states, "that his near relatives had intended him for the service of the Church." 2 However, since Scott cites no early authority for this, and Spottiswoode (our one slender source of information for this period of Craig's life) does not mention the fact, it may be readily discounted. If Craig as a student at St Andrews had any leanings towards entering the priesthood, events there which we have noted, may well have caused him to have had

1. Acts Parl. Scotland, Vol. 2, p. 295. 2. Edinb. Christian Instructor (1811), Articles on John Craig. NOTE: For Wodrow's affirmation that Craig graduated in Arts with "applause," Vide Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 1.

A. "ON SEPT. 20TH 1527, THE ENGLISH AMBASSADOR AT ANTWERP REPORTED TO WOLSEY THAT 'DIVERS MERCHANTS OF SCOTLAND' WERE SHIPPING NEW TESTAMENTS, 'A PART TO EDINBURGH AND MOST PART TO ST ANDREWS.' — HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND, VOL. 1, P. 417 NOTE — A. R. MACLEEN.

second thoughts on the matter ere he made the great decision.

Around the year 1532, we find John Craig in the north part of England, as private tutor to the children of Lord Dacre, the English warden of the north. 1 It is of interest to note, "that Dacre's Horse played heavy havoc on that fatal day (at Flodden)." 2 During his long and distinguished life, Craig was to prove himself on occasion, rich in sentiment, but with him clarity of mind and balance of judgment were always its ward. There is every reason to believe that in the present Lord Dacre, John Craig found a warm-hearted and firm friend. The Dacres were a staunch Catholic family, and continued so, long after the Reformation in religion had become an accomplished and accepted fact in both Scotland and England. In 1583 the then Lord Dacre and the unruly Earl of Westmorland wrote from Tournai (May 5th) to William, Cardinal Allen, the undoubted and popular champion of English Catholicism: "Next unto God, of all our nation we do repose a most special trust and affiance in you.... We hereby have wholly resigned and committed ourselves to be ordered by you." 3

About the year 1534, John Craig returned home to his native Scotland, "because of wars arising between the two lands (Scotland and England)." 4 Since Lord Dacre was an active commander in the army of England, Craig's position at his lordship's house would be rendered quite impossible by reason of these hostilities, even although he had retained Dacre's confidence and friendship as he seems to have done. 5 Back once more in Scotland, Craig without further delay joined the Dominicans or Black Friars in their priory at St Andrews. 6 It may well be, that the

1. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, p. 91 et seq. 2. John Craig-Alec Walker, LL.D. (privately printed 1889), p. 4. 3. Collected Essays & Reviews-Law, p. 196. 4. Spottiswoode, as above. 5. Ibid. 6. Affairs of Church & State-Keith, Vol. 1, p. 494. Also Spottiswoode, Grab-Eccles. History of Scotland, Vol. 2, p. 113, and Law's Collected Essays, p. 280.

influence of Dacre, a sincere and devout Catholic, had decided Craig to devote himself to religion, at the same time restoring his confidence in Mother Church. This was a great, significant, and all-important step in the future reformer's long and honorable career. Henceforward, his interests became centred in the ~~spirit~~ aspirations and service of the Christian Religion; and this new zeal was to lead him in due course, by long and devious ways, and under the Divine Providence, to become right-hand man of that indomitable and forthright champion of our religious liberties, John Knox.

Craig had doubtless chosen with great care and after much earnest thought, his new sphere of service; for the Scottish Dominican Orders of this pre-Reformation period were concerned, and in some notable instances, with matters of Church reform (Vide, p. 11). As Knox says, the Black and Grey Friars waxed eloquent in their denunciation of ecclesiastical abuses, and in Bishop Lesley's History there are instances, where we hear of friars up before Church courts on charges of heresy.

We may take it for granted, that the doctrines of Martin Luther were quite obnoxious to John Craig at this decisive juncture of his life, and no doubt would continue so for many years to come, but that he hadn't wholly orthodox views on certain matters of Catholic doctrine and practice was to become soon apparent. This deflection of his was due in all probability to influences which were for the most part, external. He possessed the enquiring mind, a legacy from his student days amid surroundings that on occasion were daringly critical of standards then obtaining in the Scottish Catholic Church. Forbidden books had doubtless by surreptitious means, come his way, and scholar-like he would in all likelihood give them pain-staking consideration. He knew of Erasmus; he

had no doubt seen and possibly met John Major professor at St Andrews, and he was to find himself in due course, imitating these great teachers in his forthright criticisms of his Mother Church. But a personal cleavage from Rome, was probably, as in the case of Erasmus and John Major, the last thought that would at this time have entered into Craig's head. Would it be now, or even at an earlier stage, that he studied with growing wonder and delight the New Testament, indeed the whole Bible in its complete form, rather than the accepted and limited scripture passages supplied in current Catholic Breviaries and Catechisms? Certain it is, that the Holy Scriptures and Lutheran works were being freely distributed throughout Scotland at this period, 1 and some of these coming Craig's way, must have helped form opinions in his mind, which being expressed too freely on occasion by this new friar, brought him into trouble with established ecclesiastical authority. It is surely relevant at this stage to note, that it was the reading of a "heretical" book in years to come (The Institutes of John Calvin), that led Craig to make his final break with Rome. His restiveness in regard to matters papistical had certainly begun many years before. Was Craig, then, at this time 1534-35, one of the Black Friars of whom Knox speaks, who "began publicly to preach against pride and the idle lives of bishops, and against the abuses of the whole ecclesiastical estate." ? At any rate, he seems to have said enough in public to incur the charge of heresy. We do not know what the specific charge against Craig was, or who preferred it: whether his immediate monastic superiors, or some diocesan bishop in whose area Craig had been preaching. It was considered sufficiently grave, however, to merit condemnation, and John Craig was thrown into prison. 2 "He had

1. Act Parl. Scot., Vol. 2, p. 295. 2. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, p. 91 et seq.

not been long among them (the Dominicans) when, upon suspicion of heresy, he was put in prison," are Spottiswoode's exact words. At the early age of twenty-three, therefore, John Craig had his first considerable brush with leaders of his own Church and monkish order. How long he remained incarcerated is not indicated, but from the simple statements that "he had not been long among them," when he was arrested, and that "being cleared of that imputation, he went back again to England," it would appear that he was at least several months behind prison bars. Free again, and no doubt considerably shaken, if not chastened as well, by what must have been a most unpleasant and dangerous experience, Craig, probably feeling himself insecure in Scotland, and noting that he was still being watched by his superiors with a suspicious eye, departed for England once more. He made his re-appearance at the home of his former employer and benefactor, Lord Dacre, hoping Spottiswoode informs us, to have obtained a teaching post in the University of Cambridge, through the good offices of his nobleman friend. But in this Craig was to be disappointed; for if his native land in 1536 was not the safest place for him to reside, the England of that particular year was much less so. In any case, Lord Dacre's power and influence had considerably waned; he was no longer in favour at court since his trial before his peers on July, 9th, 1534. He had been accused of high treason, a serious charge indeed; of having as warden of the North given occasion for the late war between the two countries. Although he had been acquitted, he was not, at the moment of Craig's solicitation of his services, any more looked upon with a kindly eye by the English authorities in 1536, than Craig had been in Scotland during that same eventful year. Craig, therefore, not a little disappointed, proceeded abroad. One writer, attempting an inspired guess as to what Craig real-

17
ly did, says that he "received a reasonable offer to accompany, as traveling tutor, some English gentlemen going abroad to improve their education." 1 This of course, may well be, but no early document is available in support of this interesting and plausible theory.

There was probably a deeper reason, and one much nearer to the truth, for John Craig's sudden exodus from English soil, and this was the uneasy religious state of that country in 1536. Here is what a contemporary historian of the sixteenth century has to say with regard to that year, and his words can be proved from other similar writings of the period: "Because the King of England had repudiated his wife, Queen Catherine, and renounced and abrogated the Pope's authority within his realm, and taken upon himself the supremacy, calling himself supreme head of the Church of England, and because different religious men preached and spoke against the same, he put several of them to death; others he put in prison, and at last banished all friars forth of his realm, and some of them were received in Scotland." 2 It would seem, then, that no friar wearing the black habit of a Dominican was on secure territory particularly in the southern half of England in 1536, and it was probably for this reason more than for any other, that John Craig left these shores as expeditiously as possible, for a more hospitable country. Kirkwood Hewat maintains that Craig, on receiving no preferment in England, returned once more to Scotland, "but, like several others he was so dissatisfied with the ignorance and intolerance of the clergy, that in the following year he left his native land for France, whence he proceeded to Italy." 3 Certain it is that Craig journeyed on to Italy, but no early authority supports the contention that he came home ere he went abroad, remaining in Scotland for

1. Selections from Wodrow-Lippe, p.2. Also Christian Instructor (Edinb.), 1811, Scott Arte. on Craig. 2. History of Scotland-Lesley, p.150.
3. Makers of the Scottish Kirk-Hewat, p.351. Vide also, John Knox-Hume Brown, pp.41-56, Vol.1.

several months during 1537. He, in any case, had no need to learn as late as 1537 what many of his clerical brethren were like. It was surely dissatisfaction with the ignorance and intolerance of these very priests that was the reason why he had left Scotland during 1536.

John Craig arrived in Rome probably late in 1536 or early in the following year. 1 In all lik²lihood, he was in possession of useful letters of introduction from his patron Lord Dacre, who knew Reginald, Cardinal Pole, and would be in sympathy with his Eminence for the stand he had taken against Henry viii in the matter of the royal divorce from Queen Catherine. Pole, now living in exile in Rome, had provoked the undying resentment of the strong-willed king by his own (Pole's) well-known treatise, *De Unitate Ecclesiastica*.¹ Craig gained an access to the presence of the cardinal who was most influential and popular at the Vatican, himself being of the Carthusian order, and Pole was immediately attracted to this young and promising Scottish Dominican friar. His Eminence doubtless listened with interest and evident attention to Craig's story, and in particular would learn of his trouble with the Scottish ecclesiastical authorities, and he seems to have felt a certain amount of sympathy for this young man's point of view. The cardinal himself was credited with having liberal principles in Church matters, and indeed at times he was thought by some of his enemies not to be a true papist. "He held moderate opinions upon many points of controversy between the Churches." 2 As Hewat says, "There must have been something arresting about this young monk, for it was on the recommendation of one so great and influential as Cardinal Pole that ~~Craig~~ was admitted^{to} a place among the Dominicans *IN THE CITY OF* Bologna, where he soon became Master of the Novices." 3 Pole himself was a comparatively young man at this time, being but twelve years the senior of John Craig; and in a fashion, he too had suffered like the other for having expressed too firmly and forcibly, a young man's forthright opinions.

1. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93. 2. Collected Essays-Law, p. 280. 3. Makers of the Scottish Kirk-Hewat, p. 351.

That Craig at the comparatively early age of twenty-five received this important and responsible position at the priory in Bologna, speaks as much for his obvious personal ability, as well as for his singular good fortune. "Afterwards, when they (his superiors) perceived his diligence and dexterity in businesses, he was employed in all their affairs throughout Italy, and sent in commission to Chios, an isle situated in the Ionic sea, to redress things that were amiss amongst those of their order." 1 The cardinal in recommending Craig, had shewed himself a shrewd judge of men; in Craig, the Dominicans of Bologna had found a first-class scholar, a disciplinarian and a splendid administrator. As we shall see, these were the very gifts that Craig was in due time to bring over to the service of the Reformed Church of Scotland. Advancing in learning and in influence, Craig was at length appointed Rector of the Dominican College in Bologna, "by which he became connected with the university," but of this latter ^{STATEMENT} fact we are not certain. 2 Craig at this time must have been well grounded in the theological science of the Church to which he belonged; for Bologna, a university city, was then a flourishing centre of Catholic learning. 3 As Rector of the College, Craig apparently had under his supervision, besides the young men intended for the priesthood, the sons of noblemen and country gentlemen, who had in all probability been sent to this famous school to complete their education. How the historian would seem to have telescoped events with regard to Craig's teaching responsibilities. 4

Attention has been drawn to the fact that in the case of John Knox, there are some twenty-three years of his life, from 1522-1545, of which

1. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93. 2. Edinb. Christian Instructor, 1811, Artc. on John Craig-Scott. 3. Collected Essays-Law, p. 280. 4. Row's History (also Coronis and additions to Cor.), p. 415 & pp. 457-461.

we know practically nothing. 1 & N. Knox's own History, which is simply, besides being an apologia for the Lords of the Congregation, his own biography in his inimitable and lively style, writ large, only begins in the year 1546. 2 His friends may have considered his early life of little consequence, and in no way related to his main endeavours and therefore left us no memoirs on it (if so, they were surely in error); or Knox himself, as Hume Brown points out, may have regarded that period as worthless and ill-spent years, and indeed the "embodiment of every evil principle," which he had every good reason to abhor and detest, and therefore of such a character as to merit utter oblivion. For these or similar reasons, an equally dark veil has been drawn over the long and crowded years which John Craig spent as a highly-placed official of the Catholic Church in Bologna. Only on the rarest of occasions do we catch a glimpse of Craig amid his duties during this lengthy period of ecclesiastical and educational enterprise between the years 1538 and 1559. Once or twice do we see him in the company of his students, and there is that important occasion when in conference with other divines and laymen, "in the place of the Black Friars," Bologna, he heard famous academicians Thomas de Finola and Vicentius de Placentia speak most daringly on the true relation between princes both lay and ecclesiastical, and their subjects (we shall return to this later). 3 Craig, once again independent in thought, seems to have viewed their rather heterodoxical opinions with considerable warmth and sympathy. 4 Incidentally, according to Calderwood, Craig indicated that Finola was Rector of the University of Bologna, which seems to show that his (Craig's) own rectorship was not directly connected with Bologna's principal seat of learning.

1. John Knox-Hume Brown, Vol. 1, p. 31. 2. Knox's Works (Laign), Vol. 1, p. 137.

3. Calderwood, Vol. 2, p. 252 et seq. 4. John Knox-M' Crie, p. 282.

NOTE: Fourteen years, if Beza's reckoning of Knox's age be correct (Vide the Icones).

In all probability, John Craig was resident in Bologna during the year 1547, when the Council of Trent was transferred to that city, and duly held its second session in the palace of the archbishop, and he (Craig) may even have been present when it was in conference. The doctrines of the German reformers had however, penetrated even into the strongholds of the Pontifical territory. John Mollo had in his lectures at the university used dangerous language on points of theology, which brought upon him a citation to Rome, an admonition to abstain in future from expositions of St Paul, and finally, at the request of the archbishop, his removal from the university. 1 Bucer, in 1541, congratulated the Protestants of the city on their progress, and a few years later they can boast of being able to raise, if need be, six thousand soldiers to fight against the Pope. 2 However, there is no evidence to show that Craig was in any way deeply influenced by the new learning, though he may well have been, or that he ever lost the confidence of his superiors or incurred their suspicions until many years after.

About the year 1558 or possibly even earlier, John Craig, while engaged in the library of the Inquisition at Bologna, was attracted one day by a fairly recent published volume, The Institutes of John Calvin (first printed in 1536). 3 Deeply interested, and indeed fascinated by his wonderful discovery, we may see Craig in the privacy of his cloister, avidly reading and pondering the challenging doctrines propounded by the Genevan reformer, which he, Calvin, had been himself inspired to pen through his deep and enlightened study of the works of St Augustine. Here, surely, was the religion and theology of the early Church! Thoughts such as these must have taken possession of Craig's mind, until he became con-

1. Collected Essays-Law, p. 281. 2. Reformation in Italy-M' Crie, pp. 79, & 83. 3. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93.

vinced of their certainty. The sincerity of the change in Craig's religious thinking is revealed in the fact that he dared, with commendable courage, to share his new convictions with a fellow-Dominican. There was within the Dominican priory at Bologna, a venerable old friar with whom John Craig was on intimate terms of friendship. To him this new disciple of the Reformed Religion unburdened himself at an opportune moment, and was delighted to find that this aged friar had himself been constrained to rethink the Christian Religion also through reading Calvin's "Institutes." 1 But his venerable friend urged Craig to be silent about his new-found faith, "since," said he, "the times are perilous." ~~But~~ According to Spottiswoode, Craig neglected the counsels of the other, and began to vent too freely his criticisms of the Roman Church and its doctrines. He was quickly apprehended by his superiors, delated for heresy, and since he was a prominent churchman, he was sent to Rome, where after due examination and trial at the hands of the Inquisition, he was found guilty of the charges preferred against him, excommunicated, and condemned to be burnt at the stake.

There is a somewhat different version of this story, and one which is possibly nearer to the truth. 2 According to this account, the aged friar to whom Craig revealed his new convictions was a fellow-countryman, who, while sharing the others views, warned him to be above all things ^{TO BE} cautious, and that if he intended to become a follower of John Calvin or any other reformer, he had better, with all speed, find his way to some more tolerant country. 3 Craig complied with this advice to the extent of procuring his discharge from the priory, but did not proceed far from Bologna as he was able to find a place of refuge and of service in the family of a neighbouring nobleman who had embraced Reformation principles. 4

1. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93. 2. History of the Church of Scotland-Row (also Coronis and additions to Coronis), p. 415 & pp. 457-461. 3. Life of Knox-M' Crie, p. 238. 4. Makers of the Scottish Kirk-Hewat, p. 353.

Some time afterwards, as Craig and his youthful pupils, the children of the nobleman, were walking and conversing together in a little wood or park near the castle, whither they usually went in fine weather for prayer and study, they came upon a badly wounded soldier who had been attacked by bandits, stripped of his clothing, and left for dead. Craig tenderly cared for the helpless man, refreshed him with food and drink, and gave him clothes and money. In a second version of this particular incident, the soldier is represented as having been gravely wounded in battle, and there follows gruesome details of his injuries. 1 Whatever the true facts of the case, the point is that Craig was able to assist some wretched man in dire misfortune, and this, according to both Spottiswoode and Row, was to have a fortunate sequel for Craig himself when he too found himself in serious trouble. His peaceful days in this "secret pleasant place" with "his young students and their books," soon came to an end. His retreat of refuge was soon discovered by his ecclesiastical enemies, who were now bent on encompassing his destruction. They arrested Craig and his Protestant nobleman friend, charged them with being heretics, thereafter sending them to the Inquisition authorities in Rome who cast them both into a foul prison. We learn that up till then, Craig had "continued a considerable while teaching the Reformed Religion." 2 Although this statement is to be found in the somewhat embellished account of Row, it does seem to fit in with what subsequently happened to John Craig, namely, his condemnation to be burnt at the stake. 3 Like Huss, Hamilton and Wishart, Craig very likely persisted in teaching unorthodox opinions in defiance of the Roman Catholic authorities, so that in their eyes he had been a marked man for some considerable time.

Craig lingered for upwards of nine months within a gloomy dungeon of the Inquisition, which means that his arrest had taken place during No-

1. Row (additions to Coronis), pp. 457-461. 2. Ibid. 3. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93, and also Row, as above.

125
vember or December of the year 1558. 1 According to Row's account, he was confined within "a base prison or pit, into which the river Tiber flowed at every tide, so that the prisoners stood in water sometimes almost to their middle." This statement has been challenged on the grounds that the Mediterranean is practically tideless. Yet, since Craig and his fellow-prisoners spent the entire winter and spring in prison, there must have been times when through torrential rains, the Tiber would be in spate which may well have resulted in their cells being flooded to their ^{CAPTIVES'} very great misery and peril.

Dr. Law in his "Collected Essays and Reviews," says that

"With Paul iv who then occupied the papal chair, Craig seemed to have had small chance of escape. The chief interests of this rigorous and austere pontiff centred in the Inquisition, which he had been the means of restoring. He was busy during his pontificate (1555-1559) with enlarging its jurisdiction and in legislation for its action, and in his zeal against heretics he authorised the application of torture for the detection of their accomplices. In his dying moments he commended his favourite institution to the care of his cardinals." 2

This terrible old man died on the evening of August, 18th, 1559, aged eighty-four years. All that night the prisoners of the Inquisition in Rome, Craig included, sang praises to God, and bespoke their prayers, as Paul and Silas of old. 3 Pope Paul iv had been cordially hated by the Roman citizens, and as soon as they learned of his death, they started riots throughout the city. The furious mob pulled down the late pope's statue from its pedestal, dragged it through the streets of Rome "for three days," and finally threw it into the Tiber. During these tumultuous happenings, some of the mob broke into all the prisons, subjected officers of the Inquisition to rough handling, and set their buildings on fire. 4 Finally, all prisoners were set free, including the con-

1. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93. 2. Collected Essays-Law, p. 281. 3. Row (Coronis) p. 452. 4. History of Scotland-Grub, Vol. 2, p. 113 et seq.

demned heretics among whom was John Craig. His deliverance came none too soon, for he was to have been burnt at the stake on the morning of August, 19th, 1559. ¹ Regaining, therefore, his eleventh hour escape from death as if by miracle, Craig made his way out of Rome with all possible speed. Spottiswoode warrants that even at this marvellous stroke of good fortune, there were some among the liberated prisoners whose courage failed (their powers of resistance being probably sapped through their rigorous confinement), "for they thought that it had been some snare." ² According to Row, Craig's own escape from Rome was rendered more hazardous through his being apprehended in the first instance as a Huguenot, for so, says the former, all these of the Reformed Religion were called. Row goes on to tell how all the prisoners, except the Huguenots, had been released during the rioting. They had been forgotten in the excitement of the moment, because their prison lay in an obscure part of the city. "But," continues he, "on the second day (of the riots), the Lord opened their doors, and they including John Craig, were set free." This part of Row's story bears a strong resemblance to what happened to Paul and Silas at Philippi (Vide Acts 16). It is highly probable, though, that Craig and the other condemned heretics found it more difficult to escape than others in custody for ordinary offences, for they would be specially guarded. Kirkwood Hewat seems to think so. He also mentions that there was an ancient custom in Rome to the effect that when the Pontiff died, all prisoners were set free; "but, while those who were confined for debt and other civil offences were liberated, heretics were granted only a partial or temporary freedom. They had to return to their cells." ³ Row on the other hand says that on such occasions, "all prisoners, no matter what their crimes had been, were released." ⁴ One thing is certain, and that is that John Craig regained his freedom.

1. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93. Also Row (add. to Coronis & Coronis) pp. 457-461. 2. Ibid. 3. Makers of the Scottish Kirk-Hewat, p. 353. 4. Row, as above.

After their escape from prison, Craig and his companions sought temporary refuge in a secluded suburban hostelry. Meanwhile, order being restored in Rome, a commission from the Inquisition had been dispatched with all possible haste to recapture the fleeing heretics, and its officer and men met up with them, though at first unaware of the fact, in the inn where Craig and they were sheltering. The Inquisitors crowded into its main room whilst Craig, cold, hungry and in rags, was warming himself before the fire. Spottiswoode, differing from Row's two accounts of this incident, affirms that Craig fell into the hands of brigands, "loose men," he calls them.¹ The soldiers or brigands ordered their meal from the hostler, and Craig was filled with fear lest ^{he} should be recognised and recaptured. Their leader, "an officer of the Pope's army,"² began to observe Craig, being soon convinced that this was one of the men he was seeking. Craig noted this, and thinking that his last hour had really come, in considerable trepidation he awaited the end. But a strange providence occurred at this very instant. The soldiers too, had recognised Craig, and would have killed him there and then, but their leader ordered them to desist, and calling him aside, he demanded if at such and such a time and place near Bologna, he had ever seen a naked, wounded man, and had mercifully and generously come to his assistance. Craig, doubtless in a highly nervous condition through this sudden intrusion of his enemies, answered that he did not recall the incident. "Do you recall," insisted the officer, "that walking in a time among fields with some young noblemen, there came unto you a poor maimed soldier, begging for relief?" Craig had still some difficulty to call the happening to mind; for it had in all probability taken place several years before, slipping his memory in the terror of his present plight. "Then I do," said the other; "I'm the man, and

1. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93. 2. Row (Coronis & add. to Cor.), p. 452, & pp. 457-461.

your kind and humane liberality to me then, the Lord calls me to requite now." Thereupon he assured Craig that he need fear no longer, bidding him to make good his escape, and giving him, says Row, his horse and money. Spottiswoode tells us that this benefactor "conveyed Craig through the suburbs of Rome and showed him his safest course to Bologna." Craig hastened there with all possible speed in the hope that he would find a suitable place of refuge: "He trusted to find some kindness among his acquaintances there, but on coming they eyed him with suspicion, and fearing more trouble he slipped away secretly and made tracks for Milan."¹

The earliest sources for this portion of Craig's life are the historians Spottiswoode and Row, who tell in the main the same story, although their accounts differ somewhat in points of detail. Row gives twice, the incident of Craig and the soldiers, the second account being more fullsome. He does not mention in either of these, Craig's return to Bologna to seek help from his friends. The fact is that Row gives a more Protestant complexion to Craig's actions from 1557-1558 onwards, than does Spottiswoode. As we already noted, according to Row there was an interval of quite considerable extent between John Craig's conversion to the reformed faith, and his delation for heresy, during which he was tutor to a Protestant nobleman's children. Dr. M'Crie in his life of John Knox, adopts this version of Craig's story, and states that he had obtained his discharge from the Dominican priory at Bologna.² Dr. Law opines that

"It would be interesting, if from original documents at Bologna or Rome, the facts of the case, and the character of Craig's convictions at the time, could be ascertained with certainty. But there can be little doubt that at Vienna (which he reached eventually) he preached as a Dominican friar."³

¹. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93. ². John Knox-M'Crie, p. 238. ³. Collected Essays-Law, p. 283.

Wodrow, accepts the Spottiswoode version of John Craig's escape, and suggests that Row has simply related the same story with additional circumstances. Row, Wodrow continues, being ordained to the ministry shortly after Craig's death in 1600 (Row was actually ordained around 1592), might have had the true facts from the reformer himself. Since there was a great intimacy between Craig and the historian's father (John Row the reformer, and minister of Perth), Row secundus might well have been in possession of circumstances that Spottiswoode omits. This is also the view taken by Dr. Thomas M'Crie, who wrote the lives of Knox and Andrew Melville. Row's "Coronis" (which tells of Craig's Italian adventures), was probably written by John Row, his second son, who was born at Carnock, Fife, in the year 1598, where his father was parish minister. The "Coronis" was written considerably later than the historical book of Row primus, yet it is obviously the result of close personal contact on the author's part, with the family of John Craig, particularly his widow. The "Additions" to Row's "Coronis" came into being even later still; its author was most probably William, another of Row the historian's sons. 1 Concerning these "Additions," William Row (or whoever he be) claims that here "you have the following particulars, and others anent Mr. Craig, better and more particularly related." 2

Did John Craig ever meet John Row, the father of the Church historian, whilst the former was stationed at Bologna? It is not unlikely that he did, for Row the reformer, himself a graduate of St Andrews and some fourteen years younger than Craig, was engaged for some time in study at Padua, some forty miles north of Bologna, where he graduated Doctor of Laws in 1557. Row was in Italy for some eight years altogether, being mostly resident at Rome, 1550-1558. At the Reformation he repudiated this doc-

1. Makers of the Scottish Kirk-Hewat, p.261. 2. Row's History (Additions to Coronis), pp.457-461.

torate of the University of Padua, being addressed thereafter as Master John Row. 1

But to return to John Craig. Some weeks after his escape from Rome, Craig found himself again in dire circumstances. He had exhausted the money that his liberator had so generously given him, since he had been forced to travel slowly by keeping to side-roads for fear of being discovered on the main highway. According to Row, he had been given the use of a horse, but if so, he seems to have parted company with it. He may well have been forced to sell the animal to provide himself with money; or, he may have abandoned it, since riding on horse-back made him too conspicuous. There now occurred what was probably the most colourful incident in his long career, the truth of which has been roundly challenged by his Catholic enemies and others. Spottiswoode says of it:

"I should scarce relate (the incident), so incredible it seems, if to many of good place he himself had not often repeated it (surely this is the phrase to weigh?) as a singular testimony of God's care of him." 2

When Craig had travelled for several days along tracks which were little frequented, he came at length to a forest in the midst of a wild and deserted place, where, sore weary with his journey and privations, he lay down among the shelter of some bushes, near to which flowed a small stream. As he sought what refreshment he could in rest, he lay there "full of thoughts," and not a little afraid, for he seems to have lost his way. At this moment, a stray dog came fawning upon him, glad doubtless at finding company in so lonely a place; it had a purse between its teeth, and it laid this down at Craig's feet. Craig sprang up greatly startled, for his immediate thought was that the creature's owner or owners were near at hand. At length satisfied that he was quite alone,

1. Makers of the Scottish Kirk-Hewat, p. 227. Row's History (Introduction).
2. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93.

he picked up the purse which he found to contain money, and construing the same, in great thankfulness, to proceed from God's favourable providence, he pursued his way with renewed hope till he came to a little village. He had intended to make his way into France, but meeting with friendly travellers proceeding to Vienna in Austria, he changed his intended course and went in their company thither. 1

This remarkable, though by no means incredible story, is also told by Row, but with additional circumstances "and signs of legendary growth." 2 According to him

"As Craig journeyed through a country town, there followed him a pretty dog, fawning upon him as if he were his master. He chased the dog away from him, fearing that he should have been challenged for stealing so pretty a dog, but the dog would not be chased away, but followed him a space out of town.... At last Mr. Craig began to make of the dog, and was content, seeing he would not go back, to take him to bear him company on his travels, and so the dog followed him for some days, and waited carefully on him as master."

It was not till later on in his flight, when Craig, overcome with heat and fatigue, had betaken himself to prayer that

"his dog, his kind fellow-traveller, comes to him, and with his foot scrapes upon his shoulder. After he had scraped once again and the third time, Mr. Craig looks up and sees in the dog's mouth a full purse. The dog shakes the purse upon Mr. Craig, offering it to him. He was astonished, and feared to touch the purse, but the dog looked kindly in his face.... Mr. Craig took the purse out of the dog's mouth, and opening it, finds it a purse full of gold, of one kind of gold..... and being then well provided by this which he called his viaticum (travel-money), after some stay in France, he comes home to Scotland, and brought with him to Edinburgh, the dog, the purse, and some of the gold." 3

This, Row says in conclusion

"though it may seem fabulous to some, I know it to be as certain as

1. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93. 2. Collected Essays-Law, p. 283.
3. Dr. Scott-Fasti Eccles. Scot., Vol. 1, p. 82-accepts as historical, this part of Row's narrative.

any human thing can be, for the wife of this worthy servant of Jesus Christ, living in Edinburgh (where he was one of the town ministers, and very honest, straight and famous in his time), survived her husband for many years, until the year 1630, did often relate this history, with all the passages of it, to me and many others. She was an honest woman, fide digna, well-known in Edinburgh under the name of Dame Craig." 1

This singular piece of good fortune, coming as it did at a critical hour during his escape, enabled Craig to elude his pursuers, and to reach at last the comparative safety of Austrian soil. The experience made a deep and lasting impression on the mind and heart of the reformer, for he never tired of relating it to his Scottish friends. "He often repeated it to many in good standing," are, as we have noted, Spottiswoode's very words. This marvellous story of Craig and the dog with the purse of gold, became known to all and sundry, he doubtless using it at times in his sermons, as an example of the strange and kindly ways of providence. The reply of his Catholic enemies was to the effect that the incident only went to prove that Craig was really in league with the Devil! 2 But long before John Hamilton, a Scottish secular priest and an able champion of Catholicism, began to pour scorn and ridicule upon the incident (Vide his Facile Tractise, published in 1600), an earlier Catholic writer of satirical verse appears to have alluded to it, albeit indirectly. This was Nicol Burne, formerly professor of Philosophy at the University of St Andrews, who around 1579 re-embraced Catholicism, only to find himself soon afterwards in serious trouble with the General Assembly of the Church, as also with the civil authorities at Edinburgh. John Craig, in the name of the Reformed Church, had a principal hand in dealing strictly with Burne, a circumstance which he (Burne) did not lightly forget or forgive. In France, where he had been allowed to go for asylum, Burne wrote and published in the Scottish vernacular his "Dispu-

1. Row's History (Coronis and add. to Cor.), pp. 452-461. 2. Catholic Tractates-Law, p. 53 (Introd.), and also his chapter on the Facile Tractise by John Hamilton.

tation concerning the heads of Religion....," and to several copies of this work was appended a satirical poem in the vernacular, which is generally accepted as his own creation. 1 It is entitled "An admonition to the antichristian ministers in the 'deformit' Kirk of Scotland," and it runs to 370 lines, but it is on the whole a weak effort. 2 However, it is not without interest if only for its numerous references to clergymen of the time who had gone over to the Reformed Church. It was first published in 1581. It makes mention of John Craig thrice, and in lines 131-132 there is, without doubt, a contemptuous reference, even if oblique, to the "uncanny" incident of the dog:

"Practices and prophecies of Necromancy
Craig that apostate, has in tuition(hand)."

This was a shrewd hit at Craig, whose miraculous story of the "fawning dog," laid him open to the charge of practising the "black arts," and the comparison would not be without its appeal to the strong superstitious instincts of ordinary Scots of that time. Dr. Cranstoun, editor of the "Satirical Poems of the Reformation," is of the firm conviction that this reference by Burne to Craig, hints broadly at the story of "the dog with the purse of gold."

Dr. John Hamilton, to whom reference has already been made, was a brave, clever but unprincipled opponent of the Scottish reformers. 1 In his *Facile Tractise*, he has some harsh words to say about John Craig:

"We have a notable example of Friar John Craig who cast his cowl, and went through a forest in Italy, as he himself boasted in sundry companies, because a black dog gave to him by the way a purse of gold. The colour of the dog may declare whether it was sent by a good spirit or not; for the Holy Spirit descended upon Christ in the likeness of a white dove. For this apostacy, this unfrocked friar was made an apostle of this fifth Gospel in Edinburgh..." 2

Hamilton's virulent criticisms in this section of his work, are directed against the (as he says) lustfulness of the ex-priests who married, and we will return to this particular later. In fulminating against John Craig, Hamilton gratuitously furnished valuable corroborative evidence on the reformer's earlier life. As for his criticisms, they did no real damage either to the reputation of Craig, or to the cause of the Scottish Reformation. Naturally, Hamilton as a loyal Catholic, could not believe that a condemned heretic such as John Craig, would be assisted by providence in the time of his extremity. But this direct reference to Craig's adventure, surely proves that it was already well-known during his lifetime to friend and foe alike, and that by neither was it held in any doubt. That Craig "boasted in sundry companies" about the adventure, is sheer exaggeration on Hamilton's part, for the reformer has left on his contemporaries the impression that he was the most modest of men. It is of interest to note, that Hamilton's account of Craig's adventures has more in common with Row's story than with Spottiswoode's: "John Craig who cast off his cowl..." and "this unfrocked friar..." 3 These words, meant only to be sarcastic, are most revealing. We may take it as highly probable, therefore, that Craig did sever his connection with the Bolog-

1. *Catholic Tractates-Law*, p. 53 (Intro.). 2. *Facile Tractise-Hamilton*, p. 438. 3. *Row*, p. 415, & 457-461.

35
nian Dominican priory some time before his arrest on the charge of heresy. That Hamilton refers to Craig as an "unfrocked friar," is further proof that he was a Romish priest, and that he had been excommunicated by his Church. All this Row affirms, and it is most unlikely that he obtained his facts from the Facile Tractise. However, in Row's History, there is mention made on at least two occasions, of the "pretty dog" that met up with Craig during his wanderings. May not this be an indication that Row or his sons had read Hamilton's work? Would their insistence on the animal's attractiveness be intended as a counter to the insinuation of Hamilton, that the dog which had aided Craig was black? Black, because Hamilton wished to convey the idea that the animal was an evil spirit in bodily form. But Hamilton must have supplied the colour of the creature from his fertile imagination only, for neither Spottiswoode nor Row make any mention of this singular fact.

At least one Protestant historian scorns the "credulity" of Spottiswoode, Row, Wodrow, Thomas M'Crie and others, for accepting these "marvels" concerning Craig, which he says, "grow greater at every stage." This is Grub, and he concludes thus:

"It is worth observing that the author of the most wonderful edition of the dog and the purse of gold, by whose assistance Craig effected his escape, is also the sole voucher for the conversion of Row by the means of the pretended miracle of Loretto." 1

Grub is sceptical about Craig's Italian adventures. While it does seem that accretions have supplemented these, they are nevertheless essentially true. Hamilton's Facile Tractise, were it to stand alone, proves by its acceptance of them, that Grub has failed to do them justice. Even the Catholic Bellesheim has left these incidents an open question, though his translator, Hunter Blair says that "Spottiswoode relates on no sufficient

1. Ecclesiastical History of Scotland-Grub, Vol. 2, p. 114 NOTE . . .

authority, various wonderful adventures supposed to have been experienced by Craig after his escape from Rome." 1 Blair was either unaware of their mention in Hamilton's Facile Tractise, or he chose to ignore it. The significant thing is, surely, that the kernel of Craig's "wonderful adventures" was first given in book form a few months before he died, not by friend or partisan, but by an able Catholic opponent.

In a most unusual book, full of the superstitious beliefs of the time, and written about the year 1670 by George Sinclair, professor of Philosophy and later of Mathematics at the University of Glasgow, we find the story of "the dog with the purse of gold" linked with the strangest of folk-lore. 2 Sinclair's facts have been obviously gleaned from Row, and make Craig appear, as Hill Burton remarks, "in rather awkward company." 3

There is to be found in the High Kirk of St Giles, on one of its main pillars near to the pulpit, a brass tablet in memory of John Craig, minister there for almost ten years, on which is represented his faithful canine friend. Above the animal, which is depicted with a purse in its mouth are the well-chosen words, "My Ally." Craig is also depicted, among others of the Scottish reformers, on a stained-glass window in the banqueting hall of Edinburgh castle, scene of several of his chief endeavours.

Around the time when John Craig was making good his escape, great events were being shaped in Scotland. John Knox and his reformer friends were steadily gaining ground, and on October, 16th, 1559, the forces of the Congregation, as the Reformation party called themselves, entered Edinburgh in triumph. 3 They were still to know serious reverses, but by their agreement with England, signed at Berwick-on-Tweed, on the 27th,

1. History of the Catholic Church in Scotland-Bellesheim, Vol. 3, pp. 92-93.
 2. Satan's Invisible World Discovered-Sinclair, p. 155. 3. Knox's Works-Laing, Vol. 1, p. 437. NOTE: Vide, C, appendix. Also, History of Scotland-Hill Burton, Vol. 5, p. 149.

January, 1560, their ultimate success was assured. Their cause was strengthened also from an altogether different circumstance; for by the death of the Queen Regent, Mary of Lorraine, on the 10th June, 1560, the Scottish Catholics soon found themselves without the assistance of French armed forces. The reformers had won the day, and John Knox had the satisfaction of seeing the Protestant party triumph. Without his labours, faith and courage, things might well have been otherwise. Thus, by the time John Craig arrived in Scotland, which he did during the winter of 1560-1561, the Reformation in his native land had begun. But the reformers were to discover that a hard task lay ahead of them. They soon found themselves engaged in a protracted struggle, against reactionary forces at court and even within their Reformed Kirk, a struggle which continued almost unabated till the end of the sixteenth century and even beyond. In this sustained and sometimes bitter contest, John Craig was destined to play a conspicuous and worthy part.

Towards the end of the year 1559, Craig crossed into Austria, his troubles for the present over, and on reaching Vienna he was fortunate to gain an entrance to the royal court, where he received a favourable reception from the Archduke Maximilian. Spottiswoode calls Maximilian the emperor, but though it is true that at this period he shared with his father Ferdinand the responsibility of government, Ferdinand was still on the throne. Indeed, because of his alleged Lutheran sympathies, Maximilian, when the throne fell vacant, experienced no little difficulty in being accepted as emperor. Sir James Melville, who was engaged on a diplomatic mission in Austria during 1562, says that "Maximilian was chosen lately King of the Romans not without difficulty. Ferdinand (his father) had been a devout Catholic.... but Maximilian seemed to be a zealous protestant." 1 In 1558, Paul iv, part of whose career we have noted, hesitated to

1. Sir James Melville's Memoirs-Bannatyne Club, p. 93.

recognise Ferdinand as emperor, and severely blamed him for being the cause of his son's alienation from the Catholic faith by having given him a heretical education. 1 The reproaches of the Pope gave a fresh stimulus to Maximilian's opposition to Rome, so that when Craig-whose name and fame had obviously preceded him-appeared at the imperial palace, the archduke welcomed him. He listened to Craig with pleasure, since he too had been a sufferer from the late Pope's persecuting zeal. Craig, we learn, "professed there as a Dominican-which seems odd, after what had befallen him at Rome-and preached before Maximilian, who liking him and his teaching, would have detained him." 2 But Craig was to have no respite from his enemies; for the new Pope, Pius iv, learning of the whereabouts of this heretic, sent letters to Maximilian, demanding that he be sent back to Rome since he was under the condemnation of the Church. But the archduke, liking Craig too much to hand him over to certain death, yet at the same time not being desirous of engaging in an open quarrel with the new pontiff over giving asylum to a heretical preacher, sent him away with letters of safe conduct. Craig hastened from Vienna, and travelling through Germany and France, he reached England probably during the summer of 1560. 3 Row is silent about the Vienna episode, though Wodrow has accepted Spottiswoode's account of it as being historically correct. 4 Did John Craig meet any of the great continental reformers on his way home? It would surely be of interest to know; but history is silent as to the vicissitudes of that journey.

