

THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
DISSENT AND THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, 1660-1690

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF ARTS IN CANDIDACY
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

BY
MARK LINDEN MIRABELLO

JANUARY 1988

TO PAUL MIRABELLO, THE LATE REGINA BARANSKI MIRABELLO,
AND ALL MY STUDENTS

Contents

1. The Collapse of the Covenants
2. The Restoration Settlement
3. The Nadir of Presbyterianism
4. The Royal Supremacy
5. The Bishops of the Post-Restoration Church
6. The Ministers of the Post-Restoration Church
7. The Ecclesiastical Courts
8. The Worship of the Established Church
9. Presbyterian Dissent: 1663-1668
10. Presbyterian Dissent: 1668-1679
11. Presbyterian Dissent: 1679-1688
12. Persecution and Presbyterian Nonconformity
13. The Triumph of Presbyterianism

Summary

The subject of this dissertation is the ecclesiastical history of Scotland between 1660 and 1690. This work will examine the struggle between "presbytery" and "prelacy" in detail, and it will examine the role of the state in that conflict.

The first three chapters deal with the post-Restoration church settlement and public reactions to that settlement, and these chapters are revisionist in approach. It is usually claimed that the decision to disestablish "presbytery" and revive "prelacy" in 1661 was unpopular, but the evidence in chapters one, two, and three suggests that the king's church polity--at least in the early years--aroused no great protest or outcry? Why? The war, turmoil, and taxes between 1637 and 1660 (the bitter harvest of the covenants) had left the Scots indifferent to religion in general and presbyterianism in particular, and although such attitudes would change in time, they were initially very real.

Chapter four is an examination of the royal supremacy, one of the most controversial aspects of the post-Restoration church. In chapter four it will be argued that the presbyterians fundamentally misconstrued the nature of the royal supremacy--they exaggerated the king's ecclesiastical claims--but it will be shown that the crown's authority over the kirk was extensive nevertheless.

Chapters five and six will examine the clergy of the

post-Restoration kirk, the bishops and ministers that made it function. Chapters five and six will analyze the background and credentials of the clergy, and it will discuss the validity of the various charges made against them.

Chapter seven will examine the ecclesiastical courts of the post-Restoration church, and it will discuss how the revival of prelacy affected these courts and changed their composition and function. It has been argued that the post-Restoration kirk was basically a "presbyterian church" with bishops superimposed for political purposes, but chapter seven will show that this opinion is incorrect, for in the period "church power" was clearly concentrated in the hands of the bishops, and, by and large, the church courts only existed in a mutated or abbreviated state. The changes in the church courts are important, for they help explain why the post-Restoration kirk could not accomodate presbyterians in the long run.

Chapter eight is an analysis of the worship of the post-Restoration kirk. It will discuss the various developments in worship--the rejection of the Directory of Public Worship, the resurrection of set forms of prayer, the repudiation of the lecture, the reinstitution of kneeling, the revival of the Perth Articles--and it will argue that the post-Restoration kirk was slowly drifting from the simple; spontaneous covenanter mode of worship to a more elaborate and structured mode that derived its inspiration from the Church of England.

Chapters nine, ten and eleven are a history of presbyterian nonconformity. These chapters divide the history

of dissent into three periods. First, a period of weakness (extending from early 1663 to roughly 1668-1669), when conventicles were few and most Scots conformed. This weakness was largely the result of the initial unpopularity of the covenanting cause and the traditional Scottish aversion to schism. Next, there was a period of vitality (extending from 1668-1669 to the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion), when dissent grew stronger and stronger and began to show some militant tendencies. The evidence suggests that this burst of vitality was inadvertently fostered by the government's "indulgence" policy. And finally, a third period (extending from the Rebellion to the granting of religious toleration in 1687), when conventicles again became rare and most Scots again conformed. This collapse, it will be argued, was the result of persecution (the traditional explanation) and the actions of certain radical sects who unwittingly undermined and disrupted presbyterianism with their "excesses."

Chapter twelve analyzes the persecution which the presbyterians endured. In the course of examining the various penalties used against dissenters--some of which were designed to deprive the nonconformist of his wealth and property, and others which were designed to affect the liberty, health, and even the life of the nonconformist--chapter twelve will correct some presbyterian hyperbole. The traditional presbyterian sources, such as the definitive work by Robert Wodrow, tend to emphasize the rigor of the persecution, but chapter twelve shows that the penal laws were often inconsistently applied.

And finally, chapter thirteen will examine Scotland's last ecclesiastical revolution, the victory of presbyterianism in 1689-1690. The directors of the "revolution," King William and his supporters, justified the charge on the grounds that presbyterianism was favored by the majority, but chapter thirteen questions the validity of that claim, and argues that political considerations, rather than demographic factors, were responsible for the presbyterian triumph.

Preface

The transition from Roman Catholicism to Protestantism was easy for Scotland--the former was outlawed with little fuss in 1560--but the triumph of the Reformation would create a serious dilemma. What brand of Protestantism should Scotland embrace? Should she choose prelacy or presbyterianism? The problem, which seems simple enough today, would lead to disputations and tumults in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and it would not be resolved until 1690.

This dissertation deals with the decisive chapter in Scottish Reformation history: the thirty crucial years between 1660 and 1690. It will analyze the ecclesiastical settlement of 1661-1662 and the public reaction to that settlement, it will examine the structure and clergy of Scotland's last "prelatical" church, it will trace the course of presbyterian dissent during the reigns of Charles II and James VII and evaluate the persecution that the presbyterian dissenters endured, and it will examine the presbyterian victory in 1689-1690.

Any mistakes in this work are my own, but I must express my gratitude to certain individuals. First of all, I must thank Professor Ian B. Cowan, of the University of Glasgow. Professor Cowan gave me his time, patience, and direction, and this dissertation would have been stillborn without him. I must also thank Professor A. A. M. Duncan, who made my work at Glasgow possible, and Dr. James Kirk, who provided me with some invaluable information. I also wish to

thank Mrs. Anne Duncan, Mrs. Kathleen Gavin Richardson, Mrs. Paula Sheroian, the librarians of the University of Glasgow, and the staff of the Register House in Edinburgh. Finally, I want to thank my present colleagues at Shawnee State University (especially Professor John Kelley, Professor Eleanor Marsh, and Dr. James Flavin) and my former colleagues at the University of Toledo (especially Professor James Larson). Their example of excellence has inspired me.

Chapter One

The Collapse of the Covenants

The covenants were remarkable documents. The National Covenant of 1638, drawn up by Alexander Henderson and Archibald Johnston of Wariston, was designed to halt the innovations introduced by Charles I --innovations such as a prayer book for Scotland and "civil places" for churchmen--until they had been tried and allowed by free assemblies and parliaments. The Solemn League and Covenant, drawn up in 1643, was dedicated to the preservation of the Reformed religion in Scotland, the reformation of religion in England and Ireland, the extirpation of popery and prelacy, the preservation of the rights and privileges of the parliaments of Britain and Ireland, and the firm peace and union of England and Scotland.¹ These two covenants unleashed the energies of a nation, and they inspired the Scots to fight for "religion and liberty."

The covenanting struggle had noble aims, but the righteous crusade would not turn out as expected. To the contrary, the covenants would produce bitter civil wars, and these would lead to death, privation, military defeat, a forced union with England,² and "one abyss of misery, distraction, and disorder."³ One historian has suggested that the period of the "Rebellion" was the worst period in Scottish history,⁴ and there is a substantial amount of material to support his grim opinion. The covenanters themselves admitted that the 1640's and 1650's had seen a "flood of troubles," and one

contemporary described the period in graphic terms:

The land was defiled with much innocent blood,⁶ by an unjust war, by rising up against the king.... How many mournful widows and fatherless orphans have our late civil, or rather, incivil wars made in Scotland? How many poor creatures have been snatched away perforce, from their weeping wyves, and poor babies, and sent out to be soldiers, that knew not how to handle a sword or arms? What could these do but be cutted down like beasts? And doth not the blood of these poor creatures cry to God for vengeance, against rebels, usurpers, and tyrants? Is not the land defiled with much innocent blood by most unjust and cruel sentences on benches? Is not the land defiled with much innocent blood upon scaffolds?... Thus was the land defiled with bloodie crimes. And was it not full of violence also, full of unrighteousness, falsehood, deceit, cheating, injustice, oppression, and robbery, defiled with violence of all sorts? What oppression, injustice, and violence was there by blind bands, loan money, or rather, taking men's means, and imprisoning their persons, forcing their consciences, and several things of that nature.⁷

Other observers expressed similar opinions. The anonymous author of A Letter Containing an Humble and Serious Advice to Some in Scotland, in Reference to Their Late Troubles and Calamities described Scotland during the "Rebellion" as "a sad and tragicall scene," and a "bloody stage," and Sir George Mackenzie, looking back on the covenanting years, declared:

My heart bleeds when I consider how scaffolds were dyed with Christian blood, and the fields covered with carcasses of murdered Christians; and it is probable, that there were more damned by unprepared deaths, in the fields, than were saved by peeping sermons in incendiary churches....⁹

Civil wars are the most ruinous wars, and Scotland's "rebellion" was no exception. Untold thousands died in the battles for the covenants, and thousands of other Scots were killed by the epidemics (in 1645 the bubonic plague appeared in Scotland) that the marauding armies helped to spread. And, on top of all the bloodshed, there was financial collapse. The covenanting struggle disrupted commerce (privateers preyed upon

Scottish shipping, and only nine Scottish ships were able to participate in the Baltic trade in 1651) and multiplied taxes. The latter was especially severe. Scotland had to support an army almost continuously from 1639--first the covenanting army, then the English army that conquered the Scots--and the resulting increase in taxation meant that a "vast, incredible treasure of money" was "drained" from the "poor nation." The levies were especially severe during the 1650's: England tried to squeeze 10,000 pounds sterling out of Scotland each month after the "union," but the impoverished Scots could only raise a fraction of the required sum.¹⁰

Robert Baillie, a faithful covenanter, witnessed the economic collapse of Scotland, and he described it in his letters and journals. "A great armie, in a multitude of garrisons," he wrote, "hydes above our head, and deep povertie keeps all estates exceedingly at under; the taxes of all sorts are...great, the trade...little." Later, Baillie wrote that the nation was "exhaust in money, dead in trade--the taxes near doubled," and on a third occasion he described the financial plight of individuals:

Our noble families are almost gone; Lennox had little in Scotland unsold; Hamilton's estate, except Arran and the barony of Hamilton, is sold,...the Gordons are gone, the Douglasses little better; Eglinton and Glencairn on the brink of breaking; many of our chief families...are cracking."¹¹

Other examples could be given: the Dalrymples of Carnwath lost 188,000 pounds scots, the earl of Perth lost 150,000 pounds scots, the earl of Queensberry lost 255,000 pounds scots, the earl of Home and the earl of Lothian were virtually bankrupt,

and Sir William Dick of Braid, once the richest man and "the most considerable merchant" in the kingdom, lost everything he had. Dick of Braid's fate is especially illuminating. He embraced the covenanting cause with enthusiasm and lent his own money to the rebels. By Martinmas of 1647 Dick of Braid had contributed over 530,000 pounds scots--an astronomical sum in the seventeenth century--and this money would never be repaid, even though it had helped to make the covenanting cause possible. Dick of Braid ended up in an English debtors's prison, and he died in 1655 "in great misery and want, and without the benefit of a decent funeral."¹²

The fact that Scotland was "so harassed and spoiled" during the 1640's and 1650's was bad enough, but the Scots who lived during the "miseries and calamities" (which lasted "for more than half the time the people of Israel wandered in the wilderness") had another reason to complain. The clergy were powerful during the "rebellion," and they arrogantly abused that power, and "lorded it over kings, parliaments, and people." On the local level, Scotland had "one thousand parochial bishops," as the ministers in their kirk sessions behaved as petty tyrants and exercised a "coercive power" over their parishes, and on the national level the kingdom had to endure the excesses of a General Assembly, a "many-headed pope" filled with "covenanting Hildebrandists" who liked to "set their feet on the necks of Christian princes" and "profess a papal sovereignty" over all men. Regarding the General Assembly, George Hickes, a critic, described it in its heyday in these terms:

It was the supreme Sanhedrin, wherein the King of Sion sat in the highest power and glory he could upon earth. It was there, where ecclesiastical sovereignty and infallibility were to be found.... The authority they exercised in it, they pretended to have by immediate trust from Christ; and declared, that whosoever obeyed not this sovereignty, be he king or subject,... was to be excommunicated.... In this court the spiritual legislative power was seated, it was the highest tribunal and judicatory of Christ upon earth, from which no person, no office, no condition of creature was privileged, and from whence no appeal could be had.¹³

The accounts of clerical usurpations may sound exaggerated, but even Robert Douglas, a leading presbyterian minister and a covenanter, conceded that they had an element of truth in them. Douglas admitted that many thought the ministers had been too "rash, heady, and undiscerning to authority," and too "rigid in their dealings with noblemen, gentlemen, and others in the land, and although he denied some of the more extravagant charges made against the clergy, Douglas confessed that they had shown too much "brousknes" to "superiors." And this "brousknes," he added, had "given occasion" to "many" to "entertain hard thoughts" about the ministers.¹⁴ In other words, clerical activities had produced anticlericalism in the land, the kind of anticlericalism that could be observed in the writings of Sir Thomas Urquhart. Urquhart, best known for his translation of Rabelais into English, condemned the clergy with the strongest terms. Urquhart wrote, in rather convoluted prose:

how covetousness, under the mask of religion, took such deep root in that land, was one way occasioned by some ministers, who, to augment their stipends, and cram their bags full of money, thought fit to possess the minds of the people with strong opinion of their sanctity, and implicit obedience in their injunctions: to which effect, most rigidly Israelizing it in their synagogical sanhedrins, and officiously bragging

In their pulpits (even when Scotland, by diverse notorious calamities of both sword, plague, and famine, was brought very low) that no nation (for being likest to the Jews of any other) was so glorious as it; they, with a pharisaical superciliousness, would always rebuke the non-covenanters and sectaries as publicans and sinners, unfit for the purity of their conversation, unless by the malignance or over-mastering power of a cross winde they should be forced to call the hypocritical bunt, let fall the top-gallant of their counterfeit devotion, and tacking about, to sail a quite contrary course (as many of them have already done), the better at last to cast their anchor in the harbour of profit, which is the butt they aimed at, and sole period of all their dissimulations.¹⁵

Such anticlericalism, coupled with all the disasters of the Rebellion, could not but have an effect on the nation, and they did. When Charles II returned from exile in the spring of 1660, there were many who blamed the "fury and zealotry of the kirk" for the "miseries and confusions which had befallen" Scotland, and there was a great reaction against the covenants and the coven^rters.¹⁶ Robert Douglas, it is true, tried to stem the tide. He told the people that "the rubbish of seditions and rebellions, wherewith the covenant had been covered, if not buried," had been the work of "false covenanters," and he entreated the people to "learn ... both to forgive and forget" the "bypast wrongs done to ... persons or estates,"¹⁷ but his efforts were in vain, and the covenants were despised by a large part of the population.¹⁸ Various contemporaries noticed this fact. Archibald Johnston of Wariston, the covenanting leader, wrote in his diary in 1660 that "the bulk of the nation was turned ... against ... presbyterial government," and he added that there were "as many now against the covenant as were for it in 1643."²² John Nicoll, another diarist, wrote of the

"malice borne aganes the covenant" when he described "the temper of the pepill" in the early Restoration period. William Row, a presbyterian minister and a contemporary, wrote that "too many in Scotland ... had an evil eye to the covenant and prebyterial government" in 1660. And James Stewart and James Stirling, the authors of Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland, wrote that at the time of the king's Restoration a "prejudice" against the covenants was "in the hearts of our nobles, rulers, and generality of the land," in spite of the nation's "solemn engagements, sacred oaths, public professions," and "vigorous actings and appearances for the cause and covenant of the Lord."¹⁹

This "prejudice" against the covenants can be seen in a number of tracts printed shortly after the king's return. The authors of these tracts, to say the least, rated the covenants with Cromwell and the devil. The author of Edinburgh's Joy for His Majesties Coronation in England compared the covenants with Dagon, the pagan god of the Philistines. The author of A Letter Containing an Humble and Serious Advice to Some in Scotland in Reference to Their Late Troubles and Calamities declared to his readers that the covenants were "the grand engines of drawing you away from your duty at first, and the very womb that impregnated all the treasons, warrs, and calamities you have acted, seen, or felt; sinful in the matter, as obliging to injustice, breach of duty, and former oaths, to the abetting and maintaining of rebellion and war, against your sacred sovereign his person and authority; by which oaths God was highly

provoked, your king's just rights trampled on, and obedience to him subjected and made subordinate to inferior ends." Another contemporary writer described the covenants as a plot by "grand imposturs" and "factious and self-designing men" who "speciously" promoted "their own base and carnal interests under the colour of the interests of Jesus Christ," and he denounced the "unparalleled fraud and force practiced in imposing these oaths, upon honest and wel-meaning subjects." John Paterson, the author of Tandem Bona Causa Triumphant, or Scotland's Late Misery Bevailed, called the covenants a "chain of bondage and slavery," and he added that "it will never be well with Scotland, neither will God be fully pacified with us, and turn his anger from us, till all ranks of people in Scotland, nobles, gentry, Burrows, and, in particular, till ... the ministry, come to an ingenuous confession," and "repent and mourn before God," for their "accession to the making of the chain." Paterson especially emphasized that the clergy should repent and not "wipe" their own mouths "like the whore," for "God will extort a confession from us, whether we will or no."²¹

One of the most elaborate denunciations of the covenants can be found in A Brief Resolution of the Present Case of the Subjects of Scotland. The author of the tract cited Hosea 10:4--"they have spoken words, swearing falsely, in making a covenant; thus judgement springeth up as hemlock in the furrows of the field"--and then he denounced the covenants as "sinful" oaths that were no more binding in the eyes of God than Herod's pledge to deliver the head of John the Baptist to the

daughter of Herodias. Why were the covenants unlawful? First, to be legitimate, an oath cannot "prejudice" "another man's just rights," and since the covenants were obviously prejudicial to the king's presumed "rights," the covenants were illicit. Secondly, the oaths under discussion were illegal because "a combination or confederation of subjects against their sovereign for redressing abuses and reforming religion is contrary to scripture." The covenanters, of course, justified rebellion on scriptural grounds, but here they joined "issue with the phanatick anabaptists and the bloodiest of the pope's devotionaries (who with them, in this resemble Sampson's foxes, being linkt together by the tails, though their heads look different ways), and with them cry up the lawfulness on carrying on a Reformation in religion, by outward force and violence: so much contrary to the ways and word of God." The aims of Christians are spiritual, not temporal, and "there is no command from Christ to kill and slay the common enemies of our religion, but contrariwise, to pray for our persecutors." Finally, the covenants were illegal because "no oath is or can be justifiable or of binding force, which is taken against a righteous, laudable oath formerly sworn."²² For, one lawful oath can never "make void another, much lesse can an unlawful, vacat the obligation of a righteous oath." Since the covenanters had previously taken a "lawful" oath of allegiance to their sovereign (and, in the case of ministers, a "lawful" oath of canonical obedience to their bishops), the terms of the covenants could not be binding upon them.²³

Hostility to the covenants manifested itself in other ways besides the manufacture of polemical tracts. In the town of Linlithgow, some people poured public scorn on the oaths by erecting a strange structure in the town's market square. The structure consisted of an arch supported by four pillars. On one side of this structure there was a figure of an old hag, and she held the "Solemn League and Covenant" and the words "A Glorious Reformation." On the other side there was a figure of a covenanter, and he held the "Remonstrance" and the words "No Association with Malignants." A figure of the devil was on top of the arch, and in his mouth were written the words "Stand to the Cause." On the pillars were drawn "kirk-stools," "rocks," "reels," "brochans," "cogs," and "spoons." Within the arch were painted a "Committee of Estates" with the words "Act for delivering up the King," "A Commission of the Kirk," and "Act of the West Kirk." In the center of the arch, these lines were suspended:

From covenanters with uplifted hands,
From Remonstrators with associate bands,
From such committees as governed this nation,
From kirk-commissions and their protestation,
Good Lord, deliver us.

Behind the arch there was a figure of "Rebellion" in a "religious habit, with turned up eyes and a fanatic gesture," and he was holding Lex Rex in one hand and the True Causes of God's Wrath in the other. Above this last figure was the inscription, "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft," and around it were scattered the acts of the covenanting parliaments, General Assemblies, and Commissions, and all the protestations,

declarations, and other covenanting documents "hatched" during the two decades before 1660.²⁴

In other areas, hostility was shown by berating covenanters. This, Archibald Johnston of Wariston, the Marquis of Argyll, and James Guthrie--three covenanting leaders who were executed for treason in the first years after the king's return--found to their cost. When Wariston died, there was not sorrow, but hilarity.²⁵ The diarist Lamont wrote that when Johnston was on the scaffold delivering his last speech, "alwayes while he was speaking the Lord Kingston cryed outt at the fore-stare, that they should cause him to hold his peace, for he was speaking treason, upon which the whole multitude fell a laughing." The Marquis of Argyll, who at one time had been the most powerful man in Scotland, also received ill-treatment from the crowd. When he was brought to Edinburgh for trial and certain condemnation in December of 1660 with the laird of Swinton, "many thousands did gaze and exclaim against them as they came up the streit, calling them traytors and such like." And, as for Guthrie, no description of the mob's reaction to him has been found, but in his last speech on the scaffold he did refer to the opposition he had encountered in his own parish. "God forgive," he declared, "the misleaders ... who tempted" some of the people of Stirling "to reject their own pastor."²⁶

It seems, in short, that covenanters and the covenants they represented were both unpopular in the early Restoration period. Twenty disastrous years between 1640 and 1660 had seen to that. But this "heart-hatred" toward "covenant

principles" (and the presbyterianism they represented) did not, however, mean that Scotland was suddenly in love with episcopacy. To the contrary, bishops had never really been popular in Scotland, and the people were certainly not clamoring for the reestablishment of prelacy after the king's return. One pamphlet published early in the period claimed that "petitioners are hourly expected to supplicate the parliament" for the restoration of the "government of the church" by bishops,²⁸ but such supplications, needless to say, never in fact poured into Edinburgh. There was simply not enough zeal in the land for episcopacy. Indeed, Scotland showed little zeal for religion in any form in the early Restoration period, and instead there was a preoccupation with secular concerns. The people were interested in repairing their broken fortunes, and there was, in the words of one contemporary, "no talk of reformation" in the early 1660's.²⁹ This indifference to religion was found especially among the nobles, lairds, and burgesses. In 1660, no fewer than twenty-eight nobles were in England to greet the newly restored king, but it does not appear that either singly or as a body did they do anything in the interest of either presbytery or episcopacy. As for the lairds and burgesses, they were similarly indifferent. In 1660 the estates of the barons and the burgesses sent their agents to the king, and when Charles II met these agents (together with some nobles) in the earl of Crawford's lodgings, the king was asked for a free parliament, a free Council of Estates, the removal of the English forces in Scotland, the abolition of the cess and

the excise, and so forth, but no one made any mention of religion.³⁰

Yet, if the anti-covenanter emotions of the 1660's did not produce a reaction in favor of prelacy, they nevertheless did have an important side effect. They fed into and were in turn fostered by an important phenomenon, the royalist hysteria that gripped Scotland in the early Restoration period. This royalist hysteria took the form of a sheer, unmitigated outburst of joy at the king's Restoration. The return of Charles II meant the end of a national humiliation--a forced union with England and unwanted English troops on Scottish soil--and the jubilation was unbounded as a result. Ironically, at first even the ministers celebrated. John Jameson, in a sermon published in 1661, declared that with the Restoration "we have received salvation from our enemies, deliverance from our oppressors," by the power of God and His servant Charles, and Robert Douglas, in a 1661 sermon, pressed the then popular belief that "God ... delivered our king.... He brought him home without armes, yea, without shedding of blood; who ever make men sharers in this deliverance, they are ignorant of the Lord's walking."³¹

The royalist passions that gripped Scotland in the early Restoration period were as hysterical as the fervor that surrounded the events of 1637 and 1638. In one pamphlet, Edinburgh's Joy for His Majesties Coronation in England, it is remarked that Jenny Geddes, the semi-legendary figure who allegedly inaugurated the St. Giles riot of 1637 by hurling her kirk stool, was a new woman in 1660, for she celebrated the

king's return by burning her "chair of state" and "countenancing the action with high flown claret and vermillion majesty."³²

Obviously, the sudden support for the king was a dramatic switch for the nation. Robert Baillie, writing at the beginning of the covenanting era some years before, commented that "no man " could "speak any thing for the king's part, except he would have himself marked as a sacrifice to be killed one day,"³³ but in 1660, according to Kirkton, a presbyterian historian, it was the king who was on every man's lips, not the covenants. Kirkton, describing the mood of the ruling classes, declared:

high were the clamours against the behavior of the nation in opposing their gracious king. Great were the commendations of the king's excellencies: terrible threatenings against his enemies.... As for that notion religion, many of them hade it in the same esteem a chamber-maid has a spider in the window, wishing heartily to be rid of it; and if they could not destroy the thing, they resolved at least to suppress the name: nothing could be seen, but debauch and revelling, nothing heard but clamorous crimes, all flesh corrupted their way.³⁴

In his description of the general mood of the nation, Kirkton wrote:

as soon as the certainty of the king's return arrived in Scotland, I believe there was never accident in the world altered the disposition of a people more than did the Scottish nation. Sober men observed, it not only inebriate but really intoxicate, and made the people not only drunk but fanatick; men did not think they could handsomely express their joy, except they turned brutes for debauch, revels, and pugeants; yea, many a sober man was tempted to exceed, lest he should be condemned as unnatural, disloyal, and unsensible.³⁵

Another contemporary also described the "universal and superlative joy" that greeted the news of the king's Restoration, and this observer added that during the celebrations all "gravity was laid aside to give place to all

sort of frisking and gamboling, and nothing was more out of fashion and ridiculous," than to see "any one man, in space of three minutes, not to be seen hanging two of them in the aire with capriols." Reflecting on this sudden outburst of royalism after two decades of treason and sedition, he added: "Blest be God,... the people are restored to their wits."³⁶

The early 1660's was a "mad roaring time"³⁷ of royalist enthusiasm and anti-covenanter hysteria, but the mood of the period could not last. Eventually, the "love" that the people bore toward the king's "unknown person"³⁸ would weaken, and the memory of the covenanter excesses of the 1640's and 1650's would grow fainter and fainter. Charles II, however, would exploit the "mad roaring time" while he could, and he would use his temporary popularity and the temporary reaction against the covenants to dismantle the political and ecclesiastical achievements of the covenanters. The implementation of the king's program, the so-called Restoration settlement, will be the subject of the next chapter.

Notes

- ¹David Stevenson, The Scottish Revolution, 1637-1644 (London, 1973), pp. 84-86, 285-286; Gordon Donaldson, Scotland, James V to James VII (Edinburgh, 1965), pp. 313-315, 331; F. Dow, Cromwellian Scotland, 1651-1660 (Edinburgh, 1979).
- ²William Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, ed. Thomas McCrie (Edinburgh, 1848), p. 291.
- ³A Letter Concerning an Humble and Serious Advice to Some in Scotland, in Reference to Their Late Troubles and Calamities, by a Person of That Nation (N.P., 1661), p. 7.
- ⁴Donaldson, Scotland, James V to James VII, p. 356.
- ⁵Robert Douglas, A Sermon Preach'd at the Down-Sitting of the Parliament of Scotland, January 1661 (Edinburgh, 1661), p. 27; James Stewart and James Stirling, Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland (Glasgow, 1721), p. 149.
- ⁶The most notable of the cases of the shedding of innocent blood was the massacre of the camp followers of Montroses's army after the Battle of Philiphaugh in 1645. See W. L. Mathieson, Politics and Religion in Scotland, 1550-1695, 2 vols. (Glasgow, 1902), II:70; James Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, ed. C. K. Sharpe (Edinburgh, 1844), pp. 44n., 45n., 49n.
- ⁷John Paterson, Tandem Bona Causa Triumphant, or Scotland's Late Misery Bevailed (Edinburgh, 1661), p. 14. See also A Letter Containing an Humble and Serious Advice to Some in Scotland, in Reference to Their Late Troubles and Calamities, by a Person of that Nation, p. 7; John Paterson, Post Nublia Phoebus, or a Sermon of Thanksgiving for the Safe and Happy Return of Our Gracious Sovereign (Aberdeen, 1660), p. 2; A Scrougie, Mirabilia Dei ... a Congratulatory Sermon (Edinburgh, 1660; Laetitiae Calidonicae, or Scotland's Raptures upon the Return of ... Charles II (Edinburgh, 1660).
- ⁸A Letter Containing an Humble and Serious Advice to Some in Scotland, in Reference to Their Late Troubles and Calamities, by a Person of that Nation, p. 7.
- ⁹Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, Religious Stoic (London, 1693).
- ¹⁰R. Chambers, Domestic Annals of Scotland, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1858-1860), II:163; Donaldson, Scotland, James V to James VII, pp. 351-2; Row, The Life of Mr.

Blair, p. 291; Paterson, Tandem Bona Causa Triumphant, or Scotland's Late Misery Bevailed; T. C. Smout, The History of the Scottish People, 1560-1830 (Glasgow, 1969), p. 137.

¹¹Robert Baillie, Letters and Journals, ed. David Laing, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1842), III:357, 387, IV:430.

¹²Donaldson, Scotland, James V to James VII, p. 349; Henry Guthry, The Memoirs of Henry Guthry, ed. George Crawford (Glasgow, 1748); Chambers, Domestic Annals of Scotland, II:236; The Lamentable Estate and Distressed Case of Sir William Dick in Scotland, and His Numerous Family and Creditors for the Commonwealth (London, 1657).

¹³John Paterson, A Brief Resolution of the Present Case of the Subjects of Scotland (N.P., 1661), p. 15; A Letter Containing an Humble and Serious Advice to Some in Scotland, in Reference to Their Late Troubles and Calamities, by a Person of that Nation, p. 12; George Hickes, The Spirit of Popery Speaks out of the Mouths of Phanatical Protestants (London, 1680), pp. 2, 51; Andrew Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali (Edinburgh, 1665), II:44.

¹⁴Douglas, A Sermon Preach'd at the Down-Sitting of the Parliament of Scotland, January 1661, p. 26.

¹⁵Thomas Urquhart, Jewel (London, 1652), cited in Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland.

¹⁶James Fraser, Chronicles of the Frasers, ed. William Mackay (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1905), p. 444; John Jameson, Rebellio Deballata, et Scotia Rediviva: or the Downfall of Rebellion, and Scotland's Resurrection, as it was Presented in Two Sermons (Edinburgh, 1661).

¹⁷Douglas, A Sermon Preach'd at the Down-Sitting of the Parliament of Scotland, January 1661, p. 22.

¹⁸When the covenants were first forged, they were enveloped in an aura of sanctity, but they soon became rather commonplace. What initially was an individual act of self-dedication to the cause, soon became a spiritless ritual. Parish ministers gave the covenants to mere children, and eventually the General Assembly ordained that everyone in the nation had to take the oaths. Presumably, this included hypocrites. See Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, ed. T. Pitcairn (Edinburgh: The Church Law Society, 1843).

Archibald Johnston of Wariston, Diary, ed. James Ogilvie, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1940), III:27, 61, 181; John Nicoll, A Diary of Public Transactions and Other Occurrences, Chiefly in Scotland, from January 1650 to June 1667, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1836), p. 254; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 370; Stewart and Stirling, Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland, p. 176. See also Baillie, Letters and Journals, III:448; Robert Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, ed. R. Burns, 4 vols. (Glasgow, 1823-30), I:15.

²⁰The seventeenth century mind, for all its readiness to "frame" oaths, seemed to be able to break them at will. Virtually all the ministers of the 1638 General Assembly who voted to depose and excommunicate the bishops had formerly taken an oath of canonical obedience to them (See Baillie, Letters and Journals, III:461, 463), and most of the men who would be consecrated as bishops in 1661 and 1662 had, at one time, taken the Solemn League and Covenant and sworn to extirpate prelacy. It is also curious that James Renwick, the radical Cameronian leader of the 1680's and a violent enemy of the king, took the oath of allegiance to the crown on two separate occasions (once at his laureation at the University of Edinburgh and once when he became a burghess of Lanark). (See A. D. Robertson, Lanark: The Burgh and Its Councils, 1469-1880 [Lanark, 1974], p. 114.) This, of course, is not to say that the Scots were an especially perjured race, for a similar indifference to "swearing" also existed in England. One seventeenth century Englishman could write on oaths: "no man regardeth them any more than the taking up of a straw.... Tush, thinks every man, the taking of these oaths is a matter of nothing; all my neighbors have taken them before me, and made no reckoning of them." (See Keith Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic [London, 1971], p. 670.)

²¹Edinburgh's Joy for His Majesties Coronation in England, p. 6; A Letter Containing an Humble and Serious Advice To Some in Scotland, in Reference to Their Late Troubles and Calamities, by a Person of That Nation, p. 6; Paterson, A Brief Resolution of the Present Case of the Subjects of Scotland, p. 34; and Paterson, Tandem Bona Causa Triumphant, or Scotland's Late Misery Bevailed. See also Andrew Honyman, The Seasonable Case of Submission to the Church Government as Now Re-established by Law (Edinburgh, 1662), p. 21 ff; Mercurius Caledonius, Comprising the Affairs Now in Agitation in Scotland, number 1, 25 January to 1 February 1661.

²²In this connection, it is interesting to note that Robert Baillie wrote in 1661 that "thirty-six years agoe, when I entered regent in our college, I took the oaths of supremacie and allegiance, but was not hindered thereby to oppose both books and bishops to my pith." See Baillie, Letters and Journals, III:461, 463.

²³Paterson, A Brief Resolution of the Present Case of the Subjects of Scotland, pp. 3ff.

²⁴Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, nos. 34, 35, "Descriptions of Linlithgow's Covenant Burning"; A Dismal Account of the Burning of Our Solemn League and Covenant (N.P., 1662); Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, pp. 79-80; Chambers, Domestic Annals of Scotland, II:291-2; John Parker Lawson, The Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution (Edinburgh, 1844), pp. 722-3.

²⁵Johnston of Wariston for a time eluded capture and was not in fact executed until 1663. Argyll and Guthrie were executed in 1661. From the similarities of the accounts, it is clear that attitudes did not change between 1661 and 1663.

²⁶John Lamont, Diary, ed. R. Kinloch, (Glasgow: Maitland Club, 1830), pp. 129, 163; Gilbert Burnet, History of His own Times, ed. O. Airy, 3 vols. (London, 1897), I:194, 205; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:194; Fraser, Chronicles of the Frasers, p. 431.

²⁷Robert Douglas, quoted in Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:15.

²⁸Edinburgh's Joy for His Majesties Coronation in England, p. 6.

²⁹Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Kirk of Scotland, p. 78.

³⁰J. Stephen, The Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp (London, 1839), p. 51; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 51; Paterson, A Brief Resolution of the Present Case of the Subjects of Scotland, p. 19; Baillie, Letters and Journals, III:409; Extracts from the Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland, 1651-1676, ed. J. D. Marwick (Edinburgh, 1878), pp. 499-503; Julia Buckroyd, Church and State in Scotland, 1660-1681 (Edinburgh, 1980), p. 25.

³¹Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, pp. 291-2; George Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, 4 vols. (Edinburgh, 1891), III:168; Paterson, Post Nubilia Phoebus, or a Sermon of Thanksgiving for the Safe and Happy Return of Our Gracious Sovereign; Scrougie, Mirabilia Dei ... a Congratulatory Sermon; Laetitiae Caledonicae, or Scotland's Raptures upon the Return of ... Charles II; Jameson, Rebellio Deballata, et Scotia Rediviva: or the Downfall of Rebellion, and Scotland's Resurrection, as It Was Represented in Two Sermons; Douglas, A Sermon Preach'd at the Down-sitting of the Parliament of Scotland, January 1661, p. 35.

³²Edinburgh's Joy for His Majesties Coronation in England, p. 6.

³³Baillie, Letters and Journals, I:23.

³⁴Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Kirk of Scotland, p. 78.

³⁵Ibid., p. 65.

³⁶Edinburgh's Joy for His Majesties Coronation in England, pp., 2, 5.

³⁷Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:220.

³⁸Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 58.

Chapter II

The Restoration Settlement

During the covenanting years, a political and ecclesiastical revolution had been effected in Scotland. In a relatively short period of time, the covenanters had circumscribed the royal prerogative, destroyed episcopal power, and revived and reestablished a presbyterian polity. All of these changes, however, were reversed after the triumphant return of Charles II.

The Scottish parliament did not engineer the Restoration settlement--that was the work of the king and his chief ministers--but the parliament was a ready and willing accomplice during its 1661 and 1662 sessions. It was "well disposed ... to go in with every thing that came about," and the servility of parliament was so remarkable that "never" was a Scottish legislative assembly "so obsequious to all that was proposed to them."¹ Why was parliament so submissive? Various theories have been put forward to explain the "great compliance." Robert Wodrow, the presbyterian apologist, claimed that the parliament was packed. "Great pains," he wrote, were "taken upon the elections" at the end of 1660, and "matters" were "so carefully managed" in "the shires and burghs" that "persons entirely at the devotion of the court" were "for the most part" "chosen." To accomplish this, Wodrow claimed that in "some places" where the "most zealous gentlemen" from the "former times" were elected, "letters were writ" under

"some pretext or other, for a second choice." Regrettably, Wodrow provided only one cryptic example, and he did not supply names. In Ayr, he claimed, when "a gentleman," who was a firm presbyterian in principle," was elected, a "courtier" (who happened to be a "near relation" of the elected man) used influence in the shire to make an alteration.² Wodrow's evidence, needless to say, is rather weak, but it is nevertheless certain that the 1660 election was the target of some royal "influence," for Robert Baillie also wrote that "the chancellor ... so guided it, that the shyres and burroughs" chose individuals "that were absolutely for the king."³ Yet, if the Restoration parliament was "packed," it was not unrepresentative according to the standards of the time. Indeed, James Fraser, a contemporary observer, claimed that the Restoration parliament exceeded all former parliaments in "popularity,"⁴ and James Kirkton,⁵ a presbyterian writer, also admitted that the elected representatives reflected public opinion. "The commissioners," he wrote, "were according to the complexion of their principals who sent them," and Kirkton added that "many honest gentlemen were sent."⁶

Another theory holds that the Restoration parliament was "obsequious" because parliament--once it had been selected--was coerced in some way.⁷ It has been argued, for example, that the king gained parliamentary approval for his legislative program by intentionally delaying an "act of indemnity." John Blackadder, a presbyterian writer, held this opinion. In Blackadder's words:

England and Ireland had the benefit of a general amnesty to obliterate their past misconduct, but this generous forgiveness, this act of royal clemency, did not extend to the kingdom of Scotland. It was thought expedient to hold the fear of punishment over the heads of that devoted people, to terrify them into submission, by placing their lives, liberties, and estates, at the mercy of the crown, or rather, in the hands of legalized robbers, who had contrived to put off the king's indemnity, until their schemes of plunder were matured, and iniquity established by law.

Blackadder was not alone in his opinion, and even Sir George Mackenzie, a supporter of the government, claimed that an act of indemnity "was kept up till episcopacy, and other things designed, should be first settled."⁸

An indemnity for Scotland was in fact slow in coming. On February 27, 1661, the earl of Middleton presented a letter from the king to the parliament, and in this letter the king declared that he was willing to give a general remission to all Scots (with the exception of any individuals the parliament should wish to exclude) for their previous activities against him or his father. This news was received with great joy, and a letter of appreciation was drawn up and sent to the crown. The indemnity itself, however, would in fact be "laid aside" for another year (the king's letter notwithstanding), and this kept the "greatest enemies" of the king's program within parliament "under a general consternation." Yet, if delaying the "remission" did help gain parliamentary approval for the king's more controversial measures, it could not have been the only factor at work. The 1663 session of parliament met after the indemnity had already been secured, and the 1663 parliament was as agreeable to the king's will as the previous two sessions.⁹

Still another theory maintains that the king cowed parliament by using the English forces in Scotland as a means of persuasion. According to this argument, the king kept the said troops in Scotland until he had received legislative approval for his program. It is in fact true that the last English forces did not leave until the bishops had been reintroduced into parliament, and William Row, writing in May 1662, could note:

about this time all the English soldiers that were still kept in the citadels (for they were retained over the heads of honest men even until this time, until the prelates were seated in their saddle) were convened, and shipped in Leith Roads, with Morgan their commander,...

but the chronological correspondence between the departure of the troops and the implementation of the Restoration settlement was in reality a mere coincidence. It is true that the earl of Clarendon, supported by the earl of Middleton, had suggested that the English troops should stay in place until the king's ecclesiastical settlement was complete because of "some fear that Scotland was yet too fanatick to be trusted," but the earl of Lauderdale had vigorously resisted the suggestion. Lauderdale's opinion prevailed, and in the summer of 1660 "it was agreed on, that the citadels should be evacuated and slighted, as soon as the money could be raised in England for disbanding the army." If this decision was reached in 1660, why did the troops not leave until 1662? Contrary to Row's belief, the delay was not intentional; it was merely the result of the inordinately slow pace of government. Before the troops could be removed, the citadels the English had built for them in

Leith, Inverness, Inverlochy, Perth, and Ayr had to be demolished, for the king could not afford to garrison the citadels with Scottish troops. (The strongholds could not be left empty, for empty fortresses were dangerous since they could be taken by rebels and used against the crown.) On July 13, 1661, at the first meeting of the Privy Council, the government issued orders for the demolition of the fortresses, but there was the usual inefficiency, and in November the structures were still intact. The king complained about the slow pace of the process in a letter to the Council, but the last of the English troops were unable to leave until May 29, 1662, when "the remaines of the English regiment at Inverness went off...."¹⁰ It is significant that the troops stationed in Inverness were the last to leave. If soldiers had been kept in Scotland to intimidate those persons inclined towards the covenants, the fortress in Ayr would have been held the longest.

