University of Glasgow

Birkeland, Mairianna (1999) *Politics and society of Glasgow 1680-1740.* PhD thesis.

http://theses.gla.ac.uk/1487/

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Glasgow Theses Service
http://theses.gla.ac.uk/
theses@gla.ac.uk

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My first debts are to my supervisors, Dr Irene Maver and Dr Colin Kidd, of the Scottish History Department, for their scholarship and unfailing assistance in reading and commenting on this thesis and for providing constant advice and encouragement. Professor E J Cowan is also due thanks for his continuing patience and support. The indefatigable scholarship of Dr John Durkan provided invaluable advice in the early stages, as did the commentary of Professor Tom Devine, then of Strathclyde University. Dr John McCaffrey has also provided scholarly hints at many crucial moments. Thanks are also due to Gordon Jackson of the City of Glasgow Archives (formerly Strathclyde Regional Archives) for his knowledge and assistance which provided important insights into the workings of the city. Likewise I am indebted to all his archival staff for their patience and guidance at all times. David Weston of Glasgow University Special Collections is due special thanks for his knowledge of eighteenth-century Glasgow intellectual material, especially on Francis Hutcheson, and for providing scholarly regeneration at times when my spirits were flagging. I am also indebted to his staff for their efficient and friendly assistance at all times with the extensive collections of the Glasgow lawyer, David Murray. Inez MacIntyre of Glasgow University Library provided invaluable assistance as did Michael Moss with the university's own archives. At the National Archives of Scotland my debts are too many to acknowledge as they are at the National Library of Scotland, but Dr Louise Yeoman is due a special thanks for her assistance with the daunting and voluminous material generated by the church historian Robert Wodrow, and for her knowledge of the impenetrable world of seventeenth century spirituality. Dr Alex Murdoch of Edinburgh University has likewise provided insight and commentary on eighteenth century ecclesiastical and political figures and given unstinting advice.

The growth in Scottish historical studies in recent years has created an abundance of fellow travellers whose friendship and conversation have been invaluable in providing encouragement and stimulus. In this light I would like to thank Dr Kristina Fenyo, Dr Eila Williamson, Dr Andrew Mackillop, Mhairi Dewar and above all the late Robert G Lindsay whose comradeship I continue to miss. The late Mary McGilly has been a beacon of inspiration whose light will never diminish.

I would like to thank the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland for providing me with the scholarship which made this research possible.

Finally, and most importantly, my husband, Dr Robert Clyde, is due my deepest thanks for all his sacrifices and sufferings during the writing up of this thesis, and especially for his undiminished belief in its completion. It is dedicated to him.

Mairianna Birkeland
November 1999

POLITICS AND SOCIETY OF GLASGOW 1680-1740

Ph.D. thesis

University of Glasgow 1999

Mairianna Birkeland

Abstract

Abbreviations

INTRODUCTION p. 1

Chapter One: Glasgow and the Whig Revolution of 1688-89. p. 16

Chapter Two: *Civitatis Dei*, the Church at Glasgow 1687 - 1740 p. 59

Chapter Three: Revolutioners, Cavaliers and Country Party Men p. 135

Chapter Four: The Hanoverian Ascendancy and the City of Glasgow p. 189

Chapter Five: Glasgow and the Malt Tax Riots of 1725 p. 225

CONCLUSION p. 286

Appendices

Bibliography

ABSTRACT

The thesis examines political culture in Glasgow from the Revolution until 1740. During this time Glasgow was conservative in religion but radical in politics, the pivotal moment being 1648-50. Both tendencies converged to support the Whig Revolution and the Presbyterian settlement of the church 1688-90. The presence in the city at the Revolution of an influential minority Jacobite Episcopalian element with deep roots in the city, requires careful assessment. This exercised a lingering impact on the politics and society of Glasgow 1690-1740, which, though detrimental to the long-term survival of the seventeenth century Calvinism to which the city's majority Presbyterians remained fervently attached, was by no means an illiberal or negative influence on the city's administration or in encouraging the citizens' aspirations for greater political freedom. A distinction must therefore be made between the ideology and the role of such an element, for they were not found giving passive obedience to any monarch or government after 1689 but assumed the role of an active, articulate opposition, whose interaction was frequently positive. By contrast, the monopolisation of office by the Whigs in the form of the Argathelians, perpetuated the 'black legend' of the Scots nobility and ensured that civic aspirations were kept in check leading to a confusion in the Revolutioner city by 1725 as to what 'revolution principles' actually were. Nonetheless the citizens mounted spirited efforts at asserting their autonomy and worked the spoils system of the eighteenth century, outwitting the great and the mighty, with increasing success. Glasgow pre-1707 was not a political island but an intergral part of the informal Scottish 'state' revealing a greater centralisation of power than is perhaps realised in the period. Nonetheless the city was also a proud self-conscious

civic corporation with its own commercial development agenda and sought to improve its position by utilising all elements within it, both Whig and Tory, resisting the pressure to become a satellite. A degree of civicness erupted when conflicts of state threatened to overawe the 'public good' of the city indicating involvement in party intrigue was far from subservient.

Abbreviations

APS	*Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, 1124-1707, ed. T. Thomson et al., 11 vols., (Edinburgh, 1814-75).
BRG	Burgh records of Glasgow, (printed series, *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Glasgow,* ed. Robert Renwick, Scottish Burgh Records Society, vols. iii, 1663-1690; iv, 1691-1717; v, 1708-1738, with charters 1708-1738, Glasgow Corporation).
Fasti	Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae*, 7 vols., iii, Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, (Edinburgh, 1915-28).
Glas. Chtrs.	*Charters and Documents relating to the City of Glasgow*, vol. ii, 1649-1707, eds. Sir James Marwick and R. Renwick, Scottish Burgh Records Society, (Glasgow, 1906).
GUL	Glasgow University Library
HMC	Historical Manuscripts Commission.
NAS	National Archive of Scotland (formerly, Scottish Record Office).
NLS	National Library of Scotland.
NLS. Adv.MS	Advocates' manuscripts, Advocates' Library, (within National Library of Scotland).
NLS. MS	National Library of Scotland, manuscripts.
RPC	Records of the Privy Council.
RSCHS	*Records of the Scottish Church History Society.*
SBRS	*Scottish Burgh Records Society.*
SHR	*Scottish Historical Review.*
SHS	*Scottish History Society.*

INTRODUCTION

This study examines the political culture of a community which underwent a dramatic process of transition in the early modern period. It covers the enigmatic years from c.1687 to c.1740, when the country as a whole was adjusting to the changes brought about by the Revolution, the union, and the Hanoverian succession. It follows on from W. S. Shepherd's earlier work, covering the period 1648-1674.[1] The economic changes have been dealt with extensively by T. C. Smout and T. M. Devine.[2] But in sum, Glasgow's progress in the seventeenth century was exceptional; the city grew in wealth and population faster than any other burgh in Scotland to become the fourth in wealth by 1649 (on the evidence of the customs paid), and the second by 1670, overtaking Aberdeen and Dundee. This disturbed a pattern of economic ranking which had prevailed since the fourteenth century.[3] From 1690-1740 the pace was slower, a period of recovery from the traumas of the later seventeenth century. Some expansion becomes apparent in the 1710s and then from 1735 onwards, but the overall picture remains a static one. Glasgow retained the second place in terms of taxation but population actually fell from a mid-century peak to just below 12,000 at the Revolution

---

1 William Scott Shepherd, 'Politics and Society of Glasgow 1648-1674', Glasgow University Ph.D. thesis, 1978.

2 T. C. Smout, 'The Development and Enterprise of Glasgow, 1556-1707' in *Scottish Journal of Political Economy,* vii (1960), pp. 194-212; 'The Early Scottish Sugar Houses 1660-1720' in *Economic History Review,* 2nd series, xiv, (1961-62), pp. 240-53; 'The Glasgow Merchant Community in the 17th century' in *SHR,* xlvii (1968), pp. 53-70; T M Devine, 'The Scottish Merchant Community 1680-1740' in R. H. Campbell and A. S. Skinner (eds.), *The Origins and Nature of the Scottish Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 1982), pp.26-41; 'The Cromwellian Union and the Scottish Burghs; the case of Aberdeen and Glasgow, 1652-60' in J. Butt (ed.), *Scottish Themes* (Edinburgh, 1976), pp.1-16.

3 Michael Lynch (ed.), *The Early Modern Town* (London, 1987), p.4.

and was little more by 1708. In the 1710s numbers grew. By 1721 the ministers could report a cure of between 16-17,000 souls - figures which were little different in 1743 when Webster made his calculations of just over 18,000 persons for the widows' fund.[4] Moreover, as the great 'sea-adventurers' developed Glasgow's commerce westwards across the Atlantic to the Caribbean and North America, they established an independent base of economic power. The focus of burghal wealth shifted from the bishop's vast regalian desmesne to the meritocratic republic of the high seas in which skill and daring brought their own rewards. The achievement of becoming the second city proved inspirational for one Glasgow patriot:

> Glasgow, very memorable among towns, beautiful in situation, with a bright sky, pleasing in its soil. For which the bell rings, the fishes feed, the ring enriches, the tree bears fruit, the bird sings. If thy river, situation and climate be considered, nothing of praise can remain to thee, O Edinburgh. Grant at least, O bounteous country, to hope for the second place. If Edinburgh shall be to thee the heart, Glasgow will be the eye. Whatsoever glory may rise to thee from my nativity, Glasgow will be renowned by its bard, Paterson.[5]

The 'second city' theme which thus made its first appearance in print in 1677, was to become a self-conscious propaganda weapon for successive generations of Glasgow

---

4 T. C. Smout, 'The Glasgow merchant community', p.54; George Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow: from the Revolution to the Reform Acts*, iii, (Glasgow, 1934), p.74; George Campbell, John Gray, John Hamilton, John Scott, ministers of Glasgow, *A true and exact double of two papers exchanged betwixt some of the ministers of Glasgow and that which is called the General Session there,* (1721), p.15.

5 'To Dear Mother Glasgow', Ninian Paterson, *BRG*, 29/9/1677. The magistrates awarded Paterson £10 stg. to have his book printed, *Epigrammatum Libri Octo. Cum aliquot Psalmorum Paraphrasi Poetica*, which he had dedicated to Glasgow and prefaced with this poem.

activists. It was next employed at the Revolution in pursuit of a free constitution for the city in the opening lines of a petition from the citizens to King William: 'May it please your Majestie to knou, that Glasgou is no mean Citty, but hath bein a most flourishing place. And the second Citty in all Scotland'.[6] The original progenitor of the 'no mean city' line was thus a confident statement of the exceptional qualities of the city by the resourceful ebullience of its citizens.

The cultural and political changes which affected this dynamic community in the seventeenth century were equally momentous. Glasgow, the medieval bishop's burgh, with its magnificent Gothic cathedral which its conservative citizenry had saved from the iconoclasm of the Reformation, had benefited extensively from the bishops' care and patronage and was also favoured by the Stuart kings. James VI had been responsible for erecting Glasgow into a royal burgh in 1611, (though subject to the bishop's rights in the election of the magistrates).[7] And prior to the General Assembly of 1638, Charles I had considered Glasgow to be his most loyal city, stating on 22nd September that, 'in summoning the assembly to meet in Glasgow and no where else, ... it was because of the known loyalty of the town to his service'.[8] Nonetheless, despite its being a bishops' burgh and the seat of an archdiocese which was the foundation of its late medieval prosperity, Glasgow became a storm centre of radical Presbyterianism

---

6 National Archives of Scotland (hereafter NAS), *Leven and Melville Papers*, GD26.7.278, petition of the magistrates and inhabitants of Glasgow to King William of Orange.

7 The craftsmen of Glasgow were responsible for opposing Andrew Melville's plans for demolition of the Cathedral. This exceptional action was noted by one of the earliest historians of the city, John Gibson, merchant, who also noted that because of 'the temporal benefits' the inhabitants derived from the city being the seat of a bishopric, the citizens, in opposing the former regime 'were by no means so active as the people who resided in their neighbourhood', i.e., the western shires. John Gibson, *History of the City of Glasgow, from the Earliest Accounts to the Present Time*, (Glasgow, 1777) pp. 80, 86-87. This anecdote acquired legendary status in the nineteenth century.

under the leadership of Patrick Gillespie, minister of the east parish of Glasgow 1648-1661 and Principal of Glasgow University in 1653. It also became the crucible of the Whig Revolution in Scotland in 1688-89. During both these struggles, an entrenched patrician elite with deep roots in the city clung determinedly to power. This grouping was associated with the regime of the bishops; conservative, authoritarian, Episcopa-lian, royalist, and latterly, Jacobite. Yet their ultimate ejection from the civic citadel in 1689 represented the end of a revolutionary process which had in fact begun in 1638. In this respect the Whig Revolution emerges as merely the conclusion of unfinished business.

I. B. Cowan has pointed (somewhat negatively) to the Scots as being the 'reluctant revolutionaries' of 1688-89, because the principle military action occurred south of the Border.[9] Yet Thomas Maxwell made the more salient point, (quoting A. V. Dicey), that in England little was changed as a result, especially in respect of the national church, while in Scotland, 'the Revolution really was a revolution'.[10] The form of church government changed from Episcopacy to Presbytery, and the ancient House of Stuart was replaced by the 'interregnum' of William and Mary which pointed forwards to the Hanoverian succession. The curious rejection of the native House of Stuart, from 1371-1714 one of the most successful and long-lived dynasties in Europe, represented a major shift in Scottish political consciousness and no less so than at

---

8 David C. Coghill, *Old Glasgow Printers and Printing, Transactions of the Old Glasgow Club,* vol. i, (1900-1908), p. 139.

9 I. B. Cowan, 'The Reluctant Revolutionaries: Scotland in 1688' in Eveline Cruikshanks (ed.), *By Force or Default: The Revolution of 1688-89* (Edinburgh, 1989), pp. 65-81.

10 Thomas Maxwell, 'The Presbyterian-Episcopalian Controversy in Scotland from the Revolution Settlement to the Accession of George I', Edinburgh University Ph.D. thesis, 1954, p. 3.

Glasgow. Opposition to the Stuarts had been building since at least the Reformation and latterly support for the 'ancient race of our kings' had bitterly divided the country, largely as a result of the Stuarts' targeted persecution of Presbyterianism.[11]

The religious and political changes which swept through Scotland as a whole in the turbulent century from c.1640-c.1740, are thus marked out in particularly high relief at Glasgow; the loyal bishop's burgh in 1638, but 'the warmest nest of the Cameronians' by 1690. When the final end of the Stuart line came in 1714 with the death of Queen Anne, this was celebrated in the city with much self-conscious pomp and circumstance and the Episcopal meeting-house was mysteriously destroyed.[12] The image of Glasgow as a 'Whig' Presbyterian city thus suggests an element of propaganda and of conscious ideological re-shaping. A study of Glasgow in the post-Revolution era ought therefore to reveal further information about the changes brought about by this process and of the forces of counter-revolution or reaction.

The economic and demographic changes noted above were reflected in cultural terms, for the expansion of the university in Glasgow during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was also significant. Indeed, the university of the late 1690s and the first decade and a half of Principal Stirling's administration, was little different when Adam Smith arrived in the city as professor of logic in 1751. Stirling's report to the Commission of Visitation in 1717 indicated that besides the four regents, specialist professorships in divinity (1692, for James Wodrow), law, medicine, mathematics,

---

11 In 1690 Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, could refer to 'the inveterate hatred which the Presbyterians show for the family of the Stewarts', *Evelyn's Memoirs* (1827), vol. iii, p. 293; quoted in R H Story, *William Carstares, a Character and Career of the Revolution Epoch,* (London, 1874), p.148.

12 John Sage, *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland in Several Letters,* 1st letter, Thomas Morer, (London, 1690), p.2; *Glasgow's Parrad* (1714).

oriental languages, botany and ecclesiastical history, plus a special lectureship for blind William Jameson, had been created, largely as a result of his efforts. Student numbers also increased dramatically after the Revolution, from an estimated 250 in 1696 to about 400 in 1702 and this, again, was little different from the situation in Adam Smith's time.[13] The university anno 1750 was substantially a seventeenth century creation. After the Revolution, the patrimony of the former bishops' rents embellished this by the founding of the Regius chairs. Some specialist chairs had however been attempted in the early seventeenth century.[14]

Improved educational opportunities facilitated cultural change; yet it would be quite untrue to attribute the ideological shift which was conspicuous in the mid-seventeenth century to the teaching of Glasgow University. Purges occurred, but were short-lived, until the Commission of Visitation of 1690 proved permanent. But during the decade of greatest Covenanting radicalism, the 1640s, the conservative Robert Baillie was the professor of divinity. And Patrick Gillespie's radical influence thereafter, as Principal from 1653, was curtailed by the Restoration in 1660 and his arrest for treason in 1661. By the 1650s, divisions between Resolutioners and Protestors had in any case fatally weakened the Covenanting movement.

---

13 [NLS 1.14(14)] *Remarks upon a Paper Intitled Grievances with respect to the Revenue of the University of Glasgow offered to the Honourable Commission*, (1717); *Calendar*, Glasgow University; in 1695 the magistrates noted that the students' seat at the High Church could not contain them all, *BRG*, 2/11/1695, p.180. See Roger L. Emerson, 'Scottish Universities in the Eighteenth Century: 1690-1800' in *Studies in Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century, v. 167*, (1977), p. 473, who accepts Henry Gray Graham's figure of 400 students in 1750. Henry Wyndham, writing in 1758, put the figure at 300, R. B. Sher and Andrew Hook (eds.) *The Glasgow Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 1995), p.10.

14 A chair of medicine in 1636 and humanity in 1637. These were not however secure foundations; at the Restoration the new professorships disappeared through lack of cash (the Covenanters had applied some of the revenues of the See of Galloway to the university). However, an attempt was made to restore the chair of humanity from 1682-87 in the person of James Young.

An important study of the arts curricula at Scottish universities during the seventeenth century certainly did not indicate the presence of religious fanaticism on the curricula at Glasgow, or elsewhere. Christine Shepherd's study found the arts curricula at Scottish universities to be wider and more experimental than at Oxford or Cambridge but concluded that they most resembled the more conservative Dutch institutions. She certainly refuted Hugh Trevor-Roper's statement about their being 'seminaries of a fanatical clergy'.[15] Roger Emerson also found consistent evidence of a liberal arts curricula in the education of the clergy from the 1690s onwards.[16] Greek, Latin language and culture, rhetoric, mathematics, moral and natural philosophy were amongst the broad range of secular subjects taught. Glasgow university archives contain a number of accounts from the regents of the 1690s, John Law, Gershom Carmichael and John Tran, giving an account of their teaching which supports the same thesis.[17] Shepherd noted that though the scholastic method of disputation was retained the authors consulted showed innovation in the curricula away from the scholastics and Newton was actually more utilised in Scotland by the late seventeenth century than he was at Oxford or Cambridge. David Allan's more recent work has also indicated that

---

15 Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'The Scottish Enlightenment', in *Studies in Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, vol. lviii, (1967), p.1636.

16 Christine Mary Shepherd, 'Philosophy and Science in the Arts Curriculum of the Scottish Universities in the Seventeenth Century', Edinburgh University Ph.D. thesis, 1975; Roger L Emerson, 'Scottish Universities in the Eighteenth Century, 1690-1800' in *Studies in Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century, v. 167*, (1977), pp. 453-77. See also Christine Mary Shepherd, 'Newtonianism in Scottish Universities in the Seventeenth Century', in R. H. Campbell and T. M. Devine, *The Origins and Nature of the Scottish Enlightenment*, (Edinburgh, 1982), pp.65-85.

17 Glasgow University Archives, MSS 43227, 'Account of John Law's method of teaching philosophy'; MSS 43228 'Account of John Tran's method of teaching philosophy'; MSS 43170, 'Gershom Carmichael's account of his teaching philosophy'. Carmichael's statement was particularly detailed. The exercise appears to have been part of a joint attempt across the Scottish universities to provide a standardised philisophy course for undergraduates. Glasgow was to provide the ethics component; statements are found from St. Andrews and Edinburgh universities on their opinion of Glasgow's proposals. MSS 43229, 'college of St. Andrews on the method used by the College of Glasgow'; MSS 4320, 'College of Edinburgh's remarks on the teaching of ethics

seventeenth century Presbyterianism was by no means hostile to rational inquiry, especially science. Moreover, Durkan's investigation of Glasgow University in the seventeenth century supported Shepherd's findings and found evidence of continuity across periods of disruption, despite the purges, plus gradual change over the century as a whole. Durkan's conclusion was that although the personnel changed, the teaching remained much the same. A safe rationalist theology based on Aristotle and Aquinas in the earlier part of the century gave way to more modern authors such as Pufendorf in the later half, and there was also a notable development in scientific studies in the innovative teaching of George Sinclair, a Covenanter, active in the 1650s, who returned to take up a specialist chair in mathematics after the Revolution.[18] Far from being a hot-bed of radicalism, Durkan found more evidence of conservatism at Glasgow than elsewhere, both before 1638 and afterwards; and attributed this to Glasgow's isolated position - the other universities were on the east coast and faced towards Europe.

Further evidence of the confident expansion of learning can be found in architecture. The university acquired a new building 'a magnificent example of the distinctive school of Scots masoncraft which developed as the Scottish Renaissance', and had ample and elegant premises at a time when Edinburgh University (founded 1583) languished in a series of temporary structures. The new university, begun by public subscription in 1630, was built by two masons, John Boyd and John Clerk, and consisted of two adjoining quadrangles with a splendid facade which fronted the High

---

at the College of Glasgow'. Also, MSS 43231, 'Animadversions of the College of Edinburgh upon the teaching of ethics at Glasgow University'.

18 David Allan, *Virtue, Learning and the Scottish Enlightenment; Ideas of Scholarship in Early Modern History* (Edinburgh, 1993), p.9; John Durkan, 'King Aristotle and Old Butterdish: the making of a graduate in seventeenth century Glasgow', *College Courant,* vol. 63 (Glasgow, 1979) pp.18-24.

Street adjacent to the Cathedral. It was completed in 1639 and in 1658 a Dutch steeple was added. Seven acres of pleasure gardens leading from the quadrangles sloped down to the Molendinar burn and looked out towards rising hills and open farmlands.[19] Its library (originally housed within the seventeenth century structure) was also far better organised, being one of the first in Scotland to possess a printed catalogue (late seventeenth century) plus the services of a salaried librarian, usually a gifted student; Robert Wodrow once possessed this position. A new library was built in 1732, designed by William Adams.

Accompanying this academic endeavour was the growth in publishing and related activities. The earliest known Glasgow printer, George Anderson, arrived in the city in 1638, the year of the Assembly. Others followed, though none so long-standing as Robert Sanders, senior, who for forty years had the monopoly of printing in the city and became wealthy enough on the proceeds to leave valuable property to the poor of the Merchants House on his death in 1696.[20] As a literary centre Glasgow was tiny compared with Edinburgh. Yet Aldis's list reveals that in this field too, a greater level of expansion was evident in publishing and book-selling activity than anywhere else in Scotland outside of Edinburgh and Aberdeen. In all, 22 individuals are named either as printers or booksellers in his survey to the year 1700, beginning with George Anderson

---

19 Charles McKean, David Walker and Frank Wallace, *Central Glasgow: An Illustrated Architectural Guide* (Edinburgh, 1993), p. 27. Further adornments followed in the Lion and Unicorn staircase which led from the outer court up to the Senate room, built in 1690, surviving today, at the Gilmorehill site.

20 David C. Coghill, 'Old Glasgow Printers and Printing' in *Transactions of the Old Glasgow Club,* vol. i, (1900-1908), p. 148.

in 1638. Certainly Glasgow was the fastest growing literary centre in Scotland and was beginning to rival Aberdeen for second place by the Revolution.[21]

It was the clerical establishment of the 1650s however, assisted by Covenanting radicals within the burgh council, which was largely responsible for the dramatic shift in the city's religious and political culture. Close examination thus reveals the transformation to have been effected by the introduction of outsiders and outside agencies. In 1645 the Porterfield group of Covenanting radicals was appointed to the city by the Committee of Estates, and gained control of the burgh council. This group began to make a series of radical calls to the pulpits of the city, beginning with James Durham (1622-1658) in 1647, Patrick Gillespie (1617-1675) in 1648, and John Carstairs (1623-1686) in 1650.

Durham, Gillespie and Carstairs were from the east of Scotland, St. Andrews-educated theological radicals who had studied under Samuel Rutherford (1600-1661), the professor of divinity. Rutherford was the leader of the extreme Covenanting party in the church which emerged after 1643, and the author of *Lex Rex* (1644), the most radical attack on monarchy ever produced by the Covenanting revolution. It was duly burned by the public hangman at the Restoration and remained prominent thereafter on the hate-list of Restoration censors.

Significantly, few if any of this clerical group had any former links with Glasgow. This was unusual in a Glasgow setting as an examination of Hew Scott's *Fasti* for the burgh and Presbytery of Glasgow reveals. Most of the clergy since the

---

21 H. G. Aldis, 'A List of Books Printed in Scotland before 1700', NLS, *Edinburgh Bibliographic Society*, (Edinburgh, 1970).

Reformation were Glasgow-educated and had strong local links.[22] Several of the new clergymen however married into the families of local Covenanter lairds, most notably the Mures of Glanderston,[23] forging powerful links for the future. It is also evident from these marriage alliances that a pre-disposition towards a radical form of religion existed amongst local families, for radically-inclined ministers appear to have been targetted as marriage partners for the Glanderston girls. Several such matches, for instance, are found pre-dating the transition from Episcopacy to Presbytery in 1638, and later, the divisions into Resolutioner and Protestor in 1652. At each critical juncture, the Mures and their clerical sons-in-law are consistently found taking the radical side. The Mures' religious bias does not therefore appear to represent conversion by their sons-in-laws' ministry, but rather their inherent religious sentiments and their excercise of patronage.

This observation lends support to the comment made by one of the earliest historians of the city, John Gibson, (*History of Glasgow*, 1777) that at the Reformation the countryside around Glasgow was more radical than the conservative bishops' burgh itself. W S Shepherd came to much the same conclusion in his study of Glasgow 1648-1674.[24] It introduces the possibility that the rapid expansion of Glasgow in the early seventeenth century lay behind the alteration in its political character by 1650. This expansion absorbed numbers from the surrounding country districts, and demographic change, rather than polemic or persuasion, may have contributed significantly to the

---

22 Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae*, 7 vols., iii, Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, (Edinburgh, 1915-1928).

23 John Carstairs (father of Principal William Carstairs, of Edinburgh University 1703-1715) and James Durham married daughters of this family; a third daughter married Alexander Dunlop, minister of Paisley, (father of Principal William Dunlop of Glasgow University 1690-1700). Thus both Principals were cousins.

24 W. S. Shepherd, thesis, p.362; John Gibson, *History of Glasgow*, 'amidst the numerous riots which happenned about this time, I do not find that they (sic., the people of Glasgow) were ever engaged in any of them', pp.80-81.

Covenanter revolution in the city. Certainly Shepherd found that the Porterfield group substantially consisted of 'new' men - in the main, Renfrewshire lairds who had become burgesses and merchants of Glasgow.

However, when Gillespie became Principal of Glasgow University in 1653, he was responsible, in conjunction with the Porterfield group, for planting the burgh and Presbytery with more Protesters, so that by the Restoration the majority of the sixteen charges were held by adherents of that faction.[25] These included the famous Robert McWard, (d.1683), another non-local St. Andrews-educated radical. Exiled in Holland at the Restoration, McWard spent the 1670s being strongly condemnatory of the policy of the indulgences, becoming the inspiration for the young Richard Cameron, the founder of the Cameronian sect of Covenanting revolutionaries.

But prior to Gillespie's arrival, with the notable exception of Zachary Boyd (1585-1653), minister of the Barony parish (a suburb), the city's clergy had consisted of a number of theological conservatives. Hew Blair (c.1602-1663), minister of the Tron, and George Young (d.1659), Collegiate charge, had been appointed in 1644 by the royalist council under Provost James Bell. Ironically the royalists gained control of the burgh council due to the intervention of the Covenanter parliament of 1641. This had allowed the city to select its own magistrates, and royalists were returned. It indicates the entrenched nature of conservatism within civic circles at Glasgow. Bell's group

---

25 Extreme Covenanters who protested against the General Assemblies of 1650 and 1651 in which they were a minority. The issue at debate was dilution of the extreme Act of Classes of 23 January 1649, which aimed at purging both church and state of those 'malignants' who had favoured the recent Engagement of 1648 or had supported Montrose. The General Assembly favoured an easing of the conditions of this act.

however was purged the following year for its having assisted Montrose's rebellion.[26] Both Blair and Young were older men ordained under former Episcopacy. Significantly, they were Glasgow-educated, and from the west of Scotland. Both took the Resolutioner side; and at the Restoration Blair's leanings were evident in his authorship of two royalist publications, *A Sermon on the King's Return* (1660), and *God's Sovereignty, his Majesty's Supremacy: A sermon preached before Parliament* (1661). Young died before the Restoration. When in 1662 Episcopacy was re-established, Blair readily conformed, as did his son and namesake. Hew Blair jnr. became the 'curate' of Rutherglen, an ardent anti-Covenanter who chided his parishioners for their non-attendance at church and for their stubborn adherence to the Covenants.[27]

The shift from conservatism in religious matters to a more radical political theology in the 1640s and 1650s, continued during the Restoration era. The extent of the Covenanting revolution was revealed in 1662 when thirteen out of the fifteen ministers in the Presbytery of Glasgow were 'outed' by the infamous Act of Glasgow (and one charge lay vacant). They were replaced by inexperienced Episcopalian 'curates' whom Gilbert Burnet, professor of divinity at Glasgow University in 1669, and himself an Episcopalian, branded as 'the worst preachers that ever were heard, ignorant to a reproach' and 'a disgrace indeed to their function' (Table 1 and Table 2).[28]

---

26 APS, v, p.412; David Murray, *Early Burgh Organisation in Scotland; as illustrated in the history of Glasgow and of some neighbouring burghs*, 2 vols., i, (Glasgow, 1924), p.170; John Gibson, *History of Glasgow*, p. 91.

27 Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, pp.474; 477; 487-488.

28 Bishop Gilbert Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, (London, 1724-1734), David Allen, (ed.), Everyman edition (London, 1991), pp. 75; 99.

Dissent then became widespread in Glasgow following the Act of Glasgow. House conventicles took place regularly, such as the large meeting noted by Provost James Campbell in the Saltmarket in 1678 which was discovered in broad daylight and was carried on under the very noses of the magistrates. The resultant 'scuffle' in which Mr. John Lees, sent for by the Provost to deal with the incident, was brutally attacked by a violent female mob and left lying near to death in the street, reveals the extent of the citizens' animosity towards the forces of coercion.[29] Others of the former Presbytery of Glasgow, such as Andrew Morton, ex-minister of Carmunnock, and Donald Cargill, ex-minister of the Barony parish, were also able to hold covert meetings in the burgh for their parishioners when they came into town on market days during the 1660s and 1670s.[30]

In civic circles however the Episcopal regime proved more difficult to dislodge. The royalist Bell-Campbell group, ejected by the Covenanter Committee of the Estates in 1645, was actually restored by Cromwell in 1652 because the Covenanter council under Provost John Graham, sent for to Dalkeith to meet with the Commonwealthmen, proved resistant to the new political masters and 'did not condescend to the Englische propositions'.[31] Upon their refusal, nine companies of horse and foot were sent to Glasgow. The Bell-Campbell group continued to wield power throughout the Restoration era, though at times they were forced into unwelcome alliances with

---

29 *BRG*, 5/10/1678, p.257-258.

30 Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p.392, 393; 377.

31 *Letters of Robert Baillie*, ed. David Laing, Bannatyne Club, 3 vols., iii, (Edinburgh, 1841-42), p.175; Historical MSS Commission, 'Thirteenth Report', part i. pp. 628, 635; C. S. Terry, *The Cromwellian Union*, SHS, vol. xl, (Edinburgh, 1902), pp. 35, 116, 117.

Whigs. The most notable of these were Provost William Anderson (Provost, 1664-1672) and Provost John Johnstone of Clauchrie (Provost 1684-1686). The figure of John Anderson of Dowhill, ygr., Dean of Guild 1669-70, and latterly a noted Presbyterian dissenter, was another notable Whig who made frequent appearances on the burgh council during the Restoration era. Such was the degree of collusion that in 1683 the ultra-royalist Provost John Barns, in his rivalry with the Bell-Campbell group, accused Campbell of disturbing the peace of the town 'from ane discomposed, unjust and fanatical principle (and party whom they formerly connived and complyed with against his Majestie and lawes)' when he dared to challenge Barnes's management of the excise.[32]

Thus it is evident that by the last days of the Stuart regime complexities had entered into the picture within the burgh of Glasgow and that elements of change were positioned towards the Whig Revolution. Religious dissent was quiescent by 1688 but had never been stamped out, and politically, the presence of Whigs in the last years of the Restoration council indicated that their position might one day improve. All in all, Glasgow was no longer a bishop's burgh, but a more complex society whose political and cultural profiles, as well as her economic interests, were more diversified than in 1638.

---

32 *BRG*, 1/10/1683, p.341.

Chapter One

THE REVOLUTION AT GLASGOW

The city of Glasgow was to play a key role in securing a Whig Revolution in Scotland. This chapter sets out to describe the city's involvement and the dualism which was evident in the process. Glasgow contained both royalist Jacobite and Revolutioner Williamite elements and over the winter of 1688-89 these were engaged in an open struggle within the burgh to gain possession of the city's pulpits; a contest representing the culmination of nearly 50 years of bitter ideological warfare.

But at the same time another more covert 'holy' army was on the move. Whilst the rest of the country lay paralysed by inaction, and no large burgh came to the defence of the crown, John Anderson ygr., of Dowhill, ex-Dean of Guild and a noted Presbyterian dissenter, mobilised a body of citizens to ride to the king's magazine at Stirling and secure vital supplies of arms and ammunition.[1] This gave the Presbyterian Revolutioner party a distinct advantage and contributed considerably to their confidence. Not only did the rabbling of the Episcopal clergy begin from a storm centre at Glasgow shortly afterwards, but the city was instrumental in supplying an armed military force to protect the Convention of Estates in Edinburgh in March 1689, a part of the western Covenanting army.

---

1 Michael Lynch, *Scotland: A New History*, (London, 1992) p.300; *Extracts from the records of the burgh of Glasgow*, ed. Robert Renwick, SBRS, 11 vols., iii, (Glasgow, 1876-1916), 23/1/1689, p.419, (henceforth, *BRG*). Bannatyne Club, *The Siege of the Castle of Edinburgh*, (Edinburgh, 1828) p.10. Lenman, in an important article, noted the same lack of response amongst the Scottish nobility. B. Lenman, 'The Scottish nobility and the Revolution of 1688-1690' in R. Beddard (ed.), *The Revolutions of 1688*, (Oxford, 1991), p.135-162. *BRG*, 23/1/1689, p.419.

Moreover, Glasgow was the first Scottish city to declare for William of Orange, on Christmas day 1688.[2] This was a full 3 weeks before the deputation of Scots nobles and gentry, convened at London, asked William to undertake the interim administration of Scotland; two months before the elections to the Convention took place in February; three months before the Estates met; and four months before the crown was eventually offered to the new monarchs. The declaration of Glasgow was a decisive political event which occurred at a time when confusion and indecision reigned in other parts of the country.[3] The 'Revolutioner' interest which established itself in the city during the winter of 1688-1689 was thus pivotal in determining Glasgow's future political character yet represented a complete reversal of the previous political order in the city. An entrenched Episcopalian Jacobite patrician elite continued to offer stout resistance after the Revolution, and as late as 1708, the Jacobite interest in the city continued to worry the government.

The event which signalled the Revolution, the birth of the new Prince of Wales on the 10th June, had been duly celebrated at Glasgow, as was the King's birthday on 14th October 1688 - but in increasingly nervous circumstances.[4] John Sage, a leading Episcopalian writer after the Revolution, and a life-long Jacobite, was then a minister and Synod clerk at Glasgow and gave October as the month when 'the late great Revolution began to cast up'.[5] But from the middle of September onwards, an invasion

---

2 Gilbert Rule, *A second vindication of the Church of Scotland being an answer to five pamphlets*, (1691), p.28.

3 Lenman, 'Scottish nobility', pp.135-162.

4 *BRG*, 3/8/1688, p.412; account for 7 barrels gunpowder and for French wine, used to celebrate his birth; 13/10/1688, p.414-415; magistrates order a proclamation to be sent through the town for keeping the King's birthday.

5 John Sage, *An account of the present persecution of the Church in Scotland in several letters*, 4 letters, (London, 1690), p.13. Wodrow states that from mid-October 1688, 'the heads of the prince of Orange's declaration and

force from Holland was imminently expected. On the 18 September the Privy Council called out militia units along the east coast and instituted arrangements for lighting a series of warning beacons across the country, should a Dutch fleet be sighted off shore. Difficulties however were encountered in getting this force to turn out, even in Jacobite heartlands.[6] The magistrates of Glasgow meanwhile, wrote to the Chancellor, Lord Perth, offering to raise 10 companies of 120 men for the king's service from amongst the burgesses - a figure which almost certainly represented the entire burgess rank.[7] Even widows of burgesses, who were in a position to do so, were to supply a man for the militia who would be equipped with their deceased husband's war gear.[8] Similar measures were instituted elsewhere - even in the western shires. An act of the Privy Council dated 3 October, named commanders and rendezvous dates for 26 shire militias which were to muster at burghs across the country from 10 to 29 October.[9] Significantly no specific mention was made for the arrangements for Argyll. An earlier act of the Privy Council in 1684 had taken action against the exiled Earl, the usual lieutenant in that country, to prevent him or his cohorts from raising militias there, and

---

manifesto began to be spread', Robert Wodrow, *The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the Restoration to the Revolution*, 4 vols., iv, (Glasgow, 1828-1830), p. 467.

6 Lenman, 'Scottish nobility', p.147; Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.463.

7 That the companies were drawn from the burgesses may be concluded from their numbers (1200, equivalent to the approximate number of burgesses in the city); the fact that the Dean of Guild, the president of the burgesses and merchants of the city, and the Deacon Convener, the president of the trades burgesses, were consulted for the selection of fit captains and officers for the companies, *BRG*, 13/10/1688, p.414-415; plus the fact that the men were required to supply their own firelocks, gunpowder and swords. It was a normal requirement of a burgess to keep in readiness a set of personal arms with which to defend the city if need be. Lord Perth, in his letter to the magistrates accepting this militia, describes them as 'citizens' as opposed to inhabitants , the word usually described for a non-burgess resident .

8 ibid.

9 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.466.

these arrangements, which awarded the effective policing of Argyll's vast regalian demesne to his enemies, were still in force.[10]

These measures reflected an earlier undertaking by James's first parliament. In addition to granting the crown the excise duty for all time, James's obsequious assembly had agreed to a proposal whereby every able-bodied male between 16 and 60 was to be placed in readiness for the king's service, as and when he should desire. James's slavish parliament had also given the most fulsome expression of its endorsement of absolute monarchy.[11]

The Glasgow militia, like the Ayrshire militia, was to play a crucial role in events at the Revolution; and was, despite Perth's optimism, to prove by no means reliable. But one reason for raising it, apart from the extreme crisis, (and the magistrates' attempt to gain credit with the government), was that after the Test came into force in 1681, increasing numbers of burgesses had been pressed into swearing the oaths to the king, on one pretext or another, and this may have created the false semblance of loyalty. Often the pressure to conform was economic. Furthermore, religious dissent was more or less eradicated after Charles had withdrawn the last of his indulgences in December 1684. Thereafter, Sage was to boast, until James's Toleration of 1687, religious compliance was virtually total. Only the Cameronians continued to defy the government, whilst the remainder of the Presbyterians 'had lived in Communion with us for some years before the first Edition of the Toleration'.[12]

---

10 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.179-180, 'Proclamation for lieutenants in Tarbet and the Highlands, May 5th, 1684'; Gordon Donaldson, *James V - James VII*, (Edinburgh, 1990), p.380. Argyll's enemies were given powers to raise forces to contain him, notably Huntly, Breadalbane, Atholl, Glengarry, Clanranald, MacDonald of Sleat, the Mackinnons, MacIntoshes, MacLeans, MacLeods.

11 I B Cowan, 'Reluctant Revolutionaries: Scotland in 1688', in E. Cruikshanks, (ed.), *By Force or Default: The Revolution of 1688-89*, (Edinburgh, 1989), p.66; Donaldson, *Scotland: James V - James VII*, p.380.

12 Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.11.

As early as 1678, an act of the Privy Council had empowered the magistrates of Glasgow to tear the burgess tickets of all burgesses who refused to sign a bond obliging them to relieve the burgh council of any hazard it should sustain from its recent undertaking to the government, that none of the inhabitants of Glasgow would attend conventicles.[13] This additional bond, effectively putting the burgesses in the dock, (and not the council), was known as the 'bond of relief for the magistrates', and was understandably, highly unpopular amongst the burgesses, especially in a city where conventicling was rife. The burgesses had to convene in their two ranks, both trades and merchants, and publicly sign the bond of relief under the supervision of the Dean of Guild (for the merchants) and the Deacon Convener (for the craftsmen). Besides the financial burden this placed them under, such action represented unprecedented interference into the autonomy of royal burghs. Thus quite apart from their purses and their religious sympathies, many would have considered the Privy Council's actings as an infringement of the burgh's constitution as a self-regulating community of 'free' traders.

One prominent citizen of Glasgow who certainly quarrelled with Provost James Campbell at this time, and had his burgess ticket torn as a result, was one Thomas Crawford of Crawfordsburn[14], an importer of French wines, and a younger son of the laird of Jordanhill.[15] Provost Campbell was standing on the plainstanes outside the Tolbooth one day, shortly after the bond of relief was advertised, at the appointed hour and at the traditional place of the hearing of complaints from burgesses, when in plain view of all and sundry, he was accosted by Crawfordsburn in a most furious manner.

---

13 *BRG*, 26/3/1678, 249; Wodrow, *History*, ii, p.411. A similar bond was instituted at Stirling.

14 *BRG* 2/4/1678, p.250-1.

The burgh records do not minute the exact conversation, beyond the fact that Crawford publicly rebuked and raged at Campbell, to the latter's great affront, saying to him, 'that he knew his malice, and would bide the butt of it ... and that he defied him', and many other such hostile expressions[16]. Crawford's burgess ticket was torn up and the burgh records minute further economic action taken against him in the following months; notably in challenging a 'yair' for salmon and herring fishing he had erected in the Clyde at the Garvald point, near Crawfordsdyke. This was alleged to be detrimental to Glasgow's fishing interests in the river and a hazard to shipping. Appeal was made to the Privy Council, and as an act of further malice, it was suggested to the provost, whilst in Edinburgh, by the magistrates, that since it was a legal matter, Crawford should be made to defend his action, rather than that the burgh be forced into the expense of taking an action against him. As a consequence, Crawford faced being cited to appear before the Privy Council for his 'yair', and under this threat, appears to have backed down.[17] However, in 1683 his burgess ticket was restored to him[18] and his fine of £100 returned, all for 'taking away differences and keeping concord amongst friends'[19]; and in 1688, suitably rehabilitated, he was named, along with his son and namesake, as captain and lieutenant, respectively, in the 10 companies of the burgh militia raised to defend James's interest.

Yet there was more to this affair than merely a dispute over fishing. Between 1683 and 1688, we encounter Crawford in another context; that of the exiled Earl of

---

15 See Williamson's *Old Cartsburn* (1894) for family details.

16 *BRG* 2/4/1678, p.250-1.

17 *BRG*, 24/6/1678, p.252; 12/8/1688, p.255; 4/11/1678, p.260.

18 *BRG*, 31/1/1683, p.329.

19 ibid.

Argyll, and his failed rising of 1685. According to Wodrow, Argyll had a particular regard for Crawford. After Argyll's capture, before he was brought prisoner in the Tolbooth at Renfrew, he met Crawford, to whom he gave a silver snuff box as a token of his regard.[20] During this interview Argyll was said to have told him:

> Thomas, it hath pleased Providence to frown on my attempt, but remember, I tell you, ere long one shall take up this quarrel, whose shoes I am not worthy to carry, who will not miscarry in his undertaking.[21]

Thus there are some indications that Crawford was not a completely solid royalist, or particular friend of the royalist Bell-Campbell clique who were responsible for tearing up his burgess ticket, or for imposing the bond of relief on the burgesses. It may also be possible that his accusing Campbell of 'malice' was due to the fact that either Crawford, or his family and close associates, were of known Presbyterian sympathies, and that the magistrates intended to selectively make use of such burgesses as were of dissenting sympathies, to be scapegoats in any financial penalties to be enacted on the burgh by the Privy Council for dissenting activities. Such, for instance, was the ploy used by Campbell's ally and successor, Provost Sir John Bell, in 1679, after the battle of Bothwell Bridge, when Monmouth's troops were hosted in the city at the expense of local Whigs.[22] One prominent known Presbyterian, John Anderson of Dowhill, one of the wealthiest merchants in Glasgow, was likewise made to stand cautioner for the

---

20 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.299.

21 ibid.

22 William Scott Shepherd, 'The politics and society of Glasgow 1648-1674', Glasgow University Ph.D. thesis, 1975 p.353; *Memoirs of Captain John Creichton*, (ed.) Jonathon Swift, (1731). *In Autobiography...*, (London, 1827), p.34.

jailer of the Tolbooth. When there was an escape of prisoners, Anderson found himself liable for a huge sum in expenses[23].

It is perhaps remarkable that Crawford was placed in command of a company of militia in the city at the Revolution, as were several Whigs. Yet the success of repression since 1679 had been almost total. Religious dissent and political opposition were more or less eradicated by 1685. The ease with which Argyll's putative rising 'For God and Religion, against Poperie, Tyrannie, Arbitrary Government and Errestianisme' had been crushed indicated that further Whig rebellion now seemed remote.[24] Argyll had found few willing to join him, either in his own country, or in the Lowlands, and was opposed throughout, not by the regular army, but by militia units carrying out the king's orders. Some, like Crawford, whose small band of local militia had greeted a contingent of Argyll's men on the shore at Greenock, were ambivalent and lukewarm;[25] whilst others, like those who seized him, were notably unenthusiastic for their task, and wept to do it.[26] Only the Cameronians maintained some element of military resistance, yet were reluctant to join with Argyll. Moreover these were reduced to small scattered units, incapable of serious assault. Nobody in Scotland, according to P W J Riley, expected a revolution to break out in September 1688.[27]

Nonetheless cracks were apparent, and if pressure or opportunity were forthcoming, would soon widen into chasms. Also named as officers in the Glasgow

---

23 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.211; town fined for the escape of prisoners from the Tolbooth in November, 1685.

24 Cowan, 'The Reluctant Revolutionaries', p.66. The Whig interest had declined more in Scotland by the eve of the Revolution, than in England. William Law Mathieson, *Politics and Religion in Scotland, a study in Scottish History from the Reformation to the Revolution*, 2 vols., (Glasgow, 1902), vol. ii, p. 339.

25 Wodrow, *History*, iv, pp.292-293.

26 Wodrow, *History*, iv, pp.297, 298. 'Of the militia who wounded and took me, some wept, but durst not let me go.'

27 P W J Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, (1979), p.11.

militia were others with links to Presbyterian dissent or with a history of recent opposition to the tyranny of the court, notably Hugh Montgomerie, merchant, named as a lieutenant; and John Johnstone of Clauchrie, late Provost, named as a captain.[28]

Montgomerie (c.1664-1735) was the younger brother of the 'Club' plotter, Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie (1654-1694), whom Balcarres considered as one of the chief personalities engaged in promoting the Revolution in Scotland. Skelmorlie was also active at this time in raising the Ayrshire militia; he was named as commander in the Privy Council's act for the baillierie of Cunningham (the northern part of Ayrshire).[29] Both brothers came from a staunch Presbyterian family[30] and are readily identified as Whigs; Skelmorlie for his actions in the Estates in March and subsequently; and Hugh for his being popularly elected onto the town council of Glasgow by the free poll of all the burgesses at the Revolution. This followed the Estates act of 4th June 1689, for purging burgh councils of royalists and those favourable to the former Restoration regime (Appendix i).[31] Hugh Montgomerie was eventually elected provost of Glasgow 1701-1703, and was named as one of Anne's first commissioners for the union, (to which he was strongly opposed).[32]

John Johnstone of Clauchrie (1624-1690) was Provost from 1684-1686, when he was associated with attempts to clear up much of the financial corruption brought in

---

28 *BRG* 16/10/1688, p.415-6.

29 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.466; James Halliday, 'The Career and Significance of Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie, 1654-1694', Glasgow University B.Litt thesis, 1963, p.30. Sir George Mackenzie also named Montgomerie as one of the leaders of the Presbyterian lairds who moved to Edinburgh over the winter of 1688-89 to be at the centre of events. Andrew Lang, *Sir George Mackenzie* (1909), p.296.

30 Skelmorlie was married to Margaret Johnstone, the (3rd) Earl of Annandale's sister, and was a cousin of the (10th) Earl of Argyll. Riley, *King William*, p.31.

31 *BRG*, 3/7/1689, p.425-6. Appendix i.

32 J Gourlay, (ed.), *The Provosts of Glasgow 1609-1832*, pp. 44-45.

during Provost Barns's time in taking unwarranted measures to seek favours in his rivalry with Provost Sir John Bell. Latterly, this jousting had involved Barns in the dangerous steps of asset-stripping the burgh's patrimony.[33] Bell, on the other hand, had contented himself with financially stripping dissenting Whigs to gain favour, a measure to which, as an Episcopalian, he was in any case naturally committed, (we note his use of Whig money to host Monmouth, above) but he had not been involved in such large scale mis-appropriation of public funds. Further, he was also a more civic-minded individual who defended the burgh's liberties[34] where he could, and had at least attempted to use the crackdown on dissent constructively - trading it for financial favours to the city in the form of various acts and privileges granting Glasgow trading and manufacturing monopolies. Most notable of these was the act of 1681 declaring the sugarworks at Glasgow to be a manufactory[35] which offered considerable scope. The product of the Easter Sugar-works was to be free from customs and excise for nineteen years and the importation of raw materials was to remain a Glasgow monopoly free from duty in all time coming.[36] Barns, a bankrupt, likewise attempted to asset-strip

---

33 Gourlay, *Provosts of Glasgow*, pp. 35-6.

34 See for instance, the entry in the burgh records, 13 September 1681, when Bell was in Edinburgh at the parliament as commissioner from Glasgow, in which it is evident that he was attempting to stave off as far as possible any attempts to 'resigne their royaltie', i.e., to avoid resigning 'the tounes priviledeges in his Majesties hand', *BRG*, 13/10/1681, p.300. Bell was also attempting to enforce settlement of a debt from the present Earl of Argyll, restored to his father's forfeited estates in 1669, for the sum of £10,000 Scots lent on bond to his father, Archibald, marquis of Argyll, (1607-1661) in 1636. The sum had been raised by the citizens of Glasgow to fund another minister for the town, at the Blackfriars kirk, which building the town acquired from the university in 1635. Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae*, 7 vols., vol. iii, Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, (Edinburgh, 1915-1928), p.398. The interest on the fund maintained the minister's stipend; this had ceased being paid some time ago, and as a result, the city was unable to provide stipend for a fifth minister. The church itself was destroyed by a fire in 1666 and was not rebuilt until 1699.

35 *APS*, 17 September 1681, p.360. Other acts which followed in this session were the act allowing James Armour's woollen works, where he made 'searge de mein' (serge denim, i.e., 'de Nimes') to be a manufactory, ibid., p.361; a ratification in favours of the Incorporation of Weavers of Glasgow, ibid., p.396; a ratification of an act of the Convention of Royal Burghs allowing Glasgow to feu the burgh muir, ibid., p.431.

36 NLS MSS 14491 f194, 'Information for the masters of the Easter Suggar work att Glasgow against the Tacksmen of His Majesty's customs and excise'. Under the terms of a royal grant given when James VII, while Duke of York, visited the city in 1681, given in Charles II's act of that year setting up the sugar works as a manufactory, the product was to be free of duty for 19 years. In 1687 there was a dispute as to whether the distillation of rum was a

Whigs;[37] but applied this activity to personal financial gain and not to civic purpose, hoping for a substantial share of the fines.[38] Yet the returns from the fines he so notoriously collected were perhaps less than expected. The political rewards of his zeal in persecuting the city's Presbyterians were greater; he supplanted Bell as provost at the next burgh election.[39] It was in such circumstances that the Whig element in the council - always a shadowy presence, and never entirely absent -made something of a comeback in the 'election' of John Johnstone in 1684.[40] Johnstone's critical comments about Archbishop Arthur Ross in 1686, concerning the dubious financial transactions which went on between him and Barns in 1684 regarding the tack of the teinds of the

---

by-product (as the customs establishment alleged) of the manufactory, and therefore outwith the scope of the grant; or a product, as its operators alleged, and therefore within its terms.

37 See for instance his attempts to ingratiate himself with the Privy Council in 1682 (at Bell's expense) by complaining that the current magistrates were not sufficiently active in prosecuting those who had withdrawn from church and were (allegedly) attending conventicles. *RPC*, vii, p.503. Or his subsequent claim that the deacons of the crafts were not planning to take the Test and were being actively encouraged to do so by Andrew Ross, late Deacon Convener. Barns claimed that at a recent meeting of about 800-900 tradesmen, John Hall and Alexander Ross, two deacons, had incited the city's tradesmen to rebel against the archbishop, Lord Advocate and provost, claiming that they planned to deprive the trades of Glasgow of their privileges. *RPC*, vii, p.576.

38 Later Barns applied to the Privy Council for a share of the spoils, claiming that as 'he was the only person did discover, persue and sentence the fanatick and schismaticall persones in Glasgow and was at great trouble and expenses in that affair' that he be allowed to retain a proportion of the fines. *RPC*, vii, p.608.

39 Barns was not awarded the franchise he was presumably angling for; the Privy Council essentially granted him his petition but demanded that the fines first be delivered up to the Lord Treasurer's office. *RPC*, vii, p.608. Since this would probably have involved a further creaming off of the returns, Barns's enthusiasm for this enterprise may have been diminished. Barns was appointed provost the following Michaelmas, *BRG*, 3/10/1682, p.322.

40 In terms of the burgh's constitution, Barns, having served two terms, 1682 and 1683, could not be re-appointed in 1684. A successor to Barns was required. Whilst Johnstone was actually appointed by Archbishop Ross - whom he criticised - this was from a leet of three names presented to the Archbishop by the magistrates. In forming this leet, Barns's faction was unlikely to support any candidate favourable to his rival, and in such divided circumstances it seems that in the leet for the provost, Johnstone was pitched on as a neutral party. Both royalist factions - Barns's and Bell's - accused each other of being in league with a fanatical party; it thus seems that those associated with dissent actually held the balance of power in a bitterly divided council. Ross himself was translated to St Andrews at the end of 1684. When Johnstone raised his action against him, the current Archbishop was Alexander Cairncross, a moderate, who was deprived of the see in January 1687 for opposing James's Roman Catholic policy. I B Cowan, *The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688*, (London, 1976), p.130; Mathieson, *Politics and Religion*, ii, p.329; Sir John Lauder, (Lord Fountainhall), *Historical Notices of Scottish Affairs Selected from the manuscripts of Sir John Lauder of Fountainhall bart., one of the senators of the College of Justice*, ed. D. Laing, 2 vols., ii, Bannatyne Club, (1848), p.692, 740, 750, 775; Skinner's *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, ii, p.502-503. Cairncross was also the only one of James's former hierarchy to conform at the Revolution, where he was appointed to the see of Raphoe in Ireland in 1693. Mathieson, *Politics and Religion*, ii, p.330n.

Barony and other lands about Glasgow[41] earned him the censure of James's Privy Council and a brief period of imprisonment in 1686. He was removed from office as provost by the Privy Council and Barns was re-instated. By the eve of the Revolution, there could not have been many burgesses who were satisfied with the handling of the burgh's finances.

The inclusion of known or suspected Whigs in militias raised for the king's support in the west of Scotland may be commented on.[42] In King Charles II's time militias were raised in areas of the country known to be strongly royalist, and quartered on the western shires to crush religious dissent; the most notorious incident being the Highland Host in 1678. But in September 1688, as conditions in the country worsened, James had asked Perth to ascertain the likely support he might have amongst the Presbyterians, given his recent Toleration to them.[43] The answer from the Presbyterian leaders was distinctly equivocal and should have raised some doubts: that 'they would meddle no more with him' and would act as God inspired them.[44]

Recent events had however suggested that Presbyterian rebelliousness was now extinguished. The expressions of gratitude which flowed from James's recent toleration were notably obsequious. The citizens of Edinburgh 'could not find suitable expressions' to evidence their sense of 'so surprising a favour.'[45] Those of Glasgow

---

41 *BRG*, 19/4/1684, p.347-348. The tack was for 19 years, leased from the Archbishop for 20,000 merks, plus £200 pa, beginning with the crop for 1685. The teinds were only worth 500 merks pa - making a profit to the Archbishop. Gordon Jackson, 'Glasgow in Transition, c. 1660 - c.1740' in *Glasgow, vol. i: Beginnings to 1830*, T M Devine and Gordon Jackson (eds.), (Manchester, 1995), p. 66.

42 Most of the western shires were commanded by known Whigs. Wodrow noted that such figures as Cassillis (Kyle and Carrick), Hamilton (Lanarkshire), Dundonald (Renfrewshire) were 'not very agreeable to the court measures'. Wodrow, *History,* iv, p.466. Glencairn, the commander for Dumbartonshire, was part of the old Presbyterian interest. William Ferguson, *Scotland 1689 to the Present*, (Edinburgh, 1978) p.1.

43 J. K. Hewison, *The Covenanters*, 2 vols., ii, (1913), p. 515.

44 ibid.

45 Mathieson, *Politics and Religion*, ii, p. 332.

emitted similar returns, which for their 'high strains of flattery and vast promises of duty and compliance' were marvelled at by Episcopalians.[46] Even prior to the toleration, between 1685 and 1687, Presbyterians had appeared meekly to conform to the Episcopal church establishment. All of which may have been taken as a sign of acquiescence, perhaps even of loyalty to mitre and crown. The extent of such compliance was gingerly acknowledged by Gilbert Rule, future Principal of Edinburgh University, but he refuted that it had ever represented willing adherence. 'If some under the heat of Persecution stretched their consciences to comply, it is nothing but that which hath been common among men of infirmities' he retorted.[47] It was soon evident that dissatisfaction with the Episcopal church establishment was deep, bitter and widespread in the south and west of Scotland.

This began to emerge towards the end of October, when the main points of William's declarations to the Scots and the English nations, drawn up at the Hague on the 10 October, became known and began to be discussed.[48] On the 24 October 1688 a General Meeting at Glengeber of the Societies (Cameronians) considered the potential for a military alliance with the Dutch,[49] 'providing their declarations of the causes and ends of the warr wer right and approvable'. William was to be assisted only if the conflict extended to Scotland, and under a separate military organisation which would reflect the Covenanting theology of its members.[50] The measures concerted at this

---

46 John Sage, *The case of the present afflicted clergy in Scotland truly represented*, (in four collections of papers), Fourth Collection of Papers , (London, 1690), p.80.

47 Rule, *A Second Vindication.*

48 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.467.

49 Robert Wodrow, *Analecta, or Materials for a History of Remarkable Providences, mostly relating to Scotch ministers and Christians*, 4 vols., i, Maitland Club, (Edinburgh, 1842-43), p.182-184. (Extracts from the Diary of Alexander Shields)

50 ibid.

meeting were eventually realised. The Angus regiment, later the Cameronians or the 26th Regiment, was formed in 1689 and pursued Dundee in the brief Highland war.

The importance of William's separate declaration to the Scots has been overlooked by some historians. Although in many ways similar to the English declaration, it contained the matter for some considerable controversy.[51] The Scots' declaration left the church question deliberately open; but it contained very strong and clear hints that William would favour Presbyterians. That at least, was the message picked up by Sage and his fraternity who complained of the declaration's hostile description of the Episcopalian ministers who replaced the 350 Presbyterians 'outed' in the south and west in 1662. This was clearly a sensitive issue. The replacements were characterised as 'ignorant and scandalous persons' and the Act of Glasgow was stated as a particular grievance. William's Scottish declaration was 'downright Presbyterian and presaged no good to us.'[52] As Sage indignantly retorted:

> It seems that either His Highness has been diffident of the regular clergy in Scotland, and dreaded they would not so readily embark with him as the Presbyterians were likely to do; or he has had none or very few of the Scottish nation then about him but such as were of that persuasion; for the Declaration for the Kingdom of Scotland we found to be purely Presbyterian.[53]

---

51 Donaldson, in *Scotland: James V - James VII*, p.384, claims the declaration 'was not in itself likely to stir the Scottish people'. I B Cowan likewise concurs, stating that the declaration to the Scots had fallen on 'deaf ears'. Cowan, 'Reluctant Revolutionaries', p.65. W L Mathieson, however, acknowledges the declaration's political impact, particularly its naming the Act of Glasgow as a grievance, and its denouncing the Episcopal replacements as insufficient men, which gave 'satisfaction' to the Presbyterians; *Politics and Religion*, vol. ii (1902), p.348.

52 Sage, *Account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.14.

53 ibid.

Sage speculated as to who had been responsible for advising the Prince of Orange on these delicate matters. Suspicion fell on Gilbert Burnet, a Dutch exile and the former Professor of Divinity at Glasgow University in 1669, who, although an Episcopalian, had been outspoken on the Scottish prelates in the 1660s. Burnet was a close associate of William and had come over with him at the Revolution, settling in England where, by William's interest, he became bishop of Salisbury. He also wrote the most famous history of the Revolution, *History of His Own Time.* Burnet had some familiarity with the complained-of clergy from his Glasgow days, but his opinion of them was hardly flattering.[54] To draw a rebuttal, Sage sarcastically concluded that it could not, of course, have been him.

> I am confident that Dr Burnet did not pen it, otherwise the Act of Glasgow had not been put into it as a Grievance: He knows very well upon what reasons it was made, and, if he pleases, can easily justify it; neither had the clergy of the West (for they must be the men) been so generally pronounced scandalous and ignorant; he was better acquainted with many of them than so: I had rather think, the Dr had never seen that Declaration until it was published.[55]

The significance of Sage's comments are their defensiveness. Episcopalian suspicions that William did not favour their communion increased in December and January when Presbyterians began congregating in droves in London at William's court and began 'misrepresenting' the Episcopal establishment in Scotland.[56] However any allegations as

---

54 Gilbert Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, (London, 1724-1734), abridged by Thomas Stackhouse, Penguin Everyman edition, David Allen, ed., (1979), p.75.

55 Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.14.

56 ibid.

to its trenchant Jacobitism were no more than the bare truth. The bishop of Edinburgh, Rose, was also in London but, lying low 'under a cloud', he could do little to further the interests of his co-religionists, whilst his opponents could do much. Rose received little help from the English bishops either and a request for an audience with William was turned down in case it offended Presbyterians.[57] His business in London was in any case to offer James the continuing support of his Scottish hierarchy. He had no commission to treat with William and little dreamed, when he set out from Edinburgh at the beginning of December, of the momentous events which would greet him on his arrival.[58] Reaching London about the middle of the month he became trapped in the city after the dramatic turn of events which saw William triumphantly reaching St James's Palace on 18 December, and James fleeing London ignominiously on 23 December 1688. Rose's political incapacity however was due to an earlier blunder; for the Scottish bishops had written an infamous letter to James late in October attacking William and 'wishing the King might have the necks of his enemies' etc..[59] Unfortunately only a couple of days later William's fleet landed at his second attempt.[60]

As Rose pondered his fate in London, lawlessness was becoming increasingly apparent back in Scotland, especially in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Pro-William and anti-Episcopal demonstrations appeared from the middle of November onwards which shadowed William's progress closely. On 13 November, as news of William's landing at Torbay with 14,000 troops the week before reached Glasgow, the magistrates began

---

57 Cowan, *The Scottish Covenanters*, p.136.

58 Lionel K J Glassey, 'William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland 1688-1690', RSCHS, vol., 23 (1989), p.321.

59 Burnet, *History*, p.290.

60 The bishop's letter was dated 3rd November; William's landing the 5th November. Burnet considered it a political misjudgement, Burnet, *History*, p.290.

to report that they were having difficulty mustering the king's militia units. Numbers were failing to turn up to do guard duty; fines were enacted, but had little or no effect. In the coming weeks fiscal arrangements in the city also broke down. A fourteen week strike of the maltmen, resulted in the city being unable to pay its public dues by the spring. The tacksman of the pecks, William Somerville, also found his annual returns were dramatically reduced after he had to hire a private army to guard the mealmarket when some people broke into the premises on 18 December.[61] By the end of November students at the university, amongst them the young Earl of Loudon, were able to burn effigies of the pope and the two archbishops, Glasgow and St. Andrews, under the noses of the magistrates, with no reprisals taken. Assisting in this action was said to be one Tolland, future author of a deist tract, 'Christianity not Mysterious' and a former student at the university.[62]

That Glasgow students had links with the Cameronians, was acknowledged by the Principal, Dr. Fall, whose suspicions led him to believe that Tolland might even have been one of them.[63] Some students at Glasgow, Dr. Fall states, 'herded themselves amongst the wild Cameronians' at that time. Tolland however was by Dr. Fall's account a student at Edinburgh in 1688; yet he may well have assisted in the Glasgow action. Close correspondence between the two cities is evident throughout the crisis even

---

61 *BRG*, 13/11/1688, p.417; *APS*, 1689, c.13, vol. ix, p.24; *BRG*, 18/5/1689, p.421. A peck was a measure of dry grain - a fiscal unit of measurement.

62 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.472. Sage, writing in 1690 however, gave the date as Christmas 1688, and the nobleman as the Earl of Argyll, an elder kinsman of Loudon (Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, 3rd letter, p.59). This gives a different cast to the event, as Argyll was too old to have been a student, but may have been a suspected instigator. Loudon was certainly of age to have been a student. Both agree on the identity of the effigies. This Argyll, if it was he, must have been Archibald, the 10th earl, (d.1703) created Duke in 1701, the father of 'Red John of the Battles' (1678-1743, 2nd Duke), and Islay (1682-1761, 3rd Duke).

63 As he had left Glasgow university suddenly and had obtained a testimonial from the magistrates, stating that he was a 'zealous Protestant' and not the regents. NLS MSS 9251 f150, Dunlop Correspondence, Dr Fall to Principal William Dunlop, 1697. Fall suggested to Dunlop that Tolland might have fallen foul of the college authorities, and conjectured that it might have been because of Cameronian associations.

before the Estates met in March and contingents of between 6-8,000 men from Argyll and the Glasgow and Ayrshire militias were despatched east to protect Parliament house.[64] There was also active correspondence between the western shires and Edinburgh. As the crisis worsened, Presbyterian lairds flocked to the capital in increasing numbers to receive up to date information; by December 'the Whiggs' were well in evidence. The Cameronians also despatched a delegation to Edinburgh which held frequent and close conferences with 'the Whiggs' throughout December and probably beyond.[65] Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie, active in raising the Ayrshire militia, was one of the leaders of the Presbyterian party who moved to Edinburgh at this time and according to Balcarres, it was he who led the attack on Holyrood on 10 December when the 'mob' he was commanding sacked the Jesuits' school and altar plus the chapel royal, where it signified its wish to remove the House of Stuart by desecrating its royal tombs.[66]

As the nobility and gentry began deserting Edinburgh for London, a form of interim 'government' developed from a command centre in Edinburgh orchestrated by the lesser lairds and the large numbers of Presbyterians assembled there, recalling the heady days of 1649.[67] Pressure from such 'mobs' acted as a catalyst for the displacement of key elements of the existing order, thus facilitating the outcome of the

---

64 *APS*, 25 March 1689, p.23; 'Act Approving the good services done by severall persones belonging to Glasgow and Argyll and other western shires' thanks them for protecting the Estates recently.

65 Halliday, 'Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie', p.30; Lang, *Sir George Mackenzie*, p.296; Wodrow, *Analecta*, i, 'Extracts from the Diary of Alexander Shields', p.186

66 Halliday, 'Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie', p.30; Bannatyne Club, *Balcarres Memoirs touching the Revolution in Scotland 1688-1690*, (Edinburgh, 1841), p.16; Donaldson, *Scotland: James V - James*, p.384.

67 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.477-82, notes a meeting of Presbyterian divines in Edinburgh in January who composed a lengthy address to William demanding the extrusion of Episcopacy as 'contrary to the genius of the nation' and the re-establishment of Presbyterianism. Wodrow did not know if this was ever sent. ibid. The Societies however were holding back from the rest.

Revolution in Scotland. When Skelmorlie's men attacked Holyrood on 10 December, the Chancellor, Perth, a recent convert to Roman Catholicism, was forced to flee the city, leaving the Privy Council to its own devices. Over the next few days many more privy councillors, finding no other focus of authority in the country and fearing the eclipse of their own interest in the developing political situation south of the Border, began deserting the capital for London, leaving the western lairds and their militias in effective control in Edinburgh. By 15 December thirteen privy councillors had left.[68] By 24 December a majority were assembled in London and were able in constitutional terms, to ask William to call a free parliament in Scotland.[69] In Edinburgh however their colleagues could barely raise a quorum.[70] The small Scottish army had been sent south in October to assist the king.[71] Where command in the country lay became increasingly uncertain, and the militias, under whatever guidance, began assuming the real power in the land. The shadowy figure of Ker of Kersland, a Cameronian leader, looms large and played a key role organising forces.[72] He was even said to have assumed the position of 'chief magistrate' during this brief 'interregnum', overrunning

---

68 Tweeddale, writing to Yester, 15 December, noted there was a bare quorum. Riley, *King William*, p.11.

69 I B Cowan, 'Church and State Reformed? The Revolution of 1688-9 in Scotland', reprinted from *Israel: The Anglo-Dutch Moment*, CUP (1991), p.164.

70 Tweeddale to Yester, 31 January, 1689. Riley, *King William*, p.11.

71 Mathieson, *Politics and Religion in Scotland*, ii, p.345; Burnet, *History*, p.281; Cowan, 'Reluctant Revolutionaries', p.76.

72 Robert Ker (d.1692), son of Robert Ker of Kersland (d.1680). The family had close connections with the Cameronians. Their home was one and a half miles north east of Dalry, (the parish of Rev. William Boyd after the Revolution); the Rev. Thomas Linning was married to a sister. The lands were given to Lt.-General Drummond, but were restored to the family by act of parliament in 1689. One of Ker's brother-in-laws, John Crawford of Crawfordland (1673-1726), purchased the estate and assumed the title in 1697, taking the name John Ker of Kersland, the author of the *Memoirs*, p.3; Wodrow, *History*, ii, pp.28, 29, 73, 76, 187, 330, 331, 332, 361. The author of the *Memoirs* was said by Donaldson to have been a Jacobite spy. Donaldson and Morpeth, *A Dictionary of Scottish History* (Edinburgh, 1977). By all accounts he was involved in 'intrigue', traded on the family name, and appears to have been a double agent. His account of his times is however particularly lucid and perceptive, and contains details of the period not found elsewhere.

the whole kingdom and seizing the revenues of the crown in several places. He made a notable appearance at Glasgow in February 1689, which we will return to later in the discussion. Of Ker himself, details are few but are given by Wodrow. He came from an ancient ultra-Protestant Ayrshire family which had wholeheartedly embraced the Covenanting cause. This had strong links latterly with the Cameronians but became extinct in the male line in the 1690s.

Questions must be asked, however, as to why such a lengthy interregnum was allowed to continue in Scotland, in view of the disturbances, the divisions in the country, the absence of the regular forces, the uncertain activities of the militias and the disintegration of executive government. From 10 December 1688 when Perth fled, until 14 March 1689 when the Estates met, executive government effectively ceased to exist. At Glasgow the burgh records are silent from 2 February to 18 May. In London, a constitutional majority of James's Privy Council had asked William on 24 December 1688, as a matter of urgency, to call a free parliament. Why did this not materialise until the 14 March 1689? Moreover, the date in March was not set until the 14 January, a further three weeks after the Privy Council's urgent plea; and was fixed only after William had met formally with a group of about 100 Scottish peers and noblemen in London, on the 8 January - and not by advice of the Privy Council.[73]

It may be sufficient to note that an extended interregnum represented a considerable window of opportunity for the various factions within the country, like Kersland's, to effect their agendas, especially after 18 December when it was known that William had reached St James's Palace. At that point the prospects of a change of regime needed little encouragement in a way which had not been possible for Argyll

---

73 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.476. The address to William was signed by 30 nobles and 80 gentry. William accepted this proposal on 14th January. Ibid.

three years earlier. As a consequence, the Episcopal clergy were easily evicted in the south and west, and the burgh and shire elections, held in February, took place 'in an atmosphere of excitement and violence.'[74] Armed groups appeared at elections throughout the country who intimidated electors.[75] The contests were viewed in pro-William or pro-James terms. Prudence played as strong a role as conviction in shaping the voting intentions of electors in many areas. At the Stirlingshire election when two of the voters, Mr Craig and Mr Buchanan, both of whom were Episcopal ministers in the Presbytery of Dumbarton, found they had the casting votes between two Jacobites and two Williamites, they cast their votes 'in favour of the new statesmen'.[76]

The burgh records of Glasgow do not record how the election was conducted in the city. However evidence from other sources indicates considerable dislocation at the time. A major riot occurred on 17 February in which Kersland's assistance was sought and it was evident Cameronian militia units were in the vicinity of Glasgow. John Anderson of Dowhill, a noted Presbyterian dissenter, was elected as burgh commissioner although he was not even a member of the council, or an officer in the king's militia, and Walter Gibson, the current Provost had only just been re-appointed by the Privy Council in December 1688.[77] This alone suggests some sort of coup. The burgh commissioner was elected by the council, who by tradition returned the Provost. We will recollect Anderson's jaunt to the king's magazine at Stirling some weeks before with a party of townspeople to obtain gunpowder and picks for the town's use, to

---

74 Riley, *King William*, p. 8.

75 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, Fourth Collection of Papers, p.91, claimed that the 'zealots of the west' who drove out the clergy also interfered with the elections.

76 Sage, *An Account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.34.

77 *BRG*, 4/12/1688, p.417.

highlight his involvement in military organisation in the city, despite having no commission from the king.[78] The burgh minutes record payment for this journey to Stirling in January; but given the confusion of the times, the status of the action is uncertain; whether sanctioned by the royalist council or not; whether for the king's use or otherwise. However what is incontrovertible is that the acquisition of these arms by Presbyterian militiamen tipped the arms balance in favour of forces hostile to Episcopalians. The re-armament however may have been in connection with the curious business of the Irish invasion scare which took air in mid-December. Episcopalians claimed this was part of a Whig plot to disarm them as a first step towards the infamous 'rabblings over the winter of 1688-89.

In regard to these infamous and much exaggerated evictions, the current Episcopal establishment was a natural target of Whigs. Its supine hierarchy and doctrine of passive obedience was associated with the support of absolute monarchy and with tyrannous government in which the rights of subjects had been contravened.[79] This was no abstract question of political theory. The crude attempts at enforcing royal supremacy ecclesiastic spheres had involved the arbitrary arrest, fines, execution, torture and transportation of thousands of people and the breach of civil rights and titles on a massive scale. The Episcopal church was distinctive culturally and more liberal theologically by the Revolution, but any such merits it might have possessed on these grounds were nullified by its political role in propping up a despotic and despicable regime. Episcopal ministers had been responsible for reporting absent parishioners to

---

78 *BRG*, 23/1/1689, p.419.