Now in England, a friendlier land than he had known it in 1536, Craig learned that the Reformation in Religion had begun in Scotland. It is probable, that over the previous twenty years, he had been kept in touch with the main current of events in Scotland, through corresponding

1. Collected Essays-Law, p. 285. 2. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93.
3. Ibid. 4. Selections from Wodrow-Lippe, p. 6.

with his relatives and friends in Edinburgh and elsewhere. There were also Scotsmen sojourning in Italy, some of whom on occasion he was bound to meet, and from whom doubtless he would learn news about Scotland. When Craig returned to England, it may well be that he met John Willock; for the latter was there during the summer of 1560. He had been sent to London with the Scottish ambassadors, to seek aid from Queen Elizabeth.

As soon as John Craig returned to Edinburgh, he offered his services to the newly Reformed Church of Scotland. Knox was doubtless glad to have Craig, for there was great need of ministers with gifts of character and ability such as his. At the first General Assembly, or Convention of the Church as it was called, only six ministers were present (some authorities say eight), together with thirty-six laymen.¹ Craig seems to have remained in the background for upwards of a year, because, according to Spottiswoode, "His long disuse of his native language, made him not very useful at first. Occasionally, to the intellectuals he preached in Latin in the Magdalene chapel."² Wodrow, commenting on these lectures, says that they were given by Craig because "He was a learned and pious person."³ The Magdalene chapel still stands, and of it Dr. Story wrote:

"The chapel of St Mary Magdalene, in the very heart of the old city, still raises its tower above the meaner roofs; but its destiny is hardly worthy of its tradition. It has passed into the hands of a body known as the 'Protestant Institute,' and is no longer one of the national churches. Although it has suffered from mutilation and neglect, it is not beyond the reach of careful and intelligent restoration."⁴

At least one of the General Assemblies was held there, that of the 24th April, 1578, Andrew Melville being moderator, and John Craig serving on several of their important committees. The setting of this General Assembly must have provided Craig with happy memories.

It is probable, that among those who heard Craig preach in the Magdalene chapel, was his nephew Thomas Craig who later became the celebrated feudalist lawyer, and friend of King James vi. The younger Craig had recently returned from his studies abroad, and he appears to have continued his education under the superintendence of his uncle who was an auth-

¹.Book of the Universal Kirk,p.3. Petrie,p.222. ².Spottiswoode,Vol.3, pp.91-93. ³.Wodrow Selections-Lippe,p.1. ⁴.John Craig,D.D.-Story (privately printed lecture),p.25.

ority on civil and canon law. 1 D.B.Smith, writing in the Scottish Historical Review, says

"Two influences, the grave humanism of the French jurists, and the bourgeois wisdom of the noblesse de la robe, were sufficiently strong to limit the effect of the close personal relation which bound him (Thomas Craig) to his paternal uncle for a period after his return to Scotland. To the latter was entrusted the completion of the lad's education, which in 1561 meant in effect the assimilation of the atmosphere of the Scottish Reformation. Craig was fortunate in being initiated into this new world by a cosmopolitan whose prestige must have been sufficient to impress his pupil.....; for John Craig was destined to form one of the band of regular clergy which gave intellectual force and organisation to the Scottish Reformed Church.... The sanity and theological acumen of John Craig appealed to him sufficiently to make him define himself as a Protestant lawyer but lightly incumbered with theological baggage. During his long life, he played a part in Church courts—he seems to have been advocate of the Church of Scotland around 1600—but his part was always that of a lawyer, primarily interested in the Church as an institution." 2 N.

This last phrase may be said with equal truth of the reformer, from whom in all likelihood the younger Craig derived the idea.

John Craig's facility to speak his native tongue seems to have returned to him quickly, for during the summer of 1561 we find that he was appointed minister of Holyroodhouse chapel in the Canongate. 3 Yet this appointment, as Law has shown, could have been only nominal, for Queen Mary returned from France during August, commandeering the chapel for the use of her Catholic priests. 4 Craig, however, was retained in Edinburgh, Knox and others doubtless not wishing to part with his services in the capital. It would appear, that Knox as sole minister of the High Kirk of St Giles, had already plans for Craig's future. It had become essential for Knox in the interests of the Reformation, to itinerate from time to time, and in Craig, Knox was certain he had found the man who would be an adequate deputy minister at St Giles. Thus, aided by the

JOHN KNOX'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND -
 1. Sir Thomas Craig-Tytler, p. 21 et seq. ~~Knox's Works~~ - Dickinson (editor), Vol. 2, p. 132. 2. Scottish Historical Review, Vol. 12, pp. 278-279, and note. 3. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, pp. 91-93. 4. Collected Essays - Law, p. 286.

NOTE: HE IS MENTIONED IN THE REFORMER'S LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT. VIDE, P. 196.

42
Town Council, and having the consent of Craig, Knox took steps to have him as colleague. The Town Council Minute of 8th April, 1562, reads as follows:

"The Council understanding the tedious and heavy labours sustained by their minister, John Knox, in preaching thrice in the week, and twice on the Sunday, ordains unanimously to solicit and persuade Master John Craig, presently minister of the Canongate, to accept upon him the half charge of the preaching in the said Kirk of Edinburgh, for such good deed as they can agree upon." 1

Note that Craig only is designated "Master"; for although John Knox studied at the College in Glasgow, he was not a graduate. Craig was still officially "minister of the Canongate," (indeed, the burgh's first Reformed minister), which implies that he had been able to function there during the previous winter, notwithstanding the presence of the French priests at Holyroodhouse chapel.

The "General Assembly" was so designated for the first time during December, 1562. When it had met in May, 1561, it was described as the "Whole Kirk convened"; in June, 1562, it was called the "Convention of the Kirk of Scotland"; but when it met during December of this year, it was officially described as "The General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland," and so it has continued to be designated with the exception of the word, "Kirk," which has been supplanted by that of "Church."

The fourth General Assembly met in Edinburgh on the 29th of June, 1562. At their fourth sederunt of July 2nd, "It was ordained that Mr. Craig should be joined with Mr. Knox in the ministry of Edinburgh," the Assembly recording that "the harvest is great, but the labourers are few." 2 It was due to this scarcity of ordained men, that Craig was delegated at this time, along with David Lindsay of Leith, to teach in the unplanted kirks of the Merse, for a month each. 3

1. Burgh Records of Edinburgh (1557-1571). 2. Calderwood, Vol. 2, p. 186.
3. Book of the Universal Kirk (Maitland Club), p. 18.

Although Craig had no hand in compiling the First Book of Discipline of the Reformed Church of Scotland, his name is to be found among the important men who signed it. This is surely an indication that already, Craig was being reckoned among the leading reformers.

For over ten momentous years, John Craig with courage, distinction and exemplary devotion to duty, ministered in the High Kirk of St Giles. He became one of Scotland's outstanding preachers, was reasonable yet forthright in his sermons, and it is little wonder that the citizens of Edinburgh and not a few of the nobility, crowded to hear him. He lived in stirring times, when the pulpit exercised the function of the public press of to-day and boldly criticised public men and public measures. Craig was sometimes brought into collision with constituted authority, for his fearless yet relevant denunciations. Unlike Knox, Rollock and others, Craig with a modesty that was characteristic of the man, never published any of his sermons. There exist excerpts from a few of these, and also copious notes on a sermon which he delivered on the "Babylonian captivity of the Church," on new year's day-25th of March as it was then-1582.N. The manuscript of this sermon, which was in all likelihood copied out by the English ambassador Bowes or his secretary, is in the custody of the British Museum. Yet Craig was a master of the spoken word and of the written; and with regard to the latter, though comparatively few works have come from his pen, what we have is of the highest order, being characterised by lucidity of thought, scholarship and vigour. We know what the substance of many of his sermons was. In his "Short Sum of the Whole Catechism," published in 1581, and which he dedicated to his Aberdeen congregation which he served faithfully for six years he wrote as follows:

"It is not unknown to you, dear brethren, in the Lord, that for your sakes chiefly I took pains, first to gather this

NOTE: Vide, p.146.

brief sum. Therefore, willing now to set it out, and make it common to others, I thought it good to recommend the same to you again in particular, as a token of my good-will towards you all, and as a memorial of my doctrine, and earnest labours, bestowed among you, and upon that (part of the) country, for the space of six years..." 1

At St Giles, Craig preached the great truths about God and man, relating these truths with perception, to the events of the time. Nor did he always please his hearers, any more than did John Knox. Occasionally, there were noisy protests against his preaching, particularly from courtiers. He narrowly escaped being murdered in his pulpit, when a soldier of the royal guard, possibly at the instigation of the court, struck at him with a dagger. This outrage is mentioned in a letter which Sir John Foster, the English ambassador, sent to Cecil on the 8th of May, 1566.² Craig was also assaulted in the High street, at a spot not far from St Giles, on the following year by one, George Coutts. But the Town Council dealt sternly with Coutts as its Minute of 20th June, 1567, clearly shows:

"The provost, bailies, and council ordain John Harwood, treasurer, to deliver George Coutts, now being imprisoned in the thieves hole for his contempt done to Master John Craig, minister, the sum of 12/6; and ordains him to be taken from prison and conveyed to Leith and shipped from there by two officers, and this in respect of our Sovereign's writing obtained to that effect and of his long imprisonment...." 3

Transportation seems a rather harsh sentence for Coutts, but his crime must have been sufficiently grave for the authorities to have acted thus. That Queen Mary appears to have sympathised with Craig, surely shows that she regarded the assault as an exceedingly lawless act. It is possible, that the soldier with the dagger, and George Coutts were one and the same person, but of this we cannot be sure.

Three weeks after the General Assembly had approved of Craig's ap-

1. Craig's Catechism (Introduction by the author). 2. Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, 1566-1568, No. 385. 3. Burgh Records of Edinburgh-1557-1571.

pointment to St Giles, the Town Council engaged his services and those of Spottiswoode, the superintendent of Lothian, to examine the scholastic qualifications of their Grammar School head-master, William Robertson. 1 Trouble had been brewing between members of the Town Council and Robertson for some time. John Mescrop, procurator of Edinburgh, had laid complaints against him, alleging in the Council that he wasn't sufficiently trained for his responsible position, being in particular deficient in his knowledge of Greek and Latin. Robertson had obtained his appointment in pre-Reformation days, through the favour of the abbot of Holyroodhouse, whose "gift" it was. The abbot, apparently, was at the time of the appointment a minor under fourteen years of age, and Mescrop contended that since this was so, Robertson's appointment ought to have had the imprimatur of the abbot of Cambuskenneth, who was administrator and governor of the abbot of Holyroodhouse. 2 The Town Council decided that Robertson should be examined "by cunning and learned men," Craig, as we have noted, being considered one of these. 3 With commendable alacrity and thoroughness, Spottiswoode, Craig and others put Robertson to the test, and duly reported on the 3rd, October, 1562, that he was deficient in his knowledge of "Greek and Latin." Robertson was, therefore, dismissed from his post, but the queen intervened on his behalf with the result that the case dragged on until 1584, when the Town Council was able to be quit of him, at the same time granting him a retiral pension of 200 merks a year. 4

Robertson was doubtless a misfit, but probably the real reason why the Town Council was so keen to be rid of him, was that at the Reformation, he had remained attached to the Catholic religion. 5 Knox, who was a keen educationalist, and other of the reformers including Craig, must have decided that the training of the young people of Edin-

1. Burgh Records of Edinburgh-22nd July, 1562. 2. Ibid-3rd October, 1562. 3. Ibid-22nd July, 1562. 4. Ibid-3rd April, 1584. 5. John Knox-M' Crie, p. 362.

burgh, would never be in the best of hands, while Robertson an unrepentant papist remained head-master. The reformers may also have considered this a test case; for while Church patronage remained, Knox and his co-adjutors knew only too well that the work of religious upbuilding would be greatly inconvenienced thereby, if not considerably thwarted. That Queen Mary came to the support of Robertson, was but another straw in the wind, that showed the reformers that they need look for little sympathy and understanding from what Knox called "that corrupt court." That Robertson was suffered to continue as head-master of the Grammar School for so long, receiving a generous pension in the end, is surely proof, if that be needed, of the tolerance and forbearance of the men who consolidated the Reformation in Scotland.

Craig appears to have commenced his duties at St Giles in the autumn of 1562, though he may well have been assisting Knox in an unofficial capacity from the previous April. Thomas M'Crie is of the opinion that Craig was not inducted as minister there, until the following summer of 1563, because of difficulties relating to the settlement of his stipend. But from a study of the Burgh Records of Edinburgh, it is evident that M'Crie is in error. For instance, he quotes as his authority for Craig's delayed induction, a Town Council Minute of 18th June, 1563, there-after giving in full the content of this Minute in support of his theory. But the Minute which he really produces is not that of 18th June, 1563, but that of the 19th June, 1562, a Minute which was simply supplementing that of 8th April of the same year:

"The provost and council after long reasoning upon the necessity of ministers find there shall be another minister elected by the provost...and elders of this burgh, and joined to John Knox, minister, and for the sustaining of them both, together with John Cairns, reader, ordain that the bailies each within his own quarter, to convene the merchants and require of every one of them what they will give quarterly for the cause of the aforesaid; and like-

wise the said deacons to convene their crafts, and report their answers upon Wednesday next." 1

These officials duly reported on the day specified that

"If my lord provost, bailies.....would appoint a special sum in the year for the said ministers-Knox and Craig-, they and their crafts would gladly consent.... to give a fifth of the whole...." 2

It is true, however, as M'Crie says, that John Craig had considerable difficulty to obtain his stipend, which must have caused him much inconvenience. Even the reader, John Cairns, seems to have been similarly neglected. Hence we learn that

"the council understanding that this half year past there has been no manner of provision made nor support given to John Craig, minister, and John Cairns, reader, neither touching their sustentation nor otherwise; wherefore they ordain persons....to pass among the faithful who have communicated, and require of them their support to the said minister and reader for a quarter of a year while it shall please God that better order may be obtained...." 3

The "faithful," however, were hard to move in this matter, for we find that even towards the end of November, 1563, Craig and Cairns were still without their stipends:

"The bailies....after long reasoning...taken for the sustenance of the minister's reader and other officers of the Kirk....conclude that there shall be gathered from every "fired" house 4/-in the year....;and this to be done with diligence because the said minister and reader have been without their stipend for the most part of a year past." 4

Stipend problems apart, it is quite clear from these references that Craig was one of the ministers of St Giles as from the summer of 1562.

Knox was away from Edinburgh during the autumn of 1562, having been

1. Burgh Records of Edinburgh-19th June, 1562. M'Crie misquotes this as 18th June, 1563. There is no such Minute. 2. Ibid-24th June, 1562.
3. Ibid-11th June, 1563. 4. Ibid-26th November, 1563.

appointed by the General Assembly of the 25th June, to visit the churches of the west country, and as we shall see, the faithful there were to remember with affection for years to come, that great itinerary. Knox confirmed these faithful in Nithsdale and Galloway and Kyle. It was whilst he was in Ayrshire during this time, in the town of Maybole, that he engaged in disputation with an able champion of the Catholic Church, Quintin Kennedy, abbot of Crossraguel. Meanwhile, Craig and his reader Cairns, continued to carry on a vigorous ministry at St Giles during the absence of their leader, who, having strengthened the Reformed Church in the west, returned to Edinburgh; and from thence, early in the following year, he proceeded to Jedburgh, dealing among other things with the case of Paul Methven. 1

The General Assembly met on Christmas day, 1563, as it had done on the year before; they were also to convene likewise in 1567. This date was chosen by the reformers in order to have as many ministers and elders as possible away from their parishes, to the end that they might stop the superstitious practices that had become connected with the festival. Knox had little to say in this Assembly, for he was under a cloud at court and with his principal friends; for many were of the opinion that he had been harsh in his treatment of Queen Mary. 2 The General Assembly, however, stood by him loyally. Both Craig and he shared at this Assembly in an unusual proceeding with regard to the erring wife of one, John Baron, minister of Graston. Mrs. Baron had deserted her husband and gone off to England, and Craig, Knox and a few others were commanded to send and subscribe a letter to the Archbishops of York and Canterbury, desiring them to apprehend her and to return her to Scotland, that she might be dealt with for her moral lapse by John Spottiswoode. 3

1. John Knox-M' Crie, pp. 241-250. 2. Ibid, p. 262. 3. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 42. Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 2, pp. 31, and 40.

If Knox seemed somewhat chastened during the winter of 1562-1563, not so his colleague John Craig. Much of the weather of that winter was very severe, in which "even the sea (presumably the coast-line) stood still." ¹ But while the people of Edinburgh shivered in the streets and in their houses more than usual, and the royal court feasted and danced (also more than their wont), Craig thundered with more than his ordinary powers from his pulpit at St Giles. In a forthright sermon, he denounced the corruption of the times, Knox considering that the pith of what Craig said was worth recording:

"Sometimes hypocrites were known by their disguised habits. We had men to be monks and women to be nuns. But now, we cannot discern the earl from the abbot, nor the nun from the noble-woman. But seeing that you are not ashamed of that profession, would to God you had therewith the cowl, the veil, and the rest belonging thereto, that you might appear in your true colours." ²

Kirkwood Hewat considers that Craig was simply protesting against the rapacity of the nobles. ³ Craig had ^{this} in view, no doubt, but his thrusts went far deeper—they were directed against certain lords of the Congregation for their betrayal of Reformation principles. At Craig's penetrating words, Maitland of Lethington, the queen's secretary, who had been listening to the sermon, was furious. In recent months, he had been drifting from the side of the reformers, and linking himself more and more with the interests of his royal mistress. Now, he doubtless felt, that Craig's sermon had been directed at such as he, as indeed it was. Stamping out of St Giles in a great rage, Maitland "gave himself to the Devil, if after that day he should regard what became of the ministers; but should do what he could that his companions might have a part with him. And," concluded he, "let them bark and blow as they list." ⁴ Thereafter there arose whisperings and complaints by all

1. Calderwood, Vol. 2, p. 252. 2. Ibid, pp. 248-252. Knox's Works-Dickinson, Vol. 2, p. 104. 3. Makers of the Scottish Kirk-Hewat, p. 360.
4. Knox's Works-Dickinson, Vol. 2, p. 104.

the flatterers of the court, grumbling that men's persons were so particularly described, that all the world might take notice of whom the preacher meant, for, said they, "Might not sins be referred to in general, albeit that men were not so specially taxed that all the world might know of whom the preacher spoke?" Whereupon the reformers answered:

"Let men be ashamed to offend publicly, and then preachers shall abstain from particular description, but so long as Protestants are not ashamed to manifestly do against the Evangel of Jesus Christ, so long cannot the ministers of God cease to cry that God will be revenged upon such abusers of his Holy Word." ¹

Calderwood's acid comment on this is: "Yet would some of these courtiers have been reputed the chief pillars of the Kirk within this realm." Maitland had succumbed to the blandishments of the queen, and Macgill the Clerk Register was of the same ilk.

St Giles, on the day of Craig's stirring sermon, had been crowded. The great church was as yet the one place of Protestant worship in Edinburgh, being able to accommodate some three thousand people. ² To a vast congregation, therefore, Craig had sounded the warning note and at the right time, and to an audience who could appreciate what he meant. Their Reformation was in danger of being betrayed by certain men in high places, and so pointed had been the preacher in his denunciations, that his hearers were left in no doubt as to whom he meant. Maitland might well be filled with rage at what Craig had said, for his words had been deliberately chosen to put the faithful on their guard and their mettle, against these wolves of the Church in sheep's clothing. There were dissemblers at court, some of whom were professed leaders of the Protestant cause, who had now set themselves the task of destroying what they had helped to build up. When Craig spoke against vice and treachery in the way he did on that memorable occasion, he proved himself to be

¹.Knox's Works-Dickinson, Vol.2, p.104. ².Calderwood, Vol.2, p.157.

worthy of the trust that John Knox had in him:"that worthy servant of God," is Knox's approving comment. Craig's timely exposure of these hypocritical courtiers,gave to the responsible citizens who had embraced the Reformation a fresh stimulous,which helped to keep the reactionary forces at bay for several months to come.

That Craig's public rebuke to certain courtiers was timely,may be seen from the following facts. Maitland had tried his hardest by the subtlest of means in recent days,to have John Knox imprisoned.¹ But,to the great chagrin of the queen,this move had failed. It only made her, however,redouble her efforts to thwart the work of the reformers. In a letter to the Council of Trent,dated 3rd January,1564,she entreated the Cardinal of Lorraine to assure the Pope of her resolution to live and die a Catholic;and on the last day of the same month,she wrote to his holiness herself,lamenting the damnable errors in which she found her subjects plunged,and informed him that her intention,from the time she left France,had uniformly been to reestablish the ancient religion.² It is more than likely that the reformers had wind of her latest moves;and of who were secretly aiding and abetting her.

A few weeks after Craig's notable sermon,his colleague Knox,then in his fiftieth year,married for the second time,his bride being Margaret Stewart the daughter of Lord Ochiltree his loyal supporter. Craig very likely proclaimed the banns of marriage and performed the ceremony in St Giles. Randolph,the English ambassador,in a letter to Cecil,18th March, 1564,wrote:"Knox asked in church to be married to Margaret Stewart,the daughter of Lord Ochiltree."³ This proclamation must have caused something of a stir in St Giles,for the young lady was but in her 'teens,but in a matter of three years time,Craig was to publish other marriage banns,

1.Knox's Works-Dickinson,Vol.2,p.100. 2. MS letters extracted from Barberini Library,National Lib. of Scot.A.2.11. 3.State Papers(Eliz.)-1564-1565.



-those of Queen Mary and Bothwell-the proclamation of which evoked a nation-wide sensation.

At the General Assembly which met in Edinburgh on the 25th June, 1564, Craig, Row and others formed the business committee. 1 During one of the sederunts of Assembly, Craig was given commission to visit the Merse for a month, as he had done in 1562, and Knox with a similar commission was dispatched towards the north. A Town Council Minute shows that they both set out on their preaching itinerary towards the end of August:

"The provost, bailies.....understanding that by command of the Kirk, John Knox and John Craig, are instantly to depart, the one to the north and the other to the south parts for the preaching of the Gospel....., and that it is appointed that Christopher Goodman, minister of St Andrews, shall abide and remain in these parts (Edinburgh) until they return, to minister and preach in their place.....ordain Master John Spens.... to offer him in their names honourable entertainment..." 2

Goodman was obviously chosen by Knox and Craig to be locum tenens at St Giles; for they were aware that he would not be the man to be influenced by Maitland and his friends at court. During the previous General Assembly, Goodman had quarrelled violently with the Secretary on the matter of the "thirds" allotted by the crown for the maintenance of the ministry. 3 That both the ministers of St Giles were able to leave Edinburgh simultaneously, surely proves that Church affairs had now attained a more settled state. This situation was undoubtedly achieved as a result of a conference between commissioners of the General Assembly of this summer, and several of the courtiers whose chief spokesman was Maitland. Although he, following upon Craig's forthright sermon of a few months before, had sworn to have nothing to do with the ministers and to influence others accordingly, and had seen to

1. Book of the Universal Kirk, p.50. 2. Burgh Records of Edinburgh, 1557-1571, 18th August, 1564. 3. Church of Scotland; Lee, Vol. 1, p.255.

it that none of the king's commissioners attended the opening of the Assembly, he and they had appeared on the following day. ¹ Thus was the conference arranged, and during its progress there arose a prolonged debate between Maitland and Knox on the extent and validity of royal claims. Both men argued skillfully and with evenness of temper, and later on in the debate John Craig was able to be of valuable assistance to his colleague. This conference was held during the General Assembly, and Maitland had with him a formidable array of the nobles including Chatelherault, the Earls of Moray, Morton and Argyll, while Knox had the support among others of Willock, Row and Craig. ² The conference had been arranged to debate the pros and cons of the queen's mass, but it became soon apparent that because of this, much deeper issues were involved. According to Knox's detailed account of the proceedings, the conference resolved into a long and spirited argument between Maitland and the former on the prerogatives of monarchs and the rights of the Reformed community. Maitland was both skillful and subtle in debate, while Knox was bold, uncompromising and on occasion harsh, but he forced the pace whilst Maitland did most of the parrying. For instance, Maitland challenged Knox with, "Then will you, make subjects to control their princes and rulers?" "And what harm," replied at once the other, "should the Commonwealth receive, if the corrupt affections of ignorant rulers were moderated, and so bridled, by the wisdom and discretion of godly subjects, that they should do wrong or violence to no man?" Maitland, finding himself cornered, replied rather weakly that they had wandered from the main argument, ought or ought not the queen to have her mass, but Knox pressed home his point and had Maitland admit, that if the queen were to be a persecutor, he would be as ready as any within the realm to adopt the doctrine of the reformer. "But," persisted Maitland, "the

1. Knox's Works-Dickinson, Vol. 2, p. 107. 2. Ibid, pp. 107-108.

question before us is whether we may, or ought to suppress the Queen's Mass. Or whether that her idolatry should be laid to our charge." "Idolatry ought not only to be suppressed," said Knox, "but the idolator ought to die the death." "I know," answered Maitland, "that the idolator ought to die the death (another admission on Maitland's part), but by whom?" "By the people," was Knox's bold reply. Knox and Maitland debated on, selecting for the purpose of their arguments, illustrations from the books of the Old Testament, and occasionally from the New Testament. Patriarchs, prophets, ancient kings of Israel and apostles, were in turn referred to by both these able debaters to prove this point or that; but neither would make any real concession to the other. 1

Maitland had opened the conference with a wheedling and plausible speech, in which he had asked for tolerance and understanding between the Crown and the Kirk. But Knox in a courteous yet firm reply, showed all present how very false were these sentiments of the Secretary. From then onwards, their verbal combat while free in the main from rancour, was both candid and determined. It was now plain to all concerned, and particularly to the reformers, that the issue at stake was the extent of the royal prerogative. The debate, therefore, became a contest between that of the politicians insisting on the rights of feudalism, and the reformers pressing with at least equal vigour, for the rights of incipient democracy. Maitland contended for what amounted to "the divine right of princes," whereas Knox held firm for the rule of established law (without doubt, he had the Settlement of 1560 in mind), it "being agreeable to the Word of God." Exhausted both mentally and physically by all this seemingly endless reasoning at cross-purposes, Maitland, demanded in exasperation that the questions discussed should be put to the vote. Knox was against this being done, thus following the

1. Knox's Works - Dickinson, Vol. 2, pp. 108-134.

express command of the General Assembly then in session. At length it was agreed that the opinions of all present should be given. Douglas, the rector of the University of St Andrews with whom agreed Winram the Superintendent of Fife, expressed a moderate view:

"If the queen oppose herself to our religion, which is the only true religion, the nobility and the estates of the realm professing the same may justly oppose themselves to her. As concerning the Mass, I know it is idolatry, yet I am not resolved whether that by violence we may take it from her."

Other reformers voted more decidedly, that

"as the Mass is an abominable idolatry, and that by so doing men did no more wrong to the Queen's Majesty than those who should by force take from her a poisoned cup, when she is going to drink it." 1

It should be noted, that the position of the extreme Protestant party of this conference with regard to Queen Mary, is in effect the same as that of the extreme Papists of the time against heretical princes. Cardinal Allen, in maintaining that heretical sovereigns are deprived of their dominions by the law of Christendom, supported the Papal pretensions by quotations from the Old Testament. He shows how in deposing kings, God made use of the ministry of priests and prophets, and Allen employs exactly the same passages of Scripture to prove his arguments, as Knox used to substantiate his own at this conference of 1564. 2

John Craig on being asked for his judgment and vote, replied:

"I will gladly show unto your honours what I understand; but I greatly doubt whether my knowledge and conscience shall satisfy you, seeing that you have heard so many reasons and are so little moved by them. But yet I shall not conceal from you my judgment, adhering first to the protestation of my Brother, to wit, 'that our voting prejudge not the liberty of the General Assembly.' I was (said he), in the University of Bologna, in the year of

1. Knox's Works-Dickinson, Vol. 2, pp. 108-134. 2. Sincere and Modest Defence of English Catholics, pp. 79, 89 et seq.

God, 1554, where, in the place of the Black Friars of the same town, I saw in the time of their General Assembly this Conclusion set forth: This same I heard reasoned, determined, and concluded: 'That is, All Rulers, be they supreme or be they inferior, may and ought to be reformed or deposed by them by whom they are chosen, confirmed, or admitted to their office, as oft as they break that promise made by ^{THE} oath to their subjects: Because that their Prince is no less bound by oath to the ~~the~~ subjects, than are the subjects to their Prince, and therefore ought to be kept and reformed equally, according to the law and condition of the oath that is made of either party.' (All this Craig rendered in Latin).

"This Conclusion, my Lords, I heard sustained and concluded, as I have said, in a most notable auditory. The sustainer was a learned man, Magister Thomas de Finola, the Rector of the University, a man famous in that country. Magister Vincentius de Placentia affirmed the Conclusion to be the most true and certain, agreeable both with the law of God and man. The occasion of this disputation and conclusion, was a certain disorder and tyranny that was attempted by the Pope's governors, who began to make innovations in the country against the laws that were before established, alleging themselves not to be subject to such laws, by reason that they were not instituted by the people, but by the Pope, who was King of that country; and therefore they, having full commission and authority of the Pope, might alter and change statutes and ordinances of the country without ~~the~~ consent of the people. Against this their usurped tyranny, the learned and the people opposed themselves openly: and when that all reasons which the Pope's governors could allege were heard and confuted, the Pope himself was feign to take up the matter, and to promise to keep not only the liberty of the people, but also ^{yet} that he should neither abrogate any law or statute, neither ^{own} make any new law without their ^{own} consent. And, therefore, my Lord (said he, addressing Maitland), my vote and conscience is, that princes are not only bound to keep laws and promises to their subjects, but also, that in case they fail, they justly may be deposed; for the band between the Prince and the people is reciprocal." ¹

Then up started a claw-back (sycophant) of that corrupt Court, writes Knox, and said:

"Ye wat not what ye say; for ye tell us what was done in Bologna; we are a kingdom, and they are but a commonwealth."

"My Lord, (said Craig), "my judgment is, that every kingdom is, or at least, should be a commonwealth, albeit that every commonwealth be not a kingdom; and therefore, I think, that in a kingdom no less diligence ought to be taken, that laws be

¹. Knox's Works-Dickinson, Vol. 2, p. 131f.

not violated, than ^{is} in a commonwealth; because that the tyranny of princes who continually reign in a kingdom, is more hurtful to ^{the} subjects, than is the misgovernment of those that from year to year are changed in free commonwealths. But yet, my Lords, to assure you and all others further, that head was disputed to the uttermost; and then, in the end, it was concluded that they spake not of such things as were done in divers kingdoms and nations by tyranny and negligence of people. 'But we conclude,' said they, 'what ought to be done in all kingdoms and commonwealths, according to the law of God, and unto the just laws of man. And if by the negligence of the people, or by the tyranny of princes, contrary laws have been made, yet may that same people or their posterity, justly crave all things to be reformed, according to the original institution of kings and commonwealths: and such as will not do so, deserved to eat the fruit of their own foolishness.' " 1

The late Professor James Mackinnon in his History of Modern Liberty, makes a distinction between the beliefs of Knox and Craig as expressed at this conference: "John Craig, Knox's colleague, in recording his vote at the conclusion of the debate, stated his conviction in less theological and more convincing terms. In his general proposition he, in fact, anticipated Languet, Hooker, and Locke." 2 Knox, says Mackinnon, was the theocrat who spoke in the language of the democrat, and "though we may agree with his contention that 'to resist a tyrant is not to resist God, nor yet His ordinance,' the reasons he adduces are sometimes monstrous enough, and too often merely theological where they should be purely political." Yet Knox but used the same text-book of reference, the Bible, as Maitland did; both illustrated their arguments for PRINCELY claims and for popular rights from its pages. If Knox was a pure theocrat, then, according to the reasoning of Mackinnon, so also was Maitland of Lethington. Maitland was anything but a theocrat, nor was John Knox. Far from being "the theocrat who speaks in the language of the democrat," Knox, although his terms of reference seem archaic to modern ways of thinking, was a democrat who employed the language of the theocrat. Principal Hugh Watt, commenting on the relationship of prince and people

1. Knox's Works-Dickinson, Vol. 2, p. 133. 2. History of Modern Liberty-Mackinnon, Vol. 2, pp. 457-8.

in his book, John Knox in Controversy, says of Knox's interviews with Queen Mary that they reveal him

"as laying down firmly as the fundamental principle that subjects and rulers must alike and equally live in obedience to the rule of God as revealed in his Word. They also reveal, quite as unmistakably, that he is not contemplating in this, merely certain duties that both owe directly to God, he explicitly includes those duties which they owe to each other." 1

Craig, who understood as well as Knox, the delicate situation resulting from a Catholic and authoritarian queen ruling over a Protestant country, gave his judgment at the conference in support of John Knox. Craig was skilled in both civil and canon law, and he from contemporary history summed up in modern and legal terminology, all that his colleague had been contending for out of the Word of God. Knox faithfully recorded everything that Craig had said at the conference; and had he differed from Craig's opinions, he would have said so. Both of these reformers were firmly opposed to the arbitrary rule of princes; to them their sovereign was not above law, but its symbol and hence its servant.

If Maitland had hoped to divide the ministers on this fundamental issue, he was mistaken. It is true to say, that none of the other reformers, including Craig, went so far as Knox in denouncing the Queen's Mass, but they were as one in standing firm for the rule of law over against the arbitrary power of monarchs. Craig, apparently, made no comment on the "abomination" of the Queen's Mass, but his statesman-like citation of the reasoned opinions of Finola and Placentia, shows that he was in complete agreement with Knox and the other reformers that princes as well as their subjects must be firmly dealt with if and when they break the law that they had on oath sworn to maintain. That this was a novel proposition for sixteenth century ears to hear, must be allowed, but Scottish politicians were much less aware than were the reformers,

1. Knox in Controversy-Watt, p.104.

particularly Knox and Craig, that a revolution in political and social as well as religious thought, was being shaped in the Scotland of their day. The late Principal Story has rightly said that "The men who could uphold these principles, in days so perilous to order and freedom, were not only Reformers of the Kirk—they were the nursing fathers of our civil liberties, and assertors of the rights of manhood." 1

At the conference, Knox was right about the evil effects of the Queen's Mass in its relation to the Scottish Reformation; and although his words on the subject were at times harsh and vindictive, they stand justified by the facts, a circumstance that even Craig apparently did not notice. With Queen Mary, and in particular the politicians at her elbow, her Mass was regarded not simply as an act of personal devotion; she wilfully paraded it for the purposes of propaganda. For example, after Knox's tour of the west in 1562, on the succeeding year Mary toured these parts, exhibiting her Mass wherever she went. 2 Indeed, throughout her short but troubled reign, she took her Mass with her up and down Scotland, as an example for her subjects to follow—and not a few of them did. 3 She had no right to exhibit the Mass thus; for in so doing she was guilty of breaking the law she had sworn to uphold. To Knox, "the idolator must die the death," and would he have anticipated Cromwell and committed regicide, if he had had the power to do so? The answer to that must be yes, if we take his hot words of July, 1567, at their face value. N. Yet he hoped Mary might ^{change} for _A he reasoned with her at Lochleven on the mutual responsibilities of the Crown and the commoners. 4

The Knox and Maitland debate ended inconclusively, but it had at least served to bring out into the light of day, the differences between

1. John Craig, D.D.—Story, p. 35. 2. History of Modern Liberty—Mackinnon, Vol. 2, p. 450. 3. Knox—Hume Brown, Vol. 2, p. 197. Knox in Controversy—Watt, 105. 4. Ibid, Watt, p. 104. NOTE: Vide, John Knox—Percy, p. 410.

the politicians and the reformers. It convinced the latter, that (to use Russell's words) "A Catholic sovereign in a Protestant state-especially in one not consolidated, and with many important questions of organisation still undetermined-was a serious anomaly, dangerous in exact proportion to the force and ability of the sovereign, who, in the prestige, the patronage, and the feudal rights of the Crown, had a mine of resources for building up a party in its own interest...."

"The position of Knox and his party," continues Russell, "is therefore quite intelligible, and far from indefensible." ¹ We may say, then, that this conference of 1564 helped to clear the air of false optimism, and at the same time strengthened the reformers in their determination to make their political and religious principles succeed.

¹. Maitland of Lethington-Russell, p. 109.

At the General Assembly of June, 1565, Craig, Goodman, George Buchanan, Adam Bothwell, Bishop of Orkney and others, were commissioned to meet each morning from 6 till 8 a.m., to arrange the business of the day. 1 This Assembly appointed Craig and several others to collect causes for a public fast, and they duly reported that the time was ripe for such an act of public contrition and repentance. Thereupon, the Assembly gave commission to Knox and Craig to set down the form of exercise to be used in the fast, and to have it printed by Robert Lekprevik. According to Calderwood, this treatise on fasting was preserved in several editions of the Scottish Psalter even into the seventeenth century. The desire of the Scottish Reformed Church for this fast was induced through the growing tolerance of Catholics by the civil authorities, and also as a protest against one of the recent decrees of the Council of Trent, which declared that the Catholic Church was determined to suppress throughout Europe, all who abhorred the papacy. The text of this fast which Knox and Craig had written, was approved by the General Assembly which met during December, 1565, and they appointed the fast to be kept on the "last Sunday of February and on the first Sunday of March, 1566. 2 The "Public Fast" contains this interesting admonition: "Men that will observe this exercise may not any of the two days use any kind of games, but exercise themselves after the public assemblies in private meditation with their God." From this it has not been unnaturally inferred that certain kinds of sports were permitted on the other Lord's days, outwith the hours of public worship. But the evils which flowed from any such permission may have lead to its withdrawal. These matters, however, are but incidental compared with the following significant passage from the same Treatise:

"Strength and friends, honour and blood joined with godliness,

1. Book of the Universal Kirk, p.60. Calderwood, Vol.2, p.290 et seq.

2. Reformation in Scotland-Hay Fleming, p.297.

are fallen before our eyes. Men had before hope (or at least some opinion), that God should move the Queen's Majesty's heart to hear the blessed Gospel of Jesus Christ truly preached, and so consequently that she should abandon all idolatry and false religion. But now she hath given answer in plain words, that the religion in which she hath been nourished (and that is mere abomination), she will maintain and defend.... That Idol the Mass is now again in divers places erected."

was

It would seem, that although Craig, daily crowded with work, he was not neglecting his studies; for during this autumn he must provide more space for his books as the following entry shows: "ITEM. 7th November, 1565; for two broad planks (of wood) which I cut and gave to Master John Craig, minister, with which he desired to make shelves and rests for his books, price of piece 5/3... ITEM. For bearing them from Leith to the said Master John's house-7d." 1

During the autumn of 1565, Knox was prohibited from preaching, through having offended Darnley whom Queen Mary had married according to Roman Catholic rites, on the 22nd of July of that year:

"Upon the 19th day of August, the King (Darnley) came to St Giles Kirk, and John Knox preached, whereat he was 'crabbit,' and caused discharge the said John of his preaching." 2

Darnley was as much offended at the length of Knox's sermon as at what it contained, though he was furious at the preacher's audacity in saying "that God sets in that room, for the offences and ingratitude of the people, boys and women." 3 John Craig, loyal as ever to his colleague, refused to minister also: "When Mr. Knox was silenced, his colleague (Mr. Craig), because of Knox's prohibition, refused to do any service in Edinburgh, which put the people in a stir; yet upon better advice, he was moved to continue in his charge." 4 It is significant to note, that with regard to the incident, the Town Council took sides with the preach-

1. Edinburgh Dean of Guild's Accounts-1565-6, p.219. 2. Diurnal of Occurrences, p.79. 3. Knox's Works-Laing, Vol.2, p.497. 4. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p.8 (quoting from Spottiswoode).

ers:

"The bailies, council....after long reasoning upon the discharging of John Knox, minister, of further preaching, as long as their Majesties the King and Queen are in town, with one voice conclude and deliver that they will in no way consent or grant that his mouth be closed or he discharged in preaching the true Word, and therefore will him at his pleasure, as God should move his heart, to proceed forward in true doctrine as he has done before, which doctrine they would approve and abide by to their live's end." 1

The Protestants were learning fast how to match John Knox in his independent attitude to arbitrary powers of government. A further proof of the Town Council's loyalty to Knox is shown in their Minute of November, 1565, according to which they guaranteed him a yearly stipend of 400 (merks, pounds ?) for life, out of annual rents derived from properties formerly in possession of the Catholic Church. The Reformed Kirk in Scotland was fortunate in having the support of the middle classes in the principal towns, the influence and strength of whom the politicians consistently underestimated. In the civil war of 1570-72, these bourgeoisie were to play a decisive part in deciding its issue in favour of the principles of the Reformation.