The problem still remains, why was the Restoration parliament so "obsequious"? Royal interference in the elections and the use of the "indemnity" and the English troops as bargaining chips may have been factors, but they were not the primary cause. What was the primary cause? The Restoration parliament, it seems, was "well disposed to go in with every thing that came about"¹¹ because its members were infected with the effusive royalism that gripped Scotland in the early 1660's. The members of parliament, like the nation as a whole, remembered that "our mischiefs began with tumults and sedition,"¹² and in the early Restoration period they hoped

that "obedience" would help them recover from the disasters of the 1640's and 1650's and make them "all men of gold." In consequence, "loyalty was on horseback amongst them," and this was especially true since most of the old covenanter leaders were dead, old, or converted by adversity, and the young leaders did not have the old zeal. As Kirkton observed:

Few of our noblemen who had been actors in the late times were then alive, and of their old men, some of them were devoted to destruction, as Loudoun; some had perfectly sold themselves to vain hopes, as Home; the rest were mostly young men, bred in want, when their fathers were pinched by their creditors, under the English, haveing no hope but in the king's favor, whose humour they were to study at any rate, and one engadged the other.¹³

The members of parliament demonstrated their "loyalty" in 1661 and 1662 by approving one of the most reactionary legislative programs in Scottish history. The acts submitted to parliament were approved without "great reasonings" as the king and his supporters "renewed" the "old laws" which, like "our good, honest, ancient customs," had been "covenanted out with raisons and roasted cheese." In civil affairs, the parliament approved legislation that reinvested the royal prerogative with its erstwhile "glory." The covenanters had limited the authority of the crown during the late "rebellion," and they had forced the king to sign the "Dunfermline Declaration" and agree to "cast himself and his interests wholly upon God, and in all matters civil to follow the advice of his parliament, and such as shall be intrusted by them," but now the clock was turned back. Legislation was passed, for example, that restored the Lords of the Articles, a committee that drafted all acts of "a public nature." The covenanters had abolished the Lords of the

Articles as grievance because the committee had increased royal power at the expense of parliamentary power, but that "reform" was eradicated in 1661. In other legislation, it was declared to be "his majesty's royal prerogative to choose officers of state, counsellors, and lords of session," and it was asserted that the "calling, holding, proroguing, or dissolving" of all parliaments, conventions, or meetings of estates was part of the king's special powers. It was also ordained that "no convocations, leagues, or bonds" could be made without the sovereign," and in consequence the king was given the "sole power of making peace and war." And finally, the culmination of this royalist legislation was the "rescissory act," an act which literally erased a large fragment of Scotland's political history. The rescissory act, passed in 1661, annulled, at a stroke, all the public acts of every parliament since 1633, and this eliminated all the "achievements" of the covenan^hters.¹⁴

While Charles II and his royalist parliament were reasserting the "prerogative" of the crown in "a most extraordinary manner," the king was also taking steps to dismantle presbyterianism, the ecclesiastical fruit of the covenanting era. This part of the Restoration settlement, the part directly affecting the Church of Scotland, was introduced more gradually than the political changes, but the effects were dramatic nevertheless.¹⁵ The first really important act of state touching ecclesiastical affairs was a cryptic letter of the king which was transmitted to the presbytery of Edinburgh by James Sharp¹⁶ in September 1660. In this letter the king

declared that he was resolved "to protect and preserve the government of the Church of Scotland as it is settled by law, without violation," and many presbyterian ministers were encouraged by these words. They believed that the king's missive referred to the "present presbyteriall government," especially since the letter mentioned the "General Assemblie at St. Andrews." Others, however, were not so optimistic. Some presbyterians claimed that the crucial "clause" in the king's letter "imported no more," except that the king was "resolved to maintain that government of the church which at any time comeing should be the legal government, whatever it was or should be; and that as in the year 1660, the government was presbyterial, so in the year 1662, the legal government might be episcopacy, and either of them the king engaged to protect." The more pessimistic presbyterians, as it turned out, were the better "grammarians," and time would show that they had been correct.¹⁷

After the king's letter to the presbytery of Edinburgh, the next important development was the passage of two important pieces of legislation in 1661. The first of these was the rescissory act. The rescissory act has already been mentioned in connection with civil affairs, but the act also had important ecclesiastical consequences, for its passage voided all the "civil sanctions" given to presbyterianism since 1638.¹⁸ With this one item of legislation, the government forced presbyterianism into a legal "limbo." The second important act of parliament from 1661 touching church affairs was a vague

piece of legislation "anent the government of the church."

Passed right after the rescissory act, the act concerning the "government of the church" contained a great many words without substance. In the text of the law, the king, "with the advice and consent of his estates of parliament," declared that it was "his full and firm resolution to maintain the true reformed protestant religion, in its purity of doctrine and worship, as it was established within this kingdom, during the reign of his royal father." Furthermore, the king also declared that "as to the government of the church," it was his desire to "settle and secure the same, in such a frame as shall be most agreeable to the Word of God, most suitable to monarchical government, and most complying with the peace and quiet of this kingdom."

Technically, the king's promise could mean all things to all men, but the reference to the "peace and quiet of this kingdom" alarmed perceptive presbyterians, for they remembered that under "episcopacy" "no rebellion" had ever been "hatch'd."¹⁹

The definitive step in Charles II's Restoration church settlement was taken in London at a meeting of the "Scots Council" in the summer of 1661. At this meeting, the earl of Middleton, the king's commissioner, came out in favor of episcopacy, and he was supported by the earl of Glencairn, a man of vintage protestant stock, who claimed that the "insolence of the presbyterian had so far dissatisfied all loyal subjects and wise men that six for one in Scotland^a long'd for episcopacy." The earl of Rothes,²¹ who had all of his late father's carnal vices but none of his covenanting fervor, supported

Middleton and Glencairn. On the presbyterian side, considering that all the Scots present had once signed the covenant,²² there was a poor showing. The earl of Lauderdale,²³ a former member of the Westminster Assembly who had lost most of his commitment to presbyterianism during ten long years in prison (by August 1660, Lauderdale's devotion to presbyterianism was so weak that he was actually trying to advance his political career by going to "chapell to hear bishops preach" in England and saying "amen to the service, as much as any about court"),²³ spoke out as the voice of moderation, and suggested that the Council reach no decision until a General Assembly, the synods, or some leading churchmen had been consulted. Middleton, however, rejected Lauderdale's idea. The king's commissioner stated that consulting the clergy would only tend "to continue prelacy" because the "leading" men among the ministers, "whom the inferior clergy durst not disown," would "defend stoutly their own supremacy." Middleton also argued that a General Assembly could not be called in any event because "presbytery" had been abrogated" by the "act rescissory," and to call an Assembly would, he said, violate that act. At this point the earl of Crawford,²⁴ who, like Lauderdale, had spent several years in prison, came out with the most vigorous defense of presbyterianism at the meeting. Crawford claimed that Scotland was six to one in favor of presbyterianism, and he argued that Scotland should keep the system it already had, especially since all change brought hazzards. Crawford denied Middleton's contention that the rescissory act had overturned

presbyterianism, and he pointed out that presbyterianism was secured by several unrepealed acts of General Assemblies--acts that had the sanction of royal commissioners. The Duke of Hamilton²⁵ gave some support to Crawford by suggesting that the rescissory act had passed smoothly only because it was believed that the king had promised to maintain the presbyterian system in his 1660 letter to the presbytery of Edinburgh, but this was unconvincing. After Hamilton had spoken, the earl of Clarendon threw his influential support behind prelacy, and the king declared that the majority were in favor of bishops. A royal letter announcing the decision to restore prelacy was then drawn up and dispatched to Edinburgh. The letter was dated August 14, 1661.²⁶

From a purely political point of view, the reestablishment of episcopacy made sense. James VI had called the "parity" principle of presbyterianism "the mother of confusion,"²⁷ and events during the "Great Rebellion" had apparently verified the late king's observation. The crown had suffered--one king was executed and another king was exiled--and the church itself had suffered. A formal schism sundered the presbyterian Church of Scotland after the military defeat at Dunbar in 1650, and the factions that emerged (the Protesters and Resolutioners) were still in existence in the Restoration period and still in conflict, and this seemed to demonstrate "the impossibility of maintaining the government of the church in a parity, and the necessity of setting a superior order" over the clergy "for keeping them in unity and peace." Charles II, after

his "travels," was interested in "peace," and he wanted to find a church polity "suitable to monarchical government" and public order.²⁸ From past experience, prelacy, rather than presbytery, appeared to be the correct choice.

The reestablishment of episcopacy, moreover, was also sensible on political grounds because Scotland, although technically independent, was in reality a part of a larger unit. The useful fiction that a British monarch could have a presbyterian conscience in Scotland and an episcopalian conscience in England had not yet emerged, and the uniformity of the churches in Charles II's kingdom^s was still the ideal. Thus, once England, where the churches in the diocese of London alone were more numerous than all the churches in all of Scotland, had made prelacy its choice,²⁹ the days of Scottish presbyterianism were numbered, especially since the English knew that the existence of a presbyterian system north of the Tweed would "strengthen the hands" of the English dissenters. In addition, the situation in the king's Irish dominion also helped to make a Scottish episcopate obligatory. As the Duke of Ormonde pointed out, the Ulster presbyterians would be encouraged by the establishment of presbyterianism in Scotland, and the maintenance of the Irish bishops would then become more difficult.³⁰ Clearly, from a broad perspective, prelacy was the correct choice for Scotland--or so it seemed.

Be that as it may, when the news of the decision to restore prelacy reached the Privy Council in Scotland, two members, the earl of Kincardine³¹ and the earl of

Tweeddale, voiced some concern. These men were in favor of cautious actions, and they said the king should consult the synods before making a decision. This suggestion, however, was overruled by the majority, and a proclamation was immediately issued concerning the reestablishment of episcopacy, and a letter was sent to the king indicating that obedience had been given. A few months later, in December of 1661, the first of the new bishops were consecrated. Finally, to complete the revival of prelacy, the 1662 parliament passed "with little opposition" an act regarding "the reestablishment of the ancient government of the church by archbishops and bishops,"³³ and another act obliging all parish ministers admitted to a parish since 1649³⁴ to accept presentation to a patron and collation from a bishop before September 20, 1662. The latter act was designed to help enforce conformity to the new order.

When the 1662 session of parliament ended, the Restoration settlement was, for all intents and purposes, complete. Needless to say, the "settlement" was reactionary in substance, uncompromising in spirit, and provocative in tone. Basically, it meant that all the struggles of the covenanters had been in vain. How would the Scots--or, more to the point--how would the clergy react to the settlement? Would they, to use Middleton's phrase, "defend stoutly their own supremacy,"³⁵ or would they quietly accept a settlement that brought the presbyterian "ministry under beggary and the extremity of contempt"?³⁶ This topic, the reaction of the clergy to the Restoration settlement, will be the subject of the

next chapter.

Notes

¹Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 89.

²Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:90, 93. See also Baillie, Letters and Journals, III:463; Lamont, Diary, p. 128; Buckroyd, Church and State in Scotland, 1660-1681, p. 3.

³Baillie, Letters and Journals, III:463.

⁴Fraser, Chronicles of the Frasers, p. 432.

⁵Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Kirk of Scotland, p. 89.

⁶The Restoration parliament, which was selected in the midst of peace and jubilation, was probably more representative of public opinion than the 1689 Convention of Estates, which was elected in a time of uncertainty and revolution.

⁷In the first two sessions of parliament, the sessions that ratified the Restoration settlement, no member was harassed for the way he voted, except for the earl of Tweeddale. Tweeddale was imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle in September 1661 for speaking "somewhat in vindication of James Guthrie," the radical covenanter, and voting him not guilty of death. Tweeddale was soon released from the castle and confined to his house, however, and all restrictions on him were removed on May 7, 1662. See Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, ed. Thomas Thomson (Edinburgh, 1821), p. 60.

⁸Andrew Crichton, ed., Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 75; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:96, 192; Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, p. 52; Buckroyd, Church and State in Scotland, 1660-1681, pp. 40ff.

⁹Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:108; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:217.

¹⁰Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 407; Lauderdale Papers, ed. O. Airy, 3 vols. (London: Camden Society, 1884-5), III, appendix III; Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, p. 24; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, third series, 16 vols. (Edinburgh, 1908-76), I:IX; Fraser, Chronicles of the Frasers, pp. 441, 447, 449; Buckroyd, Church and State in Scotland, 1660-1681, pp. 145ff.

¹¹Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, 93; Dow, Cromwellian Scotland, 1651-60.

¹²Mercurius Caledonius, Comprising the Affairs Now in

Agitation in Scotland, no. 1, 25 January to 1 February 1661.

¹³Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland. pp. 79-80, 87.

¹⁴Mercurius Caledonius, Comprising the Affairs Now in Agitation in Scotland, no. 1, 25 January to 1 February 1661; Chambers, Domestic Annals of Scotland, II:267; Stephen, The Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp, pp. 105-113; Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, pp. 21ff; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 373, 381; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:94, 107.

¹⁵Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:211.

¹⁶James Sharp, a prominent presbyterian, was consecrated the archbishop of St. Andrews in December 1661, a step made easier by his northern origins and his earlier studies with the conservative "Aberdeen Doctors." Sharp would ultimately be killed by some radical covenanters in 1679. See Life of James Sharp (N.P., 1719); Robert Keith, A Large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1824); Stephen, The Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp; Hew Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, 8 vols. (Edinburgh, 1915-50), VII:326; James Willock, "Sharp and the Restoration Policy in Scotland," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 20 (New Series): 149-169.

¹⁷Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto LXIII, Robert Douglas, "A Brief Narration of the Coming of Prelacy again within This Kirk"; Buckroyd, Church and State in Scotland, 1660-1681, p. 32; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:80; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 75; Andrew Lang, A History of Scotland, 4 vols. (Edinburgh, 1900-07), III:299.

¹⁸Alexander Shields, A Hind Let Loose (Edinburgh, 1797), p. 125.

¹⁹Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:102; Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, pp. 52ff.

²⁰John, the first earl of Middleton, was a "royalist" from the "Engagement" onwards. He was taken prisoner after the defeats at Preston and Worcester, but the resourceful Middleton managed to escape both times. See Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:235.

²¹One contemporary has left a colorful description of Rothes. Rothes, according to Gilbert Burnet, "delivered himself without either restraint or decency, to all the pleasures of wine and women." On the former vice, Burnet wrote that Rothes "was unhappily made for drunkenness; for as he drank all his friends dead, and was able to subdue two or three sets of

drunkards one after another, so it scarce ever happened that he was disordered; and after the greatest excesses, an hour or two of sleep carried them off so entirely that no sign of them remained: he would go about business without any uneasiness, or discovering any heat in either body or mind. This had a terrible conclusion; for after he had killed all of his friends, he fell at last under such a weakness of stomach, that he had perpetual cholics, when he was not hot within and full of strong liquor, of which he was presently seized; so that he was always either sick or drunk." See Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:186.

²²Lauderdale, according to one contemporary, had "great impressions of religion on his mind" during his early years, but he had "scarcely" any of these "impressions" left by the time of the Restoration. Ibid., I:184.

²³Baillie, Letters and Journals, III:409.

²⁴The earl of Crawford, who was "look'd upon as the great patron of the presbyterians, and as a stout assertor of the covenant," was John Lindsay, the tenth lord of the Byres. Lindsay became the earl of Crawford after the sixteenth earl, the last of the original line, had been stripped of his title (because of his royalism) during the "Rebellion." The sixteenth earl, it should be noted, died in exile in 1652.

²⁵The duke of Hamilton was the son of the marquis of Douglas and was the earl of Selkirk in his own right. He married the dutchess of Hamilton, the heiress of the family of Hamilton, and became the duke of Hamilton for life in 1660.

²⁶Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, pp. 52-56.

²⁷James VI, The Basilicon Doron, ed. James Craigie (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1944), p. 76.

²⁸Burnet, History of His Own Time, I:199; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 137; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 357; Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, p. 53; Marchmont Nedham, The True Character of a Rigid Presbyter (London, 1661).

²⁹In an August 1660 letter on the situation in England, three leading English presbyterian ministers informed the ministers of Edinburgh that "the general stream and current is for the old prelacy in all its pomp and height; and therefore it cannot be hoped for, that the presbyterial government should be owned as the public establishment of this nation, while the tide runneth so strongly that way." (Quoted in Stephen, The Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp, I:235.)

³⁰Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:235.

Alexander Bruce, the second earl of Kincardine, made generous contributions to the exiled royal family during the interregnum. After the Restoration, Kincardine would promote a moderate policy toward the presbyterians. (See Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:129.)

32 The second earl of Tweeddale is remembered as a moderate, but he was apparently an opportunist. He kept his head and estates in the turbulent seventeenth century by supporting--to use Burnet's term--the "uppermost" side. He joined the standard Charles I at Nottingham, but soon changed his allegiance and charged with the parliamentary forces at Marston Moor in 1644. In 1648, he was at Preston, this time charging the English on behalf of Charles I. Tweeddale assisted at the coronation of Charles II in 1651, but later in the same decade he renounced the royal family and took a seat in Cromwell's parliaments. In 1660 he supported the royal family and the Restoration, and he was given a position on the Privy Council. Tweeddale survived until 1697, long enough to support the Revolution and to become the Chancellor of Scotland for William and Mary in 1692. The earl was fluid in religion as well as politics, and he always conformed to the ecclesiastical arrangement that prevailed during any given period. See Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:187.

33 Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:259; Lawson, The Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution, p. 740; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair.

34 The covenanters abolished patronage in 1649.

35 Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, p. 54.

36 Quoted in Buckroyd, Church and State in Scotland, 1660-1681, p. 32.

Chapter III

The Nadir of Presbyterianism

In a relatively short period of time--from the rescissory act in 1661 to the legislation concerning episcopacy in 1662--Charles II presided over an ecclesiastical revolution in Scotland as presbyterianism was eliminated and, to use the words of one critic, "that old absurd yoke of absurd prelacy"¹ was restored. During this whole process, Scotland was more or less mute. In 1637, during the reign of Charles I, the slightest meddling by the king in religious affairs created riots and tumults, but in the early Restoration period Charles II was able to introduce wholesale changes with impunity. As one writer later noted:

this tyrant ... overturned the sworn work of Reformation, and burnt the covenants, and brought in abjured and antichristian prelacy upon us, ... yet there was not only a deep silence at all this, ... but also a dreadful compliance expressed by all ranks.²

That the "people," in other words, the laity, "silently acquiesced to the unexpected overthrow of presbytery and the re-establishment of prelacy"³ was in fact not that remarkable. Robert MacWard, a presbyterian observer and the author of The Poor Man's Cup of Cold Water, was shocked that the news of the revival of prelacy and the news of the first episcopal consecrations caused no great outcry among the people,⁴ and he was appalled by the fact that the men and women in Scotland merely went about their daily affairs while the revolution in the kirk was occurring,⁵ but that was the

mood of Scotland in the early 1660's. The people were tired of ecclesiastical squabbles--the country had been bled white in the name of religion in the 1640's and 1650's--and, for a time at least, they wanted to enjoy the peace and work to recover their former prosperity. Religious rebellion, something which had opened the "box of Pandora" once already, was far from their minds.⁶ But, if the reaction of the laity to the Restoration settlement was predictable, that of the clergy was not, for they--contrary to all expectations--also did relatively little to save presbyterianism in the early Restoration period. The clergy did not "alarm the whole nation ... to rise for religion and liberty,"⁷ but instead they behaved very cautiously--even timidly--and showed none of their erstwhile boldness during the "revolution in kirk affairs." In the words of Robert Douglas, who was writing in 1663, the ministers "not only walked peacefully themselves, forbearing all manner of carriage which might in the least savor of any turbulent disposition," but they were also "instrumental to persuade others to do the like."⁸ Such "decent" behavior was new to the presbyterian ministers--during the "rebellion" the "preachers" had always "vented their spleen and arraigned all proceedings"⁹--but caution characterized the temper of the clergy in the early 1660's. Even Robert Wodrow, the presbyterian apologist, wrote that "no ... seasonable and regular application was made" by the ministers "for preventing the change." "One would have wished," he added, that "they had made a greater stand."¹⁰

Aggressive actions on the part of the ministers in the

early 1660's were needed to save presbytery, but the necessary actions were not taken. To the contrary, instead of resisting the king, the clergy were often making war on themselves. The Protester-Resolutioner schism¹¹ in presbyterianism was roughly a decade old when the king returned, and the hostilities were still strong and bitter. With the wisdom of hindsight, it is clear that the Protesters and Resolutioners should have "joined hands" to defend presbyterianism in 1660, 1661, and 1662, but they did not. Instead, they continued to "let loose on one another." The Resolutioners, the larger of the two groups by far, were especially vindictive. The Resolutioners informed the king in 1660 that they believed the "principles" of the Protesters were bound to "breed continual distempers and disorders" if the Protesters were given "any hand in affairs," and soon the Resolutioners were going beyond verbal attacks.¹² As early as May 1660, in the synod of Lothian, "some Protesters" were "discharged" from "the exercise of their ministry in their respective churches," and in the autumn of the same year other synods also deposed members of the minority group, for there was, to quote William Row, "a spirit of revenge to be seen against the Protesters."¹³ The synods of Merse and Teviotdale, Aberdeen, and Moray were all involved in this business, and the behavior of the above synods moved Kirkton to write:

hade you been a Protester and in one of our synods that harvest, you should have thought yourself a captive in ane of the enemies court of guard; it was not enough to censure them, but it was done with so much spite and disdain ... it was a horror to a man to behold it.¹⁴

The Protesters, being numerically weak, could not easily retaliate against the Resolutioners, but they were no less hostile.

While the presbyterians were savaging themselves, they were doing relatively little to stop the changes that Charles II was introducing into the Kirk of Scotland. Needless to say, the ministers had many opportunities. In 1660, when it was still unclear which way Scotland's ecclesiastical settlement would go, the ministers could have boldly asserted their support for presbyterianism, but, by and large, they were content with token measures, such as sending James Sharp to represent their interests to the king. On August 23, 1660, ten ministers did draw up a "humble address and supplication" in a private house in Edinburgh, and this "warm paper" was, it must be admitted, forthright in tone. In their address, the ten represented the great danger that threatened the work of reformation from "the remnant of the popish, prelatical, and malignant party," which was "beginning to lift up the head," and they stated that they could not, "without horror of spirit and astonishment of heart, think upon what dreadful guiltiness kings, princes, ministers, and people" would be "involved into," and "what fearful wrath" would "attend them from the face of an angry and jealous God, if, after all the light he hath made to shine in these kingdoms from his blessed word," the people "should again" turn to their wicked ways and "lick up the vomit" of prelacy.¹⁵ The wording of the "supplication" contained the old covenanter zeal, but, as it turned out, the authors of the "warm paper" did not. The ten

ministers, after being warned "thrie several times," to disperse and "goe to their houses" by the Committee of Estates, were incarcerated in Edinburgh Castle, and in their prison most of the "supplicants" soon lost their courage. One of the ministers, for example, became "distracted" in a few days and had to be released.¹⁶ A short time later several of the other ministers began to have second thoughts about their commitment, and they drew up a second "supplication" to the "Comitty of Estates." In the latter supplication the signatories declared that they were "very sensible of" and "sorry" "for any offense" they had given by their "late unseasonable meeting," and they promised to live peaceably under his majesty's authority in the future.¹⁷

The timidity of the clergy continued in 1661. The rescissory act was passed in March of the said year, and by that point (to use the words of Wodrow) "every reflecting person" knew that "the house" would^L be "rifled," and that presbyterianism would be replaced by episcopacy,¹⁸ but when the synods held their spring meetings they did not, at this crucial juncture, make a bold stand to save presbytery.¹⁹ In fact, some synods made no stand at all. The synod of Lothian and Tweeddale spent a good part of its spring meeting deposing "Protesters," and its victims included Gilbert Hall, one of the ten ministers who had been imprisoned for signing the August 1660 petition in favor of presbytery.²⁰ The synod of Moray, meanwhile, carried on with apparent indifference to the fate of presbyterianism (the synod spent its time debating whether or not to restore "the singing

of the "doxologie" or the "Gloria Patri" to the worship of the church),²¹ and the synod of Aberdeen spent its meeting paving the way for the reintroduction of prelacy. The actions of the last synod are especially interesting. The "brethren" of Aberdeen, some fifty-three ministers in all, drew up and signed in April a "humble address" to "his majesties high commissioner and the high court of Parliament." In their "address," the ministers declared:

we cannot, unless we would blindfold our own consciences, stop the mouth thereof, hide our sinne in our bosom with Adam, and keep fast deceit under our tongue, but give glory to God in ane humble and ingenuous confession, as of the national guiltiness of Scotland, so of our own iniquity, in so far as we been any way accessory to these sinfull and rebellious affronts and wrongs which have been put upon royal authority.

The address also contained a long list of the main activities, occurrences, achievements, and failures of the covenanting period--these were summarily identified as "affronts and wrongs"--and a "promise" by the ministers "never to be accessory to any disloyal principle or practice" again. The ministers pledged that in the future they would keep themselves under "subjection, obedience, and submission to royal authority and commands," and they declared it would be their intention to preach "that it is sinfull and ungodly for subjects to resist the king's authority," and that it is the "duty" of the people to "suffer" if they are dissatisfied with "anything commanded by his majesty." Finally, the address included an acknowledgement that the rescissory act had annulled all the "laws and acts of parliament" whereby "presbyterial government" had "any civil authority," and it closed with a request that the king would

settle the "government of this rent Church" in such a way as to be "most consistent with royal authority" and most likely to preserve the peace of the three nations." At court, the last request was interpreted as a veiled petition for the reestablishment of prelacy.²²

At least four synods²³--Dumfries, Galloway, Fife, and Glasgow and Ayr--did declare their devotion to presbytery during their meetings in the spring of 1661, but they did so with caution. Their actions, to put it simply, lacked the boldness of spirit and the "indiscreet zeal" that characterized the actions of the church courts in the 1640's. The synod of Dumfries, for example, started to draw up an act which would have deposed any minister in the synod's bounds who complied with prelacy in the future, but the earl of Queensberry ordered the members of the synod to disperse, and the Dumfries ministers (unlike the ministers in the 1638 General Assembly) meekly obeyed the king's man and went home.²⁴ The synod of Galloway, meanwhile, at its spring meeting drew up four draft supplications to parliament, and the most strident of these traced the "course of defection" in Scotland (beginning with the arrival of the first bishop in the Middle Ages), denounced episcopacy as a grievance, and asked the covenants be renewed in Scotland, England, and Ireland, but the earl of Galloway dissolved the synod in the king's name before any of the supplications could be completed, and the Galloway ministers, after protesting against "the encroachment made upon ... a court of Jesus Christ by the civil magistrate," prudently obeyed the

earl and retired. Another synod that defended presbytery, the synod of Fife, also showed a lack of fortitude in the spring of 1661. The ministers of Fife gravely drew up a paper declaring their intention to stand by presbyterianism and their covenant oaths, but the earl of Rothes and the "laird of Ardrosse" ordered the ministers, "under pain of treason," to "repaire to their several charges," and this the ministers, their brave words notwithstanding, "accordingly did." The moderator of the synod of Fife, a man who had "tendered" the covenant to "thowsands," did try to protest, but Rothes silenced the moderator by accusing him of speaking "high treason and rebellion."²⁶

A fourth synod that tried to defend presbytery in the spring of 1661 was the synod of Glasgow and Ayr.²⁷ The actions of Glasgow and Ayr, however, were halting and indecisive in the extreme, and it is safe to say that this synod, more than any other, demonstrated the disordered state of the presbyterian "party" in the 1660's. The ministers of Glasgow and Ayr did attempt to draft a supplication in favor of presbytery, but the supplication was never submitted to the government, for the synod could not agree on the wording, and at length the ministers of Glasgow and Ayr decided to simply adjourn "till they saw what other synods did." Before dispersing, however, the ministers of the synod were able to agree on a declaration which was to be entered in their register rather than given to the government. The declaration, which Wodrow called an "exoneration of their consciences," is here given in full:

whereas there is a scandal, as if some ministers in this church, had made, or were intending to make defection from the government of the Church of Scotland, to prelatical episcopacy; therefore the whole synod, and every member thereof, do willingly declare, that they are fixed in the doctrine, discipline, worship, and church government, by sessions, presbyteries, synods, and general assemblies, as it is now professed and practised within this church; and that they are resolved, by the grace of God, so to remain. And because divers of the members are absent, therefore the synod recommends it to the several presbyteries to require the same of them.

In order to gain "unanimity among themselves," the synod specifically referred to "prelatical episcopacy" (Laudian or immoderate prelacy), rather than just "episcopacy." The declaration also, in the interest of prudence, left out any mention of the obligation of the covenants. This circumspection "grieved many" at the synod, but all the ministers present nevertheless signed the declaration. The synod of Glasgow and Ayr then adjourned with the intention of meeting in one month's time.

On May 2, 1661, the ministers returned to Glasgow as planned. But, when they were about to convene in the synod-house, they were discharged from meeting (by a proclamation from the cross) on the grounds that they were an adjourned synod that had already met twice that year (it was the custom for synods to meet twice each year). Whereupon, the ministers in the town gathered in a private house and drew up a paper intended for the earl of Middleton, the king's commissioner. The nature and content of this supplication is significant:

That whereas your grace ... hath been pleased to interdict this adjourned meeting of our synod of Glasgow and Ayr, as

illegal and unwarrantable by the laws of this kingdom; we judged it our duty, to testify the due respect we owe to the supreme magistrate, whom the Lord in his good providence hath set over us, to forbear, in obedience to your grace, his majesty's high commissioner, your inhibition, the constituting ourselves into a synod; yet lest we should be found wanting in the discharge of the duty we owe to our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, who hath given power to the ministers of the gospel to meet in their respective judicatories ... we ... find it incumbent upon us ... to signify to your grace, that as we are hopeful, whatever may be your grace's apprehensions of the inconveniency of our meeting at this time, it is not the intent of your grace's proclamation to declare that synod can at no time warrantably meet, whatever be the necessity of the church within our bounds, but twice in that year; so we do humbly, and with all due respect and reverence to our sovereign, the king's majesty, and your grace his commissioner, seriously testify, that our forbearing to meet in a synod at this time, in obedience to your grace's prohibition, doth not import our yielding that the provincial assemblies of this church have no power to meet, when the edification of the church doth call for it, even oftener than twice a year.

Thus, the synod of Glasgow and Ayr, which only a few years before could shake the throne of the king, now, with presbyterianism crashing down into ruins, only turned in a paper in which the synod humbly asserted its privilege on a minor constitutional point, even as it obeyed.

After the spring synods were dissolved, the ministers, to use the caustic words of one contemporary, continued to show a "cowardice unworthy of the spirit of the ambassadors for Christ."²⁸ The execution of a presbyterian minister (James Guthrie) for his "seditious" actions during the "rebellion" apparently contributed to this silence, for no presbyterian minister had ever been executed for "treasonable courses and practices in ... sermons, prayers, declamations, and private discourses," and the sentence "struck the whole party with

consternation." Some of the ministers continued to make "sly and secret insinuations" from their pulpits--such as "the ark of God was shaking and the glory departing"²⁹--but the clergy did not issue "a joint and formal protestation" when the king announced his intention to restore prelacy in August of 1661, and they made no "public testimony" against either the consecrations of the bishops in December of 1661 or the parliamentary ratification of the new church establishment in May 1662.³⁰

The final reckoning, so to speak, came at the end of 1662 and the beginning of 1663. It was then that the government forced the issue of conformity or nonconformity to an episcopalian kirk polity with one act of parliament and two proclamations of the Privy Council. Basically, it was ordained that any minister admitted to a charge since 1649 (this affected the vast majority of clergy) was obliged to accept presentation from a patron and collation from a bishop by February 1, 1663 (at the latest) on pain of deposition. Ministers who refused to cooperate were not to exercise their ministry in the future, they were supposed to leave their presbyteries and move to some other locality in the kingdom, and they were not to collect any part of their 1662 stipend.³¹ Faced with this ultimatum, the great majority of ministers, some 528 out of a total of 802,³² decided to ignore their covenant oaths and embrace "prelacy."³³ A minority of some 274 ministers,³⁴ most of whom were in the west and southwest, did refuse to conform to prelacy, but these nonconformists made no spirited resistance.

Instead of staying in their pulpits like "faithful watchmen" until "they had been turned out forcibly one by one," they decided to "run from their posts, and obey the king's orders for their ejection."³⁵ This quiet obedience to the law was criticized--James Kirkton admitted that "many" people censured the ministers for abandoning their pulpits so easily, William Row wrote that the "ministers were blamed ... for too sudden and ready obedience," and Robert Douglas indicated that some believed the ministers "should have stayed and preached notwithstanding of the parliament's inhibition"³⁶--but it occurred even in Galloway, the most militant of the presbyterian districts. On February 24, 1663, some three weeks after the deadline, sixteen ministers from Galloway synod were cited by the Privy Council and accused of "still laboring to keep the hearts of the people from the present government of the church and state," and a rebellion must have seemed imminent. But that rebellion did not come. The Galloway ministers appeared before the Privy Council on March 24, 1663, and when they were "examined upon their obedience to the late acts of parliament and council anent their submission to the government of the church as the same was presently established by law," they "declared they were not yet clear to give obedience" to prelacy, but they "judicially promised" to "obey the said acts for removing from their manses and paroches and desisting from preaching conform to the same in every point." It is interesting that one of the ministers who "judicially promised" to desist from "preaching" was "Mr. Alexander Pedden at the

Muirchurch of Glenlouse." Peden would later become a prominent "conventicler," but in 1663 he, like most of the rest of his "brethren," was docile.³⁷

At court the meekness of the presbyterians was greeted with astonishment. The government was disturbed by the sudden creation of three hundred vacancies in the kirk, but it was delighted by the fact that the vacancies were created peacefully. The leader of the government at that time, the earl of Middleton, was, to use the words of Gilbert Burnet, especially "surprised at this extraordinary submission of the presbyterians," for he had thought that the more "intractable" ministers would do "some extraordinary thing," such as raise a tumult, rather than leave their pulpits without a struggle, but no such violence occurred, and Middleton's stature soared as a result. The "obedience of a party, so little accustomed to it, was much magnified at court," and it was said that "all plied before the earl of Middleton."³⁸

The behavior of the clergy in 1662-1663 was indeed extraordinary. For two decades the clergy had been praising presbytery and execrating episcopacy, but in 1662-1663 "600 of the ministers ... complied with that detestable prelacy, and the rest slipped from their kirks, as if they had not been obliged to obey God rather than man."³⁹ What happened to the old spirit of resistance in 1662-1663; indeed, where had it been in 1660-1661? Robert Douglas, commenting on the period, wrote that "men are ready to say that the ministers did not enough to resist episcopacie," but in defense of the ministers he could

only declare: we found no more lawful means than to preach and and suffer."⁴⁰ Actually, several factors "daunted the ministry from their duty in that day."⁴¹ They did not do more in part because they were disorganized by the Protester-Resolutioner schism, an internecine struggle that sapped the vitality of the presbyterian movement. The ministers, moreover, also did not do more because many of their leaders were old and dying: Samuel Rutherford, Robert Baillie, David Dickson, Andrew Cant, and James Wood would all die between 1661 and 1664.⁴² Thirdly, the ministers did not do more because they realized the king was riding a crest of popularity in the early 1660's, and the clergy were "unwilling" "to contend with his majesty ... so early after his much desired restoration."⁴³ And finally, the ministers did relatively little to prevent the reestablishment of episcopacy because they knew they did not have the support of the people. The disasters of the rebellion were still a vivid memory, and anticlericalism was still in the air (it is significant that in 1662-1663, when the government was deposing ministers who refused to comply with the new establishment, the "heritors and parishioners" did not close ranks behind the nonconformists, but almost universally kept their stipends from them as the Privy Council demanded⁴⁴). In time, it is true, things would change. The schism would heal, new leaders would arise, the king's popularity would decline, the calamities of the 1640's and 1650's would be forgotten, and thousands of people would rally around the nonconformist ministers and encourage them to "contend with his majesty." But in the early

Restoration period, all of this was still in the future.

Notes

¹Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 124.

²Walter Smith, "A Brief Rehearsal of Some Few of the Many Steps of Our Defections," in Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, II:71-72.

³History of the Affaires of Scotland from the Restauration of King Charles the 2d (London, 1690).

⁴When the new bishops first entered Scotland in April of 1662 (they had been consecrated in England), great crowds turned out to greet them (Nicoll, A Diary of Public Transactions and other Occurrences, Chiefly in Scotland, from January 1650 to June 1667, p. 363), but this did not mean that the bishops were suddenly popular. For, to paraphrase a quip by Oliver Cromwell, the same crowds would have turned out if the bishops were being hanged. For material on the new bishops, see Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto L, "A Satyr against the Present Episcopal Clergy"; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 41, "Satyr on the Bishops"; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 195, "The Scotts Lettinie."

⁵Robert MacWard, The Poor Man's Cup of Cold Water (Edinburgh, 1678).

⁶Paterson, A Brief Resolution of the Present Case of the Subjects of Scotland, p. 19; A Letter Containing an Humble and Serious Advice to Some in Scotland, in Reference to their Late Troubles and Calamities, p. 12; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, pp. 79-80.

⁷Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 125.

⁸Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 33, "Draught of a Memorial of the King and Lauderdale in Favour of the Presbyterian Ministers Cast out." The author of this "draught" is uncertain, but Wodrow believes it was Robert Douglas.

⁹Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:205.

¹⁰Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:87.

¹¹The division between the Resolutioners and the Protesters formally took place after the military defeat at Dunbar in 1650. The Resolutioners were so named because they approved the "first public resolution," an act which permitted all persons to fight the English invaders who were not excommunicated, notoriously evil, or known enemies of the covenants. The Protesters, in contrast, were opposed to the said act because they wanted a purely godly army to use in the defense of Scotland. This specific issue, of the first public resolution, however, only sparked the division and was not the

sole cause, for the bitterness continued even after the first public resolution had ceased to be a meaningful issue. The fundamental problem was a difference in philosophy. The moderate presbyterians wanted a presbyterian kirk that respected the magistrate's powers to some extent, and the radical Protesters wanted a virtual theocracy. See Dow, Cromwellian Scotland, 1651-1660; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 362n.

¹²Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:24; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:199; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 362; Baillie, Letters and Journals, III:459.

¹³Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 357.

¹⁴Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 78.

¹⁵John Brown, An Apologeticall Relation of the Particular Sufferings of the Faithful Ministers (N.P., 1665), pp. 47-50; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:66; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, pp. 356-7; Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, III:173.

¹⁶Brown, An Apologeticall Relation of the Particular Sufferings of the Faithful Ministers, p. 47; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:87; Lamont, Diary, p. 125; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 73.

¹⁷Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 6, "Draught of a Supplication by the Ministers Imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle to the Committee of Estates."

¹⁸Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:117.

¹⁹According to Sir George Mackenzie, when James Wood, a leading presbyterian minister, heard about the rescissory act, he went to the earl of Middleton and declared that the ministers "would let loose the people upon them" if such an act passed. (See Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, p. 25). A presbyterian author named Gilbert Rule, however, wrote that the whole story was a "forgery." See Gilbert Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets (London, 1691), p. 227.

²⁰"Minutebook of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale," May 1661. The register of the above synod is in the National Library of Scotland (Adv. Ms. 16. 1. 4.). For information on Gilbert Hall, see Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae, I:212.

²¹Extracts from the Records of the Synod of Moray, ed. William Cramond (Elgin, 1906), p. 130.

See the "Humble Address of the Synod of Aberdeen, 1661." A copy can be found in the Register House in Edinburgh (CH8/1333).

²³Most of what was done in an attempt to save presbyterianism was done on the synod level. The presbytery of Edinburgh did give in a supplication in defense of "presbyterial government" when the act rescissory was made known (see Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto LXIII, Robert Douglas, "A Brief Narration of the Coming of Prelacy again within This Kirk," p. 12), but the majority of presbyteries simply conducted routine business when the changes in the kirk were occurring. (See, for example, the manuscript registers of the presbytery of Paisley and the presbytery of Linlithgow.)

²⁴Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, p. 25; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:123; Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, I:180.

²⁵Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, nos. 29, 30, 31, 32, "Draft Supplications of the Synod of Galloway." See also Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:123.

²⁶Lamont, Diary, p. 134; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:119.

²⁷For a description of the activities of the synod of Glasgow and Ayr, see Lamont, Diary, p. 135; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:117ff.

²⁸Robert MacWard, preface to John Brown, History of the Indulgence (N.P., 1678).

²⁹Burnet, History of his Own Times, I:205, 361. Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:76, 79, 109; Donaldson, Scotland, James V to James VII, p. 361.

³⁰James Renwick and Alexander Shields, An Informatory Vindication of a ... Remnant of the ... Church of Christ in Scotland (Edinburgh, 1744), p. 6; Shields, A Hind Let Loose, pp. 125-129.

³¹Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:259; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, I:269-270, 312-315; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 412.

³²According to calculations based on Scott's Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, 528 ministers conformed and 274 did not. There were 96 vacant charges on the eve of the depositions. See also Frederick Goldie, A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland (Edinburgh, 1976), pp. 24ff.

Renwick and Shields, An Introductory Vindication of a ... Remnant of the ... Church of Christ in Scotland, p. 6; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:268.

³⁴Virtually all of the "nonconformist" ministers in Ulster had been deposed in 1661, and 2,000 English "nonconformists" had been deposed in August 1662. See Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 418n.

³⁵Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto LXIII, Douglas, "A Brief Narration of the Coming of Prelacy again within this Kirk," p. 21; Renwick and Shields, An Informatory Vindication of a ... Remnant of the Church of Christ in Scotland, p. 6; Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 129.