79 B P Lenman, 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism', in E. Cruikshanks, (ed.), *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759* (Edinburgh, 1982); Lenman, 'Scottish nobility', p.147; R H Story, *William Carstares, a character and career*, (London, 1874), p.167. Lenman, 'Scottish nobility', notes, p.159, the comment of Lord Lothian regarding the brain-washing of the prelates and clergy, that they were 'tools for tyrannical and arbitrary men'.

the military as suspected non-conformists.[80] Such persons faced considerable hazards - loss of life, health, wealth, or torture, by the soldiers. Sage however, was outrageous on this point. No-one, he claimed, had ever suffered for conscience's sake under Episcopacy - but because they were rebels who refused due obedience to their king.[81] Thus he purported the matter conscience as civil, not religious. The role of the Episcopal ministers in reporting absents he deemed reasonable. How could ministers 'top' with the government on this issue and disobey the law, 'when all the obedience that was required was so reasonable?' he asked innocently.[82] This demonstrates a thoroughly secular mentality and unwillingness to recognise the rights of conscience - even where the penalty was death. The simple refusal to say 'God save the king' could condemn a man to the gallows but to Sage this was not a point of conscience but an act of treason and could be treated as harshly. Bishops sitting in the Privy Council condoned such severe acts against Presbyterian dissenters. Neither were the clergy they presided over, (if Sage was typical), unduly troubled in their consciences to apply them.

Instances of Episcopalian ministers attempting to shield their flocks from the brutality of the soldiers do exist.[83] But the doctrine of passive obedience to which they adhered prevented them from challenging such policies. Given such straits, we are

---

80 How many did so, and with what eagerness, is unknown. Sage claimed that there were many instances of those who tried to protect their parishioners; Wodrow, too, was prepared to give one or two examples of this. But the greater point is surely that no true pastor could have readily accepted such an invidious police role, or accept a ministry in such an unattractive regime, knowing that those who faced 'discipline' for such defaultures received it, not at the hands of the clerical authorities and by moral means, but by brutal means at the hands of soldiers who were outwith clerical control. Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.48; Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.151, case of Mr Fisher and William Niven, smith of Pollokshaws.

81 Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.48; 'the state found there were a number of people of such seditious and ungovernable tempers that they could not be well kept from breaking out daily into open rebellions, therefore they made laws for keeping the law'.

82 ibid.

83 ibid.

entitled to ask what manner of individual would have willingly entered the Episcopal church in those parts of the country known to be hostile to it. Sage, for instance, before coming to Glasgow in 1686, was an impoverished, though well-educated, country schoolmaster and private tutor from an obscure rural background in Perthshire who had been unemployed for two years. His father had been a royalist, a major in Lord Duffus's regiment which had opposed Cromwell at Dundee. But despite the family's sacrifices, the Restoration government had proved ungrateful and the family remained in much reduced circumstances. Sage's career had also been dogged by ill-health. He had shown no interest in the ministry, until he first entered it at Glasgow, at the age of 34, after having applied to Rose, then Principal of St. Andrews University, whom he knew personally, for assistance.[84] On the whole, despite Sage's evident gifts as a scholar, the picture is one of desperation.

It was essential from a civil point of view, that the Episcopal clergy be removed from office in that part of the country which had faced arbitrary persecution for opposing them. This was a political requirement quite unrelated to the church government question. During the eleven and a half weeks before the Estates sat, 'mobs' in the south and west began the forcible eviction of the Episcopal clergy in what appears to have been part of an orchestrated Whig agenda. Episcopal claims that this was hatched by leading figures such as the Earl of Crawford and Secretary Johnstone and that 'the mobile was nothing but the base instrument', have to be taken seriously.[85]

---

84 Charles Shand, ed., *Works of John Sage*, 3 vols., (1844-6), Spottiswood Society, i, Memoir, xiv-xvi.

85 Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.25. Thomas Maxwell, 'The Presbyterian-Episcopalian controversy in Scotland from the Revolution Settlement to the accession of George I', Edinburgh University Ph.D. thesis, 1954, p.17, quoting Charles Leslie, a London journalist, in *Gallienus Redivivus*, p.1, 'it being known to all the world that the pretence of "the inclinations of the people" which was made the grounds for the abolishing of Episcopacy and the settling Presbytery there, was a mere sham contrived by this Johnstone and the bigot Presbyterian party in Scotland who were all put in power at the beginning of the Revolution, and set on the barbarous rabbling of the clergy in the west of Scotland'. See also, T. Maxwell, 'Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688', pt I, *RSCHS*, vol. xiii, (1957), pp.25-37.

The purpose was to vindicate the Claim of Right's statement that prelacy was contrary to 'the inclinations of the people'.

News of the first disturbances reached William at the beginning of January but were dismissed by the many Whigs around him. Only after repeated representations were made, most notably, by the Dean of Glasgow, Dr. Scott,[86] did William undertake to protect the Episcopal clergy, by a further declaration, dated the 6 February[87] ordering the militia units to disband and proclaiming freedom of religion for all Protestants.

The disturbances began at Glasgow and were heralded by a much celebrated event. On 25 December 1688 a Cameronian minister, William Boyd (1658-1741)[88] accompanied by 'a group of his friends in arms' read out William's declaration to the Scots from the stairhead of the Town House of Glasgow[89], the first such public reading in Scotland. This audacious act had much propaganda value. The Town House was the civic citadel of the west. The Tolbooth had held many martyrs and the stairhead was the traditional platform from which the magistrates made their more important announcements including acts of the Privy Council. As in the incident some weeks earlier when students had burned the effigies of the Pope and the two archbishops, no action was taken by the magistrates and the reading of the declaration appeared to be

---

86 Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.20. Dr. Scott brought with him signed statements of their injuries, which prompted William to issue a second declaration to the Scots, entitled, a 'Declaration for the Preservation of the Peace of this Kingdom', 6 February 1689.

87 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, Second Collection of Papers, p.88-89.

88 Boyd was the minister of Dalry for over 50 years after the Revolution. In 1685 he was a divinity student in Glasgow. A close search for non-conformists revealed him in the house of Rev Gardner's widow, but he escaped out of a window and went to Holland where he was ordained at Groeningen. He returned to Scotland about the Revolution, though offered a place at Leyden, and joined the Cameronians. Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.255.

89 *Caledonian Mercury*, no. 3291, 30 April 1741, obit.. Boyd died on 14 April 1741.

the signal for a general rising against the 'curates' in the west of Scotland. Similar proclamations followed at Irvine and Ayr over the next few days.[90]

The reading of the declaration was greeted with evident joy and showed signs of having been carefully orchestrated in that the country people for miles around were advertised to attend, including the major part of the parish of Cathcart.[91] When the Cathcart people returned home that night, they attempted to evict their unpopular 'curate', Robert Finnie, and lit celebratory bonfires around the parish, including a bonfire in front of his teind barn, (using his coal).[92] Finnie had been a notorious informer against his parishioners and had once set the soldiers on a poor lame man from Langside, whose disability had prevented him from attending church.[93]

The Glasgow ministers themselves were not threatened but letters were sent to them warning them to stop preaching and their houses were searched for arms.[94] This follows the plan outlined by Alexander Shields.[95] His diary records on 17 December 1688 that 'the Whiggs' had been consulting about 'falling on the prelates and curates', beginning at Glasgow on 27 December, but that he had advised against it, claiming it

---

90 George Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow from the Revolution to the Reform Acts*, 4 vols., iii, p.1.

91 Rule, *A second vindication*, p.28. The Cathcart incident referred to by Rule gives the precise date - 25 December 1688. Previous historians have confused the details. Eyre-Todd, for instance, tends to assume that the proclamation took place on 10 October, the day it was published at The Hague, Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, p.1. Mathieson likewise refers to the event but tends to assume that it happened before the Holyrood incident on the 10 December 1688; Mathieson, *Politics and Religion*, ii, p.345.

92 Rule, *A second vindication*, p.28; Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, First Collection of Papers, p.34; Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.16.

93 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.184; Lord Ross, when he caught up with the case, dismissed it out of hand and gave the victim alms of half a crown.

94 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, First Collection of Papers, p.34.

95 Alexander Shields, (c.1660-1700), author of *Hind Let Loose* and *Life of James Renwick*; arrested in London 1685 and imprisoned in the Bass Rock, he was released in 1688 and joined the Cameronians. In 1690 he, with Boyd and Thomas Linning, joined the Established Church, but unlike them did not take up a ministry in it. He became pastor to the Cameronian regiment after the Revolution, then went out with the (2nd) Darien expedition in 1699, to establish a presbytery of the Church of Scotland in the Isthmus of Panama. He died of fever at Jamaica on its return.

was still too dangerous[96]. This suggests that a variety of agencies were at work in the rabbling, (as Episcopal sources claimed), and that there was active correspondence, intelligence-sharing and common purpose between the 'Whiggs' and the Cameronians. Shields had also requested that the Episcopal clergy be first warned to remove in writing, against a certain date, before any action be taken against them and that the whole events be preceded by a declaration in favour of William accompanied by a remonstrance.[97] Most of Shield's recommendations seem to have been carried out. The action began at Glasgow; Boyd delivered the declaration; the Glasgow clergy received written warnings, which Milne and Inglis ignored; and the prelates and curates were acted against.

Over the next few days rabbling took place in the vicinity of the city in a series of incidents occurring in quick succession which had the appearance of spontaneity and spread outwards like a ripple. The first targets were unpopular clergymen who, like Finnie, or like Robert Boyd of Carmunnock, had informed against their parishioners.[98] Gabriel Russell, the minister of nearby Govan, was attacked between 5-6pm on the evening of 25 December; a mob broke into his house and tried to remove the poor's box.[99] Later that night between 11-12pm Finnie's house in Cathcart was attacked. Robert Boyd of Carmunnock was also allegedly assaulted sometime on the 25 December. (The alternative version relates that he was merely approached to remove by a delegation of his parishioners led by Andrew Morton, the former minister). Two days

---

96 It seems Shields erred on the cautious side. The next day (18 December) William reached St. James's Palace and a few days later (23 December) James fled London. The news of James's flight may have reached Glasgow by the 25 December; certainly the news of William's reaching St James's Palace would have been received as Boyd and his friends read aloud his declaration.

97 Wodrow, *Analecta*, i, p.186.

98 Rule, *A second vindication*, p.28.

99 ibid., p.27.

later Hew Blair of Rutherglen and Gilbert Mushet of Cumbernauld were evicted, and about the same time David Milne in the parish of Cadder was also attacked.[100] Some form of action was thus taken against six out of the sixteen Episcopal clergy within the Presbytery of Glasgow within days of Boyd's declaration. All the initial incidents occurred within a walking distance of the city. Over the next few weeks similar attacks were replicated in many areas of the south and west. By mid-February it was claimed that all the ministers within the Presbyteries of Paisley and Dumbarton had been forced out; whilst in the Presbytery of Irvine both indulged Presbyterian ministers and Cameronians had invaded the pulpits of several churches. In the Presbytery of Ayr a majority of pulpits had been seized.[101]

The riots had certain standardised features. The main objective appears to have been possession of the manse and pulpit, 'voiding the manse'. A secondary objective, where the fixed assets could not be seized, was possession of the goods and paraphernalia of the church. The poor's box, the church keys, the communion cups etc., were all contested objects in the pulpit war. Episcopalians resisted stoutly and where they were obliged to leave the fixed assets behind attempted to retain possession of the moveables. Sage, as Synod clerk of Glasgow, removed the administrative records of the Synod, which were not returned for over a century. At Edinburgh, where the Episcopal clergy could not be evicted, there was a lengthy contest with the magistrates over the communion silver.[102]

---

100 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, First Collection of Papers, p.34; Sage, *Account of the Present Persecution*, 2nd letter, p.16.

101 George Gregory, Francis Fordyce, William Irvine, James Hodge, *A Letter Concerning the Persecution of Several Other Ministers*, dated 14 February 1689, Edinburgh.

102 Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 3rd letter, p.53.

Ritual humiliation of the pastor, though much played up by Episcopalians, was secondary to these more material aims but also had certain standard features; notably the tearing up of canonical gowns over the heads of their wearers and then stamping on them; the tearing off of clothes in an attempt to expose to the cold; the knocking off of hats, making the victims go bare-headed.[103]

Some days prior to Boyd's appearance in Glasgow, events occurred in the west of Scotland which the Episcopal clergy later claimed were calculated to lay them wide open to attack. This was the notorious Irish scare, noted above, said to have been orchestrated by leading Whigs such as the Earl of Crawford and Lord Stair, the former Lord President of the Court of Session. On 18 December Shields' diary records[104] a rumour that an Irish invasion force had landed in Galloway and was making its way north burning and destroying as it went. The news 'flew at the rate of a miracle, for within 24 hours it was spread everywhere'.[105] The Irish never materialised, but in this confused and lawless situation in which it is difficult to tell apart official from unofficial militias, musterings took place, some of which searched the manses of Episcopal clergy for arms. On 21 December John Irvine of Paisley wrote to Laurence Crawford of Jordanhill, commissioner of the shire, giving him notice to attend a meeting of the shire the following day. Tenants and vassals were warned to appear with him 'in readiness'.[106] On 22 December, at Livingstone, 30 armed men appeared at the

---

103 Exposure to the cold, rather than indecency, seems to have been the main objective; though James Little, minister of Trailflat, set upon by a mob of females, had to plead for his and their modesty when they attempted to remove his breeches, and 'cried to them over and over, that it would be shame for them to look on a naked man'. Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.21.

104 Wodrow, *Analecta*, i, p.187; 'the suddain allarume came of Kilcubright, on which a great many Popish monuments wer destroyed up and doun the country'.

105 Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.5.

106 *Analectica Scotica*, John Irvine to Laurence Crawfurd of Jordanhill, 21 December 1688, p. 226.

manse of the minister, searching for arms.[107] By mid-January, the Episcopal clergy were in a situation of defensive weakness when warned to surrender their pulpits.

The rabbling at Glasgow began on the 17 January 1689. The first target was Alexander Milne, minister of the west parish since 1664, who was on his way to deliver his Thursday sermon when he was approached by a group of inhabitants who advised him to go home as a 'multitude' of women awaited him in the church and intended to put him out. Milne, however was not dissuaded but when he reached the church gates he was upbraided by the women. They accused him of being a perjured man, an informer against his parishioners, and a persecutor of the most godly in the town, for the last 24 years.[108] Milne was then allegedly attacked after he had decided to turn back.[109] The Presbyterian version admits he was 'roughly handled', but only because he refused to go home. The same day a group of women appeared at the minister of the Barony parish, Alexander George's house, and demanded the keys to the church. The mob seized his gown and informed him they would tear it 'as he had torn the church of God, and lately before them in the high church, had railed, like a bigot papist, out of the pulpit, against the reformers as Luther, Calvin, John Knox, Mr George Buchanan' and that John Sage had also preached Arminian doctrine in the High Church, to the offence of all his discerning hearers.[110] The Episcopal version paints a more pathetic account and relates that George was lying in bed sick when the mob arrived to eject him. This

---

107 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, First Collection of Papers, p.45-46.

108 NLS, Wodrow MSS, 4to, 73, f9-12; 'Information anent the putting out of the Curats in Glasgow in 1689'.

109 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, First Collection of Papers, p.34.

110 NLS Wodrow MSS, 4to, 73, f9-12 'Information anent the putting out of the Curats in Glasgow in 1689'.

made no mention of it being female; but stated that he was saved from it by the timely intervention of Provost Walter Gibson who arrived with about 8 or 10 men.[111]

Following these first riots a common agreement was reached between the Presbyterians and the magistrates, whereby no sermon was to be held in any of the churches of Glasgow until the Estates determined the question of church government. For the magistrates to have capitulated so easily to two female mobs indicates that they were merely the front for a much larger force which they could not easily subdue. The Presbyterian meeting houses continued to hold their services; the issue was not about freedom of religion but about possession of the city's pulpits, as is evidenced in the above noted struggles which were focused on securing the patrimony of the church. However, the concordat was unstable from the start for the Episcopalians soon began planning a counter-offensive, even before William's second declaration was obtained. The Presbyterians were alerted to this and on the 22 January issued a letter to the Episcopal ministers telling them that Walter Gibson, 'our pretended Provost', planned restoring them to their churches this or the next week but that for their own safety, this was not advisable.[112]

The depth of the crisis was further evidenced the following day, 23 January 1689, when the council met to discuss the current situation. It granted John Anderson of Dowhill a warrant for the money he had expended in going to Stirling to pick up arms from the king's magazine for the town's use and 'in respect that the regiment in toune refuises to obey the magistrats', ordered the militia to disband and all arms belonging to the town to be handed back in. Only a night watch of 60 men was to be

---

111 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, First Collection of Papers, p.34.

112 ibid.

kept up.[113] The magistrates, by their own admission, had lost control of the burgh. On 24 January, in what must have constituted an emergency session, 'the maist part' of the council, at the instigation of Provost Gibson, signed a half-hearted address to William. Such was the confusion in the country they had no firm idea who to convey this to, or even whether they should send it at all.[114]

The fragile agreement reached after the 17 January riot[115] was shaken after an Episcopal delegation from Glasgow under the Dean of Glasgow, Dr Scott, successfully represented to William the plight of the Episcopalians in the west of Scotland. This prompted William's second declaration to the Scots, dated the 6 February 1689, which the Episcopalians made much of. It allowed freedom of religion to all Protestants, and required all armed men to disband, whether standing forces or militia units. Only the town guard of Edinburgh and the garrisons in the castles were to be excepted; but all Roman Catholics were to give up public office.[116] The 'declaration for preservation of the Peace of the Kingdom' was read out in Edinburgh on the 13 February[117] and was proclaimed at the Mercat Cross in Glasgow.

Much encouraged, the city's Episcopalians attempted to repossess Glasgow's pulpits. The disastrous attempt on Sunday 17 February 1689 resulted in much bloodshed and was by far the most violent of these incidents in Scotland. Bailie James Gibson, the brother of the Provost, deputising in his absence, solicited the Episcopal clergy to 'give

---

113 *BRG*, 23/1/1689, p.419.

114 *BRG*, 24/1/1689, p.420.

115 NLS, Wodrow MSS, 4to, 73, f9-12.

116 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, Fourth Collection of Papers, p.88-89

117 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, First Collection of Papers. George Gregory, Francis Fordyce, William Irvine, James Hodge, *A Letter Concerning the Persecution of Several Other Ministers*, 14 February, 1689, p.34

punctual obedience to His Highness's Declaration' allowing freedom of religion.[118] Only Archibald Inglis, the parson of Glasgow, was willing to undertake the risky mission of conducting the service, which Gibson planned on advertising by the 'usual legal methods of ringing of bells and the public use of all other accustommed solemnities'.[119] Thomas Crawford, ygr., of Crawfordsburn, the captain of the militia, 'one of the chief commanders of that party in this place that keep themselves in contempt of the law of the kingdom and the Prince's declaration to the terror of the magistrates and all good and peaceable people in this place',[120] was ordered to disband his company in line with William's order, but refused. Gibson told him that he would provide for the security of the town. The Presbyterian version states that Gibson anticipated violence and that the congregation went to church not only with a 'hired company of profligate ruffians' for protection, but with concealed weapons under their clothes.[121] When Gibson arrived at the Cathedral with his hired guard to open the church and ring the bells, he found himself opposed by a company of about 40 women who accused him of breaking the agreement, and informed him defiantly:

> that they should goe over their bellies; yea that they would die, before they would suffer these Arminian persecuting curates to re-enter the churches again, especially seeing the delivery of the land from such

---

118 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, Second Collection of Papers, 'Relating to the practice of the Rabble, after the Prince's Declaration against some Ministers who were later deprived by the council', signed by James Gibson, John Gilhagie, Patrick Bell, magistrates of Glasgow, p.50.

119 ibid.

120 ibid.

121 NLS, Wodrow MSS, 4to, 73, f9-12.

> persecuters was one particular case of the Prince of Orange's expedition into Brittain, mentioned in the declaration.[122]

This indicates the importance of the Prince's declaration to the Presbyterians. An affray ensued in which several of the women were seriously wounded. The news went round the city in a flash, and Cameronians who were in the Glasgow area were summoned for assistance, led by Kersland, and began beating drums through the town, the traditional signal to muster. The Presbyterians in the meeting houses were alerted and all marched, Cameronians and Presbyterians together, armed, towards the Cathedral in a body.[123]

The Episcopal version of the story ignores the earlier incident with the women. It begins at the point when the bells were being rung and 'that great Body of People that keep still very stedfast in frequenting the Assemblies of the Church' began making their way to the service. These were threatened with violence as they went, one minister was chased with clubs and sticks into a house. The account does however make an oblique reference to the fact that earlier, the bells were hindered from being rung. The culprits were those Presbyterians 'that go to the hills and the Meeting houses' i.e., a combined force of Cameronians and regular Presbyterians.[124] When the Episcopal congregation reached the Cathedral it was met by a large mob of 'rude' people, armed with sticks and stones who refused to disperse and returned 'scolding and bloody language'. John Bell, late bailie, was given a severe blow; upon which Gibson ordered the Town's Officers to clear a way and disperse the mob so that the congregation could enter the church 'peaceably'.[125]

---

122 ibid.

123 ibid.

124 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, Second Collection of Papers, p.50-51.

125 ibid.

However, during the service the fury of the city continued to rise. Gibson had fatally miscalculated the strength of feeling, thus putting the lives at risk of the congregation, which included women and children, now trapped inside the Cathedral, literally barricaded behind its stout doors. The service was suddenly interrupted half way through by Crawford, who burst in saying that the 'town was in arms' but was calmly answered 'that 500 or 600 people of the best quality in town were seated in Church, to the service of God',[126] and that if the town was in arms, it behoved him as the Captain of the guard, to do something about it. Inglis continued with his preaching.

The more responsible element of the citizenry outside, meanwhile, fearing a bloodbath, had summoned the assistance of Kersland, to act as a negotiator with those inside the Cathedral, and to control 'the mountain folk' gathered outside, over whom he had considerable influence.[127] With Kersland's help, a deal was struck whereby the injured women were to receive compensation, and those who had attacked them in breach of the previous agreement for keeping the peace, were to face legal process for their actions. In return, all inside the Cathedral would be given a safe conduct home. Both versions agree on these points.[128]

The Episcopal version has it that after the meeting houses emptied, they joined with the burgh militia and the Cameronians amassed outside the Cathedral in a great body under the command of Kersland.[129] Both versions agree that things thereafter went badly wrong; the Presbyterians claiming that unfortunately some of the mob, relatives of the women, could not be prevented from seeking revenge on the

---

126 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, Second Collection of Papers, p.52.

127 NLS, Wodrow MSS, 4to, 73, f9-12.

128 Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, Second Collection of Papers, p.52

129 ibid..

congregation as it emptied; the Episcopalians claiming that the attempt was deliberately botched and that the promise of safe conduct was never sincere. People were hurried out in fives and sixes and exposed to the fury of the mob. Lord Boyd was roughly treated; Sir John Bell was pelted with over 100 snowballs; Walkinshaw of Barrowfield and his wife, along with his two brothers, James and William, were beaten to the ground five or six times; James Corbett received a dangerous head injury from a blow with a scythe; George Graham, late bailie, was likewise cut in the head in two places; Dr Wright and his wife, with her mother and two sisters, were very roughly treated; as was Anna Paterson, the Archbishop's daughter and Margaret Fleming and several other gentlewomen, who were 'cruelly pinched' and had the clothes torn off them.[130]

The above graphic account has been related in some detail in order to indicate the scale of the violence. The reference to scythes and to head wounds indicate potential fatalities. It also indicates the rustic identity of the attackers; no reference was made to swords, halberts or firearms. Further, a congregation of 500-600 prepared to risk injury represents a sizeable minority of Glasgow's 12,000 population and the presence of so many dignitaries within it supports Thomas Morer's claim that even though Glasgow was a Presbyterian stronghold, yet:

> the most considerable, and persons of the best quality are very well affected and would prevail were it not for the assistance of the mountaineers which the malignants have sometimes brought into the town to assault and over-awe the others.[131]

---

130 ibid., p.53.

131 Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 1st letter (Thomas Morer), p.2.

Following this incident the remaining Episcopal clergy melted away, mainly to Edinburgh, where their brethren retained possession of the churches for a further year. In Glasgow, on application to the Estates the Presbyterians gained formal control of the city's pulpits on 13 May 1689 - a full year before Presbyterianism became legally established.[132] At Edinburgh the curates could not be rabbled out but were deposed by acts of the Privy Council and Presbytery in 1690. However the Presbyterians of Glasgow and Edinburgh were in constant correspondence throughout the winter of 1688-89. Troops from the west were sent on a daily basis and fearing an insurgence, the Edinburgh magistrates invited the College of Justice in January, (gentlemen of 'liberal and generous education'), to form a militia to protect the city's pulpits because they did not trust the loyalty of their ordinary guards.[133] This lawyers' militia however promptly disbanded on receiving William's second declaration in the middle of February.

The most prominent impact of the west however was the 6000-8000 strong 'Covenanter' army from Glasgow, Argyll and other western shires sent to guard the Estates under the command of the Earl of Leven until the regular army under Major General Mackay arrived.[134] Clearly this was a very large force, especially by Scottish standards, and there can be little doubt that it exercised an impact on the membership and conduct of the house.[135] Part of it comprised a 500 strong contingent under John

---

132 *Charters and other documents relating to the city of Glasgow*, vol. ii, ed. Sir James Marwick, SBRS, (Glasgow, 1906), henceforth, *Glas. Chtrs.*, (886), p. 394; *APS*, vol. ix, App., p.22.

133 Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, 2nd letter, p.22.

134 The size of the Covenanter army is variously given as 6000, 7000, and 8000, viz.: SHS, *An Account of the Proceedings of the Estates in Scotland*, 1689-1690, third series, vol. xlvi, 2 vols., i, (Edinburgh, 1954), p.10, gives it as 6000. Bannatyne Club, *The Siege of The Castle of Edinburgh*, p.37, gives it as 7000. Sage, *Present afflicted clergy*, Second Collection of Papers, p.91, gives it as 8000.

135 Mathieson, *Politics and Religion*, p.349; L K Glassey, 'William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland 1688-1690', p.325. Opinion on this vital point is divided. I B Cowan and W Ferguson state that the numbers of 'Williamites' to 'Jacobites' in the Convention were about even though Cowan concedes attempts had been made by Presbyterians to influence its composition. I B Cowan, 'The Reluctant Revolutionaries', pp.76-77; W Ferguson, *Scotland 1689 to the Present*, p.2. Most sources focus on the fact that monarchical allegiance was fluid; but that

Anderson of Dowhill carrying a banner in William's name.[136] An English observer at the Estates admired the civic virtue of these west country men, who would take no pay for their services, 'declaring that they came only to save and serve their country and not to impoverish it'. They had as their colours a bible and some other devices with the words 'For Reformation according to the word of God'.[137] By order of the Estates, the Glasgow contingent was sent to Stirling on 23 March to secure more arms with which to protect the west from an Irish attack, and these, sufficient for 4000 men, were housed in the Tolbooth of Glasgow. The Glasgow men however encountered resistance from the magistrates of Stirling, still loyal to King James, and arrangements had to be made to bring the arms to Glasgow under separate escort.[138] Within Glasgow itself, the key to the west, new militia units were raised under William Napier, Dean of Guild, Hugh Montgomerie, John Hall, John Colquhoun, Thomas Crawford of Crawfordsburn and James Peadie of Ruchill, some of the former officers in King James's militia. Others though, like ex-Provost Sir John Bell, a Jacobite, were not given fresh commissions. It was also proposed to equip two merchant ships as frigates to patrol the Clyde, the

---

cultural and political attitudes (i.e., whether 'whiggish' or not; whether Presbyterian or Episcopalian) were only approximately linked to support for either monarch; i.e., Williamite Episcopalians existed. Lynch states only 1000 Covenanters protected the Convention. Michael Lynch, *Scotland A New History*, p.302; T Clarke, 'The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland', RSCHS, 24, Pt i, (1990). Evidence of Presbyterian Jacobitism is fragmentary and only emerges after dissatisfaction with William's reign had set in. J Halliday, 'The Club and the Revolution in Scotland, 1689-1690', SHR, 45 (1966). The fluidity of the situation is best put by Riley. P W J Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, 'Introduction', p.6-7.

136 NAS, GD26.7.278, (3 docs.), 'Petition from the town of Glasgow desyring liberty to choice their own magistrates', 1689.

137 SHS, *Proceedings of the Estates in Scotland*, i, p.21. W Mcmillan considered that these Covenanter flags dated from the Revolution, not earlier. On 13 February a General Meeting at Crawfordjohn decided to send a force to protect the Estates. This had flags. W Mcmillan, 'The Covenanters after the Revolution of 1688', vol. x, RSCHS (1950), p.143.

138 *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, (876), 22 March 1689 p392; *APS*, vol. ix, pp.18, 19; *Glas. Chtrs.*, (880), 2 April 1689, p.393; *APS* (1689, c.21), vol. ix, p.32.

Pelican and the Janet, owned by Provost Walter Gibson, who thus ingratiated himself with the new regime.[139]

In all this activity the city of Glasgow and its commissioner occupied a key position since the primary arena of engagement was in the west. Anderson was appointed to the committee to consider the state of the government, and in 1690, to the committee for settling church government.[140] In April the Estates ordered fresh elections in royal burghs, and at length, after some difficulty with the Duke of Hamilton who pretended a right to the election of the magistrates of Glasgow 'in the vacancie of the bishopric', the city was granted a free election by the poll of all the burgesses which took place on 3 July (Appendix I).[141] The July election however left the city with a council and bailies but without a Provost. Anderson however continued to act in that capacity until the Michaelmas elections in the autumn, by which he was unanimously returned. Hamilton's action was constitutional and he claimed he was acting to protect the King's interest; but Anderson's letter to Melville of 25 June indicated that a royal agreement had already been reached:

> Now my Lord, this is neither conform to the king's mind, nor to the town's privilege; for the king's mind is, that we should have full and

---

139 *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, (876, 877, 882, 884, 895), pp. 392-396.

140 SHS, *Proceedings of the Estates*, i, 20; ii, p.161.

141 *Leven and Melville Papers: letters and state papers chiefly addressed to George Earl of Melville, Secretary of State for Scotland, 1689-91*, ed. W. L. Melville, Bannatyne Club, (1843), Andrew Kennedy of Cloburne to William Denham of Westmill in London, 22 June 1689, p.74; John Anderson of Dowhill, Lord Provost of Glasgow, and Robert Spreull, to Lord Melville, Edinburgh, 25 June 1689, p.85-6; Duke of Hamilton to Lord Melville, Holyrood House, Edinburgh, 4 July 1689 p.142-3; Duke of Hamilton to Melville, Holyrood House, Edinburgh, 6 July 1689, p.144. *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, (883), p.394; *APS* (1689, c. 48), vol. ix, p.49; *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, (887), p.394; *APS* (1689, c. 95), vol. ix, p.92; *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, (888), p.395; *RPC*, vol. 1689, p.72; *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, (889), p.395; *RPC*, vol. 1689, p.80; *BRG* 3/7/1689, p.425-427.

> ample liberty to elect our magistrates as freely as any other burgh in the kingdom, and carries no restriction...[142]

A letter to the magistrates and council of Glasgow dated 19 September 1689 allowed the town council to elect their own provost and magistrates for the coming year. In this King William recognised 'the particular service done to us by that our city, and of the zeale and affection wee are well assured you have for us'. Indeed that Glasgow 'deserves better at King William's hands than any town in Scotland' was recognised by others.[143] The King's letter was eventually followed by a charter of 4 January 1690 granting that right for all time, ratified by an act of parliament 14 June 1690.[144]

The 'town of Glasgow' had made plainer than any other city in Scotland its loyalty to King William, beginning with the reading of the Prince's declaration to the Scots on 25 December 1688. In their petition to the king for a free constitution, after they were obstructed by Hamilton, the petitioners had stated that Glasgow had been:

> ...the first city in all Scotland that appeared for and published your Majesty's declaration, and took armes in defense of your Majesty's interest, and the publick good and peace of the Natione, Displaying a Banner in your Majesty's name...[145]

Morover,

---

142 *Leven and Melville Papers*, John Anderson of Dowhill, Lord Provost of Glasgow, and Robert Spreull to Melville, 25 June 1689, Edinburgh, pp.85-6.

143 *Leven and Melville Papers*, Andrew Kennedy of Cloburne to William Denham of Westhill, Edinburgh, 22 June 1689, p.74.

144 *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, 'Letter from King William authorising the Town Council to choose their Provost and Magistrates', 19 September 1689, no.CLVII, p.235; *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, 'Charter by King William and Queen Mary confirming the rights and privileges of the City of Glasgow', 4 January 1690, no.CLVIII, pp. 236-239; *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, 'Act of parliament ratifying to the City of Glasgow the Charter no. CLVIII', 14 June 1690, CLIX, pp. 239-240; *APS* (1690, c.18), vol., ix, p.153.

145 NAS, GD26.7.278, 'Petition from the town of Glasgow', (1689).

> ...When the conventions of the Estates was to meet at Edinburgh there being an apparent danger to them without Guards, the Citty of Glasgow sent in about 500 men ... which together with many more from the west countrie were the first guards to preserve the Estates...[146]

It is therefore clear that a profound change had taken place in Glasgow in the autumn of 1688 and that decisive offensive action had been taken to secure a military advantage as the rest of the country lay paralysed by indecision. In Glasgow at least, the Revolution really was a revolution, especially as considerable uncertainties remained within the burgh regarding its minority Jacobites. Whilst elements of the former regime such as Walter Gibson were prepared to accept the new order and even tried to curry favour with it, others formed counter-revolutionary strategies. This came to the fore on 20 February 1690, when a plot to bring over King James from Ireland was uncovered at Glasgow following the arrest of a Jacobite spy, Mr. Alexander Strachan.[147] About the same time Gavin Littlejohn, painter in Glasgow, was arrested for his part in an arson attempt involving about 80-100 others, including some soldiers, to fire the town.[148]

Strachan was remarkably free with his information when interrogated and revealed details of a projected invasion of Scotland under the Duke of Berwick, launched from Ireland. Part of his mission was to deliver some letters from the exiled king to the dowager Lady Erroll, hidden inside a pair of shoes. He was sent from Dublin by King James at the end of January in order to report on the situation in

---

146 ibid.

147 Strachan was a Roman Catholic and the son of the minister of Birse, educated at Aberdeen and St Andrews. He had been a tutor to the earl of Nithsdale for two and a half years, before going to London in 1688, then Paris, and latterly Flanders, where he was given a letter for lord Melfort from Mr Innes of the Scots College in Paris. In May 1689 he went over with the French fleet to Bantry Bay to join James in Ireland. From there he went to Dublin, then Galway, where he was in touch with Seaforth, before embarking for Glasgow; *Leven and Melville Papers*, no. 337, Earl of Argyll to Melville, 20 February 1690, p.409; NAS, GD26.7.49.

148 *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, (912), p.400.

Scotland on the advice of one Thomas Bell.[149] James had little intelligence of affairs in Scotland; any information he had came from France. Whilst at Glasgow he made contact with one of the former regents at the university, Mr. Alexander Gordon,[150] to whom he gave the shoes, and a Mr. Milne. Milne's identity has not been established, but his designation 'Mr' suggests he was possibly one of the three ministers of that name in the Presbytery of Glasgow; either Alexander Milne, Episcopal minister at Glasgow; David Milne, Episcopal minister of Cadder; or more probably George Milne, Episcopal minister of Campsie, who in July 1689 had been held on suspicion of being involved in an attempt at Edinburgh to overthrow the parliament by a series of explosions and arson attacks but was later released.[151]

Strachan's confession implicated Colin Bell, the son of Sir John Bell, the ex-provost of Glasgow who had sent one of his ships, the Mary of Glasgow, to Dublin a couple of weeks after Strachan's arrest[152] on some mysterious errand which involved the ship sailing without an outward cargo, except some unknown passengers who boarded the vessel in the early hours of the morning as she lay at anchor in the Clyde. A 'Captain Bell' was also implicated by Littlejohn in the arson attempt and may be linked. The *Mary*'s crew, hired at Leith, were told the ship was going to Bristol and were not involved in the plot. The passengers, about 35 in all, were Jacobite rebels

---

149 Thomas Bell may have been a further member of the Bell clan. In one report, it was stated that 'the three Bells' were brought in prisoner from the *Mary*. SHS, *Proceedings of the Estates in Scotland*, ii, p.130.

150 *Leven and Melville Papers*, no. 337, Earl of Argyll to Melville, Edinburgh, 20 February 1690, p.409; no. 338, Privy Council to Melville, 20 February 1690, p.410. See also SHS, *Proceedings of the Estates in Scotland*, ii, p.111.

151 SHS, *Proceedings of the Estates in Scotland*, p.161.

152 'Declairs that he knew the ship belonging to Mr Bell was not going to France but comeing straight to Scotland'. Strachan's confession, before a sub-committee of the Privy Council appointed to examine him, 18th July 1690, NAS GD26.7.49. One of those interrogating Strachan was Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie, himself involved in Jacobite intrigue.

from the north west Highlands going to Ireland to join King James.[153] The ship, however, was seized by an English frigate as she entered Dublin Bay. Letters and money totalling some L8000 were also found on board. Many of those who were seized with them, such as Mr. Forrester, a minister, and one Dunbar, a gunner at Edinburgh Castle while it had been held by the Duke of Gordon the previous spring, had been involved in the plot to blow up the Convention of Estates in 1689.[154] Bell and his brother Patrick were arrested and imprisoned for many weeks at Blackness until questioned by the Privy Council on the 18 July but were released on bail.[155] Fragmentary though these intriguing details are, they indicate the general state of alert at Glasgow and also how insecure the new order was, even in the most loyal area in the country.

In conclusion, Glasgow played an important role in the Revolution in Scotland. The rabblings were an instrument of unofficial Whig policy and a necessary pre-amble to a Whig Revolution in Scotland. The preceding narrative throws up a number of questions, in the main, concerning the extent of a revolutionary agenda in Scotland. It is evident that a real attempt at overthrowing the existing order was made after the possibility presented itself in October, in which the militias in the west of Scotland originally raised for James, played a key role by reversing their loyalties, including the militia unit commanded by Crawfordsburn which refused to disband. The Whig interest which had lain dormant since Argyll's time easily revived under these conditions.

---

153 SHS, *Proceedings of the Estates in Scotland,* ii, p.123.

154 ibid.

155 NLS Wodrow MSS, 4to, 73, f10, 'Information anent the putting out of the curates in Glasgow in 1689'; SHS, *Proceedings of the Estates in Scotland*, ii, March 22nd 1690, p.125-126; August 12th 1690, p.256.

Evidence is also found of Presbyterians and Cameronians acting in concert with the disaffected militia units raised for James. The Cameronian element emerges as having had a significant role in delivering intelligence, providing military back-up, and formulating strategy.

The relative strength of the Episcopal party in Glasgow must be noted; 500-600 people from a population of about 12,000 is not an insignificant minority, especially when these were amongst the wealthier citizens.[156] Despite being 'the warmest nest of the Cameronians' the re-establishment of Presbyterianism still had to cross deeply-etched ideological lines and the Revolution regime was far from secure.[157]

---

156 Sage, *Account of the present persecution*, 3rd letter, p.58.

157 ibid.

Chapter Two

CIVITATIS DEI

The church at Glasgow 1687 - c.1740

'Lord let Glasgow flourish through the preaching of thy word'[1]

On 22 July 1689 Episcopacy was abolished in Scotland, shortly after the Claim of Right of 11 April had declared it to have been a 'great and insupportable grievance' since the Reformation. A further year elapsed however, before, on 7 June 1690, Presbyterianism finally became the established form of the Church of Scotland.[2] The new establishment was set up on an erastian basis, i.e. with a degree of state control. The monarch retained the power to call and dissolve its principle court and executive, the General Assembly. Further, the act establishing the Presbyterian form made no mention of the Covenants. Its confessional basis was settled as the Westminster Confession of Faith of 1643 and the larger and shorter catechisms. This did not mark it out from the previous Episcopal establishment 1662-1689, which had also implicitly accepted these standards.[3] And although the patron's power in filling vacancies was abolished, this did not effect his proprietorial rights regarding the teinds. Popular calls

---

1 This was the motto inscribed on the bell cast in Holland in 1637 for the Tron kirk steeple, ('Lord Let Glasgow Flovrische Throvgh The Preaching of Thy Word and [sic] Priasing Thy Name') and later adopted by Robert Sanders in 1663 as 'Lord let Glasgow flourish through the Preaching of thy Word'. Joe Fisher, *The Glasgow Encyclopaedia* (Edinburgh, 1994), p.82; David C Coghill, 'Old Glasgow Printers and Printing', *Transactions of the Old Glasgow Club*, vol. ii, (1900-1908), p.148.

2 APS., ix, p.104; APS., ix, p.133-4.

3 I.e., it had never expressly rejected them, and this was acknowledged by Episcopalian writers.'We still maintained what themselves; the same Articles of Faith ... all that was ever controverted amongst us was the point of

did not come in place of patronage as they had, briefly, during the high tide of Presbyterianism after 1648; but the power of appointment was to fall to parish committees consisting of heritors and elders. These were to consult with the congregation, which merely had a right of appeal to the Presbytery. But in royal burghs the power of the magistrates, town council and kirk sessions to call ministers was excepted in the act and these powers were to continue as they had been practised before the year 1660.[4] The re-establishment of Presbyterianism was therefore an erastian compromise. It was not the church of the Covenants.

At Glasgow, an entire change of civic regime having occurred by the Revolution, and in particular by the election by the free poll of all the burgesses on 3 July 1689, the clerical establishment reflected the Revolutioner outlook of its patrons under the firm hand of Provost John Anderson of Dowhill, a noted Presbyterian dissenter. The Episcopalians were ejected from the city's churches by the riot of 17 January 1689 and the use of the city's pulpits was effectively in the hands of the Revolutioners by the summer of 1689, if not before.[5]

For many years afterwards, however, despite the strength of the Revolutioner interest on the council, the church establishment at Glasgow remained on the defensive, even in the city which was openly acknowledged by the Episcopalians to have been 'the warmest nest of the Cameronians' and the only area in which they had real popular

---

church government'. John Sage, *An account of the present persecution of the Church in Scotland in several letters*, (John Sage), 2nd letter, (London, 1690) p.11.

4 APS., ix, p.196-7.

5 A previous concordat reached after the 17 January riot agreed that neither side should use the churches until the Estates' meeting in March 1689 decided the fate of the church establishment. This was broken at least once by the Episcopalians, on 17 February 1689. The burgh records show that the new council was taking charge of seat rents nearly a full year before Presbyterianism was established. *BRG*, 8/8/1689, p.429, p.430; 23/9/1689, p.432; 1/2/1690, p.439.

support.[6] The Presbyterian church started off from an extremely weak base nationally and this impacted on the city which was plagued by recruitment problems into the 1710s and 1720s. General economic difficulties did not assist matters; church building, although a priority (Wynd Church, 1687; Blackfriars Church, 1699; Ramshorn Church, 1724) reflected less the inhibitions of Puritanism than a distinct lack of cash. Moreover, an open struggle ensued with the Episcopalian interests in the burgh, which, though not strong numerically, when linked with more powerful interests, were sufficient to destabilise the Presbyterians and cause grave anxieties well into the eighteenth century. For all these reasons, the re-establishment of Presbyterianism at Glasgow in the first quarter century of its existence was not a confident one.

This chapter, in two parts, sets out to deal with the relative strengths and weaknesses of the two communions and to determine to what extent their interaction and common Calvinist origins affected the eventual outcome of the church at Glasgow. It also tries to assess what the impact of this interaction was on the political culture of the city.

Part I: *the Presbyterians of Glasgow*

It is important to state at the outset that Presbyterian re-organisation did not begin as a triumph of the Revolution in 1690, but three years earlier in much different circumstances, by the will of a Catholic king.

James's toleration to the Presbyterians of June 1687 was much criticised, both at the time, and afterwards. However it allowed Presbyterians to meet openly for the first

---

6 Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, (Thomas Morer), 1st letter, (London, 1690) p.2.

time since the last of Charles's indulgences were withdrawn in December 1684; the period from December 1684 to June 1687 marks the furthest low-water mark of the fortunes of the Presbyterians in Scotland. Thus James's unexpected liberty, when it arrived, was greeted with a mixture of horror and relief. The degree of religious compliance 1684-1687 had been almost total. Presbyterian ministers had been obliged to surrender their ministries and hear Episcopalian divines; and, it was mischievously claimed - more with satisfaction than resignation[7]. Only the Cameronians or Society People, kept up some semblance of open defiance, holding thinly attended meetings in the hills and other isolated places. Yet despite considerable pressures to conform, 'many who were no Cameronians' had continued to meet in secret, and meetings of non-conformists were not as rare in this dark interlude as Episcopalian propagandists afterwards represented.[8]

For this favour from a Catholic king, the address of 'the Pastors of the People of God in the west of Scotland' was suitably obsequious, and much satirised by Episcopalians for its 'high strains of flattery and vast Promises of Duty and Compli-ance', which far out-did that of 'honest Alsop in England'.[9] It appears to have come as a great shock to the Episcopal establishment that within a few weeks of the toleration, Presbyterian meeting-houses sprang up in many places, especially in the western shires, and the churches were drained of their congregations.[10] Robert Bell of Kilmarnock, the

---

7 Episcopal writers attempted to misrepresent this brief period of enforced comprehension. 'Some of the ablest of their Preachers (within a very few weeks before they embraced the Tolleration) said to some of the Regular Clergy, they should never do it; they were resolved never to Preach more in their lifetime'. Sage, *An account of the present persecution*; (John Sage), 2nd letter, p.11.

8 Gilbert Rule, *A second vindication of the Church of Scotland being an answer to five pamphlets*, (1691), p17.

9 Sage, *The case of the present afflicted clergy in Scotland truly represented in several collections* of papers, Fourth Collection of Papers, (London, 1690), p.80.

10 ibid.

son or nephew of Provost Sir John Bell of Glasgow, found himself preaching to an audience of twelve (out of a parish of two thousand five hundred). The rest of the parish heard their old minister, James Rowat, for whom a meeting-house was hastily built the instant the toleration was announced.[11] At Kirkinner the 'curate' fared even worse. He saw his congregation reduced to one, the laird of Baldoon, until he too joined the rest of the parish in the new meeting-house.[12]

The reason for the controversy over James's toleration was its attempt to disguise the earlier toleration, in February, to Roman Catholics, under a general banner of religious liberty. The toleration to Roman Catholics was widely perceived as the first step towards a catholicising policy. Nonetheless James's toleration to the Presbyterians was enthusiastically grasped by the majority who were now able to meet and worship according to their way, on condition they met in 'private houses, chapels or places purposely hired or built for that purpose', and duly notified the authorities[13]. No oaths were required. Field conventicles, however, continued to be expressly forbidden. The proclamation of toleration in February was accompanied by strict instructions to the Privy Council to 'root out with all the severities of our laws,' 'those enemies of Christianity as well as government and human society, the field conventiclers'.[14]

Compliance with James's toleration thus increased the already acrimonious divisions between the moderate Presbyterians, demoralised by religious persecution since the putative rising of 1679, and the armed, roaming, fundamentalist Cameronians

---

11 Rule, *A second vindication of the Church of Scotland*, p.30.

12 Ian B. Cowan, *The Scottish Covenanters 1660-1688*, London, 1976, p.134.

13 *R.P.C.*, 3rd series, xiii, pp. 156-8

14 William Croft Dickinson and Gordon Donaldson (eds.), *A Source Book of Scottish History*, 3 vols., iii, (London, 1954), pp. 194-195.

hiding in the hills, who by their renewed Sanquhar declaration of 1685, denied the Catholic King James's authority and accepted only the headship of Christ in church and state.[15]

The toleration had asked for nothing to be preached at meetings which might 'tend to alienate the hearts of our people from us, our government'. Outwardly this was a reasonable and innocuous request. Taken in conjunction with the other preconditions, however, such as the right of free access of all and sundry to Presbyterian meetings, and the obligation to notify the authorities of the dates and venues, it effectively meant that the authorities were to be allowed to send agents to monitor proceedings closely.

It would thus appear, both from the express terms of James's toleration to the Presbyterians, and the criticisms of opponents, that the principle of state interference in the church, erastianism, had been reluctantly accepted by the majority of Presbyterians before the Revolution; and that the leadership had indeed, 'fallen in love with moderation'.[16] Despite this self-evident truth, however, attempts to castigate mainstream Presbyterians with the excesses of their rebellious Cameronian brethren continued to be made by the Episcopalian side for many years to come and were largely successful due to the hostility of the Anglican church towards Presbyterianism.[17]

The acceptance (under duress) of James's erastian toleration in 1687 was a defining moment in Presbyterian church history and led to much soul-searching for decades after the Revolution. Whilst the fact of erastianism was tacitly accepted, it was

---

15 Robert Wodrow, The *History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the Restoration to the Revolution*, 4 vols., iv, (Glasgow, 1828-1830), p.446. The Sanquhar declaration was penned by their minister, Rev. James Renwick (1662-1688) and publicly proclaimed, 28 May 1685, at Sanquhar with about 200 of his followers.

16 Sage, *An account of the present persecution*, (John Sage), 2nd letter, p.8.

17 Thomas Maxwell, 'The Presbyterian-Episcopalian Controversy in Scotland from the Revolution Settlement to the Accession of George I', Edinburgh University Ph.D. thesis, (1954), p.3.

never openly admitted, never lauded nor raised to the level of a religious canon. In fact it was source of shame. In the long term this schizophrenic position between what was asserted in Calvinist orthodoxy and what was followed in practice led to ideological incoherence, weakness and fragmentation. Fifty years later, at the formation of the Associate Presbytery, the Erskine brothers, the Revs. Ralph and Ebeneezer, claimed it had been 'one of our publick national sins' which had been 'stumbling to many' at the time, and was in their estimation, the root cause of current dissenssions in the church.[18] The failure to make an ideological adjustment to changed times, to effect some kind of post-Revolutionary neo-Calvinist revisionism covering the current relationship of church and state in the godly commonwealth, can certainly be viewed as a central failing of the post-Revolutionary church; although the Rev. James Clark's weak attempt in 1702 to define 'personal covenanting' and his presentation of the intrinsic power in the Church of Scotland as compatible with a civil constitution, can certainly be seen as a step in that direction.[19]

When the first meeting of the reconstituted Synod of Glasgow and Ayr convened in Glasgow at the end of August 1687[20], it was apparent that several who had been ministers and elders in the former Presbyterian time were still alive, and these

---

18 'Act, Declaration and Testimony for the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland, by some ministers associate together for the exercise of church government and discipline, in a presbyterial capacity', (Edinburgh, 1737), pp. 46, 47; quoted in, 'Synod Book of Glasgow and Ayr, 30th August 1687 - 12th October 1704', *Maitland Miscellany*, iv, Maitland Club, i.

19 Rev. James Clark, minister of the Tron Church, Glasgow, 1701-1723, *The Communicants Best Token*, (Edinburgh, 1702). This attempted to define various types of contractarian covenanting, such as 'personal covenanting', 'congregational covenanting', and 'family covenanting', as well as 'national covenanting'. *Presbyterial government as now established and practised in the Church of Scotland, methodically described, specially of the Church's intrinsic power*, (1701, 1703, 1717). See also John Warrick's comments in *The Moderators of the Church of Scotland from 1690-1740*, Edinburgh, 1913, p.19; about the paucity of theological writing in the first 25 years after the re-establishment of Presbyterianism. Also James Moore, 'The Two Systems of Francis Hutcheson: on the origins of the Scottish Enlightenment', *in Studies in the Philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment*, ed. M. A. Stewart, (Oxford, 1990), for his comments about the establishment of the out-moded 'reformed scholasticism' in the theology curriculum after the Revolution, a move which he attributes to James Wodrow at Glasgow and George Campbell at Edinburgh.

20 *Maitland Miscellany*, 'Synod Book of Glasgow and Ayr, 30th August 1687 - 12th October 1704'.

formed important links with the past. These surviving 'antediluvians'[21] were former Protestors outed by the act of Glasgow in 1662. Only a handful convened at the initial meeting in August 1687, but by the next Synod in April 1688, 20 ministers and 6 elders had gathered, and by October, as more continued to be released from prisons or returned from exile, such as Rev. Patrick Warner, called to Irvine from Holland in 1688,[22]the names of 36 ministers and 13 elders are found in the sederunt, and by April 1689, 42 ministers and 12 elders.[23] New ministers were ordained from the autumn of 1687 onwards. It is therefore clear that Presbyterian re-organisation was rapid in the west of Scotland and that by the eve of the Revolution in October 1688, a shadow ministry lay poised in waiting in the hastily-constructed timber meeting-houses.

The presence of the learned and even-tempered Ralph Rogers (1625-1689), minister of Glasgow 1659-1662, in the vanguard of Presbyterian reconstruction in the city,[24] is significant in indicating the politically moderate (though theologically orthodox) direction taken by the 'united Presbytery of Glasgow, Pasely and Dunbritton' from these early days onwards. Although a former Protestor, Rogers had been amongst the first 42 Presbyterian ministers to receive an indulgence in 1669, the contentious policy which had bitterly divided the Presbyterians in the 1670s. The critical writings of another Glasgow Protestor, the Dutch exile Robert McWard (d.1683), minister of the Tron Church from 1656-1661, fanned the controversy over the indulgences even further. McWard's views on the kirk's intrinsic power vis a vis became the inspiration

---

21 So-called because they had known the times before the flood of Episcopacy had lain waste the land.

22 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.435.

23 *Maitland Miscellany*, 'Synod book of Glasgow and Ayr, 30th August 1687 - 12th October 1704', iv, i, pp. 215, 224, 240.

24 A character sketch of Rogers is given in Robert Wodrow, *Analecta; or materials for a History of Remarkable Providences, mostly relating to Scotch ministers and Christians*, 4 vols., iii, Maitland Club, (Edinburgh, 1843), pp. 46, 247.

for Richard Cameron (1648-1680) and throughout the 1680s the Cameronians radicalised opinion, condemning the indulged and those who heard them as sinful and ungodly. At the same time their armed combat role as guerrilla fighters attacking the soldiers sent to collect the government's cess and to mop up what remained of dissent, provoked a government backlash against all Presbyterians in general.[25] The main victims of the 'killing times' of the 1680s were thus the theologically radical but politically moderate peaceable majority of the west of Scotland prepared to live on civil terms with the government. Another major figure in the continuing militant Presbyterian struggle after Bothwell was Donald Cargill (1619-1681), minister of the Barony parish of Glasgow 1655-1662, a former Protestor, and Cameron's elderly but energetic associate. The presence of McWard, Cargill, John Carstairs[26] and Rogers in the former Presbytery of Glasgow, indicates that despite being a Protestor stronghold, it contained both moderates and radicals.

Little affection was thus felt by Rogers and his colleagues for the Cameronians, especially as, in January 1688, their minister, James Renwick (1662-1688), drew up a paper condemning the recent toleration.[27] When in July 1688, it was reported that two theology students supported by the Cameronians, William Boyd (1658-1741) and

---

25 Hector Macpherson, 'The Political Ideals of the Covenaters 1660-1688', *RSCHS*, vol. i, part iv, (1926), p.230; 'The policy of passive resistance had all but paralysed the Government in the seventies; the policy of active resistance not only divided the covenanters but gave the Government the excuse for intensifying the persecution with redoubled fury'.

26 The father of William Carstairs, Principal of Edinburgh University 1703-1715. For a profile of John Carstairs's moderate outlook, an excellent biography is presented by W L Mathieson, *Politics and Religion, a study in Scottish history from the Reformation to the Revolution*, 2 vols., ii, (Glasgow, 1902), pp. 341-343. Most notably: 'when examined by the Privy Council with reference to his attitude towards the Cameronians, Carstairs "said he could not express his abominating their extremities with vehemency enough" ', ibid., p.343.

27 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.446. Renwick's paper was entitled 'The testimony of some persecuted presbyterian ministers against the toleration'. Shortly afterwards he was apprehended in Edinburgh and executed, leaving the Cameronians without a minister.

Alexander Shields (c.1660-1700), had recently been ordained in Holland,[28] Rogers was asked to write to those responsible, to see how best any further such irregularities could be prevented in future[29].

Shields and Boyd were not however as distant from Rogers's position as he imagined and were yet to serve the ends for which all Presbyterians had fought. Five months later Rev. Boyd made history at Glasgow when he became the first person in Scotland to publicly proclaim the declaration of the Prince of Orange to the Scots from the head of the Tolbooth stair, an event which signalled the rabbling of the Episcopal clergy from the Presbytery of Glasgow and the turning point of the Revolution in Scotland. Moreover, Boyd, Shields and Thomas Linning, the three Cameronian ministers, opted to set past differences aside and joined the established church in December 1690, Boyd living quietly after the Revolution as the minister of Dalry until his death in 1741.[30]

Rogers, in accepting an indulgence at Kilwinning, (a position he held for 14 years), was a guinea-pig in an uncertain experiment.[31] Only afterwards, largely due to McWard's efforts, did the policy of the indulgences became less acceptable. In 1672, when five others of the former Presbytery of Glasgow were offered indulgences, including Donald Cargill and the remarkable Andrew Morton (1616-1691), Rogers's colleague in 1687, all pointedly refused (Table 1). In all, four 'antediluvian' ministers in the Presbytery of Glasgow (16 charges), survived until the Revolution, all former

---

28 *Maitland Miscellany*, 'Synod Book of Glasgow and Ayr, 30th August 1687 - 12th October 1704', p.237.

29 Copies were sent to William Carstairs, David Blair and Robert Fleming.

30 *Caledonian Mercury*, no. 3291, 30/4/1741, obituary notice.

31 Wodrow, *History of the Sufferings*, iv, p.41; Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae*, 7 vols., iii, 'Synod of Glasgow and Ayr', (Edinburgh, 1915-1928), p.457.

Protestors, and three of these, Morton, Rogers and John Dickson (c.1629-1700)[32], minister of Rutherglen and Polmadie, resumed their former charges - Rogers shuttling between Glasgow and Kilwinning. The fourth, John Law, accepted a call to the High Kirk in Edinburgh in 1690.[33]

To summarise, Glasgow had strong connections with Presbyterian radicalism and the continuity of this tradition extended from the 1650s to the Revolution. However both Presbyterian rationalist moderatism of the kind exemplified by John Carstairs and Ralph Rogers, and militant Cameronian hyper-Calvinism as typified by Cameron and Cargill, can be said to have Glasgow Protestor origins. After the Revolution, whether due to the militancy of the Presbyterian tradition at Glasgow, religious clashes in the city, or to other difficulties associated with a large urban parish, the city continued to suffer from recruitment problems despite considerable efforts on the part of the magistrates and General Session to secure ministers, and the fact that Glasgow offered one of the highest stipends in Scotland. In the late 1690s a sixth charge was created but for much of this decade the city struggled to fill five charges. The 1700s were then blighted by the untimely deaths of three promising younger ministers, David Brown, Alexander Main and Alexander Wodrow, (son of the professor of divinity, and brother of the historian of the church). For several years

---

32 Dickson appears to have held strong views and was an early target of the Restoration, being first imprisoned 13 October 1660 for 'seditious' sermons against the government. Deprived in 1662, he became a field preacher in the 1660s, was eventually brought before the Privy Council, and imprisoned for a number of years 1680-1686. He was the author of a number of tracts:
(1) *To some Friends when a Prisoner in the Bass*, (Edinburgh, 1739).
(2) *To a Person a little before his Death*, (Edinburgh, 1739).
(3) *Testimony to the Doctrine, etc., of the Church of Scotland*, (1684).
(4) *Sermon at the Opening of the Synod*, (1698).
Wodrow, *History*, i, p.80; ii, p.153; iii, p.196. Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p.487.

33 Wodrow, *History*, ii, pp. 270, 336, 418, iii, pp. 17, 58; Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p.376. Law was ordained by the Protestors at Campsie in 1656 and imprisoned in the Bass in 1679.

between 1690 and 1713 the city had only three or four ministers and not until 1717 was a sixth charge permanently settled.

How far this can be attributed to the militancy of Presbyterianism at Glasgow or to other social factors, can only be guessed at, but a complaint given in to the Synod by the four over-worked ministers of the city in 1693, hinted that potential recruits were put off a Glasgow charge, because Glasgow's citizens were viewed as 'difficult'. There are indications in the ministers' ingenuous account that Glasgow in the 1690s was seething with social and religious tensions even before the dearth arrived in 1695 to worsen matters. A limited degree of religious pluralism is also evident from the ministers' descriptions; both Quakers and 'curates' are mentioned. But the 'curates' mentioned as attending the visiting troops, or the Quakers who clung on determinedly[34], were only some of the problems. This ministers' letter is worth quoting at length, despite its poor syntax:

> 'And as for the young men, they are so terrified by their shyness of them that have been of a long standing in the ministry, in their reasons against coming to Glasgow, doe so aggravat the difficulties of being ministers there, and their unfitness for such charge, that the young men are (sic., prevented) from looking near it; and being at their oune freedome, choose to accept of calls to any country place ... they having also bad reports of the people of Glasgow as if they were untractable and

34 A Quaker meeting-house was plundered and its seats carried off on the 12 November 1688 at Glasgow by a group of Presbyterian church elders 'attended with the rude rabble of the town'. The Quakers petitioned the Privy Council that the rabblers had attacked them in their meeting house when convened for prayer, whose treatment of them 'had been liker French dragoons usage' and included 'beating, stoning, dragging, and the like', and was connived at by the magistrates. George Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow from the Revolution to the Reform Acts*, 3 vols., iii, (Glasgow, 1934), p.3. Quakers continue to be mentioned in the burgh records, e.g., a plea against a Quaker, Alexander Seaton, *BRG*, 1/8/1695, p.168. There was a Quaker burial ground at Partick, gifted to the Society of Friends by John Purdon in 1711 which continued in use until 1857. Aileen Smart, *The Villages of Glasgow*, (Edinburgh, 1988), pp. 149-150.

ungovernable, whereof the far greater part of the well-affected there, are as easy to guide as other people anywhere, and with whom ministers may live with as much contentment and comfort as any other natione. Also, what is objected, be true of the ill-affected, and of some well-inclined but ill-informed, that have taken groundless prejudices at ministers. But as the matter stands thus, Glasgow can gett ministers neither young nor old, nor of mid-age, tho they have made essays upon all to their great disappointment and grief'.[35]

Clearly, these restless, argumentative folk needed a strong hand. Particularly intriguing in this guileless account, aimed apparently, at refuting cultural stereotypes and not at confirming them, are the revelations that Glasgow contained both those who were 'well-affected' and those who were 'ill-affected'; but that even those who were 'well-affected', (presumably orthodox Presbyterians), were little easier to govern than those who were not. Then there is the equally tantalising comment about those who, though 'well-inclined,' were nonetheless apt to take 'groundless prejudices at ministers'.

The onerous task of training new generations of ministers was given to Robert Wodrow's father, James Wodrow (1637-1707), a position eventually rewarded by his appointment in 1692 to the chair of Divinity at Glasgow University. Wodrow combined this daunting task with his charge as a minister of the city from 1688-1691. Over the next 20 years, i.e., from 1687 until his death in 1707, he was said to have been responsible for instructing nearly 700 native students in their theological training, plus

35 NLS Wodrow MSS folio xxviii, (65), 'The Present State of Glasgow as to its need of ministers humbly represented to the Synod of Glasgow and Air mett at Air the 10th day of Jun. 1693'. The letter was signed by Alexander Hastie, Neil Gillies, James Brown and John Gray, the four ministers of Glasgow.

a further 200 from amongst the dissenters of England and Ireland.[36] His conservative teaching of theology, which was anchored in the 'reformed scholasticism' of the 1640s, noted above, ensured that orthodox Calvinism of the seventeenth century acquired an extended life well into the 1720s.

Those called to the city in the 1690s and 1700s evidently needed to be men of stout heart, boundless energy and unbending Calvinism. The principal clerical figures of the 1690s responsible for meeting this challenge were recruited for their strongly orthodox views by the Revolutioner council and were often older ministers who had a background in dissent. Men such as James Wodrow's successor, Alexander Hastie (c.1655-1711) minister of the east parish 1691-1711, who founded three theology bursaries at the university. Hastie had been suspected of being involved in Bothwell, and was imprisoned in 1680. On his release he went to Holland[37] but reappeared with the 9th earl of Argyll's rebellion in 1685. After its failure, he went into hiding and preached amongst the Society People until the toleration, although he never joined with James Renwick, or with the followers of Richard Cameron.[38] Wodrow mentions a number of other Presbyterian ministers in this category, amongst them, formerly indulged ministers such as Robert Langlands, future minister of the Barony parish of Glasgow 1691-1696, George Barclay, Adam Alcorn and John Moncrief, all of whom were heard in retired places in Kyle, Carrick and Galloway during 1685 and 1686.[39] Another fugitive left high and dry by Argyll's failed rising was the famous Alexander

---

36 Wodrow, *History of the Sufferings,* vol. i, pp. i-ii,

37 Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p.462.

38 Wodrow, *History*, iv, pp. 355, 415.

39ibid., iv, p.394.

Peden (d.1686), said to have the gift of prophecy; Langlands and Peden were often in hiding together in the summer of 1685.

Peden, like Hastie, never belonged to the Societies.[40] Former exiles like Hastie or Peden stranded by the failure of Argyll's attempt would appear to have had little option but to go into hiding amongst the Society People. But the presence of some of the formerly indulged ministers 1685-1687 indicates a significant shift; a preparedness to heal wounds and to re-consolidate what remained of Presbyterian dissent. Certainly the presence of these additional ministers and their general acceptability to the faithful in the Cameronian heartlands of the south and west led to a direct challenging of Robert Hamilton's lay leadership of the Cameronians and to a questioning of the policy of ostracising the indulged.[41] Significantly, amongst those cited by Wodrow as assisting Renwick in March 1686 in the Cameronian fight-back 'to regain the people who had been cast off by them', was one 'James Clerk'. (Wodrow gives no further details of the identity of this individual).[42]

A similar figure to Hastie was Neil Gillies (1638-1701), minister of the Tron Church 1690-1701, licensed in 1661, and who could, with justice, be described as an 'antediluvian'. He was once a chaplain to the 9th earl of Argyll but evidence of his compromising nature is found in his acceptance of an erastian indulgence at Cardross in 1679. Wodrow, however, describes him as being deeply religious and of an evangelical cast of mind[43].

---

40 W McMillan, 'The Covenanters after the Revolution of 1688', vol. x, *RSCHS*, (1950), pp. 143-149.

41 Wodrow, *History*, iv, pp. 393-394n; 'Robert Cathcart's information against Mr Renwick and his party, 1686'.

42 ibid., iv, p.394.

43 Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p.474.

A major stalwart in Glasgow who held a ministry in the city for nearly 37 years, (1693-1729), was one of James Wodrow's students, John Gray (d.1729), a Glasgow-born merchant's son who was ordained in the city in 1693 and owed his call to his father's influence. He was admitted to the Collegiate charge but from 1700-1729 was the minister of the Wynd Church. Robert Wodrow thought him very learned, 'an exact disciplinarian', and someone who would have made an excellent professor of divinity. Regarding James Wodrow's successor to the chair of divinity, 1707-1729, John Simson (c.1668-1740), Gray had lent him his support in his first process over Simson's alleged Arminianism, largely out of solidarity, but had not realised how unorthodox Simson's theology was until 1725 when his trinitarian views came under intense scrutiny. Gray's theology however was entirely orthodox, a product of his teacher, James Wodrow, and he was very able in 'Polemical Divinity'.[44] In short, when Gray died in 1729, Wodrow thought him very difficult to replace.

Little is known about James Brown (d.1714), minister of the north quarter from 1690, except that he faced persecution during the Restoration era and went to America, returning at the toleration in 1687. He was one of the earliest Presbyterian organisers in Glasgow, assisting Rogers and James Wodrow, originally called to one of the meeting houses in 1688 before being offered his charge in 1690.[45] During 1703, when the prospect of an Episcopalian toleration loomed large, and Glasgow saw renewed Episcopal re-organisation in the city, Brown locked pens with the Episcopalian Dr.

---

44 Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, pp. 432-433.

45 ibid.,, pp. 457-458.

John Hay, ex-minister of Falkland, in a lengthy pamphlet war after a chance encounter in a bookseller's shop in Edinburgh.[46]

Others, less influential or fleeting, were Robert Craighead (c.1633-1711), whom local difficulties in Ireland were probably behind his coming to Glasgow in June 1689, but who meanwhile eased the recruitment problems in the city. Craighead was St. Andrews educated but ordained in Donegal, and the author of several tracts.[47] He returned to Ireland in 1690 to his charge in Derry, but later, possibly in relation to a run-in with William King, the Bishop of Derry, came back to Glasgow 1698-1700 as the minister of the recently re-built Blackfriars Church.

Another Irish minister who came over in June 1689 and stayed for a couple of years, was Thomas Kennedy (1625-1714), Glasgow educated in the 1640s, but ordained at Dungannon, about whom little is known.[48]

John Christie was a young licentiate in 1696, called to the Wynd Church in March 1696 and later ordained there in 1697. Little is known about him; he was the first additional permanent minister to appear after the ministers made their 1693 protest to the Synod, but seems to have moved on quickly and was gone by 1700.[49] David Brown (1663-1704), however, the son of the minister of Craigie, was a promising recruit who died young, whom Wodrow thought blessed with a gift of popular oratory

---

46 *The Debate in the Shop*, see page 106, infra.

47 (1) *Answer to a Discourse concerning the Inventions of Man in the Worship of God*, (Edinburgh, 1694). Reply to William King, Bishop of Derry.
(2) *Advice to Communicants*, (Glasgow, nd., reprinted Edinburgh, nd).
(3) *Answer to the Bishop of Derry's Second Admonition*, (Edinburgh, 1697).
(4) *Warning and advice to the Christian*, (Edinburgh, 1701).
(5) *Advice for assurance and salvation*, (Belfast, 1702).
(6) *Walking with God*, (Belfast, 1712), posthumous.

48 Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p 454.

49 ibid., p.432.

whilst in his former charge at Neilston.[50] He had been one of the first ministers to be licensed by the Presbytery of Glasgow after the toleration and succeeded Craighead 1701-1704 at Blackfriars.[51]

In 1701, however, after Neil Gillies's death, the city received a fresh boost in the call to James Clark (d.1723), minister of the Tron Church 1702-1723, who was to play a very prominent role in clerical circles at Glasgow. Clark, James Brown (d.1714), and John Gray thus comprised the stalwarts of orthodox Calvinism and the backbone of the kirk at Glasgow during the critical reign of Queen Anne, and Clark and Gray's orthodox influence carried forwards into the 1720s and beyond.

Rev. James Clark was a major writer on Presbyterian themes; over 30 prints have been attributed to him 1685-1722, some of which went into multiple editions, plus a possible posthumous collection published in 1741 at the height of the west of Scotland evangelical revival known as the Cambuslang Wark.[52] Clark may have been the 'James Clerk' mentioned above by Wodrow as helping Renwick in March 1686. This was the year of his first known publication, *The Cross and the Crown*, written the year before, and republished in 1705; and Clark had other, lasting, links with radical Presbyterianism. Writing in 1713, Wodrow, referring to his ample publications, describes him as 'M'Millan's tool of guide'.[53] There is certainly firm and irrefutable evidence of Clark as a champion of orthodox Presbyterianism as his publications and biographical details indicate.

---

50 Wodrow, *Analecta*, i, pp60, 127.

51 Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p.399.

52 *The Christians Pocket-book: or, A Bundle of familiar exhortations on the practice of piety*, (1741), NLS catalogue attributes this collection to James Clark.

53 Thomas M'Crie, ed., *Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow, minister of Eastwood*, 2 vols., Wodrow Society, I, (Edinburgh, 1842-43), p.377: Wodrow to Rev. James Hart, minister in Edinburgh, 21/1/1713.

A merchant's son, he had graduated from Edinburgh University in 1680 but appears to have trained afterwards in book-keeping, possibly in Holland, as there were few opportunities for Presbyterians.[54] He eventually received ordination in 1688 at the meeting-house in Dunbar to which he had been called, and held several ministries in the east of Scotland before coming to Glasgow in 1702.[55] His position in 1690 on the former Episcopal establishment was strongly condemnatory and came under attack after the Episcopal minister of Oldhamstocks, John Gibson, was deposed by the Presbytery of Dunbar and Haddington. Clark was appointed to give the news of the deposition to Gibson's congregation, but the sermon he preached on that day, which was later published, raised such high offence as to prompt Dr. John Cockburn, the ejected Episcopalian minister of Ormiston, into an attack, in which he claimed even the ultra-orthodox Earl of Crawford was ashamed of Clark's print for its excesses.[56]

The call to Glasgow was probably due to the influence of his brother-in-law,[57] the current Provost, Hugh Montgomerie, who held the civic chair from 1701-1703, during a time of some considerable political turmoil in burgh politics at Glasgow.[58] Montgomerie was however no less a 'Revolutioner' than the ex-Provost whom he supplanted, and like his brother-in-law, he was a strict Calvinist.

---

54 W J Couper, 'The writings and controversies of James Clark, minister at Glasgow, 1702 -1724', *Records of the Glasgow Bibliographic Society*, vol. xi, (1933), p.73.

55 Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p.474.

56 James Clark, *A sermon preached at the kirk of Auldhamstocks, September 28 1690. On the occasion of the deposition of... Mr. John Gibson,* (Edinburgh, 1690). This was followed by:
(2) Dr. John Cockburn, *An historical relation of the late Presbytery* (1690), a reply to Clark, and:
(3) James Clark, *Master Clark Defended*, (1691), a reply to Cockburn.

57 Clark's first wife, Mary Johnston, daughter of Capt. Robert Johnston, merchant, (whom he had married in 1687), died on New Year's Day 1696. In 1699 he married Christian Montgomerie, daughter of the deceased Sir Robert Montgomerie of Skelmorlie, 9th baronet, and sister of Hugh Montgomerie, Provost of Glasgow and of the deceased Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie. Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p.474; W Fraser, *Memorials of the Montgomeries Earls of Eglinton*, 2 vols., I, (Edinburgh, 1859), p.163.

Clark and Montgomerie emerge as men of independent mind in the critical years 1701-1706. Both opposed the union. Clark condemned the negotiations in print[59]; Montgomerie, as commissioner for Glasgow, voted against the first article and the ratification of the treaty;[60] Clark was later accused by Defoe in his *History of the Union* (1709) of having caused the anti-union riots in Glasgow in 1706, a charge which he firmly denied.[61] Clark however dabbled in the political, and on several occasions was put in the position of defending his high-flying Calvinist orthodoxy against charges that it was impolitic, unstatesmanlike, or downright subversive.[62] He was also a staunch up-holder of the 'intrinsic power', i.e., the anti-erastian tendency which viewed the church's independence from the state as divinely ordained, and free to meet without state sanction. In his most well-known work however covering the intrinsic power and the government of the church, he had attempted to represent Presbyterianism as strictly constitutional and essentially moderate.[63] This indicates that despite his firm Calvinist principles, Clark was not unbendingly doctrinaire. In 1704, at a time of particular

---

58 *BRG*, 20/11/1701, p.338, 'magistrates and town council are unanimously of the opinion' that a call be drawn up for James Clark, and therefore decide to ask the moderator of the General Session to carry the call.

59 Clark wrote a pamphlet condemning the mercenary spirit and cowardice of Scotsmen first in selling their king, then perhaps, in selling their country, 'Roman arms could never do, what English craft and Scots silliness have done'. *Scotland's, Speech to her Sons*, (1706).

60 P W J Riley, *The Union of Scotland and England; a study in Anglo-Scottish politics of the eighteenth century*, Appendix A, (Manchester, 1978), p.332.