During the early part of 1565, the completed Psalter for use in the Reformed Church of Scotland, made its appearance under the title, "The Form of Prayer and Ministration of The Sacraments, used in the English Church at Geneva, approved and received by the Church of Scotland, whereunto besides that was in the former books, are also added sundry other prayers, with the whole Psalms of David in English metre... Printed at Edinburgh by Robert Lekprevik, 1565 (Patrick's "Psalmody" gives the year as 1564)." There is every reason to believe that in this Liturgy cum Psalter, John Craig was the author of fifteen of its psalm-versions, and that these include the familiar second versions of Psalms 102, 136, 143

1. Burgh Records of Edinburgh, 23rd August, 1565. About a month later, Craig had Darnley in his congregation. Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 2, p. 732. Randolph to Bedford: "Darnley was this day at preaching and heard Mr. John Craig. 30/9/1565."

and 145. 1

At the General Assembly which was held in Edinburgh on Christmas day, 1562, "for printing of the Psalms, the Kirk lent Robert Lekprevik, printer, two hundred pounds to help to buy irons, ink and paper, and to pay craftsmen for printing." The revised and extended Scottish Psalter which appeared in 1565 was but part of a more ambitious enterprise, namely, that of a Liturgy modelled on that of the Genevan Prayer Book. 2 All this was commissioned by the General Assembly of 1562, to the end "that uniform order should be kept in ministration of the Sacraments, solemnisation of marriages, and burial of the dead, according to the Book of Geneva." 3 Due to the disappearance of several of the early records of the Church of Scotland, we do not know the names of members of the select committee that was formed to carry this important and comprehensive work to completion. We may however, take it as certain that besides Knox after whom the new Liturgy was called, Pont, Craig and others among the principal reformers, were members of THIS committee, and that over a period of two years their combined labours produced the Liturgy cum Psalter of 1564-65. "The Book owed its final form to the labours of Knox, Pont and Craig," wrote the late Principal Story. 4 According to Millar Patrick,

"Knox's pre-eminent share in these proceedings warrants the belief that he was a member of the committee on the Psalms... Who his collaborators were upon the Psalter is not told us, but the identity of them stands beyond question, for they were the only Scottish contributors of the new version—Robert Pont and John Craig." 5

David Laing maintained that we have no early authority for assigning these fifteen psalms already mentioned, as the work of John Craig, Laing basing it would appear, his reservation on Baillie, who has recorded that the initials "I.C." which are printed over these particular psalms, are

1. Letters and Journals—Baillie, Vol. 3, p. 527. 2. Wodrow Selections—Lippe, p. 39 (Introd.). 3. Church of Scotland—Lee, Vol. 1, p. 251. 4. John Craig, D.D.—Story, p. 38. 5. Scottish Psalmody—Patrick, p. 46

"supposed" to belong to the reformer.¹ It would seem, though, that Baillie was being over-cautious, for the very good reason that a like doubt as to authorship could as readily be entertained against other alleged contributors to the 1565 Scottish Psalter. For example, the name of Robert Pont, whom Baillie affirms contributed translations of six of the psalms in this version, is likewise never given in full-Psalms 57, R.P., 59, R.P., 76, R.Po., 80, "R.T.", and 81, R.Po. From a study of these particulars, it would appear that both of the Scottish contributors had decided simply to append their initials to the psalms they had translated, and that a certain amount of carelessness on the printer's part has accounted for irregularities. Baillie has no hesitation in supplying the names of the English contributors, though there again we are faced with the same difficulty of identification-Norton is always "T.N." or simply "N." and so on. The learned Principal of the University of Glasgow would seem, then, to have been over-cautious in not definitely assigning the psalms marked "I.C." to the pen of John Craig. It is well-nigh a certainty, that whoever contributed these fifteen psalms between the years 1562-64, was a member of the Reformed Church of Scotland. Concerning the 1565 Scottish Psalter Baillie says that "There were added for the first time, six (psalms) by Robert Pont, and fifteen bearing the initials "I.C." as the translator." Whoever, then, translated these between 1562-64, if it be not John Craig; for no other Scottish reformer or lord of the Congregation bears the initials "I.C.?" The reader at St Giles, of course, namely John Cairns bore the identical initials. We may also include the Latin form of Knox's own name-Ioannes Cnoxus. Knox, as we have duly noted, was a member of the select committee that laboured on the new Liturgy and Psalter. If he contributed these fifteen psalms, we would surely have discovered some reference to the fact in his voluminous works; but there is no such ref-

¹. Letters and Journals-Baillie, Vol. 3, p. 527.

erence. Indeed, there is no evidence whatsoever from his writings, that he possessed the poetic gift. Craig's case is somewhat different. He had been for many years a Dominican friar in an important position, and we have every reason to assume that he was well-versed in the words and music of the Latin ~~prose~~ psalms. Besides this, he belonged to a family with distinctly poetical gifts, his nephew Sir Thomas Craig, being a poet of no mean order. The younger Craig, for instance, wrote Latin verse on the marriage of Mary and Darnley; and Dr. Samuel Johnson has recorded that Sir Thomas's poem on the birth and infancy of their son, who was to become James vi, "would honour any nation." ¹ John Craig's son, William, is credited with having written elegaic Latin verse in memory of *Robert* Rollock, the first Principal of the University of Edinburgh. ² Wodrow says of William Craig that he also composed "Theses Theologicae, item orationes et poemata." ³ While these facts do not prove that John Craig was himself poetical, they demonstrate that there is at least the possibility that he may have been so gifted. John Craig was a genuinely modest man; his whole life is the epitome of this, and it is distinctly possible that he considered, like Pont himself, that the initials "I.C." were sufficient title for his psalms. The name of John Cairns as author of these fifteen psalms can be readily ruled out. Cairns was a good man, steady and reliable, but with mediocre gifts of scholarship and learning. Craig on the other hand, was an excellent scholar, a writer of splendid prose, and a cosmopolitan of rare and wide culture; in a word, the kind of man who would have found the translation of Latin psalms into his mother tongue a pleasurable and rewarding experience. There are, therefore, strong reasons to believe that John Craig has left his undying mark on Scottish Psalmody. The psalms which we may credit to his pen are numbers 24, 56, 75, 102, 105, 108, 110, 117, 118, 132, 140, 141, 143, and 145. The following verses are examples of their style:

1. Sir Thomas Craig-Tytler, p. 137. 2. History of the University of Edinburgh-Dalzel, p. 373. 3. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 56.

(a) Ps.24,v.7.

"Exalt your heads ye Gates on hie
Ye doores that last for aye,
Be lift:so the king of Glorie
Shal through you make his waye."

(b) Ps.102,vv.1-3.

"Lord to myne humble sute give eare
And let my cry for thee appeare:
Hyd not thy face this troublous time
But when I call thine eares encline:
Make hast to heare me(Lord,I pray)
For like as smoke consumthe away
So are my dayes here on this earth,
And all my bones partcht as an hearth."

(c) Ps.117,v.1.

"O Praise the Lord, ye Nations all
Laud him ye people great and small.
For why ? his grace & tender love:
To us is great, as we will prove."

(d) Ps.136,v.1.

"All fleshe in earth abrode,
With fude he doth fulfill.
Wherefore of heaven the God
To laude, be it your will.
For certainly,
His mercies dure,
Both ferme and sure
Eternally."

(e) Ps.145,v.1.

"O Lord, that art my God and king,
Undoubtedly I will the praise,
I will extoll and blyssingis sing,
Unto thine haly name always." 1

In the opinion of the late Dr. Millar Patrick, John Craig's fifteen psalms vary much in quality, but the second version of Psalm 145, which still remains second only to Kethe's 100th in use and honour, is a conclusive evidence of his powers. So also, although much altered in 1650, are his notable second versions of Psalms 136 and 143. 2

1. Knox's Liturgy and Psalter, 1587 (being a reprint of 1565) - New College Library, Edinburgh. 2. Scottish Psalmody - Patrick, p.49. Vide also, Scottish Psalter - Livingston, p.12.

The Public Fast (for the preparation of which Knox and Craig had laboured) was almost at an end, when, on Saturday night the 9th of March, 1566, the citizens of Edinburgh were roused by the startling news "that there was murder committed within the King's Palace." David Riccio was dead: the favourite of the queen, undoubted papal spy, and an arch-enemy of all the reformers. But what Sir David Lyndsay of the Mount wrote of Cardinal Beaton's death, can and ought to be said of Riccio's assassination, "The deed was foully done." Twelve days later, Randolph the English ambassador wrote to Cecil acquainting him of the murder and appending a list of the chief conspirators, beneath whose names a line lower down, were those of "John Knox and John Craig, preachers." 1 Randolph concluded his letter thus: "All these were at the death of Davy and privy thereunto, and are now in displeasure with the Q. and their houses taken and spoiled." After the murder of Riccio, Knox quickly left Edinburgh, not because he was one of the guilty parties, but in self-defence: he had made strategic exits before. Craig did not leave the capital, and there is no evidence that either his or Knox's house was "taken and spoiled." Also, when Mary, all powerful for the moment, returned from Dunbar to Edinburgh, she held her Privy Council on March, 19th, which took up the affair of Riccio's murder. They issued a "Charge on the Persons delated for the Slaughter of David Riccio," in which appeared the names of seventy-one lords, barons, knights and servants. It is significant, that in this detailed list of suspects, neither Knox nor Craig are mentioned. It is but true to say, that these two men and indeed all the reformers, were not sorry to be quit of Riccio who was their dangerous enemy, but as Hume Brown contends, they had "neither art nor part" in the brutal deed. 2 We must conclude, therefore, that either Randolph was misinformed about Knox and Craig, or

1. Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 2, p. 270. 2. John Knox-Hume Brown, Vol. 2, pp. 304-310 (Appendix D).

that their signatures on the incriminating letter are the forgeries of a later hand. Craig, as we have seen, remained at his post, and this fact must be allowed to tell in favour of his courage, if not of his innocence besides. That Queen Mary thought the worst about him is probably indicated from the incident we have already told; for it was on the 8th May, less than two months after Riccio's murder "that the soldier of the Queen of Scots" drew his dagger, and attempted to murder John Craig in the High Kirk of St Giles. 1

The General Assembly met during June, 1566, and we learn that "The invocation of the name of God was made by Mr. John Craig, minister of Edinburgh." 2 Knox had done likewise on the previous year, but he was absent from this Assembly, for he was still in hiding in Kyle. Craig was made a member of a select committee to deal with Paul Methven, minister of Jedburgh, who had been excommunicated a few years previously, having been found guilty of connubial infidelity. Methven's crave was granted that he should be heard by the General Assembly, who, "Shortly after....prescribed to him the form of his declaration of repentance." The exemplary punishment which they meted out to him was very severe, part of it being that "he should present himself bare-foot and bare-head, arrayed in sack-cloth, at the principal entry of St Giles' Kirk, at seven o'clock in the morning...." 3 The pre-Reformation Church had become very lax in administering discipline against moral offenders, with the result that religion was brought into contempt, but the Scottish reformers in their zeal for the glory of God, probably swung overmuch to the other extreme. Nevertheless, this insistence on Church discipline was in the main salutary, being part of the price that sixteenth century Scotland must pay for the purifying and upbuild-

1. Calendar of State Papers (Foreign Series), 1566-68, No. 385. 2. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 77. 3. Knox's Works-Dickinson, Vol. 2, p. 188.

ing of her national Church. If the reformers were severe in their strictures against Queen Mary, the Court and the politicians, whenever in their opinion vice and corruption revealed themselves, they were equally hard on their own offending members and ministers.

During this summer General Assembly of 1566, John Craig presented to them a personal petition. He desired that "John Cairns who had read prayers and exhorted four years and more in Edinburgh, and had well profited, might be joined with him in the Kirk of Edinburgh, in respect he was alone." ¹ The Assembly ordered the church of Edinburgh, with the assistance of the Superintendent of Lothian, to consider whether Cairns was sufficient for that place or some other. Apparently the crave was not granted, for Cairns's name appears in Town Council Minutes for many years afterwards as simply that of "reader." He is first mentioned in these Minutes as minister (and so thereafter) on 13th November, 1584, and in that of 15th July, 1586, as "ane of the ordinar ministers of this burgh...." This independent action on Craig's part, might be construed as being disloyal to John Knox, but at this time, Craig apart from his General Assembly work, was burdened with the sole responsibility of St Giles. His request, therefore, for ordained ministerial assistance was a genuine one, but evidently it was not granted.

Following upon instructions from this General Assembly, the Superintendent of Lothian and John Craig sought an interview with Queen Mary, then resident within the castle of Edinburgh. This being granted, they presented to her a supplication for the payment of minister's stipends due to them out of "the thirds of the benefices." At this interview, they doubtless offered Her Majesty the congratulations of their Church; for prince James had been born at the castle on the 19th of June.

¹History-Keith, p. 560. ^{Vol. 1, 1734} Church of Scotland-Lee, Vol. 1, p. 280. Vide also Calderwood and Wodrow.

The queen received Spottiswoode and Craig graciously, and promised that "she would take sufficient order therein (with regard to the ministers' stipends), so soon as the Nobility and Council might convene." 1

Mary's expansive mood must have passed quickly, for little or nothing was done to relieve the impoverished ministers. The truth is, that nothing much could be done to assist the clergy, for Mary's extravagance had brought Scotland to near-bankruptcy. In the opinion of Lord Eustace Percy,

"Mary, whatever her virtues, was no economist. Her mother had ended by barely balancing the royal budget; she ran heavily into debt. That was the background of all the pulpit denunciation of Court frivolity." 2

This last sentence contains an element of truth, but no more: Craig and the other reformers in their criticisms of Court excesses, had higher ends in view than mere pelf.

Craig

It would appear, that at the castle interview, ^{Craig} had made a favourable impression on Queen Mary, for early on in the autumn he appeared on her behalf at the Town Council meeting of 13th September, 1566:

"In the presence of the bailies and council, compeared Master John Craig, minister, and presented to them our Sovereign's writing subscribed, and desired the same to be registered in the books of this burgh, the principal to be given to him again; which the said bailies and council thought reasonable, ordained the same to be registered, and the principal to be delivered to the aforesaid minister, of which writing the tenor is as follows: 'Regina. Forasmuch as we are informed by faithful persons, that adultery, fornication, open harlotry, and other such filthy lusts of the flesh are committed and suffered in Edinburgh without any punishment, to the great dishonour of our God, to the slander of the whole realm, to the manifest contempt of our laws and authority, therefore we charge the provost, bailies, and council.... that you with all diligence from time to time inquire, search out, and take all such public slanderers and filthy persons and punish them according to the Act of our last parliament without any exception of persons (was Mary to forget this

herself in a matter of a few months, or did she still in 1567, consider herself to be above the law?), as you will answer to your God, and to our laws. At Stirling, given under our signet, and subscribed with our hand, the last day of August and of our reign the 24th year. Et sic subscribitur Marie, R.' " 1

The following General Assembly met during December, 1566, at which a letter headed by the signature of John Craig was sent to "their brethren, the bishops and pastors of God's Church in England, who profess with us in Scotland, the truth of Jesus Christ." 2 The reason for this letter was that some of the English ministers were being forced against their consciences to don canonical vestments, and they had requested their Scottish brethren to intercede on their behalf. The letter goes on to say that

"if surplice, corner-cap and tippet, have been the badges of idolators.... what hath the preachers of Christian Liberty to do with the dregs of that Romish beast? We return to our former request, which is, that the brethren among you who refuse the Romish rags, may find of you, who use and urge them, such favour as our Head and Master commandeth each one of his members to show to one another...." 3

This plea was of no avail, for Queen Elizabeth would not listen to the supplications of her bishops. Knox, who carried this letter with him when he went on his extended leave of absence to England (which this General Assembly granted), was to write later of the English queen: "She that now reigns over them is neither good Protestant, nor yet resolute Papist; let the world judge which is the third." 4 That Craig's name appears at the top of the signatures on the letter, would seem to indicate that at Knox's request, he had assumed the leadership of the Scottish reformers during the absence of his senior.

1. Burgh Records of Edinburgh, 1557-71. 2. Knox's Works-Dickinson, Vol. 2, p. 199. 3. Ibid, p. 200. Calderwood, Vol. 2, p. 335. 4. John Knox-M' Crie, p. 295.

Craig's favour, if at all, with Queen Mary was to be of short duration, for in the month of May, 1567, he had to face one of his greatest and most perplexing problems. The Diurnal of Occurrences records that "Upon the ninth day of the said month of May our Sovereign lady and the Earl of Bothwell were proclaimed in the college kirk of St Giles to be married together." This announcement must have been startling to the congregation, even although they were aware that behind it lay a scandalous tale of Court intrigue. It had the effect of confirming their worst suspicions, namely, that Mary had been unfaithful to her husband, and that she was implicated in his murder; for it was common talk that Bothwell had been the instigator, if not the perpetrator of this dark deed. Bothwell had lost no time in arranging to marry the murdered Darnley's widow. He was even able to obtain a divorce from his wife, between the few weeks that separated Darnley's death and the 12th of May, on which day he married Queen Mary. Kirkcaldy of Grange, in a letter to the Earl of Bedford, written on the 26th April, 1567, passed on to his lordship the following bit of scandal:

"The Queen will never cease till she has wrecked all the honest men of this realm. She wished Bothwell to ravish her, so that end his marriage sooner, which she promised before she brought about the death of her husband." 1

Thus did Kirkcaldy express himself, though perhaps not in the best way, but his meaning is quite clear. On the 7th of May, Robert Melville wrote Cecil:

"Bothwell has brought the Queen to Edinburgh, and required Master John Craig to proclaim their banns of marriage, which he refused to do, answering that he (Bothwell) might not be her lawful husband." 2

1. Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 3, p. 325. 2. Ibid. 326.

When the General Assembly met on Christmas day, 1567, John Row of Perth being moderator, Craig at one of their *SEDEEVANTS* and by their request, presented in writing his proceedings touching the proclamation of the banns of Mary and Bothwell. His statement was as follows:

"To the end that all that fear God may understand my proceedings in this matter, I shall shortly declare what I did, and what moved me to defend the same, leaving the final judgment of all things to the Kirk. First, being required of Mr. Thomas Hepburn, in the Queen's name, to proclaim her with the Lord Bothwell, I plainly refused, because he hadn't her hand-write; and also, because of the constant rumour that the lord had both ravished her and kept her in captivity. Upon Wednesday following, the Justice-Clerk (Sir John Bellenden) brought me a document signed by her hand, bearing in effect, that she was neither ravished nor yet detained in captivity, and therefore charged me to proclaim. My answer was, I durst proclaim no banns (and chiefly such) without the consent and command of the kirk. Upon Thursday following, after long reasoning with the Justice-Clerk, and amongst the brethren, at length concluded, that the Queen's mind should be published to her subjects, the next three preaching days. But because the General Assembly had inhibited all such marriages, we protested, that we would neither solemnize nor yet approve that marriage, but would only declare the princess's mind, leaving all doubts and dangers to the counsellors, approvers, and prescribers of the marriage. And so, upon Friday following, I declared the whole mind and progress of the kirk, desiring every man, in God's name, to discharge his conscience before the Secret Council. And to give boldness to others, I desired of the lords there present, time and place to speak my judgment before the parties; protesting, if I were not heard and satisfied, I either would desist from proclaiming, or else declare my mind publicly before the kirk. Therefore, being admitted after noon before my lord and the council, I laid to his charge the law of adultery, the ordinance of the Kirk, the law of ravishing, the suspicion of collusion betwixt him and his wife, the sudden divorce and proclaiming within the space of four days, and last, the suspicion of the King's death, which his marriage would confirm. But he answered nothing to my satisfaction. Whereupon, after many exhortations, I protested, that I could not but declare my mind publicly to the kirk. Therefore, upon Sunday, after I had declared what they had done, and how they would proceed whether we would or not, I took heaven and earth to witness that I abhorred and detested that marriage, because it was odious and slanderous to the world. And seeing the best part of the realm did approve it, either by flattery or by their silence, I desired the faithful to pray earnestly, that God would turn to the comfort of this realm, that thing then intended against reason and good conscience. And because I heard some persons grudge against me, I used their reasons for my defence:— First, I had broken no law, by proclaiming of their persons at their request. Secondly, if their marriage was slanderous,

I did well, forewarning all men of it in time. Thirdly, as I had of duty declared to them the princess's will, so did I faithfully teach them, by word and example, what God craved of them. But upon Tuesday following, I was called before the Council, and accused, that I had passed the bounds of my commission, calling the marriage of the princess odious and slanderous before the world. I answered, 'the bands of my commission, which were the Word of God, good laws, and natural reason, were able to prove whatsoever I spake; yea, that their own conscience could not but bear witness, that such a marriage would be odious and slanderous to all that should hear it, if all the circumstances were rightly considered.' But while I was coming to my probation, my lord (Bothwell) put me to silence, and sent me away. And so, upon Wednesday, I first repeated and satisfied all things spoken, and afterwards exhorted the brethren not to accuse me, if that marriage proceeded, but rather themselves, who would not, for fear, oppose themselves, but rather sharpened their tongues against me, because I admonished them of their duty, and suffered not the cankered conscience of hypocrites to sleep at rest; protesting at all times to them, that it was not my proclaiming, but their silence, that gave any lawfulness to that marriage: for as the proclaiming did take all excuse from them, so my private and public condemnation (of the marriage) did save my conscience sufficiently. And this far I proceeded in this marriage, as the kirk of Edinburgh, lords, earls, and barons, will bear me witness.

"Now, seeing I have been shamefully slandered both in England and Scotland, by wrong information, and false report of them that hated my ministry, I desire, first, the judgment of the Kirk; and next, the same to be published, that all men may understand whether I be worthy of such a report or not." 1

This carefully worded document on being read to the General Assembly made a deep impression in Craig's favour. In the succeeding Assembly, Craig's written defence was sustained, and his conduct was declared to have been highly commendable. Adam Bothwell, the Bishop of Orkney, who had performed the marriage ceremony, having acknowledged to the General Assembly his offence, was restored to the office of the ministry. That a commission of Assembly carefully studied the facts which Craig supplied, making at the same time their own investigations, is evident; for it was not until the General Assembly of the 6th July, 1569, that they overtook the formal consideration of the affair, when with one voice they declared that "The said defence (of Master John Craig) being privately and publicly read, the whole points therein con-

1. Calderwood, Vol. 2, pp. 394-396.

tained by the whole Assembly maturely considered; it was found by the brethren, that he had done the duty of a faithful minister, and had committed nothing slanderous to such as have righteous judgment, in respect of the aforesaid defence, which was found both godly and sufficient for declaration of his innocence which the whole Assembly declared, testified and ordained the same to be notified to all and sundry." 1 Row, whose father was moderator of the 1567 General Assembly in which this matter was first raised, and who was present when they met during July, 1569, notes that "Mr. John Craig is judged to have done honestly in that matter anent proclaiming the banns betwixt the Queen and the Earl of Bothwell." 2

Spottiswoode gives in detail, Craig's actions during these testing weeks, and it can be seen that the former has accepted Craig's version of what happened. 3 Spottiswoode affirms that it was really the office of John Cairns, the reader, to proclaim banns of marriage, but that with regard to those of Mary and Bothwell, he "did simply refuse," thus throwing the responsibility for their proclamation on Craig. To the General Assembly Craig maintained that in publishing these, he had acted within his rights: "I had broken no law by proclaiming their persons at their request," and this the Assembly upheld. He told Bellenden plainly that he would "neither solemnize nor yet approve of that marriage," nor did he, though the utmost pressure was brought to bear on him. In the absence of Knox, he had acted faithfully on his behalf, and with considerable courage. He had dared to oppose the marriage publicly, in the hope that better counsels might prevail with Queen Mary, but his stand was all to no purpose. When Knox learned of the unhappy affair, he was convinced that Craig had acted aright, whatever others might think. He wrote:

1. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 144. 2. Row's History, p. 40.
3. Spottiswoode, Vol. 2, p. 52 et seq.

"Notwithstanding all this done and said by Master Craig, and the opposition of many that wished well to the Queen, and were jealous of her honour, the marriage went on.... And a bishop must bless the marriage. The good Prelate was Bishop of Orkney (Adam Bothwell). If there is a good work to be done, a bishop must do it. Here mark the difference betwixt this worthy minister, Master Craig, and this base bishop." 1

Hill Burton points out that Craig, in his defence before the General Assembly, argued cleverly that if the marriage to be carried out was so outrageous and abominable as it was pronounced to be, he was doing good service to give the world previous warning of the intention to perpetrate it; and that it was not his proclaiming but the silence of others, that permitted the event to come to pass. 2 It was this frank assessment of where the responsibility lay for Queen Mary's tragic mistake, that angered certain Protestant lords, causing them in self-justification to make Craig the scapegoat with the result that the General Assembly were forced to deal with the matter. Craig, throughout all the unhappy proceedings of the marriage, never once tried to placate either Mary or Bothwell. Bishop Keith, for example, considered that it was "after abundance of reluctance," that Craig made the proclamation of the royal banns, and the Catholic historian Bellesheim was of the opinion that Craig gave "unmistakable expression of his own sentiments as to the ill-omened union." 3 The truthfulness of Craig's own testimony to the General Assembly is revealed in a letter of 11th May, 1567, which Drury the English ambassador sent to Cecil, and it reads as follows:

"He (Craig) signified that it was directly against his conscience to ask them (the banns), as he considered the marriage altogether unlawful. He asked all to leave from setting up of papers and secret whisperings, and to let them who had ought to say, say it openly." 4

There remains for us to consider, however, another letter of the 16th

1. Knox's Works-Dickinson, Vol. 2, p. 207. 2. History of Scotland-Hill Burton, Vol. 4, p. 225. 3. Church and State-Keith, Vol. 1, p. 494. History of the Catholic Church in Scotland-Bellesheim, p. 130 et seq, Vol. 3. 4. State Papers, Foreign Series (Elizabeth), 1566-68, p. 230.

May, 1567, in which he says that the marriage of Queen Mary and Bothwell was "with a sermon and not with a Mass.... The Bishop of Orkney and Mr. Craig were present and had to do." The Diurnal of Occurrents says much the same thing, adding that the wedding ceremony took place within the "auld chappell....at ten hours afore noon," but it does not mention Craig as being present. ¹ It does seem odd, that if Craig had a share in the ceremony, he made no mention of the fact in his written statement to the General Assembly. Besides, there is no record whatsoever, that they ever laid such a charge against him. We may well believe that rumour had it that he was present, and that Craig is alluding to this in his letter to the General Assembly when he writes that "I have been shamefully slandered both in England and Scotland, by wrong information, and false report..." Wodrow asserts that John Cairns was present at the marriage, in his capacity as reader. ² If so, might it not be with Drury, a case of mistaken identity? The more determined Craig was in his resistance to the marriage, the more vicious became Bothwell's conduct as Drury's letter of 14th May to Cecil shows:

"The banns were upon Sunday last asked by Mr. Craig in St Giles, church, who spared not in the pulpit to manifest his unwillingness for which the Earl (of Bothwell) says he will provide him a cord." ³

Craig was no craven, and it is therefore most unlikely that after this lawless threat on his life, he should have consented even under duress to share in the marriage ceremony. In any case, there was no need; for the Bishop of Orkney, Earl Bothwell's relative, was only too willing to co-operate.

1. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 111. 2. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 15.
3. State Papers, Foreign Series (Elizabeth), Vol. 8, p. 230.

In the midst of sensational events, the General Assembly met on the 25th of June, 1567; for eight days previously, Queen Mary had been imprisoned in Lochleven castle and Bothwell was in flight. George Buchanan, who was to become the tutor of Mary's son, was moderator of this Assembly which was opened with prayer by John Craig.¹ Knox was present; he had lost little time in returning from his long sojourn in England. But several of the leading Protestant lords were absent, their sympathies being with the captured queen. In the hope that these lords would be won over to their side, the General Assembly arranged to meet once more, namely, on the 26th July. They gave commission to Knox, Craig and several other leading reformers to contact these abstaining nobles and make every effort to gain their support.² Other matters were dealt with by this July General Assembly. They instructed Craig and a few others to take immediate measures to combat the aggressiveness of continental Papists (who were acting vigorously on the final decrees of the Council of Trent); and also to make financial provision for ministers and for the poor.

Queen Elizabeth disliked her cousin Mary, nevertheless she had no wish that harm should befall her, and so the English ambassador Throckmorton was instructed to interview the principal reformers without delay. His letter to Elizabeth, which he dated 18th July, 1567, includes the following:

"Mr. Knox arrived here in this town (Edinburgh) the 17th of this month (Knox had been away from the capital to supplicate the support of the West), with whom I have had some conference; and with Mr. Craig also, the other minister of this town. I have persuaded with them to preach and persuade leniently. I find them both very austere in this conference.... They are furnished with many arguments,

¹. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 93. ². John Knox-Hume Brown, Vol. 2, p. 242. Row's History, p. 33. Calderwood, Vol. 2, p. 370.

some forth of the Scriptures, some forth of histories, some upon practices used in this realm..." 1

Knox had been clamouring for Mary's death, but with Craig at his elbow moderate counsels did not pass unheeded. 2

When the General Assembly met during July, we learn that "Thanks was given to God by Mr. John Craig, minister, Edinburgh." 3 Craig's prestige in the affairs of the Reformed Church was now very great, and there is no doubt that Knox's mantle of leadership would in due course have fallen to him, had Craig not blotted his escutcheon—that is, in the estimation of Knox and other principal reformers—by the part he played during the civil war of 1570-72 which followed upon the assassination of the Regent Moray. At the July Assembly, few indeed of the higher nobility were present—nine in fact—which shows that but meagre success had attended the labours of Knox, Craig and others to gain their support. Nothing discouraged, the General Assembly resolutely forged ahead with their programme of reconstruction. 4 They found Queen Mary to have forfeited the crown, and ^{that} a temporary authority should be set up in the name of her son. The Acts of 1560 establishing the new religion were confirmed, with the pledge on the part of the lords present in the General Assembly, that at the next meeting of the Estates, the civil power should review its assent to all the laws that had been passed in favour of the ministers and the poor. 5 This remarkable General Assembly was virtually in the position of being, if only for a few weeks, the government of Scotland.

With Moray now back again in Scotland (11th of August, and appointed regent on the 22nd), the tide was in full flood for the Cause of the reformers. At a meeting of the new Privy Council, a committee was form-

1. Knox's Works—Laing, Vol. 6, p. 553. 2. John Knox—Percy, p. 409. 3. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 100. 4. John Knox—Hume Brown, Vol. 2, p. 244. 5. Ibid.

ed of certain noblemen, civic dignitaries and ministers, to prepare overtures for the coming session of Parliament which was to meet in December, and among the number of the ministers were "Master John Spottiswoode, Master John Craig, John Knox, Master John Row and Master David Lindsay." 1 The omission of "Master" before Knox's name was not due to a clerical error, nor was it meant to be an affront. Unlike the other ministers on this council, Knox did not possess a university degree.

Craig's financial position which up till now had not been really stabilized, became once more the genuine concern of the Town Council. Queen Mary, at her interview with Spottiswoode and Craig held in Edinburgh castle during the summer of 1566, had promised financial help for all the ministers, and so far as Craig is concerned we note that by March 12th, 1567, certain annuals (yearly rents), presumably from Church endowments of one kind or another, had been given by her specifically for the benefit of the Edinburgh ministers. 2 To ensure that these emoluments were received, the queen demanded the signatures of those concerned. This liberality on the part of Mary was probably well-intentioned, but when we recall that she had by now resolved to marry Bothwell, it is possible that the queen's grant was in the nature of a sop to Craig and his Edinburgh colleagues; for though she was young and full of charm, Mary Stewart could be most subtle. At this time, she had need of standing in their good graces, and she may well have chosen this method as a means to that end. Apart from this royal grant to Craig and the others, the Town Council still considered that their ministers were underpaid, so they arranged during that autumn to institute a tax for their sustenance. 3 We learn from a lengthy Town Council Minute of the 10th September, that Craig was consulted as to how the annuals from such sources as Church lands, farms,

1 Acts of Parliament of Scotland, Vol. 3, p. 25. 2. Burgh Records of Edinburgh, 1557-71. 3. Ibid, p. 229.

houses, cottages, orchards, chapels and so forth, could best be ingathered by their burghess Michael Chisholm, "collector general." 1 From the same Minute we learn that formerly, the benefits which came from these sources appertained to "priests, monks, friars, canons, nuns and others of that order," and we may add, to the crown and some of the nobility since 1560. These temporalities were now to be applied for the "utility and profit of the ministers, the ministry, the poor and the hospitals." 2 The fruits of Moray's regency had begun to ripen fast for the upkeep of the Reformed Church ministry.

During the first Parliament of the regency, Acts were passed in favour of the Reformed religion. We learn that

"No other jurisdiction ecclesiastical within this realm was to be acknowledged, than that which is and shall be within the same Kirk established presently or floweth therefrom concerning the preaching of the Word, administration of the Sacraments, wherein the said jurisdiction consisteth." 3

This Parliament also gave commission to Sir James Balfour of Pittendreich, Knox, Craig and several others to "search more particularly what special points or causes should appertain to the jurisdiction, privilege, and authority of the said Kirk, and to report their judgment to the next Parliament." 4 Knox must have been in his element; for here at long last was what to his mind represented (or almost so) the ideal relationship of Church and State. Now, if ever, "Both Church and State were recognised as God-appointed agencies," and this, as Dr. G.D. Henderson says, was the fundamental creed of Knox and indeed, of all the principal reformers. 5

Ten days after Parliament assembled, the General Assembly met in Edinburgh on Christmas day, and for the third successive occasion John Craig

1. Burgh Records of Edinburgh, 1557-71, p. 240. 2. Ibid, p. 241. 3. Calderwood, Vol. 2, p. 390. 4. Ibid, p. 390 et seq. 5. Claims of the Church of Scotland-Henderson, p. 145.

made "The invocation of God's name." 1 The Assembly were in jubilant mood, but conscious of their newly-acquired spiritual and material gains and lest they should dissipate these, they set their minds seriously to all the tasks to hand. As we have noted, they dealt with Craig concerning the part he played at the time of the royal marriage: this was but incidental to their work. They confirmed the appointment of Knox, Craig and the other ministers to serve on the government committee of which mention has been made. The Bishop of Orkney was suspended from his ministerial function, because he had celebrated the marriage between the Queen and Bothwell, "which was altogether wicked, and contrary to God's law and the statutes of the Kirk." 2 Early in the new year, Craig, George Buchanan and several other ministers proceeded to Cupar as commissioners of the above General Assembly, and had conference with the ministers, elders and deacons of the Fife churches who had made complaints against the conduct of their Superintendent, John Winram. Also about this time, Craig, Row and others were engaged at the command of the General Assembly in revising the "Form and order of excommunication" which Knox had penned (Vide his Liturgy, 1564), and which they thought required simplification. 3 These labours they approved in the General Assembly of July, 1568, where it was decided that for the future, excommunication was to be the function of the minister and the kirk session, and that it was to be carried out by superintendents only if and where there was no Reformed congregation. The Church of Scotland owed a great debt to the worthy labours of its superintendents, but at times they had to be made conscious of who held the reins.

Craig, Winram (he had escaped censure) and Erskine of Dun and others were formed into a select committee by the July Assembly, to bring to the notice of the regent the following pressing problems: ministerial stipends

1. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 112. 2. Ibid, p. 112. 3. Calderwood, Vol. 2, p. 424.

were still often underpaid, sometimes as much as by a half and by three-quarters; the Papists had yet retained two-thirds of the benefices, and it was requested that the common charges, namely the support of the poor and education, be met out of these funds; the University College of Aberdeen was much in need of reformation; and that vice ought to be put down by the civil authorities when the superintendents brought it to their notice. Craig and his colleagues presented these matters to the regent, who gave every assurance to the Church that they would be implemented. 1

The General Assembly of 1st March, 1570, met in Edinburgh under the shadow of the Regent Moray's death. It was under no auspicious circumstances, therefore, that John Craig, with "ane voice" was elected moderator. A strong man was needed for the hour, and Craig was the obvious choice. Little if anything is known of his activities between the years 1568-70, but that he was unanimously chosen at a critical period to lead the General Assembly proves that he had been pursuing steadily and with universal acceptance, his ministerial vocation. According to Calderwood, this General Assembly was the twentieth, and they appointed Knox, Craig, Row and several others to consult upon the order of proceeding in actions to be treated during ^{their} sederunts. The Assembly decided among other things, that in future, retiring moderators would give the exhortation, after which "the Assembly shall proceed to the choosing of a new moderator," and thus has the practice continued until this present. 2 N. They met again in June when "The exhortation and prayer was made by Mr. John Craig." 3 To him, then, belongs the distinction of being the first among many notable churchmen to perform this service.

1. Calderwood, Vol. 2, p. 424 et seq. 2. Ibid, p. 529. 3. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 175. NOTE: "A NEW MODERATOR -- WHEN HE DEMITTED HIS PLACE AT THE OPENING OR ENTRY OF THE ENSUEING ASSEMBLY -- TAUGHT A SERMON, TO STIR UP HIS BRETHREN TO THEIR DUTIES IN THEIR STATIONS AND CALLING, AND RELATING TO THE TIMES AND PRESENT EXIGENCIES." -- ROW'S HISTORY, P 54.

Craig was one of the most outstanding leaders of the General Assembly of the sixteenth century. They were not constituted as in present times, being then not unlike the Three Estates in composition. Men like Craig were chosen to lead because of their strength of character, and because, like Craig, of their knowledge of civil and canon law. During Craig's thirty-nine years of service as a minister of the Reformed Church of Scotland, he was invariably in attendance at their General Assemblies, taking a leading part until a late hour of his long life in all of their important committees. The late Dr. Lee considers that Craig's vast legal knowledge, like that of Pont and Arbuthnot, was of invaluable assistance in all matters connected with Church government, and this fact succeeding Assemblies realised and came to value more and more. ¹ Where the reformers deemed any approach to the civil authorities to be necessary, Craig was almost certain to be among the number elected by the General Assembly to prosecute this duty. He was thrice moderator of the Assembly: first in 1570, then in 1576 and finally in 1581. His opinion was usually sought by his colleagues with regard to important affairs affecting the life and witness of their Reformed Church. The amount and the range of his committee work was enormous; his pen was often employed in compiling directives for the faithful, in matters liturgical, and in manuals of instruction for the general use and guidance of Church members. Where intricate problems occurred, which involved the disciplining of the laity or ministers, there Craig was frequently to be found, forthright in opinion and fearless in action. He was, like John Knox, a statesman-ecclesiastic, though Craig's wise and moderate counsels, as we shall see, were not always acceptable to the other reformers. Throughout his career, he pursued a steady course, being personally little affected by either praise or blame, and if he made mistakes or on occasion suffered obloquy, whatever his immediate loss in prestige or in the

¹. Church of Scotland-Lee, Vol. 1, p. 272.

confidence of the Church he quickly regained through worthy endeavour, and a fine devotion to his vocation. No minister in that testing sixteenth century had ever any reason to complain that in attendance at, and in the multifarious work of the General Assembly, Craig at any time failed to "report diligence." We learn though, that on one occasion he was with John Duncanson King James's senior chaplain, criticised for non-attendance at Synod. This happened at the General Assembly of October, 1582, and arose out of a complaint of the Synod of Lothian, "that notice be given to John Duncanson to take greater attendance; and to write to Mr. Craig, as necessity shall be, for him to come." 1

At the General Assembly which met during July, 1570, and in which Craig as the retiring moderator gave the exhortation, he, Row and a few others were ordained to meet to decide questions. They duly reported among other things, that Communion should be administered on Easter Sunday, if and where superstitions regarding the day, had been removed. Dr. McMillan commenting on this says that "One is all the more surprised to find this concession, when it is remembered that just five years before, the Romanists had proposed to have Easter celebrations according to the Roman fashion where they could do so. Then, as Knox informs us, 'They did carry out their designs in Edinburgh, though one of the priests was arrested, and being placed at the cross was served with Easter eggs!'" 2 Craig and the others also recommended to the July Assembly that they ought to exercise stricter discipline on those who defrauded the ministers of their stipends, and should proceed to excommunicate them forthwith; and this they agreed to do.

1. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 746. 2. Worship in the Reformed Church-McMillan, p. 302.