³⁶Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 152; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair; Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto LXIII, Douglas, "A Brief Narration of the Coming of Prelacy again within This Kirk," p. 21.

³⁷Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, I:338, 349.

³⁸Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:268ff.

³⁹Smith, "A Brief Rehearsal of Some Few of the Many Steps of Our Defections," in Walker, Six Saints, II:73; Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 132.

⁴⁰Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto LXIII, "A Brief Narration of the Coming of Prelacy again within This Kirk," p. 20.

⁴¹Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 125.

⁴²Lawson, The Episcopal Church in Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution, p. 662.

⁴³Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio LX, no. 99, "Paper from a Meeting at Beeth Hill."

⁴⁴Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, I:269; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 423; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:109.

Chapter IV

The Royal Supremacy

The supremacy of the crown in ecclesiastical affairs was one of the most controversial issues in Scotland during the reigns of Charles II and James VII. The subject, which is central to any understanding of the period, therefore deserves a thorough examination.

The idea of "royal supremacy" was not new in Scotland. In 1612, parliament, under the direction of James VI, established the concept in the statute books with an act that required every minister, upon his admission to a parish church, to "sweare obedience to his majestie" and declare that the king was the "only lawfull supreame governour of this realme alsweill in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical as in thingis temporall."¹ The 1612 act was erastian in the extreme, and it represented a serious encroachment on the privileges of the church by the crown.

The covenanters, in the name of ecclesiastical independence, destroyed all traces of the royal supremacy during the "great rebellion," but Charles II revived the concept after his "Restoration." In 1661, an oath of allegiance asserted the supremacy concept in measured terms, and a 1662 "act for the restitution and reestablishment of the ancient government of the church by archbishops and bishops" implicitly mentioned the idea. Regarding the latter act, it made the prelates the administrators of the kirk and the lackeys of the crown. It

ordained that all "church power" was to be "regulated and authorized, in the exercise thereof, by the archbishops and bishops," and these archbishops and bishops were to be in "subordination to the sovereign power of the king," and were to "be accountable to his majesty for their administrations." In addition, the 1662 act specifically annulled all former acts of parliament and council "by which the sole power and only power and jurisdiction within this church, doth stand in this church," or any of its officers or courts.² Such legislation, needless to say, completely subordinated the kirk to the crown, but Charles II was still not satisfied, and in 1669 an "assertory act"³ was passed. This assertory act, which gave the royal supremacy its fullest expression, declared:

his majesty hath the supreme authority and supremacy over all persons, and in all cases ecclesiastical within this kingdom; and that by virtue thereof, the ordering and disposal of the external government and policy of the church, doth properly belong to his majesty and successors as an inherent right of the crown; and that his majesty and successors may settle, enact, and emit such constitutions, acts, and orders, concerning the administration of the external government of the church, and the persons employed in the same, and concerning all ecclesiastical meetings, and matters to be proposed and determined therein, as they in their royal wisdom think fit.⁴

The assertory act, by any standards, was extreme, and as it stood it was enough to outrage the anti-erastian presbyterians, a group who would never brook any interference by the crown in ecclesiastical affairs. This anger, moreover, was made even more intense because the presbyterians misconstrued the nature of the royal supremacy and charged the king with making even more exalted claims than he in fact did. The authors of Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of

Scotland, for example, argued that the king was an "invader and usurper of the crown, prerogative, and kingdom" of Christ, and Alexander Shields, in his heady Hind Let Loose, wrote that the royal supremacy was "the most blasphemous usurpation on the prerogative of Christ, that even the greatest monster among men durst arrogate; yea, the Roman Beast never claimed more." To use prosaic terms, the presbyterians were accusing Charles II of trying to replace Christ as the supreme head of the kirk.⁵

Charles II, however, never made that extravagant claim, and no adherent of the established "prelatical" church ever doubted the supremacy of Christ in the kirk. This is clear from an "act concerning public prayers for the king" passed by the diocesan assembly of Aberdeen. Aberdeen, the most royalist church court in the realm, expressly ordained that all ministers should pray for the king in the following manner:

Bless thy servant, our sovereign Charles the second, by the speciall grace of God, King of Britain, France, and Irland, Defender of the Faith, over all persones, in all cases, as well civil as ecclesiastick, nixt and immediately under thee and they Christ, supreme governour within his majesties dominions⁶

Likewise, Bishop Andrew Honyman, a leading apologist for the post-Restoration church who was shot and wounded by a covenanting zealot in 1668, also declared that Christ, not Charles II, was the head of the established kirk. Honyman wrote:

that the absolutely supreme power of governing the church is Christ's prerogative, no Christian doubteth; He is king, the lawgiver, the head of the church, in whom all authority is, and from whom it is derived, and to whom all power upon earth must humbly stoup, serving Him, not as they will, but as He willeth. He is so head of the church, that no earthly creature can, without usurpation and terrible treason against Him, claim to be head as He.... All this headship

and absolute supremacy of the church, is by our Christian king dutifully recognised to be Christ's prerogative and His only.⁷

Neither the king nor any of his government ministers would have objected to these statements; they dutifully acknowledged that Christ was the head of the kirk. During the post-Restoration period, the clergy of the established church continued to derive the authority for their spiritual functions directly from Christ and His apostles, and this was made quite clear in a November 3, 1681 proclamation that explained the so-called Test Act. In this "explanation," it was declared that, as far as the royal supremacy was concerned, "no invasion or encroachment is made or intended upon the intrinsic spiritual power of the church, or the power of the keys, as it was exercised by the apostles, and the most pure and primitive church in the first three centuries after Christ, and which is still reserved to the church."⁸ Yet, if the ministers continued to derive their spiritual authority from Christ in the post-Restoration church, it was nevertheless asserted that the persons and actions of the ministers could be lawfully regulated by the king. To explain this concept, Bishop Honyman, in his defense of the royal supremacy, noted that the position of a minister in Scotland resembled that of a physician. "The king," wrote Honyman, "gives not a commission" to a physician "to cure sick persons, . . . but the university where he was graduated gives him warrand, authority, and commission to cure sick persons, . . . and if he against the the rules of the art, kill men wilfully,

the king, with the advice of the college of physicians, may take order with him as a murtherer, yet ... the king therefore ... can not take on himself the office and part of the physician." In a similar fashion, although the king could not invest a minister with spiritual authority, the king could punish a minister if that minister abused his spiritual office.⁹

Clearly, it was not Christ's headship that distinguished the presbyterians from the establishment--the real issue was who was to be Christ's first servant on earth. The presbyterians wanted a General Assembly made up of the representatives of the clergy and the laity to be the supreme earthly authority in the Church of Scotland. They adopted this opinion because they believed the secular authority--represented by the civil magistrate--was impure and was not the proper instrument to discern Christ's mind. The king and his supporters, on the other hand, believed that that the monarch should be Christ's primary servant. They criticized the "vain and giddy preachers,... whose only quarrel is, that we will not allow them to be chief rulers, and they argued that the monarch should not be an "arch-beadle" who employs his "power" to "execute" the "decrees of the kirk," but he should be, next to Christ, the supreme authority in the realm.¹⁰ Thus, Bishop Honyman, in his defense of the royal supremacy, wrote:

that which we attribute to the king's majesty, is neither the power that is proper to Christ only, nor that which the pope ... doth arrogat to himself,... but that only which belongs to all Christian kings and sovereign powers, to whom God has committed the potestative and jurisdictional care of His church in their dominions, under Himself and His Son Jesus Christ.... There is no offense to call the king head of the church, not as a mystical society, but as political, and joyned with the civil body under Christ in His own

dominions; nor imports it any encroachment upon Christ Jesus His headship over all, no more then when Saul was called head of the tribes of Israel, wherein were not only the priestly tribe of Levi, but all the people of God, the commonwealth and church being one materially.¹¹

The king and his supporters endorsed the royal supremacy because they believed that no subject of the realm, be he a nobleman with his retainers or a clergyman with his elders, should have a jurisdiction completely independent of the crown. Everyone, the royalists argued, should be subordinate to the king, and that included the clergy in particular. For, to use the words of the earl of Clarendon, if "churchmen" were independent of the state, and "could subsist by their own acts," then all churchmen could become "kings."¹²

If the king, by virtue of his royal supremacy, did not usurp the "crown, prerogative, and kingdom of Christ," his authority and power were extensive nevertheless. In theory, the authority of the king was not direct and not excessively obtrusive, but in reality it could be. Indeed, the actions of both Charles II and James VII often went beyond mere regulation, and both kings sometimes imposed their wills on the Church of Scotland in a high-handed manner. A number of examples can be cited to illustrate this point. On September 20, 1660, the government applied strict rules of censorship to Scotland's pulpits, and it issued a proclamation which effectively silenced the ministry. The said proclamation prohibited ministers, either "privately or publically, in sermons, preachings, declamations, speeches, or otherwise, by word or writ, to utter,

devise or vent" any "reproach or slander, against his majesties person, estate, or government, his parents or progenitors, or to deprave his laws and acts of parliament, or misconstrue his proceedings." The proclamation added that since "his majesties lieges are ... easily ... ensnared and enticed to ... seditious or treasonable courses and practices, by ministers in their sermons, prayers, declamations, and private discourses," the government would "imprison" seditious clergymen and "sequesterate" their stipends.¹³ This proclamation, a powerful blow against the "freedom of speech" claimed by churchmen, was effectively renewed during the reign of James VII. The latter king shared many of the attitudes of Charles II, and James's government issued an order "discharging ministers in their sermons" from discussing the "person, principles, designs, or government" of the king¹⁴

Another example of royal interference was the imposition of "annual celebrations" on the kirk. The government declared in 1661 that in the future every May 29 would be celebrated as a "solemn day of thanksgiving" in the churches in honor of the king's restoration and birth, and this decision, one which affected public worship, was made without consulting the ministers. Many Scots believed that "anniversary celebrations" and "holy days" were "popish" because they had no "warrant in scripture," so the government's order was not popular. Bishop Honyman, again the apologist for the crown, tried to defend the government's position, and he wrote that although the king did not and could not make May 29

intrinsically "holy," the king could "depute certain dayes for exercises of the holy service of God, especially upon occasion of signal mercies obtained, for averting threatened judgements, or for obtaining great favors desired. And if the day be called holy, it is not for any inherent holiness ... but ... only in regard of the use and exercise of the holy ordinances of God therein to be performed." The logic was tenuous, but the practice of instituting "holy days" did not stop with Charles II.¹⁵ On September 16, 1685, James VII, in a letter to his Privy Council, ordained that October 14 should be celebrated each year as a "day of thanksgiving" for his own birth, accession to the throne, and deliverance from his enemies.¹⁶

The impotence of the established church was clearly visible whenever Charles II or James VII exercised the royal prerogative and intervened in ecclesiastical affairs, but on one occasion the church did attempt to thwart the royal will. The effort was an abject failure, and the episode illustrates the servile condition of the church in the period under discussion. The "rebellion" of the established church--if the term "rebellion" can indeed be used to describe the affair--was connected with an "indulgence" promulgated by Charles II in 1669. This indulgence, which placed parishes and stipends in the hands of 43 nonconformist ministers previously "outed" in 1662-1663, undermined the authority of the bishops, and both James Sharp, the archbishop of St. Andrews, and Alexander Burnet, the archbishop of Glasgow, objected to the scheme.¹⁷ As it turned out, the objections of two archbishops would mean

nothing.

James Sharp, the primate of Scotland, based his criticism on constitutional grounds. Basically, Sharp claimed that the indulgence, which was granted solely on the authority of the royal prerogative, violated several acts of parliament passed for the benefit of prelacy in 1662 and 1663. In particular, parliamentary legislation ordained that ministers should have collation from their diocesan bishops, they should attend diocesan synod meetings, and they should preach only with the approval of their "ordinaries." The indulgence, however, in effect allowed certain nonconformists to circumvent these restrictions, and Sharp therefore argued that the legality of the indulgence was dubious. The primate also pointed out, moreover, that the wording of the 1662 act for the "reestablishment of the government of the church by archbishops and bishops" seemed to indicate that ecclesiastical policy was to be forged only after consultation between the king and the bishops. Since the prelates did not endorse the indulgence, there were some grounds for maintaining that the indulgence was contrary to law. At the end of the day, however, Sharp's resistance proved in vain. Indeed, the only real effect of Sharp's constitutional argument was that it encouraged the government to pass an "assertory act" in 1669. The assertory act removed the loophole found by Sharp, and it also removed any doubts about the legality of the indulgence.¹⁸

Alexander Burnet's opposition to the indulgence was more passionate (most of the indulged ministers would be placed

in his diocese), but it was no more effective. Burnet worked in conjunction with his diocesan assembly to resist the king's new policy, and the strategy entailed the drawing up of a paper or supplication to the government. In the text of this supplication, which became known as the "Remonstrance," the conformist clergy in the synod of Glasgow and Ayr prayed for the establishment of a more precise uniformity in the church, criticized the seditious activities of the conventicle preachers, and attacked the indulgence. The archbishop and the members of his diocesan assembly predicted that an indulgence would foster dissent, weaken the morale of the conformist clergy, and create a de facto schism in the Church of Scotland, and on those grounds they denounced the whole scheme. The entire "Remonstrance" was alarmist in tone, and it was not well-received by the government. The king could tolerate the constitutional arguments used by Sharp, but the "Remonstrance" of Burnet and his synod was too frank and bore too much resemblance to the old covenanter supplications to be acceptable. The government therefore rejected the Remonstrance out of hand, and it swiftly moved against Burnet. The archbishop was prevented from sitting in the 1669 session of parliament, and by the end of the year he was in effect forced to resign his see.¹⁹

The deposition of an archbishop on such grounds seems extreme, but Charles II and his government wanted to demonstrate that a rebellious clergy would not be tolerated. Once this point had been made, however, the king and his advisors held no

long-term animosity toward the ringleaders of the Remonstrance episode. Burnet was eventually restored to his see in 1674, and in 1679 he was actually made the primate of Scotland. Other leaders, including two ministers named Ramsay and Ross, also suffered no permanent damage to their ecclesiastical careers. To the contrary, James Ramsay, the Dean of Glasgow who had helped to draw up the Remonstrance, was appointed to a bishopric in 1673, and Arthur Ross, the minister of St. Mungo's who had been another person deeply involved in the affair, was consecrated a bishop in 1674 and would eventually succeed Burnet as primate. In short, the men charged with "sedition" in 1669 made up nearly one quarter of Scotland's bishops six years later. Yet, if the government's reaction to the Remonstrance did not destroy the vocations of those involved, it did send a clear message to the clergy of the established church. Burnet's removal, combined with the passage of the aforementioned assertory act, emphasized that all "office-bearers" in the kirk were in a position of "subordination," and were clearly in a "dependance upon ... the sovereign power of the king."²⁰

The lesson was not lost on the clergy, and never again would the ministers of the established kirk really attempt to resist the crown in pre-Revolution Scotland. This subservience continued even after 1685, in spite of the fact that the accession of James VII meant that the "supreme authority" in "all cases ecclesiastical" in protestant Scotland was in the hands of a Roman Catholic king. Two bishops were deposed by James VII--Andrew Bruce in 1686 and Alexander Cairncross in

1687--but the "offenses" of these two prelates hardly constituted "rebelliousness." Neither prelate was a "radical" by any stretch of the imagination, and Bruce was deposed in 1686 for simply preaching a moderate sermon against "popery," and Cairncross was deposed in 1687 for neglecting to censure a minister in his diocese who had preached an anti-papal sermon.²¹ It is not significant that two protestant bishops would discretely criticize the "popery" of their king--what is significant is that only two bishops would do so. Clearly, acquiescence characterized the Church of Scotland in the period, and a spirited resistance to royal policies, a common enough theme among nonconformists, was virtually unknown within the establishment itself.

Notes

¹Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, eds. T. Thompson and C. Innes, 12 vols. (Edinburgh, 1844-75), IV:470.

²Brown, History of the Indulgence, pp. 170ff; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:258; "Peebles Presbytery Register," November 23, 1665.

³Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:137.

⁴For information on the royal supremacy as it was applied in England, see E. T. Davies, Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century (Oxford, 1950). See in particular Davies's discussion of the Forty-Two Articles of 1552, for in the body of the "Articles" it is stated that "the king of England is supreme head on earth, next under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland." In addition, see Davies's analysis of the Thirty-Nine Articles of 1571, for in the latter Elizabeth I claimed the "prerogative ... given to all godly princes in the holy scriptures by God Himself, that is that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with civil sword the stubborn and evildoers."

⁵Stewart and Stirling, Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland, p. 38; Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali II:43; Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 513; Robert Calder, Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed (London, 1692), p. 58; Hickes, The Spirit of Popery Speaks out of the Mouths of Phanatical Protestants, p. 9; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:137.

⁶Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, ed. T. Bell (Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1897), p. 5.

⁷Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, II:45.

⁸Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:309; Stewart and Stirling, Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland, p. 15; Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, II:39, 69; Brown, An Apologeticall Relation of the Particular Sufferings of the Faithful Ministers, p. 169.

⁹Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, II:53.

¹⁰Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:157; Alexander Monro, An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland, p. 20.

Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, II:45.

¹²Donaldson, James V to James VII, p. 198; Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland; Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, II:41; Lawson, The Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution, p. 672.

¹³Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:76; Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, II:69; Brown, An Apologeticall Relation of the Particular Sufferings of the Faithful Ministers, pp. 169, 186; Stewart and Stirling, Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland, p. 15.

¹⁴Sir John Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Notices of Scottish Affairs, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1848), II:739-740; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:401.

¹⁵Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 126; Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, II:10.

¹⁶Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, September 16, 1685; John Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, 2 vols. (London, 1918), I:415.

¹⁷Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, IV:164; I. B. Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688 (London, 1976), pp. 80, 108; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae; Brown, History of the Indulgence; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:131.

¹⁸Brown, History of the Indulgence, pp. 170ff; Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, VI:372ff; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:509; Buckroyd, Church and State in Scotland, 1660-1681, pp. 80ff.

¹⁹Lauderdale Papers, II, Appendix A, II:175; Buckroyd, Church and State in Scotland, 1660-1681, pp. 82ff; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, pp. 82, 153; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:510; Robert Law, Memorials, ed. Charles K. Sharpe (Edinburgh, 1818), p. 21; Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, pp. 157ff.

²⁰Brown, History of the Indulgence, p. 170; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:258; Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, pp. 157ff; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae.

²¹Keith, A Large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland.

Chapter V

The Bishops of the Post-Restoration Church

The prelates, two archbishops and twelve bishops, were the chief "office-bearers" in the established church. These prelates derived the spiritual authority from the uninterrupted "Apostolic Succession" of the English bishops, an authority conveyed in December of 1661 when James Sharp, Andrew Fairfoul, Robert Leighton, and James Hamilton were consecrated in Westminster Abbey. The archbishops of York and Canterbury had been carefully excluded from the above ceremony in order to avoid any unfavorable "reflections" on the independence of the Scottish church, and the presiding bishop was the bishop of London (the bishops of Worcester, Carlisle, and Llandaff served as assistants). The aged Thomas Sydserff, the only surviving pre-civil war Scottish bishop, did not participate in the consecrations, for Sydserff had become "very moderate" in his later years, and "this did so disgust the English bishops," that "they took no care of him."¹

The 1661 consecrations of the "Scots bishops" were conducted according to the procedure laid down in the English Book of Common Prayer. The ceremony contained "a great process of change of vestments, offices, prayers, bowing to the altar, and kneeling at the communion," and many Scots, such as William Row, denounced the "actings" as "superstitious and idolatrous." The English bishops seemed to be in complete control of the whole affair, and on their insistence Sharp and Leighton, who

had been ordained by the presbyterians, were reordained before their consecrations. This was unnecessary (the Scottish bishops consecrated in 1610 had not been reordained), but the "late wars" had "brought men to stricter notions" and encouraged them to maintain these notions "with more fierceness." Hamilton and Fairfoul, unlike Sharp and Leighton, were not reordained, for they had entered the ministry before the displacement of episcopacy by the covenanters.²

When the new bishops--their connection with the Apostolic Succession established--returned to Scotland, they themselves would also conduct consecrations according to the "English forms." A Scottish order drawn up in 1620 was available, but it was apparently never used in the period under discussion. Thus, when six men were consecrated at Holyrood Abbey Church on May 7, 1662, the "Book of Ordination and Service Book" of the Church of England were employed, and there were, according to one observer, "diverse goings and returnings, and kneeling often before the tabel wher the archbishop satt." The same source added that "the ground, whereon they walked in the tyme of the consecration, was all covered with carpets," and the "archbishop of Glasgow" brought the new bishops "one by one, by the hand," to the "Lord St. Andrews," and each man swore "obedience" to the primate during his "life tyme." But, although the Scottish would use the English forms in this and in subsequent consecrations, they did not have the "strict notions" of the Anglican bishops, and they did not think that reordination was necessary. George Haliburton, one of the six

men consecrated in May 1662, had been ordained by the presbytery of Brechin in 1642, and he was not reordained when he became the bishop of Dunkeld.³

All Scottish bishops, from the revival of prelacy in 1661 to its disestablishment in 1689, were appointed by the king. The procedure followed was outlined in a 1617 act of parliament. When a vacancy occurred, the crown granted a license to the Dean and chapter of a cathedral to meet. In the case of the diocese of Galloway, there were twelve ministers in the chapter, and they met in the "cathedral church of Whithern." The members of the chapter technically elected a new bishop, but this was a "mocking of God," for their choice was "predetermined by a conge-d'elire from court," and they really made "no election at all." The king then gave his assent to their "choice," and this entitled the person "elected" to claim "spirituality" of the see during his lifetime. Next the person selected was consecrated by a competent number of bishops according to "the rites and ordoure accustomed," and then the crown, by a charter under the Great Seal, deponed the temporality of the see to the new bishop, who at that point also did homage and swore obedience to the crown. This system was criticized--Andrew Symson, a conformist minister in Galloway, complained that the "members of the chapter" never received "one sixpence ... upon account of their being members," and James Gordon, a conformist minister in the north, suggested it would be a better arrangement if the king selected a candidate from a "list" that the chapter had "freely" drawn up--but no

changes were ever made.

The above procedure, which appeared to leave the selection of bishops to the king alone, was often tempered in practice, however. It was not uncommon, for example, for the king to consult one or both of the archbishops before making a choice, and in fact it seems that all the men consecrated in 1661-1662 had in fact been suggested by James Sharp. Such consultations apparently occurred throughout the period, and on several occasions the court informed the archbishops that their advice would be sought before filling any vacancies. Thus, in 1666, 1671, and again in 1676 Lauderdale informed Sharp that no one would be appointed to an ecclesiastical office (episcopal sees or parish churches) without "the approbation of the two archbishops within their respective provinces."⁵

The nobility of Scotland also had some influence over episcopal appointments. In 1676, for example, the "dutchess of Lauderdale" used her influence to have her favorite, John Paterson, translated from the see of Galloway to the more important see of Edinburgh.⁶ It was also not uncommon for the nobility to use their influence to promote relatives, and it was no coincidence that some bishops had kinship connections with some of Scotland's most important aristocrats. Thus, Robert Wallace was related to the earl of Glencairn, James Drummond was related to the earl of Perth, Murdoch Mackenzie was related to the earl of Seaforth, Robert Douglas (the bishop) was the cousin of the duke of Hamilton, Alexander Burnet was related to the earl of Teviot, and James Hamilton was the younger

brother of Lord Belhaven. This is not to say that all the bishops had aristocratic bloodlines--James Sharp was the son of a provost and sheriff-clerk of Banffshire; Arthur Ross, William Scrogie, and George Haliburton were the sons of ministers; Thomas Sydserff and David Fletcher were the sons of merchants; Patrick Scougal, David Strachan, and George Wishart were the sons of lairds; William Hay was the son of the master of the music school in Old Aberdeen; and Andrew Honyman was the son of a baker⁸--but the members of the nobility were an important factor in episcopal appointments nevertheless.

Once an individual had become a bishop, he could expect certain financial windfalls from his office. Compared to the English bishoprics, however, the remuneration was quite small. Even James Kirkton admitted that "all the bishopricks in Scotland set together will not make 4000 pounds English in ordinary years," and he noted that "some" of the "bishoprics" were "but trifles."⁹ The poorest bishopric, Dunblane, produced a rent of 1303 pounds scots, and some of the others were scarcely better. Thus, Andrew Symson, in his "Large Description of Galloway" (written in 1684), commented that the "revenues of the bishoprick" of Galloway were "not large and opulent," and "the bishopric was so dilapidated," that there was "not so much as an house in all the diocese, that, as bishop of Galloway, he can call his owne: the pityful dwelling the bishops of Galloway of late have hitherto had, being only in a chapel belonging to the abbacy of Glenluce, and within the precincts of that ruinous Abbey." On the other hand, the lifestyles of

the two archbishops in Scotland was not altogether uncomfortable. The gross rental of the see of Glasgow (as declared in 1689) was 9,700 pounds scots, and the gross rental of St. Andrews, the richest bishopric, was 13,700 pounds scots (in 1692). An archbishop such as Sharp, is is true, could be charitable--it seems he gave money to a daughter of Johnston of Wariston to pass on to the widows and orphans of "presbyterian sufferers"--but Sharp could still afford to buy a "fair new coach" in London and hire "two lakqueys in purple" to "run" by its "sides."¹⁰

Generally speaking, however, a Scottish bishopric was not a lucrative office, and the "gross rent" of most sees was a "weak tentation." Yet, this fact notwithstanding, thirty-nine different ministers became bishops in the Church of Scotland between 1661 and the Revolution. The office technically carried some prestige--men had to "beck and bing" to bishops and say "please your lordship's grace"--but it was also, in Kirkton's words, an "odious and dangerous" position, and some of the bishops found this to their cost.¹¹ Clearly, the episcopal office must have attracted an unusual breed of men, and the question naturally arises, what were the characteristics of the post-Restoration bishops? What traits did the bishops share, and how were individual bishops unique?

In terms of background, the men who were bishops had an unusual past. Fourteen of the prelates never had any connection, involvement, or sympathy with the presbyterian cause, but a large number had been willingly involved in the

work of the presbyterians during the "rebellion." Indeed, many of the bishops had been ordained by "presbyteries." Of the thirty-nine post-Restoration bishops, sixteen received their ordination from the presbyterians during the presbyterian "hegemony"; ¹² twelve received their ordination from the bishops of James VI and Charles I; two, Alexander Burnet and William Lindsay, received their ordination from Church of England bishops; one, Patrick Forbes, apparently underwent ordination in the Netherlands; and eight received their ordination from other post-Restoration bishops.¹³ The figures, it is true, must be considered in the context of the "generational factor"--it is to be expected that the largest number of bishops from the 1662 period would have received their ordination in the twenty year period before the Restoration¹⁴--but it is still significant that over one third of the bishops had "presbyterian orders," a fact that helps to explain why the prelates were constantly accused of apostasy.¹⁵ On the other hand, it must be remembered that the ministers at the 1638 Glasgow Assembly who condemned prelacy and voted to depose and excommunicate the bishops had themselves been ordained by bishops.¹⁶ The instabilities of the seventeenth century created many such unusual situations.

Besides the bishops with presbyterian ordinations, it is also remarkable that nine of the twelve post-Restoration bishops who had been ordained by prelates before 1638 had, at one time, taken the covenants and conformed to presbyterianism. Three of the twelve--John Paterson, David Fletcher, and James

Hamilton--did conform under duress, and six of the twelve were eventually deposed by the covenanters for "refusing to go into all that came about,"¹⁷ but two of the post-Restoration bishops--Murdoch Mackenzie and Henry Guthry--had once been zealous covenanters. Mackenzie, a bishop from 1662 until his death in 1688, had a rather checkered past. Ordained in 1636, he was a member of the Glasgow Assembly two years later, and during the covenanting era he was an active supporter of the "not keeping of Yule" movement. By the Restoration, however, Mackenzie had altered his opinions, and by 1665 he was holding a Christmas service in the cathedral church of Elgin.¹⁸ Henry Guthry, consecrated the bishop of Dunkeld in 1665, also had an inconsistent career. Ordained by a bishop in 1625, Guthry, although appointed by Charles I to the "Commission for the Maintenance of Church Discipline," nevertheless took an active part in the opposition to Charles I's policies in 1637-1638. William Row described Guthry as a man who was "very forward for the Reformation" during the early stages of the covenanter "revolt," and for most of the 1640's Guthry was prominently involved in the affairs of the kirk, and he worked closely with the likes of David Calderwood (the historian) and Alexander Henderson (the moderator of the 1638 General Assembly). In time, however, Guthry's zeal weakened, and in 1648 he was deposed and forced into exile because he supported the "Engagement." The deposition and his unhappy experiences in exile had an effect on Guthry, and at length he came to believe that "a parity in the church could not possibly be maintained,

so as to preserve unity, and order among them, and that a superior authority must be brought in, to settle them in unity and peace." Ironically, Henry Guthry's apostasy from presbyterianism to episcopacy was mirrored by James Guthrie, a rival who replaced Henry Guthry at Stirling in 1648. James Guthrie is remembered as a fiery presbyterian and a Protester, but, in the words of Kirkton, when Guthrie was "a regent in St. Andrews, he was very episcopal, and was with difficulty persuaded to take the covenant."¹⁹

The presence of so many erstwhile presbyterians among the bishops did not please everyone in the church establishment. James Gordon, the minister of Banchory-Devenick and a convinced supporter of episcopacy, published a book in 1679 entitled The Reformed Bishop, and in this work he sharply criticized the background of many of Scotland's bishops. One of the chief flaws of the established church, he argued, was that many of its bishops were selected not from those ministers who had always been faithful to prelacy and monarchy, but from that faction that had overthrown both. Indeed, according to Gordon, nothing had changed with the reestablishment of prelacy except that presbyterian moderators had been replaced by "presbyterian bishops"--men with new titles and larger revenues. Gordon's attack, needless to say, was not appreciated by the bishops, and the author of The Reformed Bishop was temporarily deposed in 1680, and his career also suffered irreparable damage. In one "pasquil" from the period, it was said of Gordon:

If your book had never been seen,
You had been bishop of Aberdeen;
If you had been bishop of Aberdeen,

Your book had never been seen.

But, all satire aside, Gordon's criticism was substantially correct, and there were a large number of "presbyterian" defectors on the episcopal bench. According to Gilbert Burnet, James Sharp was the man responsible for the large number of "covenanter" bishops, for from 1661 until his death in 1679 Sharp had a tendency to support the candidacy of old "Resolutioners." Thus, during the crucial selection process in 1661-1662--the one that would give shape and direction to the episcopal bench--Sheldon and the English bishops suggested that no one who ever "engaged in the covenant" should be appointed to the Scottish bishoprics because "a set of presbyterian bishops" "could have no credit" and "would have no zeal," but Sharp saw things in a different light. Sharp was opposed to "preferring" "episcopal clergy who had been driven out of Scotland in the beginning of the troubles" because "the old episcopal men, by their long absence out of Scotland, knew nothing of the present generation, and by the ill usage they had met with, they would run matters quickly to great extremities." Instead, Sharp recommended that "men of moderate principles"--in other words, Resolutioners like himself--be selected to staff the hierarchy of the kirk. Clarendon, who saw the king so remiss in that matter that he resolved to keep things in "as great temper as possible," agreed with Sharp, and "the selection of the Scottish bishops" conducted along the lines laid down by Sharp.²¹

After due weight is given to the large number of former presbyterians who became bishops, it must be emphasized that some

of the bishops did not belong to the "defector" category. At all times, a significant number of the bishops were individuals who had never been sympathetic to presbyterianism. Thomas Sydserff, the only pre-covenant bishop to survive the Restoration, was clearly in the latter category. Sydserff,²² who became the bishop of Orkney--the richest see after St. Andrews and Glasgow--with the reestablishment of prelacy, had been deposed from the see of Galloway and excommunicated by the presbyterian party in 1638.²³ Sydserff went to Paris during the "troubles," and there he exercised his episcopal office in the chapel of Sir Richard Browne, the ambassador. Sydserff suffered many hardships in exile, but he also ordained many to the ministry, including John Tillotson, a later archbishop of Canterbury.

Several other active opponents of the covenanters also became bishops in the post-Restoration church. David Mitchell, who had been deposed from the Old Kirk in Edinburgh and forced into exile in Holland for denying the legitimacy of the 1638 Glasgow Assembly, became the bishop of Aberdeen in 1662. George Wishart, an avid episcopalian, royalist, and supporter of Montrose who had been deposed by the covenanters from the kirk of St. Andrews, became the bishop of Edinburgh in 1662. Alexander Burnet, a "zealous" supporter of the Anglican "forms and worship" who was "bred a minister in England" after his father, the minister of Jedburgh, had been deposed in 1639 for resisting the covenanters, became a bishop in 1663 and the primate of Scotland in 1679. David Fletcher, who had been

deposed from St. Giles's kirk in Edinburgh for defending the 1637 service book and denouncing the 1638 General Assembly, became the bishop of Argyll.²⁴ James Hamilton, who had been deposed from Cambusnethan in 1639 for resisting the presbyterians, became the bishop of Galloway.²⁵

It should also be mentioned that a portion of the post-Restoration bishops had been educated in the royalist-episcopalian traditionsⁱ of the University of Aberdeen and the north of Scotland. The influence of the University of Aberdeen must not be overestimated--Donald Cargill, one of prelacy's fiercest opponents, apparently completed part of his education there--but it must be considered nevertheless. Altogether, eleven of the thirty-nine post-Restoration bishops had once been students at the University of Aberdeen, and although this number was not exceptionally large (thirteen had studied at St. Andrews, eight had studied at Edinburgh, five had studied at Glasgow, one had studied wholly in England,²⁶ and one had studied at an unidentified location), the influence of the Aberdeen graduates was disproportionate to their numbers. The latter occupied many important sees in the kirk, and no fewer than two out of the three primates from the period were graduates of Aberdeen. The two, James Sharp and Arthur Ross, both had a conservative "northern" streak in their characters, and the latter in particular possessed an Aberdeen pedigree. Arthur Ross (together with William Scrogie, bishop of Argyll, and Alexander Ross, bishop of Edinburgh) was related to Alexander Ross, one of the "Aberdeen Doctors," and Arthur Ross's

admiration for the Church of England rivaled that of his prestigious uncle.²⁷ With men like Arthur Ross at the helm of the established kirk, the charge that the post-Restoration church was led by "presbyterian bishops" seems less substantial.

The post-Restoration bishops, then, were a diverse group. Some of the bishops, like Robert Leighton, had backgrounds in presbyterianism, but others, like Alexander Burnet, did not. According to their critics, however, the bishops all had one characteristic in common: they were mediocre men who were morally unfit to be the leaders of the Church.²⁸ Gilbert Burnet, who could wield a caustic pen, wrote:

I observed the deportment of our bishops was in all points so different from what became their functions that I had more than ordinary zeal kindled within me upon it. They were not only furious against all that stood out against them, but were very remiss in all parts of their function. Some did not live within their diocese: and those who did, seemed to take no care of them. They showed no zeal against vice: the most eminently wicked in the country were their particular confidants: they took no pains to keep their clergy strictly to rules, and to their duty: on the contrary, there was a levity and a carnal way of living about them, that very much scandalized me.

Burnet wrote the above words after the Revolution, and the timing is significant. Burnet was not a dependable source, for in 1685--before the disestablishment of prelacy in Scotland--he wrote:

I shall not add much of the bishops that have been in that church since the last re-establishing of the order, but that I have observed among the few of them, to whom I had the honour to be known particularly, as great, and as exemplary things, as ever I met with in all ecclesiastical history: not only the practice of the strictest of all the ancient canons, but a pitch of vertue and piety beyond what can fall under a common imitation, or be made the measure of even the most angelical rank of men; and saw things in them that would look like fairer ideas, than what men cloathed in flesh and blood could grow up to. But of this I will say no more, since those that are concerned are yet alive, and

their character is too singular, not to make them to be as easily known, if I enlarged upon it, as if I named them.²⁹

If Burnet contradicted himself when he described the bishops, the presbyterians did not. All presbyterians denounced the bishops as immoral, and they did this with single-minded consistency. Many of the presbyterian accusations were based on hearsay and distorted evidence, but they were nevertheless widely believed. Among the "presbyterian rabble in the west," for example, it was rumored that the bishops were sorcerers who practiced the black arts and made pacts with Satan. It is probable that very few nonconformists actually went so far as to believe that the prelates were really "cloven-footed" and lacked shadows because they opposed "the covenant work in the land," but charges of witchcraft against some of the prelates were seriously entertained.³⁰ Bishop Andrew Honyman, for example, was found dead in 1676 with his gown allegedly "torn to peeces," and many presbyterians believed that the devil had come and taken Honyman's soul, for that had been the fate of "Dr. Faustus the Conjurer." Thus, Robert Law wrote:

This year, 1676, Mr. Hinniman ... was cut off by a strange death ... in his house.... He goes up on night to his chamber, where he was heard to make a noise and din upon the floor; and when his wife caused break up the door, for it was bolted, he was found lying on the floor, his hat cast to one place, and his cap he used on his heid to another place of the chamber, and his gown about him torn in peeces. His wife caused bring him down, and laid him in another room upon a bed, where he expressed himself thus: something come between me and my light; and in a few days he dyed languishing.³¹

Law, unlike some other presbyterian contemporaries, did not specifically accuse Honyman of dying a "Faustian" death, but Law

clearly provided all the sinister trappings.