61 see Chapter Three, p.145, infra.

62 E.g. the three pamphlets published 1704-1706, and those in 1710. *A picture of the present generation*, a sermon, (Edinburgh, 1704); *A watchword to Scotland in perilous times*, (1704); *Scotland's speech to her sons*, (1706); *A seasonable warning or, some prognostics portending great storms and tempests in Britain*, (1710), *An advertisement from Scotland to England*, (1710).

63 Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past; Scottish Whig historians and the creation of an Anglo-British identity, 1689-c.1830*, (Cambridge, 1993), p.61; James Clark, *Presbyterial government as now established and practised in the Church of Scotland, methodically described, specially of the Church's Intrinsick Power*, (Edinburgh, 1701, 1703, 1717).

anxieties in the church, Clark came under fire for appearing to endorse erastianism.[64] Before the Assembly of 1704 met, he issued a pamphlet warning of excesses, and taking the cautious, loyalist line promoted by Carstairs.[65] When during a sermon at the Assembly Clark was heard to say, 'that the external, peaceable, and legal liberty we have for exercising our government is precarious, or dependent on the civil authority' he was immediately attacked for appearing to deny the intrinsic power and had to issue a defence,[66] in which he referred back to his earlier work where 'I plainly asserted the Intrinsick of the Church ... as being specifically distinct from the Magisterial Authority, and not dependent upon it'.[67] Clark therefore occupies a position somewhere between the Cameronians and the mainstream Presbyterians, a tenuous and uncomfortable territory he was often forced to defend. At times he appeared to vindicate the dissenters and at others, to condemn them.[68]

The authorship of many of his anonymous broadsides would have remained unknown had not Wodrow carefully indicated the author in his copy.[69] However, it seems unlikely that Wodrow was on close terms with Clark. M'Crie's two volume Correspondence contains no indication that they ever wrote, neither does the collection

---

64 The Assembly of 1703 had been adjourned by the Commissioner, Seafield, after efforts were made to assert its intrinsic power. Some young ministers planned a protest at the next Assembly, 1704.

65 James Clark, *A letter dropt in the street, which may be called a seasonable advertisement to the members of the ensuing General Assembly*, (1704).

66 James Clark, *A letter to a minister in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, explaining the passage in a sermon misconstrued by some*, (1704).

67 ibid.

68 Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past*, p.61, citing Clark's, *Presbyterian Government as now established and practised in the Church of Scotland methodically described, specially of the Church's intrinsick power*, (Edinburgh, 1701, 1703, 1717), pp. 7-8.

69 Couper, 'The writings and controversies of James Clark', pp. 73-95.

of Wodrow's early letters, edited by L. W. Sharp.[70] This may however be attributable to the fact that Eastwood, Wodrow's parish, was no great distance from Glasgow; the twice annual meetings of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, would have provided sufficient regular contact. But puzzling however is that Clark does not merit a single mention in all four volumes of Wodrow's *Analecta*, except for a passing reference in 1724 to his death, which is striking in its brevity.[71] This was despite Clark's prodigious output, his lengthy ministry at Glasgow spanning more than two decades, his orthodoxy, and his notoriety at the hands of Daniel Defoe in 1708-1710. The brief reference, noted previously, in one of his letters to Rev James Hart of Edinburgh in 1713, that he was 'M'Millan's tool or guide', may provide a clue[72]; or could it be that Wodrow, the great historian of the church, resented Clark as a rival?

Clark wrote on a variety of subjects, mainly on matters connected with the faith, practice and government of the Presbyterian Church, some of it evangelical, some of it intended as practical guidance,[73] and some of it, social and political comment. *The Plain Truth: a discourse on the duty of people to their pastors,* (1693, 1701) was the work for which he was much parodied by Rev. John Anderson of Dumbarton in an unpublished sermon delivered at the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr on 2 April 1718, during the height of the controversy over Anderson's call to Glasgow. Anderson claimed that Clark was maintaining the heretical principle of clerical infallibility in

---

70 M'Crie, *Wodrow Correspondence*; L. W. Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow 1698-1709*, SHS, third series, vol. xxiv, (Edinburgh, 1937).

71 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.163. 'September 17th.- Mr. William Wisheart ordeaned, in Glasgou, much about the same time his predecessor, Mr J. Clerk, dyed.'

72 M'Crie, *Wodrow Correspondence*, i, p.377, Wodrow to Rev. James Hart, 21/1/1713.

73 See for instance, his *Spiritual merchant; or the art of merchandising spiritualised* (1703), re-published shortly after his coming to Glasgow in 1702. This was an attempt to put faith in terms intelligible in a predominantly commercial environment, and using his own merchant background.

suggesting that people were duty-bound to obey their pastors; Clark responded that he had been misrepresented and merely meant that the office of a minister of God was a divinely ordained one, and that God's 'Vice-Regents, speaking and acting in his Name and Authority' ought to be respected as such.[74] On balance, it seems that Anderson had the better argument, and that Clark's defences were unconvincing; but again it was an example of Clark trying to maintain high-flying Calvinist principles 'in the abstract' whilst trying to wriggle out of the fact that taken to their logical conclusion in practice, they could run to extremes and amount to an unwelcome form of clerical despotism. Anderson had a low opinion of the Glasgow clerical establishment in general and regarded James Clark as a 'finished idiot', though of greater ingenuity than Principal Stirling and Professor Simson ('a maggotish fool') put together.[75]

The antipathy would appear to be mutual. It was Clark's objection, along with that of the other Glasgow ministers, Principal John Stirling and John Simson (1668?-1740), Professor of Divinity at the university, to the Rev. John Anderson's[76] call to the city in 1716, which had lasting impact on the Presbyterian establishment at Glasgow and most vividly illustrates the divisions and changes which were undercurrents at the time, including the alleged back-handed, back-stabbing influence of local Episcopalian heritors. Whig divisions, Argathelian and Squadrone, were however as much to blame, as were moves within sections of Glasgow society to modernise the church. The Glasgow clerical establishment became weakened by divisions between the magistrates

---

74 James Clark, *Animadversions upon Mr John Anderson, Minister of Dumbarton, His Charge of Heretical Doctrine, & etc., on Mr. James Clark, one of the ministers of Glasgow, given in and read before the reverend Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, April 2nd 1718,* (1718).

75 New College, Anderson Correspondence, (And 1), John Anderson to Sir James Smollett of Dumbarton, June 1717, f168.

76 No relation has been found to Provost John Anderson of Dowhill.

and the clergy; between the ministers and the General Session; and between the modernisers and the traditionalists. Accordingly, the Seceders found the city fertile ground in the 1730s.[77] Not only did the Anderson case bring about a review of the clerical constitution at Glasgow, a reassessment of 'the Model', or the Presbyterian blueprint of 1649;[78] but it prompted a dispute at a national level over the form of process of kirk sessions in calling a minister, the so-called 'minister's negative' in which the Glasgow men were notably prominent[79]. Wodrow's claim that the Presbyterian church at Glasgow was shattered by the Anderson case must be accorded some weight, for when examined, it is evident that the case generated multiple fractures with implications over a whole complex of issues.[80]

The Anderson dispute covers volumes of paper, much of it tedious and petty, and little of which shows his character in a favourable light. However a number of

---

77 Robert Morton, 'The Literature of Dissent in Glasgow', *Records of the Glasgow Bibliographic Society*, vol. xi, (1933), pp. 57-69. In Glasgow the Erskines gained support from praying societies, which increased in the 1730s, and by 1739 a congregation of the Associate Presbytery was formed under the guidance of Rev. Ebenezer Erskine and Rev. Thomson. In 1741 Rev. James Fisher, the son-in-law of Ebeneezer Erskine, became the first minister of this congregation after his manse at Kinclaven was forcibly taken from him. See also Herron, *Kirk by Divine Right, Church and State* (1985), p.70. Records of the Associate Presbytery at Glasgow can be found from 1739 onwards at Glasgow City Archive, CH3.469.1, (1739-1755).

78 George Campbell, John Gray, John Hamilton, John Scott, ministers of Glasgow, and the General Session of Glasgow, *A true and exact double of two papers exchanged betwixt some of the reverend ministers of the city of Glasgow and the members of that which is called the General Session there, 30th March 1719*, (Glasgow, 1721); General Session of Glasgow, *Excerpts from the General Session books respecting the Model or form of calling ministers to the city of Glasgow, anno 1721*, (Glasgow 1721, 1762).

79 William Tennoch, *An examination of the overtures concerning kirk sessions and presbyteries transmitted by the commission of the General Assembly*, (1720); NLS Wodrow MSS, Folio, 35, 'Representation of the elders and deacons of Glasgow anent the overtures in 1719 or 1720', William Dunlop, *A full vindication of the overtures transmitted to presbyteries by the Commission, November 1719*, (1720); John Anderson, *(Six) Letters upon the overtures concerning kirk sessions*, (1720); James Clark, *Just and sober remarks on some parts and passages of the overtures concerning kirk sessions*, (1719); *Advertisement to the General Assembly, 1720, or ane account of the rise and tendencie of some new things in the printed overtures concerning kirk sessions*, (1720); Anon., *A letter concerning the overtures about kirk sessions and presbyteries which were transmitted to the presbyteries by the Commission of the General Assembly, November 11 1719*, (1720).

80 E.g., the Loudon case, which went to the Court of Session, *BRG*, 8/10/1718, pp. 36-39; 27/10/1718, pp. 41-45.
(1) *Unto the Right Hon. the lords of Council and Session, the petition of the magistrates and town council of Glasgow, 7th November 1718* [James Boswell], (1718).
(2) *Answers for James Loudon, merchant in Glasgow, to the petition of the magistrates and town council of Glasgow, 12th November 1718*, [Robert Dundas], (1718).

strands can be disentangled. These consist of Anderson's personality, political factors, and the cultural dimension, notably tensions between orthodox Calvinist high-fliers and Presbyterian modernisers.

To begin with, Anderson was certainly a quarrelsome individual, and one who, with age, demonstrated a tendency towards paranoia. He was convivial amongst his friends, 'a kind, frank, comradly man, when not grated',[81] but a cantankerous and indefatigable opponent otherwise. When in 1716 a parallel attempt was made to bring him from Dumbarton to Edinburgh, the Edinburgh ministers were unenthusiastic on the grounds that they wished to 'keep good blood among them'.[82] Objections were also laid as to his literary style and use of language in some of his later tracts, which Walter Stewart of Pardovan (d.1719), an elder of Glasgow, and Rev. James Clark found unbefitting of a minister of God, and with which Wodrow entirely agreed.[83] His re-issuing six editions of his acrimoniously written *Letter upon the overtures concerning kirk sessions,* (1720), most of them only days apart and with only slight alterations between them, was certainly approaching the bizarre. Even Wodrow, who seems to have held Anderson in some esteem, regretted this episode and considered that:

> If he continue in this pedantic and indiscreet way of writing, his reputation must sink as a writer, and the cause he undertakes; and nobody will think it worthwhile to notice what he writes. His best

---

81 Wodrow, *Analecta*, ii, p.344.

82 New College Library, Edinburgh University, Anderson Papers, (And 1), Correspondence; Bailie Archibald Macauley to John Anderson, 25/10/1716, f130. Macauley was an Argathelian, and related to the Macauleys of Ardincaple. He supervised the publication of *Curat Calder Whipt*, and in 1718 belonged to a Society of Question Starters; ibid., same to the same, 15/2/1718, f256.

83 His 'Billingsgate piece', *Curat Calder whipt*, referred to by Walter Stewart of Pardovan, in *Answers by Walter Stewart of Pardovan to the Complaint given in against him by Mr. Anderson, Minister of Dumbarton, to the last Synod at Ayr,* (1718); his 'Drydonesque banter and buffoonery', mentioned by James Clark, *Animadversions upon Mr. John Anderson, Minister of Dumbarton, His Charge of Heretical Doctrine, & etc., on Mr James Clark,* (1718); his 'Billingsgate stile', noted by Wodrow, *Analecta*, ii, p.344.

> friends, I hear, are very much displeased with his performances, and yet they say, he is still going on and on, and we expect some new volume every day.[84]

When Anderson died some months later, an autopsy was performed. The surgeons investigated the brain and thought it contained some abnormalities.[85] This indicates that contemporaries possibly suspected some form of disease or mental illness to account for Anderson's deteriorating mental condition. Shortly before he died, he was visited by Rev. James Stirling, minister of the Barony parish, who told him he had taken up groundless suspicions against the ministers of Glasgow in accusing them of attempting to alter the form of calling ministers in the new version of the Overtures, for the same clause was in an earlier version. Wodrow, summing the situation up, tried to deflect the blame:

> had he continued where he was, his character had certainly been intire; but his coming to Glasgou was certainly a great loss to him; and his papers about the Overtures were writt in frett and passion, and not like himself, and his great abilitys and gifts seemed very much to be lesned, if not blasted, after his coming to Glasgou, and his gifts failed him, even his very memory.[86]

Anderson's correspondence does not reveal him as a character of any integrity. Although he constantly denied he was implicated in moves to remove him from his parish of Dumbarton, where he had been settled since 1698, his letters to Rev. Neil

---

84 M'Crie, *Correspondence*, ii, Wodrow to his wife, April 18th 1720, p.522. Two further editions followed!

85 Wodrow relates that he had been 'felled, by a trouble in his head, which seemed apoplecticall', *Analecta*, ii, p.343.

86 Wodrow, *Analecta*, ii, p.344.

Campbell, minister of Renfrew (the future Principal of Glasgow University, and Stirling's successor) indicate a web of intrigue in which he was fully complicit. Moreover, they also reveal him to be a party man, another accusation he pointedly denied, even writing to the Duke of Montrose to assure him of his impartiality at the same time as he was hand in glove with the Argathelians.[87] It is fairly clear he was allowing himself to be promoted by the Argathelian interest, supported by his friend Neil Campbell, and assisted by Daniel Campbell of Shawfield, and Colin Campbell of Blythswood, 'the most regarded of the Glasgow Campbells'. Neil Campbell had even solicited Shawfield, a wealthy merchant and the MP for Glasgow Burghs since the by-election of 1716, for funds to print Anderson's libellous letter to Walter Stewart of Pardovan in which he sarcastically accused the Glasgow ministers of being 'perfectly innocent of all Party views'.[88] The purpose of Pardovan's initial letter to Anderson, to which Anderson was responding, and which he published along with his reply, had been to enquire if it were true that Anderson had slandered Principal Stirling some months before when at Campbell of Mamore's dining table; for if so, as a ruling elder, he might have to 'supersede his appearance' for him in his call to Glasgow.[89] In publishing Pardovan's private enquiry, Anderson was attempting to expose the Glasgow clerical establishment as a set of partisans of the Duke of Montrose.[90] Rev. Neil Campbell however thought this little literary exercise in wit quite futile; he doubted if any of 'the Glasgow people' knew enough of wit to be able to 'distinguish

---

87 New College, Anderson Correspondence, John Anderson to Duke of Montrose, 7/11/1717, f226. Montrose, whom he had known since Montrose's childhood in Edinburgh at the Canongate school, offered him the living of East Kilpatrick in 1713.

88 John Anderson, *A letter from Mr. John Anderson minister of Dumbarton to Walter Stewart of Pardovan, 27th September 1717*, (1717).

89 Mamore was the uncle of the Duke of Argyll and a future MP of Glasgow Burghs.

90 Montrose had been appointed Chancellor of the university in 1714.

betwixt handsome banter and passionate railing'.[91] Anderson though, put his letter to Pardovan through three editions - perhaps this was part of the joke. All in all, the levity and duplicity evident in his correspondence with Rev. Neil Campbell does little to raise the estimation of either man, and what comes across strongly is a supercilious sneering attitude towards such 'old-world' men as Clark, Gray and Pardovan, who by contrast, conducted themselves with dignity and principle.

Anderson's argument with the Glasgow clerical establishment however, went back to 1705 and can be said to have its origins in the influence of Episcopalian culture on the Presbyterian church, particularly in the moves to revive the use of the Lord's Prayer. Though widely used before 1638, and recommended by the Westminster Directory, this was no longer used by Presbyterians.[92] Indeed the General Assembly of 1649 had only narrowly failed to ban it outright.[93] It was not neglected under the second Episcopate 1662-1689 however and it remained popular amongst the gentry and Episcopalians, but in Presbyterian circles it was still not widely used as late as the 1860s.[94] Many laymen considered the unstructured extemporary prayer ('praying by the spirit') which had replaced it was difficult to follow, and a fight-back to re-instate the Lord's Prayer began in the reign of Queen Anne, led by Sir Hugh Campbell of Cawdor;

---

91 New College, Anderson Correspondence, Neil Campbell to John Anderson, 7/9/1717, f204; John Anderson, *Letter to Pardovan,* (Glasgow, 1717).

92 Sage, *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland,* (John Sage), 2nd letter, p. 11; Alexander Cunningham, *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland,* (1690), p.20. Cunningham refuted that the Directory for Public Worship had ever tied the Church of Scotland to such usages. Neither did Presbyterians actively condemn the Lords' Prayer as Episcopalians alleged. They merely questioned whether Christ had ever required Christians to repeat this precise formula, which they considered contained merely the 'matter for prayer'.

93 This formed part of a radical reaction against 'set forms' and a preference for 'praying by the spirit', or extemporary prayer.

94 John Campbell, 'John Anderson, minister of Dumbarton and the Ramshorn Kirk, Glasgow, 1698-1721', *RSCHS,* vol. ix, (1947), pp. 159-161.

his essay on this subject was despatched to the Moderator of 1705, Principal William Carstairs.

In some parishes after the Revolution, Episcopalian gentry who were not Jacobites and who were willing to subscribe the oaths, often attended the General Assembly as elders, and took an active part in church affairs. This raises questions about the significance of William's 1693 act[95] which probably had greater importance for the lay eldership than for the few dozen Episcopalian ministers who accepted its terms. Anderson's patron at Dumbarton, responsible for his call, Sir James Smollett of Bonhill, Provost of Dumbarton, came into this category. The Smolletts were Episcopalians and Anderson was on close terms with the whole family, tutoring Sir James's son, Archibald, (the father of the novelist Tobias Smollett), and with Smollett's assistance, establishing a celebrated school at Dumbarton. Indeed, the motive of establishing the school may have been behind Anderson's call.[96] Smollett attended the General Assembly as an elder and his correspondence with Anderson indicates that he took his social role seriously.

The General Assembly of 1705 however refused to debate the re-introduction of the Lord's Prayer but Principal Carstairs, whom it seems was sympathetic to Cawdor's position, succeeded in passing an act in favour of the Westminster Directory.

---

95 APS, ix, p.303; the 'Act for the peace and quiet of the Church', allowed Episcopalians a role in church government so long as they acknowledged Presbyterian government, agreed not to subvert it, signed the Westminster Confession of Faith, and took the oaths of allegiance and assurance. Dickinson and Donaldson , *A Source Book of Scottish History*, iii, pp. 217-218; Mathieson, *Politics and Religion*, ii, p.71.

96 After graduating from Edinburgh University, Anderson had been tutor to the Duke of Argyll and Greenwich, and had for many years since the Revolution, acted as a schoolmaster in Edinburgh; firstly in the Canongate School 1691-1693 (where the young Marquis of Montrose was a pupil), then south Leith Grammar School 1693-1695; and from 1695-1698 as a 'doctor' at the High School. The charge at Dumbarton had lain empty since 1696, and Smollett applied to the Presbytery of Edinburgh for a suitable candidate. The fact that Anderson had shown little interest in the ministry in the 1690s at a time when vacancies were plentiful, may indicate a certain reluctance to follow a clerical career and a more secular orientation. John Campbell, 'John Anderson, minister of Dumbarton and the Ramshorn kirk', pp. 156-159; Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p.438; A Whitford Anderson, 'Papers of the Rev. John Anderson, reprinted from the *Dumbarton Herald*', NLS, privately printed, (Dumbarton, 1914).

Anderson, whether to please his patron or from genuine principles, immediately introduced the prayer into his services at Dumbarton, claiming that it had been sanctioned by the General Assembly. Great consternation was felt amongst his hearers however who feared it was a step in the direction of prelacy.[97] Some parishioners who were in Glasgow shortly afterwards, asked the Glasgow ministers if it was true what Anderson had told them, that the recent General Assembly had sanctioned the use of the Lord's Prayer, and were answered in the negative. By the following week Anderson had procured a copy of the printed act, and in front of his entire congregation, called the Glasgow ministers liars. He continued to use the Lord's Prayer although his congregation clearly objected to it, and even attempted to introduce more 'set forms' into his services, such as the reading of lengthy passages of scripture,[98] another practice long abandoned by Presbyterians in the shake-up of the 1640s, but retained by Episcopalians. Anderson even went as far as to recite the prayer following his sermon at the following meeting of the Presbytery, which occasioned a strong protest to the Synod. The Synod could not condemn his practice, (which would have been to contravene the act of the Assembly), but advised the brethren to keep harmony by maintaining uniformity. Despite this injunction, Anderson continued to defy the Synod. It is clear that he was out of step with his congregation and his brethren in the Presbytery of Dumbarton and was prepared to defy both over the re-introduction of liturgical practices associated with the former Episcopal establishment. Were greater indications of piety evident in his character, this might have been more easily interpreted as a sincere determination to heal wounds and to restore to the shorn church

---

97 ibid., p.161.

98 Rev. James Cooper (ed.) 'The Introduction of the Usage of the Lord's Prayer in Dumbarton, 1698-1717', privately printed, New College, (Aberdeen, 1905).

some of the dignity of her past worship; however, the suspicion must linger that the desire to be controversial, and to inflame and poke fun at high-flying Presbyterianism, and to please Smollett, were uppermost in his mind. His links with Smollett, and his use of the Lord's Prayer at a time when this was still remarkable and contentious, were no doubt what lay behind Rev. John Gray's comment, as overheard by blind William Jameson, lecturer in history at the university, that notwithstanding Anderson's recent and much-celebrated work, *The Defence of the Church Government, Faith, Worship and Spirit of the Presbyterians* (1714), he was 'an old Scots Episcopal, and such he'll prove'.[99]

The significance of Anderson's Episcopal connections began to be appreciated by Wodrow many years later. Writing in his *Analecta* in 1727, he noted:

> I know ... that in a close caball of the Jacobites, after the last Rebellion, at Paisley, the most sensible of the Jacobites were so dashed with the appearance made by Glasgow and the west, in the 1715, that they resolved by all means to have that city, the key of the west, divided and broken; and for that end laboured to break the magistrates and ministers, by proposing and pushing Mr. Anderson's affair, which, indeed, gradually divided the friends of the government and now that place is perfectly crumbled into pieces.[100]

Those who had been present at the meeting in Paisley were the Earl of Dundonald, the Earl of Eglinton (d.1729), a wealthy Episcopalian peer (but a firm government man), the Earl of Kilmarnock, Laurence Crawford of Jordanhill, Colin Campbell of

---

99 This was reported back by one of Anderson's spies at the university, John Love, a student and assistant to blind William Jameson, lecturer in history. New College, Anderson Correspondence, (And 1), John Love to John Anderson, 27/9/1717, f214.

Blythswood and several others[101]. Some of these men (Eglinton, Dundonald, Kilmarnock and Jordanhill) can certainly be identified as Episcopalians, yet no evidence has been found to indicate that they were Jacobites; Eglinton and Kilmarnock appeared on the government side at the '15.[102] However they were evidently no friends of the Presbyterian church, and, accordingly, it was resolved by them that a minister should be brought in to Glasgow 'over the belly of the ministers and not go one way with them. One of the number was appointed to cully and speak Aird fair and upbraid him for being led by the nose by the ministers and the like'.[103]

Anderson's papers, which for some reason contain the secret correspondence between his friend, Rev. Neil Campbell and Colin Campbell of Blythswood, confirm that it was Blythswood who was the actual proposer in a close meeting with the magis-trates about the beginning of November 1716.[104] The reason for pushing Anderson, as revealed in these papers, does indeed appear to be one of dividing the magistrates from the ministers by exploiting current divisions between the now Argathelian council and the Squadrone-backed clerical establishment under the leadership of Principal Stirling.[105] It is also clear that it inspired a new defiance and anti-clericalism on the part

---

100 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.373.

101 ibid., p.259.

102 W Fraser, *Memorials of the Montgomeries, Earls of Eglinton*, 2 vols., i, (Edinburgh, 1859), p.101. It would appear that Wodrow was engaging in the same kind of hyperbole which called Presbyterians rebels or Cameronians.

103 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.259.

104 New College Library, Anderson Papers, Three-lock chest No.2 Records: Correspondence, [And 1]; Colin Campbell to Neil Campbell, Glasgow, 16 November 1716, f134-5; 'tho I never was much concerned in these affairs yet I resolved for once to offer them my opinion, and I did it to the person I thought most capable for carrying on my designe (Aird) and that with all secrecy imaginable...the person I proposed is your friend Mr. Anderson of Dumbarton'. Blythswood however, determined to keep his links with Rev. Neil Campbell secret; 'I do not incline ye should be seen in this affair tho' Shawfield told me he had written to you to come here', ibid., same to the same, 5 December 1716, f138-9.

105 The Principal of the university, always a minister until the nineteenth cenrury, was the acknowledged leader of the clerical establishment in the city, followed by the Professor of Divinity, another clergyman. In 1714, when the Duke of Montrose, a key figure amongst the Squadrone, became the Chancellor of the university, the burgh council

of the magistrates who become much more assertive of their patronage of the burgh's churches.[106] However, it is unclear in all this complex web of subterfuge, whether the various plotting parties were pursuing the same agendas, or were aware of the wider links of their collaborators. But the Campbell connections were ubiquitous and straddled the various factions, and even James Brown's successor, Rev. George Campbell (c.1680-1748), one of the Glasgow ministers, (transported to Glasgow with Montrose's help in 1714)[107] appears to have been sounded out, and was pronounced at one point to be 'no enemy at all'.[108] Rev. Neil Campbell was evidently an Argathelian intent on promoting the Argyll interest in order to further his own career. Blythswood, an enigmatic figure about whom little is known, would appear to be trying to unsettle the Presbyterian establishment (of which Rev. Neil Campbell was a part) in order to improve the prospects of the former church, or perhaps out of pique for the recent strange downfall of Cockburn's meeting house.[109] Whether Anderson was aware of an Episcopal connection via Blythswood is unclear, but given his other Episcopal links it is unlikely this mattered. It does appear however, that the foolish Aird, ever anxious to curry favour with persons of higher social standing than himself, was being duped and manipulated by both Blythswood and Anderson.

---

was also backing Montrose as its principal patron, an association going back many years. In 1715, however, Provost Aird was lured by Argyll and his agents. By 1716 Aird had secured not only an Argathelian council, but had assisted in the election of an Argathelian MP for Glasgow Burghs, the detested Daniel Campbell of Shawfield.

106 See for instance the explicit comments entered into the burgh records regarding the plans for building the Ramshorn kirk, completed in 1724, for the sixth parish, 'whereof the magistrates and town council of the city are now in all time coming to be the undoubted patrons, and to retain for ever all rights and privileges any way pertaining', *BRG* 23/9/1718, p.32.

107 NAS, *Montrose Muniments*, GD.220/5/344/2, Magistrates of Glasgow to Montrose, 27 September 1714, thanking him for his help in securing the recent presentation for Mr. George Campbell.

108 New College, Anderson Papers, Correspondence, Rev. Neil Campbell to Rev. John Anderson, 8 June 1717, f161.

109 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.259.

Anderson, on account of his personality, his views on liturgical practices associated with former Episcopacy, and his suspect links with the house of Argyll,[110] was unlikely to be backed by the Glasgow ministers. Yet there was no outward reason which could be admitted of, for refusing him. Neither his life, his qualifications, nor his doctrine were in any way objectionable, and one of the striking features of the case is the Glasgow ministers' failure to put forward any solid reasons against him. Instead their answers were awkward and evasive. This discretion may suggest party intrigue; alternately, they may have simply found a genuine difficulty in admitting publicly to a personal dislike of him, especially in view of the readiness of Episcopalians to exploit Presbyterian divisions. It did not deter the brusque Principal Stirling, however, who, at the Synod in April 1717, bluntly stated that the ministers had an 'aversion' to Anderson.[111] Certainly, when the north west quarter kirk session had convened at the beginning of December 1716 to discuss the vacancy, Clark, acting as Moderator, walked out, and promptly dissolved the meeting, on Anderson's call being proposed and refused to proceed further with it. He was heard threatening that 'we might make a kirk and a milne of it',[112] and referring to the magistrates' pretended patronage in the matter, branded them as 'Michaelmas lairds' elected for only a year at a time and with no permanent stake in the pastoral care of the community.[113] When a second meeting was held with the magistrates and ministers a few days later, the ministers put their objections more calmly; 'that their consciences would not allow them to joyne with

---

110 He had, for instance, dedicated his *Defence of the Church Government, Faith, Worship and Spirit of the Presbyterians,* (1714) to the family of Argyll.

111 John Anderson, *Letter to Pardovan*, p.2.

112 I.e., drag it out interminably; make a great song and dance about it. I am grateful to the late Robert G. Lindsay for the explanation of this term.

113 New College Library, Anderson Papers, (And 3), 'Representation and Petition of the Elders of the North West quarter to the Presbytery', f38; John Anderson, *Letter to Pardovan.*

it'.[114] Appeal was then made by the magistrates and the vacant session to the next meeting of the Presbytery in the middle of January for a minister to moderate their call, but the Presbytery, dominated by Stirling's party, likewise refused because 'there does not appear to be harmony amongst all concerned in the calling of a minister as has been usual'.[115] As the magistrates and burgesses were gathering at the door 'in considerable numbers' to hear the Presbytery's decision, tempers flared and there were acrimonious scenes. Professor Simson was heard crying out 'a mob! a mob!' and Principal Stirling told the crowding burgesses, 'pack yourselves to the door!'.[116] Bailie John Stirling for the magistrates, and bailie Coulters for the General Session, announced, on hearing the decision, that they would appeal to the Synod in April; and when this convened, it approved one of the Presbytery of Glasgow to moderate the call in view of the ministers' obstinacy. A vote taken on the Synod's decision in the General Session in May approved it by a very great majority.

It therefore emerges that within a matter of months of Anderson's call being announced, the clerical establishment of Glasgow had become locked into a bitter dispute not only with the north west quarter session, town council and magistrates, but also with the elders and deacons of the General Session. Yet despite what was

---

114 New College, Anderson Papers, Three-lock chest no. 2 Records; Correspondence, (And 1), Blythswood to Rev. Neil Campbell, 5 December 1716, f138-139.

115 New College, Anderson Papers, Three-lock chest no. 3 records, f40. The Presbytery of Glasgow consisted of eighteen charges, five of them in Glasgow (plus the sixth, which was vacant). The Principal and the Professor of divinity were also members of the Presbytery. Simson, the professor, was related to Stirling by marriage, and owed his appointment to him. The neighbouring suburban Barony parish of Glasgow was occupied by Stirling's brother, Rev. James Stirling; Rev. Charles Coats of Govan owed his charge to the university, which held the patronage of it. This gave a total of nine persons (the sixth charge would have made 10) who could be said to adhere naturally to the Glasgow clerical establishment centred on Principal Stirling; only one or two others would be required to have an outright majority. However in practise ministers from the more outlying parishes, one or more of them, often did not appear at Presbytery meetings, which were held in Glasgow, especially during the winter months. This meant that Stirling and the Glasgow ministers could more or less dominate the Presbytery.

116 John Anderson, *Letter to Pardovan.* The nineteen-strong Presbytery of Glasgow was dominated by Principal Stirling's party and the Glasgow clerical establishment

obviously a strong popular following for Anderson in the city, the ministers decided they would continue their opposition and appeal against the Synod's decision. Their attempt to subvert popular will in the matter of the call and to assume what was effectively the patronage themselves, was thus perceived as 'prelacy', and soon the magistrates' cry that the ministers were 'depriving a Presbyterian people of their just right' of electing their own pastors, even citing the authority of the worthy James Durham anent popular calls, raised righteous anger.[117] The dispute acquired some notoriety beyond Glasgow, as broadsheets by John Adamson, and a bemused 'Highlandman' indicate. Adamson criticised Anderson for refusing to condemn the Patronage act of 1712, and for supporting the magistrates' right of patronage of the five churches of Glasgow in the affair, and also the King's patronage of the High Kirk.[118]

Simson and Stirling were as unanimous in wishing to block Anderson's coming to Glasgow as the other five ministers and attempted to sway the populace at large. In a

---

117 James Durham (1626?-1658) was a celebrated minister of Glasgow, 1647-1658, a Protestor who was the first minister to have been brought in by the radical Porterfield group appointed y the Estates in 1645.

118 John Adamson, *Some Enquiries into Mr. Anderson's letters, concerning his ingenuity in pleading for Presbitery,* nd (1720?). Adamson was admitted as a preacher by the Presbytery of Perth on trials in 1708-1709, though he lacked learning, and was employed as a catechist in the Braes of Atholl. He eventually obtained a license but was never ordained. However he was a popular preacher who preached by invitation at Hamilton and at Dalziel, and had some 'wild' ideas, such as that the Revolution 'was built on a heap of dirt' and that the Pope, Queen Anne, and the King of France were all in league against Christ. He was courted by the Cameronians (Mcmillanites) but was against their separating from the Church of Scotland and so declined to join them.

Its said the ministers of Glasgow toun
At first did hatch this wicked two-faced houn
More out of splen than any good intention.
And some observe they have coupt the creills
Ay since they got of Anderson's strong peills
Near three years a doze against their will, ...
Which on them had an effect full ill, ...
They scarce have time to give the sacrament
Once in the year in this great numerous place, ...
Because of jarrs, debates, and needless strifes
More meet for kail-corss and for herring-wives
Than ministers of Christ, I trou.
Let Glasgow chuse and call men whom they please
Why may they not do that at their own ease?
To be their ministers in spite of you
It is no doubt, their privilege I trou
They pay the stipend, why not call the man?

Anon., *The Highlandman upon the overture called negative*, (1721).

sermon given in May or June 1717 in the Outer High Church, Simson made his own direct pitch for popular sympathy:

> My friends, I'll speak plainly to you and lay it home to your consciences, if it be like a gospel spirit to do what you can to break the hearts and ministry of the five worthy ministers you have amongst you to get one to assist them?[119]

This unfortunately, was a rather ill-judged appeal in support of clerical despotism to a populace that was already apt enough to take 'groundless prejudices at ministers'. A further dispute then began to break out amongst the ministers themselves about the powers of the General Session. This was started by Rev. John Gray but opposed by Clark, who disagreed with his conclusions. It concerned the so-called 'ministers' negative', especially in relation to the workings of the 'Model' of 1649 which had set up separate kirk sessions from the single burgh parish, but had retained the General Session to co-ordinate poor relief and communions on a city-wide basis, and other church matters as they should arise.[120] According to William Tennoch, merchant of Glasgow and a keen upholder of civic and popular rights, it was the divisions over Anderson's call which had first led to speculation as to whether an elder's vote in a session was of equal weight to a minister's, when they happened to disagree. It came about because Anderson's call had raised the related question of who were the true callers in an urban setting like Glasgow where there was a collegiate session, as well as

---

119 New College, Anderson Papers, Three-lock chest no. 3 records, f59.

120 Ministers of Glasgow, General Session of Glasgow, *A true and exact double of two papers, exchanged betwixt some of the Rev. ministers of the city of Glasgow and the members of that which is called the General Session there, 30th March, 1719,* (1721); William Tennoch, merchant in Glasgow, *An examination of the overtures concerning kirk sessions and Presbyteries transmitted by the Commission of the General Assembly to Presbyteries,* (Glasgow, 1720). The General Session consisted of the Principal and Professor of Divinity of the university, the ministers of the various charges of the city, plus the various kirk sessions and met at least once a month.

particular sessions. Was it the particular vacant session, consisting only of its elders; or the General Session, a collegiate body consisting of the ministers of the other charges plus the elders?[121] If the former, this appeared to nullify the rights of the other ministers to have a say in the choice of a close colleague, and contravened what had in fact been practice since 1687, especially in view of the recruitment problems. If the latter, this appeared to assert a measure of clerical patronage over subordinate congregations and individual kirk sessions which was unpleasantly reminiscent of Episcopacy. Gray, a Glaswegian, and the most long-standing minister in the city, could recollect times in the 1690s when the collectivist principle was essential for the working of Presbyterianism in the city and the General Session had appeared to act authoritatively on many occasions. It had not only called ministers, he claimed, but had also appointed elders, exercised discipline and undertaken a variety of other important clerical functions. Clark however, the exponent of the church's constitution, maintained that this was contrary to Presbyterian principles and that precedent did not make law. It was divine right that each ordained minister 'have a definite flock' with its own congregational session with the intrinsic power to judge in scandals and be a representative part of church government.[122] Thus the individual kirk session was the radical seed of the Presbyterian system which alone called ministers, and the General Session was of the nature of a voluntary consultative association which played no part in Presbyterian church government or discipline and could not effect censures or take action in its own right. Clark's arguments drew force from the fact that the General Session books themselves recorded an entry dated 10 May 1649, shortly after the Model had been

---

121 There was a level of collectivism in the workings of the General Session. All the ministers took it in turns to preach the week-day sermons heard by all. The population itself was apt to move around the city and not remain fixed to one minister. 'All the ministers of the city have some concern in the whole of it'.

drawn up, viz., 'agreed by common consent that the common session have only a consultative and not an authoritative voice in any matter that shall come before them'.[123]

The Anderson case rumbled on through the church courts for another year and a half before the cantankerous old minister was finally transported to Glasgow in August 1718. He was much feted by the magistrates who went to great lengths to see to his every comfort during his flit. In the meantime Gray and the other ministers, George Campbell, John Scott and John Hamilton, had protested at the changes they perceived to have occurred in the General Session from an authoritative body to a purely consultative one and withdrew formally from it after the declaration and vote of its members on 18 July 1718 had asserted this to be the case.[124] Much of the legal reasoning employed had been Clark's, based on his *Plain Truth* (1693, 1701) about the duty of people to their pastors and the crucial role of calling, which was depicted as a kind of social contract. Clark however continued to oppose Anderson's call, (seeing no contradiction in this) and before the Synod met in April 1718 (which approved his transportation by 42 votes to 18), had issued a printed broadsheet defending himself against Anderson's recent accusations of heretical doctrine. To all this Clark had written:

> I only presume to use this prognostick, that if Mr. Anderson be made a minister of Glasgow, whereof some are more fond than foresighty of the

---

122 Clark, *Just and sober remarks; Advertisement to the General Assembly.*

123 Clark, *Just and Sober Remarks,* p. 12.

124 Tennoch states that the General Assembly in May 1718 appointed a committee to search the records of the General Session to see whether it, or the particular session, had called ministers. After the committee concluded that it was the particular session, Anderson's call was carried. Tennoch, *An examination of the overtures.*

> fatal consequences would follow it, farewell peace and unity in that place and Presbytery.[125]

The ministers appealed against the sentence of the Synod and the matter was finally decided by the General Assembly a few weeks later.

Clark's 'prognostick' was reiterated in a letter sent out on 21 April by one James Loudon, merchant of Glasgow, to Rev. James Ramsay of Kelso. Ramsay was a member of the influential Commission of the General Assembly and he was also an acquaintance of the principle heritor in his bounds, the Duke of Roxburgh, the acknowledged leader of the Squadrone, and one of HM Secretaries of State.[126] The Loudon incident forms a curious side-line to the main plot but indicates the background shifts of power which were nonetheless a significant aspect of it. The purpose of Loudon's letter was to solicit Ramsay's help in preventing the transportation at the forthcoming General Assembly; he was evidently an individual who had as little love for the cantankerous clergyman as had the Glasgow ministers. This indicates that opposition to the call was not restricted to the narrow confines of the clergy. Moreover, the letter contained darker warnings:

> the politick at the bottom of this affair is so plain that I need not explain it to you. It would be a melancholy thing if the church of Scotland should truckle to a party of men who combine to distress our good king's just government and who have joyned with the tories for that end.
>
> I hope the moderate men of the nonjuring side will be persuaded not to

---

125 Clark, *Animadversions upon Mr. John Anderson, minister of Dumbarton, his charge of heretical doctrine & etc., on Mr. James Clark*, (1718), p.17.

126 *BRG*, 27/10/1718, p.42.

> venture at such a thing, if the assembly should transport him, then adieu to the peace and unity of this place.[127]

Clearly an awareness that Anderson's call was politically motivated, and that others had a hand in it who were, to use Wodrow's phrase, 'Jacobitish', had reached the merchant class of the city, even if it had not penetrated the civic circle commanded by Aird, currently trading on his die-hard Hanoverian loyalism since his great efforts at the '15. Loudon's letter was intercepted, its warnings unheeded and Anderson comfortably settled, when it reappeared in Glasgow following the Dean of Guild's election in the Merchants Hall in October. With the usual large crowd of burgesses assembled after the election, the magistrates took the opportunity to read the letter aloud, announced their good name had been slandered, Loudon was publicly condemned for his treachery and his burgess ticket demanded, torn up, and he was denied trading privileges. Particular umbrage was taken to the passage referring to the 'party of men who combine to distress our good king's government' and who had joined with tories for that end, by which the magistrates felt themselves unwarrantably accused.[128] Loudon's shop and warehouses were boarded up, but he, however, appealed to the Court of Session, claiming it was a private letter of a private man's thoughts, and that none were particularly accused in it. Lord Cullen upheld his case and promptly suspended the magistrates' sentence. The matter might have ended there, but the magistrates attempted to appeal against Lord Cullen's verdict and chose as their lawyer Alexander Boswell, an Argathelian. Loudon, forced to defend himself, chose Robert Dundas of Arniston, Squadrone, (later to defend Provost Charles Miller, currently one of Aird's council,

---

127 ibid.

128 *BRG*, 8/10/1718, pp. 36-37; 27/10/1718, pp. 41-45.

against the actions of General Wade and the Lord Advocate, Duncan Forbes of Culloden in 1725).[129]

The magistrates' ingenuous line of defence indicates that they too, saw party rivalries as the key to the dispute. Loudon, they said, had wanted £1000 stg. from the Equivalent to start a woollen manufactory and thought he would achieve this quicker 'should he represent himself as an opposite to the present magistracie of the city and represent them as enemies of the government'. Loudon had intended all along that the matter should reach the ears of the Court, where 'his sufferings were to be represented to a person of Honour there'.[130] Dundas's able defence, however, turned the argument on its head. 'Why will the magistrates believe they are the party of men mean'd by? Know they no more men to whom this could as properly be applied?' This raises the possibility that whilst others suspected covert Episcopal/Jacobite involvement in the Anderson affair, Provost Aird and the magistrates were the last to appreciate the scale of duplicity involved in bringing the much fawned over minister to Glasgow.

Against this wider background - the Loudon case, the secret correspondence between Neil Campbell and Blythswood, and the various references in the prints - it does appear that Wodrow's later information, that the call was part of a ploy for destabilising the church at Glasgow, was probably accurate. However, Wodrow's supposition that Anderson was unaware of these moves cannot be upheld, as is clearly evident from his papers.[131]

---

129 J Boswell, *Unto the Right Hon. the Lords of Council and Session, the petition of the magistrates and town council of Glasgow, 7th November 1718*; Robert Dundas, *Answers for James Loudon, merchant in Glasgow to the petition of the magistrates and town council of Glasgow, 12th November 1718.*

130 Roxburgh.

131 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.259; A Whitford Anderson, 'Papers of the Rev. John Anderson, reprinted from the Dumbarton Herald' p.15.

Following Anderson's death in February 1721, the magistrates and ministers made immediate moves to repair the damage. Gray and his colleagues agreed to come back into the General Session provided a new concordat was drawn up about the Model. In this it was discreetly admitted that the General Session was indeed a consultative body, and the particular session the callers, but efforts were to be made in future to ensure that the particular session, magistrates, ministers and heads of families, were all consulted closely anent future calls.[132] Only once agreement was reached would the General Session approach the Presbytery for one to moderate the call. It was an agreement not to disagree, but it established the autonomy of the individual session that Clark had argued for.

Anderson's charge lay empty for over a year. But on 10 May 1722, the above procedure having been gone through, the General Session decided to call Rev. John Maclaurin (1693-1754), the minister of Luss (and brother of the Edinburgh University mathematician, Colin Maclaurin) to the city. This was an inspired choice, a man of evangelical outlook, a noted theologian and preacher but a practical moralist and social reformer who did much to improve the organisation of poor relief in the city.[133]Other indications about Maclaurin's character make it unlikely that he was a party man. However, he had links with the Argyll interest, the dominant power in his native country, and was present at Campbell of Mamore's table the time that Anderson was said to have libelled Stirling. Maclaurin was active in the Societies for the Reformation

---

132 Ministers of Glasgow, General Session of Glasgow, *A true and exact double of two papers; Excerpts from the General Session respecting the Model.*

133 John Maclaurin, *The Case of the poor considered: or the great advantages of erecting a public manufactory and employing the poor,* (1729); *An Account of the great advantages of erecting a charitable house for maintaining and employing the poor of this city; with some general proposals concerning the plan of the house and proper regulation for the due oversight of it,* (1731); *An account of the design of erecting a charity school or workhouse in Glasgow with proposals thereanent; concerted by the after-mentioned committee and now published by the order of the magistrates and submitted to the consideration of the several societies and corporations of this city, and of such other well disposed persons as are inclined to contribute to this good design,* (1731).

of Manners at Glasgow in which he 'made it his business to inculcate upon the conscientious inhabitants the necessity of doing their part to bear down wickedness by giving information against offenders'.[134] He was also involved in the Cambuslang revival; an association disapproved of by Francis Hutcheson which probably cost him the chair of divinity at Glasgow university.[135] Throughout his lengthy ministry he did much to heal the divisions caused by Rev. John Anderson by his collaborative work on poor relief which drew together the major institutions of the city in this charitable venture. The General Session acquired an augmented role by its oversight of the Town's Hospital, a commodious building facing the Clyde, which he helped establish in 1733.[136] Indeed the building of the Town's Hospital by public subscription, was the first confident gesture of the Presbyterian establishment after decades of economic stagnation and cultural and political insecurity, a fundament of the godly commonwealth. Even the building of the three churches, the Wynd church (1687), the Blackfriars church (1698) and the Ramshorn church (1724), had been on a pinched and defensive scale.

Maclaurin, a young man of 30 when he entered his charge at Glasgow, encountered considerable difficulties in his ministry which Wodrow attributed to a dwindling of clerical authority, a direct result of the Anderson affair. Instead of exercising discipline he found himself on trial. He was, for instance, blamed for giving

---

134 John Gillies, 'Some Account of the Life and Character of John Maclaurin', in the *Works of the Rev. John Maclaurin*, ed. W H Goold, (Edinburgh, 1860), p.xv.

135 Thomas Kennedy, 'William Leechman, Pulpit Eloquence and the Glasgow Enlightenment', in A. Hook and R. B. Sher (eds.), *The Glasgow Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 1995).

136 John Gibson, *History of Glasgow from the earliest accounts to the present time*, (Glasgow, 1777), p. 181; James Denholm, *History of the City of Glasgow and suburbs compiled from authentic records and other respectable authorities*, (Glasgow, 1798) p.184.

a testimonial to baptise a child of an irregular marriage, which he could not possibly have known about. Further,

> ... in everything his session absolutely lead him; libels are given in by some of his elders against him to the session, for the most part groundless trivial things, as not visiting the sick, when he is knouen rather to exceed in this, and the like.[137]

It is evident from Wodrow's descriptions of Glasgow in the 1720s that a considerable cultural shift was taking place, which, indeed, had begun with Anderson,[138] and to which one of his principle critics, the Professor of Divinity, John Simson, also contributed by his innovations in theology. This involved greater theological liberalism, a departure from the orthodoxy of the high-fliers like Gray and Clark. It also involved a waning of the influence of the clergy. Of the two processes against Simson, the first, in 1714, for his Arminian views, resulted in an acquittal in 1717; the second, regarding his trinitarian views, began in 1726 and resulted in his suspension from the university in 1729.[139] Both lengthy processes, the second following in the wake of the Anderson fiasco, did much to diminish the authority of the church at Glasgow.

Beyond the confines of the clergy, amongst the ordinary citizens, prayer meetings were declining,[140] replaced by clubs and societies, such as the Triumpherian Club, which Clark's successor at the Tron, Rev. William Wishart, attended. (Clark had

---

137 Wodrow, *Analecta*,i ii, p.130.

138 Besides his levity, as revealed in his correspondence with Neil Campbell, his 'Billingsgate stile' in his prints, and his use of the Lord's prayer, Anderson's more liberal views can be detected in his criticisms of the Glasgow ministers as variously 'grave' or as 'old-world men', etc..

139 William Ferguson, *Scotland 1689 - Present, the Edinburgh History of Scotland*, vol. 4, (3rd edit., Edinburgh, 1978), pp. 116-117; 120-121.

140 'some years ago, I knew near 72 meetings for prayer, and these now, I am told, are sunk to 4 or 5', Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.129.

died in 1723). Wodrow noted a scoffing attitude towards religion developing amongst the younger merchants in particular, and a greater interest in speculative intellectual amusements which were replacing scriptural study. Moreover, amongst ministers, an interest in moral teaching, indicative of a more secular outlook, was replacing Calvinist orthodoxy with its emphasis on the lofty and austere abstractions of predestinarianism.

To strict Calvinists, religion was not about society or the world, but about God. Accordingly, George Campbell and John Gray found themselves becoming increasingly dissatisfied with Wishart's preaching, especially his interest in 'reason' or philosophical enquiry as a basis for faith. A pulpit war eventually broke out between Wishart and Gray over a sermon given by Wishart in which he enjoined his listeners to 'Prove all things'. Gray responded, by another pulpit broadcast, in which he asserted that the faith which was based on evidence was no better than the faith of devils, who believe and tremble.[141] Wodrow noted Wishart's immersion in such unorthodox and worldly views with a kind of horror, and it is with some relief that he records his eventual transfer to London in 1730.

Gray died in 1729, to be replaced at the Wynd church the following year by James Dick, once presented to the chair of Ecclesiastical History at Glasgow in 1720, but the Assembly refused translation. Dick however died in 1737 and the eventual replacement at the Wynd church, who occupied the charge for nearly 50 years, was Rev. William Craig (1709-1784), a Glasgow merchant's son.[142] In Craig is found a character who could not have been more opposite to Gray, the pupil of James Wodrow, and the doughty champion of orthodoxy. He was one of the new style of ministers who

---

141 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, pp. 183, 240, 246, 247, 254-255.

142 Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, pp. 432-433.

was rejected by the populace at large but adored by those with an affectation for polite values.[143] His memoirist records this with some frankness:

> His audience was not so numerous ... as those who valued good composition and liberality of sentiment, apprehended he deserved. Instead of the abstruse tenets of speculative theology, and the mysterious doctrines inculcated by many popular clergymen in the Church of Scotland, he thought his flock would be better edified by such plain exposition of their duty as was laid down in the precepts and example of Jesus Christ.[144]

Craig's fashionable emphasis on moral preaching was supported by Francis Hutcheson, professor of Moral Philosophy at the university, a personal friend and mentor. Indeed Craig was at one time a candidate for the divinity chair in 1743, but withdrew in order to assist his friend William Leechman's candidacy which was being actively promoted by Hutcheson.[145] Both men's religious sentiments were similar 'and alike obnoxious to the popular clergymen'.[146] Maclaurin by contrast, 'was believed to entertain religious opinions of a kind very agreeable to the multitude'.[147]

Of the other Glasgow ministers, the three young men who had joined with John Gray in 1719 and withdrawn from the General Session in protest over the Model and

---

143 Elizabeth Mure, Some remarks on the change of manners in my own time. 1700-1790, *Selections from the Family Papers preserved at Caldwell,* 3 vols., (Glasgow, 1854), i, pp. 267-8; records 'the taste for good morals' which an 'improved set of teachers' established in the west of Scotland, who included Wishart, Leechman, Craig and Francis Hutcheson. 'They taught that whoever would please God must resemble him in goodness and benevolence, and those that had it not must affect it by politeness and good manners'.

144 William Craig, *Twenty Discourses on various subjects,* (2nd edit., 1808), 2 vols., i, p. xi.

145 Kennedy, 'William Leechman, Pulpit Eloquence', p.7; Craig, *Sermons,* i, p. xiv. NLS, MS 4941, Caldwell Papers, Francis Hutchison to William Mure of Caldwell, M.P., 23 November 1743.

146 Craig, *Twenty Discourses*, i, p. xiv.

147 ibid., p. xv.

the changed powers of the General Session, survived into the 1740s. George Campbell held his charge until his death in 1748; John Hamilton and John Scott, likewise; both died in 1741. John Maclaurin died in 1754. Thus Calvinist orthodoxy was substantially upheld in Glasgow during the 1720s and 1730s, with Wishart, and latterly William Craig being the principle innovators, and neither of them especially popular. It is clear that though a section of the church was turning its back on 'enthusiasm', becoming more strongly directed towards ethics, towards a Christian life lived in society, the emphasis on seventeenth century Calvinism remained, with the events of 1648-50 serving as the key reference point as the disputes over the Model and the intrinsic power indicated.

Part II: the Episcopalians of Glasgow

The Episcopal presence lingered on in the city after the Revolution after the initial flurry had died down. But by the end of January 1689 Sage, active in collecting witness statements of the rabblings, could report that the ministers of Glasgow were 'scattered', following the first riot of 17 January. In February it was reported that Alexander Milne, minister of Glasgow, had been assaulted in the street a second time, and that none of the Glasgow ministers were safe. The minister of Cadder, David Milne, had also been attacked when he had come into the city. Only Archibald Inglis could be found on 17 February to give the service in the Cathedral which provoked the disastrous affray.[148]

148 Francis Fordyce et al, 'A letter concerning the persecution of several other ministers', Edinburgh, 14 February 1689', in John Sage, ed., *The case of the present afflicted clergy in Scotland truly represented,* First collection of papers, relating to the practice of the rabble before the Convention met, (London, 1690), p.43.

By May the Presbyterians had control of the churches after a successful application to the Committee of the Estates, justified because of the large number of Irish Protestants then in the city. This was a full year before Presbyterianism had become the established form, and even preceded the formal abolition of prelacy when the Estates reconvened as a parliament. On 23 April a ship had been sent by the session from Greenock to Derry which had returned with numerous refugees, amongst whom numbered two Presbyterian ministers, Robert Craighead and Thomas Kennedy.[149] The influx of such refugees carrying stories of atrocities committed in Ireland, is likely to have heightened the religious temperature of the Revolution at Glasgow and any remaining Episcopalian clergy must be assumed to have departed the city by that time.

Glasgow's Episcopalian clergy contained both Jacobite hard-liners like Sage who remained a determined non-juror, and others like Inglis, Robert Knox and Gabriel Russell, minister of Govan, who were prepared to acknowledge the new sovereigns. Nonetheless these found difficulty in being re-settled.[150] Sage and several others went to Edinburgh where Wodrow says he became the 'hack writer' of the party and where his colleagues retained possession of the city's pulpits for a further year, despite the opposition of the new magistrates returned by the free poll of the burgesses. Several Episcopalian ministers within the Presbytery of Glasgow attempted to conform but were never settled in Scotland.[151] The presence of 'prelatical' preachers in the city was

---

149 *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, (886), 'Act by the Committee of Estates, proceeding on a supplication presented to them be the people of Glasgow of the Presbyteriane perswasione', p.394; NLS, Ch.2782, Wodrow collection, f.47.

150 For a fuller picture of the Williamite Episcopalians see T. Clarke, 'The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland', *RSCHS*, vol. xxiv, Pt i, (1990), pp.33-51.

151 Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii. Archibald Inglis conformed and was called to Falkirk in 1691 but never settled. He eventually obtained a charge in Ireland, p. 457, as did Gabriel Russell of Govan, p.412. Robert Knox, who had only just come to Glasgow a few months before, conformed and was called to Peebles, but never settled, p.453-4. Robert Finnie of Cathcart was deprived in 1692 and went to America, p.382. Gilbert Mushet of Cumbernauld lingered longest; he was deprived in 1696 but remained in the parish after a chapel was built for him and was still there in 1715, p.385. Alexander George went to Edinburgh and died there in 1703, p.393. Details of the other Episcopalian ministers are scant but at least several died within a few years of the Revolution.

complained of by the Presbyterian ministers in 1698 during a visit of the Presbytery, and suggests that house conventicles continued in parts of the town.[152] The pattern for ejected Episcopalian ministers after 1688 remained much the same as for Presbyterians after 1662. Some were comprehended, some went to America, Ireland, or London; others to private families as tutors or chaplains, and some attempted to hold 'conventicles' in private houses, intruding into parishes in which Presbyterians were already settled, just as Presbyterians themselves had done. The Episcopalians also adopted self-pitying epithets to describe their communion in exile, as 'true' and 'suffering', 'persecuted', etc.. Of their former hearers, many like ex-Provost Walter Gibson conformed to the new establishment and paid their seat rents for the pews of the established church.[153]

When King William died on 8th March 1702, the act of 1693, commonly known as the 'Act for the peace and quiet of the Church' automatically became void. This had allowed Episcopalians to worship after their own fashion, so long as they took the Oath of Assurance[154]. However since the act had pertained to a particular monarch, and not to the crown in general, it ceased to apply on his decease. Notwithstanding, its being 'clogged' with such oaths had caused it to be regarded amongst Episcopalians as 'the act against Episcopacy' despite the fact that it had actually offered considerable freedom to those of that communion. The act applied equally well to Presbyterians,

---

152 NLS, MS Ch.2782, Wodrow collection, f.54.

153 City of Glasgow Archive, Presbytery of Glasgow records, CH2/171/9a, f8. A Presbyterial visit of 14 April 1715 noted that Walter Gibson still kept two laigh seats allotted to John Spreull in the west end of the kirk.

154 A.P.S., ix, p. 303. The conditions of this toleration were that ministers could be admitted to benefices who took the oaths of allegiance and assurance, subscribed the Confession of Faith, acknowledged Presbyterian government and undertook not to subvert it. Presbyteries were to be represented at the General Assembly according to the number of ministers in each. Thus in parts of the country almost wholly Episcopalian, it was possible that Episcopalian ministers, forming a majority in their local presbytery, could have a share in church government, provided they agreed to the above conditions. There were, in 1693, still considerable numbers of Episcopalians who had never been purged from their parishes and the act offered them an opportunity to come out of the cold. Dickinson and Donaldson , *A Source Book of Scottish History*, pp. 217-218.

who objected strongly to its Erastianism. Presbyterians scrupled to take the oaths on ecclesiastical and theological grounds but were not disaffected to William's government in the purely civil sense. Thus the General Assembly of 1694 sat defiantly without taking the oaths and faced dissolution by the king's commissioner, until a last minute concession on the part of William allowed it to meet without qualification[155]. A new act of 1695 extended the deadline for compliance until September 1st, and eventually 116 Episcopalian ministers complied and were comprehended within the terms of the act[156].

To adherents of the imperial ideology of the rightful House of Stuart, the taking of particular oaths to particular monarchs obviously bolstered the view that William's reign was in fact a kind of interregnum, an aberration which ought never to have occurred - an admission that William's power had been limited and conditional. Fresh oaths were not again required until the Toleration Act of 1712, and these likewise applied to all clergy, whether within the Established Church or Episcopalian dissenters. Although this act gave Episcopalians a permanent, protected legal status for the first time since 1690, it was at the price of recognising the reigning monarch as *de jure* as well as *de facto*, whomever he or she should be. However, many 'qualified' Episcopalian clergymen distorted references to the reigning monarch during George I's reign in such a way as to point to a person entirely different from the Hanoverian successor to Anne. Jacobite Episcopalians were observing the letter of the law but not the spirit of it,

---

155 Thomas Maxwell, 'William III and the Scots Presbyterians: Part I, The Crisis in Whitehall', *RSCHS*, vol. 15, (1964), pp. 117-139, and the alleged role William Carstairs was said to have had in intercepting William's instructions to the Assembly, a role which Maxwell attributed to Secretary Johnstone.

156 Compliance with the act provoked considerable bitterness and division amongst Episcopalians, similar to that which had occurred amongst Presbyterians in the 1670's by the indulgences. One of those who complied was Alexander Cairncross, former archbishop of Glasgow. Writing to the Bishop of London in 1698, Cairncross notes that those who have taken the oaths and enjoy William's protection are 'slighted by the Jacobites for their loyalty and affection to the present Government' whilst being 'hated by the Presbyterians for their serving under Episcopacy'. D. H. Whiteford, 'Jacobitism as a Factor in Presbyterian Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland 1689-1714', *RSCHS*, vol. 16, (1968), p.188.

and under the guise of the Toleration, began extending their operations rapidly across the country after 1712.[157]

But prior to this, the period 1702-1712 had actually allowed a considerable window of opportunity. Re-organisation could take place uninhibited by civil prescriptions, a situation which considerably alarmed opponents. The enforcement of the Revolution Settlement now lay with local jurisdictions, such as the magistrates and presbytery of Edinburgh, in the famous Greenshields case of 1710-1712; and in the post-union era, their authority was uncertain and increasingly open to challenge. The furore generated by this celebrated case[158], which went to the Court of Session and then to the House of Lords, formed the pretext for the eventual Toleration Act.

Many within the Episcopalian party however, remained firmly opposed to any form of legal toleration until the Stuart succession was restored, and found the ambiguity which Anne's succession brought, a more favourable climate in which to operate. The freedom which William's death had given Episcopalians was plainly enough stated by Sage in a letter of 1710 to Archibald Campbell, a co-religionist, (and a near cousin of the staunchly Whig duke of Argyll) when the question of a toleration was again raised during the Greenshields affair[159].

> None knows better than his Lordship Balmerino[160], that we do not need a Toleration. No law obliges us to be of the presbyterian communion, no law

---

157 R. Buick Knox, 'Establishment and toleration during the reigns of William, Mary and Anne', *RSCHS*, 23, Pt iii, (1989), p.354. This also gives comprehensive coverage of the transition from an Episcopal to a Presbyterian establishment.

158 Ferguson, *Scotland 1689 to the Present*, pp. 59, 110.

159 Campbell later became a bishop.

160 Arthur Elphinstone, 6th Lord Balmerino, (1688-1746), the leader of the Scottish Tories in the House of Lords, who pushed for a toleration. See NAS, Dalhousie Muniments, 14/352, Balmerino to Harry Maule, 8 March 1711. Balmerino was a Jacobite who participated in both rebellions, was captured at Culloden, and executed in London.

> forbids meeting-houses, nay no law obliges those who officiate in meeting houses to qualify. There was indeed one made in 1693 but it expired with King William and was never renewed in this reign.[161]

Though Sage was prepared to let the matter rest there, and found greater freedom in a 'connivance', others wished for more, especially as there was in general a lesser scruple amongst Episcopalians in taking oaths to Anne, a Stuart, a Tory, and a staunch upholder of Anglicanism. Thus many Jacobite Episcopalian noblemen and gentry had 'qualified' during Anne's reign (i.e., took the civil oaths to the reigning monarch) in order to enter parliament, although they had remained out during William's time. This phalanx formed the basis of the new Cavalier party[162] which soon made its presence felt. The Cavaliers' demands for concessions to their communion were not for the time being practical policy[163], but their strength and their brief alliance with the Court party was sufficient to cause speculation as to the possibility of a toleration[164].

In clerical circles, an initiative of 1702-1703 to petition Anne for better support of the Episcopal party, failed but not before it had caused some considerable alarm. It was spearheaded by John Paterson, former archbishop of Glasgow although opposed

---

161 Sage to Campbell, 18th November 1710, Episcopal Chest (MS 1980); Whiteford, 'Jacobitism as a Factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships'. On this point, see also Wodrow, *Analecta*, ii, p.109 (October 1712, after the Toleration), 'A bare connivance did them more service'; *Analecta*, i, p.311-312, (1710, before the Toleration) that Episcopalians already had 'a connivance' whereby they were not molested in their worship, and the majority were opposed to a Toleration which would involve them in civil oaths.

162 John Ker, *The Memoirs of John Ker of Kersland*, (London, 1726), p.21; a near contemporary account; that the Darien incident, which came to a conclusion in 1700, had forced a major re-alignment in Scottish politics which saw former Jacobites prepared to qualify in order to 'seek public employment', particularly in the reign of Queen Anne and to co-operate with the Country party against the Court. See also Ferguson, *Scotland 1689-Present*, pp. 38-39, for the changes made in Anne's ministry and the success of the Jacobites in the recent elections. Also P W J Riley, 'The Formation of the Scottish Ministry of 1703', *SHR*, xliv, p.114, 127, for the fate of the brief Court-Cavalier alliance. Also Riley, 'The Scottish parliament of 1703', *SHR*, xlvii, pp. 129-150.

163 Ferguson, *Scotland, 1689 to the Present*, p.39.

164 Wodrow, *History*, iv, p.429, attributes the efforts of Argyll and others, plus the commission of the General Assembly, with preventing this.

by a majority of his party[165]. Paterson supposedly had some influence with Anne; it was even rumoured he was to replace Carstairs as a royal chaplain.[166] His main motive seems to have been money. Financially things had been difficult for the non-juring Scottish Episcopal clergy since the Revolution. Those willing to take the oaths (jurors) could find livings in Ireland or England in the Anglican churches, such as Alexander Cairncross, Paterson's predecessor as archbishop at Glasgow; the only one of James's hierarchy prepared to challenge his Roman Catholic policy, and the only one who conformed at the Revolution. Cairncross was sacked from Glasgow in January 1687 but in 1693 was appointed to the see of Raphoe in Ireland.[167] Of the non-jurors who remained in Scotland, some like Sage, could find occasional insecure employment as private chaplains or tutors in Episcopalian families[168]; others became booksellers and printers. The leading figures however were supported by a private charitable fund raised by the English bishops during William's reign, but this was scant indeed[169]. For Paterson, the lure of the former bishops' rents, which as archbishop of Glasgow he had once enjoyed, proved irresistible.

The net effect of his petition, however, was to expose those who had not signed to the charge of disaffection, and gained him the enmity of Rose, bishop of Edinburgh,

---

165 Whiteford, 'Jacobitism as factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian relationships', p.191.

166 Wodrow, *Analecta*, i, p.18.

167 Mathieson, *Politics and Religion*, p.330n. See also his possible role in enabling Provost John Johnston of Clauchrie to criticise Archbishop Arthur Ross's transactions at Glasgow with Provost John Barns over the tack of the teinds, chapter one.

168 Sage briefly found employment as chaplain to Anne, Countess of Callandar, and tutor to her son, James; subsequently with Sir James Stewart of Grandtully. Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p.452.

169 Whiteford, 'Jacobitism as a factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian relationships', pp.189-190; that a fund was established after 1693 by the archbishop of York, John Sharp, for the relief of distressed Episcopalian clergy in Scotland. Sharp was even successful in securing pensions from Queen Anne for the former bishops of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen. Thomas Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury, had, during King William's time, suggested converting a part of the bishops' rents as a support for the former clergy, but on the basis that it would be tied to an oath to William.

and an extreme Jacobite.[170] By 1710, however, Paterson was dead, and Rose had assumed the undisputed leadership of the party. Sage was one of Rose's camp, made a bishop by him in 1706. Rose and his followers viewed Paterson as having put pecuniary gain before principle and saw his proposal as merely boxing the party in. Had it been successful, it would certainly have involved acknowledging Anne's successor, (whoever he or she might be). Further, their taking the oaths would have resulted in their losing their existing funding from the English non-jurors.[171]

The crown for its part was content to leave the matter of the bishops' rents unresolved for the time being, as the availability of this considerable fund of patronage was a means of controlling either clerical party. This shows that it regarded the matter of the religious establishment or its adherents, as somewhat uncertain of outcome. On the Presbyterian side, William Carstairs continued his campaign, begun in the 1690s, to secure the rents to fund specialist chairs in law, theology and medicine at the Scottish universities, an enlightened measure of practical policy, which would have benefited all willing to subscribe to the Westminster Confession (a condition of matriculation and graduation at a Scottish university and thus entry to the higher faculties).

Carstairs' services as royal chaplain were no longer required by Anne on her accession, though she retained him as an occasional adviser. He therefore continued to be credited with some influence in court circles. Fears of a Jacobite Episcopal backlash were certainly behind his appointment as Principal of Edinburgh University in 1703, an influential office which had lain vacant since the death of Gilbert Rule in 1701, and one which he increasingly used to manage the kirk. He was several times elected as

---

170 Whiteford, 'Jacobitism as a factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian relationships', p. 191.

171 Wodrow, *Analecta*, i, pp. 311-12.

Moderator of the General Assembly between 1703 and his death in 1715 and through this office helped to smooth through the acceptance of the union and the Patronage and Toleration acts of 1712.

As Paterson's initiative was undergoing discussion, an anti-Episcopal riot suddenly broke out at Glasgow, early in 1703. Details of this incident are sketchy and are provided by Wodrow[172], but it appears that the riot was a provocative attempt 'to make a broyle in this place' and news of it soon rippled across the country. The 'stirr' at Glasgow had followed a recent revival of Episcopalian organisation in the city which was taking full advantage of the new deregulated environment made possible by William's decease. Episcopal meetings were certainly evident in January 1703, and had required the protection of the magistrates. Thomas Mack, one of Wodrow's correspondents, regarded the magistrates' protection as a shameful blot on the character of the city, for there was as yet no legal obligation to provide this.[173]

Since the Revolution the city's Episcopalians had lived quietly and met secretly in private homes in the countryside, well outside the burgh, and by 1703 they were much reduced in numbers. At the Revolution 500-600 people 'of the best quality in town' had crowded into the service in the Cathedral which sparked off the riot of February 1689. However, in 1703, it seems that only about 40 individuals were congregated to commemorate the martyrdom of Charles I on the 30th January. This figure was little altered a decade later, when Cockburn opened his meeting house; and in the 1720s, Wodrow commented that a house could accommodate all the

---

172 NLS, Wodrow 4to (28), f.151-153; 'The double of a letter from a friend in Glasgow to a friend in Edinburgh anent the stirr, March 7th, 1703', and, 'A humble representation unto the Magistrates of Glasgow and other officers of justice by the Inhabitants of Glasgow, holding first the intollerable grievances from some prelatick preachers and a few malcontents in Glasgow, their Adherent and abetters, March 9th, 1703'.

173 NLS, Wodrow 4to, letters; Thomas Mack to Robert Wodrow, January 1703.

Episcopalians in Glasgow. On the other hand, most of these die-hards were leading citizens and wealthy lairds, like the Stirlings of Keir or the Walkinshaws of Barrowfield. On Anne's accession, however, Glasgow's Episcopalians were determined to make their presence felt and began meeting more openly 'as if they were confident now of protection, doe what they will'[174]. The propaganda and publicity objectives of these activities seems clear.

The meeting which took place in ex-Provost Bell's house in the Saltmarket, on 30th January 1703[175], was probably a service of commemoration of the martyrdom of Charles I; an exercise less intended to laud and lament Charles than to embarrass Presbyterians. A similar service was held in Edinburgh on the 30th January, preached by Robert Calder, a noted Episcopal pamphleteer whom Wodrow described as the 'hack writer' of the party.[176] The elderly Bell was certainly a staunch Jacobite and Episcopalian. His authoritarian regime had dominated burgh politics from 1652 onwards and he had held the council for the royalists for most of the Restoration period, assisted by his allies, the Campbells of Blythswood. An Episcopalian prayer-meeting on the 30th January was provocative enough, in a Whig city in which many had allegedly suffered by the bishops' and curates' informations[177], but the news of Anne's list of Privy Councillors when it reached Glasgow, and her letter accompanying

---

174 ibid.

175 Wodrow 4to,(28), 'The double of a letter', f151.

176 Maxwell, 'The Presbyterian Episcopalian Controversy in Scotland', thesis, p.198. Calder was a native of Elgin and was expelled from Nenthorn after the Revolution for refusing to pray for William and Mary. In 1696 he was imprisoned for intruding into parishes in which there was a Presbyterian minister, but for a while he managed to maintain a ministry in Aberdeen from his house, and was also for a while based at Elgin. Latterly he was associated with an Episcopalian meeting house at Todderick's Wynd, Edinburgh, and with attempts at introducing the Book of Common Prayer into Scotland.

177 Wodrow 4to,(28), 'The double of a letter', f151

it, seems to have raised temperatures even further[178]. Significantly, in December 1702 Anne had replaced Sir John Maxwell of Pollok, a local Renfrewshire laird and noted ally of the Anderson Revolutioner regime in the burgh, lord of session (he sat on the bench as Lord Pollok), Rector of Glasgow University and celebrated Presbyterian 'martyr'; with Tarbat's brother, Roderick Mackenzie of Prestonhall, as Lord Justice Clerk.[179] Maxwell was also removed as a Privy Councillor, though he retained his seat on the bench. Anne's letter accompanying these changes was understood to uphold the Claim of Right and the existing church establishment, but nonetheless by appearing to condone Episcopalian worship without pre-conditions, speculation as to a more general legal toleration became intense[180]. This was especially worrying as, according to Wodrow, it was through Paterson's influence that the Queen's letter had been pro cured[181]. A pamphlet war then ensued over the subject of a toleration in which Glasgow ministers were prominent, notably James Brown's debate with Dr John Hay, the ex-minister of Falkland, the so-called 'Debate in the Shop', because it began by a chance encounter between Hay and Brown in a bookseller's shop in Edinburgh. The debate ranged through many aspects of the controversy between Episcopalians and Presbyterians[182].

---

178 Six men with Cavalier connections were added to Anne's Privy Council on 4th February 1704, including Tarbat's son, and Tullibardine's father. P. W. J. Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, (Manchester, 1978), pp. 50,46. Earlier changes had indicated a 'broad-bottomed' ministry in which the Jacobite party had some share. Melville, Leven, Cockburn of Ormiston, and notably, in a Glasgow context, Maxwell of Pollok, all leading Whigs who had served under William, were all turned out. Riley, *Union of England and Scotland*, p. 45.

179 W. Fraser, *Memoirs of the Maxwells of Pollok*, 2 vols., i, Edinburgh (1863), p.88; Riley, *Union*, p.46. Mackenzie's patent was dated 1 December 1702. Maxwell continued to draw the salary until Whitsunday 1703.

180 In February 1703 Anne wrote to her new Privy Council about the treatment of Episcopalians in Scotland. This showed no significant deviation from the policy of comprehension under William - except that no form of qualification was mentioned. They were simply to 'be protected in the peaceable exercise of their religion, and in their persons and estates according to the laws of the kingdom..'. Riley, *Union*, pp. 49-50.

181 Wodrow, *Analecta*, i, p.311.

182 *The Debate in the Shop*, (1703).

The recent spate of Episcopalian meetings within the burgh provoked urgent negotiations with Colin Bell, Sir John's son, and others of the Glasgow Episcopalians, including the Walkinshaws of Barrowfield. However requests that meetings conducted by 'unqualified or scandalous persons', be held out of town or in some back corner of it in future, [183] were ignored. Here it is appropriate to note that Bell's stately tenement, where the meetings took place, was one of the finest buildings in Glasgow and was situated in a prime central location near to the Cross.[184] It had achieved particular notoriety as the house in which James VII had slept and dined during his visit to Glasgow in 1681 when he was Duke of York. Clearly alarm was raised by the revival of such overt symbols of the old order going on under the very noses of the magistrates.