Following upon the assassination of the Regent Moray, civil war broke out between the Queen's Party, composed mostly of the nobility Protestant as well as Catholic, and that of the King and the Kirk. The ensuing struggle was bitter, and as a result the economy of Scotland suffered considerable disruption, great hardships being experienced by most classes of the people, particularly the poor. Craig's sympathies were with these last, and on at least one notable occasion "The poor cried to the Regent (Lennox) and he would not hear them; at the same time this oppression was denounced by John Craig, minister." ¹ Andrew Lang considers that this refers to acts of lawlessness during November, 1571,

"when a famous retainer of Lennox, Thomas Crawford, was mercilessly despoiling the poor tenants of the Hamiltons. The preacher Craig, a just and courageous man, induced Lennox to make some amends, but Crawford was still plundering." ²

The Hamiltons belonged to the Queen's Party, but it was characteristic of Craig to put his religious principles before aught else, including factions.

At this time, John Knox became the special object of antipathy to the Queen's Party, and he went about daily in grave danger. A servant of John Craig, being met one day by a reconnoitering party, and asked who his master was, answered in his trepidation, Mr. Knox; upon which he was seized, and although he immediately corrected his mistake, they desired him to "hold to his first master," and dragged him to prison. ³ During the month of December, 1570, Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange, a "pillar of the Kirk" who had gone over to the enemy and was presently holding Edinburgh castle for Queen Mary, led a sortie which broke into the Tolbooth and rescued one of his men who had been imprisoned by the magistrates on a

1. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 194. 2. History of Scotland-Lang, Vol. 2, p. 233.
3. John Knox-M' Crie, p. 257 (quoting from the Bannatyne Memorials).

charge of murder. To Knox, this lawless act was unforgivable, particularly in an old friend and comrade in arms, and therefore on the Sunday following he waxed eloquent in St Giles against Kirkcaldy's "terrible example," and dubbed him "wicked." The act could not be worse, Knox declared, since Kirkcaldy was a prominent member of the Reformed Kirk. The latter could be as irascible as Knox, and news of this pulpit attack reaching him immediately the service was over, in a great rage he wrote a letter to Craig to whom it was handed as he was about to begin the afternoon diet of worship. Kirkcaldy wrote:

"This day, John Knox, in his sermon, called me, a murderer and a throat-cutter, wherein he has spoken further than he is able to justify. For I take God to witness, if it was my mind that that man's blood should have been shed, of whom he called me a murderer. And the same God I desire, from the bottom of my heart, to pour out His vengeance suddenly upon him and me, which of us two have been most desirous of innocent blood. This I desire you, in God's name, to declare openly to the people. At Edinburgh Castle, 24th December, 1570." 1

Having read this letter, Craig bluntly told Kirkcaldy's servant to inform his master that he would read nothing of such a nature in St Giles, without the consent of the kirk session.

As Hume Brown ably shows, the report of Knox's sermon had lost nothing of its offensiveness in its short passage from the kirk to the castle, for the words that cut Kirkcaldy to the quick, "a murderer and a throat-cutter," had been completely and doubtless, deliberately taken out of their context by someone who was obviously fishing in troubled waters. What Knox had said was (and we have no reason to doubt his words),

"that in all his days he never saw so slanderous, so fearful, and so tyrannical a fact. Had the perpetrator been a man without God, a throat-cutter and a murderer.....it wouldn't have moved me. But to see the stars fall from heaven, and a man of knowledge commit so manifest a treason what godly heart could not but lament...." 2

1. Bannatyne Memorials, p. 70 et seq. 2. Ibid.

Knox had spoken against Kirkcaldy more in sorrow than in anger. "The former honesty of the man," Knox contended, "stayed the hearts of all the faithful in their former good opinion of him, unto such time as his rebellion was so noised abroad as none could excuse it." ¹ Up until the time of his death, he preserved a real and deep affection for Kirkcaldy: "That man's soul is dear to me, and I would not have it perish if I could save it," were among Knox's last words. ² Craig in being cautious when he had received Kirkcaldy's letter, "had answered wisely," wrote Knox. ³ In all probability, Craig had listened to his colleague's sermon, and knew Kirkcaldy's accusations to be false.

Although Craig by his tactful handling of the situation had prevented Kirkcaldy from committing some more serious folly, the laird was by no means pacified. Ignoring the rebuff, he directed his complaint to the kirk session of Edinburgh, who received from him a letter dated the 28th, December, in which he endeavoured to justify his recent action and at the same time vilify Knox. He affirmed that Knox had preached thus because he had a private grudge against him and had accused him of dreadful crimes to his "slander and ignominy....," "but," concluded he, "my conscience is clear as I have declared to John Craig." When Craig read this letter to the kirk session, they resolved to stand loyally by Knox, and sent him a copy. The result was that Knox dealt with Kirkcaldy's accusations, showing in a forthright sermon how false they all were. It may well be that this quarrel was simulated; that it was but "kite flying" by Kirkcaldy and his friends in an effort to divide the reformers, but if so, it failed miserably. The tactful, yet firm handling of the situation by Craig and the kirk session bore fruit; for Kirkcaldy was forced to adopt a more conciliatory attitude. His castle "salvo" had misfired, and to Knox belonged the parting "shot"; for in another sermon

1. Bannatyne Memorials, p. 70 et seq. 2. John Knox-M'Grie, p. 341.
 3. Bannatyne Memorials, p. 70 et seq.

he bade Spottiswoode, the Superintendent of Lothian, "to be faithful and stout in his office and admonish him (Kirkcaldy)." 1

When the General Assembly met during March, 1571, they were fully expecting Kirkcaldy to renew his attacks on Knox, but nothing was attempted beyond the writing and placing in public places of scurrilous libels. A strongly-worded letter from the West, signed by Glencairn and other influential persons, and in defence of Knox, which Kirkcaldy had received in January, must have moved the Queen's Party to caution. Yet were there several prominent members of the March General Assembly, Craig among them, who now considered that Knox in his pulpit utterances was going too far. This dissent was soon evident; for when his servant-secretary Bannatyne wished the General Assembly to support a public edict to the effect that they approved Knox's doctrine, they refused. Bannatyne or Knox (by way of reproach?), gives the names of those who had urged him (Knox) to remain silent meanwhile (which he refused to do), and these included Erskine of Dun and John Craig. 2 We may date, therefore, from this time the "little rift within the lute," that was to end in Knox and Craig dissolving their joint ministry at St Giles. It is significant that when their break came, as it did during the following year, Craig according to Spottiswoode was translated to Montrose which was under the supervision of Craig's friend Erskine of Dun.

During the spring of 1571, Craig found himself in an extremely difficult position. As we have seen, he did not wholly agree with Knox's vehement pulpit oratory at this time. He counselled moderation, but his colleague would have none of it, proceeding as formerly, so that his very presence in the capital became fraught with suspense and danger to himself and others. Craig was for some form of conciliation, if not com-

1. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 70 et seq. 2. Bannatyne Memorials, p. 95.

promise, with the Queen's Party; but this was quite repugnant to John Knox, since in his opinion it would merely serve to the advantage of those whom he believed were striving to undo the work of Reformation. Thus Knox continued to act as he pleased, and so did John Craig. There were comings and goings betwixt him and the men defending the castle. For example, there is the significant Town Council Minute of the 28th April, the contents of which speak for themselves:

"The remaining bailies and council ordain—here follows a list of sixteen names including Master Craig, minister.....to pass to the castle and desire the captain that all the King's lieges may resort to the town without trouble, and that he suffer not the inhabitants of this town to be molested by the men of war raised by him and the lords, and to report his answer." 1 Kirkcaldy's response was immediate, for the Town Council wrote to the Regent Lennox then at Stirling with regard to "the order taken betwixt the township (Edinburgh) and the captain, namely, that he nor any of his shall trouble any of the inhabitants of this town...." 2 A serious attempt was now made by the Queen's Party to win Craig over to their side. On the 6th of May, the Duke of Chatelherault (Hamilton) who had lately arrived with his men to reinforce the castle, came to St Giles together with his son Claude and the Earl of Huntly, to hear Craig preach, but left, we are told, "before prayers." 3 The liturgical side of the service was Cairns's concern; it was Craig they were out to impress. With the duke now in Edinburgh, followed by Kirkcaldy's belligerent siege ultimatum to the townsmen, the "Brethren of the town seeing their minister (Knox) in danger, came unto him with Mr. John Craig, also being minister, and desired him, in the name of God, to depart." 4 Knox was at last persuaded to leave Edinburgh, albeit most unwillingly, but before he departed,

1. Burgh Records of Edinburgh, 28th April, 1571. 2. Ibid, 1st May, 1571.
3. Bannatyne Memorials, p. 119. 4. Ibid, p. 118.

he was present with Craig at a conference in the castle between representatives of the Reformers and those of the Queen's Party, with the object of discussing their differences. Hume Brown maintains that this meeting took place between the 5th of May (on which day Knox officially left Edinburgh), and the 8th of the month, the day on which Knox crossed the Forth to Abbotshall near Kirkcaldy. ¹ Since the 6th was the Sunday on which Craig was officiating at St Giles, the conference probably took place during Monday the 7th. Among the reformers who accompanied Knox, were Craig, Spottiswoode, Winram and Erskine of Dun. Wodrow asserts that they were sent by the other principal reformers "to labour for an agreement betwixt the contending parties, and for ~~the~~ preventing the effusion of christian blood." ² On the opposite side of the conference table, there were among others, Chatelherault, Sir James Balfour, Lethington and Kirkcaldy. Winram opened up the discussion by intimating that the reformers had been persuaded to come in the hope that they might reach a measure of agreement with the Queen's Party. Knox made no comment on this, but he began by reminding the nobility present, that it was they who had requested the conference, having written John Craig to this effect, and he (Knox) desired Lethington to hear along what lines they might proceed. The latter bluntly informed Knox and his colleagues, that there would be no coming to terms with the reformers for the simple reason that the Queen's Party were not present to parley with equals, but to dictate terms, since "the principals of the nobility of Scotland are here." This tactless retort nettled the reformers, and Craig was quick to reply with

"We have somewhat more to say, as it appears to me that, seeing there is a lawful authority established in the person of the King and his Regent throughout this realm, which ought to be obeyed by all the subjects thereof, therefore our duty is, as commissioners and members of the Kirk, to admonish every one of your lordships to obey the same."

1. John Knox-Hume Brown, Vol. 2, pp. 263-264. 2. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 14.

Lethington's answer to this was, that so far as he and his friends were concerned, the setting up of the king's authority after the imprisonment of his mother, had been merely an expedient, "but a fetch or a shift to save us from great inconveniences!" In fine, the nobility never intended that the king's authority should "stand and continue." To this, his colleagues nodded their agreement. But Knox had his answer ready:

"My lord, I perceive that methinks God has beguiled you, that howbeit He has used you and your shifts as an instrument of the King's authority, yet, it appears, He will not set it down again at your pleasure."

These forthright words were not to Lethington's liking, for he answered haughtily, "How do ye know that ye are of God's counsel? Ye shall see the contrary in a few days...." "Till then," Knox replied courageously, "our argument holds good...." But not to be outdone, Lethington contended that although the Papacy had been long established, yet were the reformers willing, and indeed believed it to be right, that Romanism and all its works should be "shot over the dyke," because in 1560 they had the power to do so. Now in like manner, Lethington went on, the Queen's Party were confident of their strength, and had therefore equal right to set aside the authority of the king. But Knox would not allow that there was any parallel betwixt a Revolution in religion and mere matters of politics, for according to him "although St Paul commanded christians to obey the Roman Emperor (however wicked he be), he never commanded them to obey an evil religion." Knox then proceeded to prove how the king's authority had been established on sure processes of law: first, by the Three Estates of Parliament, and secondly by the universal obedience it had received up until now. Sir James Balfour asked him how he knew that the king's authority had been established. And with a touch of characteristic humour he made answer that

"I was present in that Parliament, when I both heard and saw the same concluded, as certainly as you are standing there, or that yon little dog is lying in the Secretary's lap (for a little mongrel was lying on his knee)."

Lethington who was ill and not a little crusty, did not appreciate the remark, for he interjected brusquely that the reformers were but out for plunder, all else being pretence. "Then," said Craig, "let such things be spoken of them that be yonder, much worse is spoken of them that be here...." "And what is that, Mr. Craig?" asked Lethington. "My lord," answered he, "It is plainly spoken that those that are here labour only in their proceedings to cloak cruel murderers, and that the consciences of some of you are so pricked with the same, that you will not suffer the nobility to agree." Thereafter, Lethington pleaded that Queen Mary, but given the opportunity, would punish these very murderers if and when found guilty. But Craig would have none of this: "How can these two stand," protested he, "that the Queen being set in authority, who is guilty of the murder of the King, shall punish the murder in any others?" "Yes," interjected Knox, "who shall go caution for our Queen?" "Mr. John," replied Lethington blandly, "the Queen of Scotland will not lose her right which she pretends to the crown of England for any favour she bears to any man in Scotland." "But it's a marvellous thing," said Craig, "that albeit my Lord Duke here and some others acknowledge not the King's authority yet you, you, and you," pointing to Lethington, Balfour and Kirkcaldy, "will not deny the King's authority seeing you have professed the same, and were chief instruments in erecting the same." Lethington and his colleagues were not impressed by the arguments of the reformers; nor were they by his. The conference ended in failure; it was in a mood of frustration that all rose to depart: "Here we began to move, and as it were everyone to laugh upon the other, and so to rise." ¹ The laughter was more cynical than cordial.

1. Bannatyne Memorials, pp. 125-132. Vide NOTE D, appendix: Drury's letter to the English Privy Council on the castle conference.

Church historians are not unanimous in their opinion as to who the "Mr. John" of the castle conference was. Russell, who wrote "Maitland of Lethington," maintains that Spottiswoode the superintendent was the man, whilst Wodrow says that "Mr. John" was Craig. There is weight in Wodrow's argument, for according to Drury (Vide appendix D), Craig would appear to have been the most important reformer present at the conference. And Craig was at this time being wooed by the Queen's Party; hence it is possible to regard the frequent use of "Mr. John" by Lethington as an attempt to flatter Craig. However, as we have noted already, Drury was not always correct with his facts concerning Craig. Hill Burton seems to have been the first historian to assert that "Mr. John" was Knox himself, and Hume Brown is certain that this is correct. When "Mr. John" speaks, we have in Hume Brown's opinion, the authentic voice of Knox, somewhat subdued perhaps (Knox was a very sick man), but none the less his. With this view, the present writer agrees. Richard Bannatyne, Knox's servant-secretary, ~~xxx~~ narrates the incident from the viewpoint of an observer, and this would seem to suggest that he also was present, and if so, he would have been there in his capacity of attendant to his master.

Viewed in retrospect, the conference does seem to have served one useful purpose, namely, to harden public opinion against the pretensions of the nobility to dictate the political, economic and religious policy of the nation. In this struggle of the coronets against the Kirk, the reformers were borne to victory on the shoulders of the new middle classes whose strength and influence lay in the growing townships and in particular in Edinburgh. According to Hume Brown

"The increased importance of the towns was notably shown in the closing struggle which decided the fate of the Reformation in Scotland. When Maitland of Lethington organised

the Queen's Party for the restoration of Mary, he had three-fourths of the Scottish nobles at his back, and at an earlier period this would have decided the contest. But the party of the King, supported by all the chief burghs, were, even without the support of England, more than able to hold their own against the whole array of the powerful nobles. In an oft-quoted passage, Killigrew, the English resident in Scotland, writing in 1572, thus describes the change that had taken place in the country: 'Methinks,' he writes, 'I see the nobleman's great credit decay in this country, and the barons, burghs, and such like take more upon them.' " 1

It would seem, therefore, that by the year 1572, Sir David Lyndsay's John the Commonweal had come of age! 2

John: "I trow Sanctam Ecclesiam-
But nocht in their bishops nor their friars."
And we may add, "nor the nobles."

1. Scotland in the Time of Queen Mary-Hume Brown, p. 184. 2. Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis-Lyndsay.

With John Knox safely lodged in St Andrews, Craig who had remained in Edinburgh felt more free to speak his own mind. He had loyally supported Knox at the castle conference, and was to remain firm in the convictions he had freely expressed there, but that he was far from satisfied with the stubbornness of the Queen's Party and of his Own, was soon to become evident. What course he ought to take, must have been Craig's chief concern during the days immediately following the conference and by the end of that week his mind was made up. Knox's health was fast failing (this was as the result of an apoplectic stroke of the previous autumn), and Craig probably felt that the time was ripe to give a fresh lead to the Church and nation. At anyrate, on the 13th of May, Craig preached in St Giles from Psalm 130: "Out of the depth have I cried unto Thee, O Lord...." It would seem from his use of this whole psalm that Craig believed both contending parties guilty of wrongdoing, and that they were equally in need of the Divine pardon-"But there is forgiveness with Thee that Thou mayest be feared...." In the course of his sermon, Craig made bold to compare the estate of the Kirk of God within the city of Edinburgh to the estate of the Jews who were oppressed, sometimes by the Assyrians, and sometimes by the Egyptians. He affirmed that when wicked parties contend and strive because of their pride, ambition and worldly honour, the Kirk of God is always in trouble. He went on to lament that there was no neutral man-would it be that he conceived himself in this role ?-to make agreement between the Queen's Party and that of the King, for the reason that whoever emerged winner would only achieve a Pyrrhic victory: "the country shall be brought to ruin." "But some say," concluded Craig, "happy is that country wherein murderers, traitors and blood-thirsty men.....are punished, and so the country freed from all trouble." Craig's unorthodox opinions were

soon told to Knox, nor was he pleased; for Bannatyne records that "By these words he (Craig) offended many, because he made the cause of both parties alike." 1 Be that as it may, Craig remained a neutral throughout the rest of the conflict, and by so behaving he has surely proved that the sentiments to which he gave voice at this time were genuine. The late Principal Story, commenting on Craig's self-imposed neutrality during the civil war of 1570-72, says that

"As is often the case with those who look beyond the interests of jealous factions and walk by a higher rule than that of worldly policy or sectarian self-assertion, Craig failed to influence or satisfy either party; and most of his orthodox hearers were indignant at his suggesting that they in St Giles were blameworthy as well as the Queen's men in the castle." 2

Craig had chosen no easy path for himself. Kirkcaldy had turned St Giles into a fortress where "The vault was holed in all parts so that none could come therein without being seen of them that are above, neither can any enter or be in the kirk but they may be shot from above." 3 Some of the queen's soldiers manned the steeple of St Giles on which Kirkcaldy had installed cannon, to one of which he gave the name of Knox! Craig, now in his sixtieth year, desired peace for his fellow-countrymen, but his brother reformers thought that he was being only guileful. Wodrow defends the stand Craig made and says that

"It is an easy matter to censure a man's conduct in such a juncture as then existed. The town was fortified against the Regent. One Parliament was held in the Canongate for the King; and another in the town for the King's mother. The town was under the power of the castle, which was kept by the Queen's friends. It therefore behoved Mr. Craig to be cautious of what he spake, and to level at what he thought wrong on both hands. His peaceful temper, in wishing the breach to be made up, ought not to have been blamed." 4

It was blamed, and harshly, as we shall see.

1. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 76 et seq. 2. John Craig, D.D. - Story, p. 50.
3. Bannatyne Memorials, p. 117. 4. Wodrow Selections - Lippe, p. 13.

During the summer of 1571, Craig was joined in the ministry at St Giles by the Bishop of Galloway, who although not popular with the congregation, appears to have been on friendly terms with his fellow-minister. On the 12th of June, the Queen's Party issued a proclamation by which they called upon the citizens of Edinburgh to acknowledge "Queen Mary as sovereign and no other." The Bishop of Galloway and John Craig were commanded, as the city's ministers, to pray for the queen during church services; Craig being directed to assemble the congregation and read the missive ordering this to be done. It was accordingly read in church but not obeyed. As a result, Craig was forbidden to preach by the bishop (who had obeyed the order to pray for the queen) and Sir James Balfour. The Diurnal of Occurrents records that "It is also to be noticed, that the ministers of Edinburgh made neither prayers nor preaching from the 12th day of June (1571) unto the (here a blank) because it was enjoined to them to pray for the Queen in the same by the lords of the nobility." 1 Craig's resistance to this command was short-lived, for within a few weeks he too was praying for Queen Mary. We learn this from the Diurnal of Occurrents which states that at a Commission of the General Assembly held in Stirling around the 10th of August, it was concluded that "no minister should pray in their sermons for the Queen, and found fault with Alexander, Bishop of Galloway, minister at Edinburgh, because he prayed for the said Queen, against which act John Craig was opposed" 2 Spottiswoode informs us, that some twelve years later, Craig "gave obedience" to the request of King James that prayer be publicly offered for his mother. Bannatyne makes mention of a letter addressed during this year, 1571, by the Edinburgh ministers to the lords of the Secret Council in the castle. In this letter, which deals mainly with matters of stipend, Queen Mary is referred to as "our sovereign lady." The request of the ministers was granted, and a

1. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 224. 2. Ibid, p. 236.

Council order confirming this was signed by the Earl of Huntly. ¹ It is not hard to understand why Craig during these months gravely offended many of the reformers, and Knox in particular. Yet Craig was by no means the tool of the Queen's Party. It was inevitable that there were comings and goings between them and him, but there is evidence to prove that he maintained his neutral position throughout the civil war. For instance, we learn that during the month of November, 1571, "the nobility in Edinburgh made great labour to have John Craig, minister, to preach (this surely means, as their preacher?), but he would not come." ² The Queen's men could hear Craig preach when they chose, so that this refusal of his indicates that all their efforts to gain his support were in vain. That they failed to win him to their side, shows clearly that however misunderstood Craig was at this period of his career, he was a man of sterling integrity. He had determined to steer a middle course through these dangerous waters of civil strife, and he did, come wind, come weather!

During the closing months of Craig's ministry at St Giles, civic and business life within the besieged capital had practically come to a standstill. As evidence of the chaotic state of affairs in Edinburgh during this time, there exist no Town Council Records for 1572. Whenever the principal citizens returned, as many of them did during 1572, they took an early opportunity of dealing with their minister John Craig. They strongly disapproved of him having remained in the city, whilst they had been forced to seek refuge elsewhere, and the upshot was that Craig was left with no alternative but to resign his charge.

The General Assembly met in St Andrews on the 6th of March, 1572, probably gathering there to accommodate John Knox and to have his advice. Craig was present as a member of the commission that had been

¹.Bannatyne Memorials, p.190. ².Diurnal of Occurrents, p.254.

directed by the Convention of Leith (Row names it a General Assembly of the Church) which had met six weeks earlier, to treat with the Regent Mar on the question of allowing bishops to function in the Scottish Reformed Church. Craig and the others reported to the March General Assembly on their conference with Mar, and some twenty members of the Assembly including Craig were directed to meet in Knox's house to consider further this matter of having diocesan bishops in the Kirk.¹ This must have constituted a very unpleasant problem for this committee, and for John Knox particularly, for they found themselves by force of circumstances compelled to acquiesce in a form of leadership in the Church, against which they had set their faces resolutely since 1560. Their problem was not Episcopacy, but Bishops. 2 The Earl of Morton, their army commander at Leith (and the power behind Mar), for reasons of state policy was determined to fill the vacant benefices, and the reformers dependant on his strength, had to yield. 3 The immediate need of finance was the important factor behind this decision. N.

The General Assembly met again on the 6th of August, at Perth. Knox wrote of it as follows:

"To this Assembly the town of Edinburgh after they had come home to their houses (I mean of them that were banished and remained not in the town, nor took part with the traitors of the castle), sent their commissioners as always before they had done, at every Assembly; and because they were destitute of ministers, because Mr. John Craig and they had given each other over; for they thought that the said Mr. John Craig, who before was one of their ministers, swayed overmuch to the sword-hand. I will say no more of that man; but I pray God continue with him His Holy Spirit, and that he be not drawn aside by Lethington." 4 Thus did Knox

1. Calderwood, Vol. 3, pp. 168-210. 2. Claims of the Church of Scotland-Henderson, p. 81. 3. John Knox-Hume Brown, Vol. 2, p. 271. 4. Knox's Works-Laing, Vol. 6, p. 622. NOTE: VIDE, PRESBYTERIANISM - HENDERSON, P. 49.

lightly pass over what must have been a serious quarrel. When he chose, Knox could be most discreet; nor did he ever forget old friendships. He had disagreed strongly with Craig for remaining in Edinburgh, but his affection for his former colleague remained.

According to Spottiswoode, Craig was translated to Montrose, and if this be so, it was done probably by the August General Assembly. Notwithstanding what individuals thought of Craig to his detriment, this Assembly had not lost their confidence in him. He was sent by them on a deputation to Fife, to give guidance to the Bishop of St Andrews, the aged John Douglas, as to how his whole diocese ought to be administered. Douglas had been chosen to the St Andrews' see during February, 1572, through the influence of the now all-powerful Earl of Morton. 1 Craig, John Row and others, met each morning at 6 a.m. in the Council House, Perth, to consider the "heads and articles" concluded between the Lord Regent and his Council and the commissioners of the Kirk. Craig and his colleagues protested against references in the regent's letters to Archbishop, Dean, Archdeacon, Chancellor, Chapter and so on. The General Assembly supported these objections of their commissioners, and decided that the title bishop might be employed but not archbishop; that chapters should be renamed the bishop's assembly; and the dean to be simply known as moderator of such an assembly. The General Assembly requested that a commission be set up to consider all such names as that of abbots and priors, and suggested that they should substitute for these "other names more agreeable to the Word of God." 2 That the Scottish Reformed Church acquiesced in 1572 in a form of diocesan bishops does not mean that they voluntarily approved the scheme. It was fundamentally a question of needs must. The new bishops had little power and less honour among their brethren; and they were subject to the

1. Apologetical Narrative-Scot, p.25. 2. Calderwood, Vol.3, p.220.

General Assembly in spiritualibus, and were not to act in admission of clergy without the advice of ministers. As Dr. Lee has said, "It is a singular indication of the feelings of the Church generally towards the order, that, with the exception of Boyd, no bishop was ever chosen to be moderator of the General Assembly." ¹ Following the command of the General Assembly to assist Douglas, Craig seems to have spent part of the autumn in Fife. If, thereafter, he passed on to minister at Montrose, he would only be there for less than a year. When there, he would be of great service to his friend, Erskine of Dun, who besides being Superintendent of Angus, was provost and constable of Montrose. ² The General Assembly which convened during March, 1573, had found a wider field of service for Craig; they name him the minister of New Aberdeen. The following Aberdeen Town Council Minute informs us when he arrived in the burgh:

"The 6th day of August, the year of God 1573, Master John Craig, minister, came to Aberdeen, who was appointed by the General Kirk minister of the said burgh, whom God grant may continue in the true preaching of His Word to the people thereof." ³

Craig was successor to Adam Herriot who had been forced to resign his charge during that summer through ill-health. Herriot's stipend had been £200 Scots per annum, and it is likely that Craig was similarly provided for. *N.* Dr. Law states that Craig "passed six years of incessant activity (at Aberdeen) on a (yearly) stipend of £16-13-4," but Law seems to have been misinformed as to the correct amount. ⁴ For instance, the reader at New Aberdeen, Walter Cullen, had an annual stipend of £20, so that it seems scarcely credible that the minister in charge should have received less. ⁵ It is possible that Law was misled by an Aberdeen Burgh Record of the 7th October, 1575, which reads:

1. Church of Scotland-Lee, Vol. 2, p. 7. Apologetical Narrative-Scot, p. 32.
 2. Memorials of Parish Church of Montrose-Low, p. 39. 3. Aberdeen Burgh Records (Spalding Club), Vol. 2, p. 40. 4. Craig's Catechism-Law (Introd.) p. 40. 5. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 301 (Note). *NOTE: VIDE, REGISTER OF MINISTERS ETC (MAITLAND CLUB), P. 63.*

"7th October, 1575. The said day the provost, bailies, and council, for the favour which they bear to Mr. John Craig, minister, and for his good behaviour had unto them, and in respect of his good service in his cure and vocation, grant unto him the sum (per annum ?) of forty merks (£26-13-4), usual money of Scotland, to be paid to him at the feasts of Martimas and Whitsunday...." 1

This Minute would seem to indicate, that the grant was not part of Craig's stipend, but rather an ex gratia payment.

During Craig's ministry in Aberdeen, he acted as a commissioner of the General Assembly for visiting the churches of Mar, Buchan and Aberdeen; that was during the years 1575-78. 2 He also, during this period, attended all of the General Assemblies, so that in all he must have been absent from his Aberdeen charge on numerous occasions. He was present at the General Assemblies of March and August, 1574; at that of August, 1575; at those of March and October, 1576 (in the latter of which he was elected moderator for the second time); at those of April and October, 1577, and of April, June and October, 1578; and that of July, 1579. 3 By the following year he had become second royal chaplain to King James vi, and was back once more as minister in Edinburgh.

Whilst at Aberdeen, and notwithstanding the many and incessant demands which the Reformed Church made upon him, Craig did not neglect the ordinary duties of a parish minister. For example, there was a certain Gilbert Menzies (whose father was an elder of the kirk in Aberdeen and probably a relation of Thomas Menzies, the provost) whom Craig as parish minister found it necessary to discipline, because as a prominent citizen he was setting a bad example to the local congregation by his non-attendance at Communion. Menzies was accordingly brought before the kirk session as the following Minute shows:

1. Aberdeen Burgh Records, 1570-1625. 2. Fasti Eccles. Scot., Part 6, p. 462. 3. Calderwood, Vol. 3, pp. 304-443.

"17th August, 1574. The said day, Gilbert Menzies, younger, was accused before the lords and session for not coming to Communion according to his promise made in Edinburgh, twice before my Lord Regent's Grace and Council, when all his excuses were laid aside, and commanded either to join himself to the next Communion, between this time and All-Hallows, or else that the sentence of excommunication should pass upon him without further delay, and this injunction was given to the minister, Mr. John Craig, by the said lords and session of the kirk." 1 N.

It is possible to discern the influence of John Craig behind the following transaction which concerned the welfare of the poor; for these seem to have had a large claim on his sympathies. During the year 1574, the Regent Morton, for whom Craig appears to have had a deep respect, ordered the organs to be removed from the church at Aberdeen and disposed of for the benefit of the poor. 2 It is very likely that John Craig considered these instruments of music as unnecessary, and was therefore glad of the opportunity to be rid of what to him would appear but a remnant of Popery. There exists an Aberdeen Burgh Record of the 1st of May, 1579, which throws a kindly light on Craig's parochial duties. It tells how the Town Council gave instructions to their common clerk, one John Kennedy, who had in their name collected money from their townfolk for the support and relief of the Scottish prisoners taken by the Turks at Marocco (Morocco ?); he was "to deliver to Mr. John Craig, minister of God's Word in this burgh, the sum of 100 merks, usual money, collected and received by him....and ordained the said John Kennedy to receive the said Mr. John Craig's acquittance thereof." 3 A kindly gift surely, and for a worthy cause!

That the church of Aberdeen under the ministry of Craig were truly zealous for the glory of God may be seen from the following records:

"21st January, 1574. The Assembly (here, obviously, a local body) ordains the minister to charge and admonish, on Sunday next, all and sundry within this town to comper....and examine the lives

1. Eccles. Records of Aberdeen (Spalding Club), 1562-1681. 2. Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, Vol. 2, p. 371 (1574). 3. Aberdeen Burgh Records, 1570-1625. NOTE: Vide, appendix E.

of the minister, elders and deacons, and to lay to their charge such things as they know to be slanderous to the kirk."

"27th January, 1574. The minister, reader, elders and deacons being tried on their lives and conversation, together with their houses and families, each person examined individually, were found sufficient and qualified in their offices, lives and conversations." 1

Craig, a few years later, was able to insist on an interesting, ^{local} innovation with regard to the marriages which he performed:

"13th June, 1577. It was decided with the consent of the minister and the whole session, that no person shall be married in time coming but upon the stool before the desk, conforming to the use of Edinburgh and other kirks, and ordain the minister to publish the same order openly in pulpit." 2

According to Calderwood, the General Assembly which chose Craig as minister of New Aberdeen, had sent him there with the further duty "to illuminate the dark places in Mar, Buchan and Aberdeen, and to teach the youth of the College there." 3 Wodrow states that according to certain manuscripts in his possession, John Craig seems to have been for a short period Principal of Aberdeen University, "and," concludes Wodrow, "I doubt not but Mr. Craig was singularly useful in the north during the eight (really six) years he was there, both in pulpit and university." 4 Craig certainly procured the deposition of Anderson, the last Catholic principal of the university, and he seems to have had a hand in installing Arbuthnot the first Protestant principal. It is highly probable, that Craig acted as interim principal until the induction of Arbuthnot, meanwhile lecturing to the students. Professor John Johnston of St Andrews, in his elegaic verses on Craig, calls him "his former teacher." W. Johnston seems to have been born and brought up in or around Aberdeen, the traditional year of his birth being 1570, but as there is really no authority for this date, it may well be that he was born even earlier.

1. Eccles. Records Aberd., 1562-1681. 2. Ibid. 3. John Craig-Walker (privately printed lecture), p.9. 4. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p.21.

It is possible, of course, that Johnston who received part of his education at the University of Aberdeen, is simply referring to Craig's ministry in general, yet this "qui Doctor quondam meus" suggests rather the relationship of teacher and student.¹ It is true that there are no Aberdeen University records to prove that Craig ever taught there; but there may well have been some which were subsequently lost. At any rate, Craig at some period of his career was Johnston's teacher, and this could only have happened whilst the former was stationed in Aberdeen.

¹. Vide Johnston's Latin poem, p. 1 of this thesis. Also, The Scottish Nation-Anderson, Vol. 2, p. 576.

The eighth decade of the sixteenth century, was a time of intense discord and struggle between Church and State in Scotland, on the one question of episcopal appointments. As we have seen, the Convention held at Leith early in 1572 and the two subsequent General Assemblies, had somewhat grudgingly sanctioned the appointment of bishops within the Reformed Church, and these popular wit had promptly stigmatised as "Tulchans." With very few exceptions, these bishops proved to be real "troublers in Israel," so much so that Craig and the other principal reformers had their hands full for many ~~xx~~ years in endeavouring to bring their rule to an end. *N.*

At the General Assembly, convened during March, 1573, Craig was appointed with several others to summons the Chapter of Moray before them because it had granted George, Bishop of Moray, testimonials, although he had been publicly proved guilty of fornication. These testimonials had been granted by the Chapter to the bishop, "without trying him, and due examination of his life and qualifications in literature." ¹ This General Assembly also ordered George Hay, commissioner of Aberdeen, to "deliver a true copy of his accounts of Collectory of Aberdeen and Banff of 1572 to Mr. John Craig, to the effect that the ministers of that country may understand what allowances are taken from their stipends of the said year." ² Craig was a commissioner in whom the General Assembly had every confidence. When the Assembly convened during August of the following year, Craig and Hay duly reported on their superintendence of the Bishop of Moray and Chapter. The two reformers were evidently far from satisfied with the moral and spiritual state of the entire Moray diocese, for they signified to the Assembly the desire that their criticisms regarding the same should be registered in its Minutes. It

1. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 304. 2. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 288., 289.

NOTE: "HE (CRAIG) WAS AN EAGER OPPOSER OF PRELACY." — ROW'S HISTORY, h. 415.

is of significant interest to note, that when the commissioners were in conference over this episcopal episode, the Bishop of Moray, when required to give "proof of his doctrine," had to request permission to do so from Arbuthnot, the Principal of Aberdeen University, and from John Craig, the chief minister of that town. 1 About this time, Craig also served on a select committee with Hay and others, the purpose of which was to treat with the Regent Morton on certain decisions that the recent General Assembly had made. 2

When the General Assembly convened in Edinburgh during August, 1575, many present were of the opinion "that long continuance of commissioners in their offices would breed ambition....and they thought it good to debate if these should be changed from year to year." After lengthy discussion, they decided that where suitable men might be had, in the interests of the Church at large a yearly change ought to be made. However, we learn that "for the present, Mr. George Hay was appointed to be commissioner of Caithness, and Mr. John Craig, minister of Aberdeen, to be commissioner of Aberdeen in his room." It is not unlikely, that it was because of local complaints about Hay's conduct of his office, that led to these changes. He was still retained as a commissioner and so also was John Craig, because the General Assembly realised that men of their ability could not yet be replaced. And notwithstanding the decision of the General Assembly to have their commissioners changed yearly, whenever possible, Craig^s seems to have remained one of their indispensables. 3

With the appearance of Andrew Melville as a leader of the General Assembly, the Church and Nation soon became aware of the emergence of a commanding personality in many ways akin to that of John Knox.

1. John Craig, D.D. - Story, p. 54. 2. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 331. 3. Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 301-304. 3. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 354.

Craig and others who belonged to the original band of the Scottish reformers were now for the most part in late middle life, so that Melville and then John Davidson were able to bring to the gigantic tasks of the Reformed Church the much-needed fire and enthusiasm and fearlessness of youth. During the General Assembly of 1575, Melville, but recently appointed Principal of the University of Glasgow, rose and delivered a lengthy, powerful and stirring speech, in the course of which he made bold to affirm, "that none should bear office in the Church except those whose designation is found in the Scriptures, and though the title of bishop does occur in the New Testament, it does not denote an order of men superior to ministers. 1 This oration of Melville's made a tremendous impression on the minds and hearts of the assembled brethren, they had not been stirred so deeply for many a long day. The General Assembly, therefore, resolved to act immediately on its roused conscience, and accordingly appointed six of its trusted and most experienced members to reason together forthwith, "whether the bishops, as they are now in Scotland, have their function of the Word of God, yes or no; or, if the Chapters appointed for creating bishops ought to be tolerated in this Reformed Kirk." 2 For the affirmative, and for the purposes of debate, the Assembly ordained Hay, Row and Lindsay; and for the negative, Craig, Lawson and Andrew Melville. N. Following upon several sessions in which these six reformers engaged in protracted arguments, they gave answer to the problem which they had so keenly debated. They informed the General Assembly which was still in session that "They did not find it expedient as yet to give answer directly to the main question (the Scriptural status of bishops), but unanimously agreed, that if any unqualified bishop be chosen, not having these qualities and qualifications required in God's

1. Church of Scotland-Lee, Vol. 2, p. 13. 2. History of the Kirk of Scotland-Row, p. 56. NOTE: "SIX OF THE MOST LEARNED, HOLY, GRAVE, AND PRUDENT BRETHREN." - ROW'S HISTORY, P. 54.

Word, he be tried by General Assembly de novo, and that being found unqualified, he be deposed." 1 This recommendation was without doubt much less than both Melville and Craig desired (and indeed the General Assembly); but the Regent Morton on whose power and good-will the reformers leaned, had still his grip on the Kirk. For reasons of state policy, his express wish was for the continuance of the estate of bishops within the Reformed Church of Scotland. Nevertheless, these conclusions which were readily accepted by the General Assembly, must have been much less than gratifying to Morton, and to the bishops in particular.

The second General Assembly of the year, 1576, met in Edinburgh during the month of October, when John Craig was again chosen moderator. 2 Arising out of one of its decisions, Craig was summoned to appear before the regent's Privy Council. This summons was the result of a complaint lodged by one, John Carmichael and his wife, Margaret Scott, whom the Church had forbidden to live together as man and wife, this being the judgment that Craig as moderator had urged the Assembly to pronounce, because these complainers had been proved guilty of adultery. Craig, Hay and Boyd the Archbishop of Glasgow as representatives of the Church, appeared in person before the regent's Council, as did Carmichael together with his lawyer, Henry Balfour. Morton demanded that George Hay should produce the Act of Assembly concerning the sin of adultery, but he stoutly refused to do so on the grounds that the said Act had yet to be extracted from the books of Assembly. Hay, and doubtless his brethren, resented this interference on the part of the civil authorities with matters which were strictly ecclesiastical, hence his commendable reluctance to co-operate with the regent. Thereupon, Morton gave judgment

1. Row's History, p. 56 et seq. Book of the Univ. Kirk, p. 340. 2. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 369. Row's History, p. 57

in favour of Carmichael and his wife and ordered the suspension of the Act in their case for all time coming. The regent had been displeased in recent months with the independent spirit which the Church had manifested in taking its stand against bishops and their nominees. His judgment, therefore, in the Carmichael case, is probably an indication that he had determined to trim the sails of the General Assembly, and of Craig in particular, he (Morton) gladly welcoming this opportunity to do so. 1

About this time, over and above all this administrative work on Craig's part, he was zealously engaged with Andrew Melville and some twenty other brethren, in the preparation of the Second Book of Discipline concerning which Dr. John Cunningham, the Church historian says that to this day, it remains "the foundation stone of our ecclesiastical constitution." During the General Assembly of the following April, 1577, its commissioners decided that some of the heads on the "policy and jurisdiction of the Church," committed to John Craig to frame, should be contracted, and that others ought to be referred to further reasoning. 2 Since this Assembly felt that too much time was being spent on debating these matters, it gave commission to John Craig and a select committee to labour together for the clarification of the points at issue. Craig and his colleagues commenced their laborious task at once, being so industrious that they were able to submit their recommendations at the tenth session of this Assembly. Thereupon, the commissioners present agreed on all the heads of the Second Book of Discipline, excepting three, which they desired further reasoning upon, namely, Concerning Deacons, The Law of Patronage, and Concerning Divorce. 3 Within four years, this great book in its final form was accepted by the Reformed Church.