James Sharp, like Honyman, was also accused of being a "demonick and a witch" by his enemies. The idea seems preposterous enough today, but several prominent presbyterians, including James Kirkton, took it seriously. Thus, as evidence of the archbishop's involvement in sorcery, Kirkton alleged that Sharp's assassins found that the primate possessed a "familiar spirit" (a demon that serves a witch) disguised as a bee in a "small box," and also several "enchantments,"³² such as "pairings of nales."³³ In the "Account of the Manner of the Death of Mr. J. Sharp," which was probably concocted by someone with no involvement in the affair, the last possessions of Sharp were even more incriminating, and the archbishop was given a familiar spirit, the pairings, and also a written magic spell for good measure. In reality, of course, the claim that Sharp actually possessed such things was an embellishment of the facts, for James Russell, who was one of the assassins and therefore an eyewitness, made no mention of the familiar spirit or the "nales" or the magic spell when he described the dead primate's belongings.³⁴

Tales regarding Sharp's illicit supernatural antics were quite widespread, and it was also rumored that the covenanting assassins found it necessary to use their swords and daggers against their victim because the primate had cast an infernal spell to make himself invulnerable to firearms. The power of making such a "coat of proof" was commonly attributed to sorcerers, and Sharp was no exception. Thus, James Kirkton,

who apparently believed the "coat of proof" accusation, wrote of Sharp:

this I can say of certain knowledge, the chirurgion who first handled his body, when dead, told me his body was not pierced with any of the ball shott at him, tho' at a very near distance.³⁵

Stories similar to the one told by Kirkton abounded, and in these tales it was assumed that Sharp gained his "invulnerability" from a league with the devil. Needless to say, the three surgeons and one medical doctor who did examine the body reported that Sharp had received a wound "below the right clavicle, betwixt the second and the third rib, which was given by a shot not reaching the capacity of the breast," but the prelate's enemies refused to believe this "official" evidence, and preferred to give credence to rumors.³⁶

On a more mundane level, several of the bishops were also accused of illicit activities. Andrew Fairfoul, an archbishop of Glasgow, was accused of having "amours" with "the fair wife of Polwart," and Alexander Cairncross, another archbishop of Glasgow, allegedly "got" a "lusty maid named Greer with child" when he was the minister of Dumfries, even though the charge against Fairfoul was unsubstantiated and the charge against Fairfoul was never officially lodged because one "John Sharp" "confessed himself guilty" of relations with the "lusty maid" and "made publick satisfaction on the public place of repentance three Lord's days in the kirk" of Dumfries.³⁷ John Paterson, a third archbishop of Glasgow (the prelates of Glasgow were favorite targets), was also accused of "gross" immorality;

indeed, Paterson's critics claimed that Paterson's character was so vile that he should have been "a pimp to a bawdy-house" rather than a "govenor" of the church. Paterson was described in "obscure and virulent" pamphlets as "one of the most impure and flagitious wretches that ever was closed in human flesh," and his crimes were supposed to be countless. According to his critics, Paterson was an "arch pimp of Glasgow" who committed "violent rape" on a "poor young girle" in Fife, made "wicked solicitations" to "Dutch Anne Murray," prostituted the wife of a minister of Edinburgh, committed "whoredom with the Lady Warriston," and indulged in acts of "filthiness" with one of the Du~~x~~chess of York's "maids of honour." It was also said that Paterson owned a pair of "band-strings" from a "woman great in his favour," and that he possessed an "abominable snuff box" "carved with some of the most ugly Aretin pictures and postures."³⁸ The archbishop, needless to say, was appalled by the charges made against him, and he defended himself in print. Paterson appealed "to all the men and women in the world with whom I ever conversed" to declare "if ever they heard one single obscene word drop from my tongue, or ever perceived any immodest insinuation directly or indirectly in my actings or practice." Paterson also challenged his anonymous accusers "to come out from behind the curtain" and "prove any of these infamous articles or passages ... against me by two, nay, by any one single witness or person of known virtue and probity, and of irreproachable fame." And, to encourage his accusers to come forward, Paterson promised a "reward" of "two hundred pounds

sterling" to any one who could "prove" any of the "infamous and diabolical aspersions and calumnies" against him.³⁹ It is interesting that no one ever tried to collect the reward, including George Ridpath, the anonymous presbyterian pamphleteer who published most of the accusations. Ridpath later wrote that he did not think it was "necessary" to "judicially prove" the charges he had made against the archbishop, for "it's enough that I can prove" that Paterson "was commonly talk'd of as such a person."⁴⁰

James Sharp, the most unpopular prelate, was also accused of sins of the flesh. It was said that Sharp, in addition to being a sorcerer, was also a "fornicator" who murdered his own illegitimate child. It was alleged by Kirkton and others that Sharp "debauched" a "beautiful serving woman named Isobel Lindsay" when he was a regent in the University of St. Andrews, and the presbyterians added that after a child was born Sharp "strangled it with his own hands." Kirkton described the affair at length, and he added:

This the poor woman [Isobel Lindsay], from trouble of mind, revealed to many. When he was at his highest, yea, when he was preaching to all his diocesan meeting, she stood up before all his miserable underlings, exhorting them to beware of one that would lead them to the devil; and as she was about to proclaim the said story, she was by his friends interrupted and imprisoned; yet durst they never put the matter to a tryal, lest the truth should have appeared. Yea, when she came to complain to the king's councill, it was thought wisdom to pass it over in silence.⁴¹

There was, it should be noted, really an Isobel Lindsay who implicated James Sharp in fornication and infanticide; Kirkton neglected to mention, however, that Isobel Lindsay was considered an insane woman and a public nuisance in the town of

St. Andrews. Lindsay constantly interrupted services for worship in the burgh with her "confession" and her declaration that she had seen Sharp and the minister of Dundee dancing in the air as witches, and the presbytery of St. Andrews was at a loss as to what to do with her. Under December 4, 1672, the following entry was made in the presbytery register:

Doctor Moor represented to the brethren that Isbell Lyndsay, spouse to John Wilsone in St. Andrews, who was banished the towne by the magistrats, for hir rayling against my lord archbishop in time of God's publick worship, having returned some weeks agoe to the towne, and being connived at in hope of hir future good behavior, yit notwithstanding, had the last Lord's day save one, uttered some reviling speeches against the said archbishop and his lady at his entry to his sermon, to the great scandal of the congregation, and therfore was immediately incarcerat by the magistrats.⁴²

The presbytery, "seriously considering the greatnes" of her "scandal" and the "bad preparative and ill example thereof," decided to consult with Archbishop Sharp himself. At the next meeting, however, it was reported that Sharp merely advised the "brethren" to use "their own prudence to act in that matter," and the presbytery therefore decided to send some of their members to "confer" with Isobel Lindsay and "bring hir to a sense of her sin." This effort was apparently in vain, for on January 1, 1673 the ministers reported that Lindsay continued "obstinat," and they added that the magistrates had therefore decided "to inflict civil punishment on hir, and banish hir the toune." In light of this information, the presbytery decided to send "Doctor Moor" to visit the woman one last time, but the brethren did not anticipate success, for they informed More that he was to "declare the haynousnes of hir sin befor the face of the congregation, and desire them not to be scandalized by hir

wicked example" because "she was a person incapable of discipline and unworthy of Christian society."⁴³

The bishops, besides being charged with witchcraft and lechery, were also accused of cruelty.⁴⁴ It was alleged, for example, that the prelates delighted in torture, and the author of A Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland , Occasioned by the Episcopalians since the Year 1660 claimed that when the "brutish" and "vengeful" "tortures of boots and thumbkins" were inflicted on the presbyterians on the orders of the Privy Council, the "bishops" were always "the obdurate spectators" and the "impertinent, spiteful movers of questions to the poor tortured prisoners."⁴⁵ Robert Wodrow, the chronicler of the "persecution," repeated the same story, but in reality it had no basis in fact. The prelates were never present when the Privy Council applied torture, for Lauder of Fountainhall noted that the "bishops" always "retired forth of the council" "in sanguinary cases." Fountainhall wrote the above statement in connection with a case of torture that occurred in 1680.⁴⁶

One bishop in particular, Alexander Burnet, was accused of cruelty. Burnet, who successively filled the sees of Aberdeen, Glasgow, and St. Andrews, was allegedly a hard-hearted and violent man. This view, which survives in modern works, is somewhat strange, for Fountainhall described Burnet as "a man of much moderation," and another contemporary wrote that the prelate was a "soft and good natured man" who was inclined to peaceable and moderate counsels," but it gained currency

nevertheless, and the presbyterians claimed that Burnet was the "chief director of the persecution," even though he had the "best morals" of the bishops.⁴⁷ Burnet's reputation for severity was partly justified--he did declare his opposition to the disbanding of the army in 1667 because he thought the troops protected the "gospell" in his "diocey" from the nonconformists--but his critics portrayed him as a ruthless individual, and that was probably a distortion of the truth. It was alleged, for example, that Burnet was directly responsible for the death of Hugh McKail (a Pentland rebel who was executed for "treason" in 1667) because Burnet supposedly had the power to stop the execution and did nothing. According to this story, Burnet "had come down" from London before the execution and "had brought with him a letter from the king ... which ... ordered that such of the prisoners as would promise to obey the laws for the future should be set at liberty, and the incorrigible should be sent to the plantations," but Burnet cruelly let McKail's hanging go on, "pretending there was no-council day ... to prevent the execution."⁴⁸ The account, if it were true, would represent a severe mark on Burnet's character, but the tale may be fictitious. It is especially suspect because in most versions Sharp, not Burnet, is the guilty party--Row wrote that the "pardon came to Prelate Sharp's hands before Mr. Hugh M'Kail and the other four with him were executed, but he most cruelly concealed it," and James Russell, the assassin, declared that he and his comrades denied mercy to Sharp because their victim was responsible for "keeping up a pardon granted by the king for

nine persons at Pentland"--but Sharp was definitely not involved, for he was in Fife during the executions. As for Burnet, his involvement in the affair cannot be positively denied, but the muddled nature of the accusation makes it rather dubious.⁴⁹

Still another charge against the bishops was the allegation that they were inordinately proud. This charge, for Archbishop Sharp at least, was grounded in fact. In November of 1665, one Alexander Smith, the deposed minister of Colvend, was "committed to the thieves hoill in Edinburgh, and bound in his feet and leggis, for sum alledgit didemanouris and wordis irreverentlie spoken to the bishop of St. Androis, calling him onlie Mr. James Scharp, quhilk did not content him. Neither did he [the deposed minister of Colvend] respect the bishop's place and authority; for the quilk, he was not onlie schamefullie disgracit and holdin in the theves hoill, bot his leggis and feitt bund with yrnis and fetters."⁵⁰ Smith's refusal to use the forms of address expected by an archbishop was understandable (for, to use Row's words, "it was judged sinfull by all unconform ministers to give prelates titles of honor upon any account, even by them who formerly had done it in the former prelates' time"),⁵¹ and Sharp's reaction was therefore inappropriate.⁵² Other bishops, in contrast, would prove more flexible and moderate in this respect.⁵³ This, for example, was true of Archbishop Fairfoul. Robert Baillie met Fairfoul, and, in Baillie's words: "I excused my not useing of his styles, and professed my utter difference from his way," yet "the bishop

was very courteous to me." It was also true of John Paterson. In 1680 Paterson was bishop of Edinburgh, and when a prominent nonconformist appeared before the Privy Council and refused to use Paterson's titles, the "affront" was ignored, and the nonconformist was released. The most exemplary prelate in this respect, however, was Robert Leighton. Leighton, who successively filled the sees of Dunblane and Glasgow, "refused the title of Lord" on all occasions, and always declined "the place of gentlemen." Leighton, more than any other bishop, "hated all appearance of vanity," and although his "singularity" in this respect "provoked the other bishops," "amongst the people" he "was in much esteem."⁵⁴

The accusations made against the bishops as a group and as individuals had not been exhausted--the prelates were charged with every conceivable crime--but the general nature of the accusations has been established. To be sure, the prelates were not perfect, and there were some obvious cases of "insufficiency": William Scrogie was made bishop of Argyll even "though he understood not a word of Irish," Robert Wallace was made bishop of the Isles even though he knew nothing of the district and spoke only Latin and "his mother's tongue," and James Aitken was made bishop of Galloway even though he was aged and infirm and had to stay in Edinburgh.⁵⁵ And, although the evidence is weak, it is likely that a few of the thirty-nine men who became bishops were guilty of some immoral actions--human beings, after all, are fallible, and even Samuel Rutherford, the noted covenanting divine, confessed to fornication as a young man in

1626. But, having granted that, it must be asserted that most of the accusations made against the prelates by the nonconformists were groundless. The most obvious flaw in the defamations is that they almost all date from the time after the consecrations of the men concerned. Kirkton claimed that "all the Merse" "talked" about Andrew Fairfoul's "profane and scandalous behavior," George Wishart was "a daily drunkard and an infamous swearer," and David Fletcher was "a man of many pious prefaces ... who never missed an occasion of embracing the present world," but Fairfoul. Wishart, and Fletcher, along with Sharp, the most maligned of the bishops, had all at one time been presbyterian ministers, and during that period they had never been delated for immorality or insufficiency by the "covenanter" ecclesiastical courts. "All the Merse" did not talk about Fairfoul's alleged "profane and scandalous behavior" before 1661, but Robert Ballie did describe Fairfoul as "a good and noble scholar" in 1658. Wishart and Fletcher also possessed sterling reputations before their consecrations, and even Sharp was above reproach before the episcopal period, and as late as October 1661 Baillie wrote of the "great respect" he had for Sharp. 57

And yet, if the nonconformist indictments of the bishops were perversions of the truth, the presbyterians were not acting unilaterally. They were involved in a bitter propaganda war with the established church, and both sides were irresponsible with the facts. The dissenters maligned the bishops, but the supporters of the established church also

engaged in the business of creating lies and slanders, and the votaries of prelacy portrayed their opponents as "grumbling, cruel, furious, ill-looking, spiteful,... malicious, blood-thirsty tigers" who swilled "like leeches" in "the blood of men."⁵⁸ But the important point is not that the propaganda war was waged--what really matters is that the presbyterians won. In order to displace prelacy it was necessary to discredit the bishops in the public mind, and this the presbyterians succeeded in doing beyond their wildest dreams. The nonconformists used rumors and polemical tracts to accomplish their purpose, and their campaign was so effective that to this very day some of the old nonconformist accusations wear the guise of truth, and many modern works still portray the post-Restoration bishops as incapable and immoral men.⁵⁹

Notes

¹Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, II:192; Stephen, The Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp, pp. 174, 194; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:236, 247.

²Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 137; Lawson, The Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution, p. 715; John Skinner, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, 2 vols. (London, 1788), II:454; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 401; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:247.

³Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, I:49; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:255; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 407; Lamont, Diary, p. 147; Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, III:199; William McMillan, "The Anglican Book of Common Prayer in the Church of Scotland," Records of the Scottish Church History Society 4(1932): 147.

⁴Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, IV:529; Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, I:49; James Gordon, The Reformed Bishop (N.P., 1679), p. 66; Andrew Symson, "A Large Description of Galloway," printed in William Mackenzie, The History of Galloway from the Earliest Period to the Present Time, 2 vols. (Kirkcudbright, 1841).

⁵Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:218; Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, I:50; Miscellany of the Scottish History Society, I: 260, 266, 272.

⁶A Large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland, p. 64.

⁷Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, III: 77, 259, VII: 335, 336; Lauderdale Papers, II, Appendix A; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:376.

⁸Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, VII: 323, 327, 328, 331, 333, 335, 339, 342, 352, 353.

⁹Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 135.

¹⁰Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, I:50; Symson, "A Large Description of Galloway," p. 130; Mathieson, Politics and Religion in Scotland, 1550-1695, II:273; Baillie, Letters and Journals, III:485.

¹¹Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 135; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:352.

At least three of the sixteen were reordained after the Restoration. In addition to Sharp and Leighton, James Aitken, successively bishop of Moray and bishop of Galloway, was also reordained. Aitken's story is interesting. Entering the ministry during the "rebellion," Aitken was deposed and excommunicated and forced into exile for his attachment to the marquis of Montrose. Aitken fled to England, and he was reordained by the Church of England after the Restoration. In 1676 Aitken was appointed bishop of Moray, and his past, it seems, caused some problems. In the words of Brodie of Brodie: "I heard the chapter delayed to choos Aitkens a bishop because he stood excommunicat." See Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, VII:347; Alexander Brodie, Diary, ed. David Laing (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1863), p. 368.

¹³The ordination figures are based on material in Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, and Keith, A Large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland.

¹⁴Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, VIII:333, 350.

¹⁵The "changes of the time" caused some unusual changes to occur. In 1656, for example, Robert Leighton, a future prelate, tendered the national covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant to James Mitchell, a man later executed for his assault on Sharp. In 1656 Leighton was the principal of the University of Edinburgh and Mitchell was a student. See Monro, The Spirit of Calumny and Slander Examin'd, Chastis'd, and Expos'd, in a Letter to a Malicious Libeller, More Particularly Addressed to Mr. George Ridpath (London, 1693), p. 81.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 47.

¹⁷Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae; Keith, A Large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland.

¹⁸The Records of Elgin, 1234-1800, ed. W. Cramond and Stephen Ree, 2 vols. (Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1903-1908), II:254, 255, 304; Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland III:197.

¹⁹Guthry, The Memoirs of Henry Guthry, pp. VIII, 299; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 212; Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, I:162-163, 170; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, IV:38, VII:340; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 109.

²⁰Gordon, The Reformed Bishop, p. 242; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, VI:44; Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, III:273.

²¹Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:236.

Scott. Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, VII:346.

²³Sydserff was the friend of Robert Burnet, the father of Gilbert Burnet and the brother-in-law of Archibald Johnston of Wariston. During the covenanting era, Johnston wrote to his brother-in-law and rebuked him for associating with the then exiled and excommunicated Sydserff, and Robert Burnet replied: "Alas, brother, what would you be at, that, now when you have beggared him [Sydserff], and chased him by club-law out of the country, would you have him reduced to despair, and will you exact that every man, yea, against his conscience, shall approve your deed, how unjust soever?" See "Burnet and Leighton Papers," in Miscellany of the Scottish History Society, II:320ff.

²⁴Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, I:70, II:135, VII:327, 333, 342, 346; Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, p. 156; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:252.

²⁵Hamilton, who was later "reponed" to the ministry, helped sabotage the synod of Glasgow and Ayr's attempt to prepare a supplication in favor of presbytery in 1661. See Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, VII: 346; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 120.

²⁶John Gordon, although a Scot, was wholly educated in England. Consecrated bishop of Galloway in 1688, Gordon followed James VII into exile and became the only Scottish bishop to repudiate protestantism. Gordon was reordained by the Roman Catholic Church in 1704. See Keith, A Large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland.

²⁷See Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae; Keith, A Large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland.

²⁸Although the bishops have been accused of mediocrity, the ones admitted in 1661 and 1662 have been especially criticized. It has been noted, for example, that, with the exception of Sharp, none of the 1661-1662 bishops drawn from the covenanting church had been prominent in ecclesiastical affairs during the covenanting era, and from this it is concluded that the first bishops were second-rate men. That the bishops appointed in 1661-1662 did not really include any covenanting leaders besides Sharp is undeniable--Robert Douglas, Robert Baillie, James Wood, David Dickson, and James Ferguson had been offered bishoprics, but they declined--but the significance of this fact is questionable, since in any "revolution" the old leaders are always replaced by the new. This happened not only in 1661-1662, but also in 1638-1639, for virtually all of the covenanting leaders were "new men" who lacked important credentials before 1638. Alexander Henderson, before 1638, was minister of the humble kirk of Leuchars. After 1638 he became minister of St. Giles in Edinburgh, replacing

James Hannay, who had been deposed for defending the bishops and the service book. Robert Douglas, under the bishops, was minister of the second charge of Kirkcaldy. In 1639 Douglas received a more prestigious position in a church in the capital, replacing Alexander Thomson, who had been deposed for denouncing the 1638 General Assembly and defending the service book. Andrew Cant was minister of Pitsligo under the bishops. By 1641 he was minister of St. Nicholas in Aberdeen, replacing James Sibbald, who had been deposed for resisting the covenanters. Robert Baillie was minister of Kilwinning during episcopacy. After the covenant had been drawn up, Baillie became a minister in Glasgow and eventually the professor of divinity in Glasgow's University. Samuel Rutherford, soon after the covenant, "was brought from a landward kirk in Galloway ... to be principle master of the theology college" in St. Andrews, "and to strengthen his hands the more, Mr. Robert Blair was brought from Air to be minister" in St. Andrews, "the former ministers, Dr. Gladstones and Dr. Wishart, having both been driven away" by the covenanters. Other examples could be given, but the main point is that to argue the bishops were mediocre individuals because they held modest positions in the covenanting church is as groundless as arguing that the covenanting leaders were talentless because they had not held important positions before 1638. See Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, I:64, I:567, III:117, VI:37; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:215; Guthrie, The Memoirs of Henry Guthrie, p. 63.

²⁹Burnet is cited in Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, I:52.

³⁰Calder, Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed, p. 10; George Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, (London, 1693), p. 64; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 84.

³¹Law, Memorials, p. 101.

³²Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 84.

³³On November 20, 1601, a man was cited before the presbytery of Aberdeen on the charge that he had "familiaritie of a spirite," and the man "confessit" that a spirit had "callit upone him" twenty-seven years earlier. See Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen, ed. John Stuart (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1846).

³⁴Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 418n.

³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 85.

³⁶"A True and Short Narrative of the Horrid Murder of the Reverend Father in God, James, Archbishop of St. Andrews,"

printed in Hickes, The Spirit of Popery Speaks out of the Mouths of Phanatical Protestants, pp. 58ff.

³⁷Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 135; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 74; William Strachan, Some Remarks upon a Late Pamphlet Entitled, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence (London, 1694), p. 84.

³⁸A Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, Occasioned by the Episcopalians since the Year 1660 (London, 1690), p. 18; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 64; George Ridpath, A Continuation of the Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence (London, 1693), p. 35; Chambers, Domestic Annals of Scotland, III:12.

³⁹Strachan, Some Remarks upon a Late Pamphlet Entitled, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, pp. 78-80; Monro, The Spirit of Calumny and Slander Examined, Chastised, and Expos'd, in a Letter to a Malicious Libeller, More Particularly Addressed to Mr. George Ridpath, pp. 4-5.

⁴⁰George Ridpath, The Scots Episcopal Innocence, or the Juggling of that Party with the Late King, His Present Majesty, the Church of England, and the Church of Scotland, Demonstrated (London, 1694), p. 74.

⁴¹Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 84.

⁴²Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of Saint Andrews and Cupar, 1641-98, ed. George Kinloch (Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1837), p. 89.

⁴³*Ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

⁴⁴It is interesting to note that James Sharp in fact used his influence to intercede for several leading covenanters. In a letter to Sir Archibald Primrose, the lord register, Sharp wrote: I did, at my first access to the king, beg that the lives of Mr. Gillespie and Mr. Guthrie might be spared, which his majesty denied me; but now the recommendation of the parliament, upon a ground which I could not bring, I hope will prevail with so gracious a prince, more merciful than the kings of Israel. Upon an earnest letter from Mr. James Simpson to me, to whom I owe no great kindness, I begged of the king, that he might not be proceeded against for his life, ... which his majesty was pleased to grant me, by a letter for that purpose, directed to my lord commissioner. When your lordship shall hear my inducements, I hope you will not condemn me." The letter is cited in Stephen, The Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp, p. 124.

⁴⁵A Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the

Church of Scotland, Occasioned by the Episcopalians since the Year 1660, p. 14; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland.

⁴⁶Sir John Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Observes of Memorable Occurrents in Church and State, from October 1680 to April 1686, ed. A Urquhart and D. Laing (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1840), pp. 136-137; Mark Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1859-1862), II:132n.

⁴⁷Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:425; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 269.

⁴⁸Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:433; Lauderdale Papers, II:33.

⁴⁹Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:38; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 417; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 506; Stephen, The Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp, p. 352; Thomas McCrie, ed., Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves (Edinburgh, 1825), pp. 35-37; A Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, Occasioned by the Episcopalians since the Year 1660, p. 12; Letters from the Lady Margaret Kennedy to John, Duke of Lauderdale (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1827), February 2, 1667 letter.

⁵⁰Nicoll, A Diary of Public Transactions and other Occurrences, Chiefly in Scotland, from January 1650 to June 1667, p. 441; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 208; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 479; Calder, Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed, p. 9; Gilbert Rule, A Just and Modest Reproof of a Pamphlet, called the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence (Edinburgh, 1693), p. 18.

⁵¹Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 484.

⁵²In the seventeenth century, the bishops were not the only clergymen who expected certain courtesies, and in 1619 a man was summoned before the kirk session of Perth because he "passed by" "his pastor" "without using any kind of reverence." See The Chronicle of Perth (Edinburgh, 1831), p. 80.

⁵³It should be noted that Sharp's pride did have its limits. Charles II declared by letter that the primate was to have the "precedency" over the chancellor and all subjects within the kingdom, but Sharp "never" made use of the "letter." See The Decisions of the Lords of Council and Session, from June 6, 1678 to July 30, 1712, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1759-1761); Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:414-415.

Baillie, Letters and Journals, III:487; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:251; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 407; William Ferrie, Notices of the Life of the Reverend John Carstares ... with a Number of His Unpublished Letters, and the Letters of other Scottish Worthies (Edinburgh, 1843), p. 42; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:241; Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Observes of Memorable Occurrents in Church and State, from October 1680 to April 1686, p. 8; Mackenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, p. 161.

⁵⁵Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 490; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, VII:347; Stewart and Stirling, Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland.

⁵⁶Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, VII:349.

⁵⁷Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 135; Stephen, The Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp, p. 188; Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, III:215; Baillie, Letters and Journals, III:341-342.

⁵⁸Ninian Paterson, The Fanatick Indulgence Granted, 1679 (Edinburgh, 1683), p. 4.

⁵⁹In a careless article on John Paterson (one of the prelates) in the Dictionary of National Biography (volume 44, pp. 19-20), it is written that although "many of the charges" against Paterson were "clearly libellous," other accusations were "so definite that it must be feared that they were not altogether groundless." The article then mentions, in way of an example, that Paterson (the bishop) deposed Ninian Paterson (the minister) because the latter accused his "namesake" of adultery. The story, taken from hostile sources, is incorrect. In reality, Ninian Paterson was deposed from the ministry for his own adultery. See Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, I:171.

Chapter VI

The Ministers of the Established Church

The lower clergy were the backbone of the established church. At any given time there were as many as 900 parish ministers in Scotland, and their ranks were eventually supplemented by a few "ordained deacons." The latter, who should not be confused with the deacons in the kirk sessions, were never important, but they were interesting because they were an anomaly north of the Tweed. As late as 1666 there were no ordained deacons in Scotland, for in that year Gilbert Burnet, in a A Memorial of Diverse Grievances and Abuses in this Church complained that

our want of deacons is as essential as any relating to our government can be: for I am assured more can be said for proving them to be jure divino than bishops; and were there a true zeal for framing things according to the primitive pattern this could not be forgotten.¹

When exactly the first deacons were ordained is unclear, but in 1684 one Walter Smyth was ordained as a deacon in the diocese of Edinburgh,² and in 1685 the following minute was recorded in the register of Paisley presbytery:

Mr. Henry Henderson being presented to the parish church at Inverkip and recommended unto us by our ordinary for tryal in order to his admission to the said church, and being already in the order of deacon, wee are desired only to give him the exercise and addition. Wherefore he is appoynted to exercise and add.³

No other material relating to ordained deacons has been identified, so it seems this church^r_h office was quite rare.

The ministers were far more significant than the ordained deacons, and the former made up the rank and file of

the post-Restoration clergy. Ministers were not chosen by their local parishes in the period, but were instead selected by "patrons," for patronage, abolished by the covenanters in 1649, was restored by an act of parliament in June 1661. The patron of a given parish might be a bishop (the bishop of Galloway was the patron of twenty-one parishes, only thirteen of which were in his own diocese), or it might be the king or some other layman. The existence of the various lay patrons appeared to deprive the bishops of some of their power, but in reality it did not. The king, before making a "presentation," usually asked the archbishop of the province concerned to recommend a suitable candidate (Charles II confirmed this procedure with an August 13, 1679 declaration), and other lay patrons generally did the same. In addition, if any patron neglected to present a candidate within six months, the diocesan bishop selected a candidate for him.⁴

Whoever the patron was, after he had selected an individual for a vacant parish, he next presented that person to the bishop of the diocese. When the person presented was already a minister, the bishop collated him, but when an expectant was presented the bishop had to tender the oath of allegiance to the presentee, and then ordain and collate him. In both cases. formal admission to a charge was usually the responsibility of the concerned presbytery or the members delegated by it. Symbolically, this process usually involved the delivery of the bell-rope, the keys of the church, and the pulpit bible. Possession of the manse and glebe was

ceremonially represented by the delivery of the "earth and stone."⁵

When ordination was necessary, the bishops usually employed the ordinal of the Church of England. Thus, Kirkton commented that Archbishop Burnet of Glasgow "ordained 5 or 6 curats by the form of the English pontifical" at his first diocesan assembly; Richard Thorsby, an Englishman who visited Scotland in 1681, declared that he saw the bishop of Galloway ordain a minister with the Church of England "form"; and a pro-episcopal author, writing in 1691, stated that during the establishment of prelacy "our ecclesiastical superiors ... ordained priests and deacons according to the forms of the Church of England."⁶ The English "ordinal," however, was never mandatory, and strict Anglican "scruples" were not imported with the Anglican ceremony. In England, the Anglican church considered ordinations by "presbyters" alone quite illegitimate, but this was clearly not the case in Scotland's version of an "episcopal" church. In Scotland, no concerted effort was made in the post-Restoration era to reordain conformist ministers who had been ordained by presbyteries between 1638 and 1661,⁷ and the validity of presbyterian "orders" was usually not questioned or challenged, even though such ordinations were not permitted after 1661. There were some exceptional cases of "rigidity"--in Aberdeen Bishop Mitchell reordained some ministers in his diocese, and in Edinburgh a minister named Robison actually insisted on his own reordination--but in general more moderate opinions

prevailed.

The conformist ministers, whether ordained or reordained, were a source of controversy in the post-Restoration era, and topics of dispute included the legality of patronage, the legitimacy of "prelatical" orders, and the quality of the conformist ministers themselves. The last issue was discussed with especial vigor, and it deserves some analysis. In their own day the "curates" (as the conformist ministers were called) had their supporters--one contemporary wrote: I must tell you that I know not a more unblamable company of men upon earth than the episcopal clergy of Scotland; nor do I know any five of them in the whole nation, who could not undergo the severest examinations in the Christian church preparatory to ordination⁹--but they also had bitter critics, for the presbyterians accused the curates of incompetence and immorality. Needless to say, some of the charges were exaggerated. Over 530 ministers from the pre-Restoration church conformed to prelacy, and these men could not have possessed grave and censurable faults, for most of them had blameless reputations when they practiced their "callings" under a presbyterian system, and it is improbable that they would suddenly succumb to moral and intellectual decay simply because they decided to accept prelacy in 1661-1662. The quality of these ministers must therefore be assumed. But what of the ministers ordained after 1661? In particular, what about the ministers ordained during the early years, when the shortage of trained personnel was most critical? The "new" clergy who

entered parish churches in the early 1660's entered their vocations under unusual circumstances, so the presbyterian accusations must be given careful consideration. The question must be addressed: did the bishops ordain "insufficient" men with indecent haste in order to fill the churches?

The critical shortage of ministers in the few years immediately following the reestablishment of prelacy should not be underestimated. The parishes in Scotland numbered in excess of 900. Of these, 96 were vacant from "natural" causes unconnected with the "changes" in the kirk. To these 96 vacancies, the roughly 274 vacancies created by the deposition of presbyterians must be added. In other words, the established church was faced with the problem of filling some 370 vacancies in a century when the student population in the Scottish universities was not large.¹⁰ To complicate matters even more, the problem of empty pulpits was most severe in the west and southwest, with 135 of the 274 depositions occurring in the synods of Glasgow and Ayr, Dumfries, and Galloway. This area was the heartland of presbyterianism, and it was the area in which the criticisms of the incoming curates would be most severe.¹¹

The bishops made a genuine attempt to recruit the best men possible to fill the empty churches, but success was impossible. In normal times, when vacancies were relatively few and there were many young men anxious to enter the ministry, competition for a small number of places by a large number of candidates would maintain standards. But, the many depositions

in 1662-1663 caused a tremendous excess of demand over supply, and this excess created spectacular career opportunities in the church. Indeed, the situation was such that by 1666 not only did the many parishes in which the incumbent was deprived have a new minister, but there were also new ministers in many parishes where the incumbent had conformed, for many conformists took advantage of the vacancies in the church and translated to a richer benefice. Thus, soon after the reestablishment of prelacy, the Tron parish of Edinburgh lost its conformist minister to St. Giles, Ellon lost its conformist to the Tron, Dunoon lost its conformist to Ellon, and Morven lost its conformist to Dunoon.¹² In time conditions would become more settled, but by then the conformist ministers and the better qualified newly ordained men had taken possession of the better charges, and the less qualified men, some of whom would probably never have been ministers in "normal" times, had accepted ordination and admittance to the less desirable benefices. And where were the unwanted parishes? By and large, they were in the west and southwest.

The western and southwestern charges were undesirable for two reasons. First, it was known that the presbyterians in those regions could make life difficult for a pro-episcopal minister. Alexander Monro, in An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland, wrote that although "the people in the north" made it their practice "to love and honour" the curates, "the people in the west" believed they were "obliged by all their ties and solemn covenants to ruin and disparage" the curates as the

"limbs of Antichrist." Monro was not exaggerating, for the situation in the west and southwest, where the names and persons of the curates were often assaulted, was notorious, and even Robert Leighton, an optimistic moderate, had to admit that "ye people in most of ye parishes" in the region "would not receive angels," if they had committed the "horrid crime" of conforming to the established church.¹³ Sometimes, it is true, the disrespect the curates received in the west and southwest was relatively minor in nature. Thus, the presbytery of Kirkcudbright, at a May 1665 meeting of the synod of Galloway, complained that when the presbytery met "at Kirkcudbright on their presbytery dayes, they could not get so much as an officer to waite upon them, or any to ring a bell in order to their exercise." But at other times, however, the situation was more serious. In May 1667 the synod of Galloway referred to "the barbarous and inhumane cruelties and the insolent and bold robberies that have been committed upon ye persons and estates of some of the ministers of this diocesse," and in October 1667 the bishop and synod of Galloway had to exhort three ministers in the "presbytery of Kirkcudbright" to "make conscience to attend synodical meetings" and other "diets" of the church "as often as they conveniently can without danger."¹⁴ Under such conditions, it is not surprising that many of the best men available from the conformist party refused to become ministers in the "covenanter" districts.

The benefices in the west and southwest were also undesirable because they tended to be poor. Gilbert Burnet

wrote that "the livings" in the area were "generally well endowed," and "the parsonage houses were well built, and in good repair,"¹⁵ but nothing could be farther from the truth. There were some very lucrative benefices in the west and southwest (such as Dumfries), but most had modest stipends and less than palatial manses. (Although one party in Scotland contended for the "parity" of ministers, the "parity" of incomes apparently never occurred to anyone.) In Paisley presbytery, for example, the ministers of "Inchinnan" and "Grenock" received only "six chalder of victual" and "two chalder of victual and six hundred and four merks of mony" respectively, and conditions were also bad in Galloway. In the spring of 1666, "ye severall ministers" in the diocese of Galloway complained to their bishop about "their hard, necessitous, and singular condition," and they declared that "their respective stipends" were "mean and very unthankfully paid."¹⁶ Indeed, the benefices were so "mean" in both Galloway and Glasgow and Ayr that some years later, after the Revolution and reestablishment of presbytery, even the presbyterian ministers were slow to fill the charges in the aforementioned districts. As one critic would note in 1691: "their beloved west was destitute of ministers, the churches there and in Galloway were almost all shut up; so that when the Assembly met [in 1690], two ministers declared before them that where they lived there was not so much as the face of a church, their being no ministers but themselves and one other. Yet none were sent thither, but they showed great inclination to seat themselves in the Lothians and the south of Scotland, which is

indeed a better country, but where there was less room for them, and where they were not so acceptable to the people."¹⁷

Clearly, if the presbyterian ministers favored other regions over "their beloved west and Galloway," qualified conformists in the post-Restoration era would no doubt do the same.

And so, given the conditions in post-Restoration Scotland in general (vacant pulpits) and the west and southwest in particular (the hostility of the people and the poverty of the benefices), it was inevitable that some substandard men would enter the ministry and that most of these would end up in the "presbyterian" areas. In other words, Alexander Monro's statement that the conformist "clergy of the western shires" were "generally" "grave, sober, and assiduous"¹⁸ must have been too generous. If, however, there were some mediocre curates who were deficient in one or more ways--men who were second-rate morally and intellectually, men who could not "imitate the precious, powerful, soul-ravishing, heart-searching eloquence" of the presbyterian "sons of thunder" who preceded them¹⁹--that does not mean that the curates were the "insufficient, scandalous, impudent young fellows"²⁰ of legend, or the ignorant and profane monsters described by Kirkton, Ridpath, and other critics. The "critics" in question indulged in an orgy of hyperbole, and their descriptions were closer to caricature than to truth. Kirkton, for example, wrote that "the crew of young curates were "fetched almost wholly out of the north country" and were "unstudied and unbred." They "hade all the properties of Jeroboam's priests," and they were

so "miserable in the world" and so "unable to subsist" that they were "made" to "long for a stipend." They were "profane and void of conscience," and they "went to their churches with the same intention and resolution a shepherd contracts for herding a flock of cattell." Kirkton added that the situation was so bad that "a gentleman in the north cursed the presbyterian ministers" because their departure made it impossible for any northerner to "get a lad" to "keep" "cows," for the "lads" were all turning into "ministers."²¹ Gilbert Burnet, another critic, has left a similar account. Burnet wrote that the "new incumbents" put "in the places of the ejected preachers" were "generally mean and dispicable in all respects." Burnet claimed the curates "were the worst preachers" he had ever heard, and they "were ignorant to a reproach, and many of them were openly vicious." They were "a disgrace to orders and the sacred functions," and they were "indeed the dreg and refuse of the northern parts." Burnet added that even "those of them who rose above contempt or scandal were men of such violent tempers that they were as much hated as the others were despised."²² On the surface, these similar accounts by Kirkton and Burnet may seem credible since they came from mutually hostile opponents, but in reality both writers were dubious witnesses. Kirkton was a biased presbyterian, and Burnet was a venomous writer who enjoyed denouncing everything in his native Scotland--including the presbyterian preachers themselves, whom he called "supercilious and haughty" "little men" who had a "very low measure of learning."²³ The evidence, moreover, clearly

indicates that both Kirkton and Burnet were distorting the facts.

The charge, for example, that the curates were all "young lads" was an exaggeration. It seems that some of the curates were indeed youthful, for Burnet himself was ordained when he was only nineteen years old.²⁴ If Burnet became a minister at such a young age, no doubt others did the same as well. (In this connection, it is interesting to note that James Renwick, the noted field preacher, began his ministry at the age of twenty-one.)²⁵ On the other hand, if the ages of the curates is determined from various representative presbyteries, the immaturity of the curates as a group becomes less believable. In the presbytery of Paisley, of the six "first generation" curates (those ordained soon after the presbyterian depositions) whose year of university graduation can be identified, one had an interval of seven years between the the reception of the M.A. degree and ordination, two had an interval of five years, two had four years, and one had two years. In the presbytery of Irvine, where the year of graduation of four of the five "first generation" curates is known, one had an interval of twelve years between graduation and ordination, two had an interval of ten years, and two had an interval of three years. In the presbytery of Ayr, the curates had intervals twenty, seven, four, and two years, with one unknown. In the presbytery of Jedburgh, the intervals for the five "first generation" curates were twenty-two years for one, twenty years for a second, fifteen years for a thirld, and six years for two

others. In the presbytery of Wigtown, where the date of graduation of six of the eight curates is known, the intervals were twenty-nine years, twenty years, ten years, eight years, four years, and two years.²⁶ Needless to say, the older ages of some of the curates at the time of their ordinations did not reflect favorably upon them--the implication is that they were "old expectants" who "could find no employment under the presbyterians"²⁷--but the point here is that the alleged youth of the curates was largely hyperbole.

The claim that the curates were all from the north was also an exaggeration. Of the eighty-one curates ordained to fill the vacant charges in the synods of Glasgow and Ayr, Galloway, and Dumfries in 1662 or soon after whose place of education can be identified, thirty were graduates of the University of Edinburgh, twenty-five were graduates of the University of Glasgow, nine were graduates of the University of St. Andrews, and a mere fifteen were graduates of the University of Aberdeen.²⁸ On a more specific level, not a single one of the curates in the presbytery of Jedburgh was a graduate of Aberdeen. In the presbytery of Ayr, there were two from the University of Aberdeen, one from Glasgow, two from St. Andrews, and one unknown. In the presbytery of Wigtown, there were two from Glasgow, two from Edinburgh, one from St. Andrews, one from Aberdeen, and two unknown.²⁹

The allegations about the gross ignorance of the curates were also incorrect.³⁰ Every minister of the established church was a graduate of a university, and, even

when the vacancies were most numerous, the "trials" of the young men presented to parishes were never overlooked. In November of 1663, when Alexander Gregory and Alexander George appeared before the presbytery of Paisley "with ample testimonials from the professor of divinity at the University of Glasgow," they were the first men to request their trials from Paisley presbytery since the reestablishment of prelacy, and they did so at a time when the shortage of ministers was most severe. Yet, even in such circumstances, the presbytery carefully examined the abilities of the candidates, and George and Gregory each preached a "popular sermon" on a previously assigned text on December 17, 1663, and each "gave full satisfaction" on the same day. On January 28, 1664, the two men were responsible for the exercise and addition," and they also delivered their "common heads." The results were satisfactory, and George and Gregory finished their respective trials for the ministry on January 28, 1664, and each was "unanimously approven as being successfully qualified for preaching the gospell." Of course, such trials could have been empty rituals, but that apparently was not the case. On August 27, 1668, Alexander Summer, a schoolmaster of Inverkip who had been presented to a kirk, "sustained his disputes as ordered," but the presbytery was "not altogether satisfied," so they gave him "another common head" for the next meeting. Summer apparently improved, for on September 22, 1668 "M. Alexande Summer delivered his common head,... sustained his disputes, and gave some tryall of the languages, and was approven in all his tryalls," and recommended by the presbytery

for ordination.