It was amidst such heightening tensions that a riot broke out in the city on Sunday 7 March 1703. This was occasioned by the prayer-meetings being allowed to continue at Bell's house but also because of the presence of a non-burghal armed guard to protect the meeting. The presence of the dragoons (for such they were) seems to have given high offence and acted as the particular catalyst; perhaps recalling memories of the Highland Host. Possibly this was because the magistrates had responded to the criticisms of Mack and others and withdrawn the services of the Town guard so that the

---

(1) John Hay, *Imparity among Pastors; the Government of the Church by Divine Institution as maintained in an extemporary Debate by an Episcopal Divine against one of the Presbyterian Persuasion*, (1703).
(2) James Brown, *A Second Edition of the Debate in the Shop, about imparity amongst Pastors. Wherein the First Edition by an Episcopalian Divine is corrected*, (Edinburgh, 1703).
(3) John Hay, *Self-condemnation: or the author of the Second Edition of the Debate in the Shop condemned out of his own Mouth*, (Edinburgh, 1703).
(4) James Brown, *A Stone returning upon him that rolled it; or, an Answer unto Self-Condemnation, holding forth both the weakness and wickedness of that Episcopal*, (1703).
(5) James Clerk? or James Brown, *Self-murder, or an Episcopalian Doctor murdering his own Reputation in a pamphlet called Self-Condemnation, in pursuance of the Debate in the Shop*, (Edinburgh, 17030.

183 Wodrow 4to,(28), 'The double of a letter', f152.

184 *BRG*, 1663-1690, pp. 39, 304; said to have been situated on the southside of Bridgegate and the west side of the Saltmarket; in 1903 part of this and an adjoining property acquired by the Bells, was purchased by the city corporation in connection with the widening of the Briggait.

Bells were obliged to provide for their own security. The date too, is possibly significant, being nearly a full year to the day of Anne's accession and it may have been intended to mark the first anniversary of a new Stuart 'Restoration', (Anne being James VII's daughter). At any rate, the disorder started after the dragoons positioned at the entrance of the tenement, chased some children down the street with swords drawn. At this, a 'noise' quickly gathered in town, which some at first thought to be a fire alarm. The magistrates were alerted, and emerged from church accompanied by the Towns Officers and 'regiments' (companies of the civic militia), who calmed the situation down, dissolved the prayer-meeting and provided a safe escort home for the 40 or so persons who had attended. Wodrow's source was clearly concerned that had any of the soldiers fired, a blood-bath could have ensued in which many lives would have been lost.[185]

Memories of the Highland Host were certainly still very strong in Glasgow and were to acquire an extended after-life in folk-memory. They were still sufficiently vivid during the Malt Tax riots in 1725 to represent a significant factor of the incident. In 1703 the mere presence of a small armed guard caused great alarm. A couple of days later the inhabitants presented the magistrates with a petition protesting the 'intollerable grievances' occasioned by the 'prelatick preachers and a few malcontents' holding such services in Bell's house[186]. The lengthy petition recited the now familiar Revolutioner litany of the tyrannies of the former age, Episcopacy's notable failure, the recent happy Revolution, and the various acts upon which the present church establishment was

185 NLS, MS Wodrow, 4to, 28, f152.

186 NLS, Wodrow MS, 4to(28), f153; 'A humble representation unto the Magistrates of Glasgow', 9th March 1703.

legally founded[187]. It demanded that those who were responsible for the services be suppressed, and accused certain of them of being openly disaffected to the government whilst others, they claimed, were even atheists who derided all religious exercise. It concluded by reminding the magistrates that 'this nation is under oath to God' to make reformation[188].

Since nothing more is heard of the Glasgow Episcopalians until William Cockburn's meeting house set up at the Toleration, it seems safe to conclude that the magistrates succeeded in suppressing these very public meetings at Bell's house, pressurised by a combination of the inhabitants, the ministers, the General Session and presbytery of Glasgow. However pressure was also applied at even higher levels, for news of the riot reached Queensberry, the Queen's commissioner and Secretary of State, who expressed some annoyance. In a letter to Seafield he made it clear that in allowing the Episcopalians some measure of freedom, the Queen had expected the Privy Council '...to hinder any provocation to be given by the dissenting clergy, to whom, by her letter directed to their lordships, she promised protection only in their actings as allowed by law...'[189]

In other parts of the country the authorities also seem to have acted to suppress Episcopalian meeting houses, especially during the union negotiations. The first article of the union had involved recognising the Hanoverian succession, and political tensions with the Jacobites were therefore high. In 1706 meeting houses were closed at St

---

187 Ratified recently in Anne's first parliament, in June 1702.

188 NLS, Wodrow MS, 4to(28), f153; 'A humble representation unto the Magistrates of Glasgow', 9th March 1703.

189 Riley, *Union*, p.50; NAS, GD248, Box 5/2, correspondence between Seafield and Queensberry, Queensberry to Seafield, March 1703.

Andrews, Keith and Elgin and letters of summons sent out by the Privy Council to preachers at meeting houses at Perth, Dundee, Montrose and Stirling.[190]

After 1707, however, the union, and the abolition of the Privy Council in 1708, created a new unstable executive framework in which the powers of burghs and local jurisdictions to enforce the Revolution Settlement could be challenged. English troops and English excise officers were also brought into Scotland in increasing numbers as a result of the union and their presence led to frequent denominational clashes with the Presbyterian church establishment. A further clash was evident at Glasgow between 1712-1714 in the affair of Cockburn's meeting house.

Tensions with the few Anglicans in the city of Glasgow were evident while the Greenshields case was raging at Edinburgh. In 1711 English soldiers barracked in Glasgow began to complain of the severity of the Presbyterian discipline to which they were subject, and began demanding preachers of their own communion.[191] Thus when William Cockburn, a Scottish Episcopalian minister, arrived in the autumn of 1712 and began setting up his meeting house for the English service in terms of the Toleration Act (which had become law in October), he found a ready congregation amongst the English troops wintering there. Cockburn had qualified under the act - though some of those who assisted him, notably Alexander Duncan, had not. One of his first public acts was a controversial Anglican burial service for an English soldier held in the High Church yard, but to avoid further offence, he had been careful to remove his gown in the street before and after the service.[192] Subsequent burials were banned by the magis-

---

190 Whiteford, 'Jacobitism as a factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian relationships', p.194.

191 Wodrow, *Analecta*, i, pp. 352-3.

192 M'Crie, *Wodrow Correspondence*, i, Wodrow to Rev. James Hart, minister of Edinburgh, 31 December 1712, p.362.

trates. They were however obliged, in terms of the act, to give him some protection for his meeting house, and sent three of the Towns Officers to attend[193]. These 'protected' meetings held a dark fascination for Wodrow and were watched closely. More protection was occasionally found to be necessary, however. During the Easter service, in 1713, one of his congregation, Sir Donald MacDonald of Sleat, (who apparently lived in Glasgow), found it expedient to bring along some of his armed clansmen into the meeting, although none of them had any English. The men were striking in their Highland dress,[194] and the event created some excitement; MacDonald being a 'king' with his own private army was later the subject of a scurrilous Whig lampoon by some Grammar School boys.

Cockburn was not the only Episcopalian minister at Glasgow; he was sometimes assisted by the remarkable Alexander Duncan, a Jacobite who was still actively preaching in the city in 1729[195], although he had never qualified. Duncan had been an Episcopalian minister since before the Revolution.[196] Cockburn's venture, though it secured an annual stipend of £20 stg. for Cockburn (funded by the Episcopalians, and not from the Bishops' rents, as was hoped), the premises of a meeting-house, and acquired the later addition of an altar, did not have a large following at Glasgow, and probably consisted largely of visiting English troops. According to Wodrow, many of the local Episcopalian gentry were averse to hearing

---

193 ibid., Wodrow to Rev. John Flint, minister of Edinburgh, 10 November 1712, p.341.

194 Ibid., Wodrow to Rev. John Williamson, minister of Musselburgh, 21 April 1713, p.442.

195 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iv, p.26.

196 *Analecta*, iv, 26.

the English liturgy and preferred to hear Mr Fullarton[197] preach in their houses instead[198]. This was partly because Cockburn had qualified whilst Fullarton had not, but also because Fullarton, as even Wodrow was prepared to concede, was a far better preacher, and upright in his conduct. As well as preaching, Cockburn also catechised according to the Anglican form.[199]

However the commemorative service held for Charles I in Glasgow on 30th January 1713, not long after Cockburn had arrived in the city[200] was a highly controversial event which observers noted with alarm. The sermon was no more than a political harangue on 'the duty of obedience to God and their prince', on 'Peace and Resignation to the divine will' etc., much of it lifted, according to Wodrow, from existing Anglican high-flier tracts. It was defiantly published by Freebairn in Edinburgh. The main aim seems to have been publicity and to embarrass the Presbyterian church establishment, especially at Glasgow; for appended to the printed version was a list of names of 21 prominent Glaswegians whom Cockburn claimed to have attended.[201] The sermon began by congratulating the congregation on their 'fidelity to mitre and crown' in fitting up a chapel for the liturgy 'in a populous city hitherto thought averse to Episcopacy'[202]. Little was said of Charles's actual life and instead the

---

197 M'Crie, *Wodrow Correspondence*, i, Letter CVI, Wodrow to Rev. James Hart, 31 December 1712, pp. 361-362; Wodrow to Rev. James Hart, 2 April 1713, p.438. Fullarton was made Bishop in 1720. He frequently preached at Walkinshaw of Barrowfield's house, ibid..

198 Ferguson, *Scotland, 1689 to the Present*, p. 110, for the 'love-hate' relationship Scottish Episcopalians frequently bore towards Anglicanism.

199 M'Crie, *Wodrow Correspondence*, i, Wodrow to Rev. James Flint, 19 March 1713, pp. 431-432.

200 William Cockburn, *A Sermon upon the 30th January 1713, being the Anniversary Fast for the Martyrdom of the Blessed King Charles I, preached at Glasgow by William Cockburn, minister of the Episcopal Congregation there*, (Edinburgh, 1713).

201 Appendix ii. Wodrow however, was disinclined to believe that Jordanhill or Kilmarnock had attended. M'Crie, *Wodrow Correspondence*, i, p.404.

202 ibid.

sermon directed its polemic against 'these Republican spirits' of the present age who had still not repented their crime of having delivered Charles I into republican hands. It had been base principles indeed, claimed Cockburn, which had cut off the Royal Martyr. Charles was referred to throughout as the 'Lord's Anointed'. A similar Episcopal sermon of commemoration held two years previously in Edinburgh on 30th January[203] had used an identical phrase.

The particular context cited to illustrate the subject's duty of passive obedience, even to a tyrannical king, in both these homilies, was that of the biblical story of David and Saul. To a modern reader, there is something approaching the ridiculous, if not the plainly distasteful, (and certainly the politically illogical), about the avid enthusiasm of the preachers of these homilies, in luridly painting up the tyrannous characters of certain Old Testament kings, merely to uphold the excellence of their subjects' 'virtue' in stoically submitting to them. There appears, however, to be a latent acknowledgement in this line of argument, that recent Stuart kings had in fact been bad kings; (though not as bad, perhaps as Saul). The Edinburgh preacher, Andrew Cant, related how, for instance, when David was a subject, he had nobly resisted the temptation to kill the dreadful Saul, his rightful king, but a tyrant. David had refused on the high grounds of religious principle, answering those who had urged him to tyrannicide, 'Who can stretch forth his Hand against the Lord's Anointed?'. In this alternative Calvinist culture there thus appears no less an appeal to the stoicism and inherent masochism of the Scottish character than appears in the fabled kill-joy dourness of Presbyterians. It seems Episcopalians could also find ample Old Testament paradigms, and appeal equally well to the Scottish status of being an elect nation like

---

203 Andrew Cant, *A Sermon preached at Edinburgh on Tuesday 30th January 1711, being the Anniversary of the Martyrdom of Charles I, by one of the suffering clergy there.* (Edinburgh, 1711).

the ancient Hebrews, to uphold a doctrine of indefeasible hereditary right and passive obedience. Cockburn likewise cited David's principled stance regarding Saul, 'God's Viceregent'. 'The present age' Cockburn intoned, 'has not made a good use of the detestable Crime ... I mean that the Enemies of Monarchy have not repented of their wicked Principles'.[204]

Presbyterians naturally objected to being libelled as 'the Enemies of Monarchy' as they did to Cockburn's exhorting his congregation to pray for the restoration of Episcopacy.[205] Noise of his sermon soon began circulating the town and feeling against him was little abated 20 months later when news of Anne's death reached Glasgow, at the beginning of August 1714[206]. Anne died suddenly, yet her health had been of concern for some time and the news could not have been entirely unexpected. Her death meant that the Hanoverian succession was now a fact; it also meant an anticipated change in the ministry in favour of the Whigs and the Presbyterian establishment in Scotland. So complete was the change, Wodrow was to refer to the accession of George I as an act of deliverance; the second Revolution.

To mark the king's accession, the Lord Provost, magistrates and town council of Glasgow, with numerous local noblemen, gentry and leading burgesses of the city, immediately made their loyalty known by an impromptu ceremony on 6th August 1714. Details of this event were likewise published and celebrated; and perhaps as a counterblast to Cockburn's earlier sermon which had appended the names of 21 Episcopalians, the magistrates' proclamation listed the names of the 20 captains of the

---

204 Cockburn, *A Sermon upon the 30th January 1713*, p.13.

205 ibid.

206 Queen Anne died on 1 August 1714. The destruction of Cockburn's meeting house took place about the 6 or 7 August, i.e., the instant the news reached Glasgow. M'Crie, *Wodrow Correspondence*, Wodrow to Rev. James Hart, 26 August 1714, pp. 563-4.

town's Train Bands (the burgh militia) all prominent citizens,[207] who had assembled for the salute[208]. Those who congregated to demonstrate their loyalty to the Revolution and its principles were drawn up into three battalions and discharged their pieces as the king's health was being drunk by the magistrates and dignitaries on the Tolbooth stair head. Moreover,

> The burgers and inhabitants of the City appeared in their Arms and with Orange Ribbons in their Hats; In Remembrance of the Glorious Deliverance of the Nation from Popery and Slavery, by King William and Queen Mary, To whom under God is to be ascribed the Present Happy Settlement of the Crown, in the Illustrious and Mighty Prince George, Elector of Brunswick-Lunenburg.[209]

The presence of so many orange ribbons makes plain the celebratory mood on the death of Anne and the dominant political orientation of the citizens as 'Revolution men', which orange had come to symbolise. Anne's death could only have been greeted as a matter of considerable relief in a city which had suffered much under the later Stuarts, and lately, had feared a reversal of the Revolution Settlement by the Toleration and Patronage Acts of 1712 which Anne's ministers had endorsed. As a statement of support for the Hanoverian succession, the salute could not have been more emphatic. It is also evident that such an overt demonstration of loyalism was fuelled by the alarm over events in Glasgow since 1702.

A mysterious incident then took place about this time which was wholly unaccounted for. The night after the news of Anne's death reached the city, Cockburn's

---

207 *Proclamation in favours of George I by the Lord Provost, magistrates and town council of Glasgow, assisted with several Noblemen and Principle gentlemen of Quality and Burgesses of the City, 6th August 1714,* (1714)

208 Appendix iii

209 ibid.

meeting-house was suddenly pulled down[210], and the culprits could not be found. Cockburn himself must have anticipated the attack, for he left town beforehand with his wife and family, taking his gown and his books with him and heading for Stirling.[211]

The magistrates could offer no explanation for the incident. In their letter to Montrose, their current patron, a few days later, they stated that they had received no requests for assistance from the meeting house or its promoters; that no mob had assembled, and that when they arrived with a small party of the guard, the damage had already been done, (it was noted), from within. Seats and windows had been thrown out into the street and the demolition had taken place within an hour, they estimated. The attackers had escaped into the night, leaving no clue as to who they were or what their motive had been. The magistrates' current theory was that the perpetrators were none other than those responsible for setting up the meeting house in the first place, who, 'despairing of their king' (now that the Hanoverian succession was law), had attempted to destroy their own premises in order to implicate the Presbyterians.[212] This rather far-fetched explanation is further undermined by subsequent events. The boys of the Grammar School were allowed to publish a piece of doggerel, *The Downfall of Cockburn's Meeting House,* which celebrated the event and predictably derided its congregation, notably one Macdonald, a 'king', who notwithstanding his personal army of clansmen, was forced to flee like Cockburn to Stirling[213]. It describes how the pulpit

---

210 A manuscript note on the British Library copy of a broadsheet entitled *The Downfall of Cockburn's Meeting House* states that it suddenly 'collapsed'.

211 NAS GD.220/5/334/1 R52, Montrose Muniments, Magistrates of Glasgow to the Duke of Montrose, 11 August 1714. GD.220/5/351/1(1), Principle Stirling to Montrose, 20th August 1714; GD.220/5/344/2(2) Magistrates of Glasgow to Montrose 5 September 1714. Montrose had endeavoured to represent the incident to the Lords Justices and to deflect any criticism from the magistrates.

212 ibid.

213 *The Downfall of Cockburn's Meeting House,* (1714).

gown was pulled down and torn and the chess windows broken. The boys of the Grammar School were, it seems, blamed for the vandalism and faced imprisonment as a result[214].

A further piece of Whig polemic which was little better in literary terms, but heavier in ironics, was *Glasgow's Parrad.* This broadside vividly described events which took place in the city on 20th October 1714, as the city celebrated the coronation of George I. Significantly, both this and the previously noted print claimed that the Whigs at Glasgow were now much advanced by the destruction of Cockburn's meeting house, the departure of Harley from the government, and the anointing of George I[215]. (Harley, (1st Earl of Oxford), a promoter of the Toleration Act, was dropped from the ministry on 27th July 1714, some days before Anne's death).[216] In what was evidently a piece of street theatre intended to reassert undisputed cultural dominance over the Episcopalians for the insult of Cockburn, a procession consisting of the magistrates mounted on horseback, the burgesses, and local nobles and gentry who had come into town, assembled in the city centre to the sound of drums beating through the town which:

> Acquainted the People how they must bow
>
> And yield with submission, what e're might be
>
> The hopes that they had of Bastard Jamie.[217]

At 2pm the procession set off from the Cross for Glasgow Green, with colours, swords and guns ribboned 'as low as the knee'. It returned about 5pm to the sound of the

---

214 ibid.

215 *Glasgow's Parrad,* (1714).

216 Ferguson, *Scotland 1689 to the Present*, p. 63.

217 *Glasgow's Parrad.*

ringing of the town's bells, and guns were discharged at the Cross. Every man had to stand to attention for the salute and hats were thrown high in the air. Windows along the main streets displayed placards saying, 'God Save Our King George in Peace and Safetie'. Some traders even put out free tables laden with food, 'where all was made welcome, what ever they be'. Bonfires were lit in many parts of the town which burned throughout the night and the weather cock was even taken down from the Tolbooth steeple and fixed to a lamp mounted with many candles 'so that people might see'.[218]

This rare insight into a carnival mood at Glasgow reveals the extent of popular relief felt by the death of Queen Anne and the depth of unpopularity of her ministers and her policies. A new era was ushered in. The Duke of Montrose, a near neighbour who owned estates close to Glasgow, was made Secretary of State, a move which was seen as improving Glasgow's status considerably. The magistrates had been cultivating Montrose for some time as a potential ally in court circles. The parade at Glasgow had followed enthusiastic representations of loyalty to the new monarch in the form of loyal addresses sent to Montrose for the king from the magistrates and Presbytery of Glasgow.[219] But as early as April 1714, the MP for Glasgow Burghs, the redoubtable Dean of Guild Thomas Smith, had sent, on the instructions of the magistrates, a burgess ticket to Prince George on his expected arrival at London from Hanover.[220] This humble gift of the freedom of the city was received with much thanks by George, and

---

218 ibid.

219 NAS GD220/5/344/2(3), Montrose Muniments, Magistrates of Glasgow to Montrose, 1 October 1714, enclosing a loyal address to the king; GD.220/5/384, ibid., John Gray, Moderator of the Presbytery of Glasgow to Montrose, 1 October 1714, loyal address of the Presbytery of Glasgow; *BRG*, 1/10/1714, Address to his Majesty signed by the council, p.521.

220 *BRG*, 1/10/1714, p.522.

his reply, in French, graciously acknowledging its acceptance, delighted the magistrates.[221]

Scottish Episcopalianism continued in its shadowy existence at Glasgow after 1714. This was severely curtailed by the arrest of leading Episcopalians at the '15, attainted in the rebellion, such as the Stirlings of Keir and the Walkinshaws of Barrowfield.[222] In the 1720s the Episcopal communion at Glasgow was bolstered again by the visits of English soldiers wintering in the city. But of the native Episcopalians, Wodrow claimed that these were so few by 1728, that a private house could have held them all, a picture which seems little different from the position in 1703. Most of these were the younger generation of the same families who had convened 25 years earlier. The English soldiers generally brought their own chaplains, however, which were preferred to Scottish Episcopalians. Alexander Duncan appears to have stayed on after Cockburn's departure, or at least was present in the city throughout the 1720s. He could give the English service, yet the Anglicanism of the established Church of England was averse to the open Jacobitism which Duncan continued to profess. When called out to give the sacrament to a dying English soldier in 1721, Duncan had required him to first repent his sins, the principle of which was his having served in King George's army, renouncing his lawful king.[223] When the soldier refused, James Clark, minister of the Tron, was brought in to minister to his needs.

---

221 ibid., pp. 521-524.

222 James Stirling of Keir (1679-1749) was accused of high treason in 1708, for toasting James VIII but acquitted and was seized at Sheriffmuir. He was attainted and forfeited but was able to return in the 1720s and lived quietly. He was seized again apparently on suspicion, in 1745. W. Fraser, *The Stirlings of Keir and their family Papers*, (Edinburgh, 1858), pp.69-71.

223 Wodrow, *Analecta*, ii, pp. 347-8.

The magistrates for their part continued to resist giving help to Episcopalians, whether Scottish or Anglican, especially after the Malt Tax Riots, which appeared to signal a new low in the co-operation between a resurgent Revolutioner council under Provost Charles Miller and the contingents of the regular military. In 1726 the chaplain of the English regiment barracked in town was given scant assistance with his request for premises in which to preach[224]. Yet in the 1720s increasing fraternisation was evident between certain moderately-inclined younger ministers at Glasgow and the visiting English chaplains. It was disapprovingly noted by Wodrow that Rev. Wishart, a young minister who had recently come to the city, was keeping such loose company[225].

A further attempt made at Glasgow in 1728 to set up an Episcopalian meeting house, was also threatened by mobs after only a few meetings. Services were held in rooms across the street from the university, in James Corbet's tenement in Broad Close. Several local lairds who wintered in town contributed towards the costs of this initiative, including noted Jacobites such as Stirling of Keir, Barrowfield, Northside, plus others less openly disaffected to the government like Richard Graham.[226] The magistrates intervened after several Sunday meetings had taken place conducted by Alexander Duncan, and one Wingate, a preacher from the east country - both of them non-jurors. But by 1729, Duncan, old and frail, was driven into conducting services in his own house 'for the few upright, stiff Jacobites who will not join in places where the king is prayed for'.[227] The remainder, including Barrowfield, went to the chaplain of the

---

224 ibid., iii, pp. 257-7.

225 ibid., iii, p. 261.

226 ibid., iv, pp. 8-9.

227 ibid., iv, p. 26.

English soldiers. It was only in 1751 that a permanent structure was built for Episcopalian worship in the city, St Andrews-by-the-Green, which met with no little opposition. The 'English Chapel' was known locally as the 'Whistling Kirk'.[228]

In conclusion, in this prosophographical survey of clergy and religious culture at Glasgow 1690-1740, a number of themes come to the fore. In the first instance it is evident that amongst Presbyterians the events of 1648-1650 remained the key reference point until John Anderson came along in 1718. The disputes about the Model indicate that Gray and his colleagues interpreted the powers of the General Session as more extensive than the laity in the kirk sessions. They also regarded the clerical element as more powerful than laymen's in determining the kirk's 'intrinsic power'. The Anderson controversy, in conjunction with the Simson case, prompted a major review of what the Presbyterian church stood for. Wodrow tells us that after the Anderson call the church at Glasgow was never the same again; magistrates and ministers were divided against each other; the Revolutioner consensus which had united them in 1689 was now in tatters, and the church, lay and clerical, remained bitterly divided between old-style Calvinists and their value system and the newer, more modern men such as Wishart and Craig, who followed in their wake.

It is evident that certain features of the Episcopal church were taken on board by their successors; its rationalism, its secular focus ('moral preaching', i.e., a pre-occupation with a Christian life lived in the world), its use of literary and classical sources, its erastianism, and even its alleged Arminianism (Simson case). The Lord's

---

228 Denholm, *A History of the City of Glasgow*, p.100. This was situated at the south end of the Saltmarket, a little to the east, in what is now St Andrews Square. It was (in 1798) more opulently decorated than most Presbyterian churches, having an organ in the west, an alter in the east, a large Venetian window with festoon hangings, and seats with stuffed green cushions. The pulpit looked towards the west and had a canopy suspended from the roof, from which hung 'several beautiful lustres, gilt'. It also had lofts and fine wood panelling. Andrew Hunter, the master mason who built it, was excommunicated for his involvement. Charles McKean, David Walker, Frank Walker, *Central Glasgow an illustrated architectural guide*, (Edinburgh, 1993), p. 36.

prayer was another case in point. Modernisers like Wishart and Craig were not popular but it is evident their appeal was to a section of the wealthier burgesses who dominated kirk sessions and who were critical of overweening clerical power. Many, like Provost Aird, were anxious to pander to the tastes of more powerful men such as the Duke of Argyll; the rivalry between the Argathelians and the Squadrone intensified this tendency to curry favour, amongst smaller men especially as each faction by turns grew more powerful.

Much of the popular resistance to such modernising influences was however based less on their merits than on their historical associations with Episcopal tyranny; with the Highland Host, sent to the city in 1678; with the Stuart culture of passive obedience and absolute monarchy. Yet in a curious way, the critique of passive obedience backfired on the Presbyterians in an objection to their alleged clerical tyranny, notably Anderson's satire on Clark's duty of obedience to pastors even though the basis of Clark's position was contractarian - and justified by the people's call.

The church as a whole turned its back on enthusiasm and became more strongly orientated towards ethics. Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746), professor of Moral Philosophy at Glasgow University from 1729, and a former student of Simson, was a leading promoter of this, an important harbinger of the Enlightenment. John Maclaurin was however instrumental in modernising the old religion by retaining its evangelical flavour and 'enthusiasm' whilst leading it in a socially reformist direction. This was of course entirely in line with Calvinist ideas of the godly commonwealth. But the idea that man was good by nature or that good works could lead to salvation represented a direct onslaught on the fundamentals of Calvinist orthodoxy and was resisted for a very long time.

The Cameronians retained a shadowy existence as scattered and fragmented groups of dissenters but became more prominent after 1706 when Rev. John McMillan (1670-1753), Church of Scotland minister of Balmagie, was finally deposed by the General Assembly after years of vainly protesting the church's intrinsic power. Such was McMillan's popularity, he was able to hang onto his manse until the mid-1720s and found a following amongst the remnants of the Society People. The McMillanites eventually formed the Reformed Presbyterian Church in 1743, but through much of the 1710s and 1720s McMillan's group was an embarrassment and an anxiety to Wodrow.[229] John Ker of Kersland (1673-1726), a Jacobite-government double agent with a Cameronian background, claimed in his *Memoirs* that there were three church parties in his day, Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Cameronians; but that the Cameronians, although a minority, and 'peaceable in this reign because they were permitted to live quietly', had a cultural influence on popular opinion disproportionate to their numbers, and that they were actually the 'most considerable of the three'.[230] Given his general pre-occupation as a spy since 1707, he presumably meant as a focus for armed political dissent. The dangerously subversive doctrines of resistance and self-defence were still maintained, 'which they never fail to put into practice when violence is offered or when in the least disturbed in their worship, at their meetings or their conventicles or elsewhere, by any sort of governors or governments whatsoever'. Cameronian influence was notable in the 1706 attempt at Glasgow and the south west to promote an 8000 strong Covenanter style rising to march on the parliament in protest

---

229 Wodrow, *Analecta*, 4 vols., i, pp. 278, 287, 290, 306, 315; vol. ii, pp. 9, 75, 76, 78, 88, 112, 238, 252, 378; iii, 243, 244.

230 John Ker of Kersland, *Memoirs*, (London, 1726), p.15-16.

against the union, a further erastian compromise.[231] This projected rising was also mentioned by Sir George Lockhart of Carnwath, and it intended to join forces with clansmen of the Duke of Atholl in a combined pincer movement on the Estates, but the plan was penetrated by government spies (including, by his own admission, Kersland) who easily blew apart this unlikely and fragile alliance.[232] Lockhart inclined to believe that the part played by McMillan had been sincere, and suspicion fell on the figure of the Duke of Hamilton.[233] The involvement of Rev. James Clark in the union riots at Glasgow which broke out in 1706 has already been noted, when during his sermon he told his congregation that petitions and addresses were insufficient to protect the church from the dangers posed by the union. 'Wherefore', he ended, 'up and be valiant for the city of our God!' Cameronian influence was strong enough at Glasgow for the government to doubt the city's loyalty during the reign of Queen Anne, because of the Jacobite presence in the city, and of the known disaffection of radical Presbyterians to the union. During the Jacobite scare of 1708 the magistrates, in a letter to Seafield, admitted that, 'The prejudices of a few at the union had made them so unwary as to say, they'd rather joyn with the Pretender, then that the union should not be broke'. However, they assured him of the city's loyalty, and mindful of Clark's sermon, of the loyalty of its ministers, 'who upon all occasions from the pulpit lay open the danger of the invasion and a popish pretender, and have publicly disown'd all persons to be of their persuasion who will not appear against him'.[234]

---

231 Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, pp.66-70.

232 Kersland, *Memoirs*, pp.29-61.

233 George Lockhart of Carnwath, *Scotland's Ruine*,ed. Daniel Szechi, (Aberdeen, 1995), pp.148, 177, 179-182. The incident is also mentioned by Ferguson, *Scotland 1689 to the Present*, p.50.

234 *Seafield Correspondence 1685-1708*, ed. J. Grant, 2 vols., ii, Magistrates of Glasgow to the Earl of Seafield, 19 March 1708, pp.463-4.

This however indicates the potential for the interplay of Jacobite Episcopalian and radical Presbyterian cultural forces. Though both were conservative and reactionary in their own ways, they could, when combined, be combustible and were inclined to promote, rather than to inhibit, a radical political culture of dissent.

Chapter Three

REVOLUTIONERS, CAVALIERS, AND COUNTRY PARTY MEN

All those, who Traitors to their Country prove,

A pressing Guilt their gloomy minds shall move,

Tho' Bribes of Favour shall assert their Cause,

Pronounce them guilty and elude the Laws,

None quits himself; his own impartial Thought

Will Damn; And Conscience will record the Fau't.[1]

I

Provost John Anderson of Dowhill, younger, (1635-1710) was undoubtedly one of the great post-Revolution civic leaders, holding the civic chair for no less than four, two-year terms, in 1689, 1695, 1699 and 1703.[2] From his appearance as burgh commissioner in March 1689 until his retirement from burgh politics in 1708, he was a sober, judicious, controlling influence on the burgh council, instrumental in establishing its Revolutioner character for nearly two decades after 1689.

As previously noted, Anderson had been a prominent religious dissenter during the Episcopal period, and had suffered imprisonment and considerable financial penalties for his beliefs. This alone suggests a certain independence of mind. Yet like many

---

[1] William Seton of Pitmedden, *Memorial to the Members of Parliament of the Court Party*, (Edinburgh, 1700).

such men ruined by persecution, there is some evidence to suggest that his personal fortunes never really recovered from the difficulties of the Restoration era; a factor which is likely to have influenced his political orientation and may have led to a certain dependency on the Court. His relatively small investment in Darien[3], his receiving a small annual salary of £300 Scots in 1692 from the council for being the burgh accountant[4], and his widow ending her days on the charity of the town after her house had burned down[5]; all suggest a marked decline in substance from the once mighty merchant dynasty of the 1650s, 1660s and 1670s, whom McUre says were amongst the earliest 'sea-adventurers' and the first to import cherry sack into Glasgow. Dowhill and his father were also partners with the Maxwells of Pollok in the famous Whalefishing Company of 1667.[6] Substantial sums of liquid capital were involved in these early ventures; much of it risky -certainly no less risky than Darien. The Andersons of Dowhill were also involved with the Maxwells of Pollok and others, (Sir John Hamilton of Hamilton Ferme, John Luke of Claythorn, and John Graham of

---

2 George Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow; from the Revolution to the Reform Acts 1832-3*, iii, (Glasgow, 1934), pp.20-27; J. Gourlay, (ed..), *The Provosts of Glasgow 1609-1832*, (Glasgow, 1942), pp. 39-41.

3 NLS, Adv/MS/83/1/4; 'List of the Darien Subscribers at Glasgow', indicates Anderson personally subscribed £100, the minimum subscription. The leading merchants in the burgh were subscribing sums of £500 and £1000.

4 *BRG*, 15/9/1692, pp. 51-52. The accounting procedure Anderson used, that of 'charge' and 'discharge' was standard for the time and continued to be employed throughout the 18th century until superseded by more modern methods. It was more difficult with this system to see exactly what balances remained. Anderson's book-keeping however was performed diligently and well, and was a considerable improvement on what existed previously. He appears to have been trained in this method.

5 *BRG*. 27/8/1716, pp. 598-9; it appears that all that was bequeathed to Marion Hay and her children on his decease, was Anderson's 'great tenement of land at the head of the Saltmarket' in which they were living at the time. Also consumed in the flames were all the titles Dowhill had bequeathed to her and her children, his second family. That Dowhill remarried, at the age of 68, after having been a widower for over 12 years, suggests that the last of his 4 sons by his first wife, Ninian Anderson, born about 1676, had possibly died by 1704. Gourlay, *The Provosts of Glasgow*, pp. 39-40. His late remarriage also suggests that he was not in a financial position to remarry in the 1690s.

6 Eyre Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, pp. 20-21. M'Ure's account of the early foreign merchants, 'sea adventurers' of Glasgow, travelling to Europe, America and Africa after 1668, states that 'Before this time John Anderson, elder and younger, of Dowhill, James Peadie of Ruchill, John Luke of Claythorn, Ninian Anderson, and Capt. John Anderson, owners of the ship *Providence* first imported cherry sack into Glasgow', biographical note, Thomas Annan, *Illustrated Catalogue of the Exhibition of Portraits on loan in the New Galleries of Art* (Glasgow, 1868), p. 9.

Dougalstoun), in the soap works established in 1667, whose starting capital was, McUre tells us, £13,500. However, it was Anderson's political role at the Revolution, and his staunch support of the Presbyterian cause, which secured him a firm position in the burgh council. Following his election as Provost in 1689, he was able to consolidate his power and that of the Revolutioner interest at Glasgow throughout the 1690s and beyond.

Given the insecurities of the post-Revolution era, Anderson ran his council during this crucial period with a tight grip, ensuring that only firm Revolution men - committed Presbyterians who were also prepared to defer to his leadership - were elected as councillors.[7] Many of these, like James Peadie of Ruchill, were also business partners. Moreover, Anderson continued to represent the burgh at a national level until 1702. In parliamentary circles he was associated with supporting the Court interest along with his friend and fellow Revolutioner, Sir John Maxwell of Pollok, commissioner for Renfrewshire[8], lord of session, privy councillor, and latterly, in 1699, Lord Justice Clerk. Maxwell's political profile in Presbyterian radicalism matched Anderson's[9], and there were also the family business associations, spanning two generations, noted above. The Revolutioners, staunch supporters of the Court, thus

---

7 Before the Revolution great instability in the council was evident, with the majority of its 33 places changing hands annually or biennially. After the Revolution considerable stability appears with only a minority, perhaps 3 or 4 places, changing each year. This was especially true during Anderson's time.

8 P. W. J. Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians* (Edinburgh, 1979) Appendix A; 'Members of the Convention Parliament 1689-1702'.

9 In 1682 Maxwell was fined £93,000 Scots for illegal conventicling, the second largest fines ever imposed on any heritor for this offence. He was imprisoned the following year for refusing to take the Test and for other offences, such as resetting rebels, including Alexander Porterfield, brother of Duchal, and for attending field and house conventicles. In all he was imprisoned for three years, released in March 1687. After the Revolution he was made a privy councillor in 1689; was commissioner for Renfrewshire from 1690-1693; in 1695-1696; and in 1698. In 1698 he was raised to the bench as Lord Pollok; in 1699 he was made Lord Justice Clerk, succeeding Adam Cockburn of Ormiston. Named as one of Anne's 1702 union commission, which met on October 27th 1702, he was shortly thereafter dismissed as Justice Clerk in 1703. W. Fraser, *Memorials of the Maxwells of Pollok*, 2 vols., i, (Edinburgh, 1863), pp. 81-87.

constituted the dominant political force in burgh and county circles in the west of Scotland during William's reign.

At a national level however, the Revolutioner-Court alignment was showing signs of severe strain by 1700 and this notably impacted on Glasgow. Not only was the Revolutioners' virtual stranglehold on local politics increasingly resented in certain circles of the city, (where it faced hostile constitutional challenges, amongst others), but criticism of the Court's policy in relation to Darien and other issues placed the loyalty of the Revolutioner Presbyterians of Glasgow under considerable pressure. There had been major investment in Darien by leading Glasgow merchants, several of whom were also directors of the Company of Scotland, and the Court's handling of the Darien crisis was to significantly weaken the Revolutioner party interest at Glasgow.

Previously, staunch Presbyterians had adhered firmly to the Court interest, being convinced that only the continuing support of King William could hold together a weak and vulnerable Presbyterian church settlement, and thus far, Anderson and Maxwell carried the confidence of their constituents. But Presbyterian support for the Court was crumbling by 1700, much of it occasioned by Darien. High political tensions were certainly evident in a pamphlet entitled *Memorial to the Members of Parliament of the Court Party* published in Edinburgh in the autumn of 1700 as the Darien fiasco was reaching its final denouement, and the ministry was facing a large scale revolt.[10] The pamphlet was ordered by parliament to be burnt by the public hangman, and the author, William Seton of Pitmedden, was briefly imprisoned in Edinburgh's Tolbooth. Yet the writer had claimed, not without reason, that the fate of the entire Presbyterian

---

10 William Seton of Pitmedden, *Memorial to the Members of Parliament of the Court Party*; Sir David Hume of Crossrigg, *Diary of the Proceedings in the Parliament and Privy Council of Scotland*, Bannatyne Club, (Edinburgh 1828), pp.17, 20; *APS*, ix, p.214.

settlement lay in the balance on account of the continuing slavish, unprincipled support of its leaders for a now discreditable regime. That which drew particular offence however was a passage stating that though King William was Episcopal when in England, whether he might be Presbyterian when in Scotland, remained to be seen.[11] According to the writer, the Court party were no longer believed to be patriots. They must do something for 'the public good' if they were to retain the confidence of the nation. Thus setting his agenda, the writer makes a number of suggestions. Parliaments must meet on a regular, not an occasional basis. They must never be summarily adjourned. A Scottish act of *habeus corpus* should be established, similar to that recently passed in England.[12] And a standing army in time of peace was an expensive drain on the country which should be abolished.[13] Financial irregularities, including the £86,000 stg. of Crown rent (the former bishops' rents?) 'of which His Majesty never touches a Farthing' should be investigated; and all useless persons in receipt of sinecures should be dismissed. The affections of the whole nation, the writer claimed, were currently tied to the Country party, not to the Court-Presbyterian-Revolutioner interest; a situation, he warns, which was as inherently destabilising for the current establishment of the church, as it was for that of the state.[14]

This combination of fiscal and political anxieties, linked to fears over the security of religion, was to be mirrored at Glasgow in connection with Anderson's

---

11 Hume of Crossrigg's *Diary*, 15 November 1700, p.17.

12 A similar act to the English act of habeus corpus was brought in in 1701.

13 The whole question of standing armies was then being discussed in England. Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun's contribution, published anonymously, like this Memorial, in 1698, proposed a fairly Spartan regime for Scots men and boys, whereby they would learn military discipline and civic virtue, replacing a mercenary standing army. Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun, *Two Discourses Concerning the Affairs of Scotland, Written in the Year 1698*; David Daiches, (ed.), *Fletcher of Saltoun, Selected Writings*, (Edinburgh, 1975), pp xx-xxi.

14 ibid.

domination of the council. A series of pamphlets alleged maladministration and a programme of parliamentary action in 1700-1701 aimed at rectifying alleged abuses.[15]

Such 'patriotic' rhetoric as was contained in the *Memorial*, was an attempt to drive a wedge between the 'Revolutioner' Presbyterian wing of the Court party, and those who were simply courtiers and placemen. Division in the ranks was certainly noted by the Jacobite George Lockhart of Carnwath in the session of 1703,[16] although there appears to be some uncertainty as to whether the radical Presbyterian wing of the Court party ever became sufficiently numerous or disenchanted enough to form a separate faction.[17] To the writer of the *Memorial* (1700) however, matters were quickly coming to a head, and the Presbyterian interest needed to decide which way it was going to jump; whether for the Court, or for the 'nation'.

'In my opinion, as the Security of the King's Government is chiefly owing to the Affections of his Subjects, so is the Continuance of the Presbyterian Church Government in Scotland. For, if they begin to find that the Presbyterian Ministers prefer their own Humour and Politicks to the Honour and Safety of this Nation, and that Presbytery serves to be a Pretext for ill Practices of A Court Party, its to be feared that the Subjects of Scotland will treat it (the current Presbyterian

---

15 (1) Anon., A *Letter from _____ to his friend, concerning the state of the Town of Glasgows Business*, nd (1700),
(2) J. B., *A Letter from a Citizen of Glasgow to his friend in Edinburgh containing some modest Animadversions on a late Printed letter, concerning the Affairs of that City, Glasgow, 17 July 1700.* (1700)
(3) Anon, *Reflexions on two Late Letters concerning the Affairs of the City of Glasgow, by a citizen thereof, In answer to his Friend at Edinburgh who designed an Impartial Account of that Matter*, nd, (1700).
(4) *Information for the Magistrates and Town Council of Glasgow against George Lockhart, Merchant there, and his Adherents, Merchants and Inhabitants of the said Burgh, 1701*, (1701).

16 Carnwath distinguished three clear parties; Court, Country, and Cavaliers; but divided the Court party into two distinct groups; 'Revolutioners ... of Anti-monarchical Principles, and such as were any thing that would procure, or secure them in their Employments and Pensions'. *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, from Queen Anne's Accession, etc., to the Commencement of the Union of the Two Kingdoms*, quoted in Daiches, *Fletcher of Saltoun; Selected Writings*, p.xxvii.

17 See P. W. J. Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, Manchester, (1978*); King William and the Scottish Politicians.*

church establishment) as they did (the church establishment) after the Restauration of King Charles the second. Whereas, if we Presbyterians consult nothing but the Glory of God and the true Interest of this Kingdom, Presbyterie will become so agreeable to all sensible good honest Men, that succeeding Parliaments will make it their business to secure it from all Enemies'.[18]

Thus in the stormy sessions of 1700, the first of which was prorogued after only a few weeks, much of the Country party opposition to the hegemony of the Court was pitched in terms of defending the security of the Presbyterian settlement by pushing for a series of extreme Presbyterian acts; a strategy which Riley claimed was aimed at embarrassing the Court.[19] It could equally be argued however that the Country party's agenda was to detach the 'Old Whig' or 'true Whig' Revolutioner interest from that of the Court. The *Memorial* had insinuated that if Presbytery was to survive with any popular credit, it was essential for the Presbyterian party to remove itself from its slavish adherence to an unpopular Court and align itself with the Country party agenda - a high risk strategy attractive to some; but one which was strongly opposed by Carstairs in his sober management of the kirk. The statesman in Carstairs was only too well aware that the security of the erastian Presbyterian church settlement depended on the Crown, and not on the doctrine of popular sovereignty. He therefore advised constant caution in his letters to his Scottish church agents, with whom he had considerable credit. In a letter dated 21st April 1702 to the Principal of Glasgow University, John Stirling, for instance, commenting on the latter's report of the recent Synod meeting of Glasgow, (the first to convene after William's death), Carstairs

---

18 William Seton of Pitmedden, *Memorial to the Members of the Court Party.*

19 P. W. J. Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, pp. 135-136.

warned of the dangers the kirk was in from its recent moves 'to gain new and uncertain friends' - a reference to the Country party - and counselled 'discreet management' at all times.[20] Particularly, debates about the church's 'intrinsic power', i.e., its right to meet and organise without a commission from the king, (which had been rumbling on since the erastian settlement of 1690), 'which some few urge with so much warmth' were, he cautioned, 'so visibly inexpedient, and, I had almost said, destructive, to the solid security of our church' as to be avoided at all costs[21]. 'Cardinal' Carstairs, it must be said, was an able courtier with a London-centred view of Scottish church politics which was often quite at odds with that of many of his co-religionists north of the Tweed.

There is evidence however that such Country party-inspired appeals to 'patriotic' Presbyterianism may have borne some fruit in the emergence of a semi-detached political wing appearing amongst a section the Court-Presbyterian 'Revolutioner' party after 1700. Significantly, these men were anti-unionists and staunch Calvinists who were associated with Glasgow; individuals such as the new Provost of the city from 1701-1703, Hugh Montgomerie of Busbie; and Walter Stewart of Pardovan, elder of Glasgow, commissioner for Linlithgow during William's time, and latterly MP for Linlithgow Burghs. To Riley, whose Namierism knew no bounds, Pardovan was a particular puzzle; a man of a 'strongly independent cast of mind'; and a firm Presbyterian (and thus, Riley would assume, an unwavering Court adherent), yet one whom he found was consistently opposing the Court from 1698 onwards[22]. Hugh Montgomerie was another enigmatic 'cross-voter', whom Riley found difficult to

---

20 Robert Herbert Story, *William Carstares; A Character and Career of the Revolutionary Church Epoch 1649-1715*, (London, 1874), pp. 274-275.

21 ibid.

22 Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, p. 180.

explain[23]. As commissioner for Glasgow from 1702-1707 and MP for Glasgow Burghs, 1707-1708, he was, like Pardovan, another unwavering opponent of the Court's policy of the incorporating union - though elected onto Anne's first union commission in 1702 with Maxwell of Pollok[24]. As the 'sitting' commissioner for Glasgow, Montgomerie succeeded to the representation of Glasgow Burghs in the first parliament of the united kingdom of Great Britain which he had voted against[25]. Montgomerie had no part in the spoils system which followed the union and does not appear as an active courtier. Writing to Pollok at the end of December 1707, he describes resigned detachment, 'there are more beggars here than have got alms, everie person's merits deserveth more than another. Your lordship knoweth I had no pairt of the game and I am not mutch dipt in the aftergame'[26]. At another point, in relation to the proposals to abolish the Scottish Privy Council, he writes, 'I doe no evill though I be capable to doe little good'[27]. Pardovan was placed in a similar ironic situation; representing Linlithgow Burghs after 1707, though he had voted against the union. Pardovan's close association with the Glasgow Presbyterian party comes to light later, in 1717, in the famous church

---

23 Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland,* Appendix A, pp.332; 177, 274, 278.

24 W. Fraser, *Memorials of the Montgomerie Earls of Eglinton*, 2 vols., i, (Edinburgh, 1859), p. 166; *Memoirs of the Maxwells of Pollok*, ii, p.120; i, p. 87.

25 Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, pp. 274; 278-9. There was no election until 1708; as regards burgh representation in the new parliament at Westminster, the 'choice' of Montgomerie to represent the Glasgow district of burghs (which included Rutherglen, Renfrew and Dumbarton), seems only to represent the fact that economically Glasgow was the dominant force. The same pattern is found at subsequent elections; e.g., in 1708 Provost Robert Rogers of Glasgow was elected M.P., and was followed by Dean of Guild Thomas Smith. No weight need be attached to Riley's comment that Montgomerie 'was sufficiently a courtier to be elected to the first United Kingdom parliament'. Montgomerie certainly opposed the Squadrone's aim of abolishing the Privy Council in 1707-1708. However he seems to have opposed this for the same reasons he opposed the abolition of Scotland's parliament; that it removed 'any little government that remains amongst us'. Glasgow City Archive, Pollok Papers, TPM 115.34, Montgomerie to Maxwell of Pollok, nd, (1707), London; same to the same, 'what new proposals hath been made anent modelling our Scots government I have noe hand in them', 25 December 1707, TPM 115.35; same to same, 'I am glad you approve my being against the takeing away our Scots privie councell so soon', 10 Feb. 1708, TPM 115.37.

26 Glasgow City Archives, Pollok Papers, TPM 115.36, Montgomerie to Pollok, London, 30 December 1707.

27 Glasgow City Archives, Pollok papers, TPM 115.35, Montgomerie to Pollok, London, 25 December 1707.

case in the city in that year. As an elder of the city he queried the candidature of the controversial Rev. John Anderson of Dumbarton[28] to be a minister of Glasgow.[29] Significantly, like the Rev. Anderson, and Montgomerie's brother-in-law, Rev. James Clark, minister of the Tron church of Glasgow, another opponent of the Rev. Anderson's candidature, Pardovan had some claims to scholarship and was the author of a Presbyterian tract on church government. He also corresponded with Wodrow over the legality of the Presbyterians refusing the civil oaths demanded in 1712.[30] Pardovan was clearly no fair-weather courtier, but a staunch and committed Calvinist who was a champion of the church's, and Scotland's, independence.

Though little is known about Montgomerie,[31] (except that he was a wealthy overseas merchant who was a director of the Company of Scotland[32]), a good deal more is known about those whom he actively promoted or with whom he had close personal links - sufficient to indicate a support of orthodox Presbyterianism. Not only was he the brother of the 'Club' plotter, Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie, one of the foremost leaders of the 'Presbyterian party' in the winter of 1688-89, but he was also the brother-

---

28 He does not appear to be related to the Provost of Glasgow of that name. Rev. Anderson's family was from the North East and settled in Edinburgh after the Restoration.

29 John Anderson, *A Letter from Mr Anderson, minister of Dumbarton, to Walter Stuart of Pardovans*, (1717).

30 Walter Stuart of Pardovan was the author of *Collections and Observations concerning the Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland*, (1709). The first edition was dedicated to Sir John Maxwell of Pollok. Thomas M'Crie, *The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow, minister of Eastwood*, 2 vols. i, Wodrow Society, (Edinburgh, 1842-3), p.308; Letter XC, Wodrow to Pardovan, 28 July 1712. Pardovan had wanted to know Wodrow's thoughts on the legality of refusing the oaths of allegiance now to be demanded of Presbyterians following the Toleration Act of 1712.

31 See two brief biographical sketches in Fraser's, *Memorials of the Montgomerie Earls of Eglinton*, i, p.166, for family background; and Gourlay , *The Provosts of Glasgow 1609-1832*, pp. 44-45.

32 *BRG.* 25/4/1696, pp.203-204; John Prebble, *The Darien Disaster*, (London, 1968), p. 90; *The Darien Papers*, ed. J. H. Burton, Bannatyne Club, (Edinburgh, 1849), pp. 9, 19, 23.

in-law of the Rev. James Clark[33], the influential minister of the Tron kirk of Glasgow. Clark's call to Glasgow came shortly after Montgomerie was elected Provost in the autumn of 1701 and was probably due to Montgomerie's influence[34]. Clark became a major figure in the church at Glasgow, an intellectual heavy-weight who was the author of many Presbyterian tracts, responsible for upholding Calvinist orthodoxy in the burgh. According to Wodrow, who seems to have collected everything that Clark ever wrote, he was a major source of authority for the 'dissenters', (the Cameronians), being 'M'Millan's tool or guide'[35]. Like Pardovan, Clark opposed the incorporating union with prelatic England, and in 1712, the civil oaths demanded of Presbyterians. His greatest notoriety however stemmed from his 1706 pulpit address to the citizenry of Glasgow during the union negotiations, in defence of the security of the Presbyterian establishment, which was said by Defoe to have triggered off the major anti-union riots which flared up in the city.[36]

---

33 Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae*, 7 vols., iii, Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, (Edinburgh, 1915-28), p.475; William J Couper, 'The writings and controversies of James Clark', *Records of the Glasgow Bibliographic Society*, xi, (1933), pp. 73-95.

34 Clark was married, in 1699, to Christian Montgomerie, daughter of Sir Robert Montgomerie of Skelmorlie; Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p. 474; Fraser, *Memorials of the Montgomeries*, i, pp. 163, 167.

35 Thomas M'Crie, *Wodrow Correspondence*, i; Wodrow to Rev. James Hart, 21/1/1713, p.377.

36 Clark's sermon on the fast appointed by the Commission of the General Assembly for guidance on the union, preached from Ezra vii, 21 and concluded with the stirring words, 'Therefore be up, and valiant for the City of God'. It was this which Defoe claimed in his *History of the Union* (1709) had sparked off the riots, when the city was out of control for 6 weeks. Hew Scott, *Fasti*, iii, p. 474. Clark entered into a lengthy pamphlet war with Defoe, after obtaining pre-publication copy of his book while it was going through the presses at Edinburgh, claiming that he had been misrepresented and had not deliberately incited his congregation to riot. The result was that two wealthy Glasgow merchants, James Montgomerie and John Spreull, arranged a meeting between Clark and Defoe in Edinburgh, in which Defoe agreed to revise his copy. However, when the book was eventually published, the references to Clark had not been deleted. This resulted in:
(1) *A Paper Concerning Daniel Defoe*, Edinburgh, 1708 (Clark)
(2) *An Answer to a Paper concerning Mr Defoe, against the History of the Union*, Edinburgh, 1709 (Defoe?)
(3) *Rabbles and Abettors of Rabbles Condemned*, (Clark)
(4) *In Defence of Mr Clark*, (Clark?)
(5) *A Just Reprimand to Daniel Defoe In a Letter to a Gentleman in South Britain*, 1709 (Clark) (6) *A reproof to MrClark, and a brief vindication of Mr. Defoe*, 1710 (Defoe?)

Montgomerie, Pardovan and Clark represent an influential body of Presbyterian 'Old Whig' or 'Revolutioner' opinion in the city amongst whom a certain disaffection to the Court is evident in the last years of William's reign. The mix of religious anxieties and political and economic abuses, was to lead to considerable political instability in Glasgow for the next decade and a half.

It was in such circumstances that Provost John Anderson, acting again as commissioner for the burgh in the stormy session of 1700-1701, returned to Glasgow after the parliament was temporarily adjourned at the end of May 1700, and reported to his obsequious council, that whilst he had been in Edinburgh, he had been approached on the 15 June, by a delegation of Glasgow citizens led by one George Lockhart, merchant of Glasgow, and Henry Marshall, surgeon-apothecary there. Lockhart was a leading merchant and shipowner[37] involved latterly with Daniel Campbell (of Shawfield). Like him, he was a tobacco importer[38] who also brought in quantities of sugar, often via Liverpool. Though a substantial economic weight in the burgh engaged in the burgeoning overseas trade to Virginia and the Caribbean, he had never been elected onto the council. In 1695 Lockhart was arraigned for free-trade activities along with James Bogle, (one of his principle adherents)[39] and in 1696 he was one of the dozen or so great Glasgow merchants who invested large sums, £1000 stg., in the

---

37 In 1692 Lockhart owned 2 ships, the *James* and the *William and Marie*, 'State and Condition of the Burghs of Scotland, Reports, 1692', *Miscellany of the Scottish Burgh Records Society*, ed. Sir James Marwick, SBRS, (1881) pp. 74, 75.

38 Lockhart appears to have been one of the earliest tobacco merchants. In June 1690 he brought a cargo of tobacco from Virginia into the Clyde at Newark, and paid the excise, but nonetheless it was seized by the over-zealousness of Capt. Edward Pottinger of *HMS Dartmouth*, a frigate currently patrolling the Clyde. *Glas. Chtrs.*, vol ii, (926), 'Petition of George Lockhart to the High Commissioner and Lords of the Privy Council', August 1690, p.404

39 Gordon Jackson, 'Glasgow in Transition, c.1660-c.1740', in *Glasgow: volume I, Beginnings to 1830,* ed. T. M. Devine & G. Jackson, (Manchester, 1995), pp. 70, 73.

Darien project.[40] Less is known of Henry Marshall except that in 1691 his license to practice was revoked by Anderson's council.[41]

These slights may have acted to generate a personal hostility towards Anderson. The petition however was signed by 'several' other Glasgow citizens[42] and contained the demand that Anderson convene the Merchants and the Trades Houses in order to sign an address from the burgesses to parliament. Lockhart and Marshall's petition was in effect, a statement of the Country party's agenda. For it voiced concerns about the security of religion and demanded the suppressing of vice and encouragement of piety and virtue. Added to this was an assertion of the Company of Scotland's rights to their colony of Caledonia, and a plea for measures which would encourage manufacturies and relieve the poor. Finally, the petitioners demanded to be relieved of all unnecessary taxes.[43]

The Glasgow petition was thus a direct reflection of reactions elsewhere in the country to the tensions of William's reign which were seized on by the opposition. At the beginning of 1700, as anxiety gathered over Darien, a national address with 21,000 signatures had been sent to the king, petitioning for a parliament to meet; which William's ministers, sensing the approaching storm, had been doing their best to delay.[44] When the parliament did finally convene in May, it was soon found necessary

---

40 NLS Adv/MS/83/1/4; 'List of Darien subscribers at Glasgow, 5 March - 16 April 1696'.

41 Marshall had been licensed by the council in 1679, without the consultation or approval of the Incorporation of Surgeons and in 1691 the Faculty of Surgeons demanded Marshall's withdrawal, appealing to the magistrates to enforce the terms of the grant given to them by James VI which empowered them to make rules for the admission of members. Anderson complied with their request. *BRG.* 9/5/1691, 16-19; Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, p.23.

42 *BRG.*, 29/6/1700, pp. 303-4.

43 ibid.

44 Wodrow to Mr George Thomson at Leyden, 21 March 1700, L. W. Sharp (ed.), *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow 1698-1709*, SHS, third series, vol xxiv, (Edinburgh, 1937), p. 58.

to adjourn it. Despite this, petitions in support of the Company of Scotland's title to Caledonia continued to pour in,[45] and a new national address was started. More petitions continued to arrive in Edinburgh throughout June wherever members could be found to receive them[46]. Lockhart's move to include a petition from Glasgow, which Anderson was not prepared to sanction, thus appears to be a local variant of the Country party's programme.

Further links with the Country party are confirmed after the Estates had reconvened in December and the leader of the Country party, the Duke of Hamilton, introduced Lockhart's new petition into the house. This complained of Anderson's maladministration and his abuse of the 'sett' or constitution of the burgh.[47] Discussion of the petition was however deferred until 11 January 1701,[48] as was that of an additional petition signed by 474 citizens of Glasgow asserting 'our Companys right to our Collonie of Calledonia' and praying the Estates make laws to protect the Protestant religion and Presbyterian Church government.[49] A published list of the names of those who had voted for an act asserting Scotland's rights in Darien shortly afterwards did *not* contain Anderson's name.[50] It is thus evident that criticism of Anderson had become detached from other parts of the Country party agenda, and that he was being singled out. Parties hostile to him were clearly attempting to undermine his (and the

---

45 W. L .Mathieson, *Scotland and the Union: a history from 1695-1707*, (Glasgow, 1905), p. 61.

46 ibid.

47 Hume of Crossrigg, *Diary*, 13 December 1700, p. 30; 2 January 1701, p. 39.

48 'Representation and petition given in to Parliament by George Lockhart, merchant in Glasgow, and other inhabitants of that city, 11 January 1701', *Glas .Chtrs.* ii, (1004), p.423. See also *APS*, vol x, pp.235-7

49 'Address to Parliament by the Inhabitants of the City of Glasgow, 9 January 1701', *Glas. Chtrs.* vol ii, (1003), pp.422-3. See also *APS*, vol x, App., pp.84-6.

50 *List of members of parliament who voted for an act asserting the Indian and African company's right to their collony at Caledonia and dissisted to the address proposed to be made theranent by the Duke of Hamilton and his adherents in parliament 14th January, 1701.* NLS 1.22(97), (1701).

Court Party's) undisputed premiership of the second city. For earlier in 1700, there had appeared the series of surprising prints (noted above) concerning Anderson's management of the burgh since 1689. J. B.'s print cast doubt on his financial trustworthiness and satirised an allegedly dictatorial management style.[51] The Lockhart case, which went from parliament to the Court of Session, bore clear evidence of being fanned by the 'rage of party'. Yet it was also substantially fuelled by economic discontent centering on the fate of Caledonia - as the names of leading Darien investors amongst those who principally joined with Lockhart proves.[52] The Darien episode and Anderson's failure to prosecute Glasgow's case against the government with greater vigour, was the principal source of dissatisfaction against him and the Court interest at Glasgow. When resentment against the rise in taxation is added to this, a dramatic shift in allegiance and a questioning of the liberties won by the Revolution is discernible.

Confirmation of a change of mood at Glasgow came in the Michaelmas elections of 1701 when Anderson was dislodged from the provostship by a rank outsider. This individual, though he had also played a significant role at the Revolution, and was elected onto the council by the free poll of the burgesses in July 1689, was never thereafter a member of Anderson's council until his sudden reappearance on the council in the autumn of 1700 - Hugh Montgomerie of Busbie. Significantly, Montgomerie was a major investor in Darien and a director of the Company of Scotland. His meteoric rise to the civic chair - from councillor to Provost in the space of one year - was quite without precedent. It enabled him however, on Anne's

---

51 Anon., *A Letter from _____ to his friend, concerning the state of the Town of Glasgow's Business*, (1700).

52 *BRG.* 20/9/1701, p. 330. Those merchants who accompanied Lockhart to this meeting were John Graham of Dougalstoun, Daniel Campbell (future M.P., Glasgow Burghs), ex-bailie John Corse, ex-bailie William Woddrop, William Crawford, William Walkinshaw, James Bogle, James Corbet, James Muir and Andrew Kirkart.

accession, to supplant Anderson as Glasgow's commissioner to the Estates in the new parliament, from 1702-1707, where his qualified opposition to the policy of the Court was in certain instances, as notable Anderson's former acquiescence.

II

Since economic anxiety plays a substantial part in this discontent, it will be appropriate to examine briefly the financial situation the city fathers found themselves in at the Revolution. Lockhart's eventual petition to the Estates in December 1700 had principally complained of two things; firstly Anderson's 'unconstitutional' domination of the council since the Revolution by his control of elections, and secondly of his having overstented the burgesses in the name of the King's cess, by £32,586. 18s. 4d Scots since Whitsun 1693, when it appears, stenting for cess began.

It is important to stress that the Revolutioner council to which Anderson was elected as Provost at the Michaelmas elections of 1689, had started off with a great deal of pre-Revolution debt. This was not of its own making and the repayment and servicing of it continued to be a major source of anxiety to the council, and in the wider sense, to the burgess community, for the next two decades. The interest alone soaked up over one third of the burgh's annual income. Questions of accountability - of how and why this debt had been accumulated, and by what authority it had been transacted, and even what exactly it consisted of[53] - continued to be asked. Much of it had been transacted in secrecy without the knowledge or approval of the full council during the Restoration era. It consisted both of sums borrowed, and of sums lent out, during the course of a long century of turmoil in which Glasgow's revenues were systematically plundered by both sides of the religious divide.

---

53 The debt was not itemised, but appeared as a single figure in the burgh accounts.

After the Revolution the city had been frustrated in its efforts to recall loans of capital sums it had built up earlier in the century at a time of economic stability. One such sum, for instance, was the £10,000 Scots lent out on bond to the Marquis of Argyll (1607-1661) in 1636.[54] This had been raised by public subscription and the annual interest was to be applied to the support of a fifth minister. The servicing of the loan fell into arrears and eventually perished with the unfortunate Marquis, whose trial for treason and subsequent execution resulted in the forfeiture of his estates. When these were eventually restored to his heirs, they claimed immunity from all previous fines and debts incurred under the terms of the comprehensive indemnity offered them by the Crown. Efforts to settle the debt eventually devolved onto one of the Argyll family's debtors, the Marquis of Huntly after the Revolution.[55]

Marquises came and went, but the burgh of Glasgow was a rich emporium, whose credit, it seems, was more reliable than most of those to whom it had lent money. The burgh found itself under pressure to settle debts, whilst its debtors continued to elude its grasp. In 1704 the council took the decision to write off collection of much of the small debts owing to it in the treasurer's accounts, as most of the debtors were insolvent[56]

After the troubles of the Covenanting era, there followed the corruption scandals of the Restoration period, when the burgh's patrimony was dispensed for political favours, such as Provost Barns's notorious transactions with the archbishop over the teinds.[57] The charges the council was at in providing for the military frequently

---

54 *BRG.* 21/5/1681, pp. 293-5.

55 ibid.

56 Glasgow City Archives, *Town Council Minutes*, C1 series, 12/2/1704, C1.1.22, f84.

57 Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, p.13; Gordon Jackson, 'Glasgow in Transition, c.1660 to c. 1740', p. 66.

barracked in the city to put down religious dissent, also made further drains on its revenues, despite the fleecing of local Whigs to offset the costs to the burgh of a large body of dissenters within it. Financial mismanagement of the lands of Provan, a large and profitable estate purchased by the burgh in 1667 for 106,000 merks (£5888 stg.),[58] had caused the estate to fall into arrears of rent of £20,000 Scots by 1690, further reducing the annual revenues of the Common Good.[59]

No surprise then, that in 1689 the city as a corporation was bankrupt, owing in excess of £180,000 Scots [£15,000 stg] with latent debts of a further £20,000 Scots.[60] In comparative terms this was worse than other burghs; Edinburgh with over four times the population, and far greater wealth, had debts of £40,000 stg.. The interest on Glasgow's debt was so hefty that the revenues from its Common Good could not both service the debt and pay the town's public dues. An audit conducted in 1694 for the Convention of Royal Burghs as part of a general inquiry into burghal finances since 1660[61] showed an annual income in 1692 (the latest figures to hand) of £16,902 Scots, but outgoings of £15,994 Scots; whilst the pre-Revolution debt was only marginally reduced and stood at £178,800[62]. For various reasons this continued to rise and fall during the 1690s, and in net terms, the situation was little improved by 1700. It was the failure to make progress on the civic debt which lent fuel to Lockhart's fire.

---

58 Philopoliteius, (Alexander Skene), *Memorialls for the Government of the Royall Burghs in Scotland*, (Aberdeen 1685), pp. 178-179; relates that in the 1650s, by the agreement of the citizens to pay 6 shillings sterling on every boll of malt, sufficient revenue was brought in to pay all public dues and leave an annual surplus in the common good, so that the city was able to purchase 'lands of great rents' in the 1660s. *BRG.*, 2/9/1667, p. 95; *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, Disposition by Sir Robert Hamilton of Silvertonhill to the Provost, Baillies, Council and Community of Glasgow of the lands of Provan, 3rd September 1667, pp. 120-132.

59 Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, pp. 13; 17-18.

60 *BRG.*, 3/8/1689, p. 427; statement of account drawn up by Dean of Guild, William Napier.

61 *BRG.*, 30/6/1694, pp. 125-6.

62 'State and Condition of the Burghs of Scotland', *Miscellany of the Scottish Burgh Records Society*, (Edinburgh, 1881) pp. 71-74.

The agricultural crisis of the 1690s had caused the burgh's revenues, largely derived from agrarian sources, to rise by about 20% in the difficult years between 1695-1700; yet this had little impact on the mountain of civic debt. William's wars made heavy demands on the burgesses by way of a series of personal taxes such as the hearth tax (1690), a poll tax and a malt tax (1693), plus the land tax or cess, which continued unabated during his reign. After the attempts to revive the burgh malt tax gifted to the town in 1687 by James VII[63] were deemed insufficient to meet the demands of government, the burgesses were stented from 1693 onwards for the cess and the burgh missive dues.[64] The constitutional authority to do this derived from the act of parliament laying on the cess. But earlier the magistrates had expressed anxiety about the political wisdom of stenting the burgesses for cess, noting a particular anathema to such measures in Glasgow, 'public stent in this place being knowne to be very grieveous and obnoxious'.[65] Moreover the burgesses, property owners within the burgh, found their private revenues from rents much reduced, perhaps due to the unexplained fall in population which occurred after 1660. This had dropped from a mid-century high of over 15,000 to 11,900 by the Revolution.[66] The 1692 report

---

63 *BRG.* 28/2/1687, pp. 395-397. £1000 stg (£12,000 Scots) was borrowed to pay for this gift, ibid., p. 397.

64 *BRG.* 13/6/1693, pp. 69-70; 11/11/1693, p. 96; 23/12/1693, p. 99; 2/1/1694, p. 101; 23/4/1694, p. 119; 19/7/1694, pp. 129-130; 29/1/1695, pp. 146-147; 13/2/1695, pp. 147-149; 21/11/1696, pp. 220-221; 12/3/1698, pp. 260-261.

65 *BRG.*, 11/11/1690, pp. 468-469.

66 T. C. Smout, 'Glasgow Merchant Community in the 17th century', pp. 61-62, *SHR*, 1968, vol xlvii, pp.53-71; records that the population was 11,900 in 1688 and 14,700 in 1660; quoting James Cleland's estimate. Cleland was a 19th century statistician who examined baptismal records and evolved a methodology of multiplying the number of baptisms per annum by 26 to arrive at a statistical average for the whole city. Smout, 'The Development and Enterprise of Glasgow, 1556-1707', *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 7, (1960), p. 195, gives detail of population figures. However, he was not the first to note a sharp fall in population after 1660, as recorded in the parish registers. This was observed by Denholm, 1798, who noted a population of over 15,000 by 1651, which he considered a conservative estimate, as the great fire of 1652 had yielded further information as to the numbers of families burnt out and suggested a higher number. James Denholm, *The History of the City of Glasgow and Suburbs* (Glasgow, 1798), pp.30-31. Citing the parish registers, Denholm stated that in 1695, when the city was rated second in terms of the tax roll for the burghs, the population was 'considerably under what they had amounted to about forty years preceding', ibid.. NLS Wodrow 4to (28), f103, 'Mr. Gillies's overture account of the six ministers in Glasgow',

claimed that nearly 500 houses stood waste whilst those which were inhabited 'are fallen near a third part of the rent payed formerly';[67] a position which was alleged to be little altered, as late as 1708.[68] In response to Smout's charge that this supposed poverty was a mere ruse to avoid increased taxation,[69] it should be noted that many houses had been destroyed by fire and never rebuilt, especially the great fire in 1652 in which one third of the town perished and by subsequent fires, like the fire of 1677, in which 130 houses were destroyed. Council grants to rebuild derelict property by building in stone,[70] or to replace thatched roofs with those made of slate or tiles, appear regularly in the burgh records in the latter decades of the 17th and early decades of the eighteenth century.[71] The thesis that Glasgow experienced considerable poverty during this period despite expanding merchant opportunities, has been accepted more recently by Jackson, whose analysis of the stent rolls in 1698 noted considerable economic disparity amongst the burgesses.[72] Jackson pointed to the importance of manufacturing, then in its infancy in Glasgow, in bringing about a more even distribution of wealth. It is also

---

1698, refers to the 'numerousness' of the people of Glasgow 'which are increased to a great many, (as many suppose), to as many, or as many again as there were about fifty years ago'.

67 'State and Condition of the Burghs of Scotland', *Miscellany of the Scottish Burgh Records Society*, p. 72. Smout however, noting the continuing improvement of Glasgow's trading position after the Restoration, ('Glasgow Merchant Community', p. 54) disputes this and believes the statement to be a deliberate falsification. But an independent examination of the hearth tax records for 1691 tends to support the 1692 statement and indicates that Glasgow had a greater number of tax-exempt poor's hearths than the surrounding Barony parish, including those of destitute Irish Protestants who had fled Ulster and were still living in the city in 1691. A total of 5,458 hearths were recorded in Glasgow, of which 642 were tax exempt hearths of the 'regular' poor, and 931 were hearths of Irish refugees; i.e., 29% of all hearths; in the Barony parish the poor's hearths represented 12% of the total. This was despite the fact that Glasgow, a city, had a number of large public buildings, such as the University and the Bishop's Palace, with a large number of hearths. NAS, E.69/15/1, hearth tax returns for the city of Glasgow and the Barony parish, f127-133.

68 Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, p.105.

69 n67, supra.

70 E.g., *BRG.* 20/4/1699, pp.283-4; tax exemption offered for ten years to all willing to rebuild ruinous property in stone.

71 Jackson, 'Glasgow in Transition, c.1660 to c. 1740' , pp. 85, 86.

72 ibid.

possible that a fall in rents came about as a response to the agricultural crisis; rent abatement to half its former level was followed by heritors elsewhere.[73] The figure of a third at Glasgow, for instance, corresponds with the deviation in the weight of the twelve penny loaf sold within the burgh, which also fell by about a third between 1695-1700,[74] reflecting the local fluctuations in grain prices.

The burgh's financial position was so severe, that in 1690-91 the magistrates, in some desperation, applied to the Estates and the Convention of Royal Burghs for permission to sell off the lands of Provan, a measure which, however, does not appear to have gone ahead.[75] One significant factor likely to have forestalled the magistrates in the projected sale of Provan was the timely 'gift', in 1693, of a further local tax - a burgh ale tax of 2 pennies on the pint of every pint sold or brewed within Glasgow. Granted originally as an extraordinary measure to stave off the burgh's imminent bankruptcy, the ale tax continued until 1837 and soon became a vital source of additional civic revenue in the 18th century. It was applied first of all to paying off the civic debt, and thereafter to general purposes, financing many civic improvements by Provost Aird's time, as noted by McUre[76].

---

73 Daniel Szechi (ed.), *Letters of George Lockhart of Carnwath, 1698-1732*, SHS, fifth series, vol ii, (Edinburgh, 1989), p.1; Lockhart to Sir James Scougall of Whitehill, February 1698; requests the permission of his guardians to allow his tenants an abatement of half their rent for the year 1696, and stating that Lord Carmichael (John Carmichael, 2nd lord, 1638-1710, earl of Hyndford, 1701) and William Denholm of Westshiels, neighbouring landowners, had done the same.

74 The magistrates controlled the price of basic foodstuffs; however their method in response to variations in the grain price was to reduce the weight of the standard loaf. This was set annually, in the autumn after harvest was in, for the forthcoming year. In 1690-91 (a peak year) a twelve penny loaf weighed 12oz 7drop 4 grains; in 1698-99, (the worst year), the twelve penny loaf weighed just 7oz. On average however, between 1695-1700, the worst years of the crisis, it weighed 8oz.

75 *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, (922), p.403; *APS* (1690, c.45) vol ix, p.193; *Glas. Chtrs*,. ii, (931), p.406; *Records of the Convention of Royal Burghs*, iv, pp. 136-7; Eyre Todd, *History of Glasgow*, pp. 18-19. This step does not seem to have gone ahead, however, for rent of the lands of Provan appears in subsequent treasurer's accounts, e.g., for the year 1713.

76 McUre considered Aird as one of the four most eminent provosts who had contributed most to the amenity of the city. During his long administration two churches, a high steeple and the opening of two streets, all 'upon the

The first grant of the ale tax ran for 13 years, i.e., until 1706[77]. Subsequent renewals however became the focus of much anxiety and represented a key means of political control. The corruption of councillors before the Revolution had been put forward as the prime reason why the burgh required a free constitution in 1689; yet the system of gratuities for political favours continued after the Revolution and led, if anything, to increased dependency. The city paid 9000 merks to its 'freinds' for the 'free' constitution 'gifted' in 1690[78] and £1000 stg was paid for the grant of the ale tax in 1693.[79] When a re-grant of the ale tax, due to expire in 1706, was negotiated in 1703-1705, this too was only obtained after 'great pains, diligence and expenssis',[80] most notably, the greasing of palms of political opponents, including Jacobites. We will return to this later but briefly, it is relevant to note that the payment of £300 stg to Colin Bell, the most notorious Jacobite in Glasgow, (who, it may be remembered, was imprisoned in 1690 for his part in a plot to bring over King James from Ireland), is certainly remarkable. Also significant was the sum of up to, (but not exceeding), 9000 merks, payable to the merchant group led by Lockhart which had been intent on challenging Anderson's government of the burgh since the Revolution.[81] When in 1716 the ale tax was successfully renewed a second time for a further 16 years, (taking the

---

town's charge', plus the construction of several other great buildings - all attributable to Aird's management of the city, appeared to vindicate his opinion. Gourlay, *The Provosts of Glasgow 1609-1832*, p. 47.