1. Registers of the Privy Council of Scotland, Vol. 2, p. 560. 2. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 381. 3. Apologetical Narrative-Scot, p. 41.

According to James Melville, Andrew Melville's nephew, Craig and Arbuthnot had the chief hand in composing the overture concerning the Second Book of Discipline, the draught of which was drawn up at the General Assembly of 1578, which met in the historic Magdalene Chapel situated in the Cowgate, Edinburgh. Both Craig's and Arbuthnot's mature judgment, and expert understanding of the legal issues involved in this monumental undertaking of the Reformed Church, were of immense value to their fellow-members in committee. We do not know what actual "Heads" of this meticulously prepared Second Book of Discipline belong to Craig's gifted pen, yet since he had an intimate knowledge of both civil and canon law, it is very likely that he was the author of chapter one, on the General Policy of the Kirk, and wherein it is different from the Civil Policy; chapter two on Persons or Office-bearers to whom the Administration is committed; chapter seven on Elderships, Assemblies and Discipline; and chapter ten on the Office of a Christian Magistrate in the Kirk. This Second Book of Discipline or Policy of the Kirk, took almost five years to complete, and it was therefore the result of much earnest thought and careful deliberations. It was acknowledged in the Reformed Church by a deliverance of the General Assembly, April, 1581. The deliverance reads:

"Forasmuch as Labours have been taken in the Framing of the Policy of the Kirk, and divers Suits have been made to the Magistrate for the Approbation thereof, which yet hath not taken happy effect; Yet that the Posterity may judge well of this present age, and of the Meaning of the Kirk, the Assembly hath concluded, that the Book of Policy, agreed to in divers Assemblies before, should be registered in the Acts of the Kirk, and remain there ad perpetuam rei memoriam, and the copies thereof to be taken by every Presbytery." 1

Arbuthnot was moderator of the General Assembly which convened during April, 1577, and Craig together with Pont, Dun and a few others were instructed to meet with him in an advisory capacity prior to each of
1. Confessions of Faith, published in 1764 by Bryce, Glasgow.

its sederunts. This Assembly directed Craig and Lindsay to seek an audience with the regent and to receive his answer to the articles of the Church's Policy already decided on, and also to request his Grace to take steps to prohibit "plays of Robin Hood, King of May, and such others on the Sabbath day." 1

Arising out of the discussions and debates in the General Assemblies of the past two years on the place of bishops in the Reformed Kirk, Craig, Andrew Melville and the other principal reformers were able to lead their Church to the following important decisions:

1. The name of a bishop is common to all them that have a particular flock, over which they have a particular charge to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments, and to execute the ecclesiastical discipline with the consent of the elders.

2. Out of this number may be chosen some to have power to oversee and visit such reasonable bounds, besides their own flock, as the General Assembly shall appoint, with the consent of the ministers of that province, and the consent of the flock, to whom they shall be appointed, as well as to appoint elders and deacons to every particular congregation, where there is none, with the consent of the minister aforesaid. 2

It was in the General Assembly of October, 1577, which convened in the nether Tolbooth, Edinburgh, that the over-all plan of Church government had been completed and ratified, and that in direct contradiction to the express wishes of the regent. Craig and John Brand, the minister of Holyrood Abbey church, were sent by their brethren to seek an immediate audience with Morton with the request that he would attend the General Assembly in person that its decisions might be presented to him, but he sent back the answer that he was too busy. The truth is that he was very angry with the Assembly over its decisions with regard to bishops, and he therefore chose to show his displeasure by his absence from its

1. Book of the Univ. Kirk, p. 388. 2. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 21.

sederunts. However, the General Assembly was in too resolute a mood to be intimidated by the regent's snub, and sent to him a second deputation of ministers, a larger one this time, headed by Craig, Row and Erskine of Dun, with specific instructions to wait on him and to seek conference. 1 The Church, determined not to accede to Morton's wishes with regard to the appointment of bishops, a few months later added to its important decisions by suppressing the titles of bishops altogether, requiring these to be called by their own names only. 2 N.

It is possible, that John Craig was not so adverse as Andrew Melville, to some form of superintendence within the Reformed Church of Scotland. For instance, one of the matters of recent debate and decision in the General Assembly was, that a "chosen overseer" should "visit such reasonable bounds....to appoint elders and deacons to every particular congregation...." About a fortnight prior to the October General Assembly of 1577, we learn that "Master David Cunningham, who had been recently appointed by the crown, Bishop of Aberdeen, inaugurated elders and deacons chosen by the kirk (there were twenty new office-bearers in all), the minister being Master John Craig." 3 David Cunningham was himself consecrated Bishop of Aberdeen a month later by Patrick Constance (Adamson), Bishop (thus the Minute reads) of St Andrews, who preached the sermon. John Craig appeared as one of the collators of the new bishop, and "that in the presence of the whole congregation of Aberdeen with others of the country present for the occasion." 4 Incidentally, the ordination of so many worthy men at which Cunningham himself officiated, speaks well for Craig's pastoral care and superintendence of his Aberdeen congregation. This pastoral efficiency Craig seems to have nobly maintained, for on the twentieth of October of the following year, he person-

1. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 388. Book of the Univ. Kirk, p. 393. 2. Church of Scotland-Lec, Vol. 2, p. 18. 3. Aberdeen Burgh Records, p. 46-13th October, 1577. 4. Chronicle of Aberdeen (Spalding Club), Vol. 2, p. 51., and also Aberdeen Burgh Records, p. 51-11th November, 1577. NOTE: Vide B.U.K, p. 404.

ally "inaugurated" yet another twenty elders and deacons.

Up until John Craig resigned his ministerial charge in Aberdeen, which he did during the autumn of 1579, we find him busily engaged at each General Assembly in all the important Church matters of the time. During the spring of 1578, he was sent by the Assembly then convening in the Magdalene Chapel (where he had delivered his famous lectures in Latin sixteen years previously), to the King's Council with the earnest request that a royal commission might come to the Assembly "to assist with their presence and counsel." ¹ But Morton yet seemed loath to co-operate with the Church. Some time later, Craig, Erskine of Dun and Row sought conference with the government then convening at Stirling, and presented "such heads, articles and complaints as delivered by the Kirk."² These were: Relief for the poor in the present dearth; the Sabbath day to be universally observed; markets, plays and all other impediments which hinder the people from coming to hear the Word of God, to be forbidden. Craig and the others with him felt that little would be gained at this time by such an audience with the King and Council, yet this did not prevent them from boldly presenting these deliverances of the General Assembly. Zealous to maintain the purity and the undivided service of its ministers, the Assembly also instructed Craig and his colleagues to debate, when in royal conference, on "how far ministers may meddle with civil affairs, and if they may vote in Council, or Parliament." ³ The reason for this instruction was, that the bishops within the Kirk required to be watched carefully. Adamson, for example, when commissioner of the General Assembly, usually agreed to its decisions, but when in Parliament he invariably voted against these. The General Assembly of 1579, gave Craig, Andrew Melville, Hay and others the task of scrutinizing carefully the

1. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 401. 2. Book of the Univ. Kirk, p. 405, and 436 et seq. 3. Ibid.

"answer given in by Mr. Patrick Adamson (note, in accordance with their previous decision, no episcopal title), to removing the corruption in the estate of bishops." 1 Adamson, as we shall see, was to become from within, the inveterate enemy of the Reformed Church. He bore no love towards John Craig, and some years later did his utmost to slander the latter's good name. Craig was destined to make a public stand against Adamson after the passing of the notorious "Black Acts" of 1584. He (Craig) had nothing but contempt for this dissembler and disgracer of the Reformed Church.

During the late summer of 1579, John Craig was appointed by King James vi to be his second royal chaplain. Craig's commendation to the young king, came in all likelihood through the influence of powerful friends who had connections with the court: the Regent Morton (for whom Craig seems to have had a sincere regard), Bishop David Cunningham of Aberdeen, the reformer's own nephew, Thomas Craig, advocate, and the first royal chaplain, John Duncanson. The last mentioned knew John Craig intimately, having served with him over many years. On several important committees of the General Assembly, and indeed being at this time engaged with Craig in searching out the Papists who were gaining ground in Scotland, and in particular at the royal court, "to make them subscribe to the Articles of Religion approved and confirmed by Parliament, and to take Communion." 2 King James, although but a lad of thirteen years, was most precocious, and he may well have imagined that since Craig besides being a leading churchman was reputed to hold moderate opinions, he might prove a useful ally in time to come. Probably the real reason for the appointment was the desire of the king and his advisers to gain the good graces of the General Assembly. N. We are informed that when its commis-

1. Book of the Univ. Kirk, p. 432. 2. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 401.

NOTE: VIDE ROW'S HISTORY, P. 67.

sioners heard of the king's choice, which was intimated to them by letter at the Dundee General Assembly of July, 1580, "they blessed the Lord, and praised the king for his zeal." 1 Craig, who was a member of this Assembly, had the honour to present His Majesty's letter of greeting, "Truly beloved friends, we greet you well...." 2 He (Craig) had by then been serving in his new appointment for at least eight months. There exists an Aberdeen Town Council Minute which enables us to know exactly when he bade farewell to his northern congregation, and is as follows:

"The 13th day of September, the year of God 1579, Master John Craig, sometime minister of Aberdeen, left, with his wife, bairns, and whole household, out of the said burgh, and left his flock unprovided with a minister to be preacher to the King's grace, as he alleged." 3

Aberdeen was without ~~another~~ minister for some considerable time, but on the

"14th September, 1582.....the whole town admitted Mr. Peter Blackburn to be minister of the burgh....and obliged the same to assist the ministry, and be subject to the discipline and correction of the kirk, as also ratify, affirm and approve the articles subscribed by them beforehand, anent God's true religion, order, and discipline of the Kirk, made, given, and presented by Mr. John Craig, sometime minister of this burgh...." 4

There would appear, then, to have been no hard feelings betwixt Craig and his former congregation. Blackburn was to prove himself an able and important minister of Aberdeen, and an excellent commissioner of the General Assembly. John Craig's name and work would not be forgotten in the north for many years, if only by means of this formula of ministerial induction which he had designed. It is possible that this formula was based on material extracted from Craig's Magnum Opus, "A Short Sum of the Whole Catechism," much, if not all of which he had written, and employed, whilst he was minister of Aberdeen.

1. Row's History, p. 68. 2. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 464. 3. Aberdeen Burgh Records, Vol. 2, p. 51. 4. Ibid, (1570-1625).

John Craig, as royal chaplain, was soon to find himself called upon to do important work on behalf of King James, and that was to draw up the historic and forthright document which came to be popularly known as the King's Confession, or better still, the National Covenant. The pressing need for such a Confession arose because there had been determined attempts by several emissaries of the Pope, for the most part Jesuits, to influence the king Romewards, and his mother had raised her head again and had intimated her desire to have a priest sent to Scotland to convert her son. 1 Privy to the plot were the Earl of Huntly, the Lord Seton, and the Earl of Lennox (Esmé Stuart cousin of the king), and several of the lesser barons, who exerted all their power and influence at court in favour of a return of the nation, and in particular King James, to Catholicism. The immediate occasion, therefore, that produced the National Covenant of 1581, was the well-founded dread within the Reformed Church of the reintroduction of Popery throughout Scotland. The General Assembly of July, 1580, was fully alive to the danger, for "it severely criticised the Papists that had flocked home with Monsieur D'Aubigny (Lennox) who had presence and credit at court; with regard to whom the King's ministers Mr. John Craig and John Duncanson were admonished (this doubtless being to keep a watchful eye on their movements)." 2 It was generally believed, that a number of influential men, who were secretly Catholics, had received dispensations from the Pope to simulate Protestantism, frequent church services, and receive the Sacrament according to the rites of the Reformed Church, in order the more secretly to carry out their designs. 3 By means of this novel Trojan horse, its promoters hoped to win Scotland back again to the old faith. According to the Catholic historian Bellesheim, Lennox had declared secretly his own adhesion to Rome, and also his inten-

1. Counter-Reformation in Scotland-Maclean, p.49. 2. Autobiography of James Melville, p.80. 3. Craig's Catechism (Introd.)-Law, p.43.

sion, for reasons of policy, to fraternise with the Protestants. 1

Father Hunter Blair, the translator of Bellesheim, denies strenuously the assertion of Spottiswoode that the National Covenant was the immediate result of a discovery that a dispensation had been granted by the Pope to the Catholics of Scotland permitting them to promise and subscribe whatever was required of them, so long as they continued secretly true to their faith. 2 Deny this as he may, the facts register against him; for as we shall see, it was because of the gravest of causes that the Reformed Church was forced to adopt the universal signing of the National Covenant. The Scottish reformers had seen and heard enough in recent days to convince them that the entire fabric of their Church was being seriously threatened by ingenious Catholic adversaries, and they decided that in self-defence, they must act now or never. Throughout Scotland, therefore, there arose a popular outcry from all the pulpits, and this became so insistent and challenging, that obviously over-awed for the present, King James and Lennox summoned the ministers to Edinburgh, where James proceeded to show what labour he had taken to convert his cousin, and how he had prevailed on him to take David Lindsay of Leith as his private chaplain. Thereafter, Lennox proceeded to the High Kirk of St Giles, where he publicly denounced the Mass. When we recall that Bellesheim, an accredited Catholic historian, asserts that Lennox was a secret Catholic himself, then his public denunciation of the Mass really strengthens the argument for the alleged Papal dispensations. Notwithstanding this dramatic act on the part of Lennox, the popular mind could not free itself from the horrible suspicion that "Catholics were permitted to promise, swear, subscribe, and do whatever else should be required of them, so as in mind they continued firm and did use their diligence to advance in secret the Roman faith." 3

1. History of the Catholic Church in Scotland-Bellesheim, p. 249. Vol. 3
 2. Ibid. 3. Spottiswoode, Vol. 2, p. 268.

The Catholics at court had blundered badly in thoroughly alarming the reformers who now took command of the situation, the immediate and salutary result being the appearance towards the end of January, 1581, of the National Covenant. King James ordered his chaplain John Craig to write the famous document, so as to bind his people to the "true Christian Faith and Religion, according to God's Word and our Acts of Parliament." Craig wrote copies of the National Covenant in both Scots and Latin, the latter being for the benefit of the continental Reformed Churches. Schaff describes the document as the most fiercely anti-Popish of all Confessions, and Dr. Curtis notes that its reference to infant salvation, corresponding to the private view of Zwingli and Bullinger, is the first Confessional utterance of the kind. 1 The enemies of this Confession severely criticised it on the grounds that it was wholly negative, being but a virulent denunciation of the errors of Papacy, but as Hay Fleming points out, it is also affirmative in that it affirms the Scots Confession of 1560. 2 This is really the view of Scot, the sixteenth century historian, and a contemporary of Craig's. Scot says

"The first clause of this Confession comprehendeth the first Confession already ratified in Parliament; so it is not merely negative, but partly affirmative, partly negative; and the negative was added for the better trial of Papists, and the sincerity of converts and professors, in the renouncing of errors." 3

Although this historic document of 1581 has been called a Covenant, in name, in structure, and in contents, it is none the less a Confession. The Acts of Assembly and of Parliament ordaining and ratifying it give its description as "The Confession of Faith and Covenant." As we shall see, in its paragraphs it repeatedly refers to "this our Confession," "the Confession of Faith above written," and "the aforesaid Confession." 4

1. Creeds of Christendom-Schaff, p. 687. Creeds and Confessions of Faith-Curtis, p. 261. 2. Reformation in Scotland-Fleming, p. 285. 3. Apologetical Narrative-Scot, p. 46. 4. Confessions of the Church of Scotland-M' Crie, pp. 21-27. NOTE: IT WAS BY USE AND WONT THAT IT CAME TO BE CALLED THIS. ROW'S HISTORY, P. 73, SAYS "IT WAS COMMONLY CALLED THE KING'S CONFESSION." ROW ALSO NAMES IT "THE COVENANT," P. 78, AND THE "CONFESSION OF FAITH AND COVENANT," P. 233.

Chapter Fourteen.

.....

The original document of the National Covenant complete with signatures, reposes in the safe custody of the National Library, Edinburgh, being always on view to the general public. This bold, uncompromising, and noble declaration, couched in words of legal precision, was to prove a foundation-rock of Scottish life and liberties, and its text is as follows:

"We, each and every one of us undersigned, protest, that after long and due examination of our own consciences in matters of true and false religion, are now thoroughly resolved in truth, by the Word and Spirit of God. And, therefore, we believe with our hearts, confess with our mouths, subscribe with our hands, and constantly affirm, before God and the whole world, that this alone is the true Christian Faith and Religion, pleasing to God and bringing salvation to man, which is now, by the mercy of God, revealed to the world by the preaching of the blessed Gospel, and is received, believed, and defended by many and notable Kirks and Realms, but chiefly by the Kirk of Scotland, the King's Majesty, and the Three Estates of this realm, as God's eternal truth, and only ground of our salvation, as more particularly is expressed in the confession of our faith, stablished, and publicly confirmed, by Sundry Acts of Parliaments and now, of a long time has been openly professed by the King's Majesty, and the whole body of his realm, both in burgh and land. To the which confession and form of religion we willingly agree in our consciences in all points, as unto God's undoubted truth and verity, grounded alone upon His written Word.

"And, therefore, we abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine, but chiefly, all kinds of Papistry, in general and particular heads, even as they are now damned and confuted by the Word of God and the Kirk of Scotland. But, in particular, we detest and refuse usurped authority of that Roman Anti-Christ, upon the Scriptures of God, upon the Kirk, the civil magistrate, and consciences of men; all his tyrannical laws made upon indifferent things, against our christian liberty; his erroneous doctrine against the sufficiency of the written Word, the perfection of the Law, the offices of Christ, and His blessed Gospel, his corrupted doctrine concerning original sin, our natural inability and rebellion against God's law, our justification by faith only, our imperfect sanctification and obedience to the law; the nature, number, and use of the holy Sacraments, his five bastard sacraments, with all his rites, ceremonies, and false doctrine, added to the ministration of the true Sacraments without the Word of God; his cruel judgment against infants departing without the Sacrament, his absolute necessity of baptism; his blasphemous opinion of transubstantiation, or real presence of Christ's body

in the elements, and receiving the same by the wicked bodies of men; his dispensations for vows, perjuries, and degrees of marriage forbidden in the Word; his cruelty against the innocent divorced, his devilish mass, his blasphemous priesthood, his profane sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead; his canonization of men, calling upon angels and departed saints, worshipping of imagery, relics, crosses; dedicating of kirks, alters, days, vows to creatures; his purgatory, prayers for the dead, praying or speaking in a strange language; his processions and blasphemous Litany, and multitude of advocates and mediators; his manifold orders, auricular confession, his desperate and uncertain repentance, his general and doubtful faith, his satisfaction from men for their sins; his justification by works, opus operatum, works of superogation, merits, pardons, pergrinations, stations; his holy water, baptising of bells, exorcising of spirits, crossing, signing, anointing, exorcising, hallowing of God's good creatures, with the superstitious opinion joined therewith; his worldly monarchy and wicked hierarchy; his three solemn vows with all his tonsures of various kinds; his erroneous and bloody decrees made at Trent, with all the subscribers and approvers of that cruel and bloody band conjured against the Kirk of God; and finally, we detest all his vain allegories, rites, signs, and traditions, brought into the Kirk, to the which we join ourselves willingly, in doctrine, faith, religion, discipline, and use of the holy Sacraments, as lively members of the same in Christ, our Head; promising and swearing by the great name of the Lord our God, that we shall continue in the obedience of the doctrine and the discipline of this Kirk, and shall defend the same, according to our vocation and power, all the days of our lives, under the pains contained in the law, and danger both of body and soul in the day of God's fearful judgment.

"And seeing that many are stirred up by Satan and that Roman Anti-Christ to promise, swear, subscribe, and for a time use the holy Sacraments in the Kirk deceitfully, against their own conscience, minding hereby, first, under the external cloak of religion, to corrupt and subvert secretly God's true religion within the Kirk, and afterward, when time may serve, to become open enemies and persecutors of the same, under vain hope of the Pope's dispensation, devised against the Word of God, to his greater confusion and their double condemnation in the day of the Lord Jesus: we, therefore, willing to take away all suspicion of hypocrisy, and of such double dealing with God and His Kirk, protest, and call the Searcher of all hearts to witness, that our minds and hearts do fully agree with this our confession, promise, vow, and subscribe, so that we are not moved for any worldly respect, but are persuaded alone in our consciences, through the knowledge and love of God's true religion, printed in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, as we shall answer Him in the day when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed.

"And because we perceive that the quietness and stability of our religion and Kirk depend upon the safety and good behaviour of the King's Majesty, as upon a comfortable instrument of God's mercy, granted to this country for the maintaining of His Kirk, and administration of justice among us, we protest and promise with our hearts, under the same vow, hand-write, and pains, that we shall defend his person and authority with our gear, bodies, and lives, in defence of Christ's Gospel, liberty of our country, administration of justice, and punishment of iniquity, against all enemies, within or without this realm, as we desire our God to be a strong and merciful defender to us in the day of our death, and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom with the Father and the Holy Spirit, be all honour and glory eternally. Amen." 1

It is obvious from a study of this impassioned and forthright Confession, that John Craig who wrote it and the reformers who approved its content, were convinced of the reality of the Papal dispensations already referred to. Dr. Law has called the National Covenant, "This powerful and indignant protest against every doctrine, rite, and ceremony of the Roman Church, perhaps the most remarkable and characteristic document which ever emanated from the Church of Scotland." 2 Both Calderwood and Wodrow imagine that under the name of "wicked hierarchy," the Confession condemns equally episcopal government; but it is evident from the context that the Papal hierarchy alone is meant. This Confession of Faith was solemnly sworn and subscribed by the king and his household on the 28th day of January, 1581, and at the royal command it was committed to print. In the original document there ^{ARE} thirty-seven signatures in all, including that of perfidious Lennox, and underneath the royal hand-write at the top of the left-hand column, heading the commoners, is to be found that of John Craig. There is no doubt but that this signal honour of having his name nearest to that of his sovereign, was accorded Craig in virtue of his having written the document. Among the other signatures are those of Lord Seton and the Master of Gray, who were probably as Lennox, secret Catholics. It is difficult to understand how such a Con-

1. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 501 et seq. 2. Craig's Catechism (Introd.) - Law, p. 44.

cession could have been signed by anyone with the slightest inclination towards or respect for Roman Catholic teaching. That Lennox signed this Confession of Faith is surely proof that the Papal dispensation was a reality.

At the General Assembly which met in Glasgow during the month of April, 1581, the National Covenant was cordially approved, and all commissioners and ministers of the Church were ordered "to crave the same Confession of their parishoners, and to proceed against the refusers according to our laws and order of the Kirk...." But there was little need of coercion; for the National Covenant was the desire of Scotland. As we noted earlier on, almost the entire adult population of Glasgow signed it, and we learn that

"the subscriptions to the National Covenant in the united parishes of Anstruther, Pittenweem, and Abercromby, amounted to 743; and are still preserved with the attestation of Mr. William Clark, the minister and two witnesses." 1

Several years later, there appeared under the title of "A Short Catholic Confession," a counter-blast to Craig's Confession of 1581. It began with a Catholic Confession of Faith in direct opposition to the Scottish Confession, followed by an exposition or defence of its teaching. Its unknown author named it "A Short Catholic Confession of the heads of religion now controverted in Scotland, answering against the heretical Negative Confession set forth by John Craig in his Catechism." Craig had included in his major work, "A Short sum of the whole Catechism," the text of the National Covenant of 1581. The following is a typical example of the Catholic Confession:

"We confess that men after the fall of Adam have free-will not only to do evil but also to do good, which apparently Master Craig in his Negative Confession durst not deny for (fear of) offending the courtiers."

1. Andrew Melville-M' Crie, p. 81 (foot-note), Vol. 2.

This Catholic Tractate, like other similar effusions, lost much of its appeal through being printed in the vernacular. The National Covenant, if we may judge its worth from the rage it provoked in its Catholic opponents, had dealt their cause a resounding blow: "Triple traitors, who not only speak after the southern manner in your Negative Confession, but also caused it to be printed in London in contempt of our native language." ¹ Row the historian was but stating the truth when he wrote that

"This Confession was, for its exactness and worthiness, much esteemed in all other christian Churches professing sincerely, and is translated into many different languages. This was the touchstone to discern Papists from Protestants, and from time to time, this Confession in days of espied deflection was renewed, the Kirk acknowledging that to be the principal means, by the blessing of God, for preventing of and reclaiming from apostasy and backsliding." ²

In 1585, it was ordained that all persons graduating at a Scottish university should subscribe to it. It was signed again by King James at his coming of age, and by his household during 1587-8, and it was solemnly renewed by all and sundry in the year 1590 by a new order of Council acting on the desire of the General Assembly; it was signed yet again during 1595. A slightly abridged copy of the Confession prefixed to the Book of Laureations for that purpose, is preserved in the University of Edinburgh, and to John Craig was accorded the honour of signing it at the top of the list, December, 1585. Commenting on this Dalzel says that

"A Short and General Confession of the true Christian Religion according to God's Word, was subscribed in the College by Mr. John Craig among others, including the two professors Rollock and Nairne. And it was resolved that all those who afterwards received degrees from the College should subscribe to this solemn engagement." ³

It is common knowledge that the Confession of 1581 formed the basis of the great National Covenant of 1638, when to the original text was added,

1. Catholic Tractates-Law, pp. 56, 105, & 249. 2. Row's History, p. 78.
3. History of the University of Edinburgh-Dalzel, p. 17. Vide also Craufurd's Hist. of Univ. of Edinb., p. 29.

among other things, the abjuration of episcopacy. It was likewise used in the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643.

In the General Assemblies of 1578 to 1581, Craig and Andrew Melville were undoubtedly the guiding lights.¹ During 1580, Craig, Erskine of Dun and Duncanson formed part of a select committee whose task it was to curb the power of the "Visitors," as Superintendents of the Reformed Church were coming to be called. This committee proposed that power should not on any account proceed from these officials but through Presbytery alone. Several of these Visitors had been proving troublesome to the Church, and what brought matters to a head was the high-handed conduct of the Superintendent of Argyll who had been out-classing even bishops in his administration of ecclesiastical affairs. The General Assembly was incensed at his presumption, and determined to bring all its superintendents to heel, it accordingly resolved as follows:

"Anent the order of Visitors. Forasmuch as it is considered by the Kirk to be a corruption, and tyrannical, that such an office should stand in the person of one man, which should flow from Presbytery." ²

This resolute decision, but doubtless one that would be unfavourably received at court, Craig, Pont and Lindsay were delegated to communicate to the Lord Clerk of Register.

On the 2nd of January, 1581, the Regent Morton was arrested, being charged with complicity in the murder of the king's father. Although John Craig had never been in full agreement with all of the regent's policy, he nevertheless had him in high regard. Following on the arrest of Morton, Craig preached in the High Kirk of St Giles, and during the course of his sermon, inveighed against the "false accusations" which had been

1. Calderwood, Vol. 3, pp. 410-476. 2. Ibid.

preferred against the former. Captain James Stewart (Ochiltree's son and brother-in-law of Knox) who had had a chief hand in the downfall of Morton, happened to be in St Giles, and on hearing Craig's bold words he drew his dagger and warned him there and then, that the pulpit should not protect anyone who slandered him. 1 This man of violence and profligacy was the new royal favourite, and he was to prove himself a sharp thorn in the side of the Reformed Church. Craig was destined to clash with him again.

When the General Assembly met in Edinburgh on the 17th of October, 1581, four names were submitted in open court for the honour of being moderator, these being Andrew Melville, Lindsay, Duncanson and Craig. Craig was absent from this particular sederunt of Assembly, but he was duly elected to fill this high and distinguished office, and that for the third time. This signal event, which must have been very gratifying to Craig, marks the zenith of his illustrious career. He had been chosen anew to this high office, by open vote, and in preference to even Melville and Lindsay, which shows how popular a figure he had become to the Church, notwithstanding his reputation for austerity and independence of spirit. The distinction was doubtless generously awarded Craig as a fitting tribute to the noble and courageous part he had played in framing and presenting the National Covenant to the Church and to the Nation; but it was also the just recognition of his solid worth over many years of unstinted public service of the highest order. 2

Among his many moderatorial duties, Craig had the unpleasant task, at this General Assembly, of dealing with Robert Montgomery, minister of Stirling, whom Lennox had prevailed upon to accept the Archbishopric of Glasgow, which had recently fallen vacant through the death of James Boyd.

1. History of Scotland-Lang, Vol. 2, p. 269. (Lang quotes from a despatch of Bowes, the English ambassador). 2. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 522.

King James had bestowed the benefice upon Lennox, who thereupon made a simoniacal bargain with Montgomery to the effect that the earl would appropriate three-fourths of its revenues, the remainder to go to his nominee. Montgomery would have been judged by this General Assembly for accepting the office of bishop contrary to its Acts, but the king interfered in their debates on the matter, and ordered the commissioners to stay their proceedings on the ground that he had ratified the agreement made at Leith, 1571, and would not approve any other policy until he was of perfect age. ¹ Not to be side-stepped, the Assembly thereupon proceeded to consider certain charges against the life and doctrine of Montgomery, and whilst these deliberations were in progress Craig ordered him to remain at Stirling, and await the decision of his brethren. ²

Lennox had found in Montgomery, who was both unscholarly and indiscreet—"a stolid ass and arrogant," is Scot's description of him ³—the willing tool who was prepared, by means of this unworthy bargain, to further shape the ~~invidious~~ designs and purposes of the royal court. Although the signature of Lennox had been appended to the National Covenant, the Church did not trust him. Any reformed minister, therefore, who fraternised with Lennox, could not but be regarded by his brethren with the gravest suspicion. It is highly probable, that Lennox had immediate need of funds, not so much for his personal requirements as for propaganda purposes of the Catholic faith, which was being hindered from making headway through lack of money. ⁴ In all these proceedings, what angered Craig and the commissioners of Assembly most, were the stupid and damaging things that Montgomery had been guilty of saying in public, more particularly since they knew that these very remarks were not so much his own as those of the court and Lennox, if not the king himself.

1. Church of Scotland-Lee, Vol. 2, p. 65. 2. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 576.
 3. Apologetical Narrative-Scot, p. 49. 4. Catholic Tractates (Introd.)-Law, p. 11.

Here within their own ranks was a shallow sycophant, who did not scruple to betray to the sworn enemies of the Reformed Kirk, their dearest religious principles. Montgomery was therefore charged by the General Assembly and in particular by Andrew Melville seconded by Craig, with teaching that the discipline of the Kirk was unimportant; that educational qualifications for the ministry were unessential (in what school did Peter and Paul graduate? said he); that the reformed ministers were all traitors; that they over-meddled in civil affairs; that he was opposed to the doctrine of Christ who taught that the most part of men are rebellious and perish; that there was no New Testament authority for either eldership or Presbytery; that the ministers were quarrelsome; and that they used in preaching, the very words of libel cast in the king's chamber against them. 1 Such irresponsible talk surely bespoke a character not even worthy of the most ordinary ministerial charge, much less the elevated rank of an archbishop claiming jurisdiction over other ministers. All these accusations against Montgomery, both Melville and Craig were bold to make in open court of Assembly. 2 The Church was destined for several years to have great trouble over this contumacious minister. Disregarding the ruling of the General Assembly, Montgomery proceeded to Glasgow (doubtless with royal encouragement) to occupy the vacant see, but the local clergy successfully resisted his intrusion. Stirred to decisive action by his obstinacy and insubordination, the Church, acting through the Presbytery of Edinburgh, excommunicated Montgomery, and commanded John Davidson, the minister of Liberton, to pronounce this sentence from his own pulpit, which Davidson did before a great congregation on June, 16th, 1582. 3 Yet the cause célèbre was by no means settled, for it dragged on through successive General Assemblies and was one of the great grounds of division between the court and the Church.

1. Calderwood, Vol. 3, pp. 579-580. 2. Book of the Univ. Kirk, p. 544.

3. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 621.

The excommunication was declared null and void by Act of Parliament, 22nd of May, 1584, that is by the parliament which instituted the so-called "Black Acts." But Montgomery was not absolved from the ban of the Reformed Church until the General Assembly of 1587. He afterwards settled in Symington, Ayrshire, without ever having become a bishop; the General Assembly and their leaders had won the drawn-out battle.

Craig, besides being moderator of the October General Assembly of 1581, served on the committee that presented to the Lord² of the Articles of Parliament, their deliverances. On this occasion, Craig was joined by his nephew, Mr. Thomas Craig, advocate. ¹ It was at this General Assembly that the bounds of Presbyteries were "rightly and fully" constituted, and it was ordained that these should not be altered unless where the Assembly approved. Ministers who either celebrated the Sacraments or married people in private houses were to be deposed. This General Assembly learned that some of their ministers had not yet signed the National Covenant of 1581, and they were instructed to append their signatures without delay and if not, they would be in danger of being deposed.²

It is possible that John Craig shared in the publication of the Arbutnot-Bassandyne Bible of 1579, which was a reprint of the Genevan version. This Scottish edition included a Calendar of the Christian Year, *WHICH* was principally the work of Robert Pont. The Calendar attracted some attention from Catholic controvertialists, in particular Adam King, a native of Edinburgh, and at that time professor of Philosophy and Mathematics at Paris. King, in his "Cenisius," which was a translation of the Catechism of the Schoolman of that name, imitates Pont's Calendar, at the same time criticising it severely. Pont, for instance, included in his calendar of saints, the names of Paul Crow and Walter Mill. Commenting on this King says: "What assurance can we have of Kilpont, Craig and others who are the canonizers of their new saints, but that they may also err." ³ This would seem to suggest that Craig as well as Pont had some hand in the compilation of the Calendar.

During the summer of 1581, there made its appearance, Craig's major

1. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 544. 2. Row's History, p. 87. 3. Catholic Tractates-Law, p. 207.

work, "A Short Sum of the Whole Catechism." This book came to be known as Craig's Catechism, and according to its preface, it was printed on the 20th July, 1581, by Henry Charteris of Edinburgh. There were several subsequent editions: that of 1583 by John Wolfe, London; and those of Robert Walgrave, 1584; of Thomas Orwin, 1589; and finally Robert Robinson, 1597. A later Edinburgh edition of the Catechism was published by John Wreittoun in 1632. Dr. Horatius Bonar reproduces the edition of 1597 in his book, "Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation." ¹ It is probable that Craig was encouraged by the General Assembly to commit his Catechism to print. There is no record of this, but that need not surprise us when we recall that numerous General Assembly Minutes around this time have been lost. Wodrow affirms that these were "mutilated" by Patrick Adamson, Archbishop of St Andrews. Since Craig's Catechism passed through several editions within a few years, it seems to have been popularly received, especially in England. If what the honorable Archibald Campbell affirms be correct, a second Scottish edition was published before the close of 1581. ² Craig's Catechism has the distinction of being the first work of its kind of purely Scottish origin. A first edition by Charteris of this rare book is in the possession of the National Library of Scotland. According to Drs. Law and Story, the only other known copy of this edition was in the library of the Gibson Craigs of Riccarton, but unfortunately all trace of this book has been lost. A facsimile of the first edition of Craig's Catechism, of which 125 copies were privately printed, was edited during 1883 by the late Dr. Law the then Keeper of the Signet Library, Edinburgh. The 1581 Catechism was in due course followed by other similar works such as James Melville's "Spiritual Propine of a Pastor to his People....," ³ and John Davidson of Prestonpans' "Some helps for Young Scholars in Christianity...." ⁴

1. Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation-Bonar, p. 179 et seq. 2. Doctrines of the Middle State-Campbell (1721), p. 9 (Intro.). 3. Andrew Melville-M' Crie, Vol. 2, p. 444. 4. Davidson of Prestonpans-Gillon, p. 213.

Craig's Catechism was unknown to Dr. Scott who wrote the "Lives of the Reformers," and also to Wodrow who mentions

"a glaring mistake of the Hon^{or}able Mr. Archibald Campbell, in his preface to his extraordinary book of the Middle State, Fol. 1721. At p. 9 he pretends to do justice to the Scots Presbyterians in hailing them into his out of the way notions of the Holy Eucharist, and to support his compliment to us he cites two editions of Mr. Craig's Catechism in his hands, printed (in) Edinburgh, 1581, that is nine or ten years before the Assembly or Mr. Craig thought upon forming this Catechism.... I suspect Mr. Campbell has mistaken Mr. Craig's Catechism for some old Popish Catechism printed long before Mr. Craig's. Whatever be in this, if he considers Mr. Calvin's Catechism and the Palatine Catechism, both approved by our Assemblies, he'll find there what he calls the doctrine of mere remembrance, though the term, in my opinion is unwary and unguarded. Wodrow uses this last phrase, which is Campbell's, ironically, and what the Church of Scotland, as far as I mind, has not used." 1

To a die-hard Presbyterian of Wodrow's stamp, it was inconceivable that Craig could have written as Campbell alleged, but Craig did; for it is Wodrow who was mistaken and not Campbell. Craig, austere though he was, would have been amused could he have heard his book described as "some old Popish Catechism." It seems odd that Wodrow should have been unacquainted with Craig's Catechism of 1581, particularly since the former was a contemporary of Campbell, who, as we have noted, possessed two copies of the book in question. Campbell, a grandson of the Marquis of Argyll, was consecrated a Scottish episcopal bishop, and among his various writings is "The Doctrines of the Middle State between Death and the Resurrection." 2 In the preface of this unusual book, we find the quotation which misled Wodrow, and it reads as follows:

"Nor should I be just to even the Scots Presbyterians, if I did not acknowledge, that they had not always such notions of the Holy Eucharist as now they have, for in Mr. John Craig's Catechism (two editions which I have now by me, both printed at Edinburgh in the year 1581) under this title, "Christ's Natural Body received. Q. Then we receive the tokens and not His Body? An. We receive His very sub-

1. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 54. 2. Ibid, p. 319. Doctrines of the Middle State-Campbell, pp. 9-10.

stantial Body and Blood. Q. How can that be proved?
 An. By the truth of His Words and Sacrament. Q. Declare
 that by the Sacrament. An. As that Natural Substance of
 the Elements is given, even to the Natural Substance of
 Christ's Body. Q. But His natural body is in heaven?
 An. No doubt, but yet we receive it on earth. Q. How can
 that be? An. By the wonderful working of the Holy Spirit.
 Thus far he, and this Catechism, was the very Catechism of
 all the Presbyterians of Scotland at that time. I leave
 it to the present Presbyterians to reconcile their mere
 remembrance with this of their ancestors, which is rather
 too near Popery for me, or at least unwarily and unguard-
 edly expressed." 1

This quotation by Campbell is identical with that of the 1581 Char-
 teris edition of Craig's Catechism. Campbell, however, is in error
 in affirming that this "was the very Catechism of all the Presbyter-
 ians of Scotland at that time." There are no records to prove that
 it was ever formally accepted by the General Assembly as was the case
 with ^{Craig's} shorter work, "A Form of Examination Before the Communion."

Calvin's Catechism, "To teach children the christian religion....,"
 had held the field as a religious primer for use in the Scottish Re-
 formed churches for upwards of seventeen years, before Craig's Cate-
 chism appeared. The Scottish ministers seem to have employed Cal-
 vin's Catechism in teaching adults as well as children. Evidently,
 through much use of this book, Craig had come to believe that something
 simpler was needed for his parishoners. It was during his Aberdeen
 ministry, therefore, that he wrote his Catechism with this particular
 end in view, and used it accordingly. His experiment seems to have
 proved successful, which doubtless encouraged him when opportunity
 served to commit his Catechism to print. From the Ecclesiastical
 Records of Aberdeen we have the following reference to the catechising
 of Craig's congregation:

"22nd May, 1578. The said day with the universal consent of
 the minister and session, it is ordained, for the instruction

of the entire population of this burgh, both young and old, in the Catechism, that in times coming, the reader read a portion of the Catechism, and the bairns answer him." 1

The Catechism referred to was probably Calvin's, but since as we shall see, Craig first used his own Catechism among his own congregation at Aberdeen, we cannot rule out the possibility that it is to it that the Minute refers. Besides, the date of this Minute relates to the closing part of Craig's Aberdeen ministry, around which time presumably, he would be using his own Catechism for the instruction of his congregation.