In addition to accusations of insufficiency, charges of immorality were also made against the curates. The latter allegations were in fact the most common ones of all, and they were not reserved for curates in the west--conformist ministers in all sections of the kingdom were accused of monstrous acts, usually of a carnal nature. The most complete roster of these supposed abominations can be found in George Ridpath's polemical Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence. Ridpath recorded the names of dozens of curates and the details of their alleged sins, and the work contains so many specific pieces of information that it has an aura of authenticity. In reality, however, Ridpath's work was a compendium of fabrications and untruths. Ridpath wrote that a "Mr. Gregory, curate at Torbolton, was taken in the very act of filthiness upon a dunghill, with a woman whom he had pick'd up in the road to Irwin," but in reality there was never a curate by that name in that church.³² Ridpath wrote that a "Mr. Wilson, curate at Queensferry, met "a handsome wench" while "coming home drunk from Edinburgh," and was caught in the "posture" of "villainy" "by some people on the road," but there was not curate by the name of Wilson in Queensferry kirk.³³ Ridpath claimed that Thomas Hamilton, the minister of Hamilton and the dean of Glasgow, was "convicted" of "sodomy" by the justiciary court of Edinburgh, and here Ridpath was in part correct. Hamilton was indeed the dean of Glasgow, and he was brought before the justiciary court on a charge of "sodomy" in 1685, but he was

acquitted after one "Steil," an informer and a key witness, admitted that he had given false evidence under oath. In his recantation, it is interesting to note, "Steil" said that the "whigs" had "sett him on the affair."³⁴ In yet another case, Ridpath accused "John Waugh," the "curate of Borrowstounness" with adultery, and here again Ridpath muddled the facts. There was a minister by the name of John Waugh in the kirk of Borrowstounness, and the records of the presbytery of Linlithgow indicate that one Margaret Gardner, who had given birth to an illegitimate child in 1668, at first named Waugh as the father. In the words of the presbytery register, Gardner initially confessed "that the said Mr. Waugh had to doe with her carnally three several times," and he also "attempted" to "give her money to do the same." Later, however, Margaret Gardner changed her story, and she declared that "John Waugh the younger," the son of the minister and the "late doctor of the grammar school in Linlithgow," was the father of her child. "John Waugh the younger" tried to deny his involvement in the beginning, but he eventually confessed, and the bishop and synod ordered him (and Gardner) to do penance for fornication and for the "caluminating of Mr. Waugh."³⁵ That Ridpath muddled the facts seems rather typical, but the interesting point to all this is that Waugh was not a curate at all, but a presbyterian nonconformist. A few presbyterian ministers admitted to their charges before the abolition of patronage in 1649 had managed to keep their charges on a legal technicality, and Waugh was one of those few. (The bishop of Edinburgh could have deposed Waugh after 1663 for

boycotting church courts, but that did not happen.) Needless to say, the conformist ministers could have used the false testimony of Gardner to defame Waugh, but they instead used their time and influence to establish his innocence, and the whole case was clearly to the credit of the curates concerned. As for Ridpath, in this instance he evidently missed "a little of his aim," and he fell "foul upon one of his own party," "instead of an episcopal clergyman."³⁶

Pamphleteers like Ridpath were caustic enough, but the church records also reveal that local parishioners also tried "caluminating" the curates in order to effect their removal. One curate who was the victim of false or exaggerated charges was George Birnie, the curate of Killellan. The presbytery of Paisley records clearly show that some lairds in Killellan, encouraged by the 1669 indulgence and the presence of a conventicle minister named James Wallace on one Fleming of Barochan's estate,³⁷ actively conspired against Birnie. A visitation was held at Killellan on May 13, 1670, and the following illuminating entry was made in the presbytery register:

Mr. George Birnie being enquyred of his diligence in preaching and other dutys of his calling, declared that the ordinances were generally dishaunted by his people since September last and that none brought children to be baptized by him since, that the people did not attend dyats of examination and that his session had deserted him refusing to assist him in the exercise of discipline, the reason of which disgrace of the ordinances he declared to be becaus Mr. Alexander Fleming did entertain Mr. James Wallace who constantly preached at Barochen, before that time the people being orderlie."³⁸

The "heritors, elders, and others" were then called, and the

"lairds of Fulwood and Roslind and divers others" were asked "if they had anything to say against the doctrine or conversation of their minister," but they could make no significant charges. In the words of the register:

all declared they could say nothing against his doctrine, only one Patrick Fleming alleadged he was too generall in his application, and one John Semple said that Mr. Bierny had not visited his family nor did rebuke him sharplie when gaming and swearing. The laird of Fulwood and Mr. Alexander Fleming declared thir was a rumour of his being drunk passing, and desiring some tyme to be granted them for proving that scandall, which the presbyterie was willing to doe giving order to the officer to sumon such witnesses as the said gentlemen should give up to him, for that effect, to their next dyat,³⁹

A "rumour of his being drunk" was the only noteworthy charge that anyone could make. But, some time later, on May 26, 1670, the laird of Fulwood and Alexander Fleming produced a long and severe list of charges against Birnie, and this formal "lybel" contained "some scandalls of drunkenness and other miscarriages." To support their accusations, the two men also produced "a great number of witnesses," most of whom were also tenants or dependents. The examination of these witnesses took a great deal of time, and on September 14, 1670 the presbytery referred the case to the "committee of the synod" that Robert Leighton had established "for taking in of complaints against ministers." The Leighton committee was designed to appease and pacify the presbyterians (Leighton was a moderate who went to great lengths to accomodate the presbyterian party), and in the Birnie case it did just that. The committee took the "rumours" of "drunkenness" and "other miscarriages" at face value, and the results were not unexpected. Birnie became a convenient victim,

and on March 29, 1671 "the presbyterie, according to the act of the committee," announced the "vacancy" of "Killellan" "throuw the removall of Mr. George Birnie."⁴⁰ Ironically, no action was taken against James Wallace, the conventicle minister mentioned above. To the contrary, a few years later he would be offered the pulpit of Neilston under the terms of the 1672 indulgence. Wallace, however, declined the indulgence, and as late as December 2, 1674 the presbytery of Paisley was still reporting the "constant conventicling" of "Mr. James Wallace" in "the hous of Barochen."⁴¹

Another curate who was seriously slandered was John Chisholm, the minister of Lilliesleaf in Teviotdale. Chisholm's problems began when "Lady Cherrytrees," the mother-in-law of David Williamson, the field preacher, hired one of Chisholm's former female servants. The servant knew that "Lady Cherrytrees" was a zealous presbyterian, and to please her new employer she apparently went to a conventicle held by John Welsh and George Johnston at "Langnewton Moore" and "confessed" "before thousands" that she had been Chisholm's "whore" for "a long time." The charge was rather dubious--the servant was a prejudiced witness (Chisholm had dismissed her because she had committed "fornication" with a young man in Lilliesleaf), and when she was brought before the sheriff of Teviotdale she refused to verify her accusation with an oath--but the story nevertheless made a "great sensation" in Teviotdale, and it virtually ruined Chisholm's professional credibility.⁴²

Many curates were falsely slandered and unjustly

accused, and the list has by no means been exhausted. This is not to say, however, that there were no immoral curates. The established church, like any ecclesiastical body, had some "scandalous and profane" ministers, and these, not unexpectedly, were concentrated in the west and southwest. There were, of course, a few bad curates in other regions--Ninian Paterson, the minister of Liberton, was deposed for adulterous "immorality," and John M'Queen, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, was "suspended" for making "a wastecoate and drawers" from "a petycoat of Euphane Scott's,... with whom he was deadly in love, tho she hated him"⁴³--but the great majority of morally deficient curates were found in the west and southwest, especially in Galloway. The "unfit" individuals were relatively few in number, but they gave all the curates a bad reputation. The undesirable ministers included Robert Steel, the minister of Kells, who "very seldome" attended any "presbyteriall meetings"; David M'Querne, the minister of Kirkmabreck, who was "remov'd" from the ministry because of some improper activities; and William Harvie, the minister of Buittle, who was connected with some "very grosse scandals" in the spring of 1666. Regarding the last case, the minister of Buittle was apparently guilty of the charges made against him, for the records indicate that he "deserted his place at Bootle and went out of ye kingdom" because he was afraid of "censure." It is not altogether clear what the charges against Harvie were, but he was at the very least guilty of "drinking" with "William Harreise of Caigtown" "upon ye Lord's day in time of divine service when he himself

ought to have been preaching," and of giving "ye benefit of marriage to a man lying under ye gross scandal of bestiality." Obviously, Harvie (who also happened to be a young University of Aberdeen graduate from the north) was proof that the "curate" of legend occasionally did exist.⁴⁴

The established church was aware of the problem of insufficiency, and it made efforts to rectify the situation. In Galloway synod, for example, the bishop ordered the "several presbyteries" to "hold visitations ... and take exact tryal anent ye doctrine and qualification" and "life and conversation of ye several ministers within their bounds respective" because there were "some reports going in the east country anent ye insufficiency and scandalous carriages of some ministers within this diocese of Galloway,"⁴⁵ and similar steps were taken in Glasgow and Ayr. In the latter diocese, the archbishop and the "brethren" of the synod were convinced that "wee have bein represented to people as wicked and perjured persons ... for no other cause but our preaching ... under this ancient government," but, although they thought the complaints against them were unjustified, the archbishop and the "brethren" decided to hold "frequent visitations" nevertheless.⁴⁶ Such visitations, in which the lairds, elders, and "others interested" in a parish were "called in" and "particularly" asked "what they had to object against the minister either as to his doctrine or life or conversation," were in fact quite common in all dioceses, and they were apparently conducted in a scrupulous manner. Indeed, the evidence indicates that the

established church made every effort to find "faults" in its own ranks, and it also tried to "purge" itself of "personall defects."⁴⁷ Thus, when John Philip, the minister of Kirkcud, was accused of "scandalous drunkenness" while "travelling home," the presbytery of Peebles made it a point to carefully examine the details of the case. Philip objected to the proceedings because two of the witnesses questioned were nonconformists (and one of these was Robert Elliot, a nonconformist preacher), but Philip was overruled. Testimony from all sources was accepted, and at length "the presbyterie,... finding all witnesses in this process now examined and that the scandalous drunkenness of Mr. John Philip at Lynton on a Saturday the tenth of junii ... clearly proven," referred "the whole process against the said Mr. John to the archbishop and synod for censure."⁴⁸ Clearly, whenever there was a bad or "insufficient" curate, it was not because the prelates or the church courts were negligent. Rather, there were bad curates in spite of the ecclesiastical system, not because of it.

Notes

¹Gilbert Burnet, A Memorial of Diverse Grievances and Abuses in this Church (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1904), p. 352.

²Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, I:184.

³"Paisley Presbytery Register," March 2, 1685.

⁴Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, I:55; Symson, "A Large Description of Galloway," p. 131.

⁵Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, I:56; "Paisley Presbytery Register," May 2, 1677; Monro, An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland, p. 16.

⁶Gordon, The Reformed Bishop, pp. 84, 161, 165; Thomas Morer, A Short Account of Scotland (London, 1702), pp. 59-64; Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, III:218; Alexander Monro, Presbyterian Inquisition; as It was Lately Practiced Against the Professors of the College of Edinburgh (London, 1691), p. 30; M'Millan, "The Anglican Book of Common Prayer in the Church of Scotland," p. 147; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 221.

⁷It is interesting that the covenanters reordained a minister in 1640. John Lindsay, ordained in 1621 by a bishop, was deposed by the presbyterians in 1639 for his support for prelacy. Lindsay was at ultimately reponed by the General Assembly, and ordained by the presbytery of Lanark "as if he had not been a minister before." See Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, III:292.

⁸Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, III:218; Thomas Morer, Alexander Monro, and John Sage, An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, in Several Letters (London, 1690), pp. 41ff.

⁹Monro, An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland, p. 15.

¹⁰The figures are based on Scott's Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, an invaluable work that nevertheless does contain some errors. To cite one example, Thomas Laurie, the minister of Lesmahagow, was deposed in 1662 according to the Fasti, but the records of the presbytery of Lanark indicate that Laurie was a conformist. There are other errors as well, so estimates based on the Fasti must be considered approximations.

¹¹Goldie, A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland from the Restoration to the Present Time, p. 25.

¹²Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae.

Monro, An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland, p. 14; Lauderdale Papers, II:206.

¹⁴The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671, May 1665, May 1667, October 1667.

¹⁵Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:271.

¹⁶"Paisley Presbytery Register," April 9, 1684, June 4, 1684; The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671, May 1666, October 1664.

¹⁷John Cockburn, An Historical Relation of the Late Presbyterian General Assembly, Held at Edinburgh ... in the Year 1690 (London, 1691); Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets, p. 161.

¹⁸Monro, An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland, p. 13.

¹⁹Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence.

²⁰Lauderdale Papers, II:206.

²¹Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 160.

²²Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:275.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid., I:270.

²⁵Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, III:135.

²⁶Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae.

²⁷Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 160.

²⁸Goldie, A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland from the Restoration to the Present Time, pp. 24ff.

²⁹Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae.

³⁰After the Revolution, the presbyterians were themselves accused of ordaining "insufficient" men in order to fill the large number of vacancies they encountered, and it was said that they made "zeal for the good cause," rather learning or virtue, the "chief qualification" for ordination. Gilbert Rule, however, insisted that this "assertion" was "notoriously false," and he claimed that "our intrants to the ministrie are able to vie learning with the episcopal candidates." See

Cockburn, An Historical Relation of the Late Presbyterian General Assembly, Held at Edinburgh ... in the year 1690; Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to a Paper Intituled, Some Questions Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, p. 182.

31"Paisley Presbytery Register," November 1663; December 17, 1663; January 7, 1664; January 28, 1664; August 27, 1668; September 22, 1668.

32Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 79; Strachan, Some Remarks upon a Late Pamphlet Entitled, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 72.

33Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p.76; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae.

34Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 64; Strachan, Some Remarks upon a Late Pamphlet Entitled, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 62; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, III:259; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 186; John Lauder of Fountainhall, Chronological Notes of Scottish Affairs from 1680 to 1701, p. 147.

35Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 76; "Linlithgow Presbytery Register," September 30, 1668, November 4, 1668.

36Strachan, Some Remarks upon a Late Pamphlet Entitled, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 71; "Linlithgow Presbytery Register," November 4, 1663.

37James Wallace was the deposed minister of Inchinnan. See Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, III:144.

38"Paisley Presbytery Register," May 13, 1670.

39Ibid.

40Ibid., May 26, 1670; September 14, 1670, March 29, 1671.

41Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, III:144; "Paisley Presbytery Register," December 2, 1674.

42Strachan, Some Remarks upon a Late Pamphlet Entitled, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, pp. 68-71; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 182; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, II:182.

43Lauderdale Papers, II:206; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, I:171; Lauder of Fountainhall, Chronological Notes of Scottish Affairs from 1680 to 1701, p. 32.

The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671, October 1668, April 1669, October 1669, April 1671, May 1666, October 1666, October 1667, October 1668; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, II:398.

⁴⁵The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671, April 1668.

⁴⁶See the "Glasgow Remonstrance," in Lauderdale Papers, volume II, appendix.

⁴⁷"Paisley Presbytery Register, May 25, 1668; Lauderdale Papers, volume II, appendix.

⁴⁸"Peebles Presbytery Register," October 11, 1676; October 18, 1676; August 1, 1677.

Chapter VII

The Ecclesiastical Courts

The reintroduction of prelacy fundamentally altered the administration of the established kirk. Under the covenanters, the ecclesiastical courts had been responsible bodies with real powers, but in the post-Restoration period "church power" passed from the "church judicatories" to the "episcopal throne," and the "church judicatories" became, to quote Gilbert Burnet, "only the bishops' assistants."¹ This chapter will analyze the various courts of the established church, and it will discuss how the revival of prelacy affected those courts and altered their composition and function.

The National Synod, the "prelatical" equivalent of the General Assembly, was the most important "judicatory," at least in theory. In reality, however, the National Synod only existed on paper, for although it was never technically abolished, it was also never convened by either Charles II or James VII. Yet, if the National Synod never emerged from its theoretical limbo, it is nevertheless interesting because it would have been so very different from the old General Assembly. Consider, for example, the composition of the highest post-Restoration ecclesiastical court. According to law, the archbishop of St. Andrews would have been the "president" of the National Synod, and the archbishop of Glasgow, all the bishops, and the deans and archdeacons of the cathedral churches would have been members. Ministerial representation was set at "all the

moderators of meetings for exercise allowed by the bishops in the respective dioceses" and one minister from each presbytery "choysen and elected by the moderator and plurality of presbyters." In addition, the universities were allowed as many as six representatives. No provision, however, was made for "ruling elders," and this was a significant change.² Ruling elders, it is true, had not participated in the General Assemblies held in the early seventeenth century, but this had not been the case during the covenanting era.³

If it had met, the National Synod would have made ecclesiastical laws for the whole kingdom, and it would have been the final court of appeal in all cases of discipline. These sound like ample powers, but in fact the National Synod would have operated under severe restraints. The king, who would have sent his commissioner to the meetings, would have possessed a veto. The National Synod, moreover, could only have dealt with business approved by the crown, and it could have debated and voted upon only what had been "allowed, approven and confirmed by his majesty or commissioner." The archbishop of St. Andrews, as president of the National Synod, also would have held a veto, and this would have further limited this "judicature's" freedom. These restrictions, needless to say, were designed with a purpose in mind. The king, to quote Gilbert Burnet, wanted to keep the National Synod from "meddling" in potentially inflammatory affairs.⁴

Since the National Synod never advanced beyond the planning stage, the regional synods were in effect the highest

courts in the post-Restoration church. These regional synods, which were also called "diocesan assemblies," were composed of the bishops of the diocese, his dean, and all the ministers (and "expectants") in the bounds. Ruling elders, constituent members of the synods during the covenanting era, were excluded. As for functions, the post-Restoration synods, in a formal sense at least, seemed unchanged. They continued to pass acts (or "canons")⁵ concerning the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the church; they continued to supervise the presbyteries in their respective bounds; and they continued to deal with cases of discipline, and to pass judgement on difficult or heinous cases referred to them. But, if the synods had the same functions as before, they did not in fact have the same power, for they were clearly dominated by the prelates. In the words of one critic, the post-Restoration synod was a court where the bishop had "power and jurisdiction," and it was the place where the "ministers of the diocese" all went "to be censured."⁶

Episcopal control over the synods was very visible. A bishop presided over each synod meeting (as a kind of "permanent moderator"),⁷ and no synod could conduct business without the bishop (or his dean). The bishops, moreover, possessed a veto, and no synod acts or canons were valid without his approval. In some synods, such as Dunblane, the ministers were, it is true, "given full and free libertie of voting and declaring their assent or dissent in all things that occur as ever they had in former tymes," but this was in reality an empty privilege. All meaningful business was conducted in a committee called the

"privie conference," rather than the synod, and in the synod the bishop was clearly in control.⁸

The privy conference consisted of the bishop and a few ministers drawn from each of the synod's constituent presbyteries. In the synod of Glasgow and Ayr, there were twenty-seven members in the "privat conference," and in the synod of Galloway, there were eleven. The ministers in the privy conference were "nominated and appointed by the bishop,"⁹ and the bishops tended to choose the same individuals time after time. In the case of the synod of Galloway, there were seven ministers who served on all five privy conferences that met between October of 1667 and October of 1669, and this was out of a total privy conference membership that never exceeded ten ministers.¹⁰ The criteria for selection probably varied from bishop to bishop, but an amenable disposition toward the bishop's will was probably an important factor. There were exceptions--William Spence, the minister of Glendevon, was given a position on the Dunblane privy conference between 1676 and 1678 even though he was a lukewarm conformist who "did not think the present church government" was "agreeable to the scripture rules--but such exceptions were not common. In Spence's case, perhaps the bishop of Dunblane believed that it was better to hear Spence's complaints in the intimacy of the privy conference, rather than in the synod.¹¹

Once the bishop had selected his "privat conference," he and the other members of the committee met to conduct business. What was this business? Like the "committees of

overtures" of the synods of the 1638-1660 period, the privy conference drafted acts for the synod to vote upon. By drafting such acts, which were formally called "overtures for the advancing of pietie and repressing of profainenes," the conference conveniently expedited the work of the synod, but at the same time it robbed the synod of its initiative and power. Just as the "committees of overtures" of the covenanting era had sometimes allowed a small clique to dominate the whole synod (and just as the lords of the articles, "the security of monarchicall government," had allowed the king to dominate parliament), so the bishop's hand-picked privy conference enabled him to control the post-Restoration synod. The bishop could use the privy conference to insure that nothing he found objectionable ever appeared before the larger body, and he could in fact use the privy conference as a tool to turn the synod into a "rubber stamp." The "acts and overtures" prepared by the "brethren nominated and appointed for conference" were voted upon en bloc by the synod, and they were apparently approved as a matter of course.¹² No instance of a synod rejecting the acts submitted to it by the privy conference has ever been found, and it is unlikely that any such rejection ever occurred. No wonder one contemporary, in a description of the post-Restoration synod, called the privy conference the place "where all things are concluded."¹³

The church records indicate the significance of the privy conference. On its own, the synod only conducted routine business, such as the preaching of a sermon and the recording of

absences. It was during the interval between the first and second session of the synod, when the privy conference met "in the bishop's chamber," that the real work was carried out. This, at least, was the procedure in a typical synod. In Caithness, for example, the first session of the July 1682 synod closed as follows:

for conference, Mr. David Monro, moderator of the presbyterie of Caithness, and Mr. Jon Rose, moderator of the presbyterie of Sutherland, Mr. Patrick Cluneis, Mr. James Gray, dean, appointed to meet the bishop in the ordained place of meeting.¹⁵

The first session of the synod was then "continued untill the nixt afternoon, and so closed with prayer." At the second session, the following minute was entered:

the said day the bishop exhibited a paper containing acts and overtures condescended upon be him, and the brethren nominated and appointed for conference in the former session, and read in the publick audience of the synod be Mr. Neall Beaton, scribe thereof, the tenor of quilk acts are as followeth....

All the acts, fourteen in number, were duly entered into the register and became binding. The register does not show whether the synod's assent was formally sought, but the clerk usually noted that the synod had "unanimouslie approven" the acts submitted to it by the bishop and his "committee."¹⁶

The privy conference, in addition to "framing" acts, also became involved in other business of the synod. Ministers who had missed a previous meeting of the diocesan assembly because of negligence should have given in their "excuses" to the synod, but in Galloway in October 1667 such ministers were "appointed to wait on ... the privie conference." Difficult

discipline cases referred to the the synod from the constituent presbyteries should have been dealt with by the synod, but in Galloway in April 1670 the cases of one "John Gilhagie," who was accused of adultery, and one "Patrick Vaus," who was accused of "disorderly baptizing of his child," were directed from the synod to the privy conference. Clearly, the bishop's privy conference was threatening to make the the synod superfluous, and this was especially true in Aberdeen, where the privy conference was actually allowed to meet and conduct business when the synod was not even in session. Thus, in the Aberdeen diocesan assembly in October 1677, it was ordained, on the suggestion of the bishop, that the "brethren" of the "privy conference" should "keep meetings with the bishop betwixt and the nixt synod."¹⁷

After the synod, and the privy conference that dominated it, the next highest ecclesiastical court was the presbytery. A presbytery, which was also called an "exercise," was composed of all the ministers in a designated area.¹⁸ In addition, all the "expectants" (or licensed preachers) in the region were supposed to attend. To quote one act, expectants were required to

keep all the meetings of the presbyterie within whose bounds they reside, if they be not hindered by their attendance of ane charge, and ... use their gifts in exercising in the presbytery per vices with the brethren of that presbyterie.

Lay elders, important members of the presbyteries during the covenanting era, were excluded from these courts in the post-Restoration church.¹⁹

Presbyteries were useful administrative tools, and

they retained many of their traditional functions under the bishops. The presbyteries continued to meet for an exercise (a commentary on scripture) and an addition (a second commentary) "within the several precincts," and this procedure was supposed to "begin punctually at ten hors, and if all be not cloised before twelve of the klok," the person who was the "cause" of the delay was "to adde or exercise over again."²⁰ The presbyteries continued to conduct the "tryals" of the "young men" who wanted to be "probationers," and these courts continued to test "the gifts and abilities" of those who were "presented to churches." As in the past, the presbyteries were responsible for maintaining ministerial standards within their respective districts, and they continued to "visit" churches, to examine "kirk-session registers," and to conduct "privie censures," an annual or semi-annual examination of the "life, doctrine, and conversation of every minister in the bounds." And finally, the post-Restoration "exercises," like the covenanter presbyteries, continued to deal with cases of discipline involving the laity, and they continued to "try and examine" "scandals referred to them by particular sessions."²¹

The presbyteries did not retain all their responsibilities, however. To the contrary, the most important functions of these courts were either removed or restricted by the bishops. The authority to grant licenses to probationers and administer ordination to approved candidates was taken from the presbyteries and once again placed in the hands of the prelates. The presbyteries also lost some of the powers of

self-discipline they had once possessed under the covenanters, and although they could still "rebuke" one of their own members on their own initiative, they could no longer pronounce any "sentence of suspension or deposition" against any minister without first "aquainting the lord bishop" of the diocese and "having his authority." Finally, the presbyteries also lost all control over excommunication, the ultimate disciplinary saction over all men, clergy and laity alike. In the post-Restoration church, no presbytery could pronounce the "sentence of excommunication" against any person without the approval of the diocesan bishop.²² These restictions on presbyteries²³ were imposed throughout Scotland, but they were most clearly expressed in the diocese of Aberdeen:

the brethren of the severall exercises, in their respective bounds, being mett for matters of discipline touching referrs that shall come from severall sessiones, shall not proceed to sentence any with excommunication, unless it be by order of the bishope, after his lordship has visited and approven the process. Likewayes, at their meeting they are impowered to try young men in order to the preaching of the gospell, and, having found them qualified, to recommend them to the bishope that they may be approven and licensed by him, but they ar not to license them to preach till they be approven by the bishop. Furthermor, they ar not to censure any minister with suspension or deprivation without speciall warrant from the bishop.²⁴

Episcopal domination of the presbyteries was very marked, and the bishops gave the "brethren" of the "exercise" little room to maneuver. But, how did the prelates maintain their authority on the presbytery level? Obviously, given the number of these "judicatures" in Scotland, the bishops could not be physically present at every meeting (they did, however, attend presbytery meetings on occasion, and thus the archbishop

of Glasgow attended a meeting of the presbytery of Paisley on September 22, 1664, and the bishop of Caithness attended a meeting of the presbytery of Caithness on March 1, 1682.),²⁵ so they had to rely on indirect methods of control. One such indirect technique involved the use of episcopal letters. By writing letters, the bishops could make their wills known from a distance, and they could also direct the various presbyteries in their respective dioceses. The prelates, needless to say, made extensive use of correspondence, and they wrote to the local presbyteries to address a wide variety of issues. One letter, written by the bishop of Edinburgh to the presbytery of Linlithgow, contained general instructions, and its contents are described in a June 10, 1674 entry in the presbytery register:

this day ye brethren having received a letter from ye lord bishop of Edinburgh desireing them in all their proceedings to act with consent of their ordinarie which ye brethren resolved to doe and signified the same in answer by a letter to ye bishop.²⁶

Most episcopal letters, however, were written with specific purposes in mind. To cite some examples, some episcopal letters contained directions for public worship, and the ministers were "exhorted" to use the "doxologie" and to keep May 29 as a "solemn day of thanksgiving." In other letters, the bishops wrote to give "ane order" "authorizing ye brethren to meet for visitation,"²⁷ or a command requiring "the brethren's diligence in their duties." Still other missives contained instructions for a particular case of discipline, and a bishop might order a "presbyterie" to "desyst from any further process," or he might instruct the "exercise" to "proceed

vigorously" against an individual who was guilty of "disobedience" to the church.²⁸ One letter containing particular instructions was written by the archbishop of Glasgow to the presbytery of Peebles, and it was received by the "brethren" concerned on July 11, 1667, and its contents were described in the presbytery register:

first, that we should transmit ... a list of the present vacancies within our bounds with the names of such expectants as are worthy of such places; secondly, to send with these the names of the outed ministers with their disorderly practices and both of these to be sent ... before the first of July; thirdly, that we proceed against quakers....²⁹

In addition to writing letters, the bishops also exercised control over the presbyteries by carefully selecting the "moderators" who presided at the presbytery meetings. Moderators were appointed or reappointed every six months (the turnover in this office was not high, and thus Alexander Seton, the minister of Linlithgow, was moderator of the presbytery of Linlithgow from October 1666 to April 1673),³⁰ and they were typically chosen by the bishops during the biannual diocesan assemblies. At the October 1662 meeting of the diocesan assembly of Aberdeen, for example, one Adam Barclay was "appointed moderator of the exercise of Alford" "by the authoritie of David, by the mercie of God, lord bishop of Aberdeen." This procedure was followed in other dioceses, and thus the records indicate that in St. Andrews the "moderators of the several presbyteries" were "choisen by the archbishop." In some diocesan synod records, it is true, the minutes read that the "bishop and synod" selected the presbytery moderators, but this

phrase was only "common form," and it meant that the bishop made the appointment and the synod declared its approbation.³¹ The only exception to this rule was found in the diocese of Dunblane. In some instances in Dunblane the moderators of the "several presbyteries" were named by the bishop and "willingly accepted by the brethren," but on other occasions the selections were apparently made "by vote." This, however, was not the practice elsewhere.³²

When the bishops appointed presbytery moderators, they tended to appoint enthusiastic supporters of the established church.³³ This, for example, was clearly the case in the presbytery of Paisley. The archbishops of Glasgow appointed seven different men to serve as Paisley presbytery moderators between 1662 and 1689, and loyalty was one trait all seven shared. The more distinguished individuals among the seven included Robert Douglas, a graduate of the University of Aberdeen who would subsequently become the dean of Glasgow, the bishop of Brechin, and the bishop of Dunblane in 1675, 1682, and 1684, respectively; John Fullarton, a leading episcopalian apologist who would become a "non-jurant" bishop after the Revolution; John Hay, and "aged" minister who had been deposed and forced into exile during the "Rebellion"; and James Chalmers, an Aberdeen graduate, a relative of three bishops, and a man who had suffered "paines" during the "Rebellion" for supporting "his majesties interests and government both as to church and state." The other three moderators were less notable, but all the moderators in Paisley apparently enjoyed

the confidence of their archbishops, and, once appointed, they were reappointed until death (in the case of three), "infirmities" or illness (in the case of two), a promotion to a higher office in the kirk (in the case of one), or the disestablishment of prelacy itself (also in the case of one).³⁴

With the help of such men, the prelates were able to assert their authority on the presbytery level. The moderators served as "the bishops' delegates" (to use Gilbert Burnet's phrase), and they acted as the "eyes and ears" of the diocesan bishops. The moderator's role as intermediary can be seen in the following order from the bishop of Aberdeen:³⁵

when any person shall appeall from the presbyterie to the bishop, it is appoynted that the moderator of the presbyterie shall acquaint the bishop therewith, and that the presbyterie shall desist from any further process against the said persone, untill they have received further order from the bishop thereanent.³⁶

And the moderator's role as an episcopal watchdog can be seen in an interesting entry in the register of the presbytery of Paisley. In the archdiocese of Glasgow, visitations were only conducted after "ane order from ye archbishop of Glasgow," and the moderator of the presbytery of Paisley (as the following entry indicates) made certain that this rule would not be violated:

Mr. Taylor representing to the presbyterie the ruinous conditione of his kirk and desyring a visitatione was asked by the moderator if he had gotten a particular order for the visitation.

Since a visitation was only routine business, the above quotation also clearly indicates the subordinate position of the presbytery in respect to their "ordinarie."³⁷

After the presbytery, the last "judicatory" of the established church, inferior to both the synod and presbytery in jurisdiction, was the kirk session. Of all the church courts, the kirk session was the one least affected by the reestablishment of prelacy. That the kirk session retained its traditional membership and functions when the other church courts were modified may seem remarkable, but in reality it was not. To state it simply, the kirk session was just too valuable to be altered. The bishops realized that this court was "necessary" for the "advancing of good order in the congregation," and the bishops also realized that the kirk session, unlike a General Assembly, a synod, or a presbytery, served its purpose without posing any threat to episcopal power and leadership. It was therefore no surprise that many prelates, including the archbishop of St. Andrews, specifically ordered that "everie congregation" should have its customary kirk session.³⁸

In terms of its composition, the kirk session continued to be made up of the minister of the local church together with "a competent number of fitt persons" in the "bounds of the paroch" who served as elders and deacons. As the records of the kirk session of Alyth indicate, the procedure used to select these elders and deacons remained virtually unchanged. On July 23, 1671, three men were added to the Alyth session, and the traditional process was used. First, three men were "thought upon, chosen, and elected by the ministers and elders," and then the names of these three men were "read over publictlie in the

face of the congregation," and it was "desired if any knew anything against them" that they should "shew it tymouslie." When no objections were made, the three men were "admitted" to the session," and they "promised with upholding of hands to be faithful to their chargereceived." In the parish of Rutherglen, the procedure was identical. Hew Blair, the first post-Restoration conformist minister in Rutherglen, had thirteen "grave, sober, and discreet persones" in his session (including one provost, two former provosts, a baillie, and a town ^{clerk} ~~clerk~~), but, on October 12, 1663 , Blair and his session decided to add a new "deacone," ~ the candidate was a man named "Robert Pinkartone." The standard steps were taken, but on this occasion the candidate was rejected as unfit, for it was discovered that "Pinkartone" had once called his neighbor a "theef," and he had also called his neighbor's wife a "whoore."³⁹

The elders and deacons in the post-Restoration kirk sessions had the same responsibilities as their covenanting predecessors, and for all intents and purposes the offices were unaffected by the reestablishment of prelacy. It should be pointed out, however, that a few individuals in the post-Restoration established church did try to reduce the constitutional importance of the elder in relation to the minister. Several covenanter writers, including James Guthrie (Treatise on Elders and Deacons) and Samuel Rutherford (Lex Rex), had invested the office of elder with a quasi-ministerial dignity--Rutherford, for example, had claimed that it was a

"lie" to say that the Church of Scotland had "lay" elders--and there was a reaction against such ideas in the episcopal era. To make their point, a few conservative conformists avoided the word "elder" altogether, for the term had clerical connotations in the New Testament. Thus, in the South Ronaldshay kirk session register, there is an entry (under November 30, 1662) indicating that "the minister did signify" to "the honest men who wer formerly elders" that "thair former name of elders was now to be changed," and that in the future they would be "desyned by the name of assistants for delating and censuring of offenders and concurring with the minister in the executione of the disciplin of the church." In the same kirk session register, a similar entry was made under April 1663:

those who formerly sate as elders ... promised to be diligent and faithful assistantes,... the name and title of elder ... [being] a name properly belonging to preaching ministers only in all scripture....

It should be noted that the scruples of the minister of South Ronaldshay were not unique. In 1681, during a visitation at Linlithgow kirk, the minister of Linlithgow insisted on calling his elders the "assisters of ye minister."⁴⁰

Whatever the constitutional position of elders (and deacons), the facts are that the post-Restoration kirk sessions were in reality identical to their counterparts in the 1638-1660 era. Administering discipline to "sinful" parishioners continued to occupy most of the kirk session's time, and the great majority of discipline cases continued to involve sexual misbehavior, drunkenness, slander, violations of the sabbath, and other moral transgressions. Thus, one Agnes Morrison was

brought before the Rutherglen kirk session for being "first incestuous, then adulterous, last fornicatrix"; one Agnes Grey was summoned before the same session because she had "called Janet Millar thief and whore, bitch and jade"; and Andrew Scott was "processed" by the Peebles kirk session register because he had sold his wife for forty pounds scots and had declared that she was cheap at that price.⁴¹ As in the past, the punishments favored by the kirk sessions were still admonishment from the pulpit, fines, penance on the "pillar" or "stool" "in the face of the congregation,"⁴² and an occasional use of the "jougs" (a chain with a neck ring).⁴³ Cases involving especially serious sins or obstinate offenders were still referred to the higher church courts.

In addition to administering discipline on the local level, the kirk sessions also continued to issue "testimonials," a kind of seventeenth century character reference. There was no freedom of movement in the century for the "lower ranks" of society, and people who wanted to relocate to new parishes needed testimonials from their old ones. Testimonials were documents that stated whether a person's conduct had been acceptable, whether he was in full communion with the church, and so forth. Strangers who arrived in an area without valid testimonials were looked upon with great suspicion, and these documents were therefore useful tools against the immoral and profane. They were, moreover, also useful against dissenters.⁴⁴

A third function of the kirk sessions that also

continued unaltered was the "overseing of the poor." "Taking care of the collections for the poor and distributing what is collected for their necessitie" remained the special responsibilities of the deacons of the session, and, as in the past, theirs was not an easy task. The relief work of the deacons depended upon money from weekly contributions, communion collections, fines paid by "delinquents," and "mortifications," and these sources did not produce a great deal of revenue. Thus, when the presbytery of Lanark "visited" Lamington parish in 1669, "the minister, being asked, declared ... that he had a box for the poore, but nothing in it," for the people usually gave "nothing almost on the Sabbath for the poore." In spite of the difficulties, however, the deacons continued to carry out their duties with "diligence."⁴⁵

The functions of the kirk sessions--administering discipline, granting testimonials, and conducting poor relief--were narrowly defined, and this church court operated, by and large, without direct episcopal interference. Like the presbyteries, however, the kirk sessions were indirectly influenced by the bishops. The minister was the most important member of the kirk session--he was supposed "to preeside at session" and "approve" all significant business--and the minister was clearly subordinate to his diocesan bishop. This subordination was expressed in the oath of canonical obedience sworn by the ministers:

I, A.B., do profess and promise that I will render my
ordinarie ..., by the mercie of God, lord Bishop of ..., and
his successors, due canonicall obedience, and to them to
whom the government and charge is committed over me,
following with glad mynd and will ther godlie

admonitiones....

In short, the bishops controlled the ministers (at least in theory), and by controlling the ministers the bishops exercised their authority over the kirk sessions.⁴⁶ The line of command may have been rather tenuous in this case, but it was real enough.

Clearly, episcopal domination, in one form or another, was visible at every level of the kirk's system of "graded" courts, from the synod down to the kirk session, and the post-Restoration church seemed to confirm the words of David Calderwood, the presbyterian historian, that "the discipline and government of the kirk exercised by presbyters [in ecclesiastical courts] and bishops are so far opposed to one another, that when one is set up, the other must down." Calderwood's words, when applied to the 1661-1689 period, ring true. On the surface, the established kirk appeared to be "a presbyterian church," with bishops merely "superimposed for political purposes," but in reality it was not.⁴⁷ "Church power" was concentrated in the hands of the bishops, and, by and large, the church courts only existed in a mutated or abbreviated state: General Assemblies were suspended, synods were bridled, presbyteries were emasculated--only the kirk sessions continued virtually unaltered. In light of these facts, it is not surprising that the presbyterians considered the post-Restoration church an unacceptable alternative.

Notes

¹Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:254.

²Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, VII:465; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:262, 366.

³The presbyterians asserted that "ruling elders" were "constituent" members of the General Assemblies, synods, and presbyteries, and they believed the said "judicatures" were "illegal" without elders. See Brown, An Apologeticall Relation of the Particular Sufferings of the Faithful Ministers, p. 57. —

⁴Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, VII:465; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:262, 366.

⁵See "Paisley Presbytery Register," November 22, 1676.

⁶"Aberdeen Synod Acts," in Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 28, 1668; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 429; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:95; Walter Foster, Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688 (London, 1958), p. 83; G. D. Henderson, Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, p. 142.

⁷During the covenanting period, the synods elected their own moderators.

⁸Register of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane, 1662-1688, ed. J. Wilson (Edinburgh, 1877), September 1662; Foster, Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688, p. 86.

⁹"Glasgow Synod Acts," in "Jedburgh Presbytery Register," April 1664; The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671, April 1670; J. B. Craven, A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness (Kirkwall, 1908), p. 167; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:281; "Aberdeen Synod Acts," in Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 1670.

¹⁰The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671, October 1667, April 1668, October 1668, April 1669, October 1669.

¹¹Register of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane, 1662-1688, October 1683.

¹²Craven, A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness, pp. 33, 163; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:281; Register of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane, 1662-1688, October 1667; Lauderdale

Papers, II:245.

¹³Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 475.

¹⁴The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671, October 1662, October 1667, October 1669; "Caithness Synod Acts," quoted in Craven, A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness, p. 163.

¹⁵Alexander Gibson, the archdeacon, was examining one of the presbytery registers and did not participate in this particular privy conference.

¹⁶"Caithness Synod Acts," July 1682, October 1662, quoted in Craven, A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness, pp. 33, 163.

¹⁷The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671, October 1667, April 1670; Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen, p. 324.

¹⁸Most presbytery boundaries remained unchanged, but there were exceptions. Lanark presbytery and Peebles presbytery, for example, were both enlarged, and Biggar presbytery was eliminated.

¹⁹"Linlithgow Presbytery Register," October 29, 1662; "Perth Presbytery Register," January 14, 1663; Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 1673.

²⁰G. D. Henderson, "The Exercise," Records of the Scottish Church History Society 7(1941):24; Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, II:13; "Linlithgow Presbytery Register," February 26, 1668.

²¹"Perth Presbytery Register," January 14, 1663; "Linlithgow Presbytery Register," October 23, 1673, February 1, 1673, June 1, 1673; Records of the Presbyteries of Inverness and Dingwall, 1643-1688, pp. 311-312; Foster, Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688, pp. 77ff.

²²Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 2, 1662; "Perth Presbytery Register," January 14, 1663; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:257; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 217; Foster, Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688, p. 46.

²³On May 31, 1665, the presbytery of Elgin declared that one "William Troupe in Elgin" should be "summarily excommunicat" for adding "the crying sin of murder" to his "adultery," and the records do not show that the bishop of Moray was consulted. It is doubtful, however, that the presbytery was acting on its own initiative. Elgin was the cathedral seat of

the bishop of Moray, and the bishop probably knew about the "Troupe" case and the presbytery's proceedings, especially since the case involved sensational crimes. See The Records of Elgin, 1234-1800, II:371.

²⁴Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 1662.

²⁵"Paisley Presbytery Register," September 22, 1664; Craven, A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness, p. 161.

²⁶"Linlithgow Presbytery Register," June 10, 1674.

²⁷On occasion, a bishop participated in the visitation process and accompanied a presbytery to a local parish. In the presbytery of Dingwall, for example, the bishop of Ross visited a church on August 9, 1665. See Records of the Presbyteries of Inverness and Dingwall, 1643-1648, p. 311.

²⁸"Paisley Presbytery Register," December 27, 1682, April 10, 1684; "Jedburgh Presbytery Register," September 7, 1664; "Linlithgow Presbytery Register," June 8, 1664; Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, April 1671, October 1668.

²⁹"Peebles Presbytery Register," July 11, 1667.

³⁰"Linlithgow Presbytery Register," October 1666, April 1673.

³¹Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 24, 1662, October 1682; "Perth Presbytery Register," January 14, 1663, March 12, 1679; Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, II:4.

³²Register of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane, 1662-1688, p. 4; Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, II:5.

³³It is interesting to note that the archbishop of St. Andrews appointed George Ogilvie, minister of Portmoak, the moderator of the presbytery of Kirkcaldy in 1662. Ogilvie had been "formerly a rigid Protester," but he experienced a change of heart after the Restoration. See Lamont, Diary, p. 156.

³⁴Henderson, Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, p. 92; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:262; Craven, Records of the Dioceses of Argyll and the Isles, 1560-1860 (N.P., 1907), pp. 179-180; Robert Wodrow, The Correspondence of the Reverend Robert Wodrow, ed. Thomas McCrie, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842-1843), I:362; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, III:155, 164, 185, 186, VI:202, VII:332, 399; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, I:303.

Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 1668.

³⁶On March 12, 1668, one Alexander Innes declared (in the words of the register of the presbytery of Alford) that he "would appeal to the bishop, and then bid us all hang ourselves." See Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688.

³⁷"Paisley Presbytery Register," December 27, 1682, April 10, 1684.

³⁸"Perth Presbytery Register," January 14, 1663; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, II:111; Foster, Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688, pp. 61ff; Donaldson, Scotland, James V to James VII, p. 225.

³⁹James Meickle, An Old Session Book: Being Studies in Alyth's Second Session Book (Paisley, 1918), p. 27; Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, II:86; Foster, Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688, pp. 61ff; Extracts from the Records of the Kirk Session of Elgin, 1584-1779 (Elgin, 1897), pp. 6, 17; I. M. Clark, A History of Church Discipline in Scotland (Aberdeen, 1929), p. 115; "Perth Presbytery Register," January 14, 1663; Register of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane, 1662-1688, October 1664; Lamont, Diary, p. 156; Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 1662; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, II:11; "Rutherglen Kirk Session Register," November 13, 1662, October 12, 1663.

⁴⁰Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, II:84; Lamont, Diary, p. 156; "Linlithgow Presbytery Register," April 27, 1681.

⁴¹Meickle, An Old Session Book: Being Studies in Alyth's Second Session Book, p. 94; Foster, Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688, p. 60; Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, II:228; "Rutherglen Kirk Session Register," February 9, 1665, July 4, 1680; William Chambers, A History of Peeblesshire (Edinburgh, 1864), p. 194.

⁴²The Scottish practice of demanding "public satisfaction in the face of the congregation" was not universal in the Reformed churches. Indeed, "The Discipline" or "Book of Order" of the Reformed churches of France declared that "the custom which has obtained in some places of investigating and censuring faults publically in the presence of the people--men and women together--is condemned by the word of God, and churches are warned to abstain from it...." See Clark, A History of Church Discipline in Scotland, p. 111.

