

scoffs at those who scrupled the use of the vestments." Poor hapless king! With so many flatterers and so few friends, with the Bishop of Ross for his very humble servant, the Bishop of Moray for his chaplain, the Archbishop of Canterbury for his adviser, was it a wonder he should have lost his head? The storm broke out only four years after,—broke out in that very High Church,—which overturned both throne and altar.

Surely a curious subject of reflection! The reigning Monarch derives her lineage, not from Charles, but from the sister of Charles. The legitimate branch was lopped off, and left to wither and die, and the collateral branch grafted in. Why? What could have led to an event so contrary to the first principles of the law of succession, as embodied in statute by our legislative assemblies, and expounded in our civil courts? A question easily answered. The germ of the whole transaction might be seen in the royal progress, in which Laud and the infatuated Charles passed down the High Street together, and in the scene enacted on the following Sunday in the High Church. The abdication of James VII. was not less intimately connected with the infection communicated by the Archbishop, than the troubles and death of James's father. The Laudism of the one terminated in the Popery of the other. No one thinks it at all strange that the Puseyism of a Sibthorp or of a Miss Gladstone should land them full in the Romish Church. A hundred other such conversions of the present day from Puseyism to Popery show us that such is the natural tendency of the revived doctrines: they constitute no resting-place; they form merely a passage from one state of mind to another,—a sort of inclined plane, by which reluctant Protestantism scales inch by inch the transcendental heights of Popery. It was exactly a similar process that produced one of the most remarkable revolutions recorded in history. Two princes, educated in the *transition*