77 *BRG.*, 19/6/1689, pp.70-71; *Glas Chtrs*, ii, pp.246-251, 15 June 1689.

78 *BRG.*, 1/2/1690, pp. 441; Dowhill reports on his expenses 'ordinar and extraordinar' in obtaining the charter from King William allowing a free election, including 'what was given to persones of qualitie who were the touns freinds in dealing with his Majestie to procure the said letter of gift'. No sums are stated but 'J.B.'s' letter mentioned 9000 merks; J. B., *A Letter from a Citizen of Glasgow to his friend at Edinburgh containing some modest animadversions on a late printed letter concerning the affairs of that city*, (Glasgow, 1700).

79 *BRG.*, 25/9/1693, pp. 84-85; the council warrants the treasurer for £1000stg., plus 10 guineas to be sent to Edinburgh to pay those who were instrumental in obtaining the Glasgow ale tax.

80 *BRG.*, 25/9/1705, pp. 391; *Glas. Chtrs*,. ii, pp. 290-293.

81 *BRG.*, 5/9/1704, pp. 384-6

various grants up to the year 1738), measures were taken to 'gratify' Daniel Campbell of Shawfield, then the MP for Glasgow Burghs, for his assistance in steering the legislation through parliament.[82]

The real significance of the Lockhart affair therefore was that it became entangled with the burgh's application to parliament for a renewal of its grant of this vital supply. When the burgh's petition for an extension was rejected by parliament in the stormy sessions of 1703 and 1704, Anderson et al had found themselves latterly opposed by a powerful and effective lobby within the house, headed by John Graham of Dougalstoun, whose demands they were obliged to meet. Dougalstoun was a merchant of Glasgow,[83] and one of Lockhart's principal adherents in 1701. He was also another of the major Darien investors; and by 1708, a political agent in Glasgow of the Duke of Montrose; this suggests that a link with the nascent Squadrone was forming in 1704 as well as with Bell's Jacobite party.

Clearly then, economic factors including the growth of taxation, were of prime importance in undermining Anderson's Revolutioner interest in Glasgow. The Darien crisis, however, was undoubtedly the most significant element of economic unrest. Half the capital of Scotland, some £400,000 stg., was subscribed in this fatal enterprise, although only £200,000 was ever paid up.[84] Glasgow invested heavily; £53,250 was subscribed after the books opened in the city in March 1696, and various Glasgow citizens subscribed a further £7,700 later at Edinburgh.[85] The enthusiasm was probably

---

82 *BRG.* 19/6/1716, p. 582; *BRG.*, 21/9/1717, pp. 623-4; 'gratification to Shawfield', to be deliberated upon by a special committee.

83 His father, the Procurator Fiscal for many years in Glasgow (d.1700), had been a partner with Anderson and his father, in the soapworks set up in 1667.

84 Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, p. 29.

85 NLS, Adv/MS/83/1/4; 'List of Darien subscribers at Glasgow'.

encouraged by Anderson, a pioneer in overseas trade in his youth, and Provost at the time, who, on behalf of the city as a corporation, subscribed £3000 stg..[86] The Merchants House followed by subscribing £1000, the Trades House, £400; the Incorporations of Tailors, Maltmen and Baxters £200 each; and the Hammermen, Wrights, Masons and Cordiners, £100 each. Principal William Dunlop, for the University, subscribed £1000, plus a further £1500 for himself.[87] Some leading Glasgow merchants put up considerable amounts. About a dozen individuals subscribed £1000 each, but none more so than Anderson's council ally, Bailie John Corse, who, with his partners at the Easter Sugar House, subscribed a total of £3000, and later a further £1500 for himself.

Since Glasgow was a major player in the Darien project, Anderson, as the city's commissioner, was appointed to the General Council of the Company of Scotland, the large and unwieldy policy-making and legislative arm of the company, along with James Gibson, merchant.[88] Several other leading Glasgow figures were also directors; Principal William Dunlop (d.1700), who had acquired colonial experience in (South) Carolina as a planter with Lord Cardross in the attempted Covenanter settlement in the 1680s, William Woddrop, William Arbuckle, Hugh Montgomerie and John Corse.[89] All the last-named were major shareholders who had each invested £1000 stg. or more.

Despite this considerable Glasgow involvement, Anderson, as burgh commissioner, was not amongst those who opposed the Court over Darien in the

---

86 ibid.

87 ibid.

88 *BRG.*, 25/4/1696, pp. 203-4.

89 *BRG.* 25/4/1696, pp. 203-4; John Prebble, *The Darien Disaster*, p. 90; Bannatyne Club, *The Darien Papers*, (1849), pp. 9, 19, 23.

crucial session of parliament which began on 29th October 1700.[90] The failure to do so, or to have responded with greater vigour to Lockhart's and Marshall's approaches in the earlier session in May, was almost certainly behind the sudden reappearance on the council in the autumn elections of 1700 of Hugh Montgomerie, a major Darien shareholder and director of the Company of Scotland. Anderson however, continued to wield some economic influence, as a member of the Committee of Trade, as did his ally and patron, Maxwell of Pollok who had been appointed as one of the Lords of the Treasury and Exchequer in 1696.[91] The Committee of Trade to which Anderson had been re-appointed in the autumn of 1700,[92] acted as an economic development agency, and also received petitions from the lieges on trading matters. It operated as a think tank advising the Estates on mercantile policy; as, for instance, on trade with France after France had refused importation of Scottish herrings, part of a general embargo on all British goods. Significantly, four petitions to set up manufactories were received by the committee in November and December from leading Glasgow merchant interests, and all were granted. Matthew and Daniel Campbell petitioned to have a sugar house which would distil brandy; William Corse petitioned for a further sugar house; James and William Walkinshaws petitioned to produce canvas and cordage and other shipping necessities; and James Montgomerie petitioned for a soap and glass works similar in

---

90 Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, Appendix A, 'Members of the Convention Parliament, 1689-1702', p. 175. Anderson's voting record for the major divisions of William's reign appears in Riley's painstaking work, in which it emerges that he never deviated from support of the Court.

91 Fraser, *Memoirs of the Maxwells of Pollok*, i, p.86; ii, p. 98. Pollok received a pension of £500 stg. per annum for this role.

92 Hume of Crossrigg's, *Diary*, p. 11.

scope to that in Leith. The success of these acts may well have boosted Anderson's flagging popularity and helped offset some of the bad feeling over Darien.[93]

However, any such gratification was insufficient to stave off Lockhart's petition or the anger at the alleged constitutional and financial 'abuses' highlighted in the prints. Clearly the sustained criticism of Anderson was more than economic and raises questions for our understanding of the political culture, constitution and management of the city. As we proceed to the discussion of Anderson in the pamphlet series it will become apparent that more radical expectations were entertained by this dynamic merchant group of the liberties supposedly secured by the Revolution for which Darien merely acted as the fulcrum, prising the lid off the political relationship between taxation and representation.

III

The first of these prints, the so-called 'whitewash letter'[94], was said by his detractor 'J. B.' to have been written by Anderson himself, apparently to offset any adverse publicity after it became known that the burgesses intended to take their constitutional and financial grievances to the forthcoming session of parliament. Their petition was eventually heard on 3rd January 1701; however the Estates decided that the case ought to be judged according to law,[95] which resulted in Lockhart et al pursuing an action of declarator[96] against the magistrates in the Court of Session. The legal action was heard

---

93 *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, (999), p.422; *APS*, x, p. 209; ibid, (1000); *APS*, x, p. 212; App., p. 52; (1001); *APS*, x, p. 231; (1002), *APS*, x, p. 231.

94 *A Letter from _____ to his friend, concerning the state of the Town of Glasgow's Business.*

95 Hume of Crossrigg, *Diary*, pp. 39, 40, 41; 'Representation and petition given in to Parliament by George Lockhart, *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, (1004), p. 423; *APS*, x, pp. 235-237; *BRG.*, 11/1/1701, pp. 312-313.

96 An action of declarator is a legal process which defines the rights of subjects in relation to the Crown. Although it is not competent for a subject to interdict the Crown, yet when an action of declarator had judged in favour of the subject, this usually results in the cessation of action complained of.

later that year, in June.[97] In respect of the financial anxieties, Anderson had allowed a select number of burgesses from the Trades House and the Merchants House to view the burgh accounts in April[98]. But this 'meer sham' or 'scrimp inspection', did nothing to allay fears that substantial fraud was going on, especially as the most recent transactions, those for 1697-1699, had not yet been entered into the books. It was alleged that substantial sums were missing, totalling £126,000 Scots, which, it was claimed, had been engrossed by Anderson under the various headings of the cess, excise, ale tax, malt tax and the seat rents of Blackfriars church (before it was even built)[99]. That which had provoked particular outrage, and seems to have been a catalyst for the action, was that the previous July, 1699, at the Convention of Royal Burghs, 40 shillings of the tack of the 'unfree trade' was put on Glasgow for one year[100]. This meant that the taxation of individual burgesses was increased. Stent was laid on 'proportionally', so that the wealthiest paid most.

The anonymous 'white-wash letter', anticipating the parliamentary petition of Anderson's critics, is undated, but the new session of parliament, to which it attempted to appeal, convened on the 21 May 1700 and the letter was evidently published to coincide with that date. It gave a year by year account of the progress made on the repayment of the burgh's debt mountain by each administration since the Revolution, and bears the hallmark of other letters written by Anderson; in a sober, smooth, rational

---

97 *BRG.*, 27/5/1701, p. 320.

98 *BRG.*, 6/4/1700, pp. 300-301.

99 Blackfriars Church had been destroyed in 1670. The contract between the town council and the university to rebuild it was dated 6 May 1699, *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, p.420.

100 James Marwick, 'Preface', *Miscellany of the Scottish Burgh Records Society*, 1881, pp.xlv-lxi, contains the account of the proceedings for the 'communication of trade' to the burghs of barony and regality which caused an augmentation in Glasgow's share, and the arrangements made with the agent of the Convention of Royal Burghs, John Buchan. It related to a failed attempt to get the burghs of barony and regality to pay a share of the cess.

style which carefully avoids rhetoric. It also reveals intimate details of the burgh accounts which only Anderson or a very close associate could have known. If he was indeed the author, he appears as an able administrator, entirely plausible, and a consummate politician.

That of 'J. B.'s' criticising him, and countering the 'white-wash letter', was dated the 17 July 1700; i.e., it was written while the parliament was in recess. This is polemical, racy and journalistic.[101] It is also relatively well-informed, but makes wild speculations in places and is written in the satirical vein of contemporary popular prints so deplored by Wodrow but prevalent particularly amongst Episcopalians. The letter introduces new matter into the controversy, however, which now includes criticism of the constitutional arrangements since the Revolution as well as the financial. This indicates that the controversy surrounding Anderson's administration had widened to include other grievances. The writer clearly had some inside knowledge of the workings of the council and was alleged by the Anderson camp to be a 'Deist' 'whose testimony against a Christian is no more to be received than that of a devil'; a cryptic comment which reveals more about the Anderson camp's prejudices than about the precise identity of the author.

The third print is evidently written by the Anderson camp again, either by Anderson or one of his allies, in response to J. B.'s allegations.[102] Although undated, it was presumably written after 17 July 1700, the date of J. B.'s letter to which it responds, and probably before the Estates reconvened at the end of October. Like the first, it is anonymous and is written in a similar factual style which bears evidence of

---

101 J. B., *A Letter from a Citizen of Glasgow to his friend in Edinburgh containing some modest Animadversions on a late Printed letter, concerning the Affairs of that City*, Glasgow, 17 July 1700.

detailed knowledge of the city's accounts. In response to J. B.'s allegations concerning the character of Dowhill as a tyrant who monopolised office, it points out that Anderson when he was elected as burgh commissioner (in February 1689) was actually absent from the city at the time, and that 'the Town Council chosen by the Pole did likeways, when he was absent, elect him to be Provost', i.e., in August 1689. It claimed therefore, that far from monopolising office, he was a popular figure who had been pressed to accept it.[103]

Of J. B.'s identity, we can only speculate. James Bogle, a wealthy foreign merchant, was one of Lockhart's closest allies and was one of the dozen or so who convened with him in September 1701, at the final show-down with Anderson after the Lords of Session suggested an out of court settlement. Bogle certainly had grounds for opposing him. In July 1689 he had been elected by the free poll of the burgesses but was dropped by Anderson in the ensuing Michaelmas elections in October, and in 1695 he had been arraigned, along with Lockhart and several others of his party, for free-market activities.[104] Bogle was also married to Agnes Sanders, a relation of Robert Sanders (ygr) of Auldhouse (d.1730), Glasgow's premier printer and bookseller. We note that J. B.'s 'satire' bore a Glasgow imprint[105]. It is also evident that Sanders's protest in April 1700,[106] in refusing to pay the augmented stent, was a major blow to the

---

102 *Reflexions on two Late Letters concerning the Affairs of the City of Glasgow, by a citizen thereof. In answer to his Friend at Edinburgh who designed an Impartial Account of that Matter.*

103 ibid.

104 Jackson, 'Glasgow in Transition c.1660 to c.1740', p. 70.

105 H. G. Aldis, *A List of Books Printed in Scotland before 1700,* NLS, Edinburgh Bibliographic Society, (Edinburgh, 1970).

106 *BRG.* 6/4/1700, p. 299; the description of Sanders having 'suspended' his stents, is unusually mild; as is the following note that the council therefore 'ordains the treasurer to cause the town's agent call and discuss the said suspension'.

magistrates and appears to have spear-headed what could have turned into a major non-payment campaign. Sanders was an important citizen in Glasgow; he was the printer to both the burgh council and the university and had accumulated a great deal of personal wealth.

James Bogle also had a shop next to 'Bass' John Spreull and Henry Marshall, apothecary; two others of the principal complainants. Anderson's treatment of Spreull in keeping him off the council, was highlighted in J. B.'s print.

Another possible 'J. B.', whose treatment is noted in the pamphlet, was the Episcopalian John Barnes (d.1716), the ex-Provost whom Anderson had imprisoned and pursued for debts to the town after the Revolution and whom he had relentlessly criticised for his fraudulent management of the burgh revenues in the 1680s.

The prominent royalist Episcopalian ex-Provost, no friend of the Revolutioner regime, Sir John Bell (d.1704, aged 80), was said by Wodrow's correspondent to be in his dotage in January 1703 when the Episcopal riots took place in the city[107] and has been ruled out as no longer politically active by this date.

'J. B.', whoever he was, claimed that there was no particular criticism in Glasgow of the magistrates - merely of Anderson himself, whom we are led to believe strides the post-Revolution council like a colossus, just as the archbishop once did. Indeed the writer goes as far as to say that two of Anderson's closest allies, Provost James Peadie of Ruchill (Provost for 2 terms; 1691-1693 and 1697-1699) and Provost William Napier, (Provost from 1693-1695), were both honest and conscientious men. Yet they were only 'nominal' provosts, front men who were in reality only Anderson in

---

107 See previous; NLS Wodrow 4to (73), 'Information anent the putting out of the curates in Glasgow', 1689, f9-12; NLS Wodrow 4to (28), 'The double of a letter from a friend in Glasgow to a friend in Edinburgh anent the stirr', 7 March 1703, f151-153.

another guise, (Peadie, for instance, we have already noted, was a business partner), and supplied his place merely because the sett, or constitution of the burgh, prevented a Provost from serving for more than two consecutive terms at a time.

The sett of the burgh, it must be noted, did attempt to prevent arrogation of office but it could be manipulated. There was no proscription, for instance, against an individual who had served two annual terms as chief magistrate being re-elected again as Provost at a later date after having lain 'fallow' on the council as an ordinary councillor for a number of years. The technique of perpetual power is thus revealed in this pamphlet series, whereby a set of men, with an acknowledged leader, are able to retain power by alternately voting one another into the key positions which secures the election of the magistracy. Thus 'J. B.' claimed, though the 'free' constitution granted in 1690 by King William's charter to the city had cost 9000 merks to procure, and was obtained with the express purpose of preventing the financial embezzlement which went on lately under the recent archbishops' rule, yet it had served no further purpose 'than to put Dovehill (Dowhill) in place of the Arch-bishop'. By 'private concert' since the Revolution, Dowhill, assisted by his 'creatures', had perpetuated the magistracy in his own hands by manipulating the leeting arrangements. When Anderson wished his man to succeed, he saw to it that his preferred candidate was placed in the final leet with another who was for some clear reason objectionable to the electors, such as a known Jacobite, or a person who had to be laid aside for constitutional reasons.[108]

A burgess had to be devoted to Dowhill to get onto the council. Leading citizens and men of proven civic virtue such as 'Bass' John Spreull, John Smith, John

---

108 J. B., *A letter from a Citizen of Glasgow to his friend at Edinburgh*, pp. 4-5.

Stirling,[109] or John Armour, who opened an important woollen manufactory in 1681, had all failed to get elected, though duly placed in the leets, merely because they were men of independent mind. Even Thomas Peters, the tacksman of the excise, who had succeeded in removing £16,000 of civic debt by his management of the tack, had been passed over in favour of others more subservient to Anderson's will. At the following Michaelmas elections 1700, however, significant changes took place; Thomas Peters and John Armour were suddenly elected, as were Hugh Montgomerie of Busbie and James Montgomerie, possibly as an attempt by Anderson to buy off his critics, but certainly as a response to the current controversies as highlighted in the prints. In all, seven changes took place in the 33 strong council, and the following year Hugh Montgomerie was elected Provost. In fact, considerable instability is evident in the composition of the civic group after 1700 for the council entered a period of some political turbulence when various factions apparently competed for control. This was only halted in 1716 when Provost John Aird succeeded in establishing an Argathelian council[110] and the civic group entered a decade of political stability (or stagnation).

Since the sett of the burgh comes under particular scrutiny in the prints, it will be appropriate to comment further on it at this point. In general, in relation to Lockhart's programme, (although this is hard to quantify empirically), it may be said that throughout the seventeenth century, beginning with the Letter of Guildry in 1605, interest in the civic constitution had been growing steadily amongst the burgesses as had a more legalistic outlook. The burgh records of the period (i.e., minutes of the town

---

109 John Spreull, elder, John Stirling, James Bogle and Hugh Montgomerie, merchants, mentioned in the prints, were all elected by the free poll of the burgesses 2-3 July 1689, but failed to get elected thereafter. (See Appendix I).

110 Laird of Grant to Duncan Forbes of Culloden, 17/10/1716, 'thers not one man who was suspected of favouring the Duke of Montrose ... left in the town council of Glasgow', *More Culloden Papers*, ed. D. Warrand, 2 vols., ii, Inverness, 1923-30), p.147.

council) contain many incidents which convey the impression that in response to disputes, burgesses and councillors alike were of an increasingly litigious disposition; a phenomena which was almost certainly related to the growth of literacy,[111] the establishment of the Dean of Guild's court by the Letter of Guildry (which dealt with disputes between burgesses) the influence of the Convention of Royal Burghs in attempting to create better order in burghs, the impact of civic humanism and the improved education of burgesses. The development of the university and the expansion of literary culture in Glasgow, which forms the institutional backdrop to this, have already been referred to in a previous chapter. By contrast with the latter half of the seventeenth century, the early decades had shown an inclination at times for disputes to erupt into violence and street brawls; as for instance, the armed clash which took place in 1606 at the Bridgend of Glasgow between the followers of two ex-provosts, Sir George Elphinstone of Blythswood, and Sir Matthew Stewart of Minto.[112]

The tendency towards legalism and a constitutional defence of the burgh's liberties became particularly prominent after the Test Act of 1681 came into force and began wreaking havoc on burgh constitutions. For instance, in the Michaelmas elections of 1682 the outgoing Provost Sir John Bell accused the incoming Provost John Barns of literally hauling men off the street to be councillors, who were not even burgesses, in order to supply those unwilling to qualify in terms of the Test. The

---

111 In 1604, Robert Adam and John Dickson, two of the merchant commissioners sent to negotiate with those of the craftsmen in forming the Letter of Guildry, could not write, and appended their signatures 'with our hands at the pen, led by the nottar, because we cannot write ourselves'. John Gibson, *The History of the City of Glasgow from the Earliest Accounts to the Present Time*, (Glasgow, 1777), Appendix, 'Submission of the merchants to arbitration', p.338. By 1700, examination of the burgh court records indicated that literacy amongst burgesses was almost universal; although only about 30-40% of their wives appeared to be able to write. City of Glasgow Archives, Burgh Court records, B1 series.

112 William Mackay Mackenzie, *The Scottish Burghs*, (Edinburgh and London, 1949), p. 129; see also *Miscellany of the Scottish Burgh Records Society*. A scuffle broke out between the two knights because each disputed the other's rights to name the magistracy. The matter was referred to the Privy Council.

previous year Bell had faced a similar problem when some of the electors had not turned up, and had petitioned the Privy Council to secure a new election on the grounds that the previous one was invalid. Bell's reaction in 1682 typified what had now become the standard means of dealing with such disputes.[113] After protesting that Barns's dealings were 'contrair to the sett and priviledges of the burgh, and to the provost's oun burges oath', Bell promptly 'asked instrumentis, ane or mae, in the handis of George Andersone, nottar publict, toun clerk of the said burgh.'[114] The town clerk was an important figure in burgh councils, a legally trained employee of some considerable ability, and his position is further evidence of the extent of legalism in burgh councils.

Political interference in elections however was a long-standing grievance in royal burghs and the attempts by the Crown to secure a politically subservient magistracy in the 1680s in particular had caused wide-scale disruption to civic constitutions across the country. At the Revolution the political grievances of the royal burghs had formed an important part of the Claim of Right,[115] and had been mentioned in William's declaration to the Scots of October 1688. At Glasgow, the abolition of episcopacy in 1689 brought an end to the archbishop's right to nominate the magistracy and was hailed as bringing an end to corrupt influences on the council; especially the undue domination of the burgh by politically subservient courtiers who had formed the

---

113 *BRG.*, 3/10/1682, pp. 322-323

114 ibid., 3/10/1682, p. 323.

115 'By subverting the right of the Royal Burghs, the third Estate of Parliament, imposing upon them not only Magistrats, but also the whole Town-council, and Clerks, contrary to their liberties, and express Charters, without the pretence either of sentence, Surrender or Consent, so that the Commissioners to Parliaments being chosen by the Magistrats and Council the King might in effect als well nominat that entire Estate of Parliament; and many of the saids Magistrats put in by him, were avowed Papists, and the Burghs were forced to pay money for the Letters imposing these illegal Magistrats and Councils upon them'. 'Claim of Right', W C Dickinson, G Donaldson, (eds.), *A Source Book of Scottish History*, iii, 1567-1707, (London, 1954), p. 202.

backbone of recent administrations. The right of nomination now fell to the Crown on the archbishop's demission and Anderson had appealed successfully, on behalf of Glasgow, to have this restored to the city.[116]

By 1689 therefore, not only was a legalistic disposition evident amongst the burgesses in Glasgow, but a high level of political expectation was entertained of the post-Revolution constitution. It is also clear that the precedent of the free poll of the burgesses sanctioned by the Estates in July 1689 had increased expectations of greater burgess involvement in the election of the magistrates.

Glasgow's post-Revolution constitution however remained a closed, self-perpetuating oligarchy, despite the evident wishes of Lockhart and his adherents for a wider distribution of power. In their action of declarator of 1701, after the Estates had referred their petition to the Court of Session, it was claimed that the charter of 1690 granting Glasgow a free constitution had given the power of election to the burgesses, 'especially to the two Houses of Merchants and Trades, as being the Body of the Society and Community of Glasgow' and that therefore the town council should present the leet for the magistrates, which was formerly given to the archbishop, to them. This was a radical claim, which the law lords, in their examination of the case, concluded to be 'a strange fancie' which the pursuers' imaginations had 'brought forth from Eutopia', and threw it out of court.[117] Yet over 130 years later the first reform act effectively delivered the wider burgess involvement in the government of the city that Lockhart was arguing for in 1700.

---

116 NAS GD.26/7/278, 'Petition from the Town of Glasgow desyring liberty to choice their own magistrates', 1689.

117 *Information for the Magistrates and Town Council of Glasgow against George Lockhart, merchant there, and his adherents, Merchants and Inhabitants of the said Burgh.* NLS 1.19(80)

Lockhart's claim that there was an existing sett of the burgh which laid this down, and which he called for to be produced as evidence, was strongly denied by the Anderson camp, who retorted:

> In several places of this libel, he avers that there is a sett of the Burgh for making men believe that plain Rules are contravened. Whereas, there never was, nor is any such sett, as to the Election of Magistrates, but the same is regulate meerly by the Custom of the Burgh, which has been precisely observed ever since the Revolution by these persons who were elected by the Whole Inhabitants in their Pole.[118]

When the historical development of the sett of the burgh is examined closely, the available evidence tends to support the account given above by the Anderson camp, that the sett, as such, was merely customary, and was never committed to writing. The burgh's electoral procedures had evolved piecemeal over time; its elements are to be found in the various acts of parliament pertaining to royal burghs from the 15th century onwards, the enactments of the Convention of Royal Burghs, which began meeting regularly from 1552, and use and wont within the burgh in interpreting these. The most significant act defining current practice was probably the act of 1469,[119] (the bête noire of the burgh reformers), whereby the outgoing council elected the new; this had been adopted in Glasgow by the time of the Reformation. But for much of its history as a bishop's burgh of regality, Glasgow's constitution had been inhibited by the right of the archbishop to select the provost and magistrates. Even James VI's act of 1611 conferring on Glasgow the status of a royal burgh enhanced its economic role and right

---

118 *Reflexions of Two late letters concerning the affairs of Glasgow.* NLS 1.19(79), 3.

119 Jas. III, Parl.5, c.30

to attend parliament, but did nothing to remove the archbishop's right to nominate the magistrates.[120] In 1553 however, the council had acquired important leverage by the right to present to the archbishop a short-list of preferred candidates to the magistracy from which he then made his choice.[121] In future, when the archbishop or his agent was temporarily absent, or when there was no archbishop, the council's choice served as a default mechanism and thus established the principle of the council's shadow powers. For instance in 1641, when bishops were suppressed, and an act of parliament transferred the right of nomination of the provost to a layman, James, Duke of Lennox; this came with the proviso that if he or his agent were not present in the Bishops Palace on election day, then the council could proceed to its own election of the provost. Since the Duke of Lennox was often not present, the powers were effectively exercised by the council. Further, from 1638-1641, after the abolition of episcopacy, the council had exercised the right to appoint all the magistrates. That complained of in Lockhart's action of declarator - that the post-Revolution council, by assuming the right of election of the magistrates, had illegally 'come in place of the said archbishop' and the duke of Lennox, was thus misinformed; the principle of the council's shadow powers was already constitutionally established. There can be no doubt that the lords' ruling was other than correct, unless of course the pursuers wished to recall as a precedent the primitive democracy of the medieval burgh, the 'ancient constitution' pre-1469, as the burgh reformers did; but this was not cited by them in their action. The arrangements

---

120 *BRG.*, i, 234-5; W. M .Mackenzie, *The Scottish Burghs*, (Edinburgh, 1947), pp.121-122

121 Gibson's *History*, no. xxi, 'Instrument of John Hamilton, notary, upon the nomination of the consuls, or bailies of the city of Glasgow, taken by James, archbishop of Glasgow,' 3 October 1553, pp.310-313.

regarding the council's shadow powers of nomination had remained in place during the Covenanting and Cromwellian era, 1641-1662.[122]

The aim of removing the archbishop's powers in the constitution of the burgh, eventually realised at the Revolution, appears to have been a long-standing one and was widely supported. Both religious factions during the seventeenth century are found trying to extend the burgh's political freedom wherever possible; and in fact, in 1670, when Anderson was Dean of Guild, he himself worked in tandem with the Bell-Campbell clique regarding this. He was sent by Provost James Campbell to the court of King Charles II, to plead for a free constitution, but the mission was not successful.[123] The archbishop's power in respect of the election of the magistrates was evidently regarded as a civil matter, and the burgh's aspiration to have the power of election in its own hands was supported by at least one archbishop, the liberal and saintly Robert Leighton.[124] Opinion on this was quite without prejudice to views the burgesses might have held on the role of Episcopacy within the church.

The sett of the burgh only appears to have been written down in its entirety for the first time in 1711,[125] in response to a request made by the Convention of Royal

---

122 *Information for the Magistrates and Town Council of Glasgow against George Lockhart.* NLS 1.19(80), Edinburgh, 1701.

123 City of Glasgow Archives, Pollok Papers, TPM113, Provost Campbell to Sir George Maxwell of Pollok in London, Glasgow 25 May 1670, f473; same to the same, 31 May 1670, f474; *BRG.*, 14/5/1670, p. 134. Anderson was commissioned to get 'a frie electioune of the magistratis in their awne persones, as uther royall burghs hes, as also to act and doe all things possible to obtein the right of the bailliarie and barronye of Glasgow, or quat else may augnent the liberties and priviledges of burgh'.

124 Anderson's mission was unsuccessful; but Leighton, who succeeded Burnet as archbishop from 1672-1674, acquiesced in this desire and allowed the council and magistrates their free choice. The gratitude of the community to Leighton for his 'christian cariage and behaviour towards them' provoked a petition from the merchants to the council when it was learned that Leighton intended to resign the see, requesting that efforts be made to prevent it, *BRG.* 2/5/1673, p.167.

125 John Gibson, *History of Glasgow,* Appendix, p. xxiv, 'Act of council anent the sett of the burgh of Glasgow', pp. 319-323; also supplies details of how the leeting worked.

Burghs in 1708.[126] The Convention's initiative probably occurred as a result of the interest which the Lockhart case had generated in the constitution of the burgh. The election procedures described in 1711 were however in force throughout the 17th century and burgh statutes are found outlining these.[127]Lockhart's claims that there was an established sett of the burgh different from that mentioned above cannot therefore be substantiated and there is sufficient evidence to indicate that the sett as it was transmitted in 1711, was little different in substance from the statutes enacted piecemeal throughout the 17th century.

Although the bones of the constitution can be said to derive from the Letter of Guildry of 1605,[128] this extensive and detailed document was more concerned with economic rights than political ones and principally defined trade relations between merchants and craftsmen within the burgh. It set up a guildry under the presidency of the Dean of Guild, which both merchants and craftsmen could join, and defined the Dean of Guild's powers in establishing his council, and how it was to be elected. In the seventeenth century the ratio of thirteen merchant councillors to twelve craftsmen within the burgh council became established; and within the inner power sanctum of the magistracy, of two merchant baillies to one craftsman. James VI had determined that the ratio of merchants to craftsmen should be equal and this aspect of the city's constitution was thus established by royal fiat.[129] The Provost, according to a later act

---

126 Harry Lumsden, *Records of the Trades House of Glasgow*, p. xi; *Miscellany of the Scottish Burgh Records Society*, pp. 161-295.

127 For instance, in 1641, 'enacted that none hereafter be received Bailie, while two years after they have been bailie', *Glasgow Register*, (1781), p. 13. This was an attempt to prevent arrogation of office.

128 This is printed in full in the excellent Appendix section of Gibson's *History*, which the author published from documents, some of which have since disappeared, transcribed from the Chartulary of the Bishopric of Glasgow in the library of Glasgow University in the late eighteenth century. Gibson, *History of Glasgow*, no. xxvl, pp. 331-361.

129 NLS, MS 7103, Yester Papers, f3,8,10.

of parliament in 1609, was always to be a trafficking merchant.[130]Although J. B. claimed that Anderson was not, this act was not cited, the author merely making the libel, 'my informers assure me, that they never knew of any trade that he has had in all that time, except the Provost trade'.[131] Anderson was depicted as an out and out government man, who had given over private business in favour of lucrative public sector offices; e.g., he was the joint-manager of the tack of the customs for Glasgow, the general surveyor and also the burgh accountant 'for which he has a considerable salary'.

The method of the election of the council was not specified in the Letter of Guildry, but by sundry burgh acts in accordance with parliamentary statute. In 1637 for instance, a 'Form of election of counsall' was drawn up codifying existing practice, and this was endorsed in 1663 and 1681.[132] By this 'sett', the magistrates of the current and previous two years met each Michaelmas to elect the new councillors by a complicated system of leets in which the Provost was prevented (1663) from having a veto. Any burgess of the city was eligible for inclusion in the leets. The archbishop of course nominated the magistrates from leets supplied by the council until the Revolution. In 1700, when the Lockhart case brought the workings of the council under further scrutiny, more detail is revealed about how exactly the elections were conducted. It appears that the outgoing town council (29-33 members) met the first Tuesday after Michaelmas to elect the new magistrates (Provost and three baillies), and that these,

---

130 J McGrath, 'The Medieval Burgh', in T M Devine and G Jackson (eds.) *Glasgow; volume I, Beginnings to 1830*, p.30.

131 J. B. *A letter from a Citizen of Glasgow to his friend at Edinburgh containing some modest animadversions on a late printed letter, concerning the affairs of that city*, p.14; a reference to his salary of £300 per annum as book-keeper and his bill of charge of £4 per day when attending the Estates or Convention of Royal Burghs.

132 *BRG.* 19/8/1637, p. 382; 15/10/1663, pp. 18-19; 18/3/1682, p. 310.

along with the magistrates of the two previous years, met to elect the 25 incoming councillors the following Friday. The elections of the Dean of Guild, (the president of the merchants and guildbrethren), and the Deacon Convener, (the president of the craftsmen), both ex officio members of the council if not already councillors, took place the Wednesday after that, but involved a wider and slightly more representative group.[133] Between the Tuesday and the Friday, there was effectively no town council and its powers rested temporarily with the four new magistrates.

Neither does documentary evidence support Lockhart's contention that the gift of the 'free' constitution in 1690 was ever given to the 'community'. King William's letter of 19th September 1689, authorising the Michaelmas elections of a provost and magistrates, omitted to say who was to do the electing; the king's letter was merely addressed to 'the present Magistrates and Town Councell', who were thus inferred to be the electors, especially given the council's shadow powers.[134] The subsequent charter awarding the free election, and the act of parliament of 14th June 1690 ratifying it, confirmed all previous acts made in favours of the community, (i.e., as to its 'guildry, craftsmen and sundry societies and deacons'), yet specifically in regard to the election of the provost and magistrates, gave the power to 'the city of Glasgow and town council thereof' ('civitati de Glasgow et consilio burgali ejusdem').[135] It is doubtful that this

---

133 *Reflexions on Two Letters*, p.6; Lumsden, *The Records of the Trades House of Glasgow*p. xii; the elections of the Dean of Guild and the Deacon Convener were made by the new town council with the addition of the 14 deacons of crafts plus fourteen merchants supplied to balance the deacons. The Merchants House and the Trades House supplied the electors with leets and the election proceeded by direct vote. The deacons of crafts were directly elected by their members - the only truly element of popular election.

134 *Glas. Chtrs*,. ii, CLVII, 'Letter from King William authorising the Town Council to choose their Provost and Magistrates', Hampton Court, 19 September, 1689, p.235.

135 *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, CLVIII, 'Charter by King William and Queen Mary confirming the rights and privileges of the City of Glasgow', Kensington, 4 January, 1690, pp. 236-239; CLIX, 'Act of Parliament, ratilfying to the City of Glasgow the Charter' CLVIII, Edinburgh 14 June, 1690, pp. 239-240.

loose term, the 'city of Glasgow,' could permit interpretation as meaning the burgesses in their two ranks.

It will readily be seen from the above description that although the old council elected the new magistrates, any party which commanded the magistracy of the current and previous two years (a maximum of twelve persons) commanded the election of the town council and represented the true power elite. Further, this electoral caucus could potentially be quite a small group, (minimum of seven), if for instance, most of its members had held office for the maximum two years within the three year period. This gave considerable scope for political management - but only if a clique was tightly organised, as any divisions within the ranks could have a highly destabilising effect, lead to factionalising, and within two to three elections have effected a coup; as indeed happened several times between 1700 and 1740. Glasgow civic government was rarely so monolithic again as in the first decade after the Revolution when the Revolutioner interest was solid and undivided. After 1700, cracks appeared in the Revolutioner-Court interest which were barely stabilised by 1716 and re-emerged again in response to the Malt tax crisis in 1725. In net political terms the sett was more unstable than perhaps the opponents of Anderson at first realised, and even at the best of times required considerable skill to 'manage'.

For despite the limited franchise, the city's constitution was more responsive to the changing mood in the city than that of many other burghs. Craft representation was wider[136] and the sett and annual elections provided for constant rotation of office. In

---

136 Theodora Keith, , 'Municipal Elections in the Royal Burghs of Scotland', *SHR*, vol. xiii, (1916), Pt.i, pp. 118-119. E.g., Stirling's constitution (1620) and Dunfermline's (1618), forbade the election of craftsmen as magistrates. In 1619 Linlithgow had been fined for electing a surgeon as Provost, and in 1613 Perth had been fined for electing a craftsman as Provost. Glasgow's constitution was not awarded by the Convention of Royal Burghs, which tended to enforce a proscription against craftsmen to the most senior positions, but had been arrived at by arbitration between the burgesses themselves. In many European towns, craftsmen were also expressly excluded from city government, e.g., Hamburg, Lubeck, French cities, W M Mackenzie, *The Scottish Burghs*, p.126.

some burghs, although the franchise might extend to the entire burgess community, office was usually held for life, so that elections were few and far between. This type of constitution was actually far less democratic in spirit. The criticisms of the burgh reformers, which were fixated on a critique of the restrictive burgh franchise, overlooked the role of annual elections in altering the character of many councils. Likewise, the burgh reformers applied a civil model to burghal society, viewing it as a collection of so many unrelated individuals, when in fact a commercial one was more appropriate. A Scottish royal burgh like Glasgow in 1700, was an organic self-governing economic corporation, like a large and complex joint-stock company, which happened to have political rights in the state. But even if these political rights were marginalised, as they were after the union, the economic model still governed its internal dynamics. The burgesses of Glasgow (c.1000-1200 in number by 1700) were shareholders in the burgh as a corporation; the town council (29-33 members)[137] was its board of directors. The oligarchic 'board' might co-opt its majority share-holders to be 'managing directors' on a rotating basis; but it could not however afford to ignore its other paid-up members whom it also represented, and who were effectively its voluntary fiscal base, as this could adversely affect its economic viability. Thus J. B. complained, that as a result of over-stenting in the 1690s, many burgesses were voting with their feet, giving up their burgess tickets and leaving Glasgow altogether to set up in other parts of the country where they faced negligible levels of taxation.[138] These

137 The exact number depended on whether the Dean of Guild, Deacon Convener, Master of Work or the Treasurer, all elected annually, were already councillors, or were elected ex officio. The basic council (29) consisted of Provost and 3 bailies, 13 merchant councillors and 12 crafts councillors. The Master of Work was often a 'decayed merchant'.

138 'Many of them have already left the town, and given up their burgess tickets, to be free of the stents and burdens; and many others are like to do follow their example: So that Dowhill's management may come to empty the Town of Trading Merchants', J.B., *A Letter from a Citizen of Glasgow to his Friend at Edinburgh*, 17th July 1700.

could quite easily set up in direct competition with it. Greenock and Bo'ness were expanding ports, 'unfree' burghs of barony, increasingly accused of stealing Glasgow's trade; Lockhart and Bogle had been arraigned for dealing with 'unfree' men in 1695.

This argument was made use of by the 'board' itself, when, in response to the Convention of Royal Burghs' investigation into the low state of the burgh, the magistrates, with a view to reducing Glasgow's overall share of the tax roll of the royal burghs,[139] reported that they were so fatigued by taxation, that they were even thinking about 'resigning their royalty' to be free from such burdens.[140] Due to the rise in taxation since the Revolution, several hundred burgesses, bearing scot and lot,[141] had left Glasgow, they claimed, rather than face the government's stents, and several leading citizens had approached them recently in connection with the idea of surrendering the royalty. The Provost, Dean of Guild, Deacon Convener and one baillie, had therefore applied to the Convention offering their resignation.[142]

This threat introduces an entirely new dimension into the matter. It has been hitherto assumed that the coveted status of a royal burgh, sought by the city fathers for over a century and a half, would have been universally desired; but evidently this had

---

139 Recently increased from £15 to £20 per £100 of tax. The royal burghs contributed £6000 of the land tax, set at £48,000 p.a. at the union. When the position in the tax roll increased, this had the additional effect of increasing the burgh missive dues.

140 Magistrates and Town Council of Glasgow, *Representation of the present Condition and State of the City of Glasgow and of the Hardships done them by the late Augmentation of their Quota of the Taxt roll of the Royal Burrows*, (1704?), stated that the burgesses 'bearing burden' were some 100s fewer than at the Revolution; that rents were 50% of their former level; that houses and shops alike were ruinous. The situation had become so extreme, especially due to the recent war in which Glasgow had lost over 60 ships so that 22 merchants 'failzied' in one year alone; that the burgesses, especially the merchants, have asked the magistrates to consider resigning the royalty and privileges of the burgh altogether, and also the Common Good, in favour of the Convention.

141 The traditional obligations of a burgess were *scot*, (liability for burghal taxation), *lot*, (right and liability to be included in any leeting arrangements in relation to burghal matters, such as community defence, or the government of the burgh), *watch*, (the obligation to guard the burgh against hazards of fire, theft, attack, etc.), and *ward*, (the obligation to apprehend and hold those who have transgressed the law). The involvement in a community watch role was still being undertaken by the citizens themselves as late as 1798, according to one historian of the city, James Denholm, *The History of the City of Glasgow and Suburbs* (Glasgow, 1798).

142 ibid.

ceased to be the case. What would have been the effect on government, and on the king's cess, had Glasgow, which contributed 12-15% of the land tax payable by the royal burghs, and undertook public responsibilities of watching and warding, carried this out? Was a royal burgh free to 'opt out' in any case? Moreover, was being a burgess in a royal burgh in 1700 still viewed as a 'privilege' which gave worthwhile 'freedoms'; or was it seen as more of a feudal 'liability' which merely exchanged outmoded and unenforceable economic monopolies in foreign trade, for increasing fiscal vassallage? These and other questions are raised by the impact on the burgh of increasing non-burghal taxation. It is clear that the growth of the state, as witnessed by the growth of its fiscal demands, occurred at the expense of the 'city-state', and stimulated the burgesses into a radical re-appraisal of post-Revolution government.[143]

Neither was burghal office automatically desired by all burgesses. Far from wishing to monopolise office, as the burgh reformers alleged was the universal practice in royal burghs, there were actually those who sought to avoid it. A burgh statute of 15th May 1691 fined any councillor one rex dollar who did not appear at council meetings[144] and in 1736 a Dean of Guild, Samuel McCall, was even imprisoned for refusing

---

143 There is a long and extensive literature about this, both contemporary and modern. From the Restoration onwards the extension of trading rights to communities who bore no share of public burdens provoked increasing controversy and counter-argument, stimulating the burgesses into a defence of their position. In all there were 246 grants of non-burghal markets and fairs between 1660-1707, (Ballard, infra, pp.24-25) many of which extended into the trading areas of established royal burghs. See for instance, Philopoliteius, (Alexander Skene), *Memorialls for the Government of the Royal Burghs in Scotland* (Aberdeen, 1685); *Answers for the Royal Burghs to the Memorial in behalf of the Burghs of Regality and Baronie and Other Unfree Trades*, (1698); Magistrates of Glasgow, *Representation of the present Condition and State of the City of Glasgow and of the Hardship due to them by the late Augmentation of their Quota of the Taxt roll of the Royal Burrows*, (circa 1704); Magistrates of Glasgow, *Representation to the Right Honourable the General Convention of the Royal Burrows of this Kingdom By the Magistrats of Glasgow in relation to their Action of Compt and Reckoning against the Managers of the late Burrow Tack of the Forraign Customs and Excise*, (circa 1705); William Black, advocate, *The Privileges of the Royal Burghs, Edinburgh*, (Edinburgh, 1707); *The Case of the Royal Boroughs of Scotland* (London, 1712). Amongst the modern authors to tackle this are, Adolphus Ballard, 'The Theory of the Scottish Royal Burgh', *SHR*, xiii, 1916; Theodora Keith, 'The Trading Privileges of the Royal Burghs of Scotland', *English Historical Review*, 28, 1913; and Theodora Keith, 'Municipal Elections in the Royal Burghs of Scotland', *SHR*, xiii, 1916; William Mackay Mackenzie, *The Scottish Burghs* (Edinburgh, 1949), especially chapters vi, viii, ix.

144 *BRG.*, 15/5/1691, p. 19.

to accept the office to which he had been legally 'elected' (co-opted).[145] In 1748 a burgh statute fined such refuseniks £20 sterling (a fairly punitive sum)[146] for this demeanour. Fines for refusals remained in force throughout the eighteenth century and were doubled in the early 1800s. The Malt tax crisis (1725) had made clear the principle that magistrates were to be held liable 'jointly and severally' for the payment of the government's tax, and this anxiety evidently deterred many from accepting office. Lockhart's demands for a wider share in government have to be seen in this larger context.

After their action of declarator had failed, Lockhart's group entered into negotiations with the magistrates for a new sett of the burgh which would widen the base of electoral power. In the action, which was heard in June 1701, the lords had ruled in favour of the magistrates, and determined that their practice in electing the new provost and magistrates was according to law and in no way unconstitutional. However they had suggested that the way was open for the two parties to come to a new constitutional agreement, in the same way as the 'decreet arbitral' of the Letter of Guildry had been arrived at in determining the rights of merchants and craftsmen a century before.[147] The lords pointed out, quite correctly, that the scope of an action of declarator was to uphold an existing right, but that it could not be used to create a new one. They therefore referred the matter back to the parties themselves; in response to which Lockhart drew up a number of recommendations.

---

145 *BRG.*, 13/10/1736, 1/11/1735, pp.469-470; *Glasgow Register*, (1781), p.24-26. John Gartshore was elected to replace Samuel McCaul, who was imprisoned for his refusal; 'Such as refuse offices, let their names remain in oblivion'.

146 Gibson, *History of Glasgow*, Appendix, No XXV, p. 328.

147 *BRG.*, 30/8/1701, p. 325; 13/9/1701, p. 326.

Quite what these proposals amounted too is unrecorded, but the magistrates noted wryly that they encroached on the guildry and were 'derogative to the power and priviledge of the town council'.[148] They were concerned however, to maintain 'friendly communing and conference' and appointed a civic committee to meet with the objectors on 15th September 1701 in William Carmichael's great dining room. When this convened however, Anderson objected that too few of Lockhart's supporters had turned up to make it competent to reach any decisions about such weighty and far-reaching affairs. He therefore suggested that the matter be referred to external arbiters, naming his old friend, Sir John Maxwell of Pollok, the Lord Justice Clerk, and Hamilton of Hallcraig,[149] two of the lords of session who lived locally,[150] and who were 'knouen in the affair'. Both men were commissioners of the Estates, as well as members of the bench.

Hallcraig however was unacceptable to Lockhart and his adherents, who wanted Lord Boyle[151] and at this the meeting broke up without conclusion, Anderson confident that he had headed off the challenge presented by a disaffected minority.

The ten who accompanied Lockhart to this 'friendly communing'[152] included several of the wealthiest merchants in Glasgow who had also invested the largest sums in Darien. Substantial Caribbean and Virginia interests in sugar and tobacco were represented by this group and the sugar interests were particularly prevalent, often

---

148 *BRG.*, 13/9/1701, p. 326.

149 Sir John Hamilton of Hallcraig (d.1706). He was also the commissioner for Cullen, 1696-1702, knighted by William in 1689. Joseph Foster, *Members of Parliament of Scotland 1357-1882*, 2nd ed., (London, 1882).

150 *BRG.*, 20/9/1701, p.330.

151 William Boyle, the brother of the Earl of Glasgow.

152 George Lockhart, John Graham of Dougalstoun, Daniel Campbell, John Corse, William Woddrop, William Walkinshaw, William Crawford, James Bogle, James Corbet, Andrew Kirkart and James Muir. *BRG.* 20/9/1701, p. 330.

interconnected. Lockhart's supporters even included baillie William Woddrop, a recent ex-member of Anderson's administration; plus baillie John Corse (or Cross), a former Dean of Guild. John Corse and Partners were the owners of the Easter Sugar House, founded in 1669, in which the Peadie and Bogle families also had interests.[153] Needless to say, for his defiance of the Provost, baillie Corse was put off the council weeks later at the next Michaelmas elections. Woddrop had interests with another member of this fraternity, Daniel Campbell (of Shawfield), in the Wester Sugar House, founded in 1667, by Hugh Montgomerie's father-in-law, Peter Gemmill.[154] Bass John Spreull also had interests in this enterprise, and in 1702, John Graham of Dougalstoun, another of Lockhart's group who turned up at this meeting, acquired Woddrop's share.[155] Daniel Campbell had significant West Highland connections and by 1707 was the burgh commissioner for Inveraray.[156] In 1708 he unsuccessfully contested the Glasgow Burghs seat against Provost Rogers.[157] He was a ruthless but bold and enterprising character who seems to have been quite unacceptable to the Revolutioner set at Glasgow, whether as a councillor or as a commissioner, despite his wealth and evident commercial ability.[158] William Walkinshaw of Scotstoun, a Jacobite, also appears in

---

153 Jackson, 'Glasgow in Transition', p. 79.

154 Gourlay, *The Provosts of Glasgow*, p. 44. Montgomerie had married Lillias Gemmill, by whom he received a tocher of 12,000 merks, in 1687.

155 *Glas. Chtrs*,. (1010), 'Instrument of Sasine, 24 August and 10 September 1702 by William Woddrop in favour of John Graham of Dougalstoun, of a ninth part pro indiviso of a tenement of land called the Wester Suggarie of Glasgow,' p. 424.

156 Foster, *Members of Parliament of Scotland 1357-1882*, p.50. Commissioner of Inverary in 1707, and sat in the first parliament of Great Britain 1707-1708 as its M.P..

157 *An Exact list of the Peers, Barons and Burgesses elected to serve in the Parliament of Great Britain, 17th June 1708*. Glasgow Burghs: 'controverted betwixt Robert Rodger, present Provost of Glasgow, and Daniel Campbell of Shawfield'.

158 In 1716, following the death of Dean of Guild Smith, Shawfield eventually succeeded as M.P. for Glasgow Burghs, a position he held until 1734.

this otherwise Whig company. He too was a prominent overseas merchant interested in shipping[159], and although his involvement in Darien was insignificant, his brother James, a business partner, had invested £1000.[160]

It therefore appears that major economic interests in the burgh were being excluded from civic government, for whatever reasons, and sought redress of this grievance. The failure to gratify this was felt later, when in 1704 the burgh applied to the Estates for an extension of the ale tax, and the magistrates found that Lockhart et al were in Edinburgh to frustrate their efforts. Evidently the scandal produced by the prints in 1700 and 1701 had hit home; for Lockhart et al were able to allege maladministration on the part of the magistrates, so that their petition was not granted. Anderson's interest on the council was evidently still substantial, for in 1703, following the conclusion of Montgomerie's term, he was re-elected for a fourth two-year term, and Montgomerie no longer appears on the council.

Those who opposed Anderson at Edinburgh included, besides Lockhart, two notable Jacobites, James and William Walkinshaws; plus ex-baillie William Woddrop, John Graham of Dougalstoun, and Daniel Campbell.[161] They demanded financial payment from the next grant of the ale tax before they would remove their objections and assist its passage. The money was for their 'considerable charge and expense before the parliament and the lords of counsell and sessione, for rectifying some pretended abuses and mistakes, (as they would have it tearmed) betuixt the toun and them'. Anderson was obliged, for 'a right understanding and friendly correspondence betuixt

---

159 See for instance his parliamentary petition to the Committee of Trade (of which Anderson was a member), December 23 1700, for a manufactory to produce cordage and canvas for shipping. *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, p. 422.

160 NLS Adv MS/83/1/4, 'List of Darien subscribers at Glasgow'.

161 *BRG.*, 5/9/1704, pp.384-6.

the toun and them', to grant two bonds, dated 12 August 1704, in order to come to a speedy resolution of the difficulty. The first, it was agreed, was not to exceed 9,000 merks and was granted in favour of Dougalstoun and his party, above. The second, for 3,600 merks, was granted in favour of Colin Bell, not previously mentioned in this matter, on the basis that he would undertake to assist them to procure the extension. It will be noted that the sum negotiated for Dougalstoun and his party was equivalent to the price paid for the 'free' constitution in 1690, from which they had complained they derived no benefit. The sudden appearance of Colin Bell, a violent Jacobite, is also noteable and requires further comment.

After Anne's accession in 1702, the old Revolutioner Court interest was trimmed back. Maxwell of Pollok retained his place on the bench, but politically he was much diminished in power after he lost his commission as Lord Justice Clerk in 1703, and his place on the Privy Council.[162] Anne's ministry contained influences considered inimical to the Presbyterian interest and this gave Presbyterians grave cause for concern. Moreover, the new parliament, following the elections in 1702, contained many Jacobites who had a lesser scruple about taking the oaths to Anne, a Stuart, and a High Church Tory. This Cavalier phalanx soon made its presence felt politically in a series of radical demands, mainly the attempt at gaining a toleration for Episcopacy. Its joining with sections of the Country party, meant that the Court had great difficulty in managing the Estates in the 1703 session, when Montgomerie, as Provost, had unsuccessfully attempted to obtain an extension of the ale tax. The session of 1704 was no less stormy, when the controversial act of security, passed in the previous session,

---

162 Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, p. 45; Fraser, *Memoirs of the Maxwells of Pollok*, i, p. 88; he was succeeded by Roderick Mackenzie of Prestonhall, Tarbat's brother, Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, p. 46.

was accepted by the king's commissioner, Tweeddale, virtually undiluted.[163] Against this backdrop, Anderson had no option to but to court the burgh's Jacobites, and make deals with his opponents, in order to secure the much-needed revenues. It is therefore evident that the Cavalier interest in the burgh was the means of forcing concessions from the Revolutioners and that the net result of this, was better government and greater accountability. For, in the following session, when the ale tax was successfully obtained, strict pre-conditions were attached to it concerning the repayment of the burgh's debts. These were to be paid off from the proceeds at the rate of 10,000 merks p.a. for the first 5 years; 12,000 merks for the next 5 years, and 14,000 merks annually for the remaining period.[164] Moreover, a list of all the town's debts to date had to be made up each year as the repayment schedule proceeded, and entered into the books of the Merchants House and Trades House, so that all burgesses could inspect the progress made. No new debt was to be contracted without the additional consent of both houses. On the first Tuesday of the New Year, public intimation was to be given to all burgesses to attend a public meeting 'in order to their satisfaction anent the payment of the yearly sums above appointed'. Any burgess was entitled to pursue the magistrates and council if they failed to carry out the above conditions,[165] and if sums were missing from the repayments, the magistrates were personally liable for settling them. Finally, 'overseers' were appointed to see that the above conditions were being met. These were the Duke of Hamilton, the leader of the Country party; the Marquis of Montrose, who emerged as a prominent member of the Squadrone Volante, another non-courtier; John

---

163 Ferguson, *Scotland, 1689 to Present*, pp. 41, 44.

164 *Glas. Chtrs.*, ii, CLXXIII, 'Extract of the act of parliament, continuing to the town of Glasgow the imposition on ale and beer', 21 September 1705, pp.290-293.

165 A previous act of parliament had restricted this to a member of the council.

Graham of Dougalstoun, by 1708 a political agent of Montrose's at Glasgow; John Walkinshaw of Barrowfield, a Jacobite; William Baillie of Lamington, who had consistently voted against the Court throughout the 1690s and beyond,[166] Colin Campbell of Woodside, and Hugh Montgomerie of Busbie. Thus the conclusion is that the predominance of non-courtiers amongst the overseers, including Barrowfield, a Jacobite, and Lamington who had been opposing the court for some time, indicates an attempt to place a check on the old Court party interest at Glasgow as represented by Anderson and that the act securing the re-grant was only obtained after satisfaction had been given to non-courtiers of the 'old party'.

It is clear that there was wide-spread civic unrest at Glasgow by 1700, caused by the disasters of William's reign, mainly the growth of taxation when offset by the failure of Darien, which was heightened by the predominance of the Court party interest at Glasgow. This anxiety was fanned by the 'rage of party' but was not caused by it. However the ability to widen this dissent and to link with the Country party agenda was pivotal to the eventual outcome of greater financial accountability, for by the stringent measures attached, Glasgow's civic debt was paid off by the 1720s when the burgh came into conflict with renewed Court interference, and was in a far stronger position to resist it. Dissidents could inflict severe damage on the burgh's interests and had to be taken seriously but their interaction could also be positive..

The 1690s had been a time of severe dislocation for burgesses and merchants in general, when the very idea of a royal burgh was under threat, and becoming blurred. Just as political prospects appeared to be improving, economic rights appeared to becoming increasingly marginal. The Restoration had seen a marked rise in the

166 Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, Appendix A, p.332; Riley, *King William*, Appendix A, p.170; Lamington voted against the union.

numbers of non-burghal markets and fairs and the 1672 act had given certain rights of import and export to noblemen and barons; these measures encroached directly on royal burghal trading privileges. Smout and Devine, economic historians, were of the opinion that the growth of 'free-trade' areas on Glasgow's doorstep was more of an opportunity than a threat; this is perhaps true if one were prepared to break the rules and pay whatever consequences. However it ignores the impact on civics. Royal burghs had to pay cess for their supposed privileges as well as to undertake other public responsibilities. Politically the whole area of taxation, representation and 'accountability' was an explosive one by 1700. Lockhart and his followers were entitled to question just what their burgess ticket currently entitled them to. In 1690 Lockhart's status as a qualified merchant burgess of a Scottish royal burgh had not prevented his cargo being seized by *HMS Dartmouth* as she patrolled the Clyde. Then in 1695 he was arraigned with James Bogle and others for dealing with non-free men who might otherwise be ruining Glasgow's trade. By 1700 the attempt to get the 'unfree' burghs to pay a share in the burgh tax roll backfired and ended in an augmentation in Glasgow's share. It therefore seemed to burgesses like Lockhart that they neither had constitutional rights nor economic ones, and led to moves to 'resign the royalty'.

Lockhart's attempts to have a greater share in the running of the burgh ended in partial success, in the above pre-conditions attached to the re-grant of the ale tax, though this was not quite what he had anticipated in 1700, when he sought alterations to the sett. Nonetheless it represented an attempt to achieve a better balance between rights and obligations.

The prominence of tobacco and sugar interests, the Virginian and West Indian trade, must be noted in the above debate. Not only did this involve the richest and most

substantial merchants, who would ordinarily pay the largest share of cess laid on 'proportionally', but these were bold, expansionist free-spirited individuals involved in high-risk, high-profit ventures, in a generally low-tax regime, as Scotland was, pre-1707. The economic equation, i.e., when this became a high-risk, low-profit, high-tax regime, was pivotal in forcing an examination of the relationship between rights and obligations. It led to that fundamental examination of the relationship between taxation and representation which so pre-occupied future generations of their trading partners on the other side of the Atlantic 70 years later.

Finally, it must be noted that Lockhart and his group were headed off in 1700 by the wily and well-connected Anderson. Had their case been successfully judged in parliament, the petitioners *could* have obtained new legislation which could have in turn led to the reform of burgh constitutions the length and breadth of Scotland. The law lords may well have laughed Lockhart's scheme out of court and condemned it as one brought forth from 'Eutopia', but had it succeeded, it would have removed Henry Cockburn's famous libel of the pre-reform burghs being 'sinks of political iniquity, steeped in the baseness which they propagated, and types and causes of the corruption that surrounded them.'[167]

---

167 Henry Cockburn, *Memorials of His Own Time*, (Edinburgh , 1856) pp.90-91.

Chapter Four

THE HANOVERIAN ASCENDANCY & THE CITY OF GLASGOW

After 1707, and especially after the accession of George I, a discernible change becomes apparent in the autonomy enjoyed by the city of Glasgow. This is evident in the Burgh Council, in the College, in the Synod and in the Presbytery.[1] By 1715 Provost Aird had secured an Argathelian council and had thrown off the Squadrone patronage of the city. However the university and clerical establishment remained a Squadrone stronghold and from 1717 onwards a politically-motivated campaign against Principal Stirling was evident.[2] The period of political optimism ushered in by the Revolution, and the hope of a more liberal constitution, was dealt a blow as the Whig aristocracy headed by the Duke of Argyll moved in to secure an increasing share of power in the management of Scottish affairs.[3] Scotland after 1707, but particularly after 1715, was in rapid process of transformation from a pluralist, multi-faceted and competitive 'aristocracy' only loosely and opportunistically allied to a distant monarch, to a disciplined political monoculture wholly subordinated to the Argyll/Court interest, a *de facto* vice-regency. The '15 was especially significant as it removed Tory

---

1 Argathelian - Squadrone struggles within the College are described in J. W. Cairns, 'The Origins of the Glasgow Law School; the Professors of Civil Law, 1714-1761, in *The Life of the Law, Proceedings of the 10th British Legal History Conference*, ed. Peter Birk, (Oxford, 1991), pp.151-194. See also Henry Sefton, 'Lord Ilay and Patrick Cumming: A Study in Eighteenth Century Ecclesiastical Management', *RSCHS*, 19, (1977), pp.203-216.

2 This exploited academic rivalries and stirred up the student body. The literature on this is extensive; but a selection of the most revealing documents are: Duncan Forbes, *Memorial for the scholars and other matriculated members of the university of Glasgow*, (1717); Duncan Forbes, *Unto the Right Honourable Lords of the Council and Session, the petition and complaint of Mr. Peter Butler and John Edmonstone, students of Divinity, and matriculated members of the university of Glasgow*, (1718); John Stirling, *Remarks upon a paper called grievance with respect to the revenue of the university of Glasgow offered to the honourable Commission*, (1717); *A short account of the late treatment of the students of the university of G_____w*, (Dublin, 1722).

3 William Ferguson, *Scotland: 1689 to the Present*, p. 137. By 1715 Squadrone 'was little more than a territorial interest'. What remained of the old Court party was headed by Argyll.

Jacobites from the political scene. Two rival Whig parties remained to fill office in its aftermath, the Squadrone, headed by the Duke of Roxburgh, and the Duke of Argyll's faction, known as Argathelians. The Squadrone were routed and in disarray by 1725 and assumed the mantle of the former Country party. In the guise of Hanoverian loyalists, the Argathelians were able to assume ascendancy of office in Scotland from 1725 until Ilay's death in 1761. Though opposition to Argyll was considerable, the Squadrone were quite unable to marshall it to their advantage, despite a brief period in office 1742-1746.

The Whig values of liberty, property, and the right of resistance were embodied in the Claim of Right, but after 1715 Whig principles were progressively sublimated by the resurgence of unreconstructed feudal magnate values as represented by the 2nd Duke of Argyll. This latter ethos had been summarised, a century earlier, by one who knew it well:

> The natural sickness that I have perceived this estate (the nobility) subject to in my time hath been a feckless arrogant conceit of their greatness and power; drinking in with their very nouris-milk that their honour stood in committing three points of iniquity: to thrall, by oppression, the meaner sort that dwelleth near them to their service and following, although they hold nothing of them; to maintain their servants and dependers in any wrong, although they be not answerable to the laws (for anybody will maintain his man in a right cause); and for any displeasure that they apprehend to be done unto them by their neighbour to take up a plain feud against him and (without respect to God, King

or Commonweal) to bang it out bravely, he and all his kin, against him and all his.[4]

James VI's bleak assessment of the Scottish nobility was only too well borne out by the heavy-handed actions of the Argyll party regarding the city of Glasgow. The ascendancy of the two brothers, Argyll and Ilay, led over time to a re-examination of the term 'Whig' at Glasgow, where an opposition party on Aird's council known as the 'Plotters and Revolutioners' supplanted the group which had kept the Campbell interest in power since 1715. Argyll's domination was more akin to Tory values of hereditary right and passive obedience than Revolution principles. Elsewhere in Scotland terms such as 'a whig of Revolution principles' or simply, 'Revolutioner' began to replace the party term 'Whig', and were adopted to qualify statements of political values and objectives which signalled a shift away from the party, if not the polemic, of the Revolution and the Hanoverian ascendancy.

The essential mechanism which came to enslave burgh councils in the eighteenth century to the covetousness of the great men, was the patronage of the M.P. The electoral arrangements for the royal burghs at the union were unsatisfactory and actually led to a loss of their autonomy. Sixty-six royal burghs with one member each, and Edinburgh two, were reduced to fifteen constituency districts of several burghs with one member between them. Country districts fared little better.[5] Glasgow was grouped with Dumbarton, Renfrew and tiny Rutherglen in a designation known as 'Glasgow Burghs'. Competition for the fifteen burgh seats was fierce amongst the great

---

[4] James VI, 'Basilicon Doron', cited in W. C. Dickinson and G. Donaldson, eds., *A Source Book of Scottish History*, iii, 1567-1707, (London, 1954), p. 281.

[5] For the effects of the union on the county franchise, see William Ferguson, 'The Electoral System in the Scottish Counties Before 1832', *Stair Society Miscellany,* ii, 35, (1984), especially p. 272.

men who coveted them. A combination of threat and bribery was often used to persuade burgh councils to support one or another candidate and far from bringing about 'British liberty' the net effect of the union was frequently the opposite. The system was acknowledged to be in severe crisis by 1775, yet that burgh councils were rendered corrupt 'sinks of political iniquity' is too simplistic. Chartered communities struggled to assert their rights by other means and to govern in the interests of the community. The magistrates of Glasgow petitioned parliament directly on various occasions, regarding civic affairs, bypassing the M.P. altogether, and no-one appears to have questioned their right to do so. At other times parliamentary candidates were manipulated by burgh councils to gain the maximum benefit out of the eighteenth century spoils system. Corruption was however facilitated by the independent delegate system, whereby councils did not vote directly in elections but appointed an elector to do their voting for them.[6]

Thus the true electorate was numbered at one in each burgh, or fifteen burgh electors for the whole of Scotland. In the inner sanctum of the council chamber of the presiding burgh where the election took place, there was no absolute guarantee that the delegate chosen to deliver the burgh's vote would be bound by his original commission.[7] Frequent last minute changes of plan took place. If any one of the four or

---

6 Henry Cockburn, *Memorials of His Time,* (Edinburgh, 1856), p.90-91. Assessment of the achievements of the pre-reform burgh is currently under review by historians. See for instance I. Maver, 'Guardianship of the Community; Civic Authority Prior to 1833' in *Glasgow: Volume One, Beginnings to 1830*, ed. by T. M. Devine and Gordon Jackson, (Manchester,1995); E. L. Jones and M. E. Falkus, 'Urban Improvement and the English Economy in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in *The Eighteenth-Century Town, A reader in English Urban History 1688 - 1820* ed. Peter Borsay, (1990); and Perry Gauci, *Politics and Society of Great Yarmouth, 1660-1722*, (Oxford, 1996), p. 6.

7 Peter Mackenzie, *Reminiscences of Glasgow and the West of Scotland*, 3 vols., i, (Glasgow, 1865) was particularly critical of the power of the independent delegate. Another particular objection raised by Mackenzie was the grouping of so large a city as Glasgow with three relatively minor burghs such as Renfrew, Rutherglen and Dumbarton, Glasgow's traditional rival for control of the Clyde. Renfrew and Rutherglen could succumb readily to attempts at bribery, or force Glasgow into the same tactics to secure their vote, if some effort was to be made to elect a member who would serve the interest of the largest burgh. Attempts to do just this in the 1741 election met with the criticism of George Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow, from the Revolution to the Reform Acts,* iii, (Glasgow,

five changed his voting intention, for whatever reason, this could force the remainder into a rapid re-think of their plans, particularly if they were determined to avoid the election of an unacceptable candidate as occurred in the Glasgow Burghs election of 1734, when the plan to elect Colin Campbell of Blythswood, the city of Glasgow's own candidate, was foiled at the last minute, because of the sudden possibility of the re-imposition of Argyll's candidate, Daniel Campbell of Shawfield.[8]

The city's determined opposition to Argyll's candidate adds to the growing body of opinion on eighteenth century local politics. This indicates that burghs were by no means subservient but had to be carefully cultivated by would-be M.P.s, a point picked up by Sunter in his study[9] and developed initially by Ferguson.[10] The Treaty of Union might have effectively disenfranchised the burgesses of Scotland, causing one author to claim that 'they didn't seem to mind'[11] - yet there is widespread evidence, in the form of bitter parliamentary election struggles, disputed elections, parliamentary and burgh, vigorous petitioning of parliament anent burgh and national affairs by individual councils and the Convention of Royal Burghs, to suggest that the burgesses of Scotland were *not* content to disappear from the arena of policy-making or from membership of the political nation.

1934), p.183-5. Maver, however, is critical of Mackenzie's over-zealous attempts, followed by Eyre-Todd, at vilifying the pre-1833 council. I. Maver, 'Politics and Power in the Scottish City: Glasgow Town Council in the Nineteenth Century', in T. M. Devine, ed., *Scottish Elites,* (Edinburgh, 1994) pp. 98-129.

8 NLS, 16556, Saltoun Papers, f.219, Richard Graham to Lord Milton, Glasgow, 24 May 1734.

9 R. Sunter, *Patronage and Politics in Scotland 1707-1832*, (Edinburgh, 1986), chapter 11, 'Personal Ambition and Burgh Politics: the Failure of the Duke of Montrose in the Glasgow District of Burghs 1714-16', pp.199-210. Also chapter 12, 'Popular Issues and Burgh Politics: the Election of 1734 in the Inverkeithing District of Burghs', p. 211-232.

10 William Ferguson, 'Electoral Law and Procedure in Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Scotland', Ph.D. thesis, University of Glasgow, (1957).

11 Michael Fry, *Patronage and Principle*, p. 6.

The burghs had been the most disciplined and best organised of the 'three estates' in the seventeenth century, and the Convention, which convened concurrently with the sessions of parliament, acted as a kind of 'whip'-cum-policy-executive for the burgesses and ensured that the commissioners voted en bloc, at least on burgh matters. Despite their entrenched constitutional position, and a strong tradition of collective action, the burghs had shown little inclination to vie with the gentry and peers in terms of the political leadership of the country in the previous century. Stevenson noted rising resentment on the part of the gentry and peers to the Convention of Royal Burghs during the Civil War period, and the beginnings of an anxiety that the third estate could come to dominate the landed men in parliament after the removal of the bishops.[12] Any political advantage which the possession of a separate assembly could have conferred, however, was doomed to be rapidly reversed by the conditions which met the burghs after 1707. The sending of a rump of fifteen burgh M.P.'s to a large, far distant assembly, when once they had one third strength in a national assembly within a distance of a couple of days' journey, helped to unravel the discipline and solidarity with which the burghs had acted in the 17th century. The far larger English parliament, with its special chamber reserved solely for the peers which held a veto over that of the Commons, was moreover an overwhelmingly aristocratic institution, even more so than its Scottish counterpart. Further, the burghs' corporate voice - the Convention - had no parallel in the English constitution and was doomed to become a marginalised relic although it remained active in promoting Scottish trading and burgh interests throughout the eighteenth century. As Ferguson has noted, Scottish politics in the

---

12 D. Stevenson, 'The Burghs and the Scottish Revolution', in Michael Lynch, ed., *The Early Modern Town*, (London, 1987), p.170.

eighteenth century became 'the exclusive preserve of the upper classes'[13] even without the rise of 'management'.

The general pattern before the Union was to despatch the Provost as the burgh's commissioner in any national assembly of kirk or state. There were thus few election contests in burghs for parliamentary seats before 1707, or touting for votes as in shires; the Provost as the chief patriot of the burgh and head of its municipal authority represented it both as a community and as a civic corporation. The careerist individualism associated with the nobility which entered burgh parliamentary politics after the Union ran basically contrary to the disciplined civic ethos and the long-established view of the burgh as a single community of interest. At parliament the commissioner was fully expected to serve the community's needs, not his own or anybody else's. After 1707 this practice became increasingly difficult to maintain, not least of all because of the expense of sending a real councillor to London.[14] Neither were such men covered for loss of business meanwhile, for all councillors were active merchants[15] and the council, although it paid their expenses, lacked the resources to offer them a true salary. Further, such individuals generally lacked the high-level

---

13 Ferguson, *Scotland 1689 to the Present*, p.137.

14 John Gibson, *The History of the City of Glasgow from the Earliest Accounts to the Present Time*, (Glasgow, 1777), p. 108. 'The desire of serving in parliament, now so prevalent among our great men, was not so strong immediately after the union; in place of throwing away great sums of money to obtain a seat, the people paid their representatives for their attendance'. Provost Montgomerie was paid £2160 Sc. for attending from October 1707 to August 1708; Provost Rodger £4800 Sc. for two sessions from October 1708 to April 1710; and Dean of Gild Smith £12,224 Sc. for five sessions between October 1710 to October 1715. This amounts to between £180-203 sterling per session, and continued the long-established practice whereby civic delegations engaged on business on behalf of the town were paid for their travel and lodging expenses.

15 After Dean of Guild Smith, M.P. for Glasgow Burghs, died suddenly at London in January 1716, his burial and other expenses proved hefty for his widow who subsequently petitioned the council for financial assistance. In her petition, Mrs Smith stated that it was well known the extent to which her late husband had 'sequestrat himself to publick business and laid assyd his privat affairs for the service of his countrey, and more particularly of this city' which 'was cause of great loss to his privat business, whereby it dwindled to nothing and he became very much decayed in his estate'. *BRG*, 27/8/1716, p.597. The council granted Mrs Smith 2000 merks to be invested for the use of her family.

contacts in London society with which to gain the ear of the ministry or the king. All these factors, as well as the ambition of would-be candidates, contributed to the growing élitism of the emerging system, and the favouring of candidates who were uniquely placed to move in charmed circles - preferably on their own resources.

The Convention of Royal Burghs readily perceived the threat posed by the scramble for power amongst the many disappointed place-seekers who converged on Edinburgh in the winter of 1706-07, for the final days of the Scottish parliament were taken up with discussions for the new constituency arrangements and the distribution of other offices.[16] Through the pressure of intense lobbying for a vastly reduced number of seats and the ample exercise of patronage, the entire burgh 'estate' could over time become an élite preserve. An act was therefore passed in the Convention proscribing Royal Burghs from electing any other than burgess councillors from becoming their representatives at Westminster. Glasgow and Edinburgh and a number of the wealthier burghs adhered to this initially.[17] Yet the pressure was on them from the start. As early as January 1708 the magistrates and council were solicited to support the candidature of Major General Ross, the brother of Lord Ross.[18] The magistrates only gave 'general answers' and ex-Provost Peadie was reported to be 'very hot against any such practise'.[19] But within a month it was again reported by one of the Duke of Montrose's agents at Glasgow that the current Provost, John Aird, was dictating to the magistrates in the

---

16 Ferguson, *Scotland 1689 to Present*, p.53, mentions the measures concerted for the new commissions.

17 Sunter, *Patronage and Politics in Scotland 1707-1832*, p.204.

18 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/150.1, John Graham of Dougalstoun to Montrose, 5 January 1708.

19 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/150.2, John Graham of Dougalstoun to Montrose, 2 February 1708.