⁴³Meickle, An Old Session Book: Being Studies in Alyth's Second Session Book, p. 94; Foster, Bishop and

Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688, pp. 60ff; William Andrews, Bygone Punishments (London, 1899), pp. 239-242, 176-185.

⁴⁴Meickle, An Old Session Book: Being Studies in Alyth's Second Session Book, p. 108; Foster, Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688, p. 69.

⁴⁵"Rutherglen Kirk Session Register," November 13, 1662; Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, I:59, II:86; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, I:131; Meickle, An Old Session Book; Being Studies in Alyth's Second Session Book, p. 27; Foster, Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688, p. 62; Extracts from the Records of the Kirk Session of Elgin, 1584-1779, pp. 6, 17; Selections from the Register of the Presbytery of Lanark, 1623-1709, June 9, 1669.

⁴⁶Extracts from the Records of the Kirk Session of Elgin, 1584-1779, p. 17; "Paisley Presbytery Register," November, 22, 1676; Craven, A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness, p. 164; Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 1662.

⁴⁷See Mathieson, Politics and Religion in Scotland, 1550-1695, II:262; Burnet, History of His Own Times, I:254; Foster, Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688, p. 170. Calderwood is cited in Henderson, Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, p. 157.

Chapter VIII

The Worship of the Established Church

Public worship, like church government, was altered in the post-Restoration period. Sir George Mackenzie, a prominent nonconformist, tried to deny the obvious, and he wrote that the "way of worship in our church differed nothing from what the presbyterians themselves practiced," but Mackenzie was distorting the truth.¹ The changes were indeed modest by some standards--"hardly discernible," to use the words of Thomas Morer, an English chaplain in Scotland²--but they were very real to the parties concerned. Thus, Alexander Shields, an important dissenter, wrote:

The prelates and their curates have innovated the worship ... of the true Church of Scotland, ... and their worship, over and above the corruption adhering to it, is the worshipping of an innovating party, contrary to our Church's established order.³

In the eyes of the presbyterians, the ideal mode of worship was articulated in the Directory of Public Worship. Drawn up by the Westminster Assembly in England and ratified by the Scottish General Assembly in 1645, the Directory denounced all "set forms" of prayer as carnal, formal, and idolatrous, and it recommended free and extemporaneous prayer under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Directory itself was a collection of rubrics--a set of recommendations and prohibitions that provided every minister with "some help and furniture"--and it was the antithesis of a structured liturgy.⁴ Of course, the

elimination of all ritual was impossible, and a pro-episcopal writer satirized the presbyterians on those grounds:

it is plain superstition to a presbyterian, not to enter the church with his head covered. Mas John himself does it as mannerly as the coarsest cobbler in the parish. In he steps--uncovers not till in the pulpit--claps straight on his breech--and within a little falls to work as the spirit moves him! All the congregation must sit close in the time of prayer--clap on their bonnets in time of sermon, etc. This is the way, and it brings me in mind to an observe an old gentleman has frequently repeated to me, which was, that he found it impossible to perform divine worship without ceremonies, for (saith he) the presbyterians themselves, who pretend to be against all ceremonies, seem even to superstition, precise in observing the ceremonies of the breech.⁵

But all humorous criticism aside, the presbyterians did practice extemporaneous worship as far as it was humanly possible to do so.

The new establishment, however, did not share the same scruples. The archbishop of St. Andrews announced in 1662 that it was "his majesties will that henceforth the way of worship prescribed in the Directory should cease," and this meant that the Directory's strict prohibition of set forms of prayer would no longer have to be obeyed.⁶ The bishops quickly took advantage of their new freedom, and they reintroduced certain "ceremonies" into their dioceses. Everywhere the practice's of singing the doxology (or "Glorie to the Father") and saying the Lord's Prayer were revived. The latter was to "be repeited, once by the minister at every preaching, and twyse as the minister pleased."⁷ The use of another set form, the Apostles Creed or "Belief," was also restored. The bishops of many dioceses, such as those of Galloway and Moray, only required that the "Belief" be used at the sacrament of baptism, but other

bishops, such as those of Caithness and Dunblane, specifically ordained that the Apostles' Creed should be repeated before the congregation "each Sabbath day."⁸ Needless to say, these "prelatical" practices were contrary to the principles of presbyterianism.⁹ As one satirical writer unfairly observed:

Q.--Why do not the presbyterians say the creed and doxology?

A.--Because they are not word by word in scripture.

Q.--Why do they not say the Lord's Prayer?

A.--Because it is word by word in scripture.¹⁰

In addition to reintroducing some of the old "set forms," the bishops also made other modifications. In all dioceses, for example, the bishops revived the practice of "having larger portions of scriptures" read in the church as part of the services.¹¹ Such readings had been abandoned during the covenanting era; they had been replaced by "lectures" in which the minister would read a small passage from the Bible and then spend a half hour or so expounding on what he had read.¹² The presbyterians used lectures because they thought the simple reading of scripture in church without comment (something they referred to as "dumb reading") was "formal and unedifying." The bishops, however, saw things in a different light. They denounced the lectures, which in effect had become second sermons, and they instead recommended simple and extended readings from the bible. Thus, in the diocesan synod of Dunblane, the ministers were told:

to beware of returning to their long expositions besides their sermon at one and the same meeting, which, besides their tediousnesse and other inconvenients, is apte to forment in people's myndes the foolish prejudice and proud disdaine they have taken against the scriptures read without a superadded discourse; in which conceit, for all their zeal against popery, they seem to be too much of the Romish

opinion, as accounting the holy scriptures so obscure in themselves that it is someway dangerous, or at least altogether unprofitable, to entrust the common people either with reading or hearing any part of them at any time, unlesse they be backitt with continual expositiones.¹³

Still another change involved the posture of people during Sunday worship. It was the practice of presbyterians to sit while saying prayers or receiving communion,¹⁴ but some of the bishops disagreed with the bishops on this point. The bishop of Dunblane, for example, called sitting during "publicke worshipec" an "undecent" and "irreverent deportment," and he recommended that the people should do the following:

kneel or stand as conveniently they may.... Oh, how needful is that invitation to be often rung in our ears that seem wholly to have forgott it, "Oh come, let us worshipec and bow doune, and kneel before the Lord our Maker."¹⁵

With less eloquence, the bishop of Aberdeen and the archbishop of St. Andrews also recommended standing and kneeling as the "most reverend" postures for congregational worship.¹⁶

All of the above changes, from the reintroduction of the doxology to the revival of kneeling in the church, were radical enough, but there were also some stirrings in the church in favor of a full liturgy. Not unexpectedly, Aberdeen led the way here. Indeed, Aberdeen was the one diocese in the period that was never really without a liturgy. In 1662, during Aberdeen's first diocesan assembly since the reestablishment of prelacy, the bishop and synod, after agreeing that "the Directorie" of the "late illegal assemblie" should be "layd assyd" and not used "in tyme coming," decided that "the litugie in the old Psalm Book" (the pre-1637 liturgy) should be used in

congregational worship. This liturgy, the so-called Knox's liturgy, did not satisfy for long, however, and eventually two new liturgies were drawn up for diocesan use. One of these liturgies was the work of Henry Scougal, a professor of divinity at King's College, the son of a bishop, and the author of The Life of God in the Soul of Man. Scougal's work was reminiscent of the draft liturgies drawn up in the time of James VI, but it also clearly showed the influence of the Book of Common Prayer. Scougal's "Morning Service," for example, borrowed the following passage from the Anglican rite:

We have erred and strayed from thy ways as lost sheep. We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts; we have offended against thy holy laws. We have left undone those things we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us. But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable offenders. Spare thou them, O God, which confess their faults. Restore thou them that are penitent, according to thy promises declared unto mankind in Christ Jesus, our Lord. And grant, O most merciful Father, for his sake, that we may hereafter live a godly, righteous, and sober life, to the glory of thy holy name, and the salvation of our souls.

Scougal's liturgy apparently was designed with the cathedral church of St. Machar's in mind, and in a later edition it is referred to as "the Morning and Evening Service of the Cathedral Church."¹⁸ Whatever its purpose, Scougal's liturgy was used throughout the period at St. Machar's, but the "aforesaid Morning and Evening Prayer" were "taken away by some presbyterian men in Old Aberdeen" at "the beginning of the ... Revolution."¹⁹

Aberdeen's second liturgy was drawn up under the direction of Bishop George Haliburton, and it was clearly

intended for the whole diocese. This liturgy's origins are described in the register of the diocesan assembly of Aberdeen. At the October 1683 meeting, a small committee was chosen to prepare "a forme of morning and evening prayers," and on October 1685 (after the usual delays) the committee reported that "some prayers" and some "short petitions or collects" had been drawn up for congregational worship "upon the Lord's Day" and during the week. The little book also contained "some forms of prayer to be used in families morning and evening" and some prayers for children. This liturgy met with approval, and Bishop Haliburton ordered the ministers of the diocese to "provide themselves with a copie of the said devotions and to ... observe the same within their respective congregations."²⁰

The bishops of Edinburgh, unlike the bishops of Aberdeen, did not introduce a liturgy into their diocese, but one bishop of Edinburgh did the next best thing. It was, it is true, a modest step, but, at an October 1683 meeting of the synod of Edinburgh, the bishop asked the ministers in each of the constituent presbyteries to write their own "set forms." These "set forms," it should be noted, were only for the administration of the baptism and the Lord's Supper, and they were not for public worship on a typical Sunday, but the bishop of Edinburgh was nevertheless clearly taking his diocese in a liturgical direction. This can be seen in the following entry:

The Lord Bishop ... being very desirous to prevent ye profanationes and sacrilidges that are to be seen in the highest instances of our religione, occasioned by the want of set formes for the adminstration of ye holy sacraments of baptisme and the Lord's Supper,... his Lordship did seriouslie recommend to the severall presbyteries to comyle and use formes of their owne for ye administratione thereof,

holding as neir as possible they can to ye formes used by the ancient church.

The bishop added that the "want" of such forms "in our nationall church" was "much to be lamented."²¹

Nothing approaching a liturgy was written in the other dioceses of Scotland, but there were supporters of set forms of prayer throughout the established church. Among the bishops, those "inclined to press ceremonies" included Alexander Burnet, Robert Leighton, James Sharp, and George Wishart.²² Among the lower clergy, the supporters of a "grave liturgie" included Gilbert Burnet, the minister of Saltoun and the author of A Memorial of Diverse Grievances and Abuses in This Church,²³ and James Gordon, the minister of Banchory-Devenick and the author of The Reformed Bishop.²⁴ And Burnet and Gordon were not alone, for William Row, the presbyterian writer, noted that many conformist ministers were agitating for a liturgy by 1675. Among the people, the level of interest in a liturgy was probably weaker, but it was not unknown. Principal Monro of the University of Edinburgh stated that the Book of Common Prayer was used in some families during the post-Restoration period, and the Duke of York's chaplain, who was in Edinburgh in 1681, wrote that copies of the Anglican liturgy were selling well in the Scottish capital.²⁵

Yet, in spite of such support, the post-Restoration church never produced a standard liturgy for all dioceses. Attempts were made, however. In 1665-1666, for example, a draft liturgy was drawn up and brought to London by Archbishop Sharp

for the king's approval. When Sharp returned to Scotland, there were rumors that the Anglican liturgy itself was going to be "brought in," but nothing came out of the affair. In 1675, it was rumored that "a new modelled liturgy" was going to be introduced with the consent of parliament, but again nothing came to pass. It seems, ironically, that the implementation of both these liturgies was stopped by Charles II himself. It seems the king had learned from his father's experiences and had no desire to provoke the presbyterians by introducing a prayer book. In the words of Charles Maitland, the brother of Lauderdale, the king believed that "a liturgie" should not be "motioned" in Scotland because the government "must tak cair to keep all things reight, so much the rather now when a great many indeavour to put them wrong."²⁶

The king's prudence may have stifled liturgical development, but it did not, it should be noted, prevent the reintroduction of certain controversial practices that "aped English ways." This, for example, was the case with the so-called Five Articles of Perth. Introduced by James VI in 1618 and ratified by the parliament in 1621, the Five Articles, which enjoined kneeling at communion, allowed the private administration of the two sacraments, reestablished the rite of confirmation, and authorized the observance of Christmas, Easter, Good Friday, the Ascension, and Whitsunday, had been abolished by the covenanters during the "Rebellion." The rescissory act, however, annulled all the laws made by the covenanters, and this meant that from 1661 onwards the Five

Articles were again technically legal. Several bishops made the most of this situation, and they took steps to reintroduce some of the "articles" into their dioceses. Thus, in 1663 the bishop of Moray "ministered the communion kneeling" and "the people" went "alongst with him," and in 1662 the bishop of Aberdeen and his diocesan assembly declared "that privat baptisme and privat communione" should not be "denyed by any minister within this diocle."²⁷ In addition, in 1684 the bishop of Edinburgh and his diocesan assembly introduced a ceremony that resembled confirmation:

The Lord Bishop and synod considering that ye confirmation of children before their admissiōe to ye sacrament of ye Lord's Supper is not in practice in this kingdome, they ordaine every minister of this diocle, befor they admit such as ar young to that sacrament, to conveen them before him, and having catechised them in presence of their parents and godfathers to put them in mind of ther baptismall vow, to renounce ye devile, ye world, and ye flesh, to keep the commandments of God and to walk in his holy wayes all dayes of ther lif, and to cause them receive that sacred vow upon ther knees, and therafter to pray over them for God's grace to be bestowed upon them for ye enabling them to walk ansuerably therunto.²⁸

Sir John Fountainhall, a contemporary, actually referred to the above ceremony as a renewal of "that Article of Perth ... anent the confirmation of children,"²⁹ but he was not in fact correct. In true confirmation, a bishop would have been present.

The complete rite of confirmation may have been lacking in the post-Restoration church, but the observance of holy days, the last of the Five Articles of Perth, did slowly gain ground. In 1662, for example, "the 25 of December, being Yule day, was solemlie keepit in Edinburgh" as a "holie day," and, after the

sermon by the bishop "in the Elster Kirk, quhairin thair wes much people assembled,... command wes gevin by touk of drum that the remanent of that day should be spent as ane holie day, and that no work nor labour should be usit." Christmas was also celebrated in the archdiocese of St. Andrews, and the primate himself "preached" and "held a Christmas feast" for "the magistrates, masters of the university, and others." Christmas was also being celebrated by 1665 in the diocese of Moray, and in Ross the bishop was instructing his ministers "to preach on Christ's nativitie day" by 1668.³⁰

The observance of other "holie days" also slowly spread. In 1663, according to the diarist Nicoll, the "ascentioun day" was "keipit in Edinburgh and many other parts of this kingdome." In 1664, a special sermon was given in Edinburgh on Whitsunday "in commemoratioun of the Penthecost, quhairin the Holy Spirite was sent doun upone Chryste's apostles," and, in 1674, at least two ministers in Aberdeen diocese honored Pentecost Sunday with a celebration of the Lord's Supper. In 1677, the bishop of Moray urged the ministers in his diocese to mark Easter Sunday with a celebration of the Eucharist, and the bishop of Aberdeen did the same a few years later. In 1684, Good Friday was commemorated in Edinburgh, and, in 1685, the bishop of Edinburgh and his diocese went beyond the Articles of Perth and kept a fast on Ash Wednesday.³¹

All of these things--the revival of the Perth Articles, the reinstitution of kneeling, the repudiation of the lecture, the rejection of the Directory of Public Worship, and the

resurrection of set forms of prayer--were parts of a common trend in the post-Restoration church. This trend, which was symbolized by Hector Pape, the minister of Loth and the first post-Restoration clergyman to wear a surplice rather than a gown during the "preaching tyme,"³² can only be described as a slow, almost imperceptible drift from the simple, spontaneous covenanter mode of worship to a more elaborate and structured mode based upon the traditions of the Church of England. Needless to say, many Scots were disturbed by this development. They were convinced that the "purging and building" of their "further Reformation"³³ had been interrupted by the bishops, and this meant that public worship, like church government, would be a source of contention in the period.

Notes

¹Sir George Mackenzie, A Vindication of the Government in Scotland (London, 1691), p. 9.

²Morer, A Short Account of Scotland, p. 62.

³Shields, A Hind Let Loose, pp. 310-311; I. B. Cowan, "Worship and Dissent in Restoration Scotland," Scotia: The American-Canadian Journal of Scottish Studies 2(April 1978): 61.

⁴Bard Thompson, ed., Liturgies of the Western Church (New York, 1979), p. 356; John Ross, Four Centuries of Scottish Worship (Edinburgh, 1972), p. 8.

⁵John Sage, The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, as It Has Been Lately Established in the Kingdom of Scotland (London, 1690), p. 360.

⁶Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 2, 1662; "Perth Presbytery Register," January 14, 1663; Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, I:60; Sage, The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, as It Has Been Lately Established in the Kingdom of Scotland.

⁷"Linlithgow Presbytery Register," March 18, 1662; "Peebles Presbytery Register," December 18, 1662; "Perth Presbytery Register," October 29, 1662, September 29, 1669; "Paisley Presbytery Register," January 12, 1681; Extracts from the Records of the Synod of Moray, April 7, 1663; Nicoll, A Diary of Public Transactions and other Occurrences, Chiefly in Scotland, from January 1650 to June 1667, p. 381.

On the subject of the Lord's Prayer in public worship, it is interesting to note that the Scottish presbyterians were actually more radical than the Westminster Assembly. The Directory specifically recommended that the Lord's Prayer be "used in the prayers of the church" because it was "the prayer which Christ taught his disciples," but the Scottish presbyterians did not follow this advice. Early in the covenanting period, radicals were objecting to the Lord's Prayer in congregational worship because it was a "set form," and the moderate Baillie felt it necessary to complain in 1643 that some Ayrshire ministers had drawn up a paper in "a very bitter and arrogant strain against the three innocent ceremonies, Paternoster, Glory Patri, and kneeling in the pulpit, proving by a great rabble of arguments ... the unlawfulness of our church practices." In spite of the complaints of Baillie and others, however, the radicals eventually had their way in Scotland, and the "innocent ceremonies" were set aside. See Thompson, Liturgies of the Western Church, p. 367; William Maxwell, A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland (London, 1955); Baillie, Letters and Journals, II:69-71.

⁸The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671, October 1664; Extracts from the Records of

the Synod of Moray, April 1663; Craven A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness, p. 164; Register of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane, 1662-1688, April 1664.

The Apostles' Creed was not used during presbyterian baptisms. Presbyterian parents instead usually promised to bring the child up according to the doctrines contained in the Westminster Confession and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. See John Sage, Works, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: Spottiswoode Society, 1844-1846), I:362.

⁹It should be mentioned that the Ten Commandments were also repeated "publickly" during Sunday services in the dioceses of Aberdeen, Caithness, and Dunblane.

¹⁰Calder, Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed.

¹¹"Jedburgh Presbytery Register," October 1663; "Peebles Presbytery Register," December 18, 1662; "Linlithgow Presbytery Register," October 31, 1663; "Paisley Presbytery Register," September 28, 1681; Extracts from the Records of the Synod of Moray, April 7, 1683; Cowan, "Worship and Dissent in Restoration Scotland," p. 62; Ross, Four Centuries of Scottish Worship, p. 11.

¹²This, as in the case of the Lord's Prayer, was not actually what the authors of the Directory had intended. The Directory declared that the "reading of the word in the congregation" should be a part of the "publick worship of God (wherein we acknowledge our dependence upon Him, and subjection to Him)." The Directory allowed the lecture, but it stated that the lecture should consist of short comments on long passages. In the words of the Directory: "when the minister ... shall judge it necessary to expound any part of what is read, let it not bee done until the whole chapter or psalm bee ended: and regard is alwayes to be had unto the time, that neither preaching nor other ordinance bee straightened, or rendered tedious." See Thompson, Liturgies of the Western Church, pp. 357-358.

¹³Register of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane, 1662-1688, October 1666; Ross, Four Centuries of Scottish Worship, p. 12.

¹⁴In Scotland, opposition to receiving communion while kneeling actually dates back to the sixteenth century. Opposition to kneeling while praying in church, however, only became an issue during the civil war period. See William McMillan, The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550-1638 (London, 1931), pp. 23, 151; Ross, Four Centuries of Scottish Worship, pp. 10, 47; Maxwell, A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland, p. 110.

¹⁵Register of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane, 1662-1688, October 1666.

Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 1662; Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, I:62; Brodie, Diary, p. 294,

17Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 2, 1662.

18Scougal's liturgy has been printed in William Orem, A Description of Old Aberdeen (Aberdeen, 1830), pp. 333-346.

19Ibid.

20Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 1683, October 1685.

21"Linlithgow Presbytery Register," October 31, 1683, May 14, 1684.

22Brodie, Diary, pp. 230, 270; Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, III: 264.

23Gilbert Burnet, in his Memorial of Diverse Grievances and Abuses in this Church, declared:

How heavy and grievous must it be that all the prayers of the church depend upon the extemporary gift of the minister? The compiling of a grave lyturgie, the prayers whereof shall be short and scriptural and fitly depending one upon another, should be no inconsiderable service to the church."

24Gordon, The Reformed Bishop.

25Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 563; Monro, Presbyterian Inquisition; as It Was Lately Practiced against the Professors of the College of Edinburgh, p. 10; William Nelson Clark, ed., A Collection of Letters Addressed by Prelates and Individuals of High Rank in Scotland ... to Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury (Edinburgh, 1848), p. 29; McMillan, "The Anglican Book of Common Prayer in the Church of Scotland," p. 148; Grub, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, III:264.

26Hunter, The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689, I:65; Cowan, "Worship and Dissent in Restoration Scotland," p. 66; Lauderdale Papers. II:236.

27Henderson, Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland, p. 157; Brodie, Diary, p. 294; Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, October 1662.

28"Linlithgow Presbytery Register," May 14, 1684.

29Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Notices of Scottish Affairs, II:530.

30Nicoll, A Diary of Public Transactions and other Occurrences, chiefly in Scotland, from January 1650 to June

1667, p. 385; Extracts from the Records of the Kirk Session of Elgin, 1584-1779, II:304, 309; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 432; Records of the Presbyteries of Inverness and Dingwall, 1643-1688, p. 321.

³¹Nicoll, A Diary of Public Transactions and other Occurrences, Chiefly in Scotland, from January 1650 to June 1667, pp. 391, 413; Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688, May 19, 1669, June 14, 1671, September 23, 1674, September 27, 1676, March 20, 1678; Cowan, "Worship and Dissent in Restoration Scotland," p. 66; Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Notices of Scottish Affairs, II:522, 620.

³²Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, VII:95; Morer, A Short Account of Scotland, p. 50; Craven, A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness, p. 203; Lamont, Diary, p. 146.

³³Thompson, Liturgies of the Western Church, p. 355.

Chapter IX

Presbyterian Dissent: 1663-1668

Generally speaking, the history of presbyterian nonconformity can be divided into three periods. In the first period, which extended from early 1663 to roughly 1668-1669, dissent was quite moderate in scope and intensity. In the second period, which extended from 1668-1669 to the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion in 1679, dissent was vigorous, thousands of Scots participated in nonconformist activities, and the established church was seriously threatened. In the third period, which extended from the rebellion in 1679 to the granting of religious "toleration" in 1687, dissent was in a virtual state of collapse. In this chapter and the two chapters following, each period will be discussed in turn.

Dissent, as indicated above, was rather quiescent between 1663 and 1668-1669. Presbyterian historians have traditionally endorsed a different point of view, and they have argued that in the early years the people made the curates the targets of "curses" and "stones" and showed their support for nonconformist ministers by attending conventicles and other illegal "assemblages,"¹ but the evidence does not support the "presbyterian" interpretation. To the contrary, the facts indicate that dissent was rather weak in the early years. It is clear, for example, that only a few congregations actually resisted the curates with force. Kirkton claimed that there were hundreds of riots, but these hundreds of riots cannot be

found in the records. Some people created a scuffle in Irongray, three individuals assaulted a conformist minister in Ancrum, "some women" made "an inconsiderable and allmost ridiculous tumult" in Kirkcudbright, some "ffanatieck shumacklers and their wayffs and priniesies" staged a riot in Edinburgh, and that, it seems, was the extent of the disorder. A few other "tumults" may have passed unnoticed, but they could not have been numerous, for the government remembered the "late rebellion," and the authorities therefore made a "greate noyse" every time a pebble was thrown in anger. But, even if there were a dozen riots, that would be a poor showing for a century in which violence against ministers was not uncommon.²

The myth that the curates were greeted by tumultuous congregations is further undermined by an interesting narrative written by Andrew Symson, a "curate" in the diocese of Galloway. Galloway was one of the most "presbyterian" districts in the land, but Symson nevertheless declared:

In the beginning of the year 1663, being invited to go to that countrey to supply vacant congregations there, upon our arrival we found several parishes, not only vacantes, but vocantes, desiring and earnestly soliciting that ministers might be sent to supply their vacancies. I do not assert that we had a formal and explicit call from the parishioners,... yet we had it virtually, and upon the matter; for after we had several Lord's days preached in our respective congregations for which we were designed (seven Lord's days I am sure for my own part), our edicts served and duly execute, the representatives of the parish attended on our ordinations, and the generality of the parish came to our solemn admissions; and thereafter waited on the ordinances under our administrations, yea, and the vey members of the former sessions concurred with us, and assisted us in the exercise of discipline, and rectifying such affairs as was incumbent to them, after the old manner. Our admissions and entry being so peaceable, so orderly as many that succeeded in these places can boast of....³

Symson's contention that the "generality" of the people "waited on the ordinances under our administrations" can be corroborated from presbyterian sources. Gilbert Rule, a moderate presbyterian and the author of the Vindication of the Church of Scotland, wrote that "it is true, hearing the conform clergy was common at first"; James Kirkton, a presbyterian minister and historian, admitted that the "curates" initially had a "reasonable throng," as "the body of people in most places waited upon their preachings"; Alexander Shields, a radical presbyterian, noted that "the generality of ... professors ... went so far as to hear curates"; and James Renwick, another radical, testified that "the most part ... of ... professors did countenance prelacy, in hearing of hyreling intruders." All of the above statements seem remarkable, but they were not isolated declarations, for even Alexander Peden, in his famous sermon at Glenluce, stated that the people "were all perjured in the beginning with complying with prelacy, and hearing those cursed curates," even though they "had covenanted and sworn to God," and "engaged" themselves "in that covenanting work of reformation."⁴

An examination of the church records also supports the idea that active dissent was quite weak in the early years. Conventicles, or unauthorized meetings for worship, were of course being held--there were small "privat" conventicles (meetings held in houses, barns, and other structures) and the much larger field conventicles⁵ (meetings in which some or all of the hearers were out-of-doors)⁶--but they were relatively

few in number. This was true even in the southwest and west, the traditional presbyterian heartland. In Galloway and Nithsdale, for example, dissent was at first relatively feeble. Gabriel Semple, himself a dissenting minister, wrote that in the early years "the meetings" or conventicles in Scotland "were most frequent" in Galloway and and Niddsdale,"⁷ but the records reveal that the nonconformist activity in those regions was not all that impressive. At the April 1666 meeting of the synod of Galloway, for example, "the presbytery of Wigtowne declared that their willful withdrawers and conventicle keepers were few and insignificant," and the ministers of the presbytery of Stranraer reported that "anent their willful withdrawers,... they had none except ye earl of Cassillis, the late ministers, some chaplins (which chaplins ye synod ordains them to proceed against conform to former acts), and one James Johnstone, a fugitive." In the presbytery of Kirkcudbright, the last of Galloway's constituent presbyteries and the one which adjoined Nithsdale, dissent was more vigorous (it was reported at the April 1666 synod meeting that several ministers "within the bounds of ye presbytery of Kirkcudbright" did "either abet or keep conventicles"), but this state of affairs did not last long, and the conventicling ministers were eventually expelled from Kirkcudbright and from neighboring Nithsdale as well. According to John Blackadder, a noted nonconformist minister, "four or five" ministers preached in "the stewartry of Galloway and the sherifffdom of Nithsdale" only from "the latter end of the year 1662" until "April 1666," and then Sir James Turner and

several dozen troops arrived on the scene, and the "ministers were forced to withdraw and shelter themselves elsewhere." Most of the ministers affected apparently fled to Edinburgh and "lurked there." Galloway and Nithsdale, it should be noted, would experience no more field conventicles "until about the spring of 1675."⁸

Elsewhere in the west and southwest of Scotland, the story was about the same: conventicles were few and sporadic in the early years. The synod of Glasgow and Ayr hosted some nonconformist activity⁹--during its October 1663 meeting the synod heard "severall complaints" about "twa vagrant preachers" named "Mr. Michael Bruce¹⁰ and Mr. Robert Kelso," and during its April 1664 meeting the synod made reference to "persons . . . outed . . . of thair charges" who preached at conventicles--but in general the area was relatively tranquil. In Dumbarton presbytery, for example, the curates boasted in March of 1664 that no one in their bounds withdrew from the church or attended conventicles, and Dumbarton would not in fact experience "disorderly meetings" until 1671. In Lanark presbytery, one small conventicle was reported in 1666, but there was little other nonconformist activity, and the burgh of Lanark itself "seems to have been comparatively peaceful" until 1672.¹¹ In Glasgow presbytery, two men were delated in October 1663 for disrupting the singing of the doxology in church, and several people from Rutherglen were "processed" in 1664 "for frequent absenting themselves from the church," but a thorough examination reveals that neither case is significant. The

men who disrupted the doxology were only guilty of "laughing at the conclusion at the time when it was singing,"¹² and those who neglected to attend church were either "drinking together... in the tyme of the forenoones sermon," or had sometimes" been going "to an other church, but not ordinarilie." Of course, those going "to ane other church" may have been dissenters, but if they were they were not very scrupulous, for the register indicates that they "promised" the curates to "keep better in time coming."¹³

In the presbytery of Paisley, another constituent presbytery in the synod of Glasgow and Ayr, the level of nonconformist activity was also moderate to weak. Paisley would become a hotbed of dissent in the 1670's, but the opposite was true before 1669. The only cases of violence, for example, involved a woman who interrupted the minister of Houston with shouting "in the tyme of devyne service" and a man who interrupted the minister of "Kilbarchine" by "casting snow balls into the church" during "divine service upon a wiek day." There were a few other "disorders" in Paisley--the minister of Kilmalcolm complained about six people in his parish in March of 1666 because they refused "to come to ordinances," and the minister of Renfrew referred a woman to the presbytery in April of 1666 because she was guilty of "constant obstinacie and disobedience" to "the present church government"--but conventicles were apparently quite rare in the Paisley area in the early years. On June 14, 1666, the presbytery expressed some suspicions that "Mr. Adam Getty" had been keeping

"conventicles" in the family of the "laird of Greenock," but three weeks later it was reported that Getty had gone to Ireland. On December 20, 1666, steps were taken "for trying the truth" of a rumor of "a conventicle" in "the parochie of Kilmacolm about five weeks ago," but the presbytery reported on February 28, 1667 that a search had produced inconclusive results. This low level of conventicling activity would continue, and the presbytery could record in their register on April 21, 1667 that "anent conventicles, enquiry being made, ther was none known to the brethren within their bounds." The presbytery was also able to add, in a June 27, 1667 entry in their register "anent outed ministers," that "none within any of the paroches carry themselves disorderly."¹⁴

In the presbytery of Jedburgh and Peebles, two other presbyteries in the archdiocese of Glasgow,¹⁵ the pattern was similar. In Jedburgh presbytery, a laird named Sir William Douglas of Cavers tried to sponser small "privat" house conventicles in 1665 and 1666 in the "paroch of Cavers," and in these meetings there was some "preaching and baptizing in privat, it not being knowen by quhom," but these conventicles were apparently only a form of illegal family worship, and they were not impressive in terms of size. As for field conventicles, Jedburgh would experience no such meetings until the 1670's. In Peebles presbytery, meanwhile, the nonconformist situation was even bleaker, and on March 22, 1666 the ministers of Peebles, in a letter to the archbishop of Glasgow, declared that they had "no ... conventicles at all." Some time later, in

an answer to an April 25, 1667 letter of the archbishop regarding the "slighter of ordinances as were within ther bounds," the "brethren" replied "that they knew of non, only the minister of Mannor reported that ther wer som within his paroch who dishaunted the church, and also it wes reported that ther wer severall in the congregation of Peebles who constantly absented themselves from that church...."¹⁶ Needless to say, this level of dissenting activity was hardly impressive.

Given the lackluster condition of nonconformity in the presbyterian strongholds in the southwest and west, it should come as no surprise that a similar state of affairs prevailed in the rest of Scotland. In the north, the situation was especially grim, and one northern curate could boast that in the early years even the "presbyterians united with us" and "frequented churches and ordinances without distinction or objection," and he added that "James Fraser of Brey" (a man who would become one of Scotland's most active nonconformist ministers in the 1670's) was one of those who "lived in my own parish at Moniak" and "heard and wrot my sermons."¹⁷ There were, it is true, a few house conventicles in the northern diocese of Moray organized by Thomas Hog, John M'Gilligen, and Thomas Urquhart, but these were "obscure" meetings held in "private" places,¹⁸ and their importance should not be overestimated. Outside Moray, moreover, even the "obscure" conventicles were virtually unknown in the north, and thus on January 23, 1667, when the ministers in the presbytery of Perth made an attempt "to try if there were any private conventicles

"kept" within their bounds, they could report that "they had tried and heard of none."¹⁹

In the east, the situation was likewise disappointing. The presbytery of Linlithgow, which had been a center of Protester activity in the 1650's, was perhaps the staunchest presbyterian district in eastern Scotland, but in the early 1660's it was clearly not a hotbed of dissent. There was some dissatisfaction with the new establishment in the Linlithgow region--on March 18, 1663 one man in the presbytery was delated for putting "on his bonat at the singing of the doxologie"--but conventicles were few and far between. In October of 1662, it was reported that one "Mr. John Givan" was preaching in "several kirks" in the presbytery even though he was "authorized to preach by no approvin judicatorie of the churche," but, by June 3, 1663, "Givan" had promised to "conferr" with the moderator "anent the satisfaction he was to give to the presbyterie for these faults they had charged him with." On April 23, 1663, the members of the presbytery complained "that certane strangers" were taking it upon themselves "without any warrand" "to preach within thir bounds, as particularlie in Queinsferrie," but, on June 3, 1663, "one of the Baillies of the fferrie ... acknowledged that he had bein so far mistaken as to imploy some persons to preach in that church guhen the law did not allow, being induced therto by the solicitations of some of ther burges and the declaration of the men themselves which he trusting was deceived." This same baillie "undertook for the future to suffer none to preach ther but such as were recommended by the

bishop or the presbyterie." And finally, on September 20, 1665, in the last reference to an illegal meeting for worship in the Linlithgow presbytery register before 1668, the "brethren" appointed two of their number "to speak to Mr. John Lawder , a silenced minister dwelling in the paroch of Linlithgow quho it is alleged keeps conventicles upon the Sabbath day." There is no more information in the register on the matter, but Lauder apparently gave up "preaching" and took up teaching instead, for the presbytery complained on November 27, 1667 that he was instructing children "without warrand."²⁰

Clearly, in all areas nonconformity lacked vitality at first. In the period under discussion, it is true, some of the bolder dissenters did stage the so-called Pentland Rising on behalf of their covenanting faith, but even this was a relatively minor affair.²¹ The rebels involved "were concurred with and countenanced by few"²² in Scotland, and when they met the royal forces on Rullion Green the presbyterian "army" was only several hundred strong. The whole episode, which one contemporary called "a rabble of private country clowns,"²³ scarcely deserves to be called a "rebellion," for a "riot" by the "crafts youths" of Edinburgh some years later involved between 2000 and 3000 young men and lasted several days.²⁴ It is significant that the "crafts youths," who rioted after they had been excluded from a "yearly parade," could generate more emotion than the Pentland Rising.

Why was nonconformity in such a lethargic state in the early 1660's? The unpopularity of the covenants, after years of

turmoil, in part explains the initial weakness of dissent, but it was not the only factor at work. Seventeenth century Scots had an aversion to schism, and they hesitated to separate from an established church, even when they disagreed with its doctrines and policies. Thus Brodie of Brodie, a prominent presbyterian layman, initially conformed to prelacy, and he justified his behavior in the following entry in his diary:

I did see the bishop of Murray, and with reluctancie I proffest that the change was against my will, but God having suffered it to be brought about, and the king and his laws having established it, I was purposed to be submissive and obedient and peaceable as anie.²⁵

Interestingly, this aversion to schism was so strong that for some years even many of the "outed" ministers refused to boycott the sermons of the "curates." Thus John Brown, a presbyterian observer, noted that "at first," not a few ministers were in the dark, as to the question of hearing the curates, and upon one ground or other, did not perceive, that people were called of God to withdraw from the obtruded hirelings."²⁶ Robert Douglas, an "outed" minister, was one of those who initially "heard" the curates, and in the early period he defended his action unabashedly:

I shall deliver my mind freely. I have been, and am for hearing so long as the ordinances are kept pure; for as I am against prelacy, I am against separation from a kirk.²⁷

And Douglas was not unique. On May 9, 1667, the presbytery of Paisley referred to some ministers "outed by law" who were willing to "frequent publick ordinances," and a short time later Alexander Strang, the deposed minister of Durisdeer, told the Privy Council that he "waited on the ordinances in the parish

where he lived. Other examples could be provided; indeed, Walter Smith, a presbyterian observer, wrote:

upon the issuing of that sacrilegious act of Glasgow, when 600 of the ministers had complied with that detestable prelacy, the rest slipped from their kirks, as if they had not been obliged to obey God rather than man; and the greater part of them not only left their flock to be destroyed by hireling wolves, but also went and heard the curates themselves, and persuaded the people to follow their base and bad example.

Alexander Shields, another presbyterian writer, told roughly the same story. Shields noted that after the depositions the "generality of ministers" outed by law "went and conformed to hear curates," and he also noted, in a pamphlet written with James Renwick, that "the most part" of the deposed "ministers" "did countenance prelacy, in hearing of hyreling intruders: yea, as if not testimony had been required in this point, very few continued preaching the gospel, as if they had opportunity."²⁹

Needless to say, with so many of the outed ministers "hearing" the sermons of the curates and attending the services of the established church, it is clear that the fortunes of presbyterianism were indeed low in the early 1660's. Yet, in spite of its initial weakness, dissent would experience a dramatic increase in strength by the end of the decade. Scruples over "separation from a kirk" would begin to lose their hold by the end of the 1660's, and thousands of Scots would abandon the establishment and rally around the nonconformist banner. This next period, nonconformity's "golden age," would begin in roughly 1668 and would last until the violent insurrection in 1679. The eleven years between 1668 and 1679, which are some of the most interesting in Scottish history, will

be the subject of the next chapter.

Notes

¹Lang, A History of Scotland, III:302ff.

²Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland; Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, pp. 437, 484; Sir James Turner, Memoirs of His Own Life and Times (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1829), p. 139; Brodie, Diary, p. 297; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I: 363-369; Lauderdale Papers, I:221.

³See Andrew Symson, "a Large Description of Galloway" and "Tripatriarchichon." Both works are printed in Mackenzie, The History of Galloway from the Earliest Period to the Present Time, II:212ff.

⁴Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets, p. 19; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 221; Renwick and Shields, An Informatory Vindication of a ... Remnant of the ... Church of Christ in Scotland; Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 132; Alexander Peden, "Sermon at Glenluce," quoted in Lang, A History of Scotland, III:304,

⁵Gabriel Semple was the first minister to preach at a field conventicle. After his deposition from Kirkpatrick-Durham, Semple went to live with the laird of Corsack, a devoted presbyterian who also sheltered John Welsh. Initially, Semple preached in Corsack's house, but within a month he was preaching in the fields nearby. Wodrow wrote that the large number of "hearers" made the move to the fields necessary, but contemporaries told a different story. The author of one presbyterian manuscript wrote that "field preaching was the result not of free choice but of the constraint of invincible necessitie," for there was "no where so saiff to meet as in the fields, where trouble and disturbance may be best evited." William Violant, another observer, also wrote that "it was necessity that put prudent ministers and Christians to the fields and mountains because they were there the most free of hazard," and John Brown, still another presbyterian writer, had the same opinion. The "faithful ministers and people," Brown wrote, found "so many and so great difficulties, in their assembling in houses, where they were so easily attraped, and could with so great hazzard meet, and with much difficulty, escape the hands of the soldiers," that they "were constrained at last to keep their meetings in the fields, tho' without all shelter from the cold, wind, snow, and rain." See Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:267; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio LX, no. 99, "Paper from Meeting at Beath Hill"; William Violant, A Review and Examination of a Book Bearing the Title of the History of the Indulgence ... To Which Is Added a Survey of the Mischievous Absurdities of the Late Bond, and Sanguahar Declaration (N.P., N.D.), p. 124; Brown, History of the Indulgence, p. 133.

Regarding the official definition of a field conventicle, see Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 80.

⁷See Gabriel Sempil, "Life of Gabriel Sempil." The work is printed in Thomas McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, pp. 380ff.

⁸The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671, November 1665, April 1666; Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto XCVII, "Blackadder Memoirs"; McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, p. 380; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 178.

⁹"Glasgow Synod Acts," in "Jedburgh Presbytery Register," October 1663, April 1664.

¹⁰Michael Bruce was one of the most active nonconformist ministers in the early post-Restoration period. His conventicling career was cut short, however, for he was wounded by soldiers in 1668 and sent back to his native Ireland. See Wodrow, the History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:111; Lauderdale Papers, II:107, II:121.

¹¹Joseph Irving, The History of Dumbartonshire (Dumbarton, 1840), p. 210; James Hill and William Motherwell, eds., Memorabilia of the City of Glasgow, Selected from the Minute Books of the Burgh, 1588-1750 (Glasgow, 1835); "Cambuslang Kirk Session Register" ; "Rutherglen Kirk Session Register," December 11, 1664; Selections from the Register of the Presbytery of Lanark, 1623-1709, p. 107; Robertson, Lanark: The Burgh and Its Councils, 1469-1880, p. 99; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, III:323.