In the preface to his Catechism, Craig is at great pains to show why he had published it. He informs us that he had adopted the method of asking and answering questions in as brief a manner as possible, "for the greater use of the common people and children." Thereafter follows the dedication of his Catechism to the members of his former charge, "The Professors of Christ's Gospel at New Aberdeen." He assures them that it was for their sakes in the first instance, that he had taken every care "first to gather this brief sum," and that he now desires to "make it common to others." Because of his love for his former flock, and from a high sense of duty towards them, he exhorts them to take his labour in good part and also use it aright, "least it be a witness against you in the day of the Lord." Craig shows them quite candidly why he was lead to make his Catechism as simple as possible. It was because of the "great and gross ignorance" of some of them. Therefore, in handling his Catechism, he had studied to the best of his ability "to be plain, simple, short and profitable, not looking so much to the desire and satisfaction of the learned, as to the instruction and help of the ignorant." In a word, he had simplified his questions and answers as much as he dared, "for the sake of the children and the common people, who cannot understand, nor gather the substance of a long question...." All

1. Eccles. Records of Aberdeen.

this suggests that in his considerable experience as a minister, Craig had found Calvin's Catechism with its not infrequent lengthy and sometimes involved questions and answers, far too difficult for his parishoners to understand. Yet he used this Catechism as the basis of his own. "If any," says Craig, "will exercise their household in the common Catechism-Calvin's-which I exhort all men to do, this my labour cannot hurt but rather it shall be of great help to them, seeing I both gather the substance of the whole Catechism in few words, and also follow the same order except (for) a little at the beginning and in the end...." N. Craig is conscious of having gone somewhat farther than Calvin, for he says that "There are also some questions and answers.... chiefly in the matter of the Sacraments which serve to the right understanding of the matter in hand." Did Campbell detect one such difference when he wrote of Craig's views of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as being "too near Popery for me" ? Campbell is probably correct in the opinion that what Craig has written here is "unwarily and unguardedly expressed." But Craig was well aware of the heresy involved "in the real corporeal presence of Christ in the Communion Elements." We have but to turn to his forthright condemnation of the Mass in the National Covenant of 1581, to be assured of this. Craig was not guilty of any heretical teaching in his Catechism: the words to which Campbell took exception, to must simply be regarded as a solecism. In any case, Craig seems to have considered them in need of improvement, for when he came to pen his much shorter work, "A Form of Examination before Communion," he brought the teaching of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper into complete harmony with that of the Little Catechism of John Calvin. Craig says in his major work that the main instruction of the Reformed community is to be found in the Catechism of Calvin:

NOTE: Craig in preparing his Catechism, doubtless consulted also the Heidelberg Catechism, but he makes no mention of this great work. Vide, appendix G, p. 205.

"If men will both weary to learn the common Catechism, and also this Brief Sum, I cannot understand how they will be able to know the right way of their salvation; for it is certain and sure, that the reading or rehearsing of the Belief, the Law, and number of the holy Sacraments, cannot profit towards salvation, without the right understanding and lively application of the same to ourselves in particular....in the which only does the true christian faith consist."

These, surely, are noble and timeless words. But Craig is not done yet. He goes on to show how degrading is the professing of religion without theology, and he bluntly informs his Aberdeen friends that if they suffer others to profit more than themselves by his Catechism, "among whom it was first taught," great dishonour would be theirs. He concludes his preface thus:

"If any shall complain of my obscurity in these short answers, let him consider how hard a thing it is to be both short and plain, as yet to satisfy all men's desire and judgment in lighter matters than this is. If days be granted, I ever hope with the help of God to make this Sum more ample, and more plain, if the brethren shall judge it needful."

Dr. Story is of the opinion that "the brethren" did judge it needful, but not in ampler form; for according to him, it was endorsed by the General Assembly of 1590, who ordered an abridgement which was approved and published in 1592.¹ We shall discuss this later. But two things remain to be said about this preface to Craig's Catechism. Either Campbell didn't read it, or he failed to weigh duly its concluding paragraph. Secondly, the concluding words "if the brethren shall judge it needful," could suggest what we have already stated, namely that Craig did in fact receive encouragement from the General Assembly to print his Catechism.

Besides the preface to his Catechism, Craig in a short address to the general reader alludes to the fact that he has adduced no authority of the Scriptures, nor the Fathers of the Church for the confirmation of his doctrines. The reason for these omissions is, he says, because his work is not an apologia of the faith, but is meant simply to "put the bre-

1. John Craig, D.D.-Story, p.57.

thren in remembrance of that Doctrine which they daily hear confirmed...." He says that if the readers of his Catechism wish to have confirmation of the doctrines which he propounds, they should consult 'The Institutes of Mr. John Calvin,' and other godly men, who have written abundantly for the defence of this doctrine, according to the Scriptures of God."

Craig, besides including a copy of the National Covenant of 1581 in his Catechism, says that he has added for the better confirmation of this Confession, "the judgments of the ancient and godly fathers, concerning the authority of the Holy Scriptures." Alongside these "judgments," he has placed excerpts from medieval Catholic writers, which they have "vomited out and written in contempt of the Holy Scriptures, and in praise of men's traditions above the Word of God." Craig gives twenty-five references, nineteen of these being from the "godly fathers," the remainder being selected from what he calls the "blasphemies of the late Papists." To prove the divine and absolute authority of the Holy Scriptures, upon which, Craig affirms, the ancient churches "grounded their faith and religion," he quotes—giving chapter and page—from the writings of Irenaeus, Origen, Cyprian, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome (who says, "Take heed what they say that were, and not that are now, for whatsoever thing is spoken out with the doctrine of the apostles, let it be put away and have no authority!"); also Chrysostom, Tertullian, Athanasius and Augustine (who says, "I will that the holy Kirk be proved by the divine oracles, and not by the doctrines of men."). Craig argues that what these ancient teachers propounded, was the "Faith of the Kirk for the space of five hundred years after the ascension of Christ." And this faith, he says, diminished as the Catholic Church grew "to his own high estimation, in placing tradition over the Word of God." Then he gives examples of

how their teachers have "blasphemed the divine Word," quoting from the works of Cardinal Hosius(who says,"What the Kirk teaches,that is the express Word of God;what is taught against the mind and consent of it(the Kirk)is the express word of the Devil.");and from Eck("The Scripture is the black Gospel and the divinity of ink."). Thereafter,Craig is at pains to show that while the Council of Trent seemed to treat the Scriptures with reverence,they did so "lest they should have provoked the common people against them."

Craig concludes his Catechism on an uncompromising note:

"Let all men,therefore,that love the truth of God,flee far from this deceitful and devilish company whom God in his wrath hath raised up to blind this unthankful age,and to try our faith and patience,until the time of our full victory,through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." 1

1.Craig's Catechism-Law(Editor).

Chapter Sixteen.

.....

Craig, following Calvin's pattern, has divided his Catechism into ten sections. It begins with some historical questions such as Man's Creation, his State of Innocence, the Fall, Man's Bondage to Sin and his Call by God to Repentance. Then there follows an explanation of the Apostles Creed, "The Belief" as Craig calls it, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Means of Grace and finally, the Way of Salvation. The questions and answers, of which there are upwards of two thousand, are invariably short and of almost equal length. In its diction, the Catechism is simple, direct and clear. It is obvious from a study of this work, that Craig has endeavoured to capture the interest of the reader or catechised, by an arresting presentation of biblical truth in a way that is less in evidence in the Catechism of John Calvin. The following are examples from Craig's work, and these so far as can be are compared with that of Calvin.

Of the Creation and first Estate of Mankind.

Craig.

.....

- Q. Who made man and woman?
 A. The eternal God of His goodness.
- Q. Whereof made He them?
 A. Of an earthly body and a heavenly spirit.
- Q. To what end were they made?
 A. To acknowledge and serve their Maker.
- Q. What profit had they by their obedience?
 A. They were blessed and happy in body and soul.

Calvin.

.....

- Minister. What is the principal and chief end of man's life?
 Child. To know God.
- M. What moveth thee to say so?
 C. Because he hath created us, and placed us in this world, to set forth his glory in us. And it is good reason that we employ our whole life to his glory, seeing he is the beginning and fountain thereof.
- M. What is then the chief felicity of man?
 C. Even the selfsame; I mean, to know God, and to have his glory shewn forth in us.

Of God's Providence(The Creed).

Craig.

.....

Calvin.

.....

- Q. Who ruleth and keepeth all created things?
 A. The same eternal God that made them.
- Q. What should this fatherly care work in us?
 A. Thankfulness for all things that come to us.

- M. Wherefore is that clause added, Maker of heaven and earth?
 C. Because he hath made himself known unto us by his works, it is necessary for us to seek him out of them. For our capacity is not able to comprehend his divine substance; therefore he hath made the world as a glass, wherein we may behold him, in such sort as it is expedient for us to know him. Psal.104. Rom. 1.20. Heb.11.3.

Of His Kingdom(The Creed).

- Q. What manner of kingdom hath He?
 A. It is spiritual, pertaining chiefly to our souls.
- Q. Wherein does His Kingdom consist?
 A. In God's Word, and His Holy Spirit.
- Q. What things do we obtain by the Word and Spirit?
 A. Righteousness and everlasting life.

- M. What manner of Kingdom is that whereof thou speakest?
 C. It is spiritual, and doth consist in God's Word, and in his holy Spirit, wherein is contained both righteousness and life everlasting.

The Cross(The Creed).

- Q. Why did He suffer upon the Cross?
 A. To assure us, that He took our curse upon Himself.
- Q. Was He guilty before God?
 A. No, but He sustained the person of guilty men.

- M. Where thou sayest, Christ suffered on the cross, was that kind of death of more importance, than if he had been otherwise put to death?
 C. Yea verily; and touching that matter, Saint Paul saith, that he was hanged on a tree, to the intent that he might take upon him our curse, and so discharge us: For that kind of death was accursed of God. Gal.3.13. Deut.11.23.

His Ascension(The Creed).

Craig.

.....

- Q. Why did He ascend before us?
 A. To take possession, in our name, of our inheritance.
- Q. But He said, "I shall be with you to the end"?
 A. He spoke that of His spiritual presence.
- Q. Is He our only intercessor and mediator?
 A. Yes, seeing that He alone died for us.

Calvin.

.....

- M. What profit have we by his ascension?
 C. We receive double profit thereby, for since that our Saviour Christ is entered into Heaven in our name, even in like manner as he came down from thence for our sakes, he hath thereby made an open entry into the same place for us, giving withal an assured knowledge, that the gate of heaven is now open to receive us, which was before shut through our sins. The second profit is, that he appeareth in the sight of God the Father to make intercession for us, and to be our Advocate to make answer for us. Rom. 8.34. Heb. 7.25, and 9.24. 1 John 2.1.

Of True Faith.

- Q. What is true faith?
 A. An assured knowledge of God's mercy towards us, for Christ's sake...
- Q. Who then works these things in us?
 A. God's Holy Spirit seals them up in our hearts.

- M. Since we have the foundation whereupon our faith is builded, we may well gather hereof, what is the right faith?
 C. Yea, verily; that is to say, it is a sure persuasion and steadfast knowledge of God's tender love towards us, according as he hath plainly uttered in his Gospel, that he will be both a Father and a Saviour unto us, through the means of Jesus Christ.

Of Prayer.

- Q. What is prayer or calling upon God?
 A. It is a humble lifting up of our minds and hearts to God.
- Q. Why do we go to God alone in prayer?
 A. Because prayer is part of His true worship.
- Q. What is prayer without the

- M. How prove you that it is always necessary to pray with the understanding and earnest affection...?
 C. For so much as God is a Spirit, he requireth always the heart; and as at all other times so specially in time of prayer, when we show ourselves in his presence, and enter into communication with him: And thereupon he maketh a restraint of

Of Prayer(continued).

Craig.

.....

mind and heart?

- A. It is unprofitable, and cursed of God.

Calvin.

.....

his promise, saying, that he will be at hand to hear only all them which call upon him in truth; contrariwise he pronounceth all them accursed which pray hypocritically, or without an earnest affection.

Of the Word.

Q. Where shall we find the Word?

- A. In the Holy Scriptures.

Q. Who can assure us of this?

- A. The Holy Spirit only, working in our hearts.

Q. Is not private reading sufficient for us?

- A. No, if public teaching be had.

Q. What other thing is joined with the Word for our comfort?

- A. The holy Sacraments of Jesus Christ.

M. Where shall we seek for this his word?

- C. It is contained in the holy Scripture.

M. Does all these things lie in our power?

- C. No, not one of them all; but God worketh them in our hearts in this life by his holy Spirit.

M. Is there none other means besides his word, whereby God showeth himself unto us?

- C. God hath joined the Sacraments with the preaching of his word.

Of the Sacraments.

Q. What is a Sacrament?

- A. A sensible sign and seal of God's favour offered and given to us.

Q. To what end are the Sacraments given?

- A. To nourish our faith in the promise of God.

Q. How can sensible signs do this?

- A. They have this office from God and not of themselves.

Q. How many Sacraments has Christ given us?

- A. Two only, Baptism and the Supper.

M. What is this possible, that a visible and a material figure should have such virtue to certify our conscience?

- C. No, not of itself, but God hath ordained it for such an end.

M. How many Sacraments be there in the Church of Christ?

- C. There be but two, which be common unto all men, and which Christ himself ordained for the faithful.

M. What be they?

- C. Baptism and the holy Supper.

Baptism.

Craig.

.....

- Q. What is the significance of Baptism?
 A. Remission of our sins and regeneration.
- Q. Do all men receive these graces with the Sacrament?
 A. No, only the faithful.
- Q. How then may little children receive Baptism?
 A. Even as they were circumcised under the Law.
- Q. Why are they baptised seeing they do not understand?
 A. Because they are the seed of the faithful.

Calvin.

.....

- M. How do we obtain this grace in Baptism?
 C. Because we are there clothed with Christ, and endued with his holy Spirit, if so be that we make not ourselves unworthy of his promises, which by there given unto us.
- M. Seeing all this is required in the right using of Baptism, how is it that little children be baptised?
 C. ...for in like manner Circumcision was a Sacrament of repentance, as Moses and the Prophets do witness; and also a Sacrament of faith, as Saint Paul teacheth; and yet God did not debar little children from the receiving of the same. Deut. 10.15, and 30.6. Jer. 4.4. Rom. 4.11.

The Lord's Supper.

- Q. What does the bread and wine signify to us?
 A. Christ's body and blood once offered upon the Cross for us, and now given to us to be the food of our souls.
- Q. Whereunto, then, does the Supper lead us?
 A. Directly to the Cross and the death of Christ.
- Q. Should we offer Him again for our sins?
 A. No, for Christ did this once for all upon the Cross.

- M. What is it then briefly, that we have by this sign of bread?
 C. That the body of our Lord Jesus, for so much as it was once offered up for us in sacrifice, to bring us into God's favour, is now given unto us, to assure us that we are partakers of this reconciliation.
- M. And what have we by the sign of the wine?
 C. It assureth us, that as our Lord Jesus did shed his blood once on the cross, for a price and satisfaction of all our sins; even so he now giveth it unto our soul to drink whereby we should not doubt to receive the fruit and benefit thereof.

As we may see from these examples, there is nothing distinctive in the theology of Craig's Catechism; its teaching is wholly Calvinistic.

Calvin was the great Protestant teacher of the age, and while Craig's teaching gifts were considerable, his Catechism is essentially the work of the pastor knowing the limitations of his flock and what will serve them best. The whole material, therefore, of his Catechism is in Calvin; yet is his work as original as a picture by Turner is a Turner and nothing else. To say that Craig borrowed from Calvin would almost be like saying that Turner "borrowed" from a landscape. The Catechism bears the stamp of Craig's native genius, and it was a laudable attempt to educate the general public of Scotland in their Reformed faith.

Craig, unlike *Robert* Rollock and others of that century, left no printed volumes of his discourses, but there exists in manuscript the notes on one of these. He preached a sermon at Holyroodhouse during March, 1582, and it would seem that it contained references which were written down—presumably by the English ambassador or his secretary—and sent to England. This manuscript is in the possession of the British Museum, and it is the only known example of Craig's preaching method. The document is as follows:

"At Holyroodhouse, the 25th day of March—at that time, New Year's day—1582. 126 Psalm. John Craig's preaching concerning after the return of the people from Babylon, and shows that the manner of their deliverance was wonderful after the seventy years of captivity fore-spoken by the prophet Jeremiah. Means thereby, how the people of God lament for the sins of the wicked, and how Christ will save His own dear Kirk and children; that although they be afflicted, many years held in distress and vexation, God will come in His righteous judgment and relieve them to our great joy and comfort, and to the honour of His blessed and glorious name. And will confound them, like as the grass that grows on the tops of the house and ways of the sea. And how the Lord commands us in all our afflictions to anchor us upon His glorious name, to attend upon His blessed Word preached in the Kirk, and at all times to resort thereto that God may be glorified, Satan, anti-Christ and his supporters confounded, God's holy Word more and more advanced in all tribulations, temptations and afflictions here in earth God pleases to send upon His dear Kirk and members thereof. To call unto Him, that we may be inarmed with the spirit of patience, patiently to bear with the

same until Christ Jesus come and send deliverance, who in His righteous judgment will come, and deliver us, to the honour, praise and glory of His blessed name and to our everlasting joy, comfort and consolation, as He delivered His own dear children that were seventy years in captivity. Example: in these days of the horrible vices that reign unpunished, which provoke the wrath of God to be poured upon His dear Kirk without speedy redress and amendment of our lives and conversations, by the which heinous crimes Christ destroyed Babylon with sword and fire; for what see we in these days but trouble upon trouble, cruel murder and slaughter with all other heinous crimes most horrible, which may provoke and kindle the wrath of God upon His Kirk and members thereof. The Lord, for Christ His son's sake, quench and allay the same. Great occasion have we therefore in time to stoop, cry, lament and turn to the Lord our God; strive for amendment of our lives and to give good example thereby to our neighbours, great men that presently ring pride, oppression, greedy covetousness for suppressing of the Kirk, holy Word, and members thereof; adultery and all such other vices which may provoke the wrath of God, which storm approaches to come upon us without in time we stoop before the Lord our God. And yet, the only courage we have is to magnify and extol, set forth, praise and glorify the Lord at all times both day and night with all reverence and humility; and in all afflictions, temptations and tribulations we may inarm ourselves with God's spirit of patience, patiently to bear with the same until the Lord come and deliver us. Let us set aside all worldly riches, pomp, glory, dignities of this world, detest and abhor sin and wickedness, and anchor ourselves upon the Eternal, the Lord our God, upon His dear Kirk and holy Word, who shall come, relieve and deliver us to the perpetual shame and consternation of our enemies, such as the bloody council of France who daily inarms thereto, and seeks to devour us. N. Let us therefore, ever call to Christ to work and ingraft by His Holy Spirit in our hearts and minds, perfect and constant faith, peace and constraint in our heart. To be woeful to oppress or to do evil to our neighbours but to love them as ourselves, and constantly to abide at the faith which we now profess and holy Word. And even in time of trouble to defend His dear Kirk and members thereof, as Jesus Christ has faithfully promised to defend the same to the utter wreck and perpetual destruction of the enemies thereof, both with fire and sword, to the honour, praise, and glory of His holy name, and to our everlasting comfort, joy and salvation as He did the time of the captivity of Babylon relieve His dear Kirk and children therein, break down the walls and put them to liberty that seventy years were detained in captivity, and destroyed the king of Babylon most miserably. Example: of the great lords, councillors and devisers of the summoning of the ministry to Stirling, whom God by His experience in His righteous judgment has punished a part, and will punish the rest to their perpetual shame and confusion. To the which God of glory, blessed of all immortality, be all praise and honour forever." 1

1. Cotton MS, Caligula C IX, f. 28, British Museum. NOTE: This is probably a reference to the abortive attempt of France towards the end of January, 1582, to overrun part of the Netherlands whose government was Protestant. Vide, Moyses' Memoirs, p. 77.

Since at this time,Lennox and his faction were proving troublesome to the Scottish Reformed Church,Craig doubtless had these in mind when he referred to the "great men that presently ring pride,oppression,greedy covetousness for suppressing of the Kirk...."

In the General Assembly which convened during the spring of 1582, Craig was called upon to serve on what was surely among the earliest of Church Extension committees. Duncanson,Hay and he were instructed "to induct pastors,and plant manses and glebes." This General Assembly, making use of Craig's expert legal knowledge,commissioned him "to set down an order for collecting Acts of Assembly,betwixt this and the next Assembly." ¹ This matter had been taken up by the Reformed Church several years previously,for the General Assembly of 1569 had ordered Knox,Craig and others to revise its Acts. ² But they had made little progress in the work,due probably ^{to} the troubles of 1570-72. However, work on the Records of the General Assembly was revived during 1574,for they appointed a select committee "to take labour in visiting and perusing of the Acts of the Assembly,to mark such as are general,that thereafter they may be drawn and extracted out of the Books,that all pretext of ignorance may be taken away." Following upon their instructions to Craig,the General Assembly of 1583 "anent the labours taken by Mr. Craig in collecting and disposing the Acts of Assembly," ordained among others Pont and Balcanquhal,"to consider and oversee the same,and to return their opinion back to the Assembly." At a later sederunt,the General Assembly recorded that "anent the labours taken by Mr. John Craig in collecting the Acts of the Assembly,seeing the great labours taken by him for the weal of the same,not without singular fruit and profit of the whole brethren,to the effect the same may be absolved and brought to perfection,it is thought good that they labour in perusing

¹.Calderwood,Vol.3,p.518. ².Ibid,Vol.2,p.493.

the whole work, that the judgment of the next Assembly may be had there-
to." The "they" refer to Pont and the others. When the General
Assembly met again later on in the same year, their Records committee
reported that they "had considered the labours of Mr. Craig in the Acts
of the Kirk, and that in his labours, God was to be praised: yet some
things they had noted, wherewith they desired he should confer, and there-
after proceed with him in further reasoning." 1

Of these praiseworthy labours of Craig, nothing more appears till
the year 1593, when the following entry in the General Assembly Minutes
occurs:

"Anent the Acts of the Kirk. That every Presbytery may
be better instructed thereon, the Kirk has ordained Mr.
James Carmichael, who has already taken pains in correct-
ing thereof, to perfect the work, and to present the same
to the next General Assembly of the Kirk."

And again in 1595:

"Anent the Acts of Assembly. The brethren have ordained
the same to be reviewed, and special Acts for the practice
of the Kirk be extracted and joined with the Book of
Discipline to be published either in writing or print,
that none may pretend ignorance thereof....and to this
effect concur with the clerk, Mr. Robert Pont....and James
Carmichael." 2

Here we find no distinct allusion to the labours of John Craig, but hav-
ing had the same object, it may be presumed that those of Carmichael and
his coadjutors consisted of a revisal, perhaps enlargement and contin-
uation of the former. Wodrow in a letter dated 24th October, 1733,
concerning the Registers of the Church, gives a list of missing General
Assembly Minutes of the sixteenth century, and it is a formidable one.
He blames Adamson of St Andrews for most of the mutilations, and appar-
ently Cunningham, Bishop of Aberdeen, was also implicated. Small won-
1. Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 556-628. 2. Ibid, pp. 815-816.

der that the General Assembly of 1587, "lamented the mutilation of the said books." 1 N. Had it not been for the labours of Craig and others who followed, many more of these records would have been lost for all time. We may presume that Craig discovered that these records had been tampered with, since we learn that Pont and the others desired further consultation with him about them. For instance, during the General Assembly which convened at Glasgow, April 1581, Craig was chairman of a committee summoning ministers who had been charged with certain offences. According to Calderwood, the third and fourth sederunts' Minutes were torn out. 2 Wodrow in the same letter mentions that the Acts of the General Assembly were appointed to be extracted by Craig and others around 1592, but this surely means 1582; for in his notes on Craig's life he states that "I have not observed any more in the Registers-after 1583-upon this work of Mr. Craig's." Wodrow concludes thus:

"The troubles which befell the King leaving the lords concerned in the Ruthven raid, and falling in with Arran and the French faction, and the dark cloud which came upon the Church for two years when the records fell into Bishop Adamson's hands, I imagine stopped this design, which, as I take it, was to class and put under proper heads, all the Acts of Assembly since the Reformation.....; and Mr. Craig, because of his laborious diligence, acquaintance with the forms and proceedings of the Church since the Reformation, and his intimate acquaintance with the canon and civil law, was pitched upon for it." 3

1. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 686.
3. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 31.

2. Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 524.
NOTE: VIDE ROW'S HISTORY, P. 64 F.

The Catholic influence at the Scottish court had received a severe set-back with the popular signing of the National Covenant, but by the autumn of 1581, it was once more a force to be reckoned with, thanks to the machinations of Lennox and the Catholic nobility. The daring counter-move of the Earl of Gowrie and his associates in seizing the person of the king, in order to place him beyond the influence of Captain James Stewart (later Earl of Arran) and Lennox, was loudly applauded by the General Assembly, and John Craig together with two of his brethren were commissioned to intimate the Assembly's approbation of the proceeding, and to inquire from King James his own judgment on the matter. ¹ Craig at this interview rebuked the king publicly because he had issued a slanderous proclamation against the ministers. Calderwood says that

"Upon Wednesday, the 19th (September, 1582), Mr. Craig made a notable sermon before the King, on Psalm 2-10, the like of which was never made before in his presence for free rebuke. He reproved the King for subscribing the slanderous proclamation at Perth, July 12th last, against the ministry and their meeting upon the affairs of the Kirk. The King wept, and said that he might have told him privately. It was answered that it had been often told him but to little effect; and public vice required public reproof." ²

Craig had preached in like terms to the courtiers of some twenty years before, so that here again was the forthright preacher as of yore. James was little more than a boy (he was sixteen) for whom we may feel sympathy in being thus brow-beaten; but the exasperation of the Reformers is understandable, since James showed them no gratitude for having raised him to the throne and kept him on it.

From the point of view of the Reformed Church, one excellent result of the Ruthven raid was the eclipse of Lennox whom the king was forced to banish from the country, from which he retired to France where he died

¹. Spottiswoode, Vol. 2, p. 293. ². Calderwood, Vol. 3, p. 674.

on the 26th of May, 1583, professing, strangely enough, an inflexible attachment to the Protestant religion that he had done so much to harm. 1 Although the spear-head of the Catholic movement seemed broken, yet were Jesuit priests as active as ever, particularly at court, where King James was paying them more attention than was thought desirable by the Presbytery of Edinburgh. Genuinely alarmed, the local brethren on the 19th of March, 1583, sent Craig and Dury to the king to urge him to prosecute Father Holt, a Jesuit who had been recently apprehended. Again on the 27th of the month, Craig and Davidson were sent to James to complain about the subversive activities of the French ambassador's priest, and to press for the trial of Holt, but the king simply put them off with fair words. 2 Even years afterwards, the reformers were still somewhat nervous of the effect of Catholic intrigues. On Tuesday, 15th September, 1590, the Presbytery of Edinburgh were advertised by a letter from the Presbytery of Kirkcaldy, that Sir Robert Melville and the magistrates of Burntisland had refused to apprehend Mr. James Gordon, a Jesuit priest, although the local minister had brought forward evidence of his subversive activities. Gordon had affirmed that King James had given him a warrant to reside within the burgh. John Craig, at the desire of the Edinburgh brethren duly complained about Gordon to the king who promised to take order with one or two of "the meanest that resorted to him; but no word of the greatest sort, nor of himself. The king favoureth the Jesuit...." 3

When the General Assembly convened in Edinburgh on the 24th of April, 1583, James, doubtless displeased with his troublesome Kirk, did not send his commissioners, and it wasn't long before Craig and two brethren appeared in the royal presence with the firm request that he would remedy this omission. 4 Craig seems to have been almost ubiquitous at this Assembly. He appeared on a committee to censure Bishop Cunningham of

1. Church of Scotland-Lee, Vol. 2, p. 79. Moyses' Memoirs, p. 79. 2. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 32. 3. Calderwood, Vol. 5, p. 112. 4. Ibid, Vol. 3, p. 705.

Aberdeen for some proven fault;with Balcanquhal,Andrew Melville and others,he met each morning at 6 a.m. to arrange the Assembly's business of the day;and he convened with a select committee which included Pont, to treat with the king's commissioners(who had by now arrived)with regard to that hardy annual,ministerial stipends,and also on the general estate of the Church. 1 Public morals were giving the Church in Edinburgh serious concern at this period,for we find the Town Council,a week prior to the opening of the General Assembly,and at the request of the local ministers,ordering a proclamation to be made

"discharging all Sunday markets within the burgh,all playing of tennis,nine-pins,playing,drinking,taverning and such-like,in time of sermon on Sunday,or doing anything that may tend to break the Sabbath day." 2

The April General Assembly gave Craig two final tasks to perform:first, he was sent with Dury and Hume(minister of Dunbar)with the plea that James would conclude a treaty with England without delay,"for the defence of the Word of God,and against the persecutions of the Papists.."; and second,since James had done nothing to stop the activities of the French ambassador's priest,nor had dealt with Holt,Craig was instructed to urge the king to take action in these matters,but James as before gave evasive answers.

During the month of June,the king recovered his liberty,and the raid of Ruthven was declared treasonable. One direct result was that several notable ministers including the two Melvilles,Lawson,Davidson and Carmichael,together with many of the nobility were ultimately forced to flee to England,but Craig did not stir. 3 James Stewart,now Earl of Arran,and Patrick Adamson,Archbishop of St Andrews were in the ascendant at court. Adamson,intellectually brilliant but quite unscrupu-

1.Calderwood,Vol.3,pp.705-712. 2.Burgh Records of Edinburgh,1573-1589(19th April,1583). 3.Apologetical Narrative-Scot,p.51.

lous, did his utmost to wreck the Presbyterian government of the Church. The king appeared at the St Andrews convention of August, 1583, at which Moyses informs us, he and his council together with the ministers after long reasoning came to the agreement that the ministry should neither speak nor publish anything, but that whereof they were certainly persuaded was not repugnant to the laws of God. 1 The royal bridling of the Reformed Church in Scotland had begun.

In the Parliament of May, 1584, King James had his revenge for the raid of Ruthven, by requiring all ministers, masters of colleges, and readers within forty-six days to subscribe to an Act now made, asserting the king's unlimited power over all the Estates both temporal and spiritual, and subject themselves to bishops under pain of losing their stipends. 2 There followed in due course a Privy Council order which was particularly directed against the Edinburgh ministers:

"Forasmuch as it is understood by the King's Majesty and Lords of the Secret Council, that Masters James Lawson and Walter Balcanquhal, ministers of Edinburgh, are lately departed and left their place and charge, leaving them vacant, against their duty and profession, and the contract and bond passed between them and the inhabitants of the said burgh, over whose souls they were bound to be most careful; moving hereby not only a slander to the Word of God, but a contempt by them, by their behaviour otherwise, of his Majesty's authority and laws, whereof his Highness having consideration, and being careful, as becomes him of his princely duty, to see the glory of God advanced, true doctrine taught, and good and godly ministers universally established, and especially within the said burgh, where there is greatest resort of his Majesty's good subjects. N. For this purpose, his Highness, being also moved by the good behaviour and true and faithful service of the inhabitants of the said burgh, here nominate, appoint and ordain Master John Craig and John Duncanson to remain within the said burgh for teaching and preaching of the Word of God, upon the days and in the customary places, as also to exercise all other ecclesiastical discipline, according to the Word of God, and laws and statutes made and established within this realm, and that they in no-wise absent themselves therefrom, nor otherwise make excuse to the contrary, as they will answer to his Highness upon their obedience." 3

1. Moyses' Memoirs, p. 83. 2. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 34. 3. Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, Vol. 3, p. 668 (28th May, 1584). NOTE: "Upon the 8th of June, Mr. James Lawson, and Mr. Walter Balcanquhal, ministers of Edinburgh, fled from their flocks to England, being unpursued or put at." Moyses' Memoirs, p. 91.

An Edinburgh citizen, presumably in sympathy with the banished ministers, railed on Craig, Duncanson and others of the clergy. This was one John McGregor, who was imprisoned "for blasphemy in the High Street of the good Word of God and its ministers," the Town Council sentencing him "to be put in the jugs at the Tron at 11 a.m. and to stand therein until 5 p.m., and to be obliged never to do the like under the pain of scourging and banishment." 1

King James had apparently not implemented his decree to second his chaplains to the Edinburgh churches, for from a Town Council Minute of 24th September, we learn that

"The provost....with part of the elders and deacons of the Kirk, considering that the kirk of this burgh is destitute of pastors and teachers, through the absence of their own ministers, therefore voted and consented, in the presence of my lord bishop of St Andrews, that the King's Majesty should nominate and assign two of their persons whom the King's Majesty finds most expedient, to wit, Master David Lindsay... and Master John Craig and John Duncanson, his grace's own ministers to occupy that place." 2

Evidently James paid little heed to this request, for again the Town Council

"find it expedient for certain of their number to pass to my lord provost (the Earl of Arran) and desire his lordship to labour with the King's grace and concur with the town that Master John Craig, one of his grace's ministers, may assist the kirk of the burgh at such times as his Majesty may spare him...." 3

Since, as we shall see, James had by now forbidden Craig to preach, was all this really a tug of war between the court and the Town Council?

Although Craig had been ordered to remain at his post, he had represented the Acts of the May Parliament, and made bold to say so in out-

1. Burgh Records of Edinburgh, 1573-1589 (17th July, 1584). 2. Ibid, 24th September, 1584. 3. Ibid, 13th November, 1584.

spoken speeches. 1 James had gone off to Falkland, leaving the conduct of affairs in the hands of Arran, Huntly and others, and upon the 24th of August, Craig, Brand the minister of Holyroodhouse and others, were summoned to appear before the Council. On being commanded to subscribe to these "Black Acts" as the reformers came to call them, and at the same time being challenged for declaiming against them publicly, Craig immediately answered that they would continue to find fault with anything that was repugnant to God's Word and the holy oracles. 2 Arran sprang up at this, and called the reformers impertinent, and swore with a great oath that he "would shave their heads, pare their nails, and make them an example to all that rebelled against King and Council." He thereupon dismissed them with the command that they were to appear before King James at Falkland on September 4th, to answer the charges which the Council would prefer against them. They obeyed, and according to Calderwood, "there was some hot conference betwixt Mr. Craig and the Bishop of St Andrews in the King's presence." 3 Craig and his friends were again accused of breaking the recent Acts of Parliament, and of not obeying the injunctions of Bishop Adamson. Arran gave utterance to more "rough speeches" to Craig, and when the old reformer replied with spirit that "There have been men set up higher than you that have been brought low," Arran answered derisively: "I shall make you from a false friar, a true prophet," and falling on his knees he said to Craig in mockery, "Now, I am humbled." "Nay," replied he, "mock the servants of God as you will; God will not be mocked, but shall make you to find it in earnest, when you shall be humbled, and cast down from the high horse of your pride." 4 David Hume of Godscroft gives Craig's reply as, "Well, well, mock on as you please. God sees and will require it at your hands that you thus trouble His Church unless you repent." 5 James Mel-

1. Calderwood, Vol. 4, p. 198. 2. Ibid, p. 198. 3. Ibid. 4. Ibid. 5. History of the House of Douglas and Angus, Vol. 2, p. 337.

ville and Calderwood put into Craig's mouth words which may be taken as prophetic; for these historians say that this came to pass within a few years, when James Douglas of Parkhead thrust Arran off his horse with a spear, and slew him, his untended body being eaten by dogs and swine. 1

Arising out of the Falkland palace interview, Craig was forbidden to preach, being ordered to appear again before the king on November 16th. Meanwhile, Adamson was sent to Edinburgh to preach in St Giles, but whenever he entered the pulpit, most of the assembled congregation rose and walked out. Some of them, not content with this gesture of contempt, pushed defamatory pamphlets about Adamson into the pulpit, warning him that if he did not mend his ways, "the hand that wrote the pamphlets would kill him." 2 But the bishop, whatever his faults, never lacked courage, and threats or no threats, he continued to rule the ecclesiastical roost. During November, he boldly summoned by open proclamation, all the ministers betwixt Stirling and Berwick, Craig among them, to assemble at St Giles on the 16th day of the month and subscribe to the promise and obligation of the late Act of Parliament. They duly appeared, and met the king at Holyroodhouse on the same day, and he bluntly informed them that for the sake of good example, they would forthwith obey his laws. 3 The next step was, that the Privy Council on Adamson's motion agreed on the following band of subscription for the ministers:

"We, the beneficed men, ministers, readers, and masters of colleges, testify by this our hand-writes, our humble and dutiful submission and fidelity to our Sovereign Lord, the King's Majesty, and to obey with all humility his Highness's Acts of the late Parliament, held at Edinburgh, the 22nd of May, 1584, and that, according to the same, we shall show our obedience to our Ordinary, the bishop or commissioner appointed, or to be appointed, by his Majesty to have exercise of the spiritual jurisdiction in our Diocese, and in case of our disobedience in the promises,

1. Calderwood, Vol. 4, p. 198 et seq. Autobiography-Melville, p. 198.

2. Ibid, Calderwood. 3. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 39.

our benefices, livings, stipends to become vacant, and qualified and obedient persons to be provided in our room, as if we were naturally dead." 1

Most of the ministers including Craig and Pont refused to sign this bond, and they were therefore ordered to appear before the Privy Council on the 7th December in a more amenable frame of mind. At this meeting, the ministers again refused to comply with the king's demands, whereupon he threatened them with the loss of their stipends and banishment from the country. Shortly afterwards, nine of their number appeared as representatives before the Privy Council, where they submitted their objections to the recent Act of Parliament in a carefully-worded and legally-framed document which Calderwood has preserved. Since Craig and Pont were the senior and distinguished ministers of the group, they probably had the chief hand in writing this apologia, though Wodrow thinks that Craig alone was its author. 2 Certain it is, that Craig had long before been in another delicate situation where every word had to be weighed carefully as now-his submission to the General Assembly concerning the marriage of Queen Mary and Bothwell-and he had then presented his testimony in writing. The tenor of the present letter to King James was as follows:

".....We are moved to make scruple, and doubt to subscribeobedience to be given to Patrick, Archbishop of St Andrews....and obedience to your Highness's laws. We cannot pass it over in silence, that we and our brethren are traduced at market crosses as seditious persons.... We desire your Majesty....to give license to all the whole Assembly of the Kirk....that by common consent, this cause concerning the whole policy and order of the Kirk may be entreated and reasoned; and that liberty may be granted to all those of the ministry, who are not here now, to reason this matter, and cannot otherwise be justly accused, but in so far as they resist the new brought in tyranny of bishops... We think it strange that we should be charged with subscriptions of the laws and Acts of Parliament, seeing it was never before required of no subject within this realm....

1. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p.38. 2. Ibid, p.39.

"Secondly, if so be your Majesty will urge us to subscribe to your cause, we offer with obedience most humbly in that part, by a general obligation, adding always this one clause, 'agreeable to the Word of God,' which obedience was offered to your Majesty when the ministers were last called before your Majesty by some, in the name of the rest, and your Majesty promised to seek no further from us.

"Thirdly, as touching the so-call Archbishop of St Andrews, called in the letter our Ordinary, we answer we cannot, in good conscience, obey him in such an office"

Here the reformers gave their Scriptural objections to all *HIERARCHICAL* offices, the sum of which was "that these titles were not agreeable to the Word of God." They contended that in the past such titles engendered Popedom, and are now like "to engender a new little Popedom in your Majesty's realm." The Scriptural name "Episkopos," wrote they, meant simply an overseer of the flock of God; and they sought to show this by reference to St Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians and the Philippians where the apostle called "all their church elders and ministers by this name." "Elders, ministers and bishops are synonymous terms," they contended, "and the office all one." Very tactfully, the reformers went on to warn the king that his present advisers were really staining his name and fame, and indeed Scotland's. We have been a good example to other European nations, in our well-reformed order in the Church, therefore why should his Majesty "now decline to the corruptions of other countries?" If, as Adamson and his colleagues contended, bishops were the safeguard against disunity in the Church, then why was it that "there were no schisms and divisions in the minds of the Kirk reformed within this country, till those by claiming to themselves the chief places and superiority above others, had brought it in?"¹ Notwithstanding all these and other arguments, James remained unimpressed; for he was determined to have his diocesan bishops.

¹. Calderwood, Vol. 4, pp. 211-246.