'foolishest manner imaginable' and that 'if he getts his will he may be foolish enough in making them determine themselves to some foolish body.'[20]

Everything about Aird's personality and background suggests he was an unashamed *politique*, a would-be courtier, but one whose political ineptitude destined him to remain disappointed in his pretensions. Aird dominated the council for twenty years after the retirement of Provost John Anderson, and their close collaboration in office suggests that he was his successor and apprentice in 'provostcraft'[21]. Although Defoe[22] in his *History of the Union,* described him as 'an honest, sober, discreet gentleman, one that has always been exceedingly beloved, even by the common people'[23] and McUre attributes him with doing much to improve the fabric of Glasgow in the first quarter of the eighteenth century,[24] almost all other sources describe him as ambitious, conceited, domineering, double-dealing and fundamentally untrustworthy. He was the principle cause of the Union riots in 1706 by his refusal to sign the townspeople's petition to parliament; and during the ensuing disorders, so great was his popularity that they broke into his house and assailed him with dirt.[25] McVean, in his

---

20 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/150.3, John Graham of Dougalstoun to Montrose, 28 February 1708. Dougalstoun was a local laird and merchant of Glasgow who acted as a banker, accountant and legal agent for Montrose.

21 Aird (1654-1730) held office as Provost on five occasions between 1705 and 1723 in a civic career which began in 1691. When not occupying the civic chair he held sway over the council as an ordinary councillor.

22 Almost every statement issued by Defoe seems to have been propaganda, for firm rebuttals can frequently be found in stronger contexts which assert the direct opposite of his views. For instance, on the trade of Glasgow following the 1722 Tobacco Act, Defoe claims (1727) that 'they now send 50 ships of sail every year to Virginia, New England and other colonies in America.' Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, p.105. Wodrow however, claimed the contrary. Wodrow's statement is bolstered by John Gibson, who published figures for shipping in the Clyde for 1735 in which only one ship out of sixty-seven vessels was headed for Virginia, and a further four for the West Indies and one for Boston. Gibson, *History of Glasgow*, pp. 210-211.

23 J. Gourlay, *The Provosts of Glasgow, 1605-1832*, p. 47

24 ibid.

25 Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, p. 68. Aird had been advised by the Lord Advocate not to sign it and deferred to his wishes. Later he was obliged to sign to restore law and order to the city.

second edition to McUre's history of Glasgow, claimed he was in the pay of Duncan Campbell of Shawfield, the notorious M.P. for Glasgow Burghs from 1716-1734, a claim repeated by Robert Wodrow.[26] Charles Morthland, professor of Oriental Languages at Glasgow University, considered him a contrary individual whose vanity rendered him perversely an enemy 'to everything that he is not the proposer of himself'.[27] It was Aird's ineptitude and pique at never being the Duke of Montrose's candidate that the burgh's interest eventually crumbled to the rapacity of Argyll's candidate, Duncan Campbell of Shawfield, a wealthy Glasgow tobacco merchant and former collector of the customs at Port Glasgow[28], though Argyll had few 'interests' in Glasgow or its locality with which to recommend himself, and Shawfield was already widely disliked.[29] Montrose however was able to maintain an influence in Glasgow Burghs until 1716, securing the return of candidates which were acceptable to the wishes of the burgesses, being elected councillors in line with the Convention's ruling.

In contrast to Argyll, Montrose had reason outwith political ambition to take a close interest in the affairs of Glasgow. Indeed, there was a natural convergence of

---

26 Robert Wodrow, *Analecta, or Materials for a History of Remarkable Providences mostly relating to Scotch ministers and Christians*, 4 vols., Maitland Club, iii, (Edinburgh, 1842-43), p.166.

27 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/628.1, Charles Morthland to Montrose, 24 January 1716.

28 Sedgewick, *History of Parliament*, i, p.520, notes that whilst collector at Port Glasgow Shawfield was accused of using his influence with the Duke of Argyll and the Duke's uncle, John Campbell, M.P. Dumbartonshire, 1715-1727, to re-instate two Campbells dismissed by the Commissioners of Customs. This was reported to the Treasury in 1708. [*Calendar of Treasury Papers*, 1708-1714, p.26.] He was also accused in 1714 by the Earl of Glasgow's brother, William Boyle, Circuit Court judge, who claimed that at the time of the commencement of the union, a 'notorious fraud' was committed which he had uncovered during the previous year's circuit and for which he was now being threatened by a person 'of the same quality with your Grace' (Argyll). NAS, Montrose Muniments GD220/5/386, William Boyle to Duke of Montrose, October 1714. Shawfield's papers indicate that an interogatory was issued to the merchants of Glasgow and Greenock from the Commissioners for Customs and Excise, dated 17 March 1714, relating to customs fraud alleged to have taken between 1 May 1707 and 1 May 1708. Mitchell Library, Shawfield Papers, 2.688.

29 See for instance Bailie Hamilton's objection to Shawfield's candidature in 1715, put forward at the behest of the Duke of Argyll, that 'the provost should acquaint his Grace that Shawfield was not acceptable to the council'. NAS, Montrose Muniments GD220/5/628.1, Morthland to Montrose, 24 January 1716; or Morthland's opinion that he believed Aird to be 'heavily and enemy to Shawfield', ibid..

interest between the burgh and Montrose. He too was a prominent Whig, his family had long held property there,[30] he had commercial interests in the city and had become a burgess as early as 1698.[31] Montrose lived in the city until the Union and maintained regular contact with it thereafter, spending at least part of the year in Glasgow. Before the Union he had held several influential positions. In 1706 he was appointed president of the Privy Council, and was also on the commission of the Treasury. Both these political and economic roles plus his local connections had placed him as an ideal patron of the burgh. Argyll was a military man who was often abroad, but Montrose was a businessman who watched commercial affairs closely. His local interests were enhanced in 1702 when he purchased the surrounding Lennox estates, substantial holdings which gave him extensive jurisdictions in the vicinity of Glasgow and Dumbarton.

This was of some importance to the townspeople, as disputes with Lennox's bailie had occurred in the 1690s when it was alleged that Glasgow people living in the regality were being unfairly treated. The council had even prepared a case to go before the Court of Session, for many prominent Glasgow merchants were living in the suburbs by the seventeenth century,[32] and there was even an attempt at conveying the

---

30 'The Duke's Lodging' which stood at the corner of Drygate and the High Street, was in the 17th century the greatest mansion in town. Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, p. 108. In contrast many citizens of title, when resident at Glasgow, lived in tenement flats, several to a stair. ibid., p. 105.

Montrose had dealings in 1714 in a sugar-house at Glasgow and in 1719-21 invested upwards of £10,000 stg. - nearly double the sum he spent on constructing his London residence - in building a great tenement of offices in the High Street, designed by a London architect, Mr. Gibbs, for which he required 'planning permission' from the council. NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5.829, 831, 450. There was an objection raised by the residents of contiguous tenements which required some adaptation to Gibb's drawings - for the 'great stair' encroached onto the pavement. *BRG*, 23/9/1721; 2/10/1721, pp. 120-2.

31 *BRG*, 2/11/1698, p. 277. Note for the payment of £10. 2s. Scots to Thomas Baxter 'for a white flowered ribban and gold freinzie about it, given to the Marquess of Montrose with his burgess ticket'.

32 See for instance William Hamilton of Wishaw, *Descriptions of the Sheriffdoms of Lanark and Renfrew*, 1710, re-printed by the Maitland Club, (1831); *Old Country Houses of the Old Glasgow Gentry*, which list many wealthy citizens living outside the town.

jurisdiction from the Duke of Lennox to the city.[33] Although this did not go ahead and the town revived its claim in 1747, relations with the new owner were much improved. By 1707 the council was conferring citizenship on Montrose's candidates and he was on record as being 'the toun's great freind'[34]. When some years later Montrose appointed Dean of Guild Smith as his bailie-depute in the regality, a move which was said to have pleased Glasgow people 'wonderfully'[35] this effectively recognised a relation of partnership in the overlapping and contiguous jurisdictions - for Montrose's property and trade within the burgh were subject to the jurisdiction of the magistrates of Glasgow,[36] just as his bailie had jurisdiction over Glasgow citizens dwelling outside the city. The magistrates and council were thus placed on a somewhat more equitable footing vis-a-vis Montrose than was usually the case with most 'great men', and their acceptance of his patronage must be seen in this light. It is significant that in his state correspondence with the Lord Provost and magistrates at the time of the Rebellion, Montrose prefaced his letters with 'My lord', a practice which was then followed by Secretary Townshend;[37] whilst the haughty Argyll's letters begin with the perfunctory 'Sir'.[38] In conclusion the Graham presence at Glasgow had a firm and long-standing

33 *BRG*, 1691-1717, p. 301; *The Old Minute Book of the Faculty of Procurators of Glasgow 1668-1758*, Appendix, i, p.208.

34 *BRG*, 18/9/1707, p. 413.

35 Sunter, *Patronage and Politics in Scotland 1707-1832*, p. 202.

36 See for instance, above, Gorthie's 'planning application' re. the office tenement - *BRG*, 23/9/1721; 2/10/1721.

37 Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, p. 90.

38 *BRG*, 1691-1717, p. 545.

civic profile for its lesser kinsmen in the 17th century had established track records as patriots of the place.[39]

Montrose's political influence at Glasgow came to an abrupt and sudden end by the unexpected death of Dean of Guild Thomas Smith in January 1716, an excellent M.P. whose untimely death was much regretted. This marked a transition, not only from a change of patron, but also a change in the nature of representation, for his successor, although a burgess of Glasgow, was not actually a member of the council. Daniel Campbell of Shawfield, Argyll's candidate, was elected after a lack-lustre by-election campaign in which Aird had played a notably divisive part.[40] Shawfield's political ambitions had been evident from the commencement of the Union. He unsuccessfully stood against Provost Robert Rodgers in the first election in 1708, which was contraverted between the two.[41] Rodgers appears to have won that round but by November 1709 Shawfield was petitioning the Commons to have Rodgers's election annulled[42] and Aird was denying speculations that he himself might stand if Shawfield succeeded in securing a fresh election.[43] Aird, as Provost, had been obliged to write a begging letter to Montrose, asking him to use his influence at Court to uphold Rodgers' case. His return letter of thanks at the close of 1709 indicated the somewhat stiff,

---

39 E.g., Dougalstoun snr, had secured the purchase of the Port Glasgow lands for the town in 1668, and was appointed Procurator Fiscal by Anderson for many years after the Revolution.

40 For a full account of Aird's role see Sunter, 'Personal Ambition and Burgh Politics: The Failure of the Duke of Montrose in the Glasgow District of Burghs 1714-1716', *Patronage and Politics in Scotland 1707-1832*, especially p. 199-200.

41 NLS 1.889.6.35, *An Exact list of the Peers, Barons and Burgesses, Elected to serve in the Parliament of Great Britain,* 17 June 1708, gives Glasgow Burghs as 'controverted betwixt Robert Rodgers, present Provost of Glasgow, and Daniel Campbell of Shawfield'.

42 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/216.1, John Aird to Montrose, 28 November 1709, asking Montrose's help against Shawfield.

43 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/219, Dougalstoun to Montrose, 22 December 1709.

fawning but basically resentful attitude he bore towards Montrose.[44] Although not Argyll's candidate either in 1716, for there is some suggestion that he too, was anxious to have become an M.P.,[45] Aird had been in close contact with Argyll during the Rebellion and was evidently flattered by this association.

The context of their collaboration was the military defence of the city. Perhaps to deflect earlier suspicions of latent Jacobite support in the putative rising of 1708[46], the town had decided to demonstrate its loyalism unambiguously at the '15 by raising a regiment of 600 men for the king's service as well as maintaining their own militia units within Glasgow. The offer of the regiment - to be paid for at the town's expense and maintained for 60 days - was conveyed to the king by Montrose along with the town's loyal address, but was however politely declined. His majesty was satisfied with current defence arrangements and did not wish to put his subjects to any 'furder expense and trouble'.[47] Nonetheless the unwanted regiment was duly raised and placed under Aird's command, for within three and a half weeks of receiving the king's letter, a volunteer force was on its way to Stirling Castle, having already been requisitioned by

---

44 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/216.1&2, Aird to Montrose, 28 November 1709; same to same, 16 December 1709.

45 Sunter, *Patronage and Politics in Scotland 1707-1832*, p.205, deals with Montose's reservations about Aird's qualities which were probably shared by Argyll.

46 The magistrates reported to Seafield and Lt. Francis Lindsay, the governor of Edinburgh Castle, that allegations by a 'Jacobite pairtie' that Glasgow and the west were for the 'Prince of Wales' because they were displeased by the union, were quite untrue. Magistrates to Seafield, 12 March 1708, *Seafield Correspondence 1685-1708*, ed. J. Grant, 2nd series, 2 vols., SHS, ii, (1912) pp.454-5; magistrates to Lt. Lindsay, 14 March 1708, NAS, GD26/13/143; magistrates to Seafield, 19 March 1708, *Seafield Correspondence 1685-1708*, pp.463-4. However, independent correspondence does suggest a somewhat reluctant support on the part of the townspeople for Queen Anne and the Hanoverian Succession. See for instance Dougalstoun to Montrose, 24 March 1708, NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/150.8 - that he hoped that 'by the influence of our ministers and weel-meaning people and the magistrates' authority the inhabitants are brought to a more dutiful behaviour'; or same to same, 29 March 1708, GD.220/5/150.5, regarding the security preparations 'our people seems to be more vigourous for the defence than att first sight'.

47 *BRG*, 26/8/1715, p. 539.

Argyll as Commander-in-Chief of forces in Scotland.[48] This suggests that Argyll and Aird had all along collaborated over the plan, for Aird was Provost at the time (October 1713-October 1715) and in a position to be particularly influential on the council. The volunteers saw no real action, being employed in guarding Stirling bridge and castle, and in receiving prisoners from the battle of Sheriffmuir that November.[49] Argyll also encouraged the town to construct ambitious defensive earthworks at a total cost of just under £20,000Sc (£1666 sterling)[50] - Aird sending Argyll's instructions to the magistrates in regular bulletins from Stirling. The town bore these heavy expenses, equivalent to half its annual revenue, whether through fear of attack, or encouraged in the belief that this outlay would eventually be re-couped from the government. The immediate expense was met by a loan of £500 stg. from the Merchants House and the Trades House.[51]The earthworks involved the digging of a huge ditch around the city, which was supervised by Shawfield's gardener.

Perhaps the state of defensive readiness of the city did indeed result in the enemy avoiding Glasgow. For on that occasion the city was not threatened and all passed peacefully. Glasgow is an open, undefended place, easily threatened, and previous risings such as that undertaken on behalf of King Charles I by a former Marquis of Montrose in 1643, had proved very expensive, as did the rebellion of 1745. In view of Argyll's military success in quelling the rebellion and the financial commitment undertaken on his advice, Aird was able to bring the council more easily

---

48 *BRG*, 12/10/1715, p. 545. Argyll's letter thanking the magistrates for the despatch of the troops, which were on their way to him at Stirling, was dated 18 September 1715.

49 T. F. Donald, 'Glasgow and the Jacobite Rebellion', *SHR*, xiii, 1916, p.130.

50 *BRG*, 23/12/1717, p. 630-32.

51 Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, vol. iii, p.91.

into Argyll's interest in the election campaign which followed in January and February 1716 - even though it meant accepting Shawfield. There is indeed evidence that the town *did* feel some debt of gratitude to Argyll. When he entered the city on 27 December, six pieces of cannon were fired three times on his approach, the burgh militia lined the streets to greet him and the music bells were played continuously. Shawfield had been active in writing circular letters to the local gentry informing them of his chief's expected arrival[52], and at the 'cabinet council' meeting held to decide on the new candidate, Bailie Charles Miller had conceded that 'it would be hard to disoblige the Duke of Argyle att this juncture'.[53]

Immediately after Shawfield's election Aird hurried away to Edinburgh to attend the Duke of Argyll on 'the toun's affairs'. The outcome of these discussions was that shortly after taking up his seat in the Commons the new M.P. secured a fresh grant of the ale tax,[54] and in due course a sum of £736 stg. was promised towards the expenses of the Rebellion. This was just under half that expended but never reached the council; for £348 stg. of it went to Shawfield as a further gratuity and the rest went on various administrative expenses in London. Opposition to Shawfield on the council was soon purged[55] and Aird's grouping enjoyed an ascendancy of office until the Tobacco Act of 1722, although there were attempts on the Squadrone side to win back

---

52 Sunter, *Patronage and Politics in Scotland 1707-1832*, ch.11, p. 202 - quoting Morthland to Montrose, 26 December 1715.

53 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/628.1, Morthland to Montrose, 24 January 1716.

54 *BRG*, 19 June 1716, p.582, notes the act is now passed. Aird and the Town Clerk, Alexander Finlayson, went with Shawfield to London to assist in procuring the renewal of the act for a further 16 years. Shawfield was paid a gratuity of £129 stg. 'upon account of the said grant'. (ibid.).

55 Bailie Thomas Hamilton, a maltman and the trades bailie, who openly opposed Shawfield's candidacy at the 'cabinet council', was not re-elected the following Michaelmas. In all there were seven changes to the council that autumn, five on the trades side, and one of which was of course due to Dean of Guild Smith's death.

influence,[56] when for instance, James Peadie was elected Dean of Guild in 1719.[57] Shawfield was re-elected in 1722, but opposition to him widened considerably by his conduct in parliament[58] in supporting legislation out of party interest which was highly injurious to Glasgow. Shawfield's parliamentary behaviour was in marked contrast to that of his able and highly-regarded predecessor, Dean of Guild Smith, a man of considerable principle and independence of mind. Although Smith was nominally Montrose's candidate, he was so far from party interest that at one point he joined with the Jacobites in forming the Scottish Steering Committee, a parliamentary grouping which agitated for Scottish trading rights, a grouping in which he was the sole Whig member.[59] And significantly too, unlike Shawfield, Smith was a vigorous and effective opponent of attempts to introduce the Malt Tax into Scotland in 1713.[60]

The legislation anent tobacco and the re-organisation of the customs and excise in Scotland which passed in the 1722 session of parliament, proved, unsurprisingly, to be deeply unpopular in the city. All accounts agree that the Tobacco Act was a great set-back to the Glasgow branch of the trade, which had been expanding steadily since

---

56 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/985, James Graham to Mungo Graham of Gorthie, the Hague, 21 November 1719. 'Your news about the election of the Dean of Guild was a very agreeable surprise ... we drank to the Dean of Guild's health. I think it very good news, and your success in these matters is much more than could have been expected'.

57 James Peadie (2nd) was the son of the Provost James Peadie (1st) who had strongly opposed the adoption of outside candidates or compromising the city's independence just after the union. He succeeded Thomas Thomson (1717-1719) as Dean of Guild, at whose election the burgh records note Shawfield was present. Peadie was a friend of Robert Wodrow who described him as 'a person of great substance, much modesty, and great firmnes'. Wodrow, *Analecta* iv, p.1.

58 Sedgewick, *History of Parliament*, i, p.520, noted that Shawfield voted for the government in every recorded division except when Argyll was in opposition; this was over the motion censuring Argyll's rival Lord Cadogan.

59 *Letters of George Lockhart of Carnwath 1698-1732*, ed. by David Szechi, SHS, 1989, p.56. Scottish Steering Committee to Sir Edward Northey, Attorney General, M.P. for Tiverton, London, 19 January 1711/12. Other members were William Livingstone, M.P. for Aberdeen Burghs, probably a Jacobite; James Murray, son of Viscount Stormont, M.P. for Dumfriesshire and future Secretary of State for the Old Pretender; Sir Alexander Erskine of Cambo, Lord Lyon King at Arms; Lord James Murray, brother of the Duke of Atholl, M.P. for Perthshire and a Jacobite; George Lockhart; and John Carnegy of Boysack, M.P. for Forfarshire, 'out' in the '15.

60 Ibid., 29/283, pp.74-75. HMC, Laing MSS, ii, pp.167-171, To Maule? unattributed, London 26 May 1713.

the Union. Tobacco spinning, an ancillary trade, created many new jobs and attracted newcomers to the city. After many decades of stagnation, population finally began to grow again to the point that a sixth parish was added towards the end of the second decade of the eighteenth century.[61] By 1717 the tobacco trade was strong enough to be undercutting English merchants[62] and complaints of customs frauds at Glasgow began to be raised in the Commons by the merchants of London, Whitehaven and Bristol. The particular objection was to the coastal trade - the re-exportation of tobacco from Glasgow warehouses to other UK destinations, at prices below those being charged by the local importers. In fact complaints to the Court of Exchequer by the Glasgow merchants against the customs officers at Port Glasgow, reveal the probable source of this trouble, for tobacco arrived in the Clyde in raw bundles, quite undifferentiated as to type and quality and was then carefully sorted and graded in the city's warehouses before being re-exported 'to advantage'.[63] A competitive edge was thus gained by this industrial process and the coastal trade brought back valuable currency from England which helped to restore the trade balance. This, and not customs fraud, was the probable means by which the Glasgow merchants were undercutting their competitors. However, to meet the objections of the London merchants, the fiscal organisation set up in Scotland at the Union was dismantled and a new UK establishment drawn up. This involved the appointment of new tax officers whose 'private instructions seem to

---

61 One contemporary clerical estimate in 1721, put the population at 16-17,000. This was a marked increase to the estimate of over 12,000 just after the Revolution. The city's population fell from just over 14,000 at the Restoration, and little revival was felt during the 1690's or 1700's due to economic stagnation.

62 Gibson, *History*, p.207.

63 NAS, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, GD18/2767, 'Petition to the Right honorable the Baron of HM's Court of Exchequer at Edinburgh for Hugh Rodgers, and Andrew Ramsay on behalf of themselves and the other trading merchants in Glasgow', 1733.

have been to ruin the trade, if possible, by putting all imaginable hardships on it'.[64] The new arrangements affected the tradesmen and the merchants alike because out-going vessels had been sent laden with Glasgow manufactures - a single merchant perhaps buying up as much as 1000 worth of stock for trade in the colonies.[65] Shortly after the Tobacco Act came into effect only seven ships were reputed to have left the Clyde, when formerly as many as sixty might sail in which Glasgow people had an interest.[66] To make matters worse, the Malt Tax, in abeyance since 1713, was revived in 1724 to come into force the following year - and Glasgow was an important whisky distilling and brewing centre. The effect of these changes was a sudden and severe recession, with resultant unemployment, to which the news of the Malt Tax was a further aggravation. The M.P. for Glasgow Burghs had, against his own constituents' interests, voted for all these measures to gain political advantage for himself and his party. Shawfield was a close political associate of both Walpole and Argyll, and he was rumoured to have given opinion or information[67] to Walpole detrimental to Glasgow's burgeoning tobacco trade, for as a tobacco merchant himself, he knew the business well. Combined with rumoured attempts of actually bringing Shawfield onto the Council, this provoked such furore that it finally ended his party's influence there for many years to come. Opposition to these recent bills, which were supported by the

---

64 Gibson, *History of Glasgow*, p.208.

65 Wodrow, *Analecta*, ii, p.392

66 ibid.

67 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/735.1, Montrose to David Graham, 25 November 1722. 'I have from time to time corresponded with Gorthie (Mungo Graham of Gorthie, a factor and agent of his at Glasgow and in Perthshire) upon the subject of the tobacco trade in Scotland, especially since the late establishment of new inspectors which ... gave occasion in several conversations betwixt me and a certain person here; tho I saw and found out plainly enough, D. C.'s views and practices in all that matter, I did not att all apprehend that matters would have come out in the shape they now appear in ... which I think will plainly be the ruin of our countrie in the most profitable branch of its trade ... and ... the undoing of any character and reputation if ever there was any, which I know there never was, of D. and his friends at Glasgow'.

Argathelians, combined to made party struggles particularly acrimonious and burgh elections in particular became the scene of fierce contests. In 1724 Wodrow reported:

> This month ... our Elections for Burghs comes on. There are great parties and factions in all of them, and all flows from the partys in State, and the vieus particular persons have as to future elections in Parliament. In a particular manner, our elections at Glasgou have been caryed on with no litle strugle. P(rovost) Aird and his party have nou managed all these for a long time. It seems a designe was talked of to bring in Shaufield to the council, with an eye to be Provest next year. This was made a handle of, though it was denyed to be a fact, to raise a terrible foment in the toun. It was lately discovered that Provest Aird, since the Rebellion, has had a hundred pound from the Government, secretly tacked to one of Shaufield's sons salarys. Shaufield is much blamed, in the late act about tobacco, which is like to prove very ruinous to the merchants; in short, the greatest ferment has been against Shaufield that can be expressed. Joyned with this, Colin Campbell of Blythswood, who brought Shaufield much into his interest in the toun of Glasgou, has been of late disobliged by Shaufield... and he joyned with the merchants to ruine P(rovest) Aird and his party. Upon all these accounts a party was formed in toun and Council called Plotters and Revolutioners, and they caried the new magistrates, by a plurality of 20 in one vote. So all 3 are of their side .. It's said that such is the present heat that P(rovest) Aird could not find men on their side in toun to choice'.[68]

In fact Wodrow's information may have been a little out of date. Charles Miller, the baillie who had thought it difficult to disoblige Argyll in 1716, was elected provost in

---

68 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.166-167, October 1724.

1723, following the Tobacco Act, and this was the discreet beginning of the purge of the Shawfield/Argyll interest at Glasgow. Lockhart of Carnwath described Miller's group as a 'set of discreet men that will not sacrifice the town to either Argyle's or the Squadrone party's projects',[69] men who 'had resisted Daniel Campbell's creatures'[70]. The Revolutioners, broadly aligned with the Squadrone, or the old Country party, had full control of the council after the autumn of 1725, although a remnant of the former Argathelian interest remained for the rest of the decade.

Nationally, there was a complete change of ministry in Scotland in May 1725. The Squadrone were turned out of office, never really to regain it, and Argyll's side brought in. Argyll's party now controlled the positions of Lord Advocate, Justice Clerk, and Solicitor General; and at local level, the appointment of non-hereditary Sheriffs and Lieutenants in the shires. Argyll himself was made Captain of the Ordinance in England and several changes were made in the military in Scotland, mainly the putting in of English officers to facilitate the disarming of the Highlands by the second Disarming Act, passed in April of that year. Argyll was said to have been behind all these changes.

The Argathelians were also consolidating their influence locally. At the burgh elections at Edinburgh in the autumn they kept control of the Council, much to the 'general dissatisfaction of the inhabitants',[71] but at Linlithgow there was a mob at the

---

69 *Letters of George Lockhart of Carnwath*, 1698-1732, p. 235.

70 ibid.

71 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.234.

election when the Argathelians carried it, and in an ominous anticipation of things to come, 'the side who wer against the present managers (were) imprisoned'.[72]

The political revolt at Glasgow which was completed by the burgh elections in the autumn of 1725, was thus remarkable in that the Revolutioners were reversing the trend establishing itself nationally, and was all the more so since it followed on from the Malt Tax Riots in June. For at the conclusion of the enquiry held at Glasgow in July, the town and Council had been outrageously abused by the new managers, most notably by a 'certain lawyer giddy with his new preferment'[73] - the recently-appointed Lord Advocate Duncan Forbes of Culloden. On suspicion of having aided the rioters but without a whit of evidence - Provost Miller, Dean of Guild John Stark, Deacon Convener John Armour, Bailies John Stirling, James Johnson, and James Mitchell, were suddenly apprehended and marched to Edinburgh on Forbes' orders like common criminals. They were even briefly imprisoned in their own prison, despite the fact that it was well attested that two of the bailies were absent from the city during the entirety of the disturbances. The episode had strong overtones of a reprisal taken against a breakaway group, and indeed, there was some speculation that Forbes intended to prevent the magistrates from making the autumn election and the expected rout. The Revolutioners were however uncowed by these events, Wodrow noting:

> Notwithstanding all the threats of the city, and the severe treatment of the Magistrates, and offers that if the next election go right, all other matters should run smooth, and offers of money, as is said, yet the opposite party to Shaufield have caryed their point, without missing one step ... Mr John Gray had a

---

72 ibid., p.235.

73 William Tennoch, *A letter from a Gentleman at Glasgow to his Fiend in London, containing an impartial History of the late Tumults at Glasgow on the Commencement of the Malt Tax,* (London, 1725).

sermon before the election, 'On the Evil of Parties,' which he handled with a very affecting seriousness; and among other, he observed that out partys was like to prevent the punishment of murder and shedding of blood, and the execution of justice'.[74]

Gray's comment referred to the proceedings currently being taken by the town against Captain Francis Bushell, of Delorain's regiment of foot, the government troops sent to see to the gauging of the kilns when the tax was due to come into force. On the 25th June, at the height of the disturbances, Bushell had fired into an unarmed crowd without reading the Riot Act, killing nine persons and injuring many others. It was one of the worst incidents of urban violence in eighteenth century Britain. The background to the Malt Tax and a detailed narrative of the disturbances are covered in the following chapter but here we look at the reactions and tactics of the Argathelian regime on the politics of the city.

After the tragic events of the 25th June Miller sent an account of the incident to Edinburgh where it was published in the *Edinburgh Evening Courant.*[75] The editor there, McEwen, was a burgess of Glasgow and printed a fair account. But the role which was played by the magistracy of Edinburgh, now controlled by the Argathelians, and the Lord Advocate Duncan Forbes of Culloden was notable for its use of arbitrary force, flagrant abuse of the law and stifling of the freedom of the press[76]. Provost

---

74 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.234.

75 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.213.

76 The magistrates' account was drawn up and dispatched to the King at Hanover on 31 July 1725. *BRG*, 31/7/1725, p.225. The narrative from which the following section is drawn is largely taken from this account, and also from Robert Wodrow's, with which it agrees. Wodrow wrote his account as a journal, apparently every few days, as he received news and evaluated it, from the 24 June - 30 July 1725. The first entry being written down, as he states below, on 6th July. *Analecta*, iii, pp.210-223.

Some of Wodrow's information appears to be printed, as for instance when he writes, (24 June, 'But the most terrible one was in Glasgou for which I referr to the printed account...' but then continues '(I) shall only here set doun some other things I hear by common report; and most of them, I think nou (July 6) when I write this, will hold'.

George Drummond demanded McEwen print an account 'which reflected violently on the Magistrates and toun of Glasgou as having fore-knouledge of the rable and having done nothing to quash it' which the worthy editor refused to do. The *Caledonian Mercury* however, whose editor was a Jacobite, was quite prepared to print a 'lying and partiall account' which represented Glasgow as being in a state of open rebellion against the government.[77] The magistrates of Glasgow then sent in a fuller version to McEwen which was printed secretly in a private press - McEwen was threatened with imprisonment as were the rest of the town's printers. The house which printed the account was searched within the hour and all copies seized; even the 'the cadys were stoped by the Clerk when hauking it'.[78]

General Wade and the Lord Advocate arrived on the 8th July; Forbes to take precognitions and Wade evidently expecting to encounter a rebellion; for they arrived in a great parade with four pieces of cannon, two regiments of horse, two of foot and accompanied by Shawfield's son-in-law Sir Duncan Campbell and his Independent Company of foot. The visitors set up their cannons and mortars in the middle of the town, quartered their soldiers, placed strong guards around the city and began questioning the inhabitants. They stayed eight days in all taking statements from

---

ibid., p.210. Wodrow was at first sceptical of reports of Shawfield's ill-doings, such as the rumour that he was responsible for raising the military the day before the tax came into force which he dismisses as an 'idle rumour' but as events developed, he became less so.

NLS pamphlet 1.5.149, William Tennoch's *A Letter from a Gentleman to his Friend in London, containing an impartial History of the late Tumults at Glasgow, on the Commencement of the Malt Tax,* also agrees with Wodrow's account and the magistrates letter to the King and fills out details omitted by them.

Later accounts tend to conflate Wade's visit with Bushell's and to make the assumption that both were called out to deal with the riot at Shawfield's house; whereas the above make it clear that it was the presence of the troops which probably provoked the attack by the impression this caused the citizens that they were being placed under military rule to enforce the uplifting of an unpopular tax. Bushell's orders do not appear to have been directed towards the protection of Shawfield's property which lay on the edge of town, but on quartering his troops directly on the townspeople.

77 Tennoch, *A Letter from a Gentleman.*

78 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.213. Tennoch, *A Letter from a Gentleman*, p.19.

witnesses. Such was the confusion of post-union government in Scotland that at no point do the magistrates appear to have asked them on whose authority they acted, or requested to see their warrant. It later transpired that the Justice Clerk, the head of all criminal proceedings in Scotland, was unaware of either the Lord Advocate's or the General's decision to go west and at the investigation into Forbes's actions by the Lords Justices it was noted he had been unable to produce a warrant. The former Lord Advocate, Robert Dundas of Arniston, who was sacked in May for his opposition to the Malt Tax, pressed Forbes hard at the enquiry and argued that the provost and magistrates had actually possessed more authority to imprison him for his insolence in taking such arbitrary action and flouting their authority than he had in setting up his inquiry without warrant or in his subsequently seizing a number of the citizens. This at least was the theory. In practice however, the 'great men' held sway and the greatest man, as even Walpole had been forced to realise recently, was Argyll.

To the great disappointment of the townspeople this self-appointed commission seemed far more intent on finding out who were the perpetrators of the destruction of Shawfield's property than on establishing Bushell's guilt for murder. The magistrates, anxious to clear their name and that of their good town, co-operated fully, and in a sudden over-hasty flush of conciliation 'Peaceable access was got into the malt-kilns, and they wer gaged ... and a good many gave their oath as to what malt they had made since June 24th'[79]. After a few days' enquiries the Advocate began to put it about that the magistrates had acted wisely. But after the information had been received, suddenly

79 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.216.

40 of the alleged mobbers were seized from their beds in the night on merely 'private informations'.[80]

A sea-change was now noted in the Lord Advocate's behaviour especially towards the magistrates. He began questioning them anew, acting this time in a puerile sort of way by asking scoffingly, questions such as 'And are you a bailie?' and, if the Town Clerk could write. He also gave great offence by his conduct in church, talking aloud during the sermon and by 'open profane cursing and swearing' in the streets. On his last day, July 16th, about one hour before the party were due to leave, he surprised everybody by suddenly sending a letter to the jailer of the Tolbooth warning him to receive into custody the provost, magistrates, Dean of Guild and Deacon Convener as aiders and abettors to the riot. When charged the magistrates were refused bail, and in full view of the town were escorted up the Tolbooth stairs and imprisoned in their own jail before being transported to Edinburgh's Tolbooth. Bushell was allowed to do the tying up of the other prisoners, the supposed mobbers. The town was left in the hands of the military and three newly-appointed Justices of the Peace.

The magistrates on their way to Edinburgh were greeted by crowds of supportive local people who turned out to meet them including most of the local gentry. At Falkirk the Earl of Kilmarnock invited them up to the Callander, but at Linlithgow, where the provost was 'of the other side' (i.e., an Argathelian) measures were concerted to ignore them. By the time the procession reached Corstorphine, it was greeted by two hundred Glasgow burgesses who had ridden ahead to organise the welcome party. At the short three day hearing which followed the Lords of Justiciary were of the opinion that the imprisonment of the magistrates was illegal but until Forbes showed his

---

80 ibid.

warrant they could not pronounce definitely on it. Since this was never forthcoming and Forbes failed to show up on the last day but was represented by the Solicitor, the magistrates were eventually released on 20th July 'and the whole toun of Edinburgh, that wer in multitudes on the street, received them with welcome'.[81] At the trial of the townspeople, Ilay and Lord Royston pressed for the death sentence. Only ten however went as far as a trial. Two were sentenced to banishment and the rest were acquitted.[82] The magistrates directed the relatives of the victims to petition for an enquiry into Bushell's conduct and agreed to support them in it. Bushell was tried and found guilty but received a royal pardon and was eventually promoted.[83]

On their return to Glasgow the magistrates had to deal with Shawfield's demand for the balance due to him from the recent sale of the Barrowfield estate. This had been purchased from John Walkinshaw, an attainted Jacobite, and neighbour of Shawfield whose debts he had been buying up since the '15, At the sale of the estate, which was agreed on 30 December 1723 and finally disponed to the council on the 28 May 1724,[84] Walkinshaw's debts to Shawfield stood at an astounding £59,000Sc. (£4166stg.). The council made a down payment in cash but a balance was subsumed on bond to Shawfield - the council by the minute of sale taking over the bulk of Walkinshaw's debt. This bond now amounted to £4500 stg. and was due for repayment at Lambas 1725. The magistrates had previously hoped to borrow the money from the bank at Edinburgh, which was controlled by Ilay, but when they now approached the bank they

---

81 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.222.

82 Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, p.140.

83 ibid.

84 *BRG*, 30/12/1723, pp.178-181; 28/5/1724, pp.187-90. Appendix, xi, Charters and documents, (1070), 'Disposition by John Walkinshaw of Burrowfield to the magistrates and council of the lands of Burrowfield', p.573.

found they were refused the expected corporate loan. The bank managers however agreed to make individual loans up to £3000; that is, six separate loans of £500 each at 4.5% interest to the provost, the three bailies, the Dean of Guild and the Deacon Convener - the same six seized by the Lord Advocate as being allegedly conspirators to the riot and of the party in opposition to Shawfield. When this was reported to a meeting of the council on 28 July it was reluctantly agreed to accept the bank's terms but to make an additional private arrangement that the bonds be countersigned by the whole council present as being 'conjunctly and severally' concerned therein.[85] Within ten years of this agreement Provost Miller however was a bankrupt and forced to apply for the charity of the town.[86]

The incident of Shawfield's next applying to parliament for compensation for his losses in the riots is also well enough known. Shawfield eventually received £6080 stg. - an enormous sum - with which he bought the islands of Ilay and Jura. The debate in parliament where the Argathelians supported Walpole and expected preferential treatment, centred on how this was to be extracted from the town of Glasgow - whether a direct tax on the citizens or 'off the public'- but reason ruled and the latter milder, action was decided on. Shawfield was to receive the money from the government and the government proposed recouping the sum back from the council via the ale tax.[87] The council unsuccessfully protested and petitioned the king that 'the public fund or stock of the city will be so charged with debt that the credit of this town will be in great

---

85 *BRG*, 28/7/1725, p.224

86 Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, p. 172.

87 *BRG*, 21/4/1726, p.259.

danger of being ruined'.[88] It was put to the council, on Shawfield's petition gaining parliament's approval, that unless the debt was paid off in full by the 24 June 1727 then the receipts of the ale tax, the council's greatest annual source of revenue at this time (currently running at about £16000Sc. or £1200-£1300 stg. pa.) were to go directly to the Commissioners of Excise until it was paid off.[89] This establishment was run by Ilay and its inefficiency was legend.[90] The idea of being further mortgaged in the most lucrative part of their revenues to a corrupt and avaricious regime was so unattractive to the magistrates that on the 13 June Provost Stark proposed to the council that they consider borrowing the money and continuing to draw the revenues of the 2p on the pint.[91] In the end the magistrates resolved to sell the lands they had just bought and preserve their fiscal autonomy rather than be further entangled in this web of corruption. The sale of the Barrowfield estates was eventually settled on John Orr, a merchant and councillor, in 1730, but at a knock-down price. The investment of £1000 stg. which the trades of Glasgow had sunk into the venture, was never adequately re-couped.

The Malt Tax episode at Glasgow illustrates how the tight net-work of political management was working under Argyll and Ilay and the perils and pressures presented to any individual or group who resisted it. The two brothers by 1725 had influence in the Commons via Walpole, in the bank, in the military, in the General Assembly, in the

---

88 ibid.,22/4/1726, p.260.

89 ibid., 26/5/1726, p.262-3.

90 Alex Murdoch, *The People Above, Politics and Administration in Mid-Eighteenth Century Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1980), pp. 16-17. The Commissioners of Excise were subordinate to the Treasury in their senior appoointments, but could appoint their subordinate officers. Walpole made several attempts at improving the efficiency of this body.

91 *BRG*, 1718-1738, p.264.

Customs and Excise, in the appointments of sheriffs and lieutenants in shires, in the election of magistrates in many burghs, in the Court of Session and Court of Justiciary and in the Convention of Royal Burghs which was increasingly controlled by Shawfield's brother, Provost Campbell, M.P. for Edinburgh, and his associate Provost Drummond. Wodrow claimed there was a plan for Shawfield's brother and Drummond to manage Edinburgh, whilst he was to manage Glasgow and the western burghs, 'to fall in with everything that was laid on'. 'And, indeed these same people have taken on them to manage our Assemblys these two or three years; and being able to manage the Burrous and Kirk, as they pretend, it folloues the Scots administration ought to be in their hands'.[92] Glasgow remained determined to be rid of the influence of Shawfield but at the same time it was realised that some healing of the rift between the town and Argyll was going to be a long-term necessity. Provost Stark was even more of the Revolutioner side than his predecessor Miller but decided to call on Argyll when he came to Edinburgh in the summer of 1726. At a somewhat frosty interview it was put to his Grace that it was less himself that the town objected to than his creature, Stark stating frankly that, 'though the toun did not much think of an attachment to any great man, and only valued themselves on the loyalty to King George, yet they had a very great affection for the family of Argyll'. The Duke was a little cold in his return, and said, 'for himself, he did not recon himself a great man, and wished the toun would not attach themselves to small men, that could not be much use to them, pointing at the Duke of Montrose'.[93]

---

92 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.214.

93 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.316.

Little rapprochement was forthcoming at that juncture and when Ilay's Commission of Visitation to the University appeared in Glasgow in September prior to the Michaelmas elections of 1726, and remained for a week, it was widely suspected that Ilay had a further agenda than merely University matters, for the substance of these changes had already been decided upon. This suspicion was borne out when Stark learned of a challenge to his Revolutioner grouping on the council by a sub-set calling themselves 'the young folk' headed by Robert Bogle, jnr., and bailie Ramsay 'the cleverest and most stirring' who 'wer once on Shaufield's side, but came off'. These were evidently feared to be too close to that side for comfort. In view of Ilay's recent extended visit Stark decided on a purge of this unstable grouping and by the time James Peadie (2nd) of Ruchill was elected to the civic chair in 1727 by a great majority, (especially amongst the trades), it was reported that 'the council is pretty much reformed and those who are reconed Squad, and against Shaufield cary all before them'.[94]

Elsewhere the Argathelians continued to break new ground, but not without opposition. At Dumbarton the contest was so fierce there was a double return. Provost Smollet and his grouping were supported by the Argathelians, but Provost Bunten and his set were supported by the bulk of the townspeople and there continued for a while two rival councils and provosts. When John Blackwood, a Scottish merchant based in London, was elected M.P. at the general election held at Dumbarton in October 1727 he secured three votes out of the four for Glasgow Burghs; Glasgow's, Rutherglen's and Bunten's for Dumbarton. Renfrew abstained.[95] Smollet, the Argathelian Provost of

94 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.448.

95 Sedgewick, *House of Commons*.

Dumbarton, alone voted for Shawfield.[96] Whilst the Court of Session debated the rival claims of the two schismatic provosts, John Blackwood, the opposition's candidate, took up his seat in parliament on 23rd January, as he informed the magistrates.[97] He was in it long enough to change the list of the Justices of the Peace to something more agreeable to his constituents, reversing the changes made by Forbes of Culloden under military rule in 1725.[98] Shawfield however petitioned the Commons to have Blackwood's election annulled, which with Walpole's support duly carried, and within three months he took up his rival's seat in parliament. The day the news came through to Glasgow, that their candidate had lost his battle, there was occasion for considerable merriment amongst Shawfield's friends which nearly caused a further riot. These went through the town at night with a fiddler and some of the English officers singing 'Up with the Campbells and down with the Grahams'. Approaching the houses of the Dean of Guild, Provost Montgomery and Shawfield, they drank toasts to the 'Damnation to Glasgow' and other such taunts.[99] Blackwood continued to petition parliament for his seat for some years, supported by his constituents, but without success.

Drummond and Campbell at Edinburgh then moved to concert further financial pressure on the break-away Glasgow administration by their management of the Convention of Royal Burghs. An increase was made on Glasgow's proportion of the cess in 1728 along with that of the other two rebel burghs of Rutherglen and Dumbarton. This was as a direct reprisal for having assisted in the election of John Blackwood. The augmentation increased the financial penury on the city as the cess by

---

96 ibid.

97 *BRG*, 29/1/1728, p.291.

98 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.490.

the former rate already absorbed over 20% of the town's annual revenues.[100] Accommodation with Argyll was thus becoming urgent. Some months after his return to parliament Shawfield issued a subpoena against those merchants who had petitoned in favour of Blackwood which Wodrow wrote 'frights many of them; and those who are frighted form a supplication to Shaufield to favour them. The Magistrates, and most by far in the toun, will not joyn in the adress; and at lenth they find out that the Subpoenas cannot be executed for three years, which putts the people who truckled to Shaufield to the blush'.[101] It became rumoured however, that a rift had appeared between Argyll and Shawfield and this was eagerly seized upon.

> Its talked that Shaufield, at London, vyes with the Duke, and recons he stands on his own legs; and that the Duke cannoy bear. His brother, Provost Campbell and G. Drummond are to be dropt. Whither all this be grimace, to fankle in the toun of Glasgou again to his interests, a little time will try... Provost Stirling, I find, speaks this side, that its fruitless to struggle,and best to keep on all sides of great men, and be out with none. At the Circuit, Lord Milton, a tool of Isla's regrated the hardships on Glasgou, and said the toun had been maltreated, and the family of Argyle had been informed they bore a personall hatred at them, and would not bear any of the name of Campbell and other such storys; and at

---

99 ibid., p.495.

100 *BRG,* Treasurer's accounts; see, for example, John Whitehill's accounts for 1713-1714, pp.637-648. Analysis in this year showed that the total revenues from all sources amounted to £46,650Sc. (the 'common good') and the cess, which stood at eight months collection for most of the eighteenth century, was £9,452Sc. A later Convention re-adjusted Glasgow's share back to the pre-1728 level.

101 Wodrow, *Analecta,* iii, p. 26.

Edinburgh, the duke told the Provest he resolved to come by Glasgou and stay all night.[102]

Provost Stirling's interview with his Grace in August 1729 proved to be somewhat more fruitful than Stark's three years earlier. The Provost's civic delegation arrived with a pre-written list of grievances and in what looks much like another pre-planned scheme, Colin Campbell of Blythswood, burgess of Glasgow, also fallen out with Daniel, and recently restored as a Justice of the Peace by Blackwood's brief tenure at Westminster, was drafted in for his family connections. The magistrates entered into a long and frank conversation with Argyll.

> They lamented that the toun for some time had been under his Grace's frouns which they wished to have removed. The Duke said he had no reason to take rubs and affronts upon his family and name well. They protested they never wer guilty of them. He said he had been told and could not well doubt that at the very last election they had said,'They would have none of the name of Campbell to represent them.' To that it was answered it was a hellish lye, and they were glad they could disprove it by one near his Grace. They ouned indeed they had opposed Mr. Campbell of Shawfield and they thought they had good reasons, considering what treatment the community had from him; but so far wer they from what had been told his Grace, that before ever Mr. Blaikwood was fixed on, they offered their vote and interest to the Laird of Blythswood, standing hard by his Grace. the Duke seemed struk with this and said, 'Colin was it so?' He said it was. 'Then', said the Duke, 'never man was more abused

---

102 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iv, p.69.

than I have been' and seemed to insinuat that Shaufield was the informer, though not directly; and said he nou found whom to deal with'.[103]

The magistrates presented their list of grievances 'and humbly desired his Grace might befriend the toun in getting them taken off' which he agreed to do. Within three weeks the Provost received a letter from Ilay in Edinburgh requesting a meeting which proved very constructive, Ilay going through the memo article by article and disapproving of all the recent obstructions Glasgow had met with. Shawfield was dropped at the next election, although in the interval Blackwood's petitions received no support from on high. The new candidate, Coronet William Campbell, was the Duke's first cousin and although he did not mercilessly oppress his constituents as Shawfield had done, was equally useless in neglecting their interests. Opposition in the Commons continued against Argyll and Walpole during the 1730's and in 1739 Argyll was dismissed for criticising the country's state of military readiness.[104] In the general election of 1741 the scattered remnants of the old Squadrone interest were enabled to revive and Glasgow Burghs were able to shed their Campbell suzerainty. Neil Buchanan of Hillington was elected as their new member. On congratulating him on his success the magistrates wrote to him for his help 'in bringing about Walpole's fall and enjoining him to be active for the restoration of trienniel parliaments' and stated that 'the securing our liberty and constitution and preserving the independence of Parliament (had been) our chief care in promoting your election' and that 'all further abuse of power we hope (will) be prevented'.[105]

---

103 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.74.

104 Ferguson, *Scotland: 1689 to the Present*, p. 145.

105 Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, iii, p. 184.

The magistrates of Glasgow showed that they were not prepared to be subservient to the great men whose support they needed to solicit but not to the point of subjugation. Certain corrupt or misguided individuals such as Provost Aird were prepared either from pique or frustrated ambition to surrender their civic pride and be the tools of magnate power but the bulk of their associates were not. Whilst accounts agree that Aird dominated the council from the Union to the tobacco act of 1722 it is apparent that he could only do so with the tacit support of a neutral group who viewed patronage pragmatically and his personal ascendancy ran only so long as matters went smoothly. Once the candidature of Shawfield proved detrimental to the city these men were no longer prepared to support him, even if it meant offending so large a figure as Argyll. A marked contrast is evident at this juncture between the behaviour of the civic leadership of the capital and that of the second city which is perhaps attributable to the fact that Glasgow remained solely a merchant city throughout. As such, her wealth was founded on her sea-borne enterprise, which was expanding, whilst Edinburgh, the capital, fell prey to the spoils system evident in a city whose wealth was partly and perhaps increasingly based on its being a centre of government. Provost Drummond was, as a Commissioner of Excise, directly in the pay of the government from 1715 until his death in 1761, and one contemporary source claimed this was his only source of revenue. Glasgow's provosts on the other hand were practising 'sea-adventurers' dependent on their trading activities and beyond the pale of the spoils system which did not reach to the west, although the university became attached to it. Another key factor affecting Glasgow's position was that she was financially solvent in the period whilst Edinburgh's finances were in such crisis that the magistrates were at times unable to pay the ministers' salaries. The fiscal autonomy Glasgow enjoyed and its healthy

balance sheet insulated the city from the evils of patronage and enabled the civic leadership to take an independent go-it-alone line. Glasgow had a real independence from the corruption round about it which its citizens were naturally unwilling to relinquish. However, in the longer term it was increasingly obvious that the Argathelian party were progressively finding more and greater levers of power, and the augmentation of the city's tax rating, if it had persisted, could have in time crippled the city.

Thus Provost Stark's statement that the toun 'did not think much of an attachment to any great man, but only valued itself on the loyalty to King George' must be accepted as the true position of the burgesses. Only lip service was paid to the family of Argyll for the king was the original and true patron of the royal burghs which were legally speaking a branch of royal government and monarchism was an integral element of the Scottish civic tradition.

Chapter Five

GLASGOW AND THE MALT TAX RIOTS OF 1725

Part I: the national background, state v. city-state

'Pro republica semper'[1]

This chapter, in two parts, sets out to establish the local and national background to these events which in many respects represented a watershed in Anglo-Scottish relations and also assumed the status of a rite of passage at Glasgow, a test of its Hanoverian loyalism. The two Malt Tax Riots at Glasgow which took place on the 24 and 25 June 1725 exist in a wider political context and are therefore dealt with here extensively. Chris Whatley commented that 'neither this event nor the Porteous Riot in Edinburgh in 1736 should be seen in isolation. These were not atypical spasms of disorder ... Both were particularly violent episodes which occurred during a period of widespread hostility to both tax collectors and military forces which were deployed to repress it'.[2] This study of the background to the riots, and in particular of the history of the Malt Tax itself, supports this surmise, linking the incidents of 1725 back to the earlier history of 1713. Links can also be established to the radical critique of the 'sinfulness' of taxation developed by James Russell, a Covenanter implicated in the murder of Sharp, who in 1682, advocated the non-payment of taxes to lustful and

---

1 William Tennoch, 'motto', in *A letter from a gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London containing an impartial history of the late tumults at Glasgow on the commencement of the Malt Tax, 31st July, London,* (London, 1725).

2 C. Whatley, 'How Tame were the Scottish Lowlanders during the Eighteenth Century?' in T. M. Devine, ed., *Conflict and Stability in Scottish Society 1700-1850* , (Edinburgh, 1990), p.9.

uncovenanted governments as a religious duty.[3] The seizure of the revenues of the Crown said to have taken place at the Revolution by the Cameronian leader Kersland and the attempt to seize the Equivalent when it arrived in Scotland in 1708 by radical Covenanting elements hostile to the tyranny of the state, indicate the sensitivity of this issue.[4] By the 1720s criticisms of the fiscal powers of the state were inspired by references to classical sources, notably to the idea of being a 'tributory' people. These dialogues indicate that contemporaries viewed taxation in far more than economic terms but were acutely aware of its political significance, as were the adherents of George Lockhart in 1700-1705 regarding the burden of taxation imposed on the burgesses following the Revolution.

The disturbances of 1725 were in fact the product of far-reaching changes in the way that Scotland was governed, which took place against a particularly hostile conflict between the Argathelians and the Squadrone for the reins of power. In this the former were prepared to be particularly ruthless and unprincipled, and opposition to the Malt Tax was as much directed against their preparedness to sacrifice Scotland's interest for party advantage as to the actual proposal itself. The Malt Tax also represented something of a constitutional crisis, as fears about the stability of the Treaty of Union were again raised which provoked a questioning of Scotland's continuing relationship to England and led to a re-thinking of economic policy. In this context the 'great change' which Checkland noted in the Argathelians' attitude towards economic development schemes after 1725, bears the hallmark of an attempt to stabilise a situation which threatened disaster, by a mixture of vastly increased patronage and by

---

3 W. MacMillan,'The Covenanters after the Revolution of 1688', *RSCHS*, vol. x, (1950), p.147
4 John Ker of Kersland, *Memoirs*, (1726), pp.10-11.

'bargains'.[5] In fact Checkland concluded that the foundation of the Royal Bank of Scotland, which was mooted in 1726, 'may be seen, not unfairly, as part of Walpole's system of political control in Scotland'.[6]

In 1713 the Scots had complained, of the depressed state of their trade, and of the many taxes which they had been subject to since 1707; for the customs union had meant that new duties became applicable against a vastly extended range of commodities, which had previously attracted little or no duty. Since England pursued a mercantilist commercial policy, raising high tariffs against foreign imports and offering bounties on native produce for export, Scotland was obliged to maintain fiscal uniformity and prevent a breach in England's 'trade wars'.

Resistance was immediate to the new customs establishment set up after the Union, for, despite the attractions of the bounty system, (a limited version of which had existed before the Union) mercantilist policy was not acceptable either in theory or in practise. Increased taxation of any sort after 1707 was politically sensitive, and raised fears of becoming a 'tributory people'; this explicit terminology was frequently voiced particularly in relation to the Malt Tax.[7] The literature of government spokesmen themselves accepts and advances this interpretation of popular opposition. Thus one pro-government pamphleteer was at pains to point out that although tariffs had of course risen as a result of the Union, yet the receipts of the revenue were still retained in Scotland, being absorbed by the upkeep of the army, the salaries of the revenue

---

5 S. G. Checkland, *Scottish Banking, A History, 1695-1973*, (Glasgow and London, 1975), p.57.

6 ibid., p.59.

7 *A Letter from a Brewer in the City to a JP in the Country, concerning the Malt Tax*, (Edinburgh, 1713). [NLS 1.889(6)].

officers, and the bounties given back on exports (mainly grain).[8] Despite such assurances, the prejudice of a 'tribute' to England which was fatally draining Scotland of money, continued to haunt the new customs and excise establishment, and for the next few decades, customs evasion was sustained on a huge scale, apparently justified,, (if not overtly motivatied), on political and cultural grounds.[9] Neither does it appear that the basic *rationale* of mercantilism was any better regarded than were its ill effects. Francis Hutcheson, no less than Andrew Fletcher, continued to argue for free trade and was followed by his more famous student, Adam Smith, who once described his greatest work, the *Wealth of Nations*, as 'an attack on the whole English mercantilist system'.

Fiscal measures were the most hotly contested areas of the Treaty of Union. Whilst mercantilist policy was reluctantly accepted, some allowance was at first made for the scale that these changes represented in Scotland. Thus although the principle of 'equity' was accepted by both sides, the Scots were allowed an exemption from the English Malt Tax for the duration of the current war. By 1712 however the war-time economy had forced the exigency of applying the tax to Scotland, to come into force on

---

8 *'A Dialogue Between a Brewer and a Gager, concerning the Malt Tax'*, (Edinburgh, 1713). [NLS, 1.889 (67)].

9 Duncan Forbes of Culloden, *Some Considerations on the Present State of Scotland in a letter to the Commissioners for the improving of Fisheries and Manufactures, 28th March 1744*, (1744). [NLS 1.889.(6)]. In a pamphlet intended purely for Scottish circulation, Forbes explicitly links customs evasion to to political and cultural factors, to, 'a dislike to the Union, an ill-opinion conceived of the first sett of Custom house-officers that were sent down hither, an unwillingness to to favour the Revenue, on a supposal that the money thence arising was to be remitted to England ... drew the bulk of the people to favour them (ie., the smuggler)'. p.5. Forbes proceeds on the basis that the smuggling economy draws its impetus from being consciously oppositional to the 'official' economy which is however, alone capable of redeployment of revenue to the sponsoring of 'patriotic' improvements and the public good. He thus attempts to undermine the cultural outlook of the smuggler, and those who support him, by accusing them of acting from a misplaced sense of patriotism.

June 23rd 1713.[10] Since the peace was not concluded until 1714, (Treaty of Utrecht) this represented a direct breach of the Treaty of Union, and created such furore along with other grievances, that it threatened to break it.[11] A motion to dissolve the Union was put forward but failed narrowly by 4 proxy votes, and the Malt Tax, though now passed into law, was not drawn at this time or in the years that immediately followed, although it was laid on annually by parliament and drawn in England. Following the collapse of the South Sea Company however, the government was thrown into a renewed crisis and the following years were taken up by anxieties about the public credit and fury against the directors of the company, whom the Ministry endeavoured to protect. The government's difficulties prompted a fiscal review and Robert Walpole, was appointed as the head of the Treasury, which now became the most powerful department of the government.

The official reason given for not drawing the Malt Tax after 1713 was that it would diminish 'other branches of the revenue far beyond what it could yield'.[12] By common agreement therefore, the Commissioners of Excise and the Exchequer in Scotland did not collect it.[13] This down-sizing of fiscal targetting was evasively and discreetly represented in the correspondence of contemporaries as being an 'adjustment' made in favour of Scotland's 'inability to pay', and a triumph for the much-vaunted principal of 'equity' with regard to Scotland's expected treatment by the Union. But as

---

10 William Ferguson, *Scotland: 1689 to Present*, the Edinburgh History of Scotland, volume 4, (Edinburgh, 1978), p.61.

11 ibid.

12 Philo Scotus, (Duncan Forbes of Culloden) *A Copy of a Letter from a gentleman in Edinburgh to his friend in the Country upon the subject of the Malt tax, August,1725.* (Edinburgh, 1725). [NLS 2.66(11)].

13 ibid.

the Lord Advocate Robert Dundas of Arniston noted in 1724 when it was again proposed to draw a levy on malt on Scotland, the various applications to parliament since 1707 for grants and renewals of the burgh ale tax, or 'pennies on the pint, show that we are able to pay it', and the true reason for the earlier inaction on the part of the Commissioners of Excise was that without massive military assistance, and risk of disturbance to the government, it was politically impossible to gather the Malt Tax in Scotland.[14]

Pamphleteers record that the shortage of specie which was acutely felt before the Union was not improved afterwards, and even as late as 1744 this remained problematic. It was popularly blamed on taxation and the 'parliament men' carrying off bullion to England, whilst the government blamed it on the 'running trade', especially the liberal importation of French brandy. Given this already severe problem, the demand of the Treasury in 1724 for a further £20,000 stg. to be raised annually from Scotland, by a Malt Tax or an equivalent, was thus greeted by a level of outrage quite on par with that of 1713. However, since the Scots had resisted a Malt Tax, the first proposal brought before the committee early in December 1724 suggested something more akin to a combination of the existing excise on malted liquor and the current burgh ale taxes. Accordingly a further imposition of 6d (stg.) was to be raised on the 9/6d (stg.) barrel of ale, and in addition - this was the measure which provoked greatest fury - the bounty was to be withdrawn from Scottish grain exports. This measure was thus guaranteed to unite all sectors - the landed proprietors, the constitutional jurists, the brewers, the burghs, and the common people - in a unanimous condemnation.

---

14 NAS, GD18/3914.13, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Robert Dundas to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, 8 December 1724.

According to one of the Barons of the Exchequer, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, it was the polical-legal implications which caused most anxiety, 'It is not the money that people here regard so much, as the dangerous innovation and a plain demonstration, that no Article of the Union is to be keept.'[15]

Clerk was one of the original Union commissioners who believed the Treaty had guaranteed the Scots 'equality in trade and in taxes'. The new bill undermined this cardinal principle by proposing to remove a bounty from one part of the kingdom whilst retaining it in another - a plain tinkering with the whole theory of a unified British mercantilist policy and again raising the fears of becoming a 'tributory people'. Amongst the dangerous consequences of this ill-judged proposal Penicuik forsaw that 'the justices of the peace will not act any part in the excise' [16] and worse, that, 'those in England who have the bounty on the exportation of grain continued to them will import the produce of the northern kingdom to their country and be in a condition to undersell all our merchants. Which will put trade upon quite a different foot than was intended by the union of the kingdoms'.[17] Penicuik was at a loss to fathom what had possessed the Treasury to propose such a tax now, since the Revenue had been making good progress of late and 'this however heavy to us, will be but a small assistance to the government'. He attributed it to the machinations of those dissaffected to HM's government, or from

---

15 NAS, GD18/3199.2, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik to Robert Dundas, 18 December 1724.

16 Since 1707 the Commissioners of the Peace had been asked to assist in the collection of the excise, a valuable diplomatic aid in preventing local disputes. The justices were unpaid and their attendance was voluntary.

17 NAS, GD18.3199.2, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik to Robert Dundas, 18 December 1724.

'peevish weak people or such as incline to humour them', and commented that 'a man must be a great stranger to our history who does not know that no prosperous appearances are to be trusted and that a government can never be too secure'. The move caused him to reflect sternly on his former commission, and on his confidence in the justice of a single British parliament and constitution. Writing to Dundas, Penicuik commented,

> Tho those who were concerned in the Treaty of Union saw very well what a majority in the British Parliament might doe, yet it was no more to be supposed that one part of the country was to be fleeced to support another, than that the members of the human body should not be equally nourished.[18]

Political tensions rocketed and the mild-mannered and scholarly Penicuik shortly wrote to the Lord Advocate, Robert Dundas, the MP for Midlothian, describing the furious reaction he had witnessed in Edinburgh. 'Now I assure you that things are much worse than I could have imagined, for in my coming into town I found all in a flame and even some had the assurance to advise to rise in a body and declare the union broke, others to protest and leave the parliament.'[19]

In the next few weeks streams of petitions addressed to the Scottish M.P.s from their constituents, with detailed instructions on opposition, flooded into Westminster; and in case Dundas was in any doubt as to the strength of feeling amongst the gentry of Midlothian, Clerk, who also acted as his constituency secretary in the shire, informed him in the covering letter that, 'the ferment of this country is so great that if any M.P.

---

18 NAS, GD18.3199.2, Clerk of Penicuik muniments, same to same, 9 December 1724.

19 NAS, GD18.3199.2, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik to Robert Dundas, 18 December 1724.

would refuse to concur with them, he might betake himself to some other part of the world, but could not expect to live here in safety'.[20] This puts into perspective the later fury against Daniel Campbell of Shawfield, the M.P. for Glasgow Burghs, and other Argathelians who were prepared to assist Walpole. The rumour that Shawfield had been behind the bill stemmed from a letter which Dundas had allegedly written to Clerk about the same time in which he was supposed to have commented, 'We have some Scotchman to thank for the project I shan't pretend to say from whom, but I in my own mind believe we owe it to Mr Daniel Campbell'.[21]

The strongest rhetoric however came from a pamphleteer in Fife.[22] The author pretended rank disbelief 'that any of the Conditions, upon which the Union is founded, will ever be in the least infringed by the Legislature' and re-iterated the supposition of equality in trade and in taxes. It compared the relationship between Scotland and England to that of the Romans and the Sabines and paralleled the British parliament of the United Kingdom with 'the incorporated Union of the Roman States' which, notwithstanding particular parliamentary majorities or 'disparity of numbers in the Senate' all constituent groups were treated with *parity* 'as if they had been all the descendents of one person'. It hinted darkly at *agents provocateurs* as being the tool of all 'arbitrary governments' when they needed a pretext for a severe clamp-down; but

---

20 NAS, GD18.3199.2, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik to Robert Dundas, 18 January 1725.

21 NAS, GD18.3199.3, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik 'to a friend who is best known in adversity', 17 January 1726. Clerk was later criticised for circulating Dundas's letter, which understandably raised a great deal of noise, and was later anxious he might be called as a witness in the affair of Shawfield's damages. However he managed to escape being drawn into the affair.

22 *Copy of a Letter from a Gentleman in Fife to His Friend at Edinburgh Upon the subject of the Malt Tax*, (2nd ed.), 31 December 1725, (Edinburgh, 1725). [NLS. Ry.1.5 (150)].

threw down the gauntlet to the proposers of the tax, by saying that the writer was of course convinced that this tax was not intended to *provoke a revolt,* and that 'we have been treated with all the mildness and humanity the public exigencies could possibly allow', a direct reference to the 'adjustments' made for Scotland's 'inability to pay' a higher taxation threshold during the war, and since 1713. But, *if,* he went on, inequality of trade and taxes *were* to occur:

> it would appear as plain as sunshine to every person of common understanding, that they are no more members of one and the same society, and not a free, but a tributory people, because in that event they must be liable to such unequal burdens and impositions as a majority of parliament should think fit at any time to impose on them, and liable to be deprived of such freedoms and branches of trade as such a majority may think fit to take from them.[23]

The author went on to expand on the theme of being 'tributories', quoted the Declaration of Arbroath, cited the treatment of the Scots by Edward I, his castles and taxes etc., and lambasted the dismal conduct of 'our nobility and great folks' on that sordid occasion, who, being 'possessed of great and extensive vassalages, submitted to the prevailing power, and went plum into his interest'. (There were thinly veiled comparisons with Walpole and the Argathelians). The author's parting shot was that since in those heady days the rot had been at the top, and the Scottish gentry and commons had now as always, retained a 'lively sense of liberty and were determined not to give it up' they had thus survived Edward, their own corrupt 'great folks', the

---

23 *Copy of a Letter from a Gentleman in Fife to His Friend at Edinburgh Upon the subject of the Malt Tax,* (2nd ed.), 31 December 1725, (Edinburgh, 1725). [NLS. Ry.1.5 (150)].

Norwegians, the Danes, the Romans, the Angles, the Saxons and the Normans as well; and that if now, 'England would hurt us, is to say, that they judge amiss of their own interest'.

Although the petitions were never presented to the House of Commons, word reached the Ministry that all was not well in Scotland and that a constitutional crisis threatened on par with that of 1713. For when the House reconvened after the Christmas break, the Scottish M.P.s sent a deputation to the Chancellor of the Exchequer 'to give their apprehensions'. However the Chanceller refused 'to treat of alterations' and requested that 'some solid proposal must be brought in place of them'.[24] Dundas was already finding himself under considerable pressure from the Argathelians for he was both being misrepresented in Scotland by them as betraying his country, as the Lord Advocate in Walpole's corrupt administration, whilst in London his noted opposition to the tax was being played up as disloyalty to Walpole by the same party.[25] He was in a no-win situation, although as Penicuik sympathetically put it, 'possibly your Lordship's great zeal in the affair may endanger your post, but you may be assured that in the opinion of all your country men, you will lose it with honour'.[26]

The Lord Advocate and a committee of Scottish M.P.s held extensive meetings over the next few days attempting to find a solution whereby 'it was possible to ascertain a certain sume to the Government as the produce of a malt duty - we were

---

24 NAS, GD18.3194.10, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Robert Dundas to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, 14 January 1725.

25 ibid.

26 NAS, GD.18/3199.2, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik to Robert Dundas, 18 January 1725.

sufficiently appraised that this was what those in the government pointed at' and they looked at Charles II's acts of parliament on this; but could come up with no more practicable a proposal than that they adopt a scaled down version of the English Malt Tax - at 2d (stg.) the bushell in place of 6d.[27] Constitutional considerations and avoiding setting an ill precedent weighed as heavily as the likely burden on the country, as Dundas was convinced this, rather than the economic dimension, was the real danger and the greatest potential source of instability for Scotland. The Lord Advocate reasoned that for the Scots to allow an English-controlled parliament to be able to legislate for different fiscal provisions for Scotland, departed from the Treaty of Union's key principle of 'equity' in trade and in taxes, and that any such departure created an unstable politico-legal environment in which all the other articles could in time be swept away.

Walpole rejected the committee's proposal. He demanded to have a definite annual sum and denied that the Scots had anything to complain of but rather that, 'the great violence and heats with which this matter seemed to be handled in Scotland must prove hurtfull instead of being of advantage to us since undoubtedly we stated ourselves as a different Body from England it would be natural for them to state themselves as opposite to us'.[28] Eventually after a further month of delays and haggling the Treasury agreed to accept the modified proposal, but at 3d on the bushel, or half the English rate, on the basis that this would assure the Treasury a definite sum of £20000 stg. annually, or just under half the current value of the cess (£48,000); that is, a 40%

---

27 NAS, GD.18/3194 .9, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Robert Dundas to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, 19 January 1725.

28 ibid.

leap in general taxation in Scotland. No more was said about the withdrawal of the bounty on grain exports. In case the Malt Tax did not raise the expected return in the first year, the shortfall was to be extracted the following year in the form of a surcharge on all the malt-makers in Scotland, pro rata.[29] This draconian measure raised further fury, and Dundas believed it 'came from higher hands than those who moved it' but thought the new resolution on the whole better for the country than the former, with its unstable constistutional innovations which were likely to undermine Scotland's status in the Union and further distress the balance of trade deficit.[30] Dundas privately hoped that Walpole might come to be persuaded that the Malt Tax was politically impossible in Scotland and to this end was soon to become prominent in a campaign of opposition against it.

In a private letter to Clerk of the same date, Dundas confessed that the attempts of his enemies to 'break him with the Ministry' had now succeeded, but bemoaned that his efforts to steer his country out of the dangerous constitutional territory it had lately been in, should be misunderstood. 'I only think it hard to be represented two ways by the same persons and that the same action intended for the service of the king as well as the good of my Country should have the unluckie effect to break me with both'.[31]

Dundas was sacked by Walpole for his opposition to the Treasury's plans, which concluded the somewhat strained relations which had existed between the

---

29 NAS, GD.18/3194.7, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Robert Dundas to Sir John Clerk of Penicuk, 21 February 1725.

30 ibid.

31 NAS, GD.18/3194.8, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Robert Dundas to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, 21 February 1725.

Squadrone establishment in Scotland and the Ministry after Walpole's coming to power as the head of the Treasury in 1721. For following the collapse of the South Sea Company, the Squadrone had supported Walpole's rival Carteret, who lost, whilst the Argathelians had backed Walpole.

Dundas was succeeded as Lord Advocate at the end of May by Duncan Forbes of Culloden, a firm Argathelian, in a shake-up of the entire public administration in Scotland in which the Squadrone were systematically removed from all appointments under central government control, except the judiciary, which were life appointments, and the burghs, which were technically beyond the pale of the state. New sheriffs were appointed in the shires, and new justices of the peace, and to ensure that the mail was as loyal as it ought to be, there was a new post office commission. This rifled the mail at Edinburgh (from whence all letters went to London) and ensured that communications between the Glasgow magistrates and the rest of the country that summer, were interrupted, so that it was only with great difficulty that after some weeks of active misinformation, the magistrates succeeded in broadcasting their version of events. The Secretary of State, Roxburgh, the leader of the Squadrone, was removed, and in July-August the Ministry eventually decided that they would make no replacement to this 'troublesome' post but that the functions of the Scottish Secretary would be taken over by one of the other two existing Secretaries, the Duke of Newcastle. Argyll's brother the Earl of Ilay became Justice General, and in effect, 'manager' of Scotland in lieu of Newcastle, who was content to take Ilay's advice.

At the same time a further Disarming Act was proposed for the Highlands, which passed in April 1725, although there had been no reports of disturbances for

some years. General Wade was appointed Commander-in-Chief of Forces in Scotland in place of Argyll, who now went to the continent. Wade arrived in June with the first contingents of troops from England, the rest of which began arriving throughout the summer. The troops arrived in sea-transports along the east coast, at Berwick, Edinburgh and Lossiemouth, and were quickly dispatched from thence to barracks in the east coast burghs. There were currently few barracks in existence in the Highlands. Wade's troops were to continue for many years as a near permanent military establishment in Scotland and busied themselves building roads when not called upon to intervene in outbreaks of disorder. It quickly became apparent that the new Lord Advocate and his associates took a radically different view to the Malt Tax from the former establishment, and were prepared to use a degree of coercive force in its collection unwitnessed since the 1670s and 80s, thus recalling memories of a time of tyranny. The timely assistance of Wade's troops made a possibility of something which had formerly been a political and administrative nightmare. Indeed, as his correspondence that summer shows, Forbes's battles with the strike of the Edinburgh brewers and his punitive swoop on the Glasgow magistrates were orchestrated to the arrivals of Wade's troops, with whom he kept in close contact, and without which he could at best only temporise.

Forbes was quick to defend the military and to use it as a threat to enforce compliance. When the magistrates of Elgin complained of three soldiers of Delorain's regiment whom they had they seized for having 'murdered' a young man in the early hours of a Saturday morning, the Lord Advocate's advice was that the soldiers must have had a good reason for shooting and that the young man could not have been up to

any good at that time of night. The magistrates had reported that the soldiers had fired because they had received orders from one of the local excise officers to shoot anyone in the street found approaching the customs house. Yet Forbes's judgement to liberate them was issued without consideration of any precognitions, and the case was dismissed simply on Forbes's informal 'advice'.[32] When an attack took place in Dundee (a Squadrone stronghold) in August, on a J.P., the M.P. for Forfarshire, a Mr. Scott of Logie, Forbes was frustrated in his attempts to find the perpetrators but sternly warned the magistrates that, since there were troops present in their city 'to assist you in suppressing all riots' they should comply straight away with the gauging of the town's kilns, for they would not be allowed to act as 'other' magistrates had, a reference to the Glasgow magistrates. Dundee, it seemed, could have been another Glasgow.[33] But it is significant that as late as 9 of August, the date of Forbes's letter, the maltsters of Dundee were still 'obnoxious to the law' and had not yet allowed access to the officers of the excise, that is, until Wade's troops arrived. This was fully a month after the Glasgow kilns had been forceably gauged by a massive military presence under General Wade.