¹²"Impious" behavior in the church was not uncommon in the seventeenth century, and a March 4, 1660 entry from the Canisbay kirk session register illustrates this fact: "Item: John Geddes, younger, in Mey, ordained to be charged for snuffing in tyme of singing of ye psalms in praise of God." See Craven, A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness.

¹³"Rutherglen Kirk Session Register," October 1, 1663, December 11, 1664, April 3, 1664.

¹⁴"Paisley Presbytery Register," November 2, 1665, February 19, 1665, March 22, 1666, April 5, 1666, June 14, 1666, August 9, 1666, September 20, 1666, December 20, 1666, February 25, 1667, April 21, 1667, June 27, 1667.

¹⁵Conventicles were also few in number in the presbytery of Ayr, but their proliferation there was ironically retarded by the large number of nonconformist ministers legally preaching in the region. By coincidence, ten of the thirty parishes in Ayr presbytery retained their "presbyterian"

ministers during the 1662-1663 depositions because of a loophole in the law (any minister admitted to his charge before 1649 did not have to seek presentation from a patron and collation from a bishop), and the presence of so many dissenting "preachers" in the bounds made "illegal" meetings by and large unnecessary.

¹⁶"Jedburgh Presbytery Register," October 11, 1665, May 9, 1666, July 18, 1666; "Peebles Presbytery Register," March 22, 1666, April 25, 1667.

¹⁷Fraser, Chronicles of the Frasers, pp. 463-464.

¹⁸Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, July 30, 1668; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:38; Thomas McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, pp. 187, 238; Robert Wodrow, Analecta, ed. Matthew Leishman, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1842-1843), II:162-171.

¹⁹"Perth Presbytery Register," January 23, 1667.

²⁰"Linlithgow Presbytery Register," March 18, 1663, October 1662, April 1, 1663, June 3, 1663, December 23, 1663, January 20, 1664, September 20, 1665, November 27, 1667.

²¹See Colonel James Wallace, "Narrative of the Rising Suppressed at Pentland," in McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves (Edinburgh, 1825), pp. 391ff; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 138; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 232; Turner, Memoirs of His Own Life and Times, pp. 169ff; C. S. Terry, The Pentland Rising and Rullion Green (Glasgow, 1905).

²²See Renwick and Shields, An Informatory Vindication of a ... Remnant of the ... Church of Christ in Scotland, p. 6. See also Colonel James Wallace, "Narrative of the Rising Suppressed at Pentland," in McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, pp. 425ff. Wallace confirmed that the rebellion was relatively unpopular, and he noted that after Rullion Green the people of the "Lothians" "killed severalls" of the rebels and took many prisoners. In addition, Wallace testified that when the captured rebels were brought into Edinburgh "their hearts" were "broken with the reproaches and blasphemies" which the "jeering" people of the city "spued out" against them.

²³Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, II:39.

²⁴Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 1665 to 1680, ed. Marguerite Wood (Edinburgh, 1950), p. XXI.

²⁵Brodie, Diary, pp. 254-255.

26

Brown, History of the Indulgence, p. 326.

27Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto LXIII, Douglas, "A Brief Narration of the Coming of Prelacy again within This Kirk," p. 20.

28Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, II:312; "Paisley Presbytery Register," May 9, 1667.

29Walter Smith, "A Brief Rehearsal of Some Few of the Many Steps of Our Defecctions," in Patrick Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, II:73; Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 132; Renwick and Shields, An Informatory Vindication of a ... Remnant of the ... Church of Christ in Scotland.

Chapter X

Presbyterian Dissent: 1668-1679

Nonconformity, in spite of its initial weakness, would experience a dramatic increase in strength by the end of the 1660's. The beginning of this next period, nonconformity's era of great accomplishments, is difficult to date, but 1668 seems to have been a key year. In July of 1668, a presbyterian zealot named James Mitchell tried to assassinate Archbishop Sharp in Edinburgh,¹ and this attempted assassination indirectly contributed to the change. The shooting caused the authorities to make a thorough search in the city for dissenters, and "this," according to William Row, "occasioned all the outed ministers, and many professors, that lurked in Edinburgh to leave town."² Among those who left were the conventicle ministers from Galloway and Nithsdale who had been hiding in Edinburgh ever since fleeing from Sir James Turner and his troops in 1666.³ These ministers had been unable to hold large conventicles while in the capital, but when they went to the localities they became more active. Great field conventicles began to appear as a consequence, and among the areas affected were Linlithgowshire and "Stirlingshire" where, to use John Blackadder's term, huge meetings "broke" out in 1668.⁴

If the year 1668 was good for presbyterians, the year 1669 was even better. In July of 1669, the government, under the influence of the earl of Lauderdale, the earl of Tweeddale,

the earl of Kincardine, and Sir Robert Moray (four "moderate" politicians who had little enthusiasm for prelacy), issued an "indulgence" which placed parishes and stipends in the hands of forty-three of the nonconformist ministers previously "outed" in 1662.⁵ In theory, the government had two main reasons for its action. First, empty pulpits had been a serious problem since the massive depositions in 1662,⁶ and the indulgence, it was hoped, would rectify this. Secondly, the government believed that the indulgence would keep the country peaceable by helping to contain dissent. It was hoped that what conventicling there was would be curtailed if certain nonconformists were "fixed" to specific parishes.⁷

The government's scheme did fill vacant parishes, but it manifestly failed to "contain" dissent. To the contrary, it did the exact opposite, and there was, to quote one contemporary, "much more preaching" in conventicles "since the indulgence than before."⁸ The indulgence fostered dissent because "the favour shewed" to the indulged ministers was interpreted as a softening of the government's position on presbyterianism, and this "encouraged" "several" non-indulged" ministers "to adventure to preach more and more publicly than they had done before."⁹ The indulgence, moreover, also fostered the spread of dissent because most of the indulged ministers were placed in parishes in the west and southwest (Paisley presbytery, to cite one example, would eventually have seven of its fifteen charges filled with indulged ministers¹⁰), and the conventicle ministers reacted by moving from the presbyterian "heartland"

(their main base of operations in the 1660's) to relatively "untilled" areas in the east and north (Fife, for example).¹¹ And finally, the indulgence also helped spread dissent because the indulged ministers themselves acted with "faithfulness and freedom," and they used their pulpits to attack the established church. Several of these indulged ministers were especially zealous men--John Spalding, indulged at Dreghorn, had been arrested for preaching at conventicles shortly before his "indulgence"; Alexander Wedderburn, indulged at Kilmarnock, had been prosecuted for nonconformity by the High Commission Court in 1664; and Thomas Wyllie, indulged at Fenwick, had been a Protester in the 1650's and a ringleader at Mauchline Moor¹²--and these men and others like them quickly became a disruptive influence on the established church. In theory, the indulged ministers labored under certain restrictions, and they were supposed to confine themselves to their respective parishes and limit their ministrations to their respective congregations. In reality, however, the indulged ministers opened their churches to all who would come, and some of them, such as Patrick Anderson, indulged at Longdreghorn, and John Osburne, indulged at Dundonald, even preached at conventicles outside their parishes.¹³ Other irregularities also occurred, and thus Robert Eliot, indulged in Peeblesshire, allowed two "conventicle" preachers, named Selkirk and Russell, to use his pulpit, and Eliot also "deposed elders out of his session" for supporting the royal forces.¹⁴ Needless to say, the curates were disturbed by such activities. The curate of Houston

complained that "the multitude of indulged ministers ... about him have drained his church totaly of hearers,"¹⁵ and some other curates, in a letter to the archbishop of St. Andrews, actually asserted that the "indulgit ministers" were the most troublesome species of nonconformist. The curates declared that the "indulgit ministers must be straitened of ther libertie and some greater ty laide upon them, or they absolutlie laid asyde, for lett people say what they will, most ... disorders flow from" the "indulgit ministers."¹⁶

The indulgence was clearly a boon to presbyterianism. The church records provide ample support for this statement. Consider, for example, the case of Paisley presbytery. Paisley presbytery was still conformist as late as 1668 when, during routine visitations, the minister of Inverkip could declare that his people "were very orderlie" and the minister of Kilbarchan could acknowledge "his encouragement from his elders and people in the work of the ministry." In the same period, other ministers in the bounds made similar reports. But things changed rapidly after the 1669 indulgence, and soon the curates were reporting serious problems. To be specific, by August 18, 1669 several of the ministers were complaining that their "people did totally desert the ordinances and not convene at the place of public worship upon the Lord's Day." Subsequent entries elucidate this statement, and it is clear that the main areas of "trouble" were Mearns, where "the people did much withdraw from hearing and baptizing"; Houston, where the kirk was "very ill kept"; and Killellan, where the curate reported on

May 13, 1670 "that the ordinances were generally dishaunted by his people since September last,... before that time the people being orderlie."¹⁷ The records indicate that at Killellan and elsewhere the people were either going to hear indulged ministers preach or they were going to hear the conventicle ministers (such as James Wallace) who had suddenly become active in the bounds.¹⁸

The first indulgence was, as far as the established church was concerned, a total disaster. The lesson should have been clear: any "mild" measure adopted by the government would encourage the presbyterian ministers and people to "lift up their heads."¹⁹ But the government did not learn its lesson, and before long it bestowed two more "favours" on the noconformists: a second indulgence, promulgated in 1672,²⁰ which brought the number of nonconformist ministers preaching in parish churches to about eighty, and an indemnity, announced in 1674, which discharged all the fines and penalties for conventicling imposed on individuals before the date of the proclamation.²¹ Like the first indulgence, the second indulgence and the indemnity provided impetus to nonconformity and inflicted serious damage on the established church. Indeed, considering the harm they did, there was certainly little justification for either the second indulgence or the indemnity. The former, by and large, was simply a continuation of the wrongheaded policy (wrongheaded as far as the established church was concerned) of 1669.²² As for the latter, the indemnity was really a product of political considerations.

Lauderdale, the king's chief minister, was being assailed by the duke of Hamilton's "party" in 1674, and the indemnity was apparently granted to broaden Lauderdale's base of support.²³

Whatever the reasons for the second indulgence and the indemnity, it is certain that they, along with the first indulgence, helped stimulate the presbyterian revival that gripped Scotland in the 1670's. This revival would last until the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion in 1679, and it would make the 1670's Scotland's golden age of nonconformity. There were two signs of this revival. First, the presbyterians, in the words of one hostile critic, began to keep "classical meetings where they ordained ignorant and factious striplings."²⁴ The decision of the nonconformists to ordain new men was an important step, for it insured that presbyterianism would survive the generation. Thomas Hog, a deposed minister from Moray, apparently was the organizer of the first nonconformist "laying on of hands," and James Fraser of Brey was the man ordained. Many other ordinations would follow, and men like Archibald Riddell, Michael Potter, John King, George Barclay, Robert Trail, Alexander Shields, and Thomas Archer were brought into the ranks of the nonconformist ministers. Many of these "illegal" ordinations were performed in Scotland, but some were performed by exiled Scots in Holland, England, and Ireland.²⁵

The second and most obvious sign of the revival in the 1670's was the spread of conventicles. In the west and southwest, the presbyterian heartland, conventicles would become almost ubiquitous by 1674. In Glasgow, by 1674 "one Simon

Pickerscall" had "disposed" of his "howse" in the "forme of a church" for "ane numerous conventickell wher ther wes publick colections and all the ordinary marks of ther contempt to king's authority." In Rutherglen, by 1674-1675 the kirk session was reporting "conventicles" "keepe" at "little Govan," "Langsyde," and "Casteltowne" by "Master Andrew Motoune" and "John Dicksone, late minister of Rutherglen," and the same session was also delating parishioners for "scandalous speeches" "against the bishops," the "present ministrie," and the "present church government." In the presbytery of Peebles, "a place" that had "bein so peaceable all this while" that "conventicles" and "disorders contrair to the lawes of this kingdom" had "bein scarcely named among them," the curates were also reporting serious problems by mid-decade.²⁶ To be specific, the following entry was made in the Peebles register under May 27, 1674:

the presbyterie (being certainlie in formed of severall disorderlie conventicles keipit within this shire viz: on kept within the house of Glen Cranstoun in the paroch of Trequair be Mr. George Johnston upon the tenth of mai last and another be Mr. Thomas Hogge in the same house upon the seventeenth of May thereafter, and again be the said Mr. Thomas the next day in the towne of Peblis in the house of Alexander Watson , scholedocter of Peblis: as also the fourth holden in Skirling upon the 25 day of the same moneth by Mr. Patrick Reed) did judge themselves concerned....²⁷

That the west and southwest should eventually show so much presbyterian activity is perhaps no surprise, but the same thing was happening in the east in the 1670's. To cite some examples, by 1674 the synod of the archdiocese of St. Andrews (which had been relatively placid in the 1660's) was complaining of "the many disorders under which the church, particularly in

this diocese, doth sadly labor," and there was even a conventicle in the town of St. Andrews itself, "close by the prelate's house."²⁸ In the diocese of of Edinburgh,²⁹ meanwhile, "betwixt fifty and three score outed ministers" were actually able to hold a meeting concerning conventicles in the capital itself (the government only learned about this illegal convocation because Alexander Forrester, the clerk of the meeting, had a copy of the minutes in his pocket when he was later arrested for conventicling),³⁰ and presbyteries like Linlithgow were forced to report a vast amount of nonconformist activity. To be specific, on January 7, 1674 the curates of Linlithgow presbytery informed their bishop of "severall disorderlie and seditious conventicles held in fields within ye bounds of ye exercise" in "ye paroches of Linlithgow, Fakirk, Tophichen, Bathgate, Livistone, Slamane, Carridin, Moravinside and Midcalder," and on June 2, 1674 the same curates complained about "ye many discouragements and seeming ruin of their ministry in their severall stationes," and they added that their "condition" was becoming "worse and worse."³¹

Both house and field conventicles were proliferating in the 1670's, but the most significant development was the spread of the latter. "Privat" or house conventicles were important in the struggle against prelacy, but they were small in size, and not without reason did Alexander Shields dismiss such meetings as preaching "quietly in ladies' chambers."³² But there was, needless to say, nothing timid or small about field conventicles. These were bold and enormous convocations,³³

and sometimes thousands of people would brave "cold, wind, snow, and rain"³⁴ to hear the nonconformist preachers send--as one wit quipped--"the king, the ministers of state, the officers of the army, with all their soldiers, and the episcopal clergy, all broadside to hell."³⁵ John Blackadder, himself a field preacher, chronicled the dramatic spread of field conventicles in a useful letter dated February 21, 1679, and this letter can be supplemented from other sources.³⁶ "Field meetings," it seems, "broke out" in "East Lothian" and the areas "about Lanark, Lesmahago, and Tintock" by 1674, and they were being held in the fields of "Tiviotdale and Merse" by 1675. Also in 1675 there was a great revival in Galloway and Nithsdale as field conventicles "appeared" in those regions with "more success than ever before," and by "August and September 1676" "great meetings" were "very publick around Glasgow, the Nether Ward of Clydesdale, and towards Renfrew and the West Country." Field meetings began "in Tweeddale about June 1677,"³⁷ and by the end of 1677 "poor Annandale" had been "visited with public preaching" in the fields. In the "spring of 1678" field meetings began around Dumbarton, and "great" "field conventicles" blossomed in "Perthshire" in April and May of 1678.³⁸ Finally, they began "among" the "ignorant People" "besouth Edinburgh" in January of 1679.

Field conventicles did not spread to every corner of Scotland³⁹--Wodrow himself noted that "there were no real field conventicles" north of Perthshire⁴⁰--but their growth was impressive nevertheless. That the government was alarmed by

this development is an understatement, but what actually happened at these "illegal assemblies"? One hostile contemporary^r, an observer named Gilbert Burnet, claimed that "in these separated meetings" there was "nothing ... to be had but a long preachment"--"church discipline" and the "Lord's Supper," he maintained, were ignored.⁴¹ Needless to say, a "long preachment" was certainly a part of every field conventicle. Some meetings lasted for days, and a succession of ministers would deliver one sermon after another to the assembled multitude. The content of these sermons varied from minister to minister. James Fraser of Brey, who was never involved in any insurrection against the government, preached "repentance" and "reformation," and he urged the people to seek deliverance by "spiritual means."⁴² Donald Cargill's sermons, on the other hand, were quite different, and he openly endorsed "rebellion"⁴³ at conventicles. Between these two extremes there was variety,⁴⁴ but a common theme was the sinfulness of prelacy. Thus, it was said of John Semple, a noted conventicler, that "his zeal was so great and flaming against bishops and their underlings that, wherever he was, and whoever were his hearers, great or small, he could never read and explain any portion of scripture, but he found bishops and their underlings, and something in it against them; even in the beginning of Genesis, the account of the whole creation, but not one word that God created bishops (as such), and from that he inferred that they were none of God's creatures."⁴⁵

Burnet's second observation, that the field preachers

ignored "discipline" at their conventicles, was less accurate. There was, it seems, an attempt to exercise discipline in some form. The formal machinery of the kirk session did not exist, but an attempt was made to encourage "hearers" to spontaneously confess their sins. Thus, a woman came forward at one of John Welsh's conventicles and confessed that she was a witch who had "covenanted herself to the devil," and a man came forward at at one of John Blackadder's field meetings to confess to a capital crime. Interestingly, an observer has left a detailed account of the latter episode. The capital offense is not identified, but the conversion experience is described in some detail. Blackadder, it seems, "was setting forth the miseries of those who had lost God forever" in one of his sermons, and this caused "a country man" to drop "down all of a sudden" and to roll "upon the ground" for "about half a minute." At length the man recovered some of his composure, and then he jumped to his feet and, with "hair all hanging about his eyes," he expressed joy at his conversion.⁴⁶ Obviously, from the above account it is clear that the field conventicles in some respects resembled the "revivals" and "camp meetings" of a later era.

Burnet's third observation, that the Lord's Supper was never celebrated⁴⁷ in the field conventicles, was only in part correct. The great field communions, where thousands gathered to receive the sacrament from outlawed ministers, have come to epitomize Scottish nonconformity in the popular mind, but in fact field communions were only held between 1677 and 1679. (Before 1677, it is true, there were some nonconformist

celebrations of the Lord's Supper--in July of 1676, for example, "a very solemn communion" took place "in the castle of Balvaird," and in 1675 John Campbell and John Blair celebrated a communion service "somewhere in the presbytery of Ayr"--but these celebrations took place in private conventicles.)⁴⁸

During this brief period between 1677 and 1679, however, "field communions" did flourish, and one of the most famous was held at East Nisbet. John Dickson, John Blackadder, John Welsh, Archibald Riddell, and John Rae were the ministers who participated in the East Nisbet communion, and the whole ceremony, which lasted three days, attracted thousands of people. During the night, most of the people attending the East Nisbet field communion stayed in nearby towns, but during the day the "faithful" gathered on the hillsides for preaching, prayer, and (on Sunday) the distribution of the bread and wine. Armed men, including seventy or eighty individuals on horseback, stood guard over proceedings. The nonconformists were especially vigilant during the east Nisbet conventicle, for a rumor was circulating that the earl of Hume, the leader of a detachment of soldiers, had threatened to give the communion wine to his horses.⁴⁹

Generally speaking, it is obvious that Gilbert Burnet had misrepresented the field conventicles, but that was a common practice in "conformist" circles. Indeed, the supporters of episcopacy slandered the "conventiclars" as a matter of course, and the nonconformists, no less than the curates, were the targets of inflammatory propaganda. Thus, the archbishop and

synod of Glasgow, in a libellous attack on the conventiclers, declared:

several horrid crimes are committed at conventicles, as incest, bestiality, murder of children, in the presbyteries of Ayr and Lanark, besides frequent adulteries, and other acts of wickedness, as our registers at length bear: particularly one who was apprehended, and confessed bestiality at Lanark, and was let go without any punishment.⁵⁰

George Hickes, an apologist for episcopacy, also accused the "conventiclers" of immorality. Hickes claimed that "nine parts in ten of the horrid sins, such as witchcraft, bestiality, and incest," were "found among" the conventiclers, and he claimed that "more bastards" were "born within their countrey, the western Holy land, than in all our nation besides."⁵¹ And Arthur Ross, a conformist minister in Glasgow, used his pulpit to (in the words of the presbyterians) "father all the scandals of the time on our party and their meeting."⁵²

According to the conformist party, lechery and greed were the most common vices of the "conventiclers." Regarding the first charge, a few supporters of conventicles were in fact guilty of sexual irregularities--Lauder of Fountainhall mentioned one "conventicler" who was "burnt for buggering mares about Melrose," and Lamont mentioned one man of "great profession" (the man attended "diverse conventicals") who was executed for incest, several adulteries, and bestiality with "mares and cows"⁵³--but most of the charges were distorted or false or ridiculous. It was said, for example, that John King, a field preacher, had seduced a maid of the "Lady Cardrosse," and it was also said that Thomas Rob, a "vagrant schismaticall

preacher," had "committed fornication in the parochie of Monkland," but both "libels" were probably groundless.⁵⁴ On the other hand, it was also said that David Williamson, a noted field preacher who would eventually marry seven wives, had "fornicated" with one Janet Kerr, and this story may have possessed some element of truth. Janet Kerr was the daughter of Lady Cherrytrees, a zealous presbyterian, and an embellished account of Williamson's "stumbling" soon became enshrined in "dainty Davie," a popular ballad. According to the embellished version, Lady Cherrytrees saved Williamson from some soldiers by hiding him in her daughter's bed, and Williamson took advantage of this "extraordinary call" and became "a man famous in his generation." Obviously, the poetic details cannot be true, but the idea that Williamson was guilty of some carnal irregularity was widely believed in Scotland (even by presbyterians), and Charles II himself was familiar with the story. Indeed, the "Merry Monarch" was impressed by the whole affair, and he confessed that "when he was in the Royal Oak, he could not have kissed the bonniest lass in Christendom."⁵⁵

After lechery, greed was supposedly the next most common nonconformist vice. The bishops and their supporters typically described the conventicling ministers as worldly men who used religion as a pretext to amass great fortunes. Thus, Robert Calder, the author of Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed, claimed that after the presbyterian ministers had been outed they "grew fat and lusty under their persecutions" because "some of the godly sisters"⁵⁶ began "supplying" the

deposed ministers "with plentiful gratuities to their families and mony to their purses," and the author of another pro-episcopal tract claimed that he "could name some, who, when removed from their places for nonconformity, had little or nothing, and yet purchased considerable estates under the pretended persecution."⁵⁷ To support the above charges, the critics of nonconformity usually mentioned the case of a field preacher named Johnston. Johnston, it was alleged, "died two thousand pounds sterling rich," even though he was not worth "forty or fifty pound when he left his charge."⁵⁸

It is true that nonconformist laymen could be generous to their ministers. Although the curates complained that "this people were generally backward to all contributions so that very little could be expected from them,"⁵⁹ this probably reflected more on the curates than the people. With the proper motivation, the Scots could be quite charitable (Lady Kilvarock gave a house to a nonconformist minister,⁶⁰ and the supporters of presbyterianism donated "400 dollars in private gifts" to James Mitchell in the period between his sentencing and execution⁶¹), and the typical conventicle minister could receive financial assistance in a variety of ways. One minister, for example, wrote that on one occasion a "servant man" sent by "a worthy and charitable lady" gave him "a horse-load of meal, cheese, and beef," and on another occasion a "sympathising" "stranger" in Edinburgh gave him "seven Scots ducatoons." In addition, money was also received from "Providence," and thus the presbyterians could tell the

following interesting tale about a minister named Henry Erskine:

Being at another time called to undertake a journey on foot, when he had nothing to bear his charges while he is upon his way, nature obliges him to step aside towards a bush of rushes. There, being about to fix the end of his staff in the marsh ground, the end of it tinkles upon a sum of money, being two half-crowns, which were very steadable to him all the time, and carried his charges home.⁶²

It was at the enormous field conventicles, however, that the really great sums could be received. It seems collections were organized in the fields, for Wodrow mentioned that John Welsh had a special assistant named Neilston to garner contributions. Needless to say, the donations of thousands of people could indeed be impressive, so it is not surprising that the hostile bishops circulated rumors that Welsh, one of the most successful "preachers," had a net worth of 40,000 merks. Yet, if a few field preachers did grow rich, it is clear that not all of them prospered. William Bell, a field preacher imprisoned in the Bass, actually had to supplicate the Privy Council for funds to sustain him in prison. Bell, it seems, was too poor to pay his own charges.⁶³

The accusations made against the nonconformists--the "lies" and "foul mouth'd vomits" "spued out" "against the presbyterians"⁶⁴--were virulent in the extreme, and the following poem, written by a curate in 1679, demonstrates this hostility in its most caustic form. The poem describes the "conventiclars" in unflattering terms:⁶⁵

They'r alwayes grumbling, cruel, furious,
Ill looking, spiteful, and malicious,
Blood-thirsty tigers, never pleas'd but when
They swill like leeches in the blood of men.
Their baptism they renounce, or do as much;
They need no devils, each of them is such;
For being baptized to the Trinitie,

They dare sit mute to the doxologie.
They dare not sing, what they dare say, like those
Despise in verse what they commend in prose;
They to their souls in consciencious care
Prefer their babbling to our Saviors prayer,
And take their grounds of fighting from the word,
Because our Savior said put up thy sword.⁶⁶

Such virulence, however, is itself significant. As the 1670's progressed, the criticism of "conventicling" "ministers and professors" became more and more hysterical in conformist circles, and that suggests that two developments were occurring in the decade to cause this hysteria: first, nonconformity was waxing stronger and stronger (a fact already discussed), and, secondly, the nonconformists were becoming more militant and were therefore becoming a greater threat to the establishment. The latter point, an important one, merits some examination.

Success, it seems, emboldened the dissenters, and encouraged militant behavior. Thus, as nonconformity waxed stronger and stronger in the 1670's, more and more dissenters became hard-liners on crucial issues. Consider, for example, the issue of "hearing" the curates. In the 1660's, the "presbyterians did not think it unlawful to hear ... ministers that had complied with episcopacy," and, "upon one ground or other, did not perceive, that people were called of God, to withdraw from the obtruded hirelings."⁶⁷ By the middle of the next decade, however, such moderation was dying. One man who changed his mind was James Fraser of Brea. In the early years, as we have seen, Fraser of Brea "heard and wrot" the sermons of a curate,⁶⁸ but Brea at length repudiated the practice, and in

the 1670's wrote a tract entitled "An Argument Showing That by the Covenant We Are Bound Not To Hear Conform Ministers."⁶⁹ Many others adopted similar opinions, and "hearing the curates" came to be regarded "as unlawful as fornication, adultery" and the "worshipping of the calves of Dan and Bethel." The curates, or so many dissenters came to believe, were not the ministers of God at all, but the priests of "Baal" who baptized with "the mark of the beast." The Memoirs of George Brysson, a noted nonconformist layman, demonstrate the inflexibility of the 1670's. The following extract describes events which occurred in roughly 1674. The local curate, wrote Brysson,

went to an honest man who had an house of me and said, Andrew, your master is a strange man; he comes never to my kirk and it seems ye are following his example, for ye have let me go also. Ye should not follow after a daft young lad, for ye have been my constant hearer of a long time, and I hope ye will not leave me now." He [Brysson's renter] said, I bless God that ever he took me alongst in his company, for I never profited by the gospel till then." He [the curate] said, "Andrew, seeing you think ye profit more by hearing these ministers than by me, I shall allow you to go sometimes to hear them; but ye must give me your your hand that ye will come sometimes to me." Andrew said, "I remember a scripture that says, 'How long will ye halt between two opinions? He that is for God, let him be for God, and he that is for Baal, let him be for Baal; for I resolve no more to be your hearer.'" So they parted.⁷⁰

During the 1670's, many dissenters also became hard-liners on the issue of erastianism. Presbyterians had been anti-erastian since the sixteenth century and would never brook state interference in church affairs, but in the 1670's many presbyterians began to take their anti-erastianism to great lengths. As a result of this development, the indulgences became a focus of controversy in the decade. The indulgences could be seen as a grievance, for by unilaterally placing

ministers in parish churches and attempting to restrict the freedom of those ministers, the state, with its indulgence policy, was technically encroaching on the rights and privileges of the church. Since an indulgence benefited nonconformity, however, at first there were really no vocal complaints, and when the first indulgence was promulgated in 1669 virtually none of the "reverend brethren" nominated in the scheme declined the favor because of a "difference of apprehension."⁷¹ But the situation, it is clear, would change dramatically by 1672. Nonconformity had become stronger and more confident by the latter date, and many dissenters had reached the conclusion that it was wrong to compromise their anti-erastian principles on the grounds of expediency. And so, when the government offered a second indulgence in 1672 to an additional ninety ministers, on this occasion some fifty individuals, citing religious scruples, refused to accept.⁷² Matters did not stop there. Soon some dissenters were becoming even more inflexible, and they began to denounce not only the indulgence itself, but also the nonconformist ministers who had taken pulpits under the scheme in 1669 and 1672. These critics, to quote one contemporary, "rail'd against" the indulged ministers, "called them Council curates, and separated from them."⁷³ A man named John Kid became the first presbyterian minister to publically urge the people to boycott the sermons of the indulged ministers,⁷⁴ and eventually one writer could list forty reasons why indulged ministers should not be "heard" by pious Christians.⁷⁵

Still a third indication of the increasingly militant

behavior of some dissenters in the 1670's was their growing willingness to use force.⁷⁶ Conventicles in the 1660's had been generally unarmed, and the chief defense in that period was flight.⁷⁷ In the 1670's, in contrast, many "conventiclers" began to carry weapons to defend themselves from government harassment. The famous "Beath-hill" conventicle, which was held near Dunfermline in 1670, was one of the first "armed conventicles,"⁷⁸ and soon "armed conventicles" (which resembled "rendezvouses of the Lord's militia")⁷⁹ became the norm. Needless to say, once the nonconformists began to carry weapons, it was only a matter of time before they and the king's men came to blows. Fortunately, at first the conflicts were quite restrained, and were characterized by bluster more than bloodshed. In 1674, for example, the "prelate's wife" in St. Andrews sent the militia to disperse a conventicle on the Kinkel estate, and, although the men marched with "muskets, lighted matches, and pikes, in warlike order," this procedure was in fact all for show, for the whole body withdrew when "Mr. Welsh" and the laird of Kinkel's brother "ran at" the "rogues."⁸⁰ But such comic encounters could not go on forever, and eventually the conflicts became more serious. In March of 1675, there occurred the first real case of fighting between conventiclers and troops,⁸¹ and not long after, in the shire of Kinross, soldiers opened fire on a conventicle meeting on a hill after "men and women" at the meeting assaulted them. In May of 1678, one soldier was killed when some troops attacked a conventicle above Whitekirk, and in 1679 the violence escalated

rapidly. The Town-Major of Edinburgh and his subordinates suffered casualties when they tried to disperse a house conventicle in the heart of the capital; seven men from the Earl of Hume's regiment were attacked by people using "forks and the like"; two soldiers quartered on a nonconformist household were murdered in the night⁸²; James Sharp, the archbishop of St. Andrews, was assassinated⁸³; Graham of Claverhouse and his men were defeated at Drumclog; and finally, the violence culminated in the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion in June of 1679, nonconformity's most impressive display of force. At one time the Bothwell Bridge rebels had at least 8000 men in the field, and they even managed to seize Glasgow itself, where they rifled the archbishop's house (the "arch-prelate" had fled) and made a "miserable havoc." In the end, however, it was all in vain, for the superior resources were on the side of the king. And, sure enough, the rebels were defeated by a much larger royal army on June 20, 1679.⁸⁴

The aborted insurrection, as it turned out, was a true watershed in nonconformist history. It marked the end of dissent's second period, the time of vitality, and the beginning of the third period, the time of decline. The change was indeed dramatic. On the eve of the rebellion one presbyterian could boast (with some exaggeration) that "the presbyterians" were "the pluralitie by far in the land,"⁸⁵ but after the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion dissent became weaker, and its condition became "lamentably sad."⁸⁶ The decay of dissent in the post-Bothwell Bridge era, and the role of the presbyterian militants or

radicals in that process, will be the subjects of the next chapter.

Notes

¹Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 115, "Letter on James Mitchell." See also George Hickes, Ravillac Redivivus: Being a Narrative of the Late Tryal of Mr. James Mitchel ... To Which Is Annexed an Account of the Tryal of ... Major Thomas Weir (London, 1682).

²Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, pp. 516, 519-520.

³Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, pp. 178ff; "Life of Gabriel Sempil," in McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, p. 381; Lauderdale Papers, II:121.

⁴Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 178ff; Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto XCVII, "Blackadder Memoirs."

⁵Brown, History of the Indulgence; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:131; Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 73; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae.

⁶Although empty pulpits were indeed a problem, the government ironically placed an indulged minister in the parish of Queensferry even though a conformist minister named David Knight was available. See "Linlithgow Presbytery Register," June 9, 1669; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, III:125.

⁷Violant, A Review and Examination of a Book Bearing the Title of the History of the Indulgence ... To Which Is Added a Survey of the Mischievous Absurdities of the Late Bond, and Sanquhar Declaration, p. 149.

⁸Ibid., p. 219.

⁹See ibid., pp. 238, 275. It is certain that the indulgence multiplied conventicles. By the close of 1669, for example, Dunblane synod was reporting its first "private conventicle" and Fife was experiencing its first field conventicle. See Register of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane, 1662-1688, October 1669; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder p. 179.

¹⁰"Paisley Presbytery Register"; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae.

¹¹Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:131-133, 203-206; Violant, A Review and Examination of a Book Bearing the Title of the History of the Indulgence ... To Which Is Added a Survey of the Mischievous Absurdities of the Late Bond and Sanquhar Declaration, p. 219; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae; Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688.

Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XL, no. 69; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, III:88, 94, 105.

13Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:264; McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 263; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, III:35.

14"Peebles Presbytery Register," April 7, 1680.

15"Paisley Presbytery Register," August 10, 1681.

16Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXVII, no. 38, "Letter Sent from the Curates to the Archbishop of St. Andrews."

17"Paisley Presbytery Register," September 22, 1668, October 15, 1668, August 18, 1669, September 22, 1670, May 13, 1670, August 23, 1671.

18James Wallace began holding conventicles in Paisley Presbytery in the autumn of 1669. Some years later, on December 2, 1674, the presbytery was still complaining about the "constant conventicling" of Wallace. (See "Paisley Presbytery Register.")

19James Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, quoted in Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 1665 to 1680, p. 8. See also Lauderdale Papers, III:59, for the text of a letter from Lord Ross to Charles Maitland. In his letter Ross declared that "this I can ashewre you of, that the conventickells ryse and falls according as they ar punished or slighted, soe that those purpose a fwrther indulgence as the properest mean to qwiet the kingdom I am shewr are much mistaken in ther mishowrs."

20The second indulgence was not exactly the same as the first, for in 1672 an attempt was made to indulge nonconformists in pairs (two per parish).

21See Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 80; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, IV: 164.

22Interestingly, in 1672 the government again offered the indulgence to several "radicals," including a conventicler named John Rae (he was offered a pulpit in Cumbray) and Donald Cargill (he was offered a pulpit in Egglestam). See McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 263.

23See A True Narratative of the Proceedings of His Majesties Privy Council in Scotland, for Securing the Peace of that Kingdom (Edinburgh, 1678).

24See George Hickes, A Caveat against Fanaticks ... with a Relation of the Barbarous Murder of the Archbishop of St.

Andrews (London, 1717), p. 9. The government was alarmed by the nonconformist ordinations, and in June 1672 an act of parliament was passed "against unlawful ordinations." See Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:198.

²⁵Memoirs of Mrs. William Veitch, Mr. Thomas Hoq of Kiltearn, Mr. Henry Erskine, and Mr. John Carstares (Edinburgh, 1846), p. 108; Michael Shields, Faithful Contendings Displayed, ed. John Howie (Glasgow, 1780), p. 284; McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, pp. 205-206.

²⁶Lauderdale Papers, III:59; Hill and Motherwell, Memorabilia of the City of Glasqow, Selected from the Minute Books of the Burgh, 1588-1750, p. 297; "Rutherglen Kirk Session Register," September 13, 1674, October 11, 1674, February 28, 1675, March 14, 1675.

²⁷"Peebles Presbytery Register," May 27, 1674.

²⁸See "Synod Acts of the Archdiocese of St. Andrews" (in "Perth Presbytery Register, April 1674"); Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of Saint Andrews and Cupar, 1641-1698; Cricton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 179.

²⁹For information on dissent in the city of Edinburgh itself, see Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 1665 to 1690, p. XIV.

³⁰Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:355; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, February 8, 1677.

³¹"Linlithgow Presbytery Register, January 7, 1674, June 2, 1674.

³²Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 132.

³³Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 344; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, I:367; Hickes, A Caveat against Fanaticks ... with a Relation of the Barbarous Murder of the Archbishop of St. Andrews, p. 9. Hickes, it is interesting to note, mentioned one conventicle that attracted 7000 people.

³⁴Brown, History of the Indulgence, p. 133.

³⁵The Memoirs of Captain John Creichton from His Own Materials, Drawn up and Digested by Jonathan Swift (London, 1827), p. 72. See also Gilbert Burnet, A Vindication of the Authority, Constitution, and Laws of the Church and State of Scotland (Glasgow, 1673), p. 200.

³⁶Crichton, Memoirs of the Reverend John Blackadder,

pp. 178-181; Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto XCVII, "Blackadder Memoirs"; Law, Memorialls, pp. 97-98.

³⁷There is an interesting minute in the kirk session register of Tweedsmuir, a Tweeddale parish. On December 2, 1677, it was reported that there was no meeting of the kirk session because the elders were at conventicles. See Chambers, A History of Peeblesshire, p. 194.

³⁸See a September 24, 1678 letter by Bishop John Paterson for material on the Perthshire field conventicles (the most northerly of such meetings). The letter is printed in Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, II:174.

³⁹The presbytery of Caithness entered the following minute into their register under November 4, 1674:

The said day compeered the earl of Caithness as ane of his Majesties Honorable Privy Council, and by veirtue of ane commission granted to his Lordship by the said honorable Councill, enquired if there was any conventicles kept within the presbytery and shire of Caithness, and the brethren of the presbyterie showed his lordship there was none, neither do they fear any to be, for quilk they blessed God.

See Craven, A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness.

⁴⁰Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:38.

⁴¹Burnet, A Vindication of the Authority, Constitutions, and Laws of the Church and State of Scotland, p. 200.

⁴²Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:272.

⁴³Donald Cargill, Torwood Excommunication, Being the Lecture and Discourse Going before, and the Afternoon Sermon Following after; with the Action of the Excommunication Itself, Pronounced at Torwood, September, 1680 (N.P., 1741).

⁴⁴It was reported that a field preacher named Thomas Hog "spent near a whole sermon" saying that a man "should choose rather to rott and die in prison" rather than pay a "fyne" imposed for nonconformity. See Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 213, "An Account of the Proceedings of the Brethren at Edinburgh with Mr. Richard Cameron, Mr. John Kid, and Mr. Thomas Hog."

⁴⁵Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, I:198.

⁴⁶Crichton, Memoirs of the Reverend John Blackadder, pp. 180-181.

⁴⁷Generally speaking, the eucharist was not celebrated very often in Scotland. In the parish of Glen Urquhart, for example, there were no celebrations of the Lord's Supper during the entire incumbency of one minister, from 1647 to 1671. See Records of the Presbyteries of Inverness and Dingwall, 1643-1648, p. XXI.

⁴⁸Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 143, "An Account of the Suffering of the People in Kinross Shire"; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio LIX, no. 35; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:284; Wodrow, Analecta, II:164-171.

⁴⁹Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, I:33; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 182.

⁵⁰Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:265.

⁵¹Hickes, A Caveat against Fanaticks ... with a Relation of the Barbarous Murder of the Archbishop of St. Andrews, p. 27.

⁵²Hugh Smith and Alexander Jamieson, An Apology for, or Vindication of, the Oppressed Persecuted Ministers and Professors of the Presbyterian Reformed Religion, in the Church of Scotland (London, 1677), p. 107.

⁵³Lauder of Fountainhall, Chronological Notes of Scottish Affairs from 1680 to 1701, p. 17; Lamont, Diary, p. 218. See also Hickes, A Caveat against Fanaticks ... with a Relation of the Barbarous Murder of the Archbishop of St. Andrews, p. 19; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 183n.

⁵⁴Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, pp. 47, 67; "Linlithgow Presbytery Register," March 22, 1682, June 14, 1682; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, III:483.

⁵⁵John Warrick, The Moderators of the Church of Scotland, from 1690 to 1740 (Edinburgh, 1913), p. 154; Calder, Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, I:97; The Memoirs of Captain John Creighton from His Own Materials, Drawn up and Digested by Jonathan Swift, pp. 28-30.

⁵⁶Female supporters of the nonconformist ministers included Lady Caitloch and Lady Craigdarloch (both women gave financial support to John Blackadder after his deposition), and the wives of Hamilton, Rothes, Wigton, Loudoun, and Colville. See Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 114.

⁵⁷Calder, Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed, p. 31; Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh and Sir George Mackenzie

of Tarbat, A Memorial for His Highness the Prince of Orange (London, 1689).

⁵⁸Cockburn, An Historical Relation of the Late Presbyterian General Assembly, Held at Edinburgh ... in the Year 1690, p. 60.

⁵⁹"Paisley Presbytery Register," December 8, 1664.

⁶⁰See McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 98; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:437. See also Wodrow, Analecta, II:162-171.

⁶¹Hickes, A Caveat against Fanaticks ... with a Relation of the Barbarous Murder of the Archbishop of St. Andrews, p. 15.

⁶²Memoirs of Mrs. William Veitch, Mr. Thomas Hoq of Kiltearn, Mr. Henry Erskine, and Mr. John Carstares, p. 139; McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, p. 207.