A few days prior to presenting the above document to the Privy Council, Craig and Duncanson had been granted a private audience with King James, Arran and Secretary Maitland. After much discussion, the royal chaplains at length expressed their willingness to sign the bond, provided that the clause were inserted, "as far as the Word of God permits." N. Arran contemptuously rejected the proposed compromise, but the king under the influence of Craig and Duncanson was more amenable. The result of this conference was the formal declaration submitted by the nine ministers to the Privy Council on December 7th. This olive branch was accepted by King James, and accordingly during the same month Craig, Duncanson and Brand subscribed. We do not know the exact wording of this particular bond, but it is of interest to note that Andrew Simpson, who was one of the nine, as incumbent of Dalkeith signed thus:

"I, Master Andrew Simpson, swear by the name of the great God, that I shall not preach any heresy or seditious doctrine, nor shall privately or publicly stir up the King's Majesty's subjects to any rebellion, and shall obey all his laws and Acts of Parliament, so far as they agree with the Word of God." 1

No mention is made of submission to bishops. Craig and the other royal chaplains must have signed a similar, if not identical missive, and the significant words to weigh in this bond are "seditious doctrine," and "rebellion"; for here we have in all probability the clue to Craig's otherwise inexplicable conduct. At this time there was much disaffection in Scotland, due to the intolerant, rough-shod methods of government by the king and his minions; already, powerful and angry men were in exile. Could it be then, that during these months of tension Craig had come to see that events were shaping themselves into

NOTE: The reformers also desired the bond to be simply in the nature of a "general obligation" to the recent Act. As we shall see, they did not subscribe as Adamson wished (Vide, p. 159 of thesis). 1. Memoirs of the Church of Scotland-Defoe, p. 89.

the threatening form of a new civil war? Would it be, therefore, that he signed the bond in order to prevent fratricidal strife? Hill Burton has surely taken a shallow view of the situation when he refers to Craig and his friends as "subtle casuists," as has M'Crie, who calls Craig volatile and as having been "caught in this snare." 1 Wodrow's comments on Craig's action if critical, are at least kindly given, but they can hardly be called in this instance discerning:

"If in his old, aged, declining years, by weight of a court where he was minister, he unwarily made some compliances not agreeable to his former zeal, he is in this matter to be pitied rather than censured, considering his temptation, age, and great usefulness." 2

Adamson and his episcopally-minded allies, and Andrew Melville and other of the rigid Presbyterians were both disgusted at this peaceable settlement; nevertheless, it probably saved Scotland from the worst effects of a second civil war. Craig surely proved himself once more, as during 1570-72, a sincere lover of peace.

1. History of Scotland-Hill Burton, Vol. 5, p. 233. Andrew Melville-M'Crie, Vol. 2, p. 105. 2. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 1.

Chapter Eighteen.

.....

Having signed the bond, Craig's next step was to convince the ministers throughout Scotland that he and his colleagues had done aright, and accordingly, he addressed a circular letter to this effect to them, at the same time urging them to follow his and Duncanson's example. Herewith is the text of his letter:

"Brethren, after my very hearty commendations, I doubt not but either you have heard, or will hear shortly, how John Duncanson and I have subscribed the obligation of obedience to the King's Majesty and Commissioners, according to Act of Parliament; whereof, because sinister reports may pass, both of the King's Majesty commanding and us obeying, I thought good to make you privy to the same. It pleased his Majesty to grant John Duncanson and me to confer with him privily, and thereafter with my Lords Arran and Secretary (Maitland), his Majesty being present in the Cabinet, where, after reasons heard and proponed on every side, two heads were agreed upon: First, that our subscription was neither sought to be allowance, either of the Acts of Parliament or the Estate of Bishops, but to be a testimony of our obedience to his Majesty. Next, it was not craved, but 'according to the Word of God,' and therefore our obligation contains nothing but our obedience to the King's Majesty, laws, and commissioners according to the Word of God: which heads are so reasonable that no man can refuse the same who loves God or the quietness of the Kirk or Commonwealth. Therefore, I pray you to show this to the brethren, whom you may advertise, either by word or by write, that they, being informed of the good meaning of his Majesty, may be conformable to the same, to the end that the Evangel having free passage with quietness and peace, evil affected persons, who of the schism of the Kirk or Commonwealth make their advantage, may be frustrated of their expectation." 1

By way of endorsement, King James wrote:

"We declare, by these presents, that this letter within contained was written with our knowledge and directed at our command, to certify all men of our good meaning, that none should have occasion to doubt the same."

Craig's example was quickly followed by that of Erskine of Dun, who used his great influence in the north on behalf of his friend. This

1. Calderwood, Vol. 4, p. 246. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, pp. 48-49.

conciliatory action was in the main successful, so that within a short time subscription was no longer insisted upon, and Andrew Melville and the other exiles were able to return to Scotland. ¹ But they were never to be convinced that Craig had taken the right course. James Melville wrote years afterwards:

"A great number of the ministry experienced what they (Adamson and his episcopal party) were; even some at the beginning went thoroughly with the archbishop, but after Mr. John Craig and John Duncanson the King's ministers, yielded; whereof that one, Mr. Craig, had stood constant for a considerable time, and sustained great threatenings and boastings from Arran, yet, at last by weakness and a sort of sophistication (casting in a clause, 'according to the Word of God,' making manifestam repugnantiam in adjecto, as if one might say, he would obey the Pope and his Prelates, according to the Word of God,) he yielded and subscribed, and drew with him the greatest part of the Ministry of Scotland, which was the heaviest news that could come to us...." ²

At any rate, John Craig had remained to weather the storm, whereas James Melville and the others had fled before it. And as it transpired, "that one" of Melville's taunt, by his statesmanship saved the Reformed Church from episcopacy, not for it. That such good and tested reformers as John Dury (granted even he did recant later) and John Erskine of Dun rallied to Craig's side, shows that other than sinister or sordid motives lay behind the deed. Craig believed and taught that the bond between the prince and the people was reciprocal, and he was sure that the diehard ministers and their friends had failed to honour it in this instance. His act was neither one of servility nor ^{of} weakness, and Scott of Perth who wrote the "Lives of the Reformers" is probably correct in calling the whole proceeding, "the boldest action in Craig's political conduct." ³ Dr. Story commenting on this impasse says that

"Craig rightly divined that to push the refusal of the clergy to an extreme would simply ruin the Presbyterian cause. Whereas, a wise middle course, would, in the long run, obtain the blessing promised to the peace-makers. He was loudly denounced as

1. Calderwood, Vol. 4, p. 381. 2. Autobiography-James Melville, p. 198 et seq. 3. Edinburgh Christian Instructor, Vol. 3, p. 223.

a trimmer; but the great majority of the ministers had the good sense to follow his example. Still the irreconcilables held out, with noisy protests; and the bishop's men were sullenly disappointed at the failure of their hopes of a general rupture in the Kirk." 1

Calderwood, who neither approved of bishops nor ^{OF} Craig's action, has preserved the following anecdote from a letter sent by Hume of Godscroft to one of the exiles, James Carmichael:

"About the same time (1584/85), the King coming from hunting, drank to all his dogs, and above the rest to one of his dogs called Tell-True, saying, 'Tell-True, I drink to thee above all the rest of my hounds; for I will give thee more credence nor either the bishop or Craig.' " 2 N.

Gratitude was never one of King James's virtues.

However ill Craig was thought of by the "Melvillians" at this time, the responsible citizens of Edinburgh were solidly in his favour. As a mark of honour, they installed him as a Burgess and Guild Brother on October, 6th, 1584. 3 During the following March, their Town Council resolved that John Craig and James Hamilton should become Edinburgh ministers, and they accordingly sent a representative "to entreat, confer, and agree with the said Master John Craig." 4 On the 23rd of April, they requested Craig to preach in the High Kirk of St Giles "to the effect that he may receive and induct Master William Watson, minister." 5 Watson, a forthright young man, found himself during the next winter in trouble with King James, for his boldness in reproving the king to his face, "and for comparing him to Jeroboam." 6 He had not been among those who had fled to England, and being a gifted minister the Edinburgh Town Council had engaged his services. 7 The point of interest here

1. John Craig, D.D.—Story, p. 73. 2. Calderwood, Vol. 4, p. 351. 3. Scottish Record Society—Boog Watson (Editor). 4. Edinburgh Burgh Records, 1573-1589 (19th March, 1585). 5. Ibid., 23rd April, 1585. 6. Memoirs—Moyses, p. 104. 7. E.B.R., 13th March, 1585. NOTE: THE BISHOP (ADAMSON) IS REPUTED TO HAVE SAID A SHORT TIME BEFORE HE DIED: "I GLORIED IN THE FAVOUR OF MY PRINCE, AND NOW HE LOVES ANY OF THE DOGS OF HIS KENNEL BETTER THAN ME." — ROW'S HISTORY, P. 131.

is, that Watson was at this time, or later became, the son-in-law of John Craig. In the City Treasurer's Accounts of September, 1589, we have this entry: "Resignation of an annual rent on the common mills by Mr. John Craig, minister, in favour of Mr. William Watson, minister, and his wife Barbara Craig." 1 Another sasine of 1587 clearly reveals that Barbara was one of Craig's three daughters, and of these domestic matters appertaining to the reformer, more will be said later.

We learn that the Town Council permitted Craig to occupy during June, 1585,

"The lodging occupied by the late Master James Lawson, minister, and ordains the keeper of the keys to deliver the same to him; and ordains John Brown, collector of the Kirk annuals, to pay the said Master John the sum of fifty pounds for one quarter's payment for his services in the kirk and ministry, which shall be allowed to the said John in his accounts." 2

Edinburgh at this time, held Craig's ministry in high esteem. During August, the Town Council sent to him the request that he would "teach twice in the week, since the town is presently destitute of ministers." 3 The Earl of Arran was provost, but lest it be judged that Craig was simply his nominee (for services rendered to King James), we note that it was two bailies, Nicoll and Little who in the Town Council's name, solicited Craig's help, Little becoming provost after Arran's disgrace and flight. The prominent citizens of Edinburgh had condemned Craig for remaining there during the civil war; now they applauded him for not having deserted it during these recent critical months.

Was Craig amid these events really in league with Adamson and his

1. Edinburgh Treasurer's Accounts (16th century), pp. 564-628. 2. Edinburgh Burgh Records, 16th June, 1585. 3. Ibid, 25th August, 1585.

friends ? Had he secretly decided to lend his influence and learning to the wishes of the king and court who favoured the introduction of diocesan bishops ? And was his subscription to the bond but a blind to bring about the subjection of the Reformed Church of Scotland to the desires of James and his minions ? The answers to these questions can be obtained by a study of the so-called Last Will and Testament of James Lawson, the displaced minister of St Giles who died in London during October, 1584. As soon as Archbishop Adamson learned of Lawson's decease, he forged a will purporting to be that of the exiled minister's, with the avowed intent says Calderwood, "to entice ministers to embrace the estate of bishops." 1 In this "Testament," several of the Scottish reformers are castigated, including John Craig:

"You are of an avaricious, greedy nature, which you know the apostle affirmeth to be the root of all sin; you are malicious and full of envy...., feigned and double-dealing.... You, brother Mr. Craig are vehemently reported as being a secret usurer.... and as I understand by common complaint of the ministry of the north.... have conveyed to yourself the whole surplus of the fruits of the diocese of Aberdeen to your particular stipend, whereby the whole ministry is reduced to miserable poverty.... You are reported as exercising your discipline with such severity and austeritv, that thereby you are likely to eject more men from the Kirk, than you by your doctrine join." 2

The reformers Hay, Lindsay and Pont also received severe handling from this spurious document. It is most unlikely that Adamson, whose forgeries were not confined simply to this Testament, 3 would have so libelled Craig, had the latter been secretly favourable to the episcopal cause. This Testament is surely, therefore, an outstanding proof that Craig had little or no sympathy for either Adamson or his episcopal party. James Lawson had held Craig in high esteem: "That godly man and excellent preacher of the Word, Master John Craig." 4 We

1. Calderwood, Vol. 4, pp. 208 and 716. 2. Ibid, p. 716. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 229. 3. Davidson of Prestonpans-Moffatt Gillon, p. 95. Davidson calls Adamson, "Diotrephes, apostate of St Andrews." 4. Knox's Works-Laing, Vol. 6, p. 653.

find this commendation in the "True account of the concluding part of the life and death of that illustrious man, John Knox," which Laing has no hesitation in ascribing to the pen of James Lawson, Knox's successor at St Giles. Although Lawson disapproved of Craig's compromise with authority in signing the bond, there is no evidence to show that he ever ceased to regard him as trustworthy. In any case, Lawson, a kindly and dignified man, was quite incapable of using such scurrility as is found in his so-called Testament. Wodrow rightly says that "these wanton, freakish letters are not worth preserving, save as a token of the reputed honesty and usefulness of the persons to whom they are directed." 1 Dr. Law considers that during the years 1584-85, Craig was the leader of a moderate party withⁱⁿ the Church, but this is hardly the case. It is true that Craig was held in much esteem by many of the ministers, and also that a lead from him would be favourably received by them, as indeed it was, but he aspired to lead no faction; he simply acted on soul and conscience and with characteristic independence. 2

But what of the accusations which Adamson made against the character of Craig? We are told that he was a "secret usurer." That he was able and willing to make investments in certain Edinburgh Town Council projects is proved by reference to Burgh Minutes and Sasine Records, and we will refer to these matters later. 3 But up until the year 1587, there exist no official records to show that he had engaged in any such transactions. Adamson also accuses Craig of having appropriated Aberdeen church funds which were intended for the support of the local clergy. The truth is, there were practically no such church funds to despoil, even if Craig had been so willing; for William Gordon, the last Catholic Bishop of Aberdeen, had wantonly seen to that! 4 This libel

1. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 69. 2. Craig's Catechism-Law (Introd.), p. 49. 3. Edinburgh Burgh Records, July and September, 1587. 4. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 324.

by Adamson may possibly be related to an incident that happened during Craig's Aberdeen ministry, and in which he was directly involved. It appears that on the 8th of October, 1577, a certain Andrew King was brought before bailie Robert Menzies on the charge of misappropriating funds which were intended for the support of the "beadsmen" of St Thomas's Hospital, Aberdeen. King confessed that he had received these, one hundred pounds Scots, "with the consent of Master John Craig, and elders and deacons of the Kirk." 1 It is not unlikely that the story went its rounds that Craig had kept the money from the hospital, using it to supplement his stipend. And it may well be that Adamson had heard some such gossip, and laid hold on it for his own unworthy purposes. As for the criticism that Craig was severe and austere, there was nothing detrimental to his character in this; for considering the times in which he lived, such an attitude to contemporary society was both wholesome and virtuous. N. That Craig was reckoned by his enemies "full of envy, feigned and double-dealing," was also the criticism that Nicol Burne (of whom we have heard) had made a year or two previously:

"Bot, or ye fecht for offecis in band,
 I man of force place ane afore another.
 Among the first I fauor (favour) flattering Brand,
 Next menn by Craig, Apostat, pailiard (deceitful) brother;
 I cannot mark tua mester of the futher (company).
 Brand salbe furriour to mark you be the heid;
 Craig, thou art clerk, I cannot find another,
 To preach poison for the true saulis remeid." 2

The truth would seem to be, that Craig's masterful leadership and diplomacy in dangerous and difficult situations was at one and the same time and stay the rage of his opponents and in large measure the confidence of the Reformed Church.

When much of the noise and dust of conflict had subsided after the

1. Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen, 1562-1681. NOTE: Vide, appendix F.
 2. Satirical Poems of the Reformation-Cranstoun, Vol. 1, p. 339.

recent struggles of 1583-85, Craig in his hour of triumph committed what was probably the one outstanding indiscretion of his long public career. He seems to have been goaded to this by the reproaches of the returned exiles, and particularly through a tactless sermon by James Gibson of Pencaithill. Gibson, "usurping the pulpit of Edinburgh, fell out in impertinent railing," 1 and gave utterance to the following damaging and inflammatory words:

"I thought that Captain James Stewart (Arran), Lady Jezabel his wife, and William Stewart, had persecuted the Church, but now I have found the truth, that it was the King himself: as Jeroboam and his posterity were rooted out for staying the true worship of God, so I fear that, if our King continue in his present course, he shall be the last of his race." 2

Craig, incensed at these anarchic words and by the criticisms of the Melvillians whom he dubbed "peregrine ministers," preached a contentious sermon before Parliament assembled at Linlithgow, making bold to justify the course he had adopted. James Melville describes the incident thus:

"A heavier cause for grief was given by a bitter invective that Mr. Craig made against us before the King and all the lords of Parliament, stirred up, as he alleged, by a sermon that James Gibson had made in the pulpit of Edinburgh, against the subscribing ministers of whom Mr. Craig was the chief; so that there was (sown) the seed of a fearful schism, had not God, by means of patient and wise brethren, borne down the same at the next Assembly." 3

This sermon, on "Submission due to Kings," was afterwards discussed at some length by the Earl of Angus (who had been also exiled) and David Hume of Godscroft who reports the argument, in which he took a very able part, in his History of the House of Douglas and Angus. 4 The earl began by asking Hume what was his opinion of this outspoken sermon, which, said he, had given offence to a great many. Hume's reply was that "if the

1. Spottiswoode, Vol. 2, p. 335. 2. Records of the Privy Council of Scotland, 21st and 23rd December, 1585. Memoirs-Moyse, p. 105. 3. Autobiography-Melville, p. 228. 4. VIDE, Vol. 2, p. 383 et seq. Calderwood, Vol. 4, pp. 466-484.

relation of subjects to their princes be as Craig says, what can we do but depend upon their pleasure." Angus mentioned that there were some good men who looked favourably on princes, and he then asked Hume what he made of Craig's interpretation of the text, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; He judgeth among the gods," Psalm 82-1. Did it teach, "obedience to the King's commands, and impunity without controlment?" Hume, who examined the text in relation to the whole psalm, said that this particular Scripture gave them no warrant for such arbitrary action. "God sits among the gods," contended Hume, "not to deify but to control them." But, it was urged, Craig had indicated that the people of God were commanded to obey Nebuchadnezzar, and he was a tyrant. Therefore, all tyrants should be obeyed. Hume maintained that Craig was in the wrong here, for he was making a general rule out of a particular case. If you accept Craig's theory, he continued, then on the same grounds God commanded Jehu, an individual to slay Ahab, so that private citizens had an equal right to, indeed ought to slay tyrants. And yet, this too must surely be wrong, because David did not slay Saul, "therefore, no man may put him (the tyrant) out, though his tyranny be never so great." It is evident that Hume took the meaning of Craig's sermon to be, obedience to tyrants whether they be good or bad. Thus had John Craig in his zeal for law and order, repudiated within the short space of an hour, all that he had ever stood for at the Knox-Maitland conference of 1564, and indeed all that he had learnt from Thomas de Finola at Bologna, thirty-five to forty years before. James Melville was quite justified, therefore, in stating in a letter dated 2nd January, 1586, that Craig "pleased the King on all points, justified the subscribers, and condemned those that had left their flocks." This letter also tells how Andrew Melville

and some of his colleagues were received in royal audience, and that Craig who was also present, urged them not to stand on their innocence, but to "bow the knee and crave pardon and grace from the King." ¹ Craig was less than dignified at this moment, and might well have spared his brethren this humiliation. Yet it must be allowed in his defence that he sincerely believed he had done aright. Concerning this regrettable phase of Craig's career Dr. Law writes: "Neither passive obedience nor the divine right of Kings was the doctrine of the minister of St Giles in 1564." ²

Arising out of these controversies, a short work appeared possibly from the pen of James Melville. ³ It takes the form of a trialogue, and concerns three persons whose names ^{are} given as Zelator, Temporiser and Palamon. Calderwood notes that one was called Zelator, because Adamson of St Andrews, in his forged Lawson's Testament, had dubbed "the sincerest of preachers" so; for the "nick-name Puritan was not then known among us." The Trialogue is a defence of the stand which the Melvillians took against the "Black Acts," and mention is made of Craig and Duncanson but not, as may well be imagined, in any favourable light. It is not difficult to discern whom the author had in mind in the person of Temporiser.

¹. Calderwood, Vol. 4, p. 489 et seq. ². Craig's Catechism-Law (Introd.), p. 53. ³. Calderwood, Vol. 4, p. 322 et seq.

Chapter Nineteen.

.....

Although Craig was now in his seventy-third year, his work on behalf of the Scottish Reformed Church was by no means over. During the next ten years, he was as useful and as indefatigable as ever and without any apparent sign of failing powers either of body or of mind. His non-subscribing brethren, as Melville had indicated, were grieved rather than angry with him for the stand he had taken, and doubtless remembering his full life of devoted service to their Church over many years, they let wiser counsels prevail, so that his highly contentious sermon at the Linlithgow Parliament, was never debated in the General Assembly.

When the Assembly met in Edinburgh on the 10th of May, 1586, King James appeared in person; and to judge from his speech to ~~the~~ ~~com-~~ ~~mit-~~ ~~tees,~~ he seemed to have been in an equitable frame of mind. He went on to tell them that "in spite of rumours to the contrary, he protested his soundness and perseverance in the Reformed religion," and in reply to which Robert Pont made bold to say, "We trust your Majesty speaks without hypocrisy." Craig, Pont and Lindsay (who was moderator) were with several others ordained to examine beneficed persons who had merited deprivation. They also instructed Craig to take two or three of their number ~~along~~ with him, "to urge the Master of Gray (a new royal favourite) to the performance of his promise made in the presence of the King at the baptism of his bairn, which was to subscribe to the Confession of Faith, and to see him subscribe." ¹ Gray was a dubious Protestant whose presence at court was disturbing to the reformers. The king pressed this General Assembly to accept the estate of bishops, but it was answered that they would acknowledge such "only in the sense described by Paul," which was what Craig, Pont and their seven brethren

¹.Book of the Universal Kirk, p.651.

had contended for in their written declaration. Wodrow gives a fine touch in his comments on the labours of this Assembly:

"I find Mr. Craig when matters were cooled, became sensible of his oversight and acknowledged so much, as did several other good men, who fainted in this dark hour, and he and they concurred heartily in the common work of the Church, and a veil of charity and love was cast over all former slips, and indeed for ten years after this the Church of Scotland had a most bright and glorious day following on this dark night." 1

Much useful work was done by Craig in the years that followed. In 1587, we find him on the moderator's committee for the handling of day to day Assembly business, and he was among those commissioned to prepare an answer to articles presented by the king. Some of these articles related to Adamson who had brought fresh trouble upon himself, and to Robert Montgomery the one-time aspirant to the see of Glasgow. Montgomery on due evidence of repentance was "to be received without further ceremony to the fellowship and favour of the Kirk." 2 We are told that Craig with Balcanquhal and Pont met one morning at 6 a.m. in the New Kirk, "for trial of the books of the commissioners' diligence." During August of this year, Craig and a few others were sent by the General Assembly to King James "to understand by what means religion shall be maintained within this realm and continued to posterity." 3 At this Assembly, Craig preached to them in the Little Kirk at 7 o'clock in the morning. 4 Old age seemed to have brought no diminution to Craig's excellent preaching gifts, for as late as 11th August, 1588, we find the Edinburgh Town Council making fresh overtures to the General Assembly to have him as their minister. 5 About this time he was among the leaders of a committee which the Assembly appointed to consider means of combatting the

1. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p. 53. 2. Calderwood, Vol. 4, p. 566 et seq. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 699 et seq. 3. B.U.K., p. 735. 4. Calderwood, Vol. 4, p. 683. 5. Edinburgh Burgh Records, 1573-89.

"apparent ruin and decay of the Gospel within this realm, for fault of provision of (for) ministers, and intertainment (support) of schools and colleges...." 1

On the 17th of May, 1590, Craig, then in his seventy-ninth year, assisted Robert Bruce and Andrew Melville at the coronation of Queen Anne, and delivered a short sermon to her. On the Tuesday following, the queen made her public entry into Edinburgh, Moyses informing us that "she passed out of Holyroodhouse, by the south side of the Canongate up by the park dyke, and came in again at the West Port, where Her Majesty was received by the magistrates; and after a speech made, the keys were delivered to her, as the custom is, under a veil. She was then conducted through the whole town to the abbey." 2 Calderwood says that "Mr. John Craig's son, a young boy (he was fifteen) made her a short oration." 3

As we noted earlier, the National Covenant or King's Confession received answering fire from Catholic opponents in their Short Confession, which was written in the vernacular and circulated in Scotland sometime during 1588/89. The reformers considered that this Confession should be answered vigorously, for in a General Assembly Minute of 12th August, 1590, we read that they

"ordained the Presbytery of Edinburgh to peruse the answer set out by Mr. Craig against a pernicious writing put out against the Confession of Faith, together with the preface made by Mr. John Davidson; and if they found it meet, the same to be published." 4

There is, unfortunately, now no trace of this work. Incidentally, it provides proof of the better understanding among the principal reformers, to find two of these so dissimilar in character collaborating in its production. We learn from an Act of this General Assembly,

1. Calderwood, Vol. 4, p. 686. 2. Memoirs-Moyse, p. 171. 3. Calderwood, Vol. 5, p. 97. 4. Row's History, p. 141. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 777.

"touching the examination before Communion, it is thought meet, for the common profit of the whole people, that an uniform order be kept in examination; and that a short form of examination be set down by their brethren, Masters John Craig, Robert Pont, Thomas Buchanan, and Andrew Melville, and to be presented to the next Assembly." 1

During the months that followed, it would appear that these four arranged among themselves that Craig should be wholly responsible for this work. Accordingly, we learn

"Anent the Form of Examination before the Communion, penned by their brother Mr. Craig, the Assembly (1591) thought it meet to be imprinted, being by the author thereof contracted in some shorter bounds." 2

This Shorter Catechism was duly printed by Robert Walgrave, for in a deliverance of the General Assembly of 1592 we find that

"Forasmuch as, at the special desire of the Kirk, a form of examination before Communion was penned and formed by their brother Mr. John Craig, which ^{is ALLOWED AND} now imprinted, and ^{WHOLE} by the voice of the Assembly: Therefore it is thought needful that every pastor labour with his flock, that they may buy the same book, and read it in their families, whereby they may be better instructed, and that the same be read and learnt in lecturers' schools, in place of the Little Catechism." 3

This Little Catechism was "The Manner to Examine Children," and was the work of John Calvin. Craig's Shorter Catechism seems to have also replaced another similar work published anonymously by Charteris in 1581, namely, "The Forme and maner of examination before admittion to ye tabill of ye Lord, usit be ye ministrie of Edinburgh. And geuin to ye maisteris of euerie familie; yet be ye oft reading yairof, yai may be better instructit in ye groundis and principall yeidis of Religion." 4 N. Craig's Shorter Catechism proved very popular throughout Scotland, and was in general use among the Reformed churches until superceded by its

1. Calderwood, Vol. 5, p. 108. 2. Ibid, p. 137. 3. Row's History, p. 143. Calderwood, Vol. 5, 159. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 788. 4. Annals of Scottish Printing-Dickson & Edmund, p. 361. NOTE: Vide, appendix G.

better-known and more famous counter-part from the Westminster *ASSEMBLY* of 1648. *N.* However, for over half a century, Craig's Shorter Catechism played a worthy part in town and country alike, in educating the youth of Scotland on the intimate matters of their Faith. For instance, we read in an Anstruther Wester Kirk Session Record of 7th September, 1600, the following:

"Anent the (parish) school. It was agreed with Henry Cunyngham that the poor of the town shall be put to school....; he shall examine the bairns, they shall be brought before the session by the elders of the quarters, the session shall enter the school and try their perfecting....; and as for the others that are not able to profit that they may read or write.... they shall be caused to learn the Lord's prayer, the Commandments, and Creed, and the heads of the catechism that are demanded on the examination to Communion." 1

Again, we have from the Session Records of South Leith Parish Church, this entry: date, 8th August, 1616:

"Every Sabbath after the prayers before the blessing, there shall be two bairns, one from the Grammar school, that shall repeat Mr. Craig's Catechism openly in the kirk, for the instruction of all present." 2

It would appear that our reforming ancestors were not reluctant to favour innovations; and, incidentally, Craig's Shorter Catechism served equally to instruct adults as well as children. It would seem to have been still used until the eighteenth century; for in the Church of Scotland's "Confessions of Faith," published by John Bryce of Glasgow in 1764 (being but a reprint of the 1725 edition), it appears together with the Westminster Shorter Catechism. The brilliant but eccentric Edward Irving regarded Craig's Shorter Catechism most favourably, and employed it in his church for the instruction of communicants. He even had it reprinted at his own expense. Irving wrote that "it is a most precious

1. Kirk Session Records, Anstruther Wester, 7th September, 1600. 2. Makers of the Scottish Kirk-Kirkwood Hewat, p. 376. *NOTE: VIDE, AN EXPOSITION OF THE SHORTER CATECHISM, PART I - PRINCIPAL SALMOND, D. D., ABERDEEN, P. 9.*

repository of vital truth, and with one alteration, the best Catechism I know." He maintains that it has the advantage over the Westminster Shorter Catechism in being divested of systematic forms, and in being expressed almost entirely in Scriptural terms. His personal wish was that it might supplant the other both in families and schools. To Irving, Craig's work was simple and vital, whereas that of Westminster in his opinion was systematic and intellectual. 1 Three leading nineteenth century Presbyterian divines, Candlish, Moody and Horatius Bonar were likewise impressed with its fine qualities, for they had it reprinted a few years after the appearance of Irving's "Confessions of Faith." In their introduction, they opined that Craig's Shorter Catechism was

"likely to be useful in assisting young communicants.... From its shortness and simplicity, it is well fitted to impart clear and distinct views of divine truth; while on the other hand, its fulness and richness of spiritual matter, and its scriptural beauty of expression, are such as to touch and impress the heart." 2

Bonar has included both of Craig's works in his "Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation."

A study of Craig's "Short Sum of the Whole Catechism," and of his "Form of Examination before Communion," shows that although both are wholly Calvinistic in theology, the second work is by no means a digest of the former. Craig, by supplying in his Shorter Catechism relevant Scripture references (as in Calvin's Catechism), has related all his questions and answers to the Word of God. Also, there is a freshness and charm, a clarity and challenge in this work, that are less in evidence in his Larger Catechism. There is a roundness of phrasing, and a finer quality of diction in his Shorter Catechism, that bear the unmis-

1. Confessions of Faith-Irving, pp. 123-128 (Introd.). 2. Craig's Shorter Catechism (published in Edinburgh, 1837).

takeable touch of a maturer pen. It was written, of course, ten years after his Larger Catechism, but it is nevertheless a remarkable achievement for a minister in his eighty-first year; it bears witness to Craig's acute mental powers even in extreme old age. Campbell, if we remember, had imagined that he detected papistical leanings in Craig's Larger Catechism with regard to its teaching on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper:

- Q. Then we receive only the tokens and not His body?
 A. We receive His very substantial body and blood.

The parallel passage in Craig's Shorter Catechism has come into direct line with the teaching of Calvin's Little Catechism:

Craig.

Calvin.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Q. What signifieth the action of the Supper?
 A. That our souls are fed spiritually, by the body and blood of Jesus Christ, John 6.54.</p> | <p>Q. What signifieth the Supper of the Lord?
 A. That by the spiritual eating and drinking of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, our souls are nourished unto life everlasting. 1</p> |
|---|--|

Craig's generous use of Scripture references in his Shorter Catechism, is also probably an indication that bibles were more plentiful in Scotland than they were in 1581. His work is of such high quality, that it is to be regretted that the General Assembly of 1591 called for this abridgement only, thus depriving posterity of the whole fruits of his labour. However, the Shorter Catechism remains as a testimony to the enduring qualities of this great reformer perennially youthful in heart and in mind, whose concern even as an octogenarian, was for the religious instruction of the young.

1. Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation-Bonar, pp. 95, 248, and 282.

Towards the close of 1591, John Craig was involved in what was in all probability his last public brush with royal authority. This arose out of an attempt on the person of the king from which he only narrowly escaped serious injury, if not assassination. The ringleader of the assault was the Earl of Bothwell, brother-in-law to Bothwell who had married Queen Mary. On Wednesday, 29th December, Craig preached before the king, choosing as his text Zechariah 6-1: "And I turned, and lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and, behold, there came four chariots out from between two mountains, and the mountains were mountains of brass." His theme was that of the divine judgment which God metes out to men, where the demands of human justice are not satisfied. King James, protested the courageous old preacher, had in recent months but lightly regarded the many bloody shirts of political victims, which his angry subjects had paraded through the streets of Edinburgh, with the demand that justice be done to brutal murderers who were sheltering behind the royal favour. ¹ The king had neglected to dispense justice, therefore, said Craig, "God in his providence had made a noise of crying and fore-hammers to come to his own doors," this being a pointed reference to Bothwell's assault on Holyroodhouse with hammers and pistols. ² After Craig had pronounced the blessing, the king rose up and desired the congregation to remain "that he might purge himself." James angrily shouted that if he had thought his paid servant (meaning Craig) would have dealt after that manner with him, he would not have suffered him so long in his house. But the old reformer, "not hearing what the King said, for the noise of the people (probably also because of deafness), went his way, and there was no more of it." ³ Much of the old sparkle, eloquence and forthrightness was evident in Craig's sermon; and it is not without its significance that

1. Calderwood, Vol. 5, p. 140. 2. Memoirs-Moyse, p. 180. 3. Calderwood, Vol. 5, p. 142. Vide also Birrel's Diary, p. 27.

there was no defence of the divine right of kings! In fact the whole tenor of the sermon was quite contrary.

It would appear, that Craig's last attendance at the General Assembly was at their May sederunts of the year 1594. Eager as ever to serve the Reformed Church, he had his opportunity once more and this arose out of their trial of a young Stirling minister named John Ross. Apparently sympathetic to the Bothwell faction then in open rebellion, Ross had visited their forces and had preached to them a rousing sermon in the course of which he had uttered words which were both "indiscreet and hot-headed." Ross was brought before this General Assembly to answer for his folly, and John Craig, Andrew Melville, Bruce of St Giles and several other ministers, were commanded to deal with him. They reported favourably on Ross

"Wherefore the moderator (Andrew Melville), at the command of the Assembly, admonished the said brother, and all young men of the ministry, and the whole Assembly in all time coming to speak so reverently and discreetly of His Majesty..... which admonition the said John Ross with all humility revered." 1

John Craig had been in failing health for some considerable time. We find King James, at the General Assembly of 24th April, 1593, making the request that a list of five or six "of the discreetest of the ministry" be prepared, that he might make a choice of two of these to become his royal chaplains "in respect of Mr. Craig his decrepit age." They agreed to this, and ordered commissioners to come to an equitable arrangement with the king. But nothing came of this for the obvious reason that during 1594 Craig's health had shown a marked improvement. However, in the year following, he seems to have been again seriously ill, for we learn that during the General Assembly of July, 1595, one of the king's

1. Calderwood, Vol. 5, p. 321.

articles is "in respect Mr. Craig is waiting what hour it shall please God to call him, and is altogether unfit to serve any longer, and His Majesty mindeth to place John Duncanson with the prince, and so hath no ministers but Mr. Patrick Galloway, therefore His Majesty desires an order to be made, granting him any two ministers he shall choose." 1 Row says that at this time Craig was at "the point of death." 2 The Assembly acceded to the king's request, 3 but according to Craig's Last Will and Testament (Vide, appendix), it would seem that he retained his royal chaplaincy up until the time of his death. The grave nature of his recent illness probably accounts for the executing of his Will, which is dated 17th May, 1595. 4 By this year, therefore, John Craig had become a spent force, but the cause for which he had given so many years of tireless and altruistic service, had never been in better shape. Defoe has written thus of the year 1595:

"At this time, if ever in this King's reign, the Church may be said to have been at its full-grown strength." 5

Among the architects and pioneers of the Church of Scotland, the name of John Craig deserves an honoured place.

Like many of the Scottish reformers, Craig married, probably during his ministry at St Giles. His wife's name was Marion or Margaret Small or Smail, but of her antecedents nothing is known. That she was much younger in years than her husband would appear from the fact that she survived his decease which was in 1600, by well over thirty years. Row testifies that she was still alive in 1630. 6 Dr. John Hamilton, in his Facile Tractise (published 1600), in which he fulminates against the ex-priests who married, says:

1. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p.55. 2. Row's History, p.166. 3. Calderwood, Vol.5, p.368. 4. Register of Testaments (Register House), Vol.35. 5. Memoirs of the Church of Scotland-Defoe, p.100. 6. Row's History, p.457 et seq.

"By this fleshly liberty, they allure voluptuous religious persons to their epicurean Evangel, to accomplish their insatiable lusts of the flesh, by adulterous and sacrilegious marriages of canons, monks, nuns, friars, and all other sorts of renegade priests, among whom we have the notable example of friar John Craig.... For this apostacy, this unfrocked friar was made an apostle of this fifth Gospel in Edinburgh, where being about fourscore years of age, he married a young lass of fifteen years old; of which sacrilegious marriage sprang out a cursed generation, as the inhabitants, and one of the chief ministers of Edinburgh (would this be Watson?) can bear witness." 1

Hamilton's libel is quite ridiculous besides being false, for by the year 1589, Craig then 77 years of age, had a married daughter. 2 Also, his only son William became a regent or professor of Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh during the autumn of 1597. 3 That John Craig was considerably older than his wife is shown from the correspondence of Andrew Melville and his nephew James. Andrew, who was a bachelor, urged his nephew-if he would marry again-not to wed the young lady of his choice, but rather a certain highly recommended widow from Newcastle, whom his friends thought a preferable match for this middle-aged widower. But these well-intentioned counsels evidently did not appeal to the "younger" Melville, who wrote to his uncle:

"I can perceive nothing of any weight in what you adduce, except it be the incongruity of an old man marrying a young woman. But I am not an old man, I am only elderly.... I have many reasons for not taking a widow, and more for taking a young woman; nor do I want the examples of the best of men, who have acted as I purpose to do; such as Knox, Craig, Pont, ^{DALGLEISH} and others in our own Church." 4

It is surely worth noting, that all former feuds forgiven and forgotten, Craig was held in remembrance by James Melville as being amongst the "best of men." In any case, it ought to be borne in mind, that "this unfrocked friar" of Hamilton's jibe, was long past his youth before he

1. Catholic Tractates-Law, p.242. 2. Edinburgh Burgh Records, 12th September, 1589. 3. Ibid, 28th October, 1597. 4. Andrew Melville, Vol.2, p. 299-M'Crie, who quotes from Melvini Epistolae.

broke with Rome.

Craig's marriage with Marion Small was fruitful; for to them were born four children, a son and three daughters. We noted that when Craig left Aberdeen to become a royal chaplain, he proceeded to Edinburgh "with his wife, bairns, and whole household." His son William who was probably the youngest member of his family, was born at Aberdeen during the autumn of 1575, being baptised in the month of October of that year. ¹ Much is revealed concerning the domestic side of the reformer's family in the following unpublished document:

"Deposition by Janet Watson, eldest daughter of the late Mr. William Watson, sometime minister at Markinch, one of the heirs portioners to the late William Craig, her mother's brother, only son of Mr. John Craig, sometime minister at Edinburgh, with the consent of David Phin, sailor, sometime of Burntisland, now of Leith, her husband, in favour of Mr. Robert Fairlie, schoolmaster at Musselburgh, of a fourth part of a tenement of the land of the late Mr. William Craig on the east side of Blackfriar's Wynd. Dated, 24th January, 1631. Registered, 3rd May, 1631." ²

The Robert Fairlie mentioned in this deed, was a grandson of the reformer. This is clearly shown in a sasine extracted from Guthrie's Protocols, and from a Laing manuscript:

"For the love and favour of Mr. John Craig, minister, to Robert Fairlie, goldsmith, and Margaret Craig his wife, daughter to the said Mr. Craig, certain annuals (interest from invested capital) in the common mills." ³

This probably refers to a wedding dowry which John Craig had settled on his daughter. Their son, Robert Fairlie, who became the Musselburgh schoolmaster, when about to begin his career, had need of a testimonial the contents of which speak for themselves, and are as follows:

1. Aberdeen Registry of Births (Register House), 9th October, 1575.
2. Unpublished Edinburgh Burgh Records, "Moses' Bundle," 96, No. 467.
3. Guthrie's Protocols (Register House), 7th January, 1598/9.