The resistance against the Malt Tax, which had threatened the end of the Union in 1713, and whose rhetoric at least, was no less vehement in 1725, was over within eight weeks. However, by the draconian measures used, it was not won without considerable political cost and, much as Penicuik anticipated, neither was there any net benefit to the Treasury at the end of the day. The careful attempts of Clerk and his

---

32 D. Warrand, ed., 2 vols., *More Culloden Papers*, 'From the Provost ans bailies of Elgin to the Lord Advocate;, Elgin, 5 July 1725, pp.263-4; 'From the Lord Advocate to the Provost and bailies of Elgin', Glasgow, 10 July 1725, pp.264-265, (Inverness, 1923-30).

associates to gradually increase the receipts of the Revenue suffered a drastic set-back after 1725, for returns fell steeply and any diplomatic progress the Barons of Exchequer had made since 1707 in encouraging a peaceful transition to a mercantilist policy, went into sharp reverse. This in itself, may indicate that opposition to fiscal policy, far from being extinguished by the action of the military, merely gained fresh impetus from the events of 1725. Indeed, as Dundas noted with some satisfaction, when it came to renewing the Malt Tax for a further year in the next session of parliament, (1726) Walpole had considerably changed his tune. Forbes of Culloden, whose mishandling of the whole Malt Tax affair was criticised by Penicuik amongst others and had by August obliged Walpole to send up Ilay to temporise, continued his clownish antics, attempting to make a silk purse out of sow's ear by his recommendation to the House that any surplus over the £20,000 be applied to a fund for manufactures and improvements in Scotland. This was promptly opposed by English M.P.s, who countered, that the since the Scots had claimed the Malt Tax was too heavy, why were they now claiming that a surplus could be collected?[34]

However, it was Walpole's contribution to the debate which was most notable and raised considerable comment in Scotland. Dundas continued:

> Sir Robert Walpole talked in a very different strain as to our country from what he had spoken of some days before. He fairly owned that £20,000 was more than the proportion of malt duty that Scotland ought to pay in comparison to what England pays, that in numbers our proportion was really no more than

---

33 Warrand, *More Culloden Papers*, 'From the Lord Advocate to Scrope', Edinburgh, 7 August 1725, pp.266-267; 'From the Lord Advocate to the magistrates of Dundee', 9 August 1725, pp.267-268; 'Magistrates of Dundee to the Lord Advocate', Dundee, 12 August 1725, pp.268-269

£15,000; and said that he was far from thinking that all the sum or any part of it was worth while to disturb the peace of the government for, or to keep them under a necessity of maintaining 6,000 men in Scotland, and as what he said was exceeding strong, and just as well handsome, I will only submit it to the gentlemen whether it was a wise thing to speak of bargains for a surplus when it seems there is a conviction that we are not able to answer that Duty that we had reason to expect from what passed at the Union and since, that it would not be exacted, and when it is plain they are convinced (to use the French proverb) that the play won't pay the candle. I am not fool enough to say or think that we might this year have gott free of the Malt Tax and indeed I always doubted that ever we could hope for it at any time. But indeed what passed yesterday and particularly what fell from that great man makes me begin to think that ane unanimous vigorous opposition might some time or other have brought the English to think of doing us Justice and that they might at last have been convinced that it is not obstinacy but real inability that makes us so averse to have that Duty laid upon us.[35]

During the debate over Shawfield's compensation, Dundas likened Wade's and Forbes's swoop on the Glasgow magistrates to the Highland Host, and a similar cultural memory was evoked by Robert Wodrow and by a pamphleteer at Glasgow, William Tennoch.[36]

---

34 NAS, GD.18/3194.4, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Robert Dundas to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, 19 March 1726.

35 The letter was concluded by a footnote in Penicuik's handwriting. 'Nota: This letter made a great deal of noise I having shown it to John Forbes... Mr Dundas complained that I should have shown it to any of the gentlemen of the shire'.

36 NAS, GD.18/3203, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Belchies to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, March 5 1726. William Tennoch, *A letter from a gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London*, (1725), p.27.

Contemporaries' reactions, and particularly Walpole's statement above questioning the 'necessity of maintaining 6,000 men in Scotland' in relation to the cost of the Malt Tax, strongly suggests that fiscal policy and military policy were linked and raises questions about the suddenly revived Highland campaign. That this represented a definite change of gear, is strongly asserted in Penicuik's comment to the minister of Greyfriars during the Edinburgh brewers' strike, 'I am sorry likewise to observe to you that there is a new sort of politics interwoven in our tumults, for now that we are exhausted of our monie we are fond of troops to bring monie again amongst us'.[37]

The Highland adventure comes increasingly to resemble a pretext or cover for a more sinister policy, as does the constant references to *agents provocateurs* which are made by Wodrow, Tennoch and the Fife pamphleteer. Dundas's suggestion that 'ane unanimous vigourous opposition' might have succeeded in forcing the Treasury to drop their plans altogether, is also notable in the light of the events of the summer of 1725, for resistance was strongest in Squadrone strongholds, such as Haddington and Dundee, and Forbes of Culloden had been convinced that an entire national campaign of resistance was on foot, inspired by the Squadrone, in which Glasgow was the storm centre - as it was certainly the scene of the worst violence. Indeed Forbes's official correspondence with the Regency during the crisis makes it quite clear that his intention was to make an example of Glasgow in order to break the back of the alleged revolt, and 'strick terror' into all the rest, a conclusion which was repeated by Lockhart of Carnwath.

---

37 NAS, GD18.3199.5, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, John Clerk to Rev John Hart, 20th August 1725.

The political circumstances of Glasgow council at that time were that it straddled a political fault line between the recently discredited Argathelian interest which had held power in the city since 1716, and the old Squadrone party which was still influential, with strong local interests in the Presbytery and clerical establishment at Glasgow. A revolt of quite a different sort had occurred since 1723, in the form of the gradual purge of the Argathelians, who were charged with co-operating with Walpole's measures against the vital interests of the city itself. In 1722 the the city was plunged into a sudden crisis by both the Tobacco Act and the changes in the Customs and Excise, for Walpole had re-organised customs collection on a UK basis and dismantled the separate Scottish division which was set up at the Union. In the new organisation most of the officers were English and they appear to have come increasingly into conflict with the Barons of the Exchequer over alleged abuses. Such policies proved highly prejuducial to Scotland's interest, especially in the west country. The provost of Glasgow, Charles Miller, and most of the magistrates seized by Forbes, had recently broken from the Argathelians and were poised to shake out the rest of that party's sympathisers in the autumn elections. Indeed, it was even rumoured that Forbes's plan in seizing them was to physically prevent them from making such a return, (this technique had been used in councils elsewhere in the run-up to the 1722 general elections in which the Argathelians had made considerable gains) and although there is no direct suggestion of this in his correspondence, his plan of having them put out of office for dereliction of duty would certainly have achieved this end. However, the magistrates were liberated on petition to the High Court of Justiciary, no case being found against them, and were freed on bail - but in a further connection with the

Highland policy - it was suggested that this be *double* bail, in terms of the late Disarming Act, a clause of which provided for double penalties against 'rebels'.

The Argathelians had considered they had won Glasgow in 1716, a city remarkable for its Protestant Hanoverian loyalism, now they were about to lose it, largely by their clumsy and arbitrary attempts to 'attaint' it with disloyalty and by their mercenary conduct in supporting causes detrimental to the city's interests. Not, however to the Squadrone, but to an independent grouping determined to shake off the destructive evils of party politics once and for all and resurrect the civic identity of which Glasgow had been notably proud.

A new group emerged at Glasgow called *Plotters and Revolutioners* whose key propagandist was the foresaid William Tennoch.[38] The Revolutioners claimed that party political struggles for control of Port Glasgow in the appointment of the Customs House officials, had been the source of much infighting on the council in recent years, and in an eve of election broadsheet urged the magistrates to 'throw off parties of great men and let the good town of Glasgow be your party' [39] taking as their motto, *Pro Republica Semper.*[40] Significantly, Tennoch referred to the 'spiritual tyranny' which had lately been perpetuated by the Squadrone in its links with the clerical establishment and the 'patriotism' of the late Rev. John Anderson, minister of the Ramshorn, in exposing and undermining this. Yet he revealed himself to be no less opposed to the

---

38 Robert Wodrow, *Analecta, or Materials for a History of Remarkable Providences mostly relating to the Scotch ministers and Christians,* 4 vols., iii, Maitland Club, (Edinburgh, 1842-43), p.166.

39 William Tennoch, 'Nathaniel Glasgow', *A Letter to the Magistrates and Town Council of Glasgow,* (1725). [NLS RB.s.1465 (3)].

40 William Tennoch, 'Nathaniel Glasgow', *A Copy of Two Letters to the Magistrates and Town Council of Glasgow,* (1725). [NLS RB.s.1465 (4)].

military-fiscal tyranny being perpetuated by the Argathelians. They agitated for the council to carry through the projected purge of the Argyll interest 'that have openly enough declared themselves our Enemies' and the Argathelians were duly routed in the autumn elections. This purge however, represented a considerable test of nerve, the pamphleteers urging the council to stand up to tyranny and 'show yourselves to be men', for Argyll's party now ruthlessly controlled the public administration in Scotland and the trial of the magistrates was still pending. The question of Shawfield's damages had also yet to come up. Tennoch however argued that the council could resist the 'slavery' of the 'great men' and win, urging that 'it is within your power to make them serve you, which you can easily do by following their example and doing with them what they do to you; I mean by neglecting their interests and minding your own'. He also exhorted them to mind their rights under the British constitution, that they had a right to petition the king and be heard in parliament.

In addition to the local campaign to rid the council of the Argyll party, Tennoch began a parliamentary campaign designed to make those in the legislature aware of the injustice suffered by Bushell's actions. Accordingly at the end of July a pamphlet was published at London, which gave the history of the riots from a Glasgow perspective and was designed to be distributed to all the members of the House at the opening of the next session.[41] This complained of a concerted campaign to suppress the truth and claimed that 'almost all letters from this city have been opened at the post office in Edinburgh and those of them destroyed that endeavoured to disabuse the world by giving a faithfull history'. Tennoch stated that the rage of the mob was provoked by

41 Tennoch, *A Letter from a gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London, containing an impartial History,* [NLS RB.s.1465 (1)].

their belief that the military power had come to enforce the levying of the Malt Tax and refuted the myth put about by Forbes that Bushell had ever given warning by firing with powder only. Two people were instantly killed by the first fire, and neither had Bushell read the Riot Act, nor consulted with the civil authority before firing. In fact, after the first shots were heard, he had defied the magistrates' orders to cease fire immediately.[42]

Forbes's correspondence confirms the rioters' supposition that the troops were indeed there to enforce the levy; they were in fact requested by the Commissioners of Excise on supposed intelligence from local excise officers that a campaign of resistance was intended in the western shires. Accordingly Wade had ordered Bushell with two company's of Delorain's troops, to set out for Glasgow from the Canongate the day before the Malt Tax was even due to come into operation. The General then remained in Edinburgh, being delayed from embarking on his journey to the Highlands by what was probably a diplomatic illness. During his unexpectedly extended stop-over, the riots took place at Glasgow, and Wade was thus quite by chance on hand to deal with them.[43] The General stayed put, awaiting reinforcements before descending on Glasgow like a mighty conqueror.

Tennoch reported the strength of Wade's military swoop on Glasgow, and the whole provocative militaristic arrangements under which the investigations into the riots were conducted. Wade and Forbes arrived on the 9 July (approximately two weeks after the riots) with 1300 or 1400 men, including several independant companies, who

---

42 ibid., p.14.

43 *More Culloden Papers.*

set up cannons and mortars in the middle of the city (pop. 17,000). They remained one week, during which time the kilns were gauged, yet despite the heavy military presence, and the recent massacre of citizens, the brewers still offered some resistance, for Forbes had to threaten additional financial penalties before he could gain the compliance of the malt-men.

> Strong guards, both horse and foot, were kept, two centinels on horseback set at every gate, and patrols went over the whole town every hour, both day and night: In short, no stricter Guards could have been kept if Hannibal had been at the gates.[44]

Forbes began taking precognitions; in all, about one hundred witnesses were interviewed, but made little headway with discovering the mobbers. Then thirty or forty citizens were suddenly seized one Sunday night, in their beds, on the singular 'evidence' of two spies Forbes had sent ahead to gather information. They were committed to jail and charged with being involved in the destruction of Shawfield's property. The conduct of Wade and Forbes was thoroughly provoking throughout, especially their bringing Bushell back from Dumbarton, who now swaggered about the town unmolested in the very streets in which he had recently caused so much bloodshed. This caused strong complaint to be made, to which Wade retorted, 'that His Majesty's troops must not be affronted', a remark which roused strong feeling and was long remembered. The magistrates were finally seized on the very last day, suddenly, quite without warning, and charged with aiding and abetting the rioters by their inaction in

---

44 Tennoch, *A Letter from a gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London, containing an impartial History,* [NLS RB.s.1465 (1)].

dealing with the riot at Shawfield's house, especially by their not using Bushell's troops, then present in their town, to the full force that the military was capable of. The warrant which was used to apprehend them, was merely that of Forbes, as a JP of Lanarkshire. Tennoch concluded his pamphlet by an exposition of the historical experience of *agent provocateur*, much in the same vein as the Fife pamphleteer:

> In some late Reigns, before the happy Revolution, we were governed by a Military Power, and soldiers were left at liberty to commit all manner of Mischiefs; but God be thanked the scene is changed: We have a just and gracious king upon the Throne; we have a noble Constitution; we have a just and wise Parliament, who are the Patrons and Bulwarks, not only of our own Liberties, but also the supporters of the distressed in most places in Europe. Party Rage may drive on things for a while: but our Laws will at length triumph over those that endeavour to cover some enormous offenders, who have delighted to oppress the Innocent[45]

After the autumn elections the magistrates raised a case against Bushell, assisted by Dundas, and succeeded in having him convicted of murder, much to the embarassment of the Regency. These now arranged with Newcastle to have him pardoned and by the time that Shawfield's petition for damages was being discussed by the House, Bushell was a free man again, and the Regency were raising the question of putting the Scottish bench on trial for having convicted Bushell and liberated the Glasgow magistrates.

The quartering of English troops at Glasgow continued for many years after 1725, presumably to assist the enforcement of the Malt Tax. Soldiers were frequently

---

45 ibid., p.27.

mentioned in contemporaries' accounts, who also noted that the presence of the troops bred tensions. For instance, in the winter following the riots 'the major of the regiment (that) is here' had requested a meeting house for their chaplain, but Provost Stark (Miller's successor, and even more strongly opposed to the Argathelians than Miller) 'did not think they were obliged to furnish them any place for that purpose'. Then the following year, Wodrow mentioned that some drunken English soldiers going through the town at night shouting 'up with the Campbells and down with the Grahams' had very nearly incited a riot.[46] The occasion was the recently elected M.P. for Glasgow Burghs, Thomas Blackwood, losing his seat, on a Commons vote at the instigation of Walpole, and the hated Argathelian candidate, Shawfield, being then re-instated for a further seven years. The soldiers appeared to support the Argathelian candidate, much to the chagrin of the inhabitants. Further evidence of the continued presence of the military are the lists of honorary burgess tickets given out at Glasgow after 1725.[47] The civic authorities were long in the habit of giving out free tickets to those whom they wished to court, honour, or at least stay on the right side of. Until the practise of recording tickets issued 'gratis' was abandoned in 1730, no fewer than four English regiments are mentioned and a score or so officers and their retainers honoured annually with the freedom of the city. The first of these was the Royal Regiment of Welsh Fusiliers, whose officers and lieutenants received burgess tickets on the 4 November 1725 and 23 August 1726; this was followed by Lt. General Whitham's regiment of foot in August and September 1727; Lord Cadogan's regiment of foot in

---

46 Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii, p.495.

47 J. R. Anderson, ed., *Burgesses and Guild-Brethren of Glasgow*, 1573-1750, SRS, (Edinburgh, 1925).

August and September 1728; and Major General Haywood's regiment of dragoons, also in September 1728.

The December following the riots, the quarter-master, William Marshall, asked the Town Council for a pay rise 'in respect of the great fatigue, trouble and service he has undergone this last summer and must undergo during the military's continuing here.'[48] The Council granted his petition and trebled his salary. Then again, in 1728, Alexander Wotherspoon, quarter-master, similarly requested an augmentation 'in respect of the military's continuing here'.[49]

Despite the heavy use of the military it is striking the extent to which this did not at first intimidate but in fact inspired an even greater militancy. When Forbes issued indictments against several of the Edinburgh brewers, he was surprised that they had 'shown a great deal of obstinacy' and even laughed at their sentence. And when some were imprisoned as an example, the others threatened with the same 'appeared in the streets in order to be seized; the rest of their brethren in place of being frightened, seem at present to be out of humour that they are not so honoured with a committment also'. Some brewers were charged with double the duty for not complying, and despite being offered a lesser fine, chose unanimously to reject the offer and continued the strike. It was public opinion which in the end broke the strike, not the threats of the Lord Advocate. Dundas's petition to the Court of Session on the behalf of the brewers was full of spirit, charging the Court with being 'the supreme explainers of laws but not yet the makers of laws' to the extent that it was ordered by the magistrates (firm

---

48 *BRG*, 11/12/1725, p.247.

49 *BRG*, 7/3/1728, p.295.

Argathelians since 1715) to be burned by the common hangman. When it was speculated that Dundas was behind it, he boasted that to save the Court the trouble of an inquiry after the author 'if they would but call upon him, he would sign it in their presence'.

The response of the citizens of Glasgow in shaking off the Argathelians when the fate of the magistrates hung in the balance was also no less resolute. Political resistance continued for some years, the election of Blackwood in 1727 being the most noted example of the citizens' firm rejection of the Argyll party. Through the mediation of Lord Milton, Ilay's chief 'doer', a better accommodation was gradually gained with the administration, but the relationship was not a subordinate one and there is indication that Tennoch's advice was taken, that the magistrates look the town's interest before the 'great men's and 'make them serve you'.

Thus in conclusion it would appear that when looked at in detail, the Glasgow Malt Tax Riots were hardly an isolated incident, but were part of a generalised popular revolt in reaction to a radical shift in policy occasioned by Walpole's attempt to gain further Treasury control in Scotland. This showed scant regard either for the legal settlement of the Treaty of Union or for what was believed of British justice in regard to 'the military power' following the Revolution. It provoked a crisis in Anglo-Scottish relations which again threatened the Union as in 1713. However Walpole, now assisted by Argyll's party, was prepared to use a degree of ruthlessness which was formerly lacking in the previous administration to quell resistance to fiscal measures; the former regime had been prepared to take more of a gradualist approach. And yet at this critical juncture matters were not allowed to fester, for it provoked a further revision of policy

north of the Border. Penicuik was amongst others in believing that the economic deprivations would be profoundly destabilising, and one cannot help but sense in his letters a deep sense of frustration and disappointment that his careful and patient work in the Revenue was being destroyed by more mercenary elements elsewhere. To George Drummond in London he confessed his private view that 'the poverty and misery of Scotland will, as is the case in private families, be the perpetual source of troubles, it will stir up an inveterate hatred at the English nation and disaffection to the government'.[50] Accordingly, schemes for economic regeneration put on hold for years, were suddenly revived which involved the grant of substantial sums in bounties - equivalent to that, in fact, designed to be raised by the Malt Tax. Forbes's suggestion that the surplus above the £20,000 be applied to a scheme for the improvement of manufactories, was in time accepted at least in outline.[51] The receipts were to be lodged in the Exchequer's hands for the improvement of the fishing, woollen, and linen manufactues, and the following year Article 15 was finally fulfilled by an act of parliament setting up the Board of Manufactures.[52] Thus a familiar pattern continued into the eighteenth century - that of London meddling and of Edinburgh managing - and the government and misgovernment of Scotland remained entangled in this complex impasse.

---

50 NAS, GD18/3199.1, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik to George Drummond, 22 February 1726.

51 NAS, GD18/3205.2, Clerk of Penicuik Muniments, Alex Belchies to Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, 10 May 1726.

52 Ferguson, *Scotland: 1689 to Present*, p.180.

Part II, the local background

'Quaeque ipse miserrima vidi'[53]

The following narrative account indicates that the spirit of liberty and the right of resistance was very much alive at Glagow in 1725. Criticism was levelled against the corruption of courtiers but loyalism to the Crown never wavered. The burgesses' response reveals that they were opposed to the spirit of party rather than the British state to which they appealed for justice, in the expectation that this would be delivered. This again reveals the extent to which they viewed their membership and support of it as essentially contractual. The tyrannous actions of Forbes of Culloden reveal him to have made critical misjudgements of the situation in his zeal for party.

On the 20 July 1725, Forbes of Culloden sent an account of the riots, with other relevant enclosures on the case, to Charles Delafaye, Secretary to the Regency, for the consideration of the Lords Justices.[54] This was with a view to having the Glasgow

---

53 Virgil, *Aneid* ,'Which terrible things I myself saw'. Following the siege of Troy, Aeneas and his fellow Trojans have ended up in Carthage at the court of Queen Dido. Aneas now tells Dido of the events which led up to the siege and of the actual siege itself. This phrase, taken from classical literature, referring to the siege of Troy, was seen as a parallel to the invasion of Glasgow by General Wade and the Argathelians, and was quoted by Tennoch in *A Letter from a Gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London containing an impartial History,* [NLS. RB.s.1465 (1)].

54 NLS MSS.2966, Culloden Papers, f169-174, afterwords referred to as 'the Lord Advocate's Account', (which is identical to a copy dated 26 July 1725, appearing in Solicitor General, Charles Erskine, Lord Tinwald's papers, NLS MSS.5127, Erskine-Murray Papers, f.25-30). It was accompanied by a long letter, Lord Advocate to Delafaye, 20 July, 1725, p.282-3, along with eight other enclosueres, below. Some of this material has been published, in *Culloden Papers*, ed. H. R. Duff, (London, 1815), and *More Culloden Papers*, ed. D. Warrand, 2 vols., (Inverness, 1923-30).

'An Account of the several magistrates of Glasgow touching the late Riots there'. [*Culloden Papers*, CXV, p.86].

'Examination of the Magistrates'. [*Culloden Papers*, CCCLXXV].

'Accounts of Bailies Stirling and Johnstone to be inserted in the public newspapers and afterwards printed and hawked about in a detatched piece of paper'. [*Culloden Papers*, CCCLXXV].

magistrates tried for treason, or at least, dismissed from office, although they were elected representatives of a chartered self-governing community and, (treason apart) otherwise independent men whose public office was technically beyond the pale of the state. Forbes though, who claimed to have studied 'the Municipal laws of Scotland', evidently reckoned himself a sufficient judge.[55]

Indeed the perception of the office of magistrate in a Scottish Royal Burgh continued to occupy legal men's minds in the eighteenth century, as they sought to portray it in a constitutional context they could understand, but failed adequately to account for it. Inevitably, the constitutional context which they could most readily understand was English, and there was no English equivalent of a Scottish Royal Burgh - perhaps the closest was the County Town.[56] Forbes of Culloden in 1725, no less than Lord Kames in 1749, (when the magistrates were attempting to extend their jurisdiction

---

'List of Rioters, furnished by the magistrates'.

'The warrant of committment for the magistrates'.

'The second petition of the magistrates to the Lords of Justiciary, on their obtaining an attested copy of their warrant of commitment'.

'Lord Advocate's answers to their second petition'.

'Lord Advocate's letter to the magistrates of 25 June 1725' [*Culloden Papers*, CIX] p.79.

All these documents were itemised in *More Culloden Papers*, p.282-3. Tinwald eventually received copies of nos. 1-5, and 9.

55 George Menary, *Life and Letters of Duncan Forbes of Culloden*, (London, 1936), p.13, quoting Brunton and Haig, *An Historical Account of the Senators of the College of Justice*. He began this study, some time after September 1707, on his return to Scotland from Leyden where he had been studying law, and appears to have been self-taught.

56 See David Murray's discussion of the fiscal and juridical role of the sheriff in England, which led to the creation of the County Town, and the creation of Glasgow into such on the English model in 1893, for no other reason than to enlarge the honorary patronage network, D. Murray, *Early Burgh Organisation in Scotland*, vol i, (Glasgow, 1924), p.180. 'As Glasgow was, and had for centuries, been independent there was no necessity for this step, and the only apparent reason for it was to give the lord provost the dignity of a lord lieutenant of a county, with power to create a large number of deputies and a legion of justices of the peace'.

into the barony of Glasgow following the Abolition of the Heritable Jurisdictions Act)[57] continued to surmise that magistrates were a kind of sheriff or sheriff depute,[58] with the implication that the state ought to be able to hire and fire them at will - which was of course, nonsense. Although 'clientalism' developed extensively throughout the eighteenth century in Royal Burghs, outright Crown or state appointments of Lord Provosts had never been a fixed constitutional proceedure of the Scottish civic tradition.[59] It is also important to recall that the rights and privileges of the Royal Burghs were restored by the Revolution and guaranteed by the Treaty of Union and that there was no subsequent constitutional alteration of their legal status to support the premise of state control. This was purely a cultural interpretation, only one indication of the instability of the political-legal environment of the eighteenth century, and the way in which the state, or those who felt they acted for it, was trying to nibble its way into the medieval *demesnes* of the Royal Burghs.

This process of subversion of a constitution was most tragically effected at Glasgow in 1725 by the use of the military. In the story which follows, no less than in

---

57 City of Glasgow Archives, Administrative note, A2.1.1, 'Powers of the city', f.13, *Answers to the Memorial and Queries for the Lord Provost and Magistrates of Glasgow,* Henry Home, 3 August 1749. After having searched the available records of the Circuit Court, Kames commented: 'this matter seems to us a little dark and no wonder considering how little is left us of the antiquities and history of our law. In particular we know extremely little of the history and constitution of our royal burghs and what were the original priviledges and burdens accompanying such erections'. This brief comment by an exact contemporary may appear to cast doubt on the confidence of Forbes of Culloden's knowledge of the municipal laws.

58 ibid. Kames' legal reasoning led him to the conclusion that magistrates in Royal Burghs 'are as much bound to obey the king than the sheriff is' ... 'they are also the king's ministers within that territory'. This imputation of a *ministerial* role for the magistrates, as with much of the reasoning of the constitutional history in this piece, was, as Kames admitted, 'conjectural'. The magistrates were appointed by the council - a minister is appointed by the king.

59 The Crown did on occasion try to make appointments in the 16th century. See Theodora Keith, 'Municipal Elections in the Royal Burghs of Scotland', *SHR* (13) 1916, p.116-117. The Civil War saw intervention by Committee of Estates in the 1640's and Cromwell tried to appoint magistrates in the 1650's. After the Restoration the various oaths and Test Acts attempted (by arguably more constitutional means, ie, acts of parliament or Privy Council) to effect a 'loyal' magistracy - but these infringements were resisted as being untypical 'arbitrary' measures with no constitutional foundation.

the case of the Elgin shooting in July,[60] it is at once apparent that the fiscal machinery of the country; that is, the local officers of excise and their central directorate in Edinburgh, were going into hyper-drive, concerting with Wade and the Lord Advocate, to assume the powers of the Crown over and above the heads of elected civil authorities and even the terms of the Revolution Settlement itself. Royal warrant was the only constitutionally legitimate basis for such drastic interventions, but even then, the Revolution had enshrined the rights of subjects vis a vis the Crown. Any infringement of Crown rights such as non-payment of HM's taxes ought to have been submitted to a due process of law; but Forbes, Wade and Walpole were men in a hurry, eager either to please their political masters or to secure their parliamentary influence. George I barely understood the English constitution, let alone Scotland's, and the Regency which he appointed to oversee royal government whilst he was abroad in Hanover, was equally in the dark and depended on the legal advice it received from the Lord Advocate. Unlike the independently and constitutionally-minded Dundas, Forbes approached the matter as little more than a client of the Regency, and was prepared to bend over backwards to accommodate their 'instructions' - until interrupted by Ilay in August, in his capacity as Justice General.

Culloden's narrative and correspondence with the Lords Justices stated unambiguously that it was Wade who had ordered out two companies of Delorain's troops from the Canongate to Glasgow for the purpose of enforcing the Malt Tax; thus answering two questions which were speculated over by contemporaries, and have never been adequately addressed by historians, firstly, *what* was the exact purpose of

---

60 Warrand, *More Culloden Papers*, Magistrates of Elgin to Duncan Forbes, 5 July 1725, pp. 263-4; and Culloden's reply, 10 July 1725, p.264,

the military? And secondly, *who* called them out? Even well-informed individuals such as Robert Wodrow or the pamphleteer William Tennoch, do not appear to have had any clear idea what HM's troops were doing in Glasgow on 24 June 1725.[61] Clearly there was a perception of fiscal absolutism, but the facts of the matter were not, *a priori,* incontrovertible. There is even a hint that it was somewhat subversive or libellous to suggest that the coming of the troops might be in order to support the levying of the Malt Tax, which suggests insecurity. It would have represented an open admission that the tactics of the Restoration were *de facto* those of the Whigs under Walpole. The magistrates' various writings do not state what the purpose of the military was, and neither does Culloden make this explicit in any of his public statements. It is in his private correspondence that we find clear evidence that these directives issued from the fiscal machinery acting in tandem with the military. But the muted reaction of educated contemporaries indicates that the despatch of the troops in the summer of 1725 was a shadowy operation. The whole question was fuzzed over with uncertainty, and nowhere does there appear from documentary evidence the semblance of a stated public policy which was an indisputable fact to those who ranked outside the narrow confines of government. Indeed, in the conditions of post-Revolution Scotland, it would have created a scenario for national rebellion for a government to have openly declared in the prints its intention of implementing such a policy. Uncertainty as to government

---

61 Tennoch wrote, that to quiet the populace, 'who thought that these Troops had come to support the levying of the Malt Tax', the Provost suggested they be dispersed to separate billets on the first evening - and avoids stating his own knowledge or opinion of the matter of why the troops were there. Tennoch, *A Letter from a gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London,* p.6. [NLS, RB.s.1465 (1)]. This lack of firm knowledge was again replicated by Robert Wodrow in his journal, 'a report was spread that Shawfield, who went out of his house the day before, had sent souldiers in to the toun ... and other idle storys', Wodrow, *Analecta*, vol.iii, p 211. Earlier, Wodrow had noted, of the extensive changes in the military which had taken place at the end of May and the beginning of June 1725, that the 'Duke of Argyle and his party have, they say, brought this change about, to put in execution the disarming of the Highlands by the late act of Parliament, and to bring about the uplifting of the malt-tax imposed this session'. ibid., p. 209.

action inhibited educated opinion from formulating a rational response, whilst the general populace was by the same factor propelled to new heights of irrationality and rebellion against authority, further widening the gulf between the governing élites and those whom they purported to govern.

The Lord Advocate's correspondence that summer makes it clear that Wade gave the order to send the military on or before the 22 June, the date the troops set off on their march west. That is, before any riot or disturbance was ever recorded. Only one company seems to have been dispatched, however, Captain Bushell apparently expecting to be re-inforced the next day,[62] although there is some doubt about this.[63] It emerges that the decision to send the military in advance of any trouble was taken upon information being received by the excise establishment at Edinburgh, that the maltmen of Glasgow had resolved not to co-operate with the officers of the excise or allow access to their kilns, and that they were to be assisted in their opposition by mobs and tumults. For instance, in a letter to John Scrope, the Secretary to the Treasury, dated the 24 June, just prior to the riots, Forbes confessed to his friend that he considered it none other than 'a species of madness' which was currently inducing the people of Glasgow to pile up 'stones and brickbatts at each maltsters door, as so many magazines of ammunition, with which the Mob was to demolish the officers if they should presume to attend any survey'.[64] As expected, the officers were unable to guauge the kilns on 23

---

62 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/1020.18, John Graham to Mungo Graham of Gorthie, Glasgow, 25 June 1725. Graham, who happened to have come into Glasgow on business, writes, 'in the evening (of 24 June) there came in a hundred of the military'. The magistrates' account gives Bushell as readily agreeing to the dispersal of his troops when they were locked out of the guard house 'by reason his men being fatigued and few and saying he expected to be reinforced the next day with two other companies'. *BRG*, 31/7/1725, 'Magistrates and Burgh Council of Glasgow to the King,' (henceforth, 'Magistrates' account') p.227.

63 The Magistrates' account stated there were two companies of Delorain's troops. *BRG*, 31/7/1725, p.226.

64 Warrand, *More Culloden Papers*, Lord Advocate to John Scrope, 24 June 1725, p.246.

June and were obliged to retreat;[65] the news was soon relayed back to Culloden in Edinburgh.[66]

The magistrates' official account of the riots was sent to the Regency on 31 July, and was addressed to the King.[67] Delafaye acknowledged receipt of it on 5 August and duly passed it on to the King at Hanover. This represented the resistance on the 23 June as a very low-key affair, 'consisting chiefly of women and boys' which was easily dispersed and they discreetly avoided any mention of whether or not the kilns had been guauged on that or the following day. There is no indication from Culloden's papers either that the resistance initially encountered by the excisemen was any way unduly violent. But despite an uneventful beginning, Forbes claimed that a plan to destroy Shawfield's house had been on foot for some time beforehand and that this was well known to the authorities in Edinburgh.[68] Others refuted this[69], and the factor of the premeditation or spontaneity of the mob was to be discussed at great length and was crucial to the authorities in establishing the 'treasonable' nature of the crimes as conscious acts of rebellion against the government. 'The general cry of these people' claimed the Lord Advocate in his report to Delafaye, 'was that they would submit to no

---

65 ibid.

66 At a distance of approximately 50 miles, news reached Edinburgh from Glasgow within 24 hours and vice versa. The quickest communication between Edinburgh and London took 5 days. Government communications were prioritised and travelled faster than ordinary mail.

67 *BRG*, 31/7/1725, p.225-229.

68 NLS MSS.2966, Culloden Papers, (Paper no. 1, of the enclosures sent by the Lord Advocate to Charles Delafaye, 20 July 1725), f169-174. This document is identical to NLS 5127, Erskine-Murray Papers, f.25-30. '... concerning whom (Shawfield) it was reported at Edinburgh and in several other places some days before the thing happenned, that his house was to be pillaged and pulled down'.

69 Wodrow, *Analecta*, vol iii, p.210-211.

malt tax but that they would take vengeance of the authors of it'[70]. There can thus be no ambiguity regarding Culloden's opinion of the premeditation of the mob.

The real rioting began the day the military arrived (Thursday 24 June) and continued throughout that night (24/25) with the looting and destruction of Shawfield's property. The bloody confrontation with the troops took place on the afternoon of 25 June (Friday). Even after Bushell was hastily expelled from the city in the aftermath of the massacre, the looters returned to Shawfield's house and continued their destruction that night (25/26) and into Saturday morning, by which time any valuables which may have attracted the interest of common thieves the previous night, may be assumed to have gone. The mob which returned the second night was clearly not motivated by profit. A clear statement of its objectives can be seen by the fact that it was equipped with demolition gear and was intent on removing the roof - the internal divisions had succumbed the night before.[71] The second night's anarchy was fuelled by fury at the massacre. It was also facillitated by the fact that three of the magistrates, viz., the Provost, Dean of Guild, and the Trades bailie, Mitchell, (who was a maltster to trade), had all fled the city. Their departure followed shortly after Bushell's.[72] Having failed to prevent a rout of the citizens in an armed confrontation with the military, they feared for their lives. The other two magistrates, Bailie Stirling and Bailie James Johnston, left the city some days beforehand and were absent for the entirety of the riots. Only the Deacon Convener remained in the city throughout the disturbances, but he kept an

---

70 NLS MSS.2966, Culloden Papers, f169-174, and infra.

71 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220/5/1020.18, John Graham to Mungo Graham of Gorthie, Glasgow, 25 June 1725.

72 *Culloden Papers,* CXIV, pp. 86-88, 'An Account of the Conduct of the several Magistrates of Glasgow, touching the late Riots there'. (No.2 of the documents sent to Delafaye on 20 July).

extremely low profile and made no attempt at keeping order. He had gone to ground shortly after Bushell arrived in Glasgow on Thursday evening.

The Sabbath saw a return to normality, when Bailie Johnstone returned to the city and assumed some measure of governance. It was he, for instance, who replied to Culloden's urgent letter of 25 June,[73] but his reply was not penned until Monday 28 June. Thus in essence, runs the outline of events.

Trouble had begun even before Bushell's troops arrived. This was omitted by the magistrates in their account, but the arrival of the troops evidently worsened matters. Zacharias Murdoch, merchant, councillor, and farmer of the burgh ale tax of 2d on the pint, gave evidence before Culloden at the enquiry in July. He stated that about 11am on Thursday 24 June, 30 or 40 people had been observed coming up the Saltmarket towards the Town House. Their leader was a woman, brandishing a great stick in a threatening manner. Provost Miller approached the woman, seized the stick out of her hand and chided 'the gathering'. The woman was then committed to the Tolbooth.[74] The deputy Town Clerk, John McGilchrist, added that she was imprisoned because she had attacked one of the town guard. However she was released later that afternoon because a fresh mob were threatening to break down the Tolbooth door in order to liberate her.[75]

The troops entered the city about 6pm on Thursday 24 June. Bushell had sent word ahead of their imminent arrival and so their entrance was expected. It was

---

73 *Culloden Papers*, CIX, p. 79. Lord Advocate to the Magistrates of Glasgow, Edinburgh, 25 June 1725.

74 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4371, 'Precognitions taken by the Lord Advocate, Glasgow, 10-16 July, 1725', Zacharias Murdoch's statement.

75 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4371, 'Precognitions taken by the Lord Advocate, Glasgow, 10-16 July', John McGilchrist's statement.

intended that they should have the main guard house in the Trongate as their principal lodging, although there was insufficient accommodation for all the troops and it was always intended that the remainder would be put up in private homes. Provost Miller ordered the guard house to be swept out and a fire lit ready for the men. This building was situated some 200 or 250 yards from the Town House and Cross, towards the western end of the city. Since the soldiers had come from the Canongate, Edinburgh, it is likely that they approached the town from the east, marching along the Edinburgh Road and down the Gallowgate. This means that they would have passed in full view of Provost Miller and his group in the Town House, from which vantage point the magistrates could command a view south, east and west across the city, especially from the top of the great external stair. Bushell soon discovered that the guard house was locked, the mob having run off with the keys. He drew his troops up in the street outside the building and promptly went off in search of the chief magistrate, claiming later to have experienced great difficulty in finding him. This suggests that he was shunned by the magistracy on his arrival, or else not made sufficiently aware of their whereabouts even as he marched past them.[76] Most probably however, it was the presence of the mob outside the guard house which prevented Bushell from discovering the whereabouts of the Provost. Word of the lock-out was meanwhile brought to Miller, who was also informed that the Town's Officers[77] had been unable to force open

---

76 NLS, Erskine Murray Papers, Ch.4373 (iv), Bushell's precognition, 'after a long search found him in the street and went along with him to the clerk's chamber'.

77 The Treasurer's accounts indicate that were between 12 and 16 Town's Officers. They were part-salaried, receiving a 'fiall' for services rendered annually, but otherwise they were essentially franchised to receive fees for the various functions they carried out such as tax-collection, issuing of warrants and proclamations, and other low-security policing and law-enforcement duties. They also acted as a civic guard for the magistrates. The Town Guard however, was unsalaried and was drawn from amongst the burgesses.

the doors, 'being bruised and beat off'[78] by the mob gathered outside. On receiving this news, Provost Miller strode angrily down the Trongate, determined to see the job done himself. Culloden, however, portrayed Miller as being too timid to order the doors broken down, having 'pretended to be affraid that such violence would irritate the Mob,'[79] although the Provost's determination to see access gained was backed up by a number of witnesses, including McGilchrist.[80]

Bushell claimed that all this time he had been much molested by the crowd, both physically and verbally. Stones had been thrown at them on their arrival, and the mob had 'said the troops were only a breakfast for them'.[81] The magistrates' account played this down. They acknowledged that the presence of the troops had indeed drawn people onto the streets but claimed that this was 'usual on such occasions',[82] insinuating that it was due to simple curiosity. But one independent witness's account, written the next day from Glasgow to a private correspondent, stated that 'at the view of the soldiers the mob were so much exasperat that they continued their opposition (against the excise officers at the kilns and now the military) and about nine at night they fell upon Shawfield's house and ruffled all that was in it or about it, gardens, office houses, furniture and all'.[83]

---

78 *BRG*, 'Magistrates account', 31/7/1725, p.227.

79 *Culloden Papers*, CX, p.80. Lord Advocate to Scrope?, Edinburgh, 26 June 1725.

80 NLS, Erskine Murray Papers, Ch.4371, 'Precognitions taken by the Lord Advocate, Glasgow, 10-16 July, 1725, John McGilchrist's precognition'.

81 NLS, Erskine Murray Papers, Ch.4373, 'Bushell's precognition'.

82 *BRG*, 'Magistrates' account', 31/7/1725, p.226.

83 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220.5.1020.18, John Graham to Mungo Graham of Gorthie, Glasgow, 25 June 1725.

The violence of the mob is crucial in any assessment of the magistrates' behaviour. Their official account repeatedly emphasised that it consisted of no more than women and boys; but this leaves their actions open to the interpretation of being weak, partisan or indecisive. But if they openly acknowledged the alleged violence of the crowd, it would fuel their enemies' accusations that the city was in a state of open rebellion. Reprisals might then be taken by the government, including a purge of the Revolutioner council. This was not without precedent. For instance, in 1645[84] the civic group which had assisted Montrose and his army, had been removed by order of the Committee of Estates, on the grounds that their action was treasonable. But with Montrose's 6000 strong army camped outside the city, they had no real option but to meet his demands for money and supplies. Needless to say the magistrates of the time protested against the legality of this procedure, a clear breach of the city's liberties, but were unsuccessful on that occasion. However, the heightened circumstances of the Civil War, and the problems of the Restoration period, could hardly serve as a yard-stick for legality or be admitted as a precedent in post-Revolutionary Scotland. Yet this was precisely the quasi-legal way Culloden was attempting to operate, in trying to force the magistrates to compromise themselves, and to set an agenda for their expulsion on grounds of treason. It further reveals the extent to which the political-legal environment of 1725 actually did resemble that of the Restoration and Civil War period.

The problem which now faced Miller and his group was that it was politically imperative to continue to portray the disturbances as minor, even at risk of characterising themselves as inept in the handling of them. This 'ineptitude' angle

---

84 John Gibson, *A History of the City of Glasgow*, (Glasgow, 1777), p.90-99, recounts this in detail, along with the subsequent re-instatement of the 'outed' magistrates at the Engagement.

which the magistrates thus exposed themselves to, was of course fully played up by Culloden. And whilst the magistrates' was certainly a partisan position, it was not necessarily the partisan position they were accused of by Culloden, namely, that they sympathised with the mobbers. It was rather that they, no less than any other civic group before them, were determined to maintain the city's freedom from outside interference, and to protect its constitutional liberties from the encroach of the state.

Miller was met half way down the street by James Henderson, merchant, and Robert Hunter, dyer, and apparently also Bushell. Henderson and Hunter had both just come from the guard house, and warned Miller against trying to intervene, informing him that the mob was now 'much increased' and likely to do him violence.[85] It was Hunter who suggested that the troops be dispersed about the city to private billets, so that 'the spirit of the mob should cool'.[86] The Provost decided to take this advice, and the magistrates' account claimed that Bushell had been only too happy to go along with it 'his men being fatigued and few'.[87] (They were probably also extremely wet and cold, for it had been raining solidly for well over a week).[88] But Bushell claimed later that he had not liked this suggestion at all, as it would mean his men would have difficulty assembling in an emergency, and had only agreed because he was under orders to take instructions from the civil authorities.[89] Hunter however, stated that although Bushell

---

85 NLS, Erskine Murray Papers, Ch.4371, 'Precognitions taken by the Lord Advocate, Glasgow, 10-16 July, 1725, Robert Hunter's statement'; *BRG*, 31/71725. 'Magistrates' account, p.227.

86 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4371, 'Precognitions taken by the Lord Advocate, Glasgow, 10-16 July, 1725. Robert Hunter's statement'.

87 *BRG*, 31/7/1725, 'Magistrates' account', p.227.

88 *Culloden Papers*, Forbes to John Scrope, 24 June, 1725, p.247, mentions the unusually wet June weather.

89 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4373, 'Bushell's precognition'.

had indeed protested, this was to the effect that several private houses had already refused to admit his men; to which Hunter recalled Miller telling the quarter-master, then present, 'find sufficient quarters for them and I shall pay for them myself.'[90] In trying to get Bushell's men off the streets and into private billets it is entirely feasible that Miller was merely trying to avert a dangerous head-on confrontation with the inhabitants, and not to impede the use of the military in an emergency.

The decision to disperse the troops, however, was much criticised by Culloden, who characterised it as an attempt to impede the military from the due exercise of their function. Yet surely their official agenda, nowhere declared openly by either Culloden or the magistrates, (as stated previously), was to see that the kilns were gauged the following day, a purpose which would be quite unaffected by where the men were to rest that night. Furthermore, the guard house was only ever intended to accommodate *some* of Bushell's men - the rest of them had already gone off to their billets even as he went in search of the Provost, as his own account made plain.[91] The contingent who were to billet in the guard house were too small to have formed a rapid reaction force in the event of any major breakdown of order involving hundreds of inhabitants, such as that which converged on Shawfield's house later that night once the troops were finally in bed. If, on the other hand, part of the purpose of the military was to protect Shawfield's property, as Culloden and Bushell seemed to suggest it ought to be (Culloden, as stated previously, having claimed that the authorities in Edinburgh knew well beforehand that there was a plan to destroy it), why were some of the troops not

---

90 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4371, 'Precognitions taken by the Lord Advocate, Glasgow, 10-16 July, 1725. Robert Hunter's statement'.

91 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4373, 'Bushell's precognition'.

ordered to be posted there? Shawfield had vacated his house a couple of days previously, taking his wife and family with him[92] and his substantial mansion, its grounds and office houses, could have accommodated some of the men, doubling as a guard.

After the troops went off the streets, both the magistrates' account and Culloden's witness statements agree that there was an apparent return to normality. The crowds dispersed and the town quietened down. The town guard 'was advertised to meet at the ordinary time', which was between ten and eleven at night. Culloden however, attempted to mis-represent this to Delafaye.[93] Provost Miller with some of the senior burgesses and Colin Campbell of Blythswood, a local heritor and JP, remained at the Town House until shortly after 9pm, after which, there being no further appearances of riot 'they went together to a tavern hard by'.[94] About ten o'clock however, word was brought to the Provost that the mob had risen again and was attacking Shawfield's house, situated at the far western limit of the town. The Provost and his entourage then hurried towards the scene, accompanied by the Town's Officers and attempted to disperse the rioters. This attempt failed, as more mobbers arrived and

---

92 One witness claimed at the enquiry that he had warned Shawfield that his house might be attacked. This was also recorded by Robert Wodrow. The witness, John Wodrow, claimed to have heard a rumour from some 'burn-bearers' (female water-carriers, who had been prominent in the mob) some weeks previously. Shawfield's house had been attacked earlier that year, and the destruction of the property of unpopular or unwanted individuals was a well-known mob tactic. Wodrow, *Analecta*, vol iii, p.216-217.

93 NLS. 5127, Erskine-Murray Papers, f.25-30; *Culloden Papers*, f.169-174. Sent to Delafaye 20 July 1725. 'An Account of the Riots and Tumults that happenned at Glasgow on the 24 and 25 of June last, drawn out from the Examinations taken at Glasgow by his Majesty's Advocate'. Forbes wrote:

'The City, who by its Charter is tyed to watching and warding and for time past memory before the 24th June, never was one night without a burgess guard mounted, except when the regular troops had possession of the Main guard, would have mounted in the ordinary manner a burgess guard, and a strong one too ... even this usual guard was discontinued for that night'. This was refuted elsewhere; Wodrow's account agreed with the magistrates' in stating that, with the Captain's agreement, the usual burgess guard was mounted that night. Wodrow, *Analecta*, vol iii, p.211.

94 *BRG*, 31/7/1725, 'Magistrates' account', p.227.

threatened them, so that they were obliged to retreat.[95] The Provost and his group then returned home. They had not read the Riot Act, although they claimed to have cautioned the mobbers in words to that effect. Culloden was to seize on this technicality as a notable breach of their 'duty', although the following day, Captain Bushell did not read the Riot Act either.

They were standing at Miller's door between 11 and 12 at night discussing the security of the town when a sergeant of the troops approached and called the Provost aside. Blythswood heard the Provost say 'How do you propose to get your men together?' to which the man replied 'By beat of drum'. After some further exchanges the soldier then went off[96]. Robert Robertson, maltman, who was present, said Provost Miller turned to the group and informed them that the soldier had just offered him the service of the troops. He had declined however, because the sergeant had confirmed that the men were now in bed, and could only with difficulty be raised. Miller stated that he feared that the mob, on hearing the drummer, would 'insult' him before the men could be assembled, and that even if the troops were to be successfully mustered, 'they might by firing, have incensed the mob to pull them to pieces and might on their part do mischief to some of the innocent inhabitants'[97].

Provost Miller's decision on this occasion can perhaps be criticised as lacking in force or conviction. However, he was caught between opposing forces and was

---

95 *Culloden Papers,* CXIX, 'A True and Faithfull Account of the proceedings touching the Riots and Tumults which have lately happened in the City of Glasgow', p.92.

96 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4371, 'Precognitions taken by the Lord Advocate, Glasgow, 10-16 July, 1725'. Colin Campbell of Blythswood's precognition.

97 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4371, 'Precognitions taken by the Lord Advocate, Glasgow, 10-16 July, 1725'. Robert Robertson's precognition.

struggling to balance the rights of the government with those of the town - and the welfare of the inhabitants. Whilst it was one matter for him to sanction the use of the troops to uplift HM taxes, (if this *was* what he was being asked to do, and indeed, we do not know that it was) - the defence of purely private property within the burgh was another issue altogether. As Miller might reason it, this was arguably the town's affair, and would come before the burgh court. Further, Shawfield was a very unpopular figure. The use of the military to defend *his* property could have profound implications for the long-term peace and security of the town were it to be a botched job attended with much brutality and bloodshed, as it was clearly likely to be. If Miller truly believed the mob to be unmanageable and dangerous, the sacrifice of Shawfield's property was, in the circumstances, the unavoidable price of the future peace of the town, his own immediate safety that night, and hopefully the guauging of the town's kilns the following day.

The next morning the town was much quietened. According to one visitor who came to Glasgow on business that day, 'the soldiers mounted guard ... about eight in the morning and all continued pretty peaceable till about four in the afternoon'[98] and even Culloden conceded that, 'the Mob appeared less violent; tho' some disorderly persons, who had got themselves Drunk overnight in Mr Campbell's house, continued running riotously up and down the Streets.'[99] Miller succeeded in putting the military in possession of the guard house at about ten or eleven in the forenoon,[100] and after

---

98 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220.5.1020.18, John Graham to Mungo Graham of Gorthie, Glasgow, 25 June 1725.

99 *Culloden Papers*, CX, p.81. Lord Advocate to Scrope (?), Edinburgh, 26 June 1725.

100 Some contention remained about the powder and ball brought by the troops. This had been stored, according to Culloden, 'in the Trongate steeple' by which he probably meant the Tolbooth steeple which adjoined the Town

inspecting Shawfield's house earlier that morning for damages, caused it to be boarded up against further depredations. The Shawfield Mansion was in 'a miserable state', pillaged throughout and with about fifty persons still inside it when the Provost's party arrived. The windows were broken and the doors were pulled off their hinges[101]. Back in town, Miller caused the Deacon Convener and the Dean of Guild to call all the burgesses together in parallel emergency sessions of the Trades House and the Merchants House to discuss security. It was decided to call out two hundred of the burgess militia[102], and these were ordered to be in attendance outside the Town House at three in the afternoon, 'in order to assist in suppressing any tumults might happen'.[103] The Dean of Guild, who was responsible for the burgh's arsenal and for issuing out its arms[104], insisted that the militia be lightly armed 'not with swords but with staves only',[105] a decision criticised by Culloden as evidence of his favouring the rioters.[106]

The first of the militia began arriving at the Town House just after two thirty. But before they gathered, mobs had began assembling on the streets around it and there

---

House. According to Forbes, when, about 12pm, Bushell requested the return of his ammunition, he was met by a mob, and forced into a detour on his return to the guard house. This may have been the cause of the 1pm riot related by McGilchrist, which took place at the Town House. NLS. Erskine-Murray Papers, 5127, f.25-30; *CP*, f.169-174; 'An Account of the Riots and Tumults that happenned at Glasgow'.

101 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4371, 'Precognitions taken by the Lord'. The deputy Town Clerk, John McGilchrist's, statement.

102 The burgh militia was still active at Glasgow in 1725. The burgh records state that there were in all ten 'train bands' of 'town's companies' each with their own captains, lieutenants and ensigns, ie., about 1000 men in all. This was probably equivalent to the number of burgesses.

103 *BRG*, 31/7/1725, Magistrates' account, p.228.

104 This was a standard function of the office of Dean of Guild in Scottish Royal Burghs.

105 *Culloden Papers*, CXV, p.87. 'An account of the Conduct of the several Magistrates of Glasgow, touching the late Riots there; from whence those Acts of Malversation in Office are deduced for which they are Committed, and may be Tryed.'

106 sibid.

began a repeat of the rituals of the day before. Culloden stated that this was due to the Provost managing to apprehend a few of the mobbers earlier in the day, 'but that Act of his alarmed the Mob afresh, who got together in great numbers to Rescue the Prisoners',[107] however this might also have been due to the return of Bushell's ammunition which was housed overnight in the 'Trongate steeple'. According to the deputy Town Clerk, a woman with a cudgell, accompanied by about fifty 'disorderly people' had indeed been seized by the Provost and his group in the early afternoon, just after one o' clock. And like the day before, threats from the mob had forced her eventual liberation. However, the woman was not arrested for her involvement in the Shawfield Mansion demolition, but for her part in a disorderly public demonstration. Not long afterwards Robert Laing, merchant, gave an account of another, similar, disturbance.

> about half an hour after two in the afternoon, I was at the Cross and saw some women and children coming from the Gallowgate towards the Tronegate in a tumultuous manner in company with a woman beating a drum, but did not see any men with them above the age of fifteen years, and but very few of those.[108]

This mob, which like the earlier one seems to have been largely female and juvenile, was easily chased by the assembled burgesses, back into Gibson's Wynd[109] and disarmed of their sticks. Unknown to Miller and the burgesses however, the women

---

107 *Culloden Papers*, CX, p.80. Lord Advocate to Scrope (?), Edinburgh, 26 June 1725.

108 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch. 4373, 'Precognitions taken against Captain Francis Bushell, November 1725'. Robert Laing's precognition. James Duncan, printer, stated that the woman had first appeared at two o' clock, coming up the Saltmarket, accompanied by a few women and children and two young men. She passed the Cross, turned, and went down the Gallowgate and returned later (probably two thirty) 'with a great deal more along with her'. (ibid., James Duncan's statement).

109 *BRG*, 31/7/1725, 'Magistrates account'; NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4371, 'Precognitions taken by the Lord Advocate, Glasgow, 10-16 July, 1725'. John McGilchrist's statement.

merely re-assembled further down the road at the guard house, where they were soon engaged in throwing stones at Bushell's troops.

Tennoch's account stated that it was Bushell's observing that the Town House was under some sort of siege, with crowds gathering outside, which brought him out into the street, drawing his troops up. These he formed into a 'hollow square' outside the guard house, facing the four directions at the intersection of the Trongate with King Street and Candle Riggs. This formation struck passers-by as curious and accordingly some women and boys 'flock'd about them, gazing at this Disposition of the Troops, that was pretty unusual to them'. After some minutes in this strange posture a few stones began to be thrown at them[110] but the soldiers retalliated by firing at the unarmed crowd. There is some disagreement in the sources as to whether or not Bushell fired first with shot, or with powder only. Culloden and Bushell maintained the latter position,[111] but the magistrates' and Tennoch's accounts refuted this.[112] Certain of the witnesses' statements however, incline to support Bushell, notably that of Alexander bailie,[113] but all are unanimous in stating that the Riot Act was not read, and in charactarising the mob as female and juvenile, and insufficient in numbers to constitute a real threat.

---

110 Tennoch, *A Letter from a Gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London containing an impartial History* [NLS. RB.s.1465 (1)].

111 *Culloden Papers*, CX, p.81. Lord Advocate to Scrope? Edinburgh, 26 June 1725; NLS. Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch. 4373, Bushell's precognition.

112 *BRG*, 31/7/1725, Magistrates' account; Tennoch, *A Letter from a Gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London containing an impartial History* [NLS. RB.s.1465 (1)].

113 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch. 4373, 'Precognitions taken against Captain Francis Bushell, November, 1725'. Alexander Baillie's precognition. Baillie stated that Bushell had divided his troops into four platoons, facing the four directions, and made them kneel, stoop and stand, then fire 'without reading any act of parliament', and that 'nobody was observed to fall at that'; but the mob intensified its assault at this provocation.

The soldiers maintained their defensive formation for some minutes before firing. James Duncan, printer, one of the militiamen who had turned up to support the Provost, had time to walk up the Trongate from the Cross with the Deacon of the Barbers after disarming the Amazon Army of the Gallowgate, and cross over to New Street, during which time he was unexpectedly caught up in the thick of the action. Duncan stated:

> Alexander Miln, late Deacon of the Barbers, says to me, let us take a turn towards the main guard, the soldiers were then forming themselves into four platoons. When we came to the east end of the guard, there was not so many people as I have seen at the mounting and dismounting of the guard.[114]

When they crossed over to New Street, evidently at a walking pace, there were only four persons standing there. Robert Laing stated that about two forty-five he was at his father's shop, opposite the Tron Church, when he saw the soldiers momentarily retire from the street and go into the guard house, only to return again to the street minutes later, 'but did not see at that distance any throwing of stones'. The only people he could see were standing around the well opposite the Fleshmarket, 'all women and children, but no men that I could perceive'. He saw the soldiers fire in that direction and heard the shots go off. A few minutes later a man came running towards the Cross shouting that two people were dead. Laing went straight to the Town House then, to the foot of the broad stair to support the Provost, and found him standing with the rest of the burgess militia who had been ordered to meet at three o' clock.

---

114 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4373, 'Precognitions taken against Captain Francis Bushell, November 1725'. James Duncan's precognition.

James Duncan narrowly escaped being shot. By the time he reached New Street, 'the platoon that faced that way was at kneel, sloop and stand, at this time there was nobody speaking or throwing to them'. Most people present were congregated around the well. 'I ... saw a stone cast from behind the Well, and hit one of the Guns in the last rank of them that faced to the west, then came two stones, then several more'. Duncan was now regretting his curiosity in taking a 'turn' towards the main guard. Now scenting danger and anxious to disappear from the scene, he attempted to take hasty refuge at 'widow Morrison's stair'...'thinking to get up, but it was full, so I got behind it and the first fire went off'. As he was running to the stair below, a second volley went off and a woman running for cover behind him was shot. 'In a twinkling of an eye I looked and saw two lying on the street betwixt me and the Fleshmarket Yett and the soldiers coming out the guard door in two's and threes slooping their bodies and levelling their guns, firing westwards.'[115]

Other citizens were equally taken aback by this sudden turn of events, and were evidently not feeling themselves to be in any particular danger before hearing the shots go off. Alexander Wotherspoon, maltman, was at his bowling green at Candle Riggs in company about 3pm, about to play a game of bowls, when they heard the gun-fire and went to investigate. As they were going down Candle Riggs an officer and two soldiers appeared at the foot of the street and appeared to 'make ready to fire upon us, at which I desired them that were with me to fall back upon the Sugar House gavel, and immediately we heard the guns fire, and the balls whistle by us, one of which wounded

---

115 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers Ch.4373, 'Precognitions taken against Captain Francis Bushell, November 1725'. James Duncan's precognition.

Will Corrie, flesher, in the hand ... all this time there was no person throwing of stones from that gate against the soldiers'.[116]

The first two casualties were Alexander Jamieson, a weaver from Govan, 'shot dead betwixt the Trongate well and the guard house' and John Buntine, cordiner of Glasgow, 'shot dead upon the said street on the west side of the guard house'. After this the soldiers continued to fire 'dropping shots at such persons as they saw passing along the streets or along the sides thereof or as they saw standing in the most innocent manner, or in the doors of the houses or looking out the windows'.[117] Several persons, including two women, one of whom was elderly, were killed attempting to take refuge in their own houses in the Trongate, and one man who escaped the musket fire, was pursued and killed at close range with a pocket pistol as he ran for cover down King Street.[118] All the fatalities took place in a generally westwards direction, ie, facing away from the Town House where the Provost and the burgesses were assembled. John Gordon, surgeon, stated that there was was interval of about two or three minutes between the first firing and the second, during which time the streets were cleared. Yet despite this, the soldiers continued firing for fully another fifteen or twenty minutes. There was then a gap of about ten minutes, after which the soldiers went off, firing as they ran.[119] Many of the soldiers however, 'fired up into the air, and some did not fire at

---

116 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers Ch.4373, 'Precognitions against Captain Francis Bushell, November 1725'. Alexander Wotherspoon's statement.

117 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch. 4373, Complainers bill to the Justiciary against Captain Francis Bushell.

118 ibid.

119 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch. 4373, 'Precognitions taken against Captain Bushell'. John Gordon's precognition.

all' otherwise, Tennoch claimed, many more would have been killed.[120] In all, nine persons died (three women and six men) and seventeen were seriously injured. Dozens more, like William Corrie, suffered minor injuries.

When the first shots went off, just before three, there was consternation at the Town House, where the Provost and 'a great many' of the burgh militia, armed with their riot-control staves, were now assembled. One of the burgesses, John Orr (later of Barrowfield) volunteered to go as a messenger to Bushell and deliver the Provost's order to cease fire immediately, for he would soon have the assistance of the militia. (Orr had formerly trained for the ministry before turning merchant, and perhaps his pastoral influence was urgently required.) When Orr arrived at the scene minutes later, (apparently before the first fatalities had occurred, or shortly afterwards) he claimed the mob he saw consisted only of women and boys, and to persuade Bushell just how easily such a gathering could be dispersed with a simple stave, demonstrated the Glasgow Amazon-bashing technique in front of him. Bushell agreed to cease fire, but as soon as Orr was on his way back to the Provost, the shots resumed.[121]

The response of certain the burgh militia is worthy of note. Whilst the majority were already assembled just before three at the Town House, at least two of the captains, Robert Fulton, coppersmith, and John Linning, dyer, were in the process of assembling their men close by when the news was received that some of the inhabitants had been killed. Fulton's men immediately dispersed, and Linning stated that when he

---

120 Tennoch *A Letter from a Gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London containing an impartial History*[NLS. RB.s.1465 (1)]. The same source claimed one soldier was seen trying to dislodge Bushell's aim.

121 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4373, 'Precognitions taken against Captain Francis Bushell, November 1725'. John Orr's precognition; *BRG*, 31/7/1725, Magistrates' account, p.228.

heard this news, it 'made him give over thoughts of having his men together'.[122] This suggests that the mob which broke down the Town House door immediately afterwards in order to gain access to the burgh arsenal, consisted of burgesses as well as ordinary inhabitants and apprentices. Robert Laing claimed that on the second volley being heard, 'a great many apprentices and others of that sort came running to my Lord Provost, crying, What shall we do now? They are killing our Friends and our Neighbours'. Whilst the Provost tried to 'pacify them with threats and smooth words' Laing saw 'these people force open the door for firearms and partisans, and ring the fire-bells'[123].

The Provost sent Orr back to Bushell to warn him that the citizens were now armed, and that he should leave immediately for his own safety, which he did, 'And tho' there was scarce anybody pursuing him, yet he continued to fire in the streets, by which he did considerable execution'[124]. Bushell's retreat proved little less damaging than his formation assault. Three persons were killed, including Agnes Naismith, an elderly woman, 'shot through the shoulder near the door of her own house in the Trongate of which wound she died in a few days' and Christian McClelland, a young lady brought to Glasgow for her education, 'shot through the head while looking out of a high window in the street called the Trongate'.[125] Witnesses said they saw a soldier step back

---

122 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4371, 'Precognitions taken by the Lord Advocate, Glasgow, 10-16 July 1725', Linning's and Fulton's precognition.

123 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch.4373, Precognitions against Captain Francis Bushell, November 1725', Robert Laing's statement; *BRG*, 31/7/1725, Magistrates' account, p.229, also claimed it was a mob which broke down the Town House door.

124 Tennoch, *'A Letter from a Gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London containing an impartial History of the late Tumults at Glasgow on the Commencement of the Malt Tax'*, London July 30th, 1725. [NLS. RB.s.1465 (1)].

125 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, Ch. 4373, 'Complainers bill to the Justiciary against Captain Francis Bushell'.

from his ranks to take a shot at that window, which was in Ferguslie's Lodging, a genteel establishment, the residence of several gentlewomen.

The town's people pursued Bushell out of town for five or six miles. Bushell was heading for Dumbarton Castle, twelve miles away, which he and his men reached later that evening. He remained there until sent for by Wade two weeks later. The next day, from the safety of the Castle, he sent one of his subalterns to Edinburgh with his account of the events of the previous day. This was naturally biased towards his side and it was this story which was picked up and further distorted by the *Caledonian Mercury.*

Back at Glasgow normal life had understandably ground to a halt. John Graham reported that there was 'little or no business to be done' either that day or the day before as a result of the disturbances.[126] While the enraged citizens were out of town pursuing their quarry, Provost Miller took the opportunity to leave the city, 'and kept private in the country for several days for fear of the mob'.[127] The Dean of Guild and the Deacon Convener mounted a strong guard of one hundred armed burgesses, but these did not attempt to inhibit the mob when it returned about eight o' clock in the evening, and began a further demolition of Shawfield's house. But before the mob returned, the Dean of Guild had also left the city, leaving only the Deacon Convener, who had kept a low profile throughout.[128]

---

126 NAS, Montrose Muniments, GD220.5.1020 (18), John Grahan to Mungo Graham of Gorthie, Glasgow, 25 July 1725.

127 NLS, Erskine-Murray Papers, 5127, f.25-30, 'An Account of the Riots And Tumults that happenned at Glasgow on the 24th and 25th of June last,' Lord Advocate's account, 26 July 1725.

128 ibid.

It is evident that there at least two strands of mob violence in the above account, and that both Culloden and the magistrates attempted to shift their ground from one to the other to suit their particular argument. Firstly, there was clearly a ritualistic element of public demonstration in which women and boys were prominent. This was relatively non-violent and served merely to indicate to the authorities the temperature of public opinion - a warning of things to come if demands were not met. Far from being covert and devious it paraded openly in the street and demonstrated outside the Town House. It was meant to be highly visible. There was a particular circuit, starting at the bottom of the Saltmarket near the river and heading up towards the Cross, down the Gallowgate, and then back again along the Gallowgate to the Cross, thus encompassing the SE 'quarter' of the city and skirting Glasgow Green - a route which took the crowd through poorer districts where it could hope to pick up most support. (The wealthiest areas were to the west and north). The beating of the drum was the traditional call to arms, and its use in a public demonstration may be read as a statement of popular militancy of the first degree. Thus it might suit the magistrates to release a relatively innocuous prisoner seized at such a demonstration, as a way of placating the mob and buying time. This need not be read as weakness on their part, but rather as part of the public ritual of authority and confrontation which was being enacted. Under normal circumstances the magistrates could have reached a 'bargaining position' with the mob, granting them some of their wishes, but they were powerless to negotiate with the state on behalf of the mob's opposition to the Malt Tax and could only stand by and watch opposite forces of localism and statism collide, with catastrophic consequences; or else

they could attempt to separate the protagonists as far as possible - stalling tactics. A further strategy might involve spread of the blame, if a catastrophe could not be averted - it was surely no co-incidence that two of the four magistrates were out of town, at the time of the introduction of one of the most contentious acts in years - and returned only once the worst was past, to pick up the pieces from the two who had just left.

However, the attack on Shawfield's house, which Culloden rightly concentrated on, was of a different order - this was a threat which was not merely threatened, but actually carried out. It involved community organisation and the muscular input of the menfolk. It may be likened with the kind of community action in the NE which witnessed the pulling down of manses in which unwanted Presbyterian ministers were to be housed, of the type often described as 'reactionary collective violence'. The stoning of Bushell's troops as they entered the city, which he clearly felt intimidated by ('they said they were but a breakfast for them'), the alleged 'arsenals' of stones and 'brickbats' placed at each maltster's door, fall into this category and indicate a level of militancy against a key state policy, if not actually the state. This degree of militancy could only have been broken by the use of troops.

As a further corollery, the following April saw a couple of changes in the traditions of the community. Although insignificant in themselves, they indicate in an emblematic way the reach of the state into the *demesne* of the burgesses, and the further separation of the council from the community. The annual roup of the town's Common Good was henceforth to take place indoors, in the Town House, and not at the Old Green as formerly. And the annual riding of the town's marches, 'land meithing day', a traditional community event, was suppressed by order of the magistrates. A committee

would now undertake this function. In enacting these statutes the council noted that on land meithing day 'there are a great many abuses committed by boys, servantts and others, to the disturbance of the peace of the place, and some customs crept in which are not agreeable'.[129] Land-meithing Day took place on the first Tuesday of June, near enough the anniversary of the first successful introduction of the Malt Tax, and the slaughter of the citizens. The equestrian cavalcade, which brought out the military accoutrements of the burgh, celebrated the burgesses' traditional determination to defend their *demesne* from any encroach on their borders. Its passage, evidently brought about by fears of mobs and growing tensions between the magistrates and the ordinary Glaswegian, was a potent symbol of the end of medieval Scotland at Glasgow, and a violent beginning to the fiscal centralisation of the modern British state.

129 *BRG*, 12/4/1726, p.259.

CONCLUSION

Between c.1680 - c.1740 the burgh of Glasgow was in the final phase of shaking off its former medieval and Renaissance Episcopalian identity as a bishop's burgh and assuming its modern Whig Hanoverian 'Revolutioner' character. The cultural transition of 'the city of God' was however neither confident nor smooth. Complexities were evident, for a minority Episcopalian Jacobite element remained which was never expelled. This lived relatively quietly for most of the period but exerted its own influence on burgh society and politics when opportunity presented itself. At a civic level relations were anxious rather than acrimonious; evidence of fair treatment and charitable toleration by Presbyterians of the former regime is found in the burgh records. The ejected Episcopalian ministers eventually received their stipends up to Martinmas 1688, the time of their enforced demission, and Provost John Barns (d.1716), who had notoriously oppressed Presbyterians in the 1680s and even swindled the town council, ended his days as a bankrupt in the city supported by its charity, although he attended the Episcopalian meeting house.[1] Political relations between the citizens themselves however could be violent, such as the 'open and manifest breach of the peace' which broke out between the Walkinshaws (Jacobites) and the Grahams (Whigs, Squadrone) at the opening of the western circuit in 1708, involving no less a figure in the affray than the sheriff-depute of Dunbartonshire; or the sudden destruction

---

1 *BRG*, vol. iii, 1663-1690, p.517, 518, 519; J. R. Anderson (ed. James Gourlay), *The Provosts of Glasgow from 1609 to 1832*, (Glasgow, 1942), p.31; NLS printed pamphlet series, 1.115.10, William Cockburn, *A sermon upon the 30th January 1713, being the anniversary fast for the martyrdom for the blessed King Charles I preached at Glasgow by William Cockburn, minister of the Episcopal congregation there*, (Edinburgh, 1713); *RPC*, vii, p. 503, 576, 608; Robert Wodrow, *History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the Restoration to the Revolution*, 4 vols., iii, (Glasgow, 1829), p. 495.

of the Episcopalian meeting house by persons unknown which was the reaction to Queen Anne's death in 1714.[2]

The Revolutioners for their part were not a unified body. Divisions were evident by 1700 as tempers flared over Darien, raising criticism of the Court and all courtiers. Jacobites entered into the heats between Court and Country party adherents in the related dispute over the sett of the burgh. The Revolutioner regime established under John Anderson of Dowhill was supported by local gentry such as Sir John Maxwell of Pollok and Lord Carmichael, 1st earl of Hyndford (1701). This gradually established wider links with other magnate interests via the Marquis, later the 1st Duke of Montrose, and the Squadrone; the dominant interest in the burgh by the first years after the union, though its grip was never as vicious as the stranglehold later established by the Argathelians. John Anderson of Dowhill was a courtier, but Hugh Montgomerie, the first MP for Glasgow Burghs, 1707-1708, held aloof from party intrigue, and his eventual successor, Dean of Guild Smith, MP 1710-1716, was sufficiently broad-minded, though allied to Montrose, to form links with Jacobite patriots, being the only Whig in the Scottish Steering Committee, an early nationalist ginger group which included Sir George Lockhart of Carnwath. Smith's effective advocacy in the House of Commons in opposing the Malt tax bill in 1713 was commended by Lockhart.[3]

---

2 NLS printed pamphlet series, 8(23) *The Downfall of Cockburn's Meeting House*, (Edinburgh, 1714); SRO, Justice Court records for the western circuit, October 1708, JC 13.1 f15. John Walkinshaw of Barrowfield and his brother Robert, along with William Paterson, son of the late Sir Hugh Paterson of Bannockburn, attacked Walter and William Graham, brothers of John Graham of Dougalstoun, merchant of Glasgow, and James Graham, the sheriff depute of Dumbartonshire, with drawn swords in the street while the justice ayre sat. The lords regarding this as 'a manifest contempt and insolence' of their authority imprisoned and fined the lot of them. Barrowfield and the sheriff depute appear to have been the ring-leaders.

3 Daniel Szechi, (ed.), SHS, fifth series, vol. 2, *Letters of George Lockhart of Carnwath 1698-1732*; Scottish Steering Committee to Sir Edward Northey, [London] January 19 1711/1712, p.56-57; To [Maule?] (unattributed and corrupt) London 26 May 1713, p.74-75.

Relations with the Jacobites prior to the '15 were complex, and often positive rather than negative. George Lockhart, merchant of Glasgow (no relation has been traced to Carnwath, above) found it expedient to link his campaign to known Jacobites, the Bells, of Glasgow, in order to force concessions in the matter of the ordering of the new grant of the ale tax; and such occasional cross-party 'patriot' alliances like the one above, in which Smith participated, could often bring results for practical men not over zealous about sectarian divides or prepared to rise above them. This raises the question that the projected Cameronian-Atholl Highlander alliance to overthrow the union parliament in 1706, in which Rev. Macmillan of Balmaghie was implicated, may have had more possibilities than such an unlikely scheme might otherwise suggest.[4] In fact 'patriot' support amongst the Cameronians lingered to the '45 when some of the most strongly worded criticism of Cumberland's activities came from that quarter.[5] Attitudes to the native dynasty had however bitterly divided the country and had come about because of the Stuarts' long-standing opposition to Presbyterianism. Latterly the Stuarts' doctrines of passive obedience and arbitrary absolute monarchy added fuel to the fire. But the Whig Presbyterian alliance's rejection of the Stuarts at the Revolution involved jettisoning a large part of the Scottish past. The resultant cultural vacuum was acutely felt at Glasgow, and efforts were made to create a Revolutioner identity based on the salvationist image of William of Orange as a Protestant (sic., Presbyterian), saviour, who was commemorated in the city. This was probably a rejoinder to the Jacobites' earlier attempts to sanctify Charles I as an Episcopalian holy martyr in 1703

---

4 John Ker of Kersland, *The Memoirs of John Ker of Kersland*, (London, 1726), pp.28-53; Daniel Szechi, (ed.), *Scotland's Ruine, Lockhart of Carnwath's Memoirs of the Union*, pp.179-183; William Ferguson, *Scotland 1689 to the Present*, (Edinburgh, 1968, 1977), p.50.