⁶³Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:58; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 186; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, October 5, 1677; McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 113.

⁶⁴Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence.

⁶⁵Ninian Paterson, The Fanatick Indulgence Granted, 1679 (Edinburgh, 1683), p. 4.

⁶⁶The presbyterians themselves, it should be noted, went to extravagant lengths to praise their own ministers. Thus, James Nisbet, a nonconformist, wrote the following passage about a field preacher named Alexander Peden:

every opening of his mouth seemed for the most part to be dictated by the spirit of God.... I observed that every time he spoke, whether conversing, reading, praying, or preaching, between every sentence he paused a little, as if he had been hearkening what the Lord would say unto him, or listening to some secret whisper. And sometimes he would start, as if he had seen some surprising sight, at which he would cry out to the commendation of God in Christ--to the commendation of the grace of God in the souls of his people, in their conviction, conversion, and upholding in Christ Jesus.

See McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 52; McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves.

⁶⁷Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland,

Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets, p. 19; Brown, History of the Indulgence, p. 326; Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto LXIII, "A Brief Narration of the Coming of Prelacy again within This Kirk," p. 34.

⁶⁸Fraser, Chronicles of the Frasers, p. 463.

⁶⁹Wodrow Manuscripts, Octavo XXII, James Fraser of Brea, "An Argument Showing That by the Covenant We Are Bound Not To Hear Conform Ministers."

⁷⁰Violant, A Review and Examination of a Book Bearing the Title of the History of the Indulgence ... To Which is Added a Survey of the Mischievous Absurdities of the Late Bond and Sanquhar Declaration, p. 527; McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, pp. 277-279.

⁷¹Violant, A Review and Examination of a Book Bearing the Title of the History of the Indulgence ... To Which Is Added a Survey of the Mischievous Absurdities of the Late Bond and Sanquhar Declaration, p. 271.

⁷²See Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae; Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 79; Brown, History of the Indulgence.

⁷³Mackenzie, A Vindication of the Government in Scotland, p. 6; Violant, A Review and Examination of a Book Bearing the Title of the History of the Indulgence ... To Which Is Added a Survey of the Mischievous Absurdities of the Late Bond and Sanquhar Declaration, p. 271.

⁷⁴McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, p. 482. Wodrow maintained that Richard Cameron was the first person to recommend "separation" from the indulged ministers, but this is doubtful. See Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:220.

⁷⁵Brown, History of the Indulgence, pp. 157, 311-331.

⁷⁶In addition to using violence, the nonconformists also had a number of other methods they could use to show their aversion to the established church. Thus, presbyterian women refused to "rise up or bow or make a curtesy to a bishop," and George Hickes, a pro-episcopal minister, noted that the "zealous rabble" liked to "bespit" the "gown" or "black coat" of the curates, and throw "bits of apple and crusts of bread." See Hickes, The Spirit of Popery Speaks out of the Mouths of Phanatical Protestants, p. 47.

⁷⁷Archbishop Alexander Burnet claimed that there was a heavily armed conventicle in Galloway in February of 1666, but he was probably exaggerating. See Lauderdale Papers, II, appendix.

78
Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p.
153.

79Brown, History of the Indulgence, p. 269.

80Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p.
153.

81Lauderdale Papers, III:77, IV: preface.

82Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 143, "An Account of the Suffering of the People in Kinross Shire"; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 246; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:36; Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, I:291, II:204, 210.

83David Simson, A True and Impartial Account of the Most Reverend Father in God, Dr. James Sharp (N.P., 1719); Life of James Sharp; Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, II:210; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 454.

84Wodrow Manuscripts, Octavo IV, "A Copie of a Letter Sent To a Friend, Containing the True Narration of the Progress of That Party Defeat at Bothwell, for the Preventing of Misreports and Calumnies Raised upon Them"; William Wilson, A True and Impartial Account of the Persecuted Presbyterians in Scotland, Their Being in Arms, and Defeat at Bothwell Briqq (N.P., 1697); A Short Compend, or, a Description of the Rebels in Scotland, in Anno 1679, by a Well-Wisher of His Majesty (N.P., 1681); The Full and True Account of All the Proceedings in Scotland since the Rebellion began (London, 1679); The Last True and New Intelligence from Scotland, Being a True and Pefect Account of the Overthrow of the Rebels, with the Number Slain and Taken, on both Sides (London, 1679); A True Account of the Rising of the Rebels in the West of Scotland (London, 1681); A True Relation of the Inhuman Cruelties Lately Acted by the Rebels in Scotland, with the Manner of Their Taking Glascough, Rifling the Archbishop's House, Digging the Bishop of Argyles Children out of Their Graves, and Many other Barbarities (London, 1679); McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, p. 380; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 232; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 138.

85Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio LX, no. 99, "Paper from a Meeting at Beath Hill."

86Shields, Faithful Contendings Displayed, p. 4.

Chapter XI

Presbyterian Dissent: 1679-1688

The post-Bothwell Bridge Rebellion period was a difficult time for presbyterianism. To say the least, the nonconformist activities that continued after the "rebellion" were very modest. Field conventicling, the staple of presbyterian dissent in the 1670's, all but disappeared, and only a handful of ministers (including Alexander Peden, Donald Cargill, and Richard Cameron) continued to preach out-of-doors.¹ House conventicling also was more or less eclipsed, but the change was less dramatic. The short-lived third indulgence of 1679, which allowed presbyterians to hold meetings for worship in private houses when they could give "security" that their minister would keep the "public peace," was withdrawn within a year,² but while it lasted it gave some encouragement to house conventicling, and "privat" conventicles continued in some areas as late as 1680 and 1681. In Peebles presbytery, for example, one curate complained on April 7, 1680 about

the frequent and rebellious meetings quihich are among them where persons who have been intercommuned since the rebellion in the year 1666 doe now goe publickly to severall persons hous and tak upon them to preach in door ... and at all which meittings thair are persons who aither hath bein at Bothwell Bridge themselves or frequent the company of such and thir meittings being now a new kindled fyre in this place of the kingdom where never any rebellious meitting of this nature formerlie was....³

And, in the archdiocese of St. Andrews, the archbishop and synod complained on September 2, 1680 about the "weeklie" house

conventicles that were held in their bounds. The meetings in the archdiocese were most common in Fife, and Row noted that some of the nonconformist ministers "that lived in Fife" continued their "preaching in private houses"⁴ some time after the third indulgence had been "discharged."

Other house conventicles held in 1680 and 1681 are mentioned in the records. On May 6, 1680, for example, the Privy Council reported that one James Kerr had preached in the house of Grange in the shire of Roxburgh, and on February 9, 1681 the presbytery of Paisley reported that a "meeting house" in the parish of "Eastwood" (built while the third indulgence was still in force for a nonconformist minister named Matthew Crawford) was still in existence and was in constant use. On May 3, 1681, moreover, the "minister of Kiltearn" in the presbytery of Dingwall reported "frequent conventicles in his parish to the dividing of his congregations and the weakening of his ministrie," and in October of 1681 other curates in the same presbytery complained about "a vagrant preacher" named "Mr. Walter Denune" and a "conventicle at Ketual."⁵

By the end of 1681, however, even the house conventicles were largely dead. "Privat meetings," it is true, never disappeared entirely--Alexander Dunbar, for example, was still preaching at an occasional house conventicle as late as 1686--but they became few and far between. The evidence for nonconformity's decline is everywhere, and such records as the registers of the presbyteries of Paisley, Lanark, Peebles, Linlithgow, St. Andrews, and Alford show virtually no dissenting

activity whatever in the years leading up to the Revolution of 1688-1689.⁶ Indeed, it may be said that by 1681 the wheel had come full circle for the presbyterians, for the condition and strength of nonconformity in the 1680's ultimately came to resemble the condition and strength of early post-Restoration non-conformity. As in the 1660's, some of the presbyterian ministers, by the close of 1681, were even willing "at some times" to attend their parish churches and "communicate with the episcopal clergy," and most of the "people" were also becoming "conformists" again.⁷ Thus, on January 2, 1682, Queensberry was able to write from the southwest (a region which had once supported a large number of "disorderly meetings") the following words:

I had given you this trouble sooner, but that nothing occurs here worth, it all being peaceable, save only that in the heads of Galloway some of the rebels meet. But their number is not considerable, not exceeding twelve or sixteen, and their business is only to drink and quarrel.⁸

On April 1, 1682, moreover, Claverhouse was able to write the following message from the burgh of Kirkcudbright, once "the most irregular place in the kingdom":

I have been at church, where there was not ten men, and not above thirty women, wanting, of all the town. Where there used to be ten, I saw six or seven hundred.⁹

In the same letter, Claverhouse described the situation elsewhere in the southwest:

They have already so conformed, as to going to church, that it is beyong by expectation. In Dumfries, not only almost all the men are come, but the women have given obedience; and Irongray, Welsh's own parish, have for the most part conformed; and so it is over all the country.¹⁰

On April 17, 1682, Claverhouse wrote from Moffat:

I must say I never saw a people go from one extremity to another more cavalierly than this people does. We are now come to read lists every Sunday after sermon, of men and women, and we find few absent.¹¹

The archbishop of St. Andrews wrote on December 30, 1682:

there be now but few who owne their former extravagancies. Great sholes and multitudes of our withdrawers are dayly returning to the church, and many of them seeme sensible of their former errors: For severall months past, we have not heard of any field or house conventicles, nor any affront or discouragement offered to any minister.¹²

On October 23, 1683, the curates of the presbytery of Paisley, in a report concerning "withdrawers" from the kirk, mentioned only "two aged women who are infirm" in the parish of "Lochweenoch,"¹³ and in 1684, in a far more comprehensive report, the curates of "Wigtonshire and Minnigaff" reported only 54 "withdrawers from the kirk" out of a total population of 9,276.¹⁴

Clearly, in light of the above evidence, it is obvious that the collapse was almost total. "The people," to quote Alexander Shields, "knew not what to do," and the "most part went to the curates."¹⁵ This state of affairs, moreover, would continue until 1687-1688, when religious "toleration" and the Revolution instilled new life into presbyterianism. Of course, the decline of active nonconformity in the 1680's did not mean that the people were suddenly zealous supporters of prelacy. Although many Scots were attending their parish churches again in the post-Bothwell Bridge period, they did so without enthusiasm. Many would hear the curates preach, but that was all. Thus, when the curates in the presbytery of

Linlithgow wrote to their bishop "anent ye celebratione of ye holy Eucharist," the curates commented:

albeit ye executione of ye law against schismaticks hath reduced many people so fare, as yet they are content for ye most part to hear sermone and joyne in publick praying and praises, yet they are most averse from ye receiving of ye holy Eucharist, in so much that in most of our churches we cannot prevaile with above thirty or forty persones, to communicate at ye Lord's table.¹⁶

This situation was not peculiar to Linlithgow. John Sage, a supporter of prelacy, wrote that "tho" the presbyterians went "generally to church" in the 1680's to hear sermons, they refused to receive Holy Communion in the conformist churches.¹⁷

But a mere scrupling to receive the Eucharist from the curates was a far cry from the activities of the 1670's. Why the decline in the post-Bothwell Bridge period? Persecution was undoubtedly an important factor. The duke of Lauderdale disappeared from the political scene right after the rebellion of 1679, and, with Lauderdale gone, the government (after toying briefly with a third indulgence) began to implement more rigorous policies. In the 1680's, for example, all indulged ministers were at length deposed,¹⁸ and the authorities repeatedly used troops to harass nonconformists. Claverhouse himself was involved in the latter enterprise, and when he wrote about the crowded church in Irongray he was actually standing by with soldiers to insure that the people did indeed go to the kirk. Such persecution was effective, but persecution alone could not destroy dissent. The Highland Host of 1678 vastly outnumbered Claverhouse's troops, but the "host" could not fill

the churches. So why the collapse after 1679? Clearly, something besides persecution was undermining Scottish nonconformity. That "something," it will be argued, was the activities of the radical presbyterian sects.

The emergence of the radical sects was an important development of the post-Bothwell Bridge years. For most of the Post-Restoration period the presbyterians had managed to maintain at least a semblance of unity, but after the crushing defeat in 1679 a few militants (people who endorsed violence, denounced the indulgences, and believed the curates were "Baal's priests") became convinced that compromise of any sort provoked the wrath of God, and they therefore broke completely with the "moderate" majority.²⁰ A number of radical sects was the result. These radical sects were small--even minuscule--in size, but if they were weak in numbers they were strong in zeal. This zeal made them persist in "conventicling" after most presbyterians had abandoned the practice, and the courage and persistence of the radicals must be commended. Their zeal, however, also "knockt out their brains" and led them to commit "unwarrantable excesses"²¹ that were harmful to the presbyterian cause.

The Cameronians, who became a distinct group in the summer of 1679, were the oldest and most consequential radical sect.²² The Cameronians were small in size--the whole group was never larger than one of Welsh's larger field conventicles--and eventually their membership was reduced (according to one critic) to "a hundred silly, poor, daft

bodies." The Cameronians, moreover, also never possessed more than a handful of ministers. Initially, the sect followed Richard Cameron,²⁴ Donald Cargill,²⁵ and Thomas Douglas,²⁶ but by 1681 Cameron and Cargill were dead and Douglas was hiding in England. On August 11, 1682, when the Cameronians had no ministers whatsoever,²⁷ they offered to invite Douglas home "if no exceptions could be found against him," but Douglas refused the invitation. Early in 1683, the Cameronians also offered calls to Alexander Peden, Michael Bruce, Samuel Arnot, Thomas Forrester, and John Hepburn, but they all declined.²⁸ Later in 1683, however, the Cameronians gained the services of James Renwick (ordained in Holland),²⁹ and by the time of the Revolution they had also recruited David Houston (ordained in Ireland),³⁰ Alexander Shields (ordained in England), and Thomas Lining (ordained in Holland). William Boyd (licensed in Holland) had also been recruited as a "probationer."³¹

The "excesses" of the Cameronians were several in number, but two are important. First, the group was fiercely opposed to the crown. One of their ministers brazenly excommunicated Charles II,³² and all Cameronians believed it was a sin to say, even on pain of death, "God save the king."³³ The Cameronian position was an extravagant one, and it was, of course, rejected by the orthodox (or moderate) presbyterians. Orthodox presbyterians had always been monarchists (even the Pentland rebels, whose only "quarrel" was with the bishops, had supported "the king and the covenant"),³⁴ and they remained monarchists in the

post-Restoration period. John Carstares, the father of William, declared to the Privy Council on November 20, 1680 that he recognized the king's authority, and he poured scorn on the disloyal Cameronians.³⁵ Archibald Riddel, a noted field preacher in the 1670's, told the committee of public affairs in 1680 that "as for the civil magistrate, I may confidently say, both for myself and all true presbyterians in Scotland, that we desire to pay all due respect and homage unto him."³⁶ And William Violant, an indulged minister, called the Cameronian way "the way of disorder, confusion, and desolation," and he declared that "the good old principles of presbyterians" did not "lead them to despise dignities," for real presbyterians "feared God and honored rulers." Violant also declared, in a rather heated pronouncement, that true

presbyterians think themselves bound in their places and stations to seek the removal of prelacy and erastianism, but they did not think it their duty to overturn civil government to erect presbyterial government; to destroy civil order in the kingdom, to erect ecclesiastical order in the kirk: they do not think it their duty to break the third article of the covenant, to keep the preceeding articles. As God hath appointed order in the church, so he hath appointed order in the state, and the one of these should not be overturned to establish the other. It's the earnest desire of presbyterians, that the removal of all disorders in the church, and the reparation of the ruines of the church, may be by the hand of their rightful rulers.³⁷

A second excess of the Cameronians was violence. Presbyterians in general were not adverse to the use of force (the Pentland Hills and Bothwell Bridge rebellions confirmed this fact),³⁸ but the Cameronians were especially inclined to shed blood. Their attitude toward violence can be found in a ponderous tome by Alexander Shields.³⁹ Shields (who devoted

over a hundred pages of verbiage to the subject) wrote that in the "time of the primitive persecutions" under the "heathen emperors" of Rome, the "privilege of self-defense was not so much improved or contended for by Christians, who studied more to play the martyrs, than to play the men," but he said the situation was different in seventeenth century Scotland. The Cameronians, he wrote, were willing to "play the men," and to "destroy, slay, and cause to perish" those individuals who assaulted the saints and deserved "death by the law of God." Shields claimed that the "godly" had the "call of God" to kill such "murderers," and such a call was important, for "every thing must have God's call in its season to make it duty, so also the time of killing, Ecclesiastes, III:3." Shields noted, however, that "by a call here, we do not mean an express or immediate call from God, such as the prophets might have to their extraordinary executions of judgements, as Samuel and Elijah had to kill Agag and Baal's prophets; but either the allowance of man, then there is no question about it; or, if that cannot be had, as in the case circumstantiate it cannot, then the providential and moral call of extreme necessity, for preservation of our lives, and preventing the murder of our brethren, may warrant an extraordinary executing of righteous judgement upon the murderers."⁴⁰

Cameronian violence manifested itself in various ways. On one hand, some of their actions were relatively harmless. Christian Fyfe, a Cameronian woman who assaulted a curate in 1682, was one of the innocuous members of the sect. At her

trial, Fyfe confessed (in Lauder of Fountainhall's words) that "on Sabbath last, she did beat Mr. Ramsay in the old kirk, at the ending of the sermon, and the reason was, she thought he was profaning the sabbath." She added that "the reason she went to church was to beat, and not to hear the minister," and she declared that she thought it would be a "very good service to kill the bishops."⁴¹ The Cameronians, moreover, also engaged in a great deal of idle blustering that was dangerous in tone but harmless in fact. The "threatenings" made against the indulged ministers⁴² fell into the latter category. The Cameronians regarded the indulged ministers as "backsliders," and Hackston of Rathillet voiced the Cameronian position when he declared: "I have drawn my sword, and I am ... ready against the indulged men."⁴³ In reality, however, no Cameronian ever in fact harmed an indulged minister, even though there was a rumor of a "bloody" Cameronian plot to "cut off" the indulged clergy.⁴⁴ Wodrow referred to this plot in his writings:

Mr. Andrew Tate, minister of Carmunnock, tells me, that he was fully informed and assured that, in the late times, there was a design formed among some of the rigid and highflying Cameronians to assassinate the indulged ministers in the shire of Ayr, at their houses, in one night, by different parties; that this design was so far gone into, that it was agreed to in a meeting of these wild people, where Nisbet, father of Mrs. Fairly, wife to Mr. Ralph Fairly in Glasgow, was present. He used to meet with them formerly; but when he heard that proposal, his very hair stood, and he never more went to visit their meetings.⁴⁵

Specific threats were indeed made--in 1681 a paper was fixed "upon the gate of Mr. James Hamilton's house, minister, indulged to Straven, full of invectives and threatenings, and Anthony Shaw, indulged to a kirk in Galloway, had a similar

experience--but nothing in fact ever occurred.

This is not to say, however, that Cameronian violence did not have its ferocious side.⁴⁷ To the contrary, the sect could be very "bloody" indeed. It "was concluded" at one of the Cameronian "General Meetings" that every man should "provide for himself fit weapons,"⁴⁸ and these weapons were not for show. James Skene, a Cameronian questioned before the Privy Council, freely declared (without torture) that there was "a declared war betwixt those who serve the Lord, and those who serve the king against the covenant,"⁴⁹ and it seems that altogether the Cameronians killed one curate and "about thirteen soldiers."⁵⁰ The murdered curate was Peter Pierson, the minister of Carsphairn. Pierson was notoriously hostile to the Cameronians (he even supplied the government with information on their activities), and he was, as a result, shot dead.⁵¹ Regarding the soldiers who were slain, the most lurid incident occurred in Linlithgowshire. The victims, named Duncan Stewart and Thomas Kennoway, were spending the night at Swyne Abbey when they were attacked and killed by a party of Cameronians. Stewart and Kennoway had both been "active persecutors."⁵²

After the Cameronians, the second oldest radical sect were the Gibbites. The Gibbites, who were also called the "Sweet Singers," emerged as a separate group in the summer of 1681. The Gibbites numbered only about four men and twenty-six women in all. They had no ministers, but followed a "sailor" from Borrowstounness named John Gibb. Gibb originally had some connection with the Cameronians (he was present when a

Cameronian minister excommunicated the king at a conventicle in 1680), but he eventually broke with the older sect and renounced it completely. Thereupon there was a great deal of ill will between the Gibbites and the Cameronians, and on one occasion a Cameronian named George Jackson actually "beat" Gibb and "dashed" his "head against the wall."⁵³

The Gibbites were a strange group,⁵⁴ a virtual caricature of the Protestant Reformation. They "disowned the king and all government" and renounced "all authority throughout the world." They rejected, among other things, "the names of the months, cross stones, Christmas, Easter, Hallow-even, Hogmynae-night, dirges, banquetings, revelling, piping, sporting, dancings, laughings, singing profane and lustful songs and ballads, story-books, romances, comedy-books, playing cards, and dice." They also rejected the division of the scriptures into chapters and verses because this was a "human innovation," and they apparently burned some bibles which contained such divisions. None of the Gibbites did any work. They believed that divine judgements were at hand, and they liked to spend their time praying, fasting, singing psalms, and fondling a "napkine" that had been "dipt in the blood" of two "martyred" covenanters. Other Gibbite "fopperies" could be enumerated, but this is unnecessary. One thing in their favor should be mentioned, however. The Gibbites were not a particularly violent sect, and only Gibb and one follower carried pistols. They used these weapons mainly to frighten the disbelieving husbands who tried to retrieve their wives from the group.⁵⁵

Still another radical sect were the Russellites. The Russellites became an independent entity in 1682. They, like the other two groups, were small, and the Russellites only had about two dozen members in all. The Russellites had no ministers, but followed an assassin named James Russell, "a man of hot and fiery spirit" who had a hand in the murder of Archbishop Sharp in 1679. Russell was a curious individual, and some of his opinions were listed in a paper he "affixt upon the church door of Kettle in Fife." In his paper Russell protested against a host of things (including his mother), and the whole document was so bizarre that the government actually printed it in order to discredit the presbyterians. Russell at one time had been a Cameronian, and he agreed with that sect on most issues, but he had one distinctive doctrine. Russell and his followers, unlike the Cameronians, insisted that paying "customs at ports and bridges" was a "sin" because it had "some tendency indirectly to the upholding and maintaining of tyrannical power." This may sound like a trivial point, but Russell thought it was important, and the customs issue was the main reason he broke with the Cameronians and established his own faction.⁵⁶

After the Russellites, no more radical sects emerged before the Revolution of 1688. The Cameronians did suffer some "defections" in 1685 when two presbyterian ministers named George Barclay and Robert Langlands caused some "debates and janglings,"⁵⁷ but these defections did not lead to the creation of another splinter group. But three sects, as far as

the moderate presbyterians were concerned, were more than enough, for the moderates were appalled by the "unwarrantable excesses" of the radicals. The moderates, needless to say, wanted to restrain their radical brethren, but since the government had outlawed nonconformist church courts and the "free exercise of presbyterian discipline which informs men's heads,"⁵⁸ there was nothing the "sober" presbyterians could do.⁵⁹ The "unwarrantable excesses" therefore continued unabated, and presbyterianism suffered as a result. Nonconformity became identified more and more in the 1680's with murder, madness, and fanaticism in the public mind, and this encouraged lairds and others to desert conventicles and return to their parish churches. They did this because they did not want to be associated with the "fanatics."

All the moderate nonconformists knew that the radicals were undermining dissent. Indeed, the activities of the radicals proved so disruptive that many moderates came to believe that the sects were actually part of a cunning "popish plot" designed to discredit presbyterianism. This "popish plot" theory began with a rumor that "sundry jesuits" disguised as "discontented presbyterian ministers in the fields" had been sent to Scotland to "stir" the people "up to rebellion."⁶⁰ This tale sounds ludicrous enough today, but it was taken seriously at the time. It was alleged, for example, that one "Father Brown" had "boasted on his death-bed at Ingestonbrigg" that he "had preach'd as downright popery" in presbyterian "field conventicles as ever he had preached in Rome itself,"⁶¹

and the story was mentioned by one moderate presbyterian contemporary in his correspondence:

I have been informed from a good hand that one Father Brown, a Jesuit, was about a year agoe in this kingdome, and hath preached in the fields and baptized. In his preaching he said most upon Christ's royall prerogative of being head and king in the church, showing how far people were obliged to believe, profess it, and maintain it. He dyed within twelve miles of this place.⁶²

Rumors of other "Father Browns" were widespread, and the Cameronians in particular were accused of being involved in a conspiracy against presbyterianism. Indeed, the Cameronians were actually portrayed as "white" devils who received money from the "papists" "to the end" that "they might divide the Church of Scotland." Many presbyterian moderates gave credence to these charges and others like them. Thus, Robert Law claimed that the "papists" had "a great hand" in the "fopperies and follies" of the Cameronians, and he also "reported" that the "papists" had "penned" "severals" of the dying speeches of Cameronians who were executed.⁶³ Lauder of Fountainhall possessed similar views, and he wrote that David Houston, a Cameronian minister active on the eve of the Revolution, was a "Benedictine monk" in disguise.⁶⁴ And Gilbert Rule, the author of A Vindication of the Presbyterians of Scotland from the Malicious Aspersions Cast on Them in a Late Pamphlet Written by Sir George Mackenzie, also believed the rumor that the Cameronians were a front for popery, and Rule wrote that he was "credibly informed" that James Renwick, the leader of the Cameronians from 1683 until his death in 1688, was in fact "a Romish priest."⁶⁵

All of these charges were, of course, patently absurd. The radical sects were all ferociously anti-Rome, and they all believed that their own actions were in the best interests of protestantism in general and presbyterianism in particular. But the radicals, their sincere convictions notwithstanding, were wrong. Midnight assassinations, bible burnings, and a redefinition of sin to include the paying of customs duties did not help the movement. To the contrary, they contributed to its decay, for the 1680's were a dark age for nonconformity, and the radical sects were in part responsible. Their culpability is ironic--for the radicals were the self-proclaimed champions of presbyterianism--but irony was a common theme in the post-Restoration years.

Notes

¹Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:147-157.

²Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 99; Wodrow, the History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:147ff. See also Paterson, The Fanatick Indulgence Granted, 1679; Law, Memorialls, p. 151.

³"Peebles Presbytery Register," April 7, 1680.

⁴Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife, 1611-1687, ed. Charles Baxter (Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1837), September 2, 1680; McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, p. 507.

⁵Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:195; "Paisley Presbytery Register," February 9, 1681; Records of the Presbyteries of Inverness and Dingwall, 1643-88, March 3, 1681, October 3, 1681; McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 373.

⁶"Paisley Presbytery Register"; Selections from the Register of the Presbytery of Lanark, 1623-1709; "Peebles Presbytery Register"; "Linlithgow Presbytery Register"; Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of Saint Andrews and Cupar, 1641-1698; Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688.

⁷Alexander Shields, The Life and Death of ... Mr. James Renwick (Edinburgh, 1724), p. 48; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:242.

⁸Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, II:252.

⁹Ibid., II:202, 273.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid., II:274.

¹²Clark, A Collection of Letters Addressed by Prelates and Individuals of High Rank in Scotland ... to Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 48.

¹³"Paisley Presbytery Register," October 23, 1683.

¹⁴Parish Lists of Wigtonshire and Minigaff--1684, ed. William Scot (Edinburgh: Scottish Record Society, 1910), p. 5.

¹⁵Shields, The Life and Death of ... Mr. James Renwick, p. 48.

¹⁶"Linlithgow Presbytery Register," August 20, 1684.

¹⁷George Garden, The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland Truly Represented, p. 3.

¹⁸The Privy Council deposed all remaining indulged ministers in November 1684. See Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:40.

¹⁹See the next chapter for material on the Highland Host.

²⁰This was not the first time in Scottish history that religious schism followed military defeat. The Protester schism, it will be recalled, occurred after Cromwell had routed the Scottish army.

²¹A Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, Occasioned by the Episcopalians since the Year 1660, p. 9.

²²Alexander Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-name Cameronians (Edinburgh, 1690).

²³Quoted in Shields, The Life and Death of ... Mr. James Renwick, p. 99. See also Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, I:107.

²⁴Richard Cameron was killed in a skirmish with government troops at "Ayr-Moss" in 1680. According to Wodrow, the soldiers "owned" that Cameron "was the person who mauled them most in the fight." See Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:220.

²⁵Donald Cargill was executed for "treason" in 1681.

²⁶Thomas Douglas preached at "Loudon-hill" and he participated in the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion. See McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, p. 482.

²⁷After the death of Cargill, the Cameronians began to meet in "United Societies" for "mutual help." These "societies" were organized on a local level, but there were also "general meetings" four times each year. The first general meeting was held on December 15, 1681. See Shields, Faithful Contendings Displayed, p. 6.

²⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 50ff.

²⁹Renwick was ordained by the Dutch because the Cameronians had reached the conclusion that all non-Cameronian

Scottish presbyterians were impure, including the Scottish presbyterians in exile in Rotterdam. Ibid., p. 172.

³⁰David Houston was the victim of an unusual accident, and his teeth were kicked out by his horse in June of 1688. This accident hindered Houston's preaching, and he at length had to return to Ireland. See Lauder of Fountainhall, Chronological Notes of Scottish Affairs from 1680 to 1701, p. 259; Shields, Faithful Contendings Displayed, p. 337.

³¹Ibid., pp. 361, 392.

³²See Cargill, Torwood Excommunication, Being the Lecture and Discourse Going before, and the Afternoon Sermon Following after; with the Action of the Excommunication Itself, Pronounced at Torwood, September 1680.

³³See Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 523. See also Shields, A Serious Inquiry into the Nature and Method of Praying for Tyrants, Kings, or Magistrates, That Are Anti-Covenanters (Glasgow, 1770).

³⁴Law, Memorialls, p. 16.

³⁵Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:241.

³⁶Ibid., p. 200.

³⁷Violant, A Review and Examination of a Book Bearing the Title of the History of the Indulgence ... To Which Is Added a Survey of the Mischievous Absurdities of the Late Bond and Sanquhar Declaration, pp. 531, 553.

³⁸There was a minor Scottish connection with the Rye House Plot in England, a plan to assassinate the king and the duke of York. The conspiracy was exposed in 1683, and Robert Ferguson, a Scottish conventicle preacher, was one of those involved.

There was also some presbyterian involvement in Argyll's Rebellion in 1685, and at least three nonconformist ministers, Thomas Archer, George Barclay, and William Veitch, were active in the rising. See Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Clverhouse, Viscount Dundee, II:414.

³⁹See Shields, A Hind Let Loose, pp. 652-775. See also the various Cameronian manifestos, especially the "Apologetical Declaration." (The Apologetical Declaration may be found in Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:148.)

⁴⁰To cite passages from the Bible to support homicide may sound unusual, but Shields's prose was filled with scriptural references. He mentioned, for example, the slaying

of Sisera by Jael in the Old Testament. Jael, it will be recalled, killed Sisera by hammering a large nail through his head. Since Sisera was, in Jael's words, "an oppressor of the people of God," Shields maintained that Jael would have "sinned" if she had not killed him. See Shields, A Hind Let Loose.

⁴¹Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 427n.

⁴²As early as 1678, some of the more violent opponents of the indulgences allegedly planned to kill Hugh Campbell, the indulged minister of Muirkirk, but the earl of Loudoun prevented this. See Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, III:59.

⁴³Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:104.

⁴⁴Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 369; Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, II:420.

⁴⁵Wodrow, Analecta, II:357.

⁴⁶Law, Memorialls, p. 185.

⁴⁷ The Cameronians inspired a great deal of fear. Thus, Lauder of Fountainhall wrote: "August 12, 1684: Sundry prisoners were brought in from Kilpatrick in Galloway, being taken at a conventicle, and refusing to tell where the rebels were harboured; pretending, first, they are bound by oath, not to discover; second, that they will be harassed, oppressed, and murdered, if they do; and the king's forces are not always at hand to protect them. One Mr. James Renwick, a fanatic preacher, lately come from Holland, is the ringleader of these foolish people. See Lauder of Fountainhall, The Decisions of the Lords of Council and Session, from June 6th, 1678 to July 30, 1712, quoted in Napier, Memorialls and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, II:420.

⁴⁸Shields, Faithful Contendings Displayed, p. 10.

⁴⁹A True and Impartial Account of the Examinations and Confessions of Several Execrable Conspirators against the King and His Government in Scotland (London, 1681), p. 4.

⁵⁰Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 450n.

⁵¹Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 102, "John Matthewson's Account of the Murder of the Curate of Carsphairn, 1685."

⁵²See Memoirs of Lord Viscount Dundee ... by an

Officer of the Army (London, 1714). The "Swyne Abbey" incident occurred in 1684, but the Cameronians had been plotting to kill Kennoway as early as 1681 because "he had taken several of their party." See A True and Impartial Account of the Examinations and Confessions of Several Execrable Conspirators against the King and His Government in Scotland, p. 7.

⁵³Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:242, III:353-55; Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, II:17, II:206, I:143, II:25; Law, Memorials, p. 185.

⁵⁴Scotland spawned a number of theological oddities in the post-Bothwell Bridge period. Lauder of Fountainhall, for example, mentioned a "fellow" who was imprisoned in the Canongate "for teaching that the day of judgement was to be the next day," and for offering "to be hanged, if what he averred should prove false." See Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Observes of Memorable Occurrents in Church and State, from October 1680 to April 1686, p. 20.

⁵⁵Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, II:24, II:19; Law, Memorials, p. 189; Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Observes of Memorable Occurrents in Church and State, from October 1680 to April 1686, p. 28.

⁵⁶See Shields, Faithful Contendings Displayed, pp. 21-22, 113-114; Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, II:149. Russell's tract, which was printed "by authority" under the title A True and Exact Copy of a Prodigious and Traiterous Libel Affixt upon the Church Door of Kettle in Fife, was published in Edinburgh in 1681. See Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 399n.

⁵⁷Shields, Faithful Contendings Displayed, p. 167.

⁵⁸A Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, Occasioned by the Episcopalians since the Year 1660, p. 9; Gilbert Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to a Paper Intituled, Some Questions Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland (London, 1691).

⁵⁹Ironically, some moderate presbyterians tried to restrain the radicals by cooperating with government authorities. Thus, Robert Millar, the indulged minister of Ochiltree, gave the military the information they needed to locate (and kill) Richard Cameron. See Row, The Life of Mr. Blair, p. 369.

⁶⁰Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Observes of Memorable Occurrents in Church and State, from October 1680 to April 1686, p. 37.

⁶¹Hickes, A Caveat against Fanaticks ... with a Relation of the Barbarous Murder of the Archbishop of St.

Andrews, p. 5.

⁶²Quoted in Andrew Lang, Sir George Mackenzie, King's Advocate (London, 1909), p. 132.

⁶³Shields, The Life and Death of ... Mr. James Renwick, pp. 119, 103; Law, Memorialls, p. 85.

⁶⁴Lauder of Fountainhall, Chronological Notes of Scottish Affairs from 1680 to 1701, p. 212. Lauder of Fountainhall, it should be noted, mistakenly referred to David Houston as "William Houston."

⁶⁵Gilbert Rule, A Vindication of the Presbyterians of Scotland from the Malicious Aspersions Cast on Them in a Late Pamphlet Written by Sir George Mackenzie (London, 1691).

Chapter XII

Persecution and Presbyterian Nonconformists

Presbyterian dissenters did not act with impunity in post-Restoration Scotland, and persecution was a fact of life. The intensity of this persecution is a matter of some dispute--Daniel Defoe claimed that 18,000 presbyterians suffered imprisonment, banishment, or death for their faith, while Robert Calder maintained that the only ones who "suffered any thing" were the "silly plowmen and shepherds in the west, whom the false teachers hounded out to die for a broken covenant"¹--but the chronology of the oppression is well established. There were, it is known, alternating periods of rigor and leniency. In the early years leading up to the Pentland Rising of 1666, the dissenters were treated rather harshly. The Rising itself was then followed by some official attempts at conciliation, and indulgences were offered in 1669 and 1672. As the 1670's progressed, however, the government became alarmed by the rapid spread of conventicles, and presbyterian successes induced the authorities to abandon their moderate policies and to crack down on conventicling by applying a number of severe measures, including the use of the so-called Highland Host in 1678. Again, as in the 1660's, the oppressions sparked another rebellion (the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion), and once more, as in the 1660's, the insurrection was followed by a policy of conciliation, and a third indulgence was offered in 1679. This third indulgence, as it turned out, was soon withdrawn after

intense lobbying by the bishops, and a period of brutal persecution followed. This last period of oppression, known as the "killing times," was by far the worst, and it lasted until 1687, when the authorities reversed themselves one last time, and reduced the pressure on dissenters by implementing a policy of partial religious toleration (field conventicles were excluded) on the eve of the Revolution.²

Throughout this long period, the established church had a hand in the "oppression," and church courts were used against nonconformists. Thus, one "John Pollocke" was rebuked before the congregation of Rutherglen in 1675 for "his scandalous speitches" against "the bishopes and present ministrie"; one Walter Aikenhead, also of Rutherglen, was "rebuked before the session" in 1677 for "not keeping the church"; and one William Brown, in the parish of "Brughton," was disciplined in 1680 for "his fault in causeing baptize his child irregularlie at privat meetings."³ Significantly, however, the established church generally did not use excommunication--its ultimate disciplinary sanction--against presbyterian nonconformists in the post-Restoration era.⁴ The presbyterians themselves had often used excommunication against "dissenters" in the 1640's and 1650's,⁵ but in the post-Restoration period only two such cases have been found: William Spence, a "curate" who defected to the presbyterians, was apparently excommunicated by the bishop and synod of Dunblane, and a dissenter named Robb, a field preacher allegedly guilty of fornication, was excommunicated by the archbishop of Glasgow.⁶ In most

instances, however, the authorities of the established church merely threatened dissenters with excommunication, and that was all. A case from the presbytery of Peebles illustrates this point. In 1681, three men in the presbytery of Peebles accused of having their children "disorderly baptized" were called before the presbytery three times without effect, and on June 8, 1681 the three men were given the "first admonition" in the process of excommunication. On July 3, 1681 the men were given the "second admonition," but the presbytery did not proceed with the excommunication, even though the men remained "obstinat." Instead, the presbytery halted the process after some delay and referred the whole matter to the archbishop and synod. What action the archbishop and synod took is unclear, but the individuals in question were never excommunicated.⁷

Why was there this reluctance to use excommunication? Actually, excommunication was unnecessary, for the established church tended to rely on the government, rather than ecclesiastical machinery, to discipline nonconformists. A classic example of the church's reliance on the government involved the laird of Kinkel. Archbishop Sharp started the excommunication process against the Kinkel because of the laird's nonconformity, but the process was abandoned before its completion, and intercommuning, a civil punishment, was imposed instead.⁸ James Gordon, the author of The Reformed Bishop, complained about such practices, and he criticized the "governors of the church" who depended upon the "criminal judge" to punish religious "delinquents." Gordon declared that

"purely ecclesiastick measures" should be used to to bring "all schismatics to the path of unity and all hereticks to the path of verity," and he said that secular authorities should only be called in after the church courts had tried all ecclesiastical censures on an "obstinate schismatick."⁹ Gordon's recommendation was sound, but it was not, generally speaking, taken seriously by the established church. Although some dissenters were at first dealt with by the church courts before being turned over to the "civil arm" (one Agnes Crawford, for example, was "referred to the civill magistrate" only after she had ignored "thrie summonses to the session for not keeping the church"),¹⁰ on countless occasions the conformist clergy reported dissenters to the magistrates without even bothering to go through the formality of a "summonds" to a church court. Thus, on March 27, 1674, when the members of the presbytery of Peebles heard of "severall disorderly conventicles kept within this shire," they did not handle the matter themselves, but asked "the sheriff to take such course as he in his wisdom, according to the standing laws of the kingdom, shall think fit."¹¹ Clearly, the readiness of the established church to use the civil power was unabashed. In 1664 the bishop and synod of Galloway asked the government to quarter troops on the nonconformists in their bounds, and in 1666 the archbishop of Glasgow, upon finding that there were in Glasgow "several persones, both men and weomen, who ordinarily dishaunts publict ordinances, and flatters themselves with the hope of impunitie," threatened to "employ some of the officers of his majesties

militia" against dissenters unless the magistrates made an attempt to "exact the penalties imposed by law."¹² The archbishop of Glasgow, like the bishop of Galloway, apparently had little confidence in the ability of church discipline to restore order. The attitude of these prelates was typical, so it is no surprise that the state, in effect, was the main "persecutor" in the post-Restoration period.

The "civil magistrate" harried nonconformists in a variety of ways, but fining was probably the most common, and it was the recommended form of punishment in many pieces of anti-dissenter legislation. A December 23, 1662 act of the Privy Council, for example, imposed a fine of twenty shillings scots for each absence from the kirk "without a lawful excuse." A July 1663 act of parliament exposed anyone who "ordinarily and wilfully" absented himself from his parish kirk to a fine of one fourth of his rent if he were a heritor, one fourth of his free "moveables" if he were a knight, and one fourth of his "moveables" (in addition to forfeiting the "liberty" of the burgh) if he were a burghess. A 1670 act of parliament raised the fines even higher, and the said act declared that absence without excuse for three consecutive Sundays would cost a heritor one eighth of his yearly rent for "each" offense, while a tenant would have to pay six pounds for each offense and a servant would have to pay forty shillings scots. All of these above fines were imposed for merely withdrawing from the parish kirk--there were also specific monetary penalties for attending conventicles. The 1670 parliament ordained, for example, that

attending a house conventicle would cost a tenant twenty-five pounds, while attending a field conventicle, a more serious offense, could cost a laird half his yearly rent. To make matters worse, the 1681 parliament doubled "the fines imposed by former laws for field conventicles."¹³

These laws were, in theory, easily enforced.¹⁴ When a person was accused of attending conventicles, the process did not run along ordinary judicial lines. Witnesses were