"I, Mr. William King, regent of King James's College at Edinburgh, "testifies" by these presents that the bearer thereof, Robert Fairlie, my disciple, is not worthy only of recommendation for his grandfather's sake, Mr. John Craig, and uncle Mr. William Craig, who being of good memory laboured faithfully here amongst us, but also for his own sake, being a youth of very good expectation, and who has profited well in his studies hitherto. For in his Greek the last year, he was not ~~only~~ inferior to any of his fellow-students; and likewise, I hope he shall prove as good in the rest of his course if so be he be not hindered by poverty and lack of necessary means. He is likewise a youth of very good inclination and has not only satisfied me but also the whole masters here in all duties whatsoever, which I testify by these presents. Subscribed with my hand. M.W.King." 1

It would seem that Fairlie did find himself in financial difficulties on one occasion, being forced to sell either part or the whole of his inherited property:

"Disposition by Mr. Robert Fairlie, schoolmaster at Musselburgh, in favour of Thomas Boswell, bailie and burghess of Burntisland, of half of a land (tenement), sometime belonging to the late George Lochmylne and latterly to Mr. William Craig, son of the late John Craig and Marion Small, on the south side of the High Street and east side of Blackfriar's Wynd, in which the said Robert is infest (endowed) as son of the late Margaret Craig, one of the two sisters of the late Mr. William. Dated, 7th October, 1631." 2

It might appear from this reference to William Craig's two sisters, that these were the only daughters of Craig the reformer, but there exists another document which proves that there was a third:

"To Mr. John Craig, minister of the Sacred Evangel, his wife, Janet, William and Margaret Craig, their children, 100 merks." 3

The late Mr. Boog Watson, a well-known Edinburgh antiquarian, makes mention in his unpublished works of a fourth daughter of Craig's, but the

1. Laing MSS, Vol. 1, p. 167, Signet Library, Edinburgh. 2. Unpublished Edinburgh Burgh Records, "Moses' Bundle," 98, No. 479. 3. Guthrie's Protocols, Vol. 6, 27th May, 1590.

present writer has been unable to verify this. Watson was a descendant of John Craig through his daughter Barbara. Among his (Watson's) works which are in the possession of the Carnegie Library, Edinburgh, there is a printed genealogical table in which he traces his descent back to ~~Craig~~ the reformer. 1

Craig's financial position, somewhat precarious during the early years of his ministry, had improved greatly as time went on and particularly so on his appointment to a royal chaplaincy. It seems that his stipend at Holyroodhouse was £200, Scots, per annum, it being granted in "contentationem et satisfactionem," for services rendered to the king's household. Over and above this, Craig's board (and probably his lodgings also) at the palace were free, for in a much later entry we read: "To John Craig, minister, in lieu of his meat which he ought to have had at his Highness's house the time aforesaid, as his acquittance bears, £66.13.4." 2 Since around this time, butter sold at 7d per pound, chickens cost 4d each, and a whole sheep 6/- to 9/-, and both meal and barley a £1 per boll (six bushels), it follows that Craig and his family were adequately provided for. 3

After several years of residence at Holyroodhouse or in one of the city manses, Craig and his family finally removed to a dwelling of his own during 1587, which formed part of the land or tenement in Blackfriar's Wynd. He had purchased this property some years previously:

"To Mr. John Craig, minister of our Sovereign Lord the King, Marion Small, his wife, and William Craig, their son, of the Land of Alexander Douglas and Marion Lochmyln, his wife, on the south side of the High Street in the Vennel of the Friars Preachers." 4

As we saw, Craig had been granted in 1585 by the Town Council, the use of

1. Boog Watson MSS, Vol. 4, p. 2. G.P., 7th January, 1578/9. 2. Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, Vol. 21, p. 153 (1580), and p. 413 (1588). 3. Church of Scotland-Lee, Vol. 1, p. 349 et seq. 4. Guthrie's Protocols, Vol. 3, 23rd April, 1583.

James Lawson's house, and it was from here that he removed to his acquired property in which he resided until the time of his death.

Like more of his fellow-Scotsmen, Craig possessed business acumen. He invested modest sums of money wisely, and on occasion advanced loans both to individuals and the Town Council of Edinburgh. For example, King James was desirous of making a present to a certain Frenchman whom he favoured, or whose good graces he wished to court, namely, Sir William Salust of Bartes a councillor to the King of Navarre. Finding himself short of funds, James requested a loan from the Town Council with which to purchase the gift, a magnificent velvet saddle costing 100 crowns. The Council sought to obtain the money elsewhere and at ten per cent interest: John Craig supplied the 100 crowns. Another transaction is linked with this, and it requires explanation. During the summer of 1587, an English pirate vessel had been seriously affecting shipping in the Firth of Forth, and the Edinburgh Town Council decided to do something to bring its depredations to an end. At this time, there was in session at Dundee a convention of burghs, to which Edinburgh sent a commissioner "to desire the said burghs to provide means to pass against the said pirate," Edinburgh being prepared to pay its share. If all the burghs were agreeable to this proposal, William Fairlie, the Edinburgh commissioner, was then to proceed to Falkland palace "to the King's grace and obtain his grace's power and authority to this effect." ¹ The convention of burghs agreed to the scheme, and King James at that moment beholden to the Town Council, gave his consent to the venture. John Craig advanced the money required as the following entry shows:

"Understanding that for the 100 crowns granted to the King, and the 500 merks for the barque against the pirates, making in all £600 got from Mr. John Craig, minister, and the con-

1. Burgh Records of Edinburgh, 4th July, 1587.

tract made between him and them for £60 annual rent upon the Common Mills being read in their presence they agreed thereto, signed the same, and ordered infetment to pass thereupon and granted their seal of cause thereto." 1

Thus did the king obtain the velvet saddle for his Frenchman; and thereby were the means provided to take action against the pirate ship.

Moyse informs us, that at the coronation celebrations of Anne of Denmark, the entertainment of Danish and other foreign guests was on a lavish scale: "They cost in expenses to their furnishers 1200 merks each day while they remained." 2 This may be exaggeration, but what remains true is that Craig advanced £1000, Scots, to Edinburgh Town Council to assist in providing suitable hospitality for the coronation guests. 3 The income from this investment, £100 per annum, was at this time resigned by Craig in favour of his son-in-law, William Watson, minister, and his wife Barbara Craig who was the reformer's eldest daughter. 4 N.

Craig's son William, a brilliant youth, became one of the professors at Edinburgh University at the age of twenty-three: "David Williamson is surety for Mr. William Craig, regent, that he will not leave till he complete his course, ending at Lammis, 1599." 5 Craig, secundus, had been recommended to the vacant professorship by Principal Rollock, and entered on his duties during the month of October, 1597, having graduated in May of that year. Shortly after his father's death, he resigned his appointment, and proceeding to France, he served for several years as professor of Theology at Saumur. 6 In an Edinburgh Town Council Minute of 11th December, 1601, we have this brief statement: "Mr. Andrew

1. Burgh Records of Edinburgh (unpublished MSS), 13th September, 1587.

2. Memoirs-Moyse, p. 169. 3. B.R.E., 1589-1603, p. 5. 4. Ibid. 5. Ibid, 6th January, 1597/8. 6. History of the University of Edinburgh-Dalzel, pp. 40-42, and 373.

NOTE: These sums of money were not as great as they seem. The pound Scots was approximately one tenth of the English pound sterling. The Scottish merk, equalled two thirds of the pound Scots. Vide, Church of Scotland-Lee, Vol. 1, pp. 349-362.

Young, regent, in the place of Mr. William Craig." The younger Craig was on intimate terms of friendship with the great scholar Boyd of Trochrig, who in his works makes several references to him. Wodrow informs us, that through over-study, William Craig fell into decline, and returning to Scotland, he died in his own house at Blackfriar's Wynd, November, 1616. 1

John Craig possessed his own official Seal. It is recorded as belonging to him as "minister of Christ's Evangel, and King's chaplain in Edinburgh." This Seal was $1 \frac{5}{16}$ of an inch in diameter, and on it a shield of arms and a star flanked by two crescents. It bore the legend, S.(sigillum)M.IONANNIS CRAIG. 2

Although Craig had been dangerously ill during 1595, he lived on for five years, retaining his chaplaincy to the end. Spottiswoode says of him that "when borne down with the weight of years he retired from court, and forbore all public exercises, living presently at home and comforting himself with the remembrance of the mercies of God that he had tasted in his life past." 3 On the 12th day of December, 1600, Master John Craig, "without any pain," passed to his eternal rest. As of Moses, so with Craig, "no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." Dr. Marguerite Wood, archivist of the City of Edinburgh writes:

"As to the burial-place of Craig, it is quite impossible to be certain. Queen Mary granted the Greyfriars to the town in 1562 for a graveyard, but it seems to have been accepted that Knox was buried in the old yard south of St Giles. It was not the custom at that time and for long afterwards, to mark graves with monuments and for that, permission had to be obtained. So Craig, like other quite important persons, had an unknown grave. The register of burials in Greyfriars starts only in 1658. There is no register for the old yard."

1. Wodrow Selections-Lippe, p.56. 2. Guthrie's Protocols, Vol.7, 7th April, 1640. 3. Spottiswoode, Vol.3, p.91 et seq.

The late Principal Story in his lecture on the reformer, calls him Dr. John Craig, but does not give his authority for doing so. Kirkwood Hewat states that there exists a portrait in oils of Craig, and proceeds to describe it in detail. It seems odd that Hewat should be the first to make this discovery, if such it is, for Dr. Law, who was on intimate terms of friendship with the Gibson Craigs, has recorded that there is no portrait of the reformer. ¹ The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, possess a printed copy, 9" X 6", of this portrait, entitled "Dr. John Craig." The original oil painting that was seen by Hewat, is now in the possession of Mrs. Sudlow, a descendant of the Gibson Craigs. The portrait depicts a powerfully built man in his late fifties, but the dress is decidedly that of the early seventeenth century. It may be an oil painting of the reformer, but it is more likely to be that of Dr. John Craig, one of King James sixth's physicians who was either the brother or the son of Sir Thomas Craig, advocate, of Riccarton. N.

When the General Assembly met at Burntisland during May, 1601, the king was present, but only the briefest reference was made to the death of Craig the reformer. ² When we consider his great services to the Reformed Church over many years, this Assembly's neglect is blameworthy. However, among those who were recommended to the king to succeed Craig was John Spottiswoode, son of the former Superintendent of Lothian, who later wrote so ably and sympathetically about the life and work of John Craig. Spottiswoode, secundus, had been the reformer's contemporary,

¹ Craig's Catechism-Law (Introd.). ² Row's History, p. 208. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 968. NOTE: Burgess Roll, Edinburgh, 1406-1700-"Mr. John Craig, one of H.M. Physicians, made Burgess 27th July, 1617." Guthrie's Protocols, 11th April, 1601: "Mr. John Craig, Dr. of Medicine, as heir of the late James Craig and of the late Robert Craig, merchant." Vide, p. 4 of thesis. The Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. 4, p. 1372, says that he was the son of Sir Thomas, but this seems hardly so.

doubtless knowing him personally (for Craig had been on friendly terms with his father), and he has left on record this just epitaph of John Craig:

"He was a great divine, an excellent preacher, of grave behaviour, sincere, inclining to no faction, and which increased his reputation, living honestly, without ostentation or desire for outward glory." ¹

¹. Spottiswoode, Vol. 3, p. 91 et seq.

Epilogue.

.....

It is a matter for regret that the historical records of John Craig the reformer are strictly limited in volume, but nevertheless enough of these have survived to enable us to form a fairly accurate picture of the man and his work.

1. Craig's scholarship was of a very high order, and it proved to be a ~~very~~ valuable asset to the Scottish Reformed Church from 1561 onwards. Like several of his colleagues, he had the benefit of a university education, and in the years which followed, particularly those which Craig spent within the cloistered walls of the Dominican priory at Bologna, he had ample opportunity (which he seems to have grasped) of enriching his learning. And there is the suggestion in his contacts with Finola and "Placentia", that he was both interested and instructed in civil and canon law. Craig's legal knowledge is further borne out in his tutoring of his nephew, Thomas Craig, who became the celebrated feudal law lawyer; it is revealed in the Edinburgh Town Council requests for his advice as to the disposal of properties formerly held by the Catholic Church; in his framing of the National Covenant or King's Confession of 1581; and finally, by his being invariably chosen by the General Assembly, when the need arose, to treat with the civil authorities. Somewhat of Craig's book knowledge is shown at the end of his Larger Catechism, and whilst no works of abiding value flowed from his pen, most of what he wrote ^{of} speaks the man's learning and erudition. He was also skilled in the classical languages as is seen from his examination of Robertson the headmaster of Edinburgh Grammar School. In collaboration with Knox, he wrote the Treatise on Fasting; he made contributions to Scottish Psalmody; he had a large share in the composition of the Second Book of Discipline,

not to mention his own Larger and Shorter Catechisms.

2. Craig was by nature and training and of choice, a man of caution; when making decisions, he was rarely if ever in a hurry. Although he worked in close co-operation with John Knox for almost ten years in the onerous charge of St Giles, no two men could have been more dissimilar. Where alone they seemed to match was in their austerity and forthrightness; though Craig was no firebrand. The origins of both these men explain much. Knox was of peasant stock, whereas Craig sprung from the landed gentry; and while both were of sterling quality, Craig paid more attention to etiquette than his colleague ever did. Craig, too, had the advantage over the other of imbibing much of the Renaissance culture during his long sojourn in Italy, and this gave him a breadth of outlook that seems absent from other of the reformers. He never had the driving force of Knox, who, as a result, worked himself to death at the comparatively early age of fifty-nine. Craig was none the less energetic, only he found it difficult to make up his mind and this his colleagues sometimes mistook for temporizing. However, having reached a decision, Craig usually stuck by it regardless of the consequences to himself. This characteristic showed itself during the civil war of 1570-72, and after the passing of the "Black Acts." Such caution as Craig practised may be intolerable to the leader, but it is surely a salutary quality for the second in command. Craig was the right kind of pilot for the Reformed Church of Scotland, if we consider the dangerous waters through which she had to forge her way during the second half of the sixteenth century. He resolutely steered a middle course, and it was in large measure due to him that his Church was prevented from veering to extremes.

3. Craig was self-reliant and of a sturdy independence. He was happy in his partnership with John Knox, but whenever Knox for one reason or another was absent from Edinburgh, and he was on occasion away from there for months, Craig proved himself capable of handling any situation however grave. He is seen at his best by the manner in which he dealt with the marriage of Queen Mary and Bothwell. He was unafraid to stand alone, either then or in 1572 or during the troubles of 1584-85. Nor did he ever allow himself to be crushed by blame; for he took this as the price he must pay for his principles, knowing that time would recover any present loss of prestige.

4. He held views on the relation of People and State far in advance of his time. Ideals akin to those of modern democracy had taken root in his mind even before he broke with Rome. To use his famous phrase, he believed that "The bond betwix the prince and the peopill is reciproce." To Craig, "every kingdom should be a Commonwealth, albeit every Commonwealth be not a Kingdom." But he was by no means anti-monarchical; he was, whether conscious of the fact or not, one of the pioneers of constitutional monarchy. His life-long study of civil and canon law led him to hold new concepts of the kingly function; to Craig, arbitrary rule was no longer admissable or desirable in a Reformed society. With men like Craig as champions of Reformed Church principles, first Queen Mary and then her son found it on occasion far from easy, indeed sometimes impossible, to carry out their royal decrees. Following upon the "Black Acts," Craig lapsed from his earlier views on monarchy, but there is evidence to show that he afterwards regretted this step; for did we not find him years later openly opposing himself to the misrule of King James? Whilst Craig's political creed was somewhat novel, it was none the less relevant to the situation which then obtained in Scotland.

For one thing, it set limits to royal claims, as was seen at the Knox-Maitland conference of 1564. Knox cordially approved of Craig's views there, as doubtless did the other leading reformers. King James tolerated Craig, but he was never fond of him; for his political views were suspect at court from 1564 onwards.

5. Like John Knox, Craig was possessed of a courage which was not born of necessity, but which was cool and deliberate. He was neither rash nor impetuous, but once having made his decision, he defended it to the last ditch. He was not intimidated by Bothwell, although the latter threatened to hang him; he kept steadily on his solitary way during the civil war; in St Giles on two occasions he faced bravely assassins' daggers; and probably his greatest display of courage was in the unpopular stand he took following upon the passing of the "Black Acts."

6. Truth and justice were dear to John Craig. There was little of gentleness in his nature, the times hardly allowed for gentleness; but his austerity did not blind him to the needs of others. Craig who once tended the wounded Italian soldier, in later years made bold to raise his voice on behalf of the poor and the oppressed, and that against the Regent Lennox. Yet had he little mercy for all offenders of the moral or divine law; both princes and commoners equally felt the lash of his rebuke. Craig himself lived by ideals which were stern and exacting; and he demanded from others the standards of conduct which he practised. It may well be that he erred at times on the side of severity (considering the frailty of lesser men), but he was no more exacting than many of his colleagues, indeed he was less so than some of them.

7. Few of Craig's colleagues equalled his record of service to the

Reformed Church, nor have many vied with it since. In seeking what he considered her best interests, Craig was quite altruistic. From the time he approached late middle life, and until his eighty-fourth year (when his active interest in the work of the Reformed Church came to an end), Craig conceived his task to be that of Church consolidation, and he employed his every power to achieve this end. In these endeavours he was but partly successful; but there were younger men following close behind, who were to catch something of his spirit and vision and thereby carry to a stage further, the work of integration.

We may justly say, therefore, in conclusion, that John Craig was a stalwart of the Scottish Reformation; a man of courage and of resource; stern as a Hebrew prophet; and yet withal modest and devoted to duty. Faithful to his trust, and high-hearted to the end of his days, he stands as an exemplar to such as dare to buy the truth and sell it not.

Appendix.

.....

Craig's Last Will and Testament.

Mr. John Craig, 23rd March, 1601. The testament, testamentar and inventory of the goods and gear, debts, sums of money pertaining to the deceased, an honest and discreet man, Mr. John Craig, Minister of the Evangel of Christ Jesus to the King's Majesty the time of his decease, who deceased upon the twelfth day of December, the year of God one thousand and six hundred, faithfully made and given by Marion Smaill his widow spouse, and Mr. William Craig his son, whom he nominates his only executors in his latter will under written before Mr. Hercules Rollok, master of the grammar school of Edinburgh, Mr. William Watson, Minister of the Evangel of Christ in Edinburgh, and Adam Lawtie, writer.

At the first, the said deceased Mr. John Craig had the goods, gear, sums of money and debts of the value and prices after following pertaining to him the time of his decease foresaid, viz., item, a silver piece of ten ounce weight, price of the ounce weight, 52 sh. 4 d, summa £26.13.4: item, a piece of six ounce weight, price of the ounce weight, 53 sh. 4 d, summa £16: item, in utensils and domiciles with the abuilzements (dress) of his body by the heirship estimate to the sum of one hundred and fourscore pounds. Summa of the inventory, £222.13.4.

Follows the debts owing to the dead. Item, there was owing to the said deceased Mr. John Craig by Patrick, Lord of Lindores, the sum of £800. Item, by Mr. Arthur Fichtie and Mr. Patrick Lindsay, the sum of £200. Item, by the provost and bailies and community of the burgh of Edinburgh, the Martinmas term's annual rent from the common mills of Edinburgh, addebted by them in anno (blank), £100.

Summa of the debts owing to the dead, £1000.

Summa of the inventory with the debts, £1,322.13.4.

To be divided in three parts dead's part is £440.7.8.

Quotta gratis. (summa of the quota is gratis at the command of the commissar).

Follows the dead's legacy and latter will.

At Edinburgh the seventeenth day of May, the year of God 1595. The which day the said Mr. John Craig, Minister of the Evangel of Christ to the King's Majesty, nominates and constitutes Marion Small his spouse and Mr. William Craig his son his executors and only intromittors with his goods and gear, and he earnestly desires his said executors to use their office by the advice of Mr. Thomas Craig, advocate, John Arnot burgess of Edinburgh, and Mr. Alex. Guthrie, common clerk of the said burgh. Item, he leaves his third of his free gear to the said Marion his spouse. Item, the said Mr. John earnestly requests all his bairns to remain in household

with their mother until their marriage with parties honest,
with their said mother's consent and advice. Item, he leaves
to the hospital of Edinburgh the sum of a hundred merks.
Sic subscribitur Mr. John Craig with my hand, Mr. William Wat-
son witness with my hand, Mr. Hercules Rollok witness with my
hand, Adam Lawtie, Witness. 1

.....

Typical Sasine relating to Craig and his family.

Contract between the Town of Edinburgh and Mr. John Craig, who
takes burden on him for spouse and children. Town infest the
said Mr. John and Marion Small, conjunct fee, and life rent, their
son William Craig, and daughter Margaret equally, annual rent of
100 lib., redeemable upon payment of 1000 lib. Scots. 20/1/1586.

Discharge on back of this document by the said Marion Small,
as life renter, and her daughter Margaret Craig, spouse to Robert
Fairlie, goldsmith and for him as fiar of annual of 50 lib., be-
ing half of the aforesaid annual rent of 100 lib. Scots, by hav-
ing received payment from the magistrates of 500 lib., Scots.
Dated 30/11/1603 (from the inventory of the Charter House in the
City of Edinburgh). 2

.....

Note A.

Professor John Johnston's MS Latin poems on Craig the reformer.

(Translation)

John of "the Rock" or Craig,
First minister of Aberdeen,
Thereafter royal chaplain.
To whom in the name of the senate
And people of Aberdeen this tomb is inscribed-
Who was my former teacher.
Died, 12th December, 1590. (1600.)

S.P.Q.A.... (Vide p.1) is without doubt on the analogy of S.P.Q.R. (Senatus
Populusque Romanus). Johnston has made clever use of "Rupanus," which

1. Register House, Edinburgh. 2. Boog Watson MSS (Carnegie Library, Edin-
burgh), Vol. 13, p. 202.

besides being a Latin equivalent of Craig's name, is meant to refer as we shall see, to his rock-like character.

Second Poem.
(Translation)

Our deep love of our city has consecrated this tomb and its titles to you, venerable old man, and our piety which you engendered as a provident father, and adviser and teacher in the way of righteousness in the past; you who so often filled thirsting minds with sacred nectar, and breasts with heavenly ambrosia. And the city (happy under your leadership), with a shudder and desire to weep, heard you so frequently hurling the thunder of the Word of God. If only it could have followed your footsteps and commands step by step; for it does not consider itself equal to such things, and it rightly lamented when your post having been vacated, the King's Household took you away from it. Now it follows you dutifully with pious tears, as you enter the House of the heavenly stars. And the desired love of our city inscribes the tomb, and on the tomb it writes these everlasting marks of honour.

Much, surely, of Craig's qualities, are revealed in this simple but moving tribute by his quondam discipulus.

Third Poem.
(Translation)

Allusion to the name of Craig, or Man of Rock.

The flower which you see rising from the green grass, grows upwards out of the rock which is covered with turf. From out of a vital seed it yielded fruit, and when crushed in death, it flourishes on. The rock itself not huge in bulk, but very great in strength, is now smaller still, and raises its head to the stars. ¹

.....

Note B.

Baillie in his short Latin Life of Sir Thomas Craig, advocate, is evidently in error when he states that he received the earliest rudiments of his education under John Craig the reformer-

¹. National Library of Scotland, MSS reference 19.3.24, pp. 28-30.

"Having been virtuously educated by the care of Mr. John Craig, a great divine, and his near relation, and made more than ordinary progress in the learned languages and in philosophy, he went to France (Vide, Ridpath, Preface to Scotland's Sovereignty, p. 28)." A comparison of the dates will convince us that John Craig went abroad two years before Sir Thomas was born; and that, at his return to Scotland around the year 1561, he found the future feudalist of the age of twenty-two. This superintendence, therefore must have taken place after the elder Craig had found a haven from his misfortunes in his native country—when the master, from his knowledge not only of the ancient but modern languages, which he acquired abroad, was well qualified to watch over the education of one destined to a learned profession—and when the pupil had himself reached that age of advanced youth, which rendered him more able to appreciate the great talents of his instructor. 1

.....

Note C

I may add to this a strange Providence of God. Master John Craig, that was a minister to King James here in Scotland, being, when he was a young man, apprehended of Rome, for venting heresy as they called it, was shut up in prison. In the meantime, Paul iv died. The Banditi that night broke up all the prison doors, and set at liberty all the prisoners. Mr. John Craig escapes with an intention to go to Bologna. But fearing hurt there, he set his mind toward Milan. When he had travelled some days, declining the high-ways out of fear, he came into a forest, a wild and desert place, and being sore wearied, lay down among some bushes, at the side of a little river, to refresh himself. He lay there pensive, and full of thought. For neither knew he in what place he was, nor had he any means to carry him out of the way. In the meantime, there came a dog fawning upon him, with a purse in his teeth, with money, and lays it down before him. He stricken with fear, rises up, but considering the same to proceed from God's favourable Providence, he accepted of it, and held on his way, till he came to Vienna in Austria. 2

.....

Note D.

Drury to the Privy Council of England, 20th May, 1571: "The

1. Sir Thomas Craig-Tytler, p. 28. 2. Satan's Invisible World Discovered—Sinclair, p. 155.

ministers and Superintendents of the country, taking with them the minister of Edinburgh, called John Craig, went to the castle, and there declared before the whole company of the nobility, that seeing the great desolation and ruin of the country like to ensue through the intestine wars began amongst the nobility, they were come to know what cause moved some of them there present who had been the principal doers in setting up the King's Majesty, so violently to take in hand wars against him under his authority. The Secretary, Balfour, and the captain of the castle answered that they were of necessity forced to do what they did, and farther said that they marvelled that they would take upon them to have anything to do with the government of the state which appertained nothing to them, and the ministers replied that they marvelled most that Grange having such trust committed unto him had left so good a cause. " 1

.....

Note E.

Gilbert Menzies and others were instructed by the Lord Regent to "punish the superstitious keeping of festival daysand all plays and feastings at these times. They were to permit no market to be kept within the town nor freedom thereof upon the Sabbath day, whereby the people may be withdrawn from the service of God.... That the persons known and suspected of having kept images or other remnants of idolatry be charged to present the same. That the organs with all expédition be removed out of the kirk, for the profit and use of the poor, and that priests stalls and backs of altars be removed.... That the poor be not defrauded of alms collected at the kirk door, but the sum to be distributed as is the custom in the other Reformed kirks of this realm. Minute of 18th August, 1574." 2

.....

Note F.

That John Craig, in common with the other principal reformers, was a strict disciplinarian, goes almost without saying. The laity quite frequently resented being "dragooned" by their ministers, and the following is a typical example:

1. Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series (Elizabeth), 1569-71. 2. Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen, 1562-1681.

"Upon Friday, the 20th October, 1592, the crafts began to storm, for (because of) the change of Monday's market to Wednesday; and the people murmured not only for the change of the market, but also for the collection to the poor, and contribution to build new kirks. The merchants that trafficked to Spain (a principal Catholic country) bragged they would not desist from carrying victuals to Spain for any censure of the Kirk, and spread some infamous rhymes and libels against the ministry." 1

Four days later, there was thrown into the pulpit of St Giles whilst the service was in progress, this "squib:"

"Will Watson's wordes, or Bruce's boist availl?
 Can Carius (Cairns) or Craige make merchants to remaine?
 Malcanker's cryes a whitt sall not prevaile;
 Balfour may barke, but all will be in vayne.
 Ye spewe your spites on such as sayle to Spaine,
 And lives like Lards by bryberye of the poore:
 Howbeit we beg, providinge ye gat gayne,
 You of your stipends, will not want one stuir (stiver),
 Ye crye for kirkes, for furnishing of your cure,
 Not taking tent howe men may doe the turne.
 I fear your falles, your dayes cannot indure,
 the best among you will be loathe to burne.
 Ye curse but cause by (beyond) warrant of the Word;
 Wee neede not fear the fury of your sword.
 What moves your mindes to mell with merket dayes?
 What law alledge you for such foolish actes?
 Your gukkt zeale procures our great dispraise,
 And heapes contempt and haitred on your backs.
 The common people craves your public wrackes,
 Detests your tournes, and damns your divelish deeds:
 The divell himself can forge no curster facts;
 You are but wolves cladde up in wether's weedes:
 You looke like lambs, yet in your bosom breides
 A poysoned speare, poore people that perverts.
 I hope to see your selves, or else your seedes,
 Abandoned all, like our lowes in deserts.
 Ye scorn but Christ, your country, kinde, and king,
 Prescribing pointes, as Scribes, in everie thing." 2

"This is, and has been the religion of Edinburgh," adds Calderwood,
 "where they are touched in their particulars."

1. Calderwood, Vol. 5, p. 177 et seq. 2. Ibid.

Note G.

"The Forme and maner of examination before the admission to ye tabill of ye Lord.....," which was, like Craig's Larger Catechism, published by Charteris during 1581, was undoubtedly written by the Edinburgh ministers of that time, namely, Dury, Lawson, Balcanquhal, Brand, and possibly Pont of the West kirk (later St Cuthbert's). Printed anonymously, it was designed by its authors for the use of the Edinburgh Reformed Church congregations only. A copy of this rare book is in the possession of the British Museum, and there is a photostat reproduction in the National Library of Scotland. Like Craig's "Short Sum," it is really a "Larger Catechism," and treats of the same subjects, namely, The Fall of Man, his Restitution, The Apostles' Creed, The Commandments, The Lord's Prayer and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. N. This "Edinburgh Catechism" is, therefore, much more comprehensive than Craig's "Form of examination before Communion;" it runs to forty-seven pages and is about half the size of Craig's Larger Catechism. Like the latter, it suffers from a lack of Scripture references. None the less, it must have proved a useful teaching manual; in size it is only 6" X 4". It is almost unknown, the following being examples of its style:

- Q. What is baptism ?
 A. A certain entry as it were, whereby we are received into the Kirk and household of God.
- Q. What is the outward sign of baptism ?
 A. Water, whereby the person is baptised or sprinkled.
-
 Q. What is signified by the bread ?
 A. The body of Christ.
- Q. What is signified by the wine ?
 A. The blood of Christ.

NOTE: This Catechism treats of the Apostles Creed before the Commandments.

Q. What is signified by the bread and wine ?

A. The whole Christ.

Q. Is Christ's body in the bread or his blood in the wine ?

A. No, but Christ's body is in heaven, where we ought to lift up our hearts, that we may apprehend him.

.....

This Edinburgh Catechism was commended to its users thus:

"The care of the Kirk and ministry has been and is such towards you (dear brethren in the Lord) that for your cause, order has been taken to teach the principal heads of religion in four several places each Sunday, for the instruction of all in general, and to teach your youth in the school in the same heads, as in a most necessary doctrine. And now besides all this, we offer unto you this short treatise, containing in effect the grounds of a christian religion. Earnestly desiring you in the name of Christ Jesus to read, or cause the same to be read diligently in your houses, for the instruction of yourselves, your children and servants, that you may be the more able to answer when you fall to be examined. In so doing (dear brethren) you shall follow the good example of Abraham, who is commended of the Lord, in that he instructed his household. Your consciences also thereby shall be better discharged, and you shall heap up blessings in your houses to your comfort and the glory of your God, which must increase you in true godliness, and rule your hearts ever in his true fear. Amen."

The point of interest in connection with this Catechism is, that the ministers who wrote it had been working along parallel lines to Craig. Apparently, they were of a like mind with him as to the need for a Catechism of a much simpler kind than that of John Calvin, or indeed for that matter, the Heidelberg Catechism. While the last named work was also in general use in Scotland from 1560 onwards, Craig and the compilers of the Edinburgh Catechism, preferred to base their teaching manuals on Calvin's Catechism. The reason would seem to be that they favoured a didactic style of teaching rather than a devotional one.

The two Scottish Catechisms of 1581 are similar in thought and presentation, though that of Craig's is more ambitious and penetrating. As regards which of these was published first, we cannot tell, for the Edinburgh Catechism simply gives the year in which it was issued; there is no record of subsequent reprints. The year 1581, therefore, marked the appearance of two Larger Catechisms of purely Scottish origin.

.....

Works by Master John Craig.

- Treatise on Fasting (shared with John Knox). Edinburgh, 1565.
 A Shorte Summe of the Whole Catechisme. Charteris, Edinburgh, 1581.
 Several of the "Heads" of the Second Book of Discipline, 1581.
 National Covenant or King's Confession, 1581.
 Ane Forme of Examination before the Communion. Edinburgh, 1591/2.
 Contributions to the Scottish Metrical Psalter, 1564/5.

.....

Manuscripts.

.....

- Alexander Guthrie's Protocols. Register House, Edinburgh.
 Unpublished Burgh Records of Edinburgh, "Moses' Bundle." City Chambers.
 Unpublished Volumes of Mr. Boog Watson. Carnegie Library, Edinburgh.
 Register of Testaments. Register House, Edinburgh.
 Professor John Johnston's Latin Poems. National Library of Scotland.
 Cotton. Caligula C.IX, f.28. British Museum.

.....

Printed Works.

.....

- Anderson, J. Early Records of the University of St Andrews. Edinburgh, 1926.
 Anderson, W. The Scottish Nation. 3 Vols., Fullerton & Co., Edinburgh, 1863.
 Brown, P. Hume. John Knox. 2 Vols., Black, London, 1895.
 " " . Scotland in the Time of Queen Mary. Methuen & Co., London, 1904.
 Baillie, R. Letters and Journals. 3 Vols., Edinburgh, 1841.
 BAILLIE, J. D. THOMAE CRAIGII, AP. JUS FEUDALE. RUDDIMANS, EDINBURGH, 1732.
 Book of the Universal Kirk (Bannatyne Club). 3 Parts, Edinburgh, 1839.

- Bannatyne Memorials(Bannatyne Club). Edinburgh,1836.
- Bellesheim,A. History of the Catholic Church in Scotland. 4 Vol.,Blackwood,Edinburgh,1887.
- Burton,J.Hill. History of Scotland. 8 Vol.,Blackwood,Edinburgh,1874.
- Bonar,H. Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation. Nisbet,London,1866.
- Calendar of State Papers(Scottish Series). Vols. 1 & 2,Longmans,London.
- " " " " " . Vols. 1 to 11,Hedderwick, Glasgow,1900.
- " " " (Foreign Series,Elizabeth). 1561-1586,17 Vols., London,1871.
- Calderwood,D. History of the Kirk of Scotland. 8 Vols.,Walker,Edinburgh, 1849.
- Campbell,A. Doctrines of the Middle State. London,1721. fol.
- Cranstoun,J. Satirical Poems of the Reformation. 2 Vols,Blackwood,Edinburgh,1891.
- CRAIG, J. *SHORT SUM OF THE WHOLE CATECHISM-T.G.LAN(EDITOR),EDINBURGH,DAVID DOUGLAS, 1883.*
- Curtis,W. Creeds and Confessions of Faith. Clark,Edinburgh,1911.
- Craufurd,T. History of the University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh,1808.
- Dalyell,J.G. Fragments of Scottish History(including Birrel's Diary). Constable,Edinburgh,1798.
- Dalzel,A. History of the University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh,1862.
- Dickinson,W.Croft. John Knox's ~~Works~~ ^{HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND.} 2 Vols.,Nelson,Edinburgh,1949.
- Dickson & Edmund. Annals of Scottish Printing. Bowes,Cambridge,1890.
- Diurnal of Occurrents(Bannatyne Club). Edinburgh,1833.
- DUKE, J.A. *HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND TO THE REFORMATION. OLIVER & BOYD, EDINBURGH, 1937.*
- Dunlop,W. Confessions of Faith. 2 Vols.,Watson,Edinburgh,1719.
- Exchequer Rolls of Scotland,Vols. 19 to 23. Hedderwick,Glasgow,1898.
- Fleming,D.Hay. The Reformation in Scotland. Hodder & Stoughton,London, 1910.
- Grub(editor). Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff(Spalding Club). 4 Vols.,Bennet,Aberdeen,1847.
- Grant,Sir F.J. Faculty of Advocates in Scotland,1532-1943. Edinburgh, 1944.
- Grub,G. Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. 4 Vols.,Edinburgh,1861.
- Gillon,R.Moffat. Davidson of Prestonpans. London,1936.
- Henderson,G.D. Scots Confession,1560. Edinburgh,1937.

- Henderson, G.D. Claims of the Church of Scotland. Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1951.
- " " . Church and Ministry. Publisher, as above, 1951.
- " " . *PRESBYTERIANISM. THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, ABERDEEN, 1954.*
- Hewat, Kirkwood. Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation. MacNiven & Wallace, Edinburgh, 1920.
- Hume, D. (of Godscroft). History of the House of Douglas and Angus. 2 Vols. Ruddimans, Edinburgh, 1743.
- Irving, E. Confessions of Faith. Baldwin & Cradock, London, 1831.
- Keith, R. Affairs of Church and State. Ruddimans, Edinburgh, 1734.
- Lesley, J. History of Scotland (Bannatyne Club). Edinburgh, 1830.
- Lindsay, T.M. A History of the Reformation. 2 Vols., Clark, Edinburgh, 1933.
- Laing, D. John Knox's Works. 6 Vols., Thin, Edinburgh, 1895.
- " " . Manuscripts. 2 Vols., Unwin, London, 1914.
- Law, T.G. Collected Essays and Reviews. Edinburgh, 1904.
- Lees, J.C. St Giles', Edinburgh. Edinburgh, 1889. 4 o.
- Lee, J. History of the Church of Scotland. 2 Vols., Edinburgh, 1860.
- Livingston, N. The Scottish Psalter. Maclure & MacDonald, Glasgow.
- Low, J.G. Parish Church of Montrose. Jolly, Montrose, 1891.
- MIDLAND CLUB. REGISTER OF MINISTERS ETC. EDINBURGH, 1830.*
- Mitchell, A.F. The Scottish Reformation (Baird Lecture, 1899). Edinburgh, 1900.
- M'Crie, C.G. Confessions of the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1907.
- M'Crie, T. John Knox. Edinburgh, 1813 (2 Vols., 1831).
- " " . Andrew Melville. 2 Vols., Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1856. *FIRST EDITION, 1819.*
- " " . The Reformation in Italy. Edinburgh, 1827.
- M'Crie, T.W. The Story of the Scottish Church. London, 1875.
- MACLEWEN, A.R. HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND. 2 VOLS. HODDER & STOUGHTON, LONDON, 1913.*
- MacMeeken, J.W. Scottish Metrical Psalms. McCulloch, Glasgow, 1872.
- MacKinnon, J. History of Modern Liberty. 4 Vols., Longman, Gunn & Co., London, 1906.
- MacLean, D. The Counter-Reformation in Scotland, 1560-1930. Clarke, London, 1931.
- McMillan, W. Worship in the Reformed Church. London, 1931.

- Moyses, D. Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland. Ruddiman, Edinburgh, 1755.
- Mackay, A.E. Article on "John Craig," Dictionary of National Biography. Vol. 4, London, 1908.
- Mathieson, W. Politics and Religion in Scotland. 2 Vols., Glasgow, 1902.
- MELVILLE, J. AUTOBIOGRAPHY & DIARY. EDINBURGH PRINTING COMPANY, 1842.
- Patrick, Millar. Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody. Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1949.
- Percy, Lord E. John Knox. Hodder & Stoughton, London.
- Parliamentary Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland (16th century). Vols. 2 & 3, published for the Crown, 1814.
- Pollard, A.F. Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th edition, art. "J. Craig."
- RAIT, R.S. HISTORY OF SCOTLAND. WILLIAMS & MORGATE, LONDON, 1914/15.
- Records. Burgh of Edinburgh. Vols. 1 to 4, 1892, Johnston, Edinburgh; Vol. 5, Oliver & Boyd, 1927, Edinburgh.
- Register of the Great Seal of Scotland, 1513-1593, 3 Vols. Neill & Co., Edinburgh, 1883.
- ROBERTSON, J. HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ABERDEEN. EDMOND & SPARK, 1887.
- Russell, E. Maitland of Lethington. Nisbet, London, 1912.
- Row, J. Historie of the Kirk of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1842.
- Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, Vols. 1 to 5. Constable, Edinburgh, 1877.
- SALMOND, S.D.F. AN EXPOSITION OF THE SHORTER CATECHISM. 2 PARTS. T.&T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.
- Spottiswoode, J. History of the Church of Scotland. 3 Vols., Edinburgh, 1851.
- Scot, W. Apologetical Narration (Wodrow Society). Edinburgh, 1846.
- Smellie, A. The Heidelberg Catechism. Melrose, London, 1900.
- Sinclair, G. Satan's Invisible World Discovered. Stevenson, Edinburgh, 1871.
- Scott, H. Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae, Vol. 1 & Vol. 6. Edinburgh, 1915, '26.
- Story, R. John Craig, D.D. (privately printed), a lecture. Edinburgh, 1884.
- Spalding Club. Aberdeen Burgh Records, 1570-1625. 2 Vols., Bennet, Aberdeen, 1848.
- " " . Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen, 1562-1681. Bennet, Aberdeen, 1846.
- " " . Collections for a History of Aberdeen and Banff. Bennet, Aberdeen, 1843.
- Schaff, P. The Creeds of Christendom. 3 Vols., Harper, New York, 1878.
- Sprott, G. Scottish Liturgies. Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1901.

Tytler, P. Sir Thomas Craig of Riccarton. Tait, Edinburgh, 1823.

Watt, H. Recalling the Scottish Covenants. London, 1946.

" ". John Knox in Controversy. Nelson, London etc, 1950.

Wodrow Selections (editor J. Lippe). Divines of North-East Scotland. University Press, Aberdeen, 1890.

Walker, A. Lecture on John Craig (privately printed). Aberdeen, 1889.

Zweig, S. The Queen of Scots. Cassell & Co., London, 1935.

.....