5 The Howdenites, followers of John Howden, an extreme faction of Cameronians, actually chastised Charles Edward Stuart for not having done enough to rid the country of those 'vermin of hell' and 'incarnate devils' who followed Cumberland. W. Mcmillan, 'The Covenanters after the Revolution of 1688', *RSCHS*, vol. x, (1950), p.147.

and 1713.[6] Royalism remained resplendant in Glasgow after the Revolution despite the Episcopalian taunt that Presbyterians were but a 'clamorous and inconsiderable faction whose nature it is to cross and resist every creature that's but called a king'.[7] Successive burgh administrations remained firm for the Court and great pomp and circumstance accompanied the Glasgow parade in 1714 on George I's accession, in which the participants wore hats festooned with orange ribbons to indicate their support for the Revolution and 'revolution principles'. In 1715 a swatch of the finest Glasgow plaids was presented to the Princess of Wales by Dean of Guild Thomas Smith, MP for Glasgow Burghs 1710-1716, as a token of Glasgow's loyalty and the princess delighted the burgesses by promising to wear them around court.[8] Provost Aird went to considerable efforts to demonstrate his Hanoverian loyalism by defending the city against the threatened Jacobite invasion in 1715, raising a regiment of 500 men and building a system of defensive earthworks around the city, and was royally thanked afterwards.[9] The gift in 1735 of a bronze equestrian statue of King William possibly by Peter Scheemakars, from a prospective parliamentary candidate, James Macrae, ex-governor of Madras, provided a permanent landmark which celebrated the city's new political orientation.[10] King William's martial aspect was placed high on a marble-clad pedestal with four canons pointing outwards, one at each corner, and overawed the

---

6 NLS, Wodrow MSS, 4to (28), 'A humble representation unto the magistrates of Glasgow', March 9th 1703, f.153; NLS printed pamphlet series, 1.115(10), William Cockburn, *A Sermon upon the 30th January 1713, being the anniversary fast for the martyrdom of the blessed King Charles I, preached at Glasgow by William Cockburn, minister of the Episcopal congregation there,* (Edinburgh, 1713).

7 Dr Alexander Monro, 4th letter, (John Sage, ed.) *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland in Several letters,* (London, 1690), p.64.

8 *BRG*, iv, 26/8/1715, p.537.

9 T F Donald, 'Glasgow and the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715', *SIIR*, xiii, (1916), pp.126-131; *BRG*, 26/8/1715, p.539; 12/10/1715, pp.545-547; 29/10/1715, p.547-548; 12/12/1715, p.548-549; 16/2/1716, p.551, pp.553-575.

citizens for over a century at Glasgow Cross, fronting the Town House and exciting the imagination of the earliest historian of the city, John McUre, (History of Glasgow, 1736).[11]

The settlement of Presbyterianism in 1690 was however markedly less triumphalist, for not until George I's accession did the Presbyterians of Glasgow begin to feel secure. Glasgow, the crucible of the Whig Revolution in Scotland, felt these strains acutely. Accordingly several Glasgow men locked pens in the debate with the Episcopalians which flared up at the Revolution and which was revived on Anne's accession in 1702; renewed engagement followed the change of ministry in 1710. These writers were William Jameson (d.1720), lecturer in history at the university, James Brown, minister of the north parish 1690-1714, James Clark minister of the Tron 1702-1723, John McBride (1650-1718), an Irish minister from Belfast on loan to the city from 1705-1709, who returned briefly in 1712, and of course, John Anderson, minister of the north-west parish 1718-1721. Leading protagonists on the Episcopalian side were John Sage, Synod clerk and minister of Glasgow 1686-1688 and William Cockburn, Episcopalian minister in Glasgow 1712-1714. Full citations of these pamphlets are contained in Appendix iv but indicate the vigour and intensity of the debate.

---

10 George Eyre-Todd, *History of Glasgow*, 3 vols., iii, (Glasgow, 1934), 161-163; *BRG*, 3/1/1733, 389; 30/9/1734, 428; 28/3/1735, pp. 431-3; 15/9/1736, pp. 464; 24/3/1737, pp. 477; 28/6/1737, 480; NLS, 8(22), *Glasgows Parrad*, (1714).

11 Methinks the steed doth spread with corps the plain
Tears up the turf and pulls the curbing rein
Exalts his thunder neck and lofty crest
To force through ranks and files his stately breast!
His nostrils glow, sonorous war he hears
He leapeth, jumpeth, pricketh up his ears
Hoofs up the turf, spreads havoc all around
Till blood in torrents overflows the ground!
Eyre-Todd, *History*, 161.

From 1690-1714 the church as a whole was weak and defensive, suffering as much from its enemies' attacks as its members anxious criticisms.[12] The church of 1690 attempted to be a broad one and admitted the three Cameronian ministers Shields, Boyd and Linning, but without requiring them to recant their former activities or anti-monarchist views, especially Shields's *A Hind Let Loose*.[13] The three were admitted merely on the promise to live peaceably.[14] The church's erastian establishment and its failure to acknowledge the Covenants led to fragmentation, beginning with the expulsion of Rev. Macmillan, minister of Balmaghie in 1706. The Covenants were never outrightly rejected, merely tacitly dropped. No new revision occurred, instead there was a policy of drift concerning theological matters as the church opted to concentrate on the safer territory of procedural affairs, such as the much criticised Overtures, finally published in 1720, in which Principal Stirling and several of the Glasgow clerical establishment became embroiled.[15] Even the Overtures became drawn on the issue of the 'intrinsic power', the theological substance of the Covenants, and it seemed almost every clerical debate from 1690-1720 touched in some way on this

---

12 Foremost amongst the Episcopalian attacks were the writings of John Sage, ex-minister and Synod clerk of Glasgow, and Dr. Alexander Monro, former Principal of Edinburgh University. The key modern work in this field is Thomas Maxwell's unpublished thesis, 'The Presbyterian-Episcopal Controversy in Scotland from the Revolution Settlement to the Accession of George I', Edinburgh University Ph.D. thesis, (1954). See also Maxwell's two articles; T Maxwell, 'Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688', *RSCHS* xiii, Pt i, (1957), pp.25-37; 'William III and the Scots Presbyterians', *RSCHS* xv, Pt iii, (1965), pp.117-140.

13 Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past; Scottish whig historians and the creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830*, (Cambridge, 1993) p.68, notes Wodrow repudiated Shields's work; but Alexander Monro in *An Apology for the clergy of Scotland* (London, 1692, 1693) referred to the three Cameronians being admitted in 1690 'without retracting any articles of doctrine', John Parker Lawson, *History of the Episcopal Church*, (1843), p.72.

14 Lawson, supra., p.72.

15 John Anderson, *(Six) Letters upon the overtures concerning kirk sessions', (1720); James Clark, 'Just and sober remarks on some parts and passages of the overtures concerning kirk sessions*, (1720); same, *Advertisement to the General Assembly, 1720, or ane account of the rise and tendencie of some new things in the printed overtures concerning kirk sessions. In a letter from a minister in the presbytery of Glasgow to a minister in the presbytery of Edinburgh, 27th April*, (1720); William Dunlop, *A full vindication of the overtures transmitted to Presbyteries by the commission, November 1719, (*1720); William Tennoch, *An examination of the overtures concerning kirk sessions and presbyteries transmitted by the commission of the general assembly, (*1720); Anon., *A letter concerning the overtures about kirk sessions and presbyteries which were transmitted to the presbyteries by the commission of the General Assembly November 11th 1719*, (1720).

pivotal issue. The committee for the Overtures contained a number of Glasgow men, Simson, Stirling and three of the Glasgow ministers. Rev. James Clark, minister of the Tron, 1702-1723, (who was not a member of the committee), and Rev. John Gray, minister of the Wynd church 1700-1729, were especially prominent in this debate, Gray disputing Clark's conclusions about clerical v. lay power in the General Session according to the Model of 1649.[16] In 1723 when a speaker at the General Assembly mentioned the Covenants, he was interrupted by the Moderator and told that the church was no longer on that footing.[17] Presbyterianism post-1690 was thus divided between its supposed intrinsic power and its erastian reality. Further divisions ensued about the signing of the 1643 Westminster Confession of Faith and of the oaths demanded of Presbyterians after 1712. Liberalisers objected to the Calvinist orthodoxy at the heart of the Confession and led a non-subscription movement; whilst others, traditionalists such as Wodrow and the ministers of Glasgow, were unable to comply with perceived attacks on the intrinsic power and refused to subscribe the new oaths after 1712 (Presbyterian non-jurors).[18] The two Simson processes and the debate about the Marrow of Modern Divinity indicate the inability to agree on the theological basis of the church which was divided between traditionalists and modernisers well before the rise of Moderatism in the 1750s.

Glasgow contained both Calvinist high-flyers such as Rev. John Gray (d.1729), 37 years a minister in the city, and fleeting liberalisers such as William Wishart, future

---

16 James Clark, *Presbyterial government as now established and practised in the Church of Scotland, methodically described, specially of the Church's intrinsick power*, (1701, 1703, 1717).

17 David Stevenson, *The Covenanters; the National Covenant and Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1988), p.80.

18 David Lachman, *The Marrow Controversy, 1718-1723*, (Edinburgh, 1988), p.169; Wodrow, *Analecta*, 4 vols., ii, p.128. Almost one third of the clergy refused the abjuration oath of 1712, including Wodrow and Thomas Linning, the former Cameronian. In 1718 the more offensive part of the oath was refused but in 1719 Wodrow could report that 30-40 'recusants' still remained. Wodrow never took the oath.

Principal of Edinburgh University, who occupied a pulpit for a number of years in the city in the 1720s until demitting for the more liberal climes of London in 1730. The city remained a bastion of orthodoxy for most of the period 1690-1740. The lengthy ministries of three of Gray's associates, who had sided with him in the affair of the Model in 1718, John Scott (d.1741), minister of the Outer High Kirk, John Hamilton (d.1741), minister of Blackfriars, and George Campbell (d.1748), minister of the north parish, indicate the survival of orthodoxy into the 1740s, especially when augmented by the able ministry of John Maclaurin (d.1754). Thomas Reid, when he arrived in the city in 1764 could comment on the propensity of the bulk of the citizens for a religion of 'a gloomy, enthusiastical cast'. Not until 1738 did Glasgow acquire more or less permanently one of the new breed of ministers with a taste for polite literature and moral preaching, William Craig, minister of the Wynd church 1738-1784 and the friend of Francis Hutcheson. During his lengthy ministry he was studiously ignored by the populace at large but had a small, select, dedicated following amongst a section of the Glasgow merchants and local gentry who affected polite values, including the Mures of Caldwell.[19] Significantly, in the seventeenth century the Mures of Caldwell and their cadet branch, the Mures of Glanderston, had been prominently associated with Presbyterian radical dissent in and around Glasgow.[20] The move away from seventeenth-century Calvinism thus reflected social stratification, for polite culture became the provenance of elites. Long after the church of the Covenants was abandoned by the minor gentry in the vicinity of Glasgow and sections of the Glasgow

---

19 William Craig, *Twenty Discourses on various subjects*, 2 vols., (2nd edit., with Life, 1808), xl.

20 An important social document therefore, is Elizabeth Mure's essay, contained in the Caldwell Papers, in which she documents the change in manners within her circle, going back to c.1700, by the memories and impressions she received from her grandmother. Elizabeth Mure, 'Some remarks on the change of manners in my own time. 1700-1790', *Selections from the Family Papers preserved at Caldwell*, 3 vols., (Glasgow, 1854), in which she mentions William Craig, ibid., i, pp. 267-8.

merchants who had been its backbone, it remained the rallying call of lesser folk.[21] A pragmatic interest in scientific rationalism however, had early on been evident amongst strict Calvinists and this was undiminished.[22] Significant also was the spate of evangelical publishing of seventeenth century works of practical piety noted by Landsman in the 1730s which was sponsored by younger merchants such as Archibald Ingram and John Glassford who were later to become prominent in the city.[23]

An anti-authoritarian attitude is detectable amongst the burgesses and inhabitants, first revealed in the ministers' plea of 1693, regarding those who took 'groundless prejudices at ministers'. This had considerable impact on power structures both clerical and civic. The debate about the Overtures in 1720 openly attacked clerical authority and accused ministers of assuming a prelatical power over lay members, (who comprised in the main, merchants and magistrates), by claimimg a right to veto popular calls. The objections of George Lockhart and his adherents to the sett of the burgh in 1700 decried the magistrates' choice of council and championed the wider rights of the burgess community.[24] These disputes however, did not so much indicate radical dissaffection from Glasgow society but rather, a radical involvement in it and must reflect the extent to which the burgh continued to see itself as a civic community, and not as so

---

21 R B Sher, 'Commerce, religion and the enlightenment in eighteenth century Glasgow', in T. M. Devine (ed.), *Glasgow Volume I: Beginnings to 1830*, p. 317; D Stevenson,'The legacy of the Covenants', in Stevenson, *The Covenanters; the National Covenant of Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1988), pp. 70-84.

22 See for instance the appointment of George Sinclair, a Covenanter, to be professor of mathematics at Glasgow University in the 1690s, whose teaching before the Restoration Durkan noted as 'innovative'.

23 Ned C. Landsman, 'Liberty, piety and patronage: the social context of contested calls in eighteenth century Glasgow', in Andrew Hook and Richard B Sher, (eds.), *The Glasgow Enlightenment*, (Edinburgh, 1995), p.222-223.

24 NLS Wodrow MSS folio xxviii, (65), Alexander Hastie, Neil Gillies, James Brown, John Gray, ministers of Glasgow, 'The present state of Glasgow as to its need of ministers humbly represented to the Synod of Glasgow and Air the 10th day of Jun. 1693'; William Tennoch, merchant in Glasgow, *An examination of the overtures concerning kirk sessions and Presbyteries transmitted by the Commission of the General Assembly to Presbyteries*, (Glasgow, 1720); *BRG*, 29/6/1700, p.303-4; *Glas. Chtrs.*, vol. ii, (1004), Representation and petition given in to Parliament by George Lockhart, merchant in Glasgow, and other inhabitants, p.423; APS, vol. x, 235-7.

many unconnected individuals. This sense of civicness is hard to measure (people tend to produce documentary material on the points about which they disagree, and not about the underlying consensus on which they operate) but the level of burgess entry into the guild and the tight stipulations of the Letter of Guildry, must provide an important guide. Guild membership continued at a constantly expanding level throughout the eighteenth and earlier part of the nineteenth centuries.[25] Each burgess, on satisfying the conditions for his entry, had to recite the burgess oath promising loyalty to the city and its government, as well as to the monarch and 'the true Protestant religion, presently professed within this realm' before receiving his burgess ticket.[26] Moreover, community participation strengthened the bonds of belonging. Glasgow burgesses carried out the obligations of watching and warding the burgh longer than at Edinburgh and by the late eighteenth century were still undertaking civic responsiblities of policing.[27] At other times, notably in 1706 and 1725, when there was widespread rioting, the burgh militia, consisting of the burgesses in their various companies under their respective captains, was summoned to restore order. The city also retained its own arms cache in the Tolbooth for its defence; this was quite distinct from the king's magazines kept in his castles. The burgh's arms were controlled by the Dean of Guild; the same individual who 'passed' burgesses into the guildry and was responsible for their discipline. The burgh militia turned out in 1714 to celebrate the coronation of George I and was found exercising on Glasgow Green in 1704 as the

---

25 J. R. Anderson,(ed.), *Burgesses and Guildbrethren of Glasgow 1573-1750*, SRS, (1925)

26 The full text of this, as it was in 1777, is given by Gibson. John Gibson, *The History of Glasgow from the Earliest Accounts to the Present Time*, (Glasgow, 1777), pp. 154-156.

27 John Ord, *Origins and History of the Glasgow Police*, (Glasgow, 1906); John Gibson, *The History of Glasgow from the Earliest Accounts to the Present Time*, (Glasgow, 1777) p.131. Gibson states that the prison and custom-house were guarded and in the absence of the military the citizens did the duty themselves.

country prepared for a possible invasion force from England following the Act of Security.[28] All the above indicate a degree of social cohesion and co-operation on a specifically Glasgow basis which transcended divisions which stemmed from essentially non-local origins.

Glasgow's civic pride was commended by one seventeenth century commentator who was impressed by the city raising funds through voluntary taxation to purchase the Provan estate and land at Newark with which to establish Port Glasgow.[29] Religious bigotry had failed to diminish such virtuous public spirit:

> An old provost of that town, J. G.[30] told me, that though they were divyded amongst themselves in some things, yet if any one should make a motion that might tend to the Publick good, they all agreed as one man.[31]

Other instances of public spirit can be found, such as the fund set up to provide a minister for the Blackfriars church in the 1630s. However the difficulties of the post-Revolution era put such ventures on hold; Darien soaked up the available capital. Not until John Maclaurin established a fund for the Town's Hospital in the 1730s was there further evidence of such public co-operation at Glasgow. The workings of the General

---

28 This little known event was also noted in the Edinburgh burgh records, where the magistrates purchased large quantities of powder from Holland in readiness and exercised on Bruntsfield Links. The Act of Security stipulated military planning in which the participants were to have 'arms of one bore' etc.. This was noted by one observer at Glasgow named Cochran who described '8000' of the citizens exercising 'as regularly as the standing army could do' with '100 well-mounted grenadiers' in each thousand, no doubt an exaggeration. NLS, MS 3740, 'Extract from a letter from the north', March 3rd 1704, f.177. 20 captains of the town's 'train bands' assembled in their martial glory in 1714. NLS printed pamphlet series, 1.14(10), *Proclamation of George I by the Lord Provost, Town Council of Glasgow, assisted with several Noblemen and Principle Gentlemen of Quality and Burgers of the City,* (1714).

29 Philopoliteius, (Alexander Skene of Newtyle), *Memorialls for the Government of the Royall Burghs in Scotland,* (Aberdeen, 1685), chapter xxvii, 'Directed to the Inhabitants, and Freemen of Cities', p.179; that during the Cromwellian interlude, despite high taxes, the citizens had opted to pay an additional tax of six shillings sterling on each boll of malt.

30 Provost James Graham, Covenanter exile in Holland. His widow in Holland married Rev. Robert McWard, the infamous critic of the indulgences, and another Glasgow exile.

Session though which involved the magistrates as elders and the ministers of the city in such measures as poor relief on a city-wide basis, was a key element of civic co-operation and social cohesion; hence the significance of the Anderson case in causing civic divisions and the withdrawal of Gray, Scott, Hamilton and Campbell 1718-1721.

The propensity for independent thought and action showed itself most convincingly in the struggles with the Argathelian faction which resulted in the extraordinary arrest and imprisonment of Provost Charles Miller and his associates in 1725. This infamous event was occasioned by the city's attempts to break with its perceived oppressors, particularly its wayward MP, Daniel Campbell of Shawfield who emerges as a most unpleasant and ruthless character. Not a single letter or indication of an opinion was found which might indicate the mind-set of this individual amongst his surviving papers. These comprise of nothing more than a pile of receipts, which, in the final analysis, may be the most fitting tribute to a life dominated by the pursuit of money. It was however evident, that he showed as little mercy to his friends and relations in matters financial, as he did the magistrates and burgh of Glasgow; for, though already a very wealthy man, he succeeded in divesting his nephew by his first marriage of his inheritance, and awarded the proceeds to his own son. This was despite having being given a very generous tocher on his marriage to a daughter of the house.[32] The magistrates succeeded in dislodging Shawfield at the election in 1727 after he had divested them of almost three years of the proceeds of the burgh ale tax in compensation for his losses in the destruction of the Shawfield mansion, valued by the

---

31 Skene, *Memorialls*, p.179.

32 Mitchell Library, Campbell of Shawfield Papers, 2/634d; 2/634e. Shawfield married, in 1695, the daughter of John Leckie, elder, of Newlands, a wealthy Glasgow merchant. In 1710 Shawfield lent £700 to Michael Leckie; in 1731, William Leckie, his son, renounced his inheritance in favour of Shawfield; in 1734 he renounced further lands to the Receiver General in Scotland - Shawfield's son.

magistrates at 1/12 the sum. Only by an astonishing piece of chicanery typical of an age of corruption was Shawfield re-instated by Walpole. However the Argathelians' stranglehold on the country was such that the burgh was eventually forced to capitulate in the 1730s. But by that time the Argathelians' reign had not much longer to run, and the fall of Walpole occasioned the brief return of the Squadrone from 1742-46. For their brave stand against the tyranny of the Argathelians, the burgesses of Glasgow, and especially William Tennoch, were commended by a patriot of Edinburgh.[33]

It is clear that taxation played a crucial role in shaping consciousness. The burgh possessed the power to tax its burgesses so long as these agreed to the purpose of the stent, as was the case in the seventeenth century for particular purposes, noted above. But more general and permanent powers of taxation involving the whole community, burgess and non-burgess, required parliamentary sanction and thus the ale tax becomes pivotal in establishing civic autonomy. Following Aird's efforts at the '15, the city was rewarded by a further grant of the burgh ale tax, which, taking the previous extensions together, took the current period of the grant to the year 1738. This gave the magistrates the safe financial cushion with which to resist the Argathelians in 1725, though Shawfield succeeded in retrenching at least three years' worth of this patrimony by his appeal to Walpole. However that faction's control of offices of vital importance to the burgh, especially within the customs establishment, led to eventual capitulation.

Taxation, the life-blood of the state, whether the city-state, the parish-state or the British state, was however subject to a radical critique by the Cameronians in the 1680s and this also impacted on the popular political culture of Glasgow. This critique supposed the state's innate corruption and tyranny and represented a potent assertion of

---

33 Anon. *A seasonable advice to all lovers of their country*, (nd., circa 1725)

the autonomy and rights of individuals. At a General Meeting of the Societies in 1682, James Russell, implicated in Sharp's murder, advocated not paying taxes or tolls, even on ale or tobacco. He even suggested abstention from these much consumed and popular substances, not on the grounds of puritanism, but on account of the taxes on them which went to feed a lustful and uncovenanted government. He therefore branded taxes as sinful unless the receivers acknowledged the Covenants and the true faith. Although he spent most of his life abroad, his followers, known as the Russellites, perpetuated his views. The theme of the sinfulness of taxes continues right through our period and is found for instance in the Lockhart case where the corruption of John Anderson's regime was supposed by his critics who therefore questioned their fiscal obligations. On George I's accession, Macmillan, the Cameronian minister of Balmaghie issued a broadside along Russellite lines condemning George as a Lutheran who was in league with tyrannical government in Europe and an uncovenanted king.[34] Given the strength of orthodox support at Glasgow and the general unpopularity of taxation, such dissaffection was a potent ingredient of opposition to the Malt tax in 1725. The ethics of taxation forced an examination of the nature of government.

In final conclusion it is evident that this restless society was in the process of developing a modern sense of liberty which the Whig Revolution had seemed to promise. This however was stifled by the magnate struggles for office after the union which took place in a limited field of national opportunities, and therefore, in net terms, indicates the failure of the Revolution. These struggles were to resurface again, apparently discovered anew, in the debates about representative government in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Moreover both the Episcopalian and the Presbyterian

---

34 W. McMillan, 'The Covenanters after the Revolution of 1688', p.147; *GUL*, Special Collections, *The Declaration, Protestation and Testimony*, (1715), [Mu56-c.4(17)].

traditions contributed to the development of a modern sense of liberty as did the interplay of Whig and Jacobite elements.

Presbytery of Glasgow 1660-1687: fate of the pre-Restoration clergy

(16 charges in 12 parishes)

PARISH	NAME with dates when entered parish	UNIVERSITY	PARTY	1662 ACT Deprived/Conformed/ Confined to parish	1669/1672 INDULGENCES Declined/Accepted	IMPRISONMENT or INDICTMENTS	RECEIVED BENEFICE after 1687	*Died*
Glasgow University	Patrick Gillespie, *Principal**, 1648	St Andrews	P	Arrested 1660	*N/A*	1661 (tried for treason)	*N/A*	1675
St Mungo 1	John Carstares, 1650	St Andrews	P	Deprived; Dutch exile	*N/A*	1662; 1664	*N/A*	1686
St Mungo 2	Robert McWard, 1656	St Andrews	P	Deprived; Dutch exile	*N/A*	*unknown*	*N/A*	1683
St Mungo 3	Hew Blair, 1644	Glasgow	R	*Conformed*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	1663
St Mungo 4	Ralph Rogers, 1659	*unknown*	P	Deprived	Accepted (1669)	*N/A*	Yes	1689
St Mungo 5	*(vacant in 1660)*							
Barony	Donald Cargill, 1655	St Andrews	P	Deprived	Declined (1672)	1674; 1681 (executed)	*N/A*	1681
Govan	Alexander Jameson, 1659	St Andrews	P	Deprived	Declined (1672)	1674	*N/A*	1675
Cadder	Thomas Melville, 1650	St Andrews	P?	Deprived	Declined (1672)	1674	*N/A*	1686
Campsie/Antermony**	John Law, 1656	*unknown*	P	Deprived	Declined (1672)	1674	Yes	*unknown*
Campsie/Antermony**	Archibald Dennistoun, 1649	Glasgow	R	*Conformed*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	1679
Carmunnock	Andrew Morton, 1650	St Andrews	P?	Deprived	Declined (1672)	1668; 1670; 1672	Yes	1691
Cathcart	James Blair, 1656	Glasgow	P?	Deprived	*N/A*	1663	*N/A*	1668
Cumbernauld	Thomas Stewart, 1656	Glasgow	P?	Deprived	*N/A*	*unknown*	*N/A*	1667
Eaglesham	James Hamilton, 1649	Glasgow	P?	Confined to parish	Accepted (1669)	*unknown*	*N/A*	1684
Kilsyth	Gabriel Cunningham, 1637	Glasgow	R?	*Conformed*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	1665
Kirkintilloch	Henry Forsyth, 1656	Glasgow	P?	Deprived	*unknown*	1674	*unknown*	*unknown*
Rutherglen/Polmadie	John Dickson, 1655	Glasgow	P?	Deprived 1660; 1662	*unknown*	1660; 1670; 1680	Yes	1700

*** Contested parish before 1660; Archibald Dennistoun was deprived by the Protestors in the Synod in 1655, but was restored in 1662*

Sources: Fasti, Wodrow's History, Analecta

**Principal 1653, imposed by Cromwell*

P = Protestor *R = Resolutioner*

Presbytery of Glasgow: Conforming clergy after 1660				
(16 charges in 12 parishes, plus Principal, Glasgow University)				
CHARGE	NAME & PERSONAL DATES	MA: Yes/No (date)	COLLEGE	DATE ENTERED CHARGE
	(where known)		(where known)	
Glasgow University	Robert Baillie, (1602-1662), *Principal*	Yes (1620)	Glasgow	1660
St Mungo 1	Hew Blair, snr., (1602-1663)	Yes (1622)	Glasgow	1644; *conformed 1662*
St Mungo 2	John Bowie (c.1609-1671)	Yes (1629)	Glasgow	1663
St Mungo 3	John Glendie (1632-1694)	Yes	St Andrews	1663
St Mungo 4	Arthur Ross* (c.1630-1704)	Yes	St Andrews	1664
St Mungo 5	William Stirling (d.1685)	Yes	Glasgow	1665
Barony	David Liddell**	Yes	unknown	1662
Govan	John Hay (1638-d. before 1690)	Yes (1654)	Glasgow	1663
Cadder	William Forbes (c.1630-1668)	Yes (1656)	Marischal	1664
Campsie/Antermony	Archibald Dennistoun (1616-1679)	Yes (1637)	Glasgow	*deprived* 1655; *restored* 1662
Carmunnock	Robert Boyd (c.1630-1703)	Yes (1648)	Glasgow	1665
Cathcart	David Hay (d.1666)	Yes (1657)	Edinburgh	1663
Cumbernauld	Alexander Auchterlony	*unknown*	*unknown*	1664
Eaglesham	Andrew Walker (1616-1669)	Yes (1639)	St Andrews	1667
Kilsyth	Gabriel Cunningham (c.1611-1665)	Yes (1632)	Glasgow	1637; *conformed 1662*
Kirkintilloch	Robert Bennet (c.1640-1679)	Yes (1660)	St Andrews	1665
Rutherglen/Polmadie	Hew Blair, jnr (1633-after 1690)	Yes (1651)	Glasgow	1662
Sources: Fasti, Gibson's History		**Archbishop of Glasgow, 1679*		
		***Professor of Divinity at Glasgow, 1674*		

Presbytery of Glasgow: Conforming clergy after 1660				
(16 charges in 12 parishes, plus Principal, Glasgow University)				
CHARGE	NAME & PERSONAL DATES	MA: Yes/No (date)	COLLEGE	DATE ENTERED CHARGE
	(where known)		(where known)	
Glasgow University	Robert Baillie, (1602-1662), *Principal*	Yes (1620)	Glasgow	1660
St Mungo 1	Hew Blair, snr., (1602-1663)	Yes (1622)	Glasgow	1644; *conformed 1662*
St Mungo 2	John Bowie (c.1609-1671)	Yes (1629)	Glasgow	1663
St Mungo 3	John Glendie (1632-1694)	Yes	St Andrews	1663
St Mungo 4	Arthur Ross* (c.1630-1704)	Yes	St Andrews	1664
St Mungo 5	William Stirling (d.1685)	Yes	Glasgow	1665
Barony	David Liddell**	Yes	unknown	1662
Govan	John Hay (1638-d. before 1690)	Yes (1654)	Glasgow	1663
Cadder	William Forbes (c.1630-1668)	Yes (1656)	Marischal	1664
Campsie/Antermony	Archibald Dennistoun (1616-1679)	Yes (1637)	Glasgow	*deprived* 1655; *restored* 1662
Carmunnock	Robert Boyd (c.1630-1703)	Yes (1648)	Glasgow	1665
Cathcart	David Hay (d.1666)	Yes (1657)	Edinburgh	1663
Cumbernauld	Alexander Auchterlony	*unknown*	*unknown*	1664
Eaglesham	Andrew Walker (1616-1669)	Yes (1639)	St Andrews	1667
Kilsyth	Gabriel Cunningham (c.1611-1665)	Yes (1632)	Glasgow	1637; *conformed 1662*
Kirkintilloch	Robert Bennet (c.1640-1679)	Yes (1660)	St Andrews	1665
Rutherglen/Polmadie	Hew Blair, jnr (1633-after 1690)	Yes (1651)	Glasgow	1662
Sources: Fasti, Gibson's History		**Archbishop of Glasgow, 1679*		
		***Professor of Divinity at Glasgow, 1674*		

Presbytery of Glasgow: Episcopalian clergy at the Revolution					
(16 charges in 12 parishes, plus Principal, Glasgow University)					
CHARGE	NAME & PERSONAL DATES (where known)	MA: Yes/No (date)	COLLEGE (where known)	DATE ENTERED CHARGE	1688-1715
Glasgow University	Dr James Fall, *Principal*	Yes	*unknown*	*unknown*	deprived 1690; precenter of York
St Mungo 1	Archibald Inglis*, *parson*	Yes (1650)	Edinburgh	1685	rabbled 1689; conformed but never settled
St Mungo 2	John Sage (1652-1711)	Yes (1669)	St Andrews	1685	rabbled 1689; non-jurant bishop 1705
St Mungo 3	Alexander Milne (1637-1691)	Yes (1662)	King's College	1664	rabbled 1689
St Mungo 4	Robert Knox	Yes (1668)	Edinburgh	1688	rabbled 1689
St Mungo 5	Alexander Kinnear (d.1697)	Yes (1659)	Glasgow	1682	rabbled 1689
Barony	Alexander George (1640-1703)	Yes (1661)	King's College	1675	rabbled 1689
Govan	Gabriel Russell (c.1643-1697)	Yes (1663)	Glasgow	1667	rabbled 1688
Cadder	David Milne	*unknown*	*unknown*	1673	rabbled 1689
Campsie/Antermony	George Milne	*presumed*	Marischal	1681	deprived 1690 (APS)
Carmunnock	Robert Boyd (d.1703)	Yes (1648)	Glasgow	1665	rabbled 1689; deprived 1690 (APS)
Cathcart	Robert Finnie (d. after 1692)	Yes (c.1670)	Glasgow	1675	rabbled 1689; deprived 1692
Cumbernauld	Gilbert Mushet (d. after 1715)	*presumed*	Aberdeen	1666	deprived 1696; refused to conform
Eaglesham	John Houston	*unknown*	*unknown*	1685	rabbled 1689
Kilsyth	Walter McGill (c.1647?-1694)	Yes (1657)?	Edinburgh	1675	deprived 1690 (Presbytery)
Kirkintilloch	William Cunningham (fl. 1687)	*unknown*	*unknown*	1687	*unknown*
Rutherglen/Polmadie	Hew Blair, jnr (1633-c.1709?)	Yes (1651)	Glasgow	1662	deprived 1690 (APS)
Sources: Fasti	* *Rector Glasgow University 1686-89*				

APPENDIX I
Returns of the free poll of the burgesses 2-3 July 1689

MERCHANTS
James Peadie - bailie
John Corse - bailie
William Napier - Dean of Guild
John Anderson of Dowhill - councillor
Hugh Montgomerie - councillor
James Stewart, Lumloch - councillor
Matthew Cumming, elder, - councillor
John Leckie, elder - councillor
John Gibson - councillor
John Aird, elder - councillor
James Bogle, Captain - councillor
John Robertson, Campsie - councillor
John Spreull, elder - councillor
John Stirling - councillor
George Muirhead - councillor
James Sloss - councillor
Gavin Wood - councillor
Peter Corbet - Treasurer

CRAFTS
Simon Tennent - bailie
John Gilchrist - Deacon Convener
Stephen Crawford - councillor
John Greer - councillor
John Gray - councillor
George Nisbet - councillor
James Cumming - councillor
Robert Young - councillor
Robert Brock - councillor
Thomas Pollock - councillor
George Robertson - councillor
George Buchanan - councillor
Robert Jamieson - councillor
James Boyd - councillor

APPENDIX II

List of those present at William Cockburn's Episcopal Meeting House in Glasgow on 30th January 1713[1]

Charles Maitland

William Cochrane of Kilmarnock, MP for Wigtown Burghs[2]

Sir Donald MacDonald of Sleat

James Stirling of Keir[3]

William Stirling of Northside

Robert Graham of Gartmore

Laurence Crawford of Jordanhill, advocate

John Walkinshaw of Scotstoun, younger

James Bell of Hamiltoun Ferme

Patrick Bell of Eastfield

Dr. William Wright of Faskin

Captain Robert Walkinshaw

James Colquhoun of Langton

John Gibson of Balshagrie

Rev. Alexander Duncan, Episcopal minister

Lieutenant John Campbell

John Barnes, former Lord Provost of Glasgow

John Herbison, merchant

James Foggo, merchant

---

1 NLS printed pamphlet series, 1.115.10, *A Sermon upon the 30th January 1713, being the Anniversary Fast for the Martyrdom for the Blessed King Charles I, preached at Glasgow, by William Cockburn, minister of the Episcopal Congregation there*, Robert Freebairn, (Edinburgh) 1713.

2 Cochrane was a Cavalier, and an opponent of the Union.

3 Involved in the Jacobite plot of 1707-1708; in the 1715 rising, in which he was attainted; returned after 1717 and purchased back his estates for a reduced sum; lived 'inoffensively' thereafter but was seized again by General Wade in 1727, Wodrow says, due to the heat about the elections. George Lockhart of Carnwath, *Scotland's Ruine*, (ed.) Daniel Szechi, ASLS, Aberdeen (1995) p.231; *Letters of George Lockhart of Carnwath 1698-1732*, (ed.) Daniel Szechi, SHS, fifth series, vol 2, (1989), p.323; Lockhart to Old Pretender, October 7th, 1727.

APPENDIX III

List of the 20 captains of the town's Train Bands (burgh militia) present at the proclamation of George I at Glasgow, 6th August 1714[1]

Thomas Smith, MP Glasgow Burghs, Dean of Guild

George Buchanan

James Maxwell

Thomas Orr

John King

John Miller

John McDonald

Gavin Struthers

John Stark

Hugh McBryde

John Brown

David Robb

Charles Miller

Robert Robertson

Robert Bogle

Adam Montgomerie

Hugh Rodger

John Graham

Robert Cross

William Carlyle

---

1 NLS printed pamphlet series 1.14(10) *Proclamation of George I by the Lord Provost, Town Council of Glasgow, assisted with several Noblemen and Principle Gentlemen of Quality and Burgers of the City* (1714).

APPENDIX IV

Presbyterian-Episcopalian controversy; Glasgow writers

JOHN ANDERSON (1667-1721) minister of Dumbarton, and Glasgow, 1718-1721.

1711? *A dialogue between a curat and a countreyman concerning the English service.*

1711 *The second dialogue.*

1711 *The countryman's letter to the curat.*

1712 *An answer to the dialogue examined.*

1712 *A letter to a friend concerning Mr. Calder's later paper entitled a return, etc.*

1712 *Curat Calder whipt*

1714 *A defence of the Church government, faith worship and spirit of the Presbyterians.*

JAMES BROWN (d.1714) minister of Glasgow 1688-1714.

1703 *A second edition of the debate in the shop, about imparity amongst pastors. Wherein the first edition by an Episcopal divine is corrected.(Edinburgh). Reply to John Hay, Episcopal minister of Falkland, Imparity among pastors. Hay replied to this with Self-condemnation, or the author of the second edition of the debate in the shop.*

1703 *A stone returning upon him that rolled it; or, an answer unto self-condemnation, holding forth both the weakness and wickedness of that Episcopal author. Reply to John Hay's Self-condemnation.*

1703 (also attributed to James Clark) *Self-murder, or an Episcopal doctor murdering his own reputation in a pamphlet called self-condemnation, in pursuance of the debate in the shop*

(Edinburgh).

JAMES CLARK (1660-1723) minister of Glasgow 1702-1723.

1690 *A sermon preached at the kirk of Auldhamstocks September 28 1690 on the occasion etc., of the deposition, etc., of Mr. John Gibson. This was answered by Dr. John Cockburn.*

1691 *Master Clark defended. A reply to Dr. John Cockburn.*

1695 'Britannus Philopresbyter', 1701, 1703, 1717, *Presbyterial government as now established and practised in the Church of Scotland methodically described, specially of the Church's intrinsic power.*

1703 *Plain grounds of Presbyterial government briefly proposed for the instruction of the common peopl.e*

1703 ? (Also attributed to James Brown) *Self-murder or an Episcopal doctor murdering his own reputation in a pamphlet called self-condemnation in pursuance of the debate in the shop*

WILLIAM COCKBURN, Episcopalian minister of Glasgow, 1712-1714

1713 *A sermon upon the 30th of January 1713 being the anniversary fast for the martyrdom of the Blessed King Charles I preached at Glasgow by William Cockburn, minister of the Episcoal congregation there.*(Edinburgh).

1723 *The persecution of the clergy reprehended in a discourse upon the ban of a divine.* (Refers to Francis Atterby).

ROBERT CRAIGHEAD (d.1711) minister of Donegal, Derry and Glasgow, 1689-90; 1698-1700.

1690 *An answer to a late book intitled a discourse concerning the inventions of man in the worship of God, by William Lord Bishop pf Derry, wherein the author's arguments against the manner of public worship are confuted.*

1696 *A modest apology occasioned by the importunity of the Bishop of Derry, etc., concerning joyning in the public worship established by law, etc., at the desire of some Presbyterian dissenters.*

1701 *Answer to the Bishop of Derry's second admonition.*

WILLIAM JAMESON (d.1720) lecturer in history, Glasgow University.

1697 *Nazianzeni Querela et Votum Justium: the foundations of the hierarchy examined.* (Glasgow).

1705 *Cyprianus isotimus, or, J S's vindication of his principles of the Cyprianic age confuted.* (Edinburgh).

1712 *The sum of the Episcopal controversy, as it is pleaded from the scriptures. Wherin the scripture arguments for Presbytery are vindicated, those for Prelacy confuted, and the false reasonings of the Prelatists confuted. (Edinburgh, Glasgow). Reply to Robert Calder.*

JOHN MACBRIDE (1650-1718), minister of Belfast, and Glasgow 1705-1709.

1697 *Animadversions on the defence of the answer to the case of the dissenting protestants of ireland in reference to a bill of indulgence.*

1702 *A vindication of marriage as solemnised by Presbyterians in the north of Ireland.*

1712 *A sample of jet-black prelatick calumny. In answer to a pamphlet called true-bleu Presbyterian loyalty; or, the Christian loyalty of Presbyterians.* (Reply to William Tidsal).

JOHN SAGE (1652-1711) Synod clerk and Episcopalian minister of Glasgow, 1686-1688, non-dioscesan bishop,

1690 *An account of the present persecution of the Church in Scotland in several letters,* (Thomas Morer, John Sage, and Alexander Monro).

1691, 1693 *The Case of the present afflicted clergy in Scotland truly represented to which is added, etc., the attestation of many unexceptional witnesses to every particular* (Four collections of papers).

1693 *An account of the late establishment of Presbyterian government by the Parliament of Scotland anno 1690, etc., in a fifth letter from a gentleman at Edinburgh to his friend at London.*

1695, 1697, 1711, *The fundamental charter of Presbytery examined,* (London). Answered by Gilbert Rule.

1695 *Principles of the Cyprianic age* (London). This was answered by William Jameson and Gilbert Rule.

1701 *A vindication of a discourse entitled Principles of the Cyprianic age, with regard to Episcopal power and jurisdiction.* This was a reply to Gilbert Rule's Cyprianic bishop examined and not found to be a diocesan).

1703 *Some remarks on the late letter from a gentleman in the city to a minister in the country and Mr. Williamson's sermon preached before the late General Assembly.* This was answered by William Jameson, Cyprianus Isotimus.

1704, 1705 *The reasonableness of a toleration enquired into,* (Edinburgh, London).This was answered by Thomas Forrester, A review and consideration of two late pamplets.

1704 *A brief examination of some things in Mr. Meldrum's sermon preached on 16 May 1703 against a toleration of those of the Episcopal persuasion inquired into purely on church principles.*

APPENDIX V

PAMPHLETS OF REV. JAMES CLARK (1660-1723), minister of the Tron Church of Glasgow, 1702-1723

1685, 1686, 1705 - *The Cross and the Crown* (various editions)

1690 - *A Sermon preached at the Kirk of Auldhamstocks, September 28 1690: On the occasion of the intimation of the sentence of deposition passed upon Mr John Gibson, late incumbent there... by Mr. J.C.* (Edinburgh).

1691 - *Master Clark Defended ... Historical Relation of the late Prebytery*

1693, 1701 - *The Plain Truth, A Discourse on the Duty of People to their Pastors. In an essay upon Hebrews 13:17. By M.J.C.* (Edinburgh)

1695 - *Presbyterial government described as it is professed and practized in the Church of Scotland, gathered out of the confessions of faith, and other public records of that Church. By Britannus Philopresbyter* (Edinburgh)

1697, 1702 - *Personal calling; or the Communicant's Best Token*, (Edinburgh).

1699 - *Memento Mori: or a Word in Season, to the Healthful, Sick and Dying,* (Edinburgh)

1700 - *Lucubratiunucula Poetica de moribus ... Symbolum Apostrolorum*

1700 - *Christs impressions strong, sweet and sensible on the hearts of believers: delivered at Athelstaneford, June 16, 1700... by J.C. M.D.*

1701, 1703, 1717 - *Presbyterial government of the Church of Scotland, methodically described, specially of the Church's Intrinsick Power*, (Edinburgh, 2nd edit., 1701).

1703 - *A Plea against Pamphlets*

1703 - *The wise or foolish choice, or the wisdom of choosing Christ, and the folly of choosing the world for our portion, discovered and asserted ... in a paraphrase on the Song of Solomon, and an abstract of the Gospel in Glasgow* (Edinburgh)

1703 - *The Spiritual Merchant: or, the art of merchandising spiritualised. ... being the substance of two sermons on Rev. 3:18. Preached towards the end of 1689. And now handled in way of treatise* ... (Glasgow)

1703 - *Plain grounds of Presbyterian Government Briefly Propos'd for the Instruction of the Common People*

1703 - *A New Year's Gift ... Piety*

1704 - *A letter dropt in the street which may be called a Seasonable Advertisement to the Members of the ensuing General Assembly, 1 March 1704*

1704 - *A Letter to a minister in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, explaining the passage of a Sermon, misconstrued by some*

1704 - *A picture of the present generation, a sermon,* (Edinburgh).

1704 - *Scotland's Speech to her sons*

1704 - *A watch word to Scotland in Perilous Times*

1705 - *The Practice of Discipline, or Some Direction for the right Managing of Ecclesiastick Discipline. In the way of Essay: Designed more especially for the Information and Use of Ruling Elders*

1705 - *Merchandising Spiritualised, or the Christian Merchant's Trading to Heaven; On Ruling Elders,* (Edinburgh).

1708 - *An Essay to discover who are the true fools and fanaticks in the World*

1708 - *A Paper concerning Daniel De Foe,* (Edinburgh).

1709? - *Rabbles and Abettors of Rabbles Condemned*

1709 - *A Just Reprimand to Daniel De Foe in a Letter to a Gentleman in South Britain*

1709 - *In Defence of Mr Clark*

1710 - *A Seasonable warning, or, Some prognostics portending great storms and tempests in Britain*

1710 - *An advertisement from Scotland to England*

1709, 1710 - *A loud call for help and sympathy; or, a sermon on Acts xvi. 9:10* (Edinburgh)

1710 - *On Propagating Christianity in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland,* (Edinburgh).

1714 - *Gratulatio Britannica ob exoptatum ... George i*

1718 - *Animadversions upon Mr John Anderson, Minister of Dumbarton, His Charge of Heretical Doctrine, & etc., On Mr James Clark, one of the ministers of Glasgow, given in and read before the reverend Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, met at Ayr, April 2nd, 1718,* (Edinburgh).

1720 - *Just and Sober Remarks on some parts and passages of the Overtures concerning Kirk sessions* (Glasgow)

1720 - *Advertisement to the General Assembly, 1720, or ane account of the Rise and Tendencie of some New Things in the Printed Overtures concerning Kirk-sessions. In a letter from a Minister of the Presbytery of Glasgow, to a Minister in the Presbytery of Edinburgh*

1722 - *Gospel Cordials, or the perplexed believer relieved from the oracles of God; in ten several cases of conscience, by M.J.C.* (Glasgow)

Posthumous
1741 - *The Christians Pocket-book: or, A Bundle of familiar exhortations on the practice of piety* (NLS catalogue attributes it to James Clark)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

i. Manuscript sources

CITY OF GLASGOW ARCHIVE

(formerly Strathclude Regional Archive)

B1 series, Burgh Court records.

C1 series, Town Council minutes.

CH2.171 series, Records of the Presbytery of Glasgow.

CH3.469.1, Records of the Associate Presbytery (1739-1755).

TPM109, 113, 114, 115, Maxwell of Pollok Papers.

MITCHELL LIBRARY

Shawfield Papers.

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY

(New College Library)

John Anderson papers, (typescript from original documents), [And 1, And 2, And, 3].

GLASGOW UNIVERSITY

Murray Collection, (Special Collections).

MSS.43170, 43227, 43228, 43229, 43230, 43231, (University Archives)

NATIONAL ARCHIVE OF SCOTLAND

(formerly Scottish Record Office)

GD26 Leven and Melville Muniments.

GD220 Montrose Muniments.

GD124 Mar and Kellie Muniments.

E69/15/1, hearth tax returns for the city of Glasgow and the Barony parish.

GD18 Clerk of Penicuik Muniments.

JC 13.1. Justice Court Records for the western circuit.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND

Adv/MS/83/1/4, list of the Darien subscribers at Glasgow.

MSS 14491.

Culloden Papers (Forbes of Culloden, Lord Advocate), MSS 2966.

Erskine-Murray Papers (Charles Erskine, Lord Tinwald, Solicitor General) Ch. 4371, Ch 4372, Ch 4373.i-iv, MSS 5072, MSS 5127.

Dunlop Correspondence, MSS 9251.

MSS 3740

Wodrow MSS:

4to, 73, 28

folios, 28, 35

Ch.2782

Saltoun Papers, MSS 16540, 16556, 1651, 16566, 17503.

Yester Papers, MS 7103, f3,8,10.

MS 4941, Caldwell Papers, Francis Hutchison to William Mure of Caldwell, M.P., 1743.

ii. Printed primary source material

(alphabetical by author if known, title & details; followed by editor, publisher, place, date).

Annan, Thomas, *Illustrated Catalogue of the Exhibition of Portraits on loan in the New Galleries of Art,* (Glasgow, 1868).

An Account of the Proceedings of the Estates in Scotland 1689-1690, 2 vols., ed. E. W. M. Balfour-Melville, Scottish History Society, 3rd series, vol. xlvi, (Edinburgh, 1955).

Analecta Scotica; collections illustrative of the civil, ecclesiastical and literary history of Scotland, ed. James Maidment, 2 vols., ii, (1837).

Anderson, J. R., ed., *The Burgesses and Guildbrethren of Glasgow, 1573-1750,* Scottish Record Society, (Edinburgh, 1925).

Burnet, Gilbert, *History of His Own Time*, (London, 1724-1734); [Everyman edition, David Allen, ed, (London, 1991)]

Charters and other documents relating to the city of Glasgow, 1649-1707, vol. ii, 1649-1707, ed. Sir James Marwick, Scottish Burgh Records Society, (Glasgow, 1906).

Culloden Papers, ed. H. R. Duff, (London, 1815).

Craig, William, *Twenty Discourses on various subjects*, 2 vols., (2nd edit. 1808).

The Cromwellian Union; papers relating to the negotiations for an incorporating union between England and Scotland, 1651-1652, ed. C. S. Terry, SHS, vol. xl, (Edinburgh, 1902).

The Darien Papers, ed. J. H. Burton, Bannatyne Club, (Edinburgh, 1849).

Extracts from the records of the burgh of Glasgow, 11 vols, vols. iii 1663-1690, iv 1691-1717, v 1718-1738, ed. Robert Renwick, Scottish Burgh Records Society, (Glasgow, 1876-1916).

Fountainhall, Sir John Lauder, Lord, *Historical Notices of Scottish Affairs Selected from the manuscripts of Sir John Lauder of Fountainhall bart., one of the senators of the College of Justice,* ed. D. Laing, 2 vols., ii, Bannatyne Club, (Edinburgh, 1848).

Fletcher, Andrew, of Saltoun, *Selected Writings*, ed. David Daiches, (Edinburgh, 1975).

Glasgow Register, (1781).

Hamilton, William, *Descriptions of the Sheriffdoms of Lanark and Renfrew*, 1710, reprinted by the Maitland Club, (1831).

Historical Manuscripts Commission, Thirteenth Report, pt i

Hume, Sir David, *Diary of the Proceedings in the Parliament and Privy Council of Scotland 1700-1707*, Bannatyne Club, (Edinburgh, 1828).

Leven and Melville Papers: letters and state papers chiefly addressed to George Earl of Melville, Secretary of State for Scotland, 1689-91, ed. W. L. Melville, Bannatyne Club, (Edinburgh, 1843).

Lockhart, Sir George, of Carnwath, *Letters of George Lockhart of Carnwath 1698-1732*, ed, Daniel Szechi, SHS, fifth series, vol. 2, (1989).

- *Scotland's Ruine*, ed. Daniel Szechi, ASLS, (Aberdeen, 1995).

Maclaurin, John, *Works of the Rev. John Maclaurin, with Life by John Gillies*, ed. W. H. Goold, (Edinburgh, 1860).

Old Country Houses of the Old Glasgow Gentry, (2nd edit., 1878).

The Old Minute Book of the Faculty of Procurators of Glasgow, 1668-1758.

Papers relating to the ships and voyages of the Company of Scotland trading to Africa and the Indies, 1696-1707, ed. G. P. Insh, SHS, (Edinburgh, 1924).

Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, ed. J. Hume Brown, third series, vol. vii, 1681-1682, (Edinburgh, 1915).

Scottish Burgh Records Society, *Miscellany*, ed. Sir James Marwick, (1881).

Seafield Correspondence 1685-1708, ed. J. Grant, 2nd series, 2 vols., SHS, (1912).

Selections from the Family Papers preserved at Caldwell, 3 vols., Maitland Club, (Glasgow, 1854).

The Siege of Edinburgh Castle, ed. Robert Bell, Bannatyne Club, (Edinburgh, 1828).

'Synod Book of Glasgow and Ayr', *Maitland Miscellany*, iv, Maitland Club, (1847).

Sage, John, *Works of John Sage*, 3 vols, ed. Charles Shand, Spottiswood Society, (1844-46).

Warrand, D., (ed.), *More Culloden Papers*, 2 vols., (Inverness, 1923-30).

Wodrow, Robert, *Analecta, or Materials for a History of Remarkable Providences mostly relating to Scotch ministers and Christians*, 4 vols., Maitland Club, (Edinburgh, 1842-43).

Wodrow, Robert, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow, 1698-1709*, ed. L. W. Sharp, SHS, third series, vol. xxiv, (Edinburgh, 1937).

Wodrow, Robert, *Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow, minister of Eastwood*, ed. Thomas M'Crie, 2 vols., Wodrow Society, (Edinburgh, 1842-43).

Wodrow, Robert, *The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the Restoration to the Revolution,* 4 vols., (Glasgow, 1828-1830).

iii. Works of reference

Aldis, H. G., *A List of Books Printed in Scotland before 1700*, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh Bibliographic Society, (Edinburgh, 1970).

Dickinson, William Croft, and Donaldson, Gordon, (eds.), *A Source Book of Scottish History,* 3 vols., vol. iii, 1567-1707, (London, 1954).

Donaldson, G., and Morpeth, R., *A Dictionary of Scottish History*, (Edinburgh, 1977).

Eighteenth Century Short Title Catalogue, CD-ROM.

Foster, Joseph, *Members of Parliament for Scotland, 1357-1882*, (London, 1882).

Fraser, William, *Memoirs of the Maxwells of Pollok*, 2 vols., (Edinburgh, 1863).

Fraser, William, *Memorials of the Montgomeries, Earls of Eglinton*, 2 vols., (Edinburgh, 1859).

Fraser, William, *The Stirlings of Keir and their Family Papers*, (Edinburgh, 1858).

Gourlay, James, (ed.), *The Provosts of Glasgow 1609-1832*, (Glasgow, 1942).

Scott, Hew, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae*, 7 vols., vol. iii, Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, (Edinburgh, 1915-28).

Sedgewick, Romney, (ed.), *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1715-1754*, 2 vols., (London, 1971).

Thomson, T., (ed.) *The Acts of the Parliament of Scotland 1124-1707*, 11 vols., (Edinburgh, 1814-75).

Warrick, John, *The Moderators of the Church of Scotland from 1690-1740*, (Edinburgh, 1913).

iv. Newspapers and contemporary journals

Caledonian Mercury

v. Contemporary works, both books and articles (author where known, title, place, date).

Adamson, John, *Some enquiries into Mr. Anderson's letters, concerning his ingenuity in pleading for Presbitery*, (nd., 1720?)

Anderson, John, *Curat Calder whipt*, (1712).

- *Defence of the Church government, faith, worship and spirit of the Presbyterians*, (1714).

- *A letter from Mr. John Anderson minister of Dunbarton to Walter Stewart of Pardovan, 27 September 1717*, (1717).

- *(Six) Letters upon the Overtures concerning kirk sessions*, (1720).

Answers for the royal burghs to the memorial in in behalf of the burghs of regalitie and baronie and other unfree trades, (1698).

[Boswell, J.] *Unto the Right Honourable the Lords of Council and Session, the petition of the magistrates and town council of Glasgow, 7 November 1718* (1718).

J. B., *A letter from a citizen of Glasgow to his friend in Edinburgh containing some modest animadversions ona late printed letter, concerning the affairs of that city*, (Glasgow, 1700).

Black, William, *The privileges of the royal burghs*, (Edinburgh, 1707).

Brown, James, *A second edition about the debate in the shop, about imparity amongst pastors. Wherein the first edition by an Episcopalian divine is corrected,* (Edinburgh, 1703).

- *A stone returning upon him that rolled it; or, an answer unto self-condemnation, holding forth both the weakness and the wickedness of that Episcopal author,* (1703).

- *Self-murder, or an Episcopalian doctor murdering his own reputation in a pamphlet called self-condemnation, in pursuance of the debate in the shop,* (Edinburgh, 1703). Also attributed to James Clark.

Campbell, George; Gray, John; Hamilton, John; Scott, John; ministers of Glasgow, and the General Session of Glasgow, *A true and exact double of two papers exchanged betwixt some of the ministers of Glasgow and that which is called the General Session there,* (1721).

Cant, Andrew, *A sermon preached at Edinburgh on Tuesday 30th January 1711, being the anniversary of the maryrdom of Charles I, by one of the suffering clergy there,* (Edinburgh, 1711).

The case of the royal boroughs of Scotland, (London, 1712).

Clark, James, *Presbyterial government as now established and practiced in the Church of Scotland, methodically described, specially of the church's intrinsic power,* (1701, 1703, 1717).

- *The Cross and the Crown,* (1686, 1705).

- *A sermon preached at the kirk of Auldhamstocks, September 28, 1690,* (Edinburgh, 1690).

- *Master Clark defended,* (1691).

- *The Communicants Best Token,* (Edinburgh, 1702).

- *The spiritual merchant; or, that art of merchandising spiritualised,* (1703).

- *A picture of the present generation,* (Edinburgh, 1704).

- *A watchword to Scotland in perilous times,* (1704).

- *A letter dropt in the street, which may be called a seasonable warning to the members of the ensuing General Assembly,* (1704).

- *A letter to a minister in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, explaining the passage in a sermon misconstrued by some,* (1704).

- *Scotland's speech to her sons*, (1706).

- *A paper concerning Daniel Defoe*, (1708).

- *Rabbles and abettors of rabbles condemned*, (1708?)

- *In defence of Mr. Clark.*

- *A just reprimand to Daniel Defoe in a letter to a gentleman in south Britain,* (1709).

- *A seasonable warning or, some prognostics portending great storms and tempests in Britain,* (1710).

- *An advertisement from Scotland to England*, (1710).

- *Gratulatio Britannica ob exepetatum, etc., George i,* (1714).

- *Animadversions on Mr. John Anderson, minister of Dumbarton, his charge of heretical doctrine, etc., on Mr. James Clark, one of the ministers of Glasgow,* (1718).

- *Just and sober remarks on some passages of the Overtures concerning kirk sessions,* (1719).

- *Advertisement to the General Assembly, 1720, or ane account of the rise and tendencie of some new things in the printed overtures concerning kirk sessions,* (1720).

- *The Christians pocket-book: or a bundle of familiar exhortations on the practice of piety, (*1741). Attributed to Clark in NLS catalogue.

Cockburn, Henry, *Memorials of His Own Time*, (Edinburgh, 1856).

Cockburn, William, *A sermon preached upon the 30th January 1713, being the anniversary fast for the martyrdom of the blessed King Charles I,* (Edinburgh, 1713).

A copy of a letter from a gentleman in Fife to his friend at Edinburgh upon the subject of the Malt Tax, (2nd ed., Edinburgh, 1725).

Craighead, Robert, *Answer to a discourse concerning the inventions of man in the worship of God,* (Edinburgh, 1694).

- *Advice to communicants* (Edinburgh, Glasgow, nd).

- *Answer to the Bishop of Derry's second admonition*, (Edinburgh, 1697).

- *Warning and advice to the Christian*, (Edinburgh, 1701).

- *Advice for assurance and salvation*, (Belfast, 1702).

- *Walking with God*, (Belfast, 1712).

Cunningham, Alexander, *A vindication of the Church of Scotland*, (1690).

Defoe, Daniel, *The History of the Union of Great Britain*, (Edinburgh, 1709).

Denholm, James, *The History of the City of Glasgow and Suburbs, compiled from authentic records and other respectable authorities,* (2nd edit., Glasgow, 1798).

Dickson, John, *To some friends when a prisoner in the Bass*, (Edinburgh, 1739)

- *To a person a little before his death* (Edinburgh, 1739)

- *Testimony to the doctrine, etc., of the Church of Scotland* (1684)

- *Sermon at the opening of the Synod*, (1698).

The Downfall of Cockburn's meeting house (1714).

[Dundas, Robert, Lord Arniston], *Answers for James Loudon, merchant in Glasgow, to the petition of the magistrates and town council of Glasgow, 12 November 1718*, (1718).

Dunlop, William, *A full vindication of the overtures transmitted to presbyteries by the Commission, November 1719,* (1720).

An exact list of the peers, barons and burgesses elected to serve in the parliament of Great Britain, 17th June 1708, (1708).

Gillies, John, 'Some account of the life and character of John Maclaurin', in W. H. Goold, (ed.), *Works of John Maclaurin*, (Edinburgh, 1860).

Glasgow, Nathaniel, see William Tennoch.

Glasgows Parrad, (1714), [NLS 8(23)]

Forbes, Duncan, of Culloden, *Some considerations on the present state of Scotland in a letter to the Commissioners for the improving of fisheries and manufactures, 23 March 1744,* (1744).

- ('Philo Scotus') *A copy of a letter from a gentleman in Edinburgh to his friend in the country upon the subject of the Malt tax,* (Edinburgh, 1725).

Fordyce, Francis; Gregory, George; Hodge, James; Irvine, William, *A letter concerning the persecution of several other ministers, 14 February 1689,* (Edinburgh, 1689).

General Session of Glasgow, *Excerpts from the General Session books respecting the Model or form of calling ministers to the city of Glasgow, anno 1721,* (Glasgow, 1721, 1762).

Gibson, John, *The History of the City of Glasgow from the Earliest Accounts to the Present Time,* (Glasgow, 1777).

The Highlandman upon the Overture called negative, (1721).

Home, Henry, *Answers to the memorial and queries of the Lord Provost and magistrates of Glasgow,* (1749).

Information for the magistrates and town council of Glasgow against George Lockhart, merchant there, and his adherents, merchants and inhabitants of the said burgh, (1701).

Kames, Lord, see Henry Home.

Ker, John, *The Memoirs of John Ker of Kersland,* (London, 1726).

A dialogue between a brewer and a gager concerning the Malt tax, (Edinburgh, 1713).

A letter from a brewer in the city to a J.P. in the country, concerning the Malt Tax, (Edinburgh, 1713).

A letter concerning the Overtures about kirk sessions and presbyteries which were transmitted to the presbyteries by the Commission of the General Assembly, November 11, 1719, (1720).

A letter from _____ to his friend, concerning the state of the town of Glasgow's business, (1700).

A letter from a gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London, containing an impartial history of the late tumults at Glasgow on the commencement of the Malt Tax, (London, 1725).

A list of members of parliament who voted for an act asserting the Indian and African Company's right to their collony at Caledonia and dissisted to the address proposed to be made thereanent by the Duke of Hamilton and his adherents in parliament, 14th January 1701, (1701).

Maclaurin, John, *The case of the poor considered; or the great advantages of erecting a public manufactory and employing the poor,* (1729).

- *An account of the great advantages of erecting a charitable house for maintaining and employing the poor of this city; with some general proposals concerning the plan of the house and proper regulation for the due oversight of it,* (1731).

- *An account of the design of erecting a charity school or workhouse in Glasgow with proposals thereanent; concerted by the after-mentioned committee, etc.,* (1731).

Magistrates and Town Council of Glasgow, *Representation of the present condition and state of the city of Glasgow and of the hardships done them by the late augmentation of their quota of the taxt roll of the royal burrows,* (circa 1704).

Magistrates of Glasgow, *Representation to the right honourable the general Convention of the Royal Burrows of this kingdom by the magistrates of Glasgow in relation to their action of compt and reckoning against the managers of the late burrow tack of the forraign customs and excise,* (circa 1705).

McUre, John, *A View of the City of Glasgow*, (1736).

Morer, Thomas, 'First letter', in John Sage (ed.), *An account of the present persecution of the Church in Scotland in several letters,* (London, 1690).

Paterson, Ninian, 'To dear mother Glasgow', *Epigrammatum Libri Octo. Cum aliquot psalmorum paraphrasi poetica,* (1677).

Proclamation in favours of George I by the Lord Provost, magistrates and town council of Glasgow, assisted with several noblemen and principle gentlemen of quality and burgesses of the city, (1714).

Philopoliteius, see Alexander Skene.

Philo Scotus, see Duncan Forbes of Culloden.

Reflexions on two late letters concerning the affairs of the city of Glasgow, by a citizen thereof, in answer to his friend at Edinburgh who designed an impartial account of that matter, (1700).

Remarks upon a paper intitled grievances with respect to the revenue of the university of Glasgow offered to the honourable Commission, (1717).

A seasonable advice to all lovers of their country, (1725).

Rule, Gilbert, *A second vindication of the Church of Scotland being an answer to five pamphlets,* (1691).

Sage, John, *An account of the present persecution of the Church in Scotland in several letters*, 4 letters, (London, 1690).

- *The Case of the present afflicted clergy in Scotland truly represented in several collections of papers,* (London, 1690).

Skene, Alexander, ('Philopoliteius'), *Memorialls for the Government of the Royall Burghs in Scotland,* (Aberdeen, 1685).

Stewart, Walter, of Pardovan, *Collections and observations concerning the worship, discipline and government of the Church of Scotland,* (1709).

- *Answers by Walter Stewart of Pardivan to the complaint given in against him by Mr. Anderson, minister of Dumbarton to the last Synod at Ayr now under consideration of the General Assembly, May 18th,* (1718).

Tennoch, William, *An examination of the overtures concerning kirk sessions and presbyteries transmitted by the commission of the General Assembly,* (1720).

- *A letter from a gentleman at Glasgow to his friend in London containing an impartial history of the late tumults at Glasgow on the commencement of the Malt Tax, London, 30 July 1725* (1725).

- ('Nathaniel Glasgow') *A letter to the magistrates and Town Council of Glasgow,* (1725)

- ('Nathaniel Glasgow') *A copy of two letters to the magistrates and Town Council of Glasgow,* (1725).

Seton, William, of Pitmedden, *Memorial to the members of Parliament of the Court Party,* (Edinburgh, 1700).

vi. Secondary works both books and articles

Allan, David, *Virtue, Learning and the Scottish Enlightenment; ideas of scholarship in early modern history,* (Edinburgh, 1993).

Anderson, A. Whitford, 'Papers of the Rev. John Anderson, reprinted from the Dumbarton Herald', NLS, privately printed, (Dumbarton, 1914).

Ballard, Adolphus, 'The theory of the Scottish royal burgh', *SHR*, xiii, (1916), pp.16-29.

Campbell, John, 'John Anderson, minister of Dumbarton and the Ramshorn Kirk, Glasgow, 1698-1721', *RSCHS*, vol. ix, (1947), pp.155-164.

Checkland, S. G., *Scottish Banking, a History, 1695-1973*, (Glasgow and London, 1975)

Clarke, T, 'The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland', *RSCHS,* vol. 24, Pt i, (1990), pp.33-51.

Coghill, David C., 'Old Glasgow Printers and Printing', *Transactions of the Old Glasgow Club,* vol. i, (1900-1908), pp.138-154.

Cooper, James, (ed.) 'The introduction of the usage of the Lord's Prayer in Dumbarton, 1698-1717', Edinburgh University New College Library, [And3], privately printed, (Aberdeen, 1905).

Couper, W. J., 'The writings and controversies of James Clark, minister at Glasgow, 1702-24', *Records of the Glasgow Bibliographic Society*, vol. xi, (1933), pp.73-95.

Cowan, I. B., *The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688*, (London, 1976).

- 'The Reluctant Revolutionaries: Scotland in 1688', in Eveline Cruikshanks (ed.), *By Force or Default: The Revolution of 1688-89*, (Edinburgh, 1989), pp.65-81.

- 'Church and state reformed? The Revolution of 1688-9 in Scotland', reprinted from *Israel: the Anglo-Dutch Moment*, (Cambridge, 1991), pp.163-183.

Devine, T. M., 'The Scottish merchant community, 1680-1740', in R. H. Campbell and A. S. Skinner (eds.), *The Origins and Nature of the Scottish Enlightenment*, (Edinburgh, 1982), pp.26-41.

- 'The Cromwellian union and the Scottish burghs; the case of Aberdeen and Glasgow, 1652-60', in J. Butt (ed.), *Scottish Themes*, (Edinburgh, 1976)., pp.1-16.

Donald, T. F., 'Glasgow and the Jacobite rebellion', *SHR*, vol xiii, (1916).

Donaldson, Gordon, *James V - James VII*, The Edinburgh History of Scotland, 4 vols., iii, (Edinburgh, 1990).

Durkan, John, 'King Aristotle and Old Butterdish: the making of a graduate in seventeenth century Glasgow', *College Courant*, vol.63, (Glasgow, 1979), pp.18-24.

Emerson, Roger L., 'Scottish universities in the eighteenth century, 1690-1800', *Studies in Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century,* vol. 167, (1977).

Eyre-Todd, George, *History of Glasgow, From the Revolution to the Reform Acts*, iii, (Glasgow, 1934).

Fry, Michael, *Patronage and Principle: a Political History of Modern Scotland*, (Aberdeen, 1991).

Glasgow University, *Calendar.*

Glassey, L. K., 'William II and the settlement of religion in Scotland, 1688-1690', *RSCHS*, vol. 23, (1989).

Gourlay, James, (ed.), *The Provosts of Glasgow 1609-1832*, (Glasgow, 1942).

Halliday, J., 'The Club and the Revolution in Scotland, 1689-1690', *SHR*, vol. 46, (1966), pp.143-59.

Herron, *Kirk by Divine Right, Church and State*, (1985).

Hewison, J. K., 2 vols., ii, *The Covenanters*, (1913).

Jackson, Gordon, 'Glasgow in Transition, c.1660 - c. 1740', in T. M. Devine and G. Jackson, (eds.), *Glasgow, volume i: Beginnings to 1830*, (Manchester, 1995), pp.63-105.

Keith, Theodora, 'The trading privileges of the royal burghs of Scotland', *English Historical Review*, 28, (1913).

- 'Municipal Elections in the Royal Burghs of Scotland, Pt i, prior to the union, *SHR*, vol xiii, (1916), pp.111-125.

- 'Municipal Elections in the Royal Burghs of Scotland, Pt ii, from the union to the passing of the Burgh Reform Bill in 1833, *SHR*, vol xiii, (1916), pp.266-278.

Kennedy, Thomas, 'William Leechman, pulpit eloquence and the Glasgow Enlightenment', in A. Hook and R. B. Sher, (eds.), *The Glasgow Enlightenment*, (Edinburgh, 1995).

Kidd, Colin, *Subverting Scotland's Past; Scottish whig historians and the creation of an Anglo-British identity, 1689-c.1830,* (Cambridge, 1993).

Lachman, D., *The Marrow Controversy, 1718-1723*, (Edinburgh, 1988).

Landsman, Ned C., 'Liberty, piety and patronage: the social context of contested calls in eighteenth century Glasgow', in Andrew Hook and Richard B. Sher, (eds.), *The Glasgow Enlightenment,* (Edinburgh, 1995).

Lenman, B., 'The Scottish nobility and the Revolution of 1688-1690', in R. Beddard, (ed.), *The Revolutions of 1688*, (Oxford, 1991), pp.135-162.

- 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism', in E. Cruikshanks, (ed.) *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, (Edinburgh, 1982), pp.36-48.

Lumsden, Harry, *Records of the Trades House of Glasgow 1713-1777*, (Glasgow, 1934).

Lynch, Michael, 'Introduction', in M. Lynch (ed.), *The Early Modern Town*, (London, 1987).

- Scotland: A New History, (London, 1994).

Mackenzie, William Mackay, *The Scottish Burghs*, (Edinburgh and London, 1949).

McGrath, J, 'The Medieval Burgh', in T. M. Devine and G. Jackson, eds. *Glasgow, volume i: Beginnings to 1830*, (Manchester, 1995), pp.17-62.

McKean, Charles; Walker, David; Wallace, Frank; *Central Glasgow: an illustrated architectural guide*, (Edinburgh, 1993).

McMillan, W., 'The Covenanters after the Revolution of 1688', *RSCHS*, vol. x, (1950), pp.141-153.

Macpherson, Hector, 'The political ideals of the Covenanters, 1660-1688', *RSCHS*, vol. i, Pt iv, (1926), pp.224-232.

Mathieson, William L., *Politics and Religion in Scotland, a study in Scottish History from the Reformation to the Revolution,* 2 vols., ii, (Glasgow, 1902).

Maxwell, Thomas, 'William III and the Scots Presbyterians Pt i, The Crisis in Whitehall', *RSCHS,* vol. xv, (1964), pp.117-139.

- 'Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688', Pt I, xiii, *RSCHS,* (1957), pp.25-37.

Menary, George, *The Life and Letters of Duncan Forbes of Culloden*, (London, 1936).

Moore, James, 'The two systems of Francis Hutcheson: on the origins of the Scottish Enlightenment', in M. A. Stewart, (ed.), *Studies in the Philosophy of the Scottish Enlightenment, (*Oxford, 1990), pp.37-59.

Morton, Robert, 'The literature of dissent in Glasgow', *Records of the Glasgow Bibliographic Society*, vol. xi, (1933), pp.57-69.

Murdoch, Alexander, *The People Above; Politics and Administration in Mid-eighteenth Cenury Scotland,* (Edinburgh, 1980).

Murray, David, *Early Burgh Organisation in Scotland; as illustrated in the history of Glasgow and of some neighbouring burghs*, 2 vols., i, (Glasgow, 1924).

Ord, John, *The Origins of the Glasgow Police*, (Glasgow, 1906).

Prebble, John, *The Darien Disaster*, (London, 1968).

Riley, P. W. J., *The Union of England and Scotland; a study in Anglo-Scottish politics of the eighteenth century,* (Manchester, 1978).

- *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, (Edinburgh, 1979).

- 'The formation of the Scottish ministry of 1703', *SHR*, xliv, (1965), pp.112-134.

- 'The Scottish parliament of 1703', *SHR*, xlvii, (1968), pp.129-150.

Sher, Richard, and Hook, Andrew, *The Glasgow Enlightenment*, (Edinburgh, 1995).

Sher, R., 'Commerce, religion and the enlightenment n eighteenth century Glasgow', in T. M. Devine, *Glasgow; volume i, Beginnings to 1830*, (Manchester, 1995).

Smout, T. C., 'The development and enterprise of Glasgow, 1556-1707', *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, vol. vii, (1960), pp.194-212.

- 'The early Scottish sugar houses, 1660-1720', *Economic History Review*, 2nd series, vol. xiv, (1961-62), pp.240-53.

- 'The Glasgow merchant community in the seventeenth century', *SHR*, vol. xlvii, (1968), pp.53-70.

Stevenson, David, 'The burghs and the Scottish Revolution' in Michael Lynch, ed., *The Early Modern Town*, (London, 1987).

- *The Covenanters; The National Covenant in Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1988).

Shepherd, C. M., 'Newtonianism in Scottish Universities in the Seventeenth Century', in R. H. Campbell and Andrew Skinner, *The Origins and Nature of the Scottish Enlightenment*, eds., (Edinburgh, 1982), pp.65-85.

Story, R. H., *William Carstares, a Character and Career of the Revolution Epoch 1649-1715*, (London, 1874).

Sunter, Ronald, *Patronage and Politics in Scotland, 1707-1832*, (Edinburgh, 1986).

Whatley, C., 'How tame were the Scottish Lowlanders during the eighteenth century?', in T. M. Devine, ed., *Conflict and Stability in Scottish Society, 1700-1850,* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp.1-30.

- 'Labour in the industrialising city', in T. M. Devine and G. Jackson, (eds.), *Glasgow, volume i: Beginnings to 1830*, (Mamchester, 1995), pp.360-401.

Whiteford, D. H., 'Jacobitism as a factor in Presbyterian Episcopalian relationships in Scotland, 1689-1714', Pt ii, *RSCHS,* vol. xvi, (1968), pp.185-201.

(f) Theses

Halliday, James, 'The career and significance of Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie, 1654-1694', Glasgow University B.Litt. thesis, 1963.

Maxwell, Thomas, 'The Presbyterian-Episcopalian controversy in Scotland from the Revolution Settlement to the accession of George I', Edinburgh University Ph.D. thesis, 1954.

Shepherd, Christine Mary, 'Philosophy and Science in the arts curriculum of the Scottish universities in the seventeenth century', Edinburgh University Ph.D. thesis, 1975.

Shepherd, William Scott, 'The Politics and society of Glasgow, 1648-1674', Glasgow University Ph.D. thesis, 1978.

GLASGOW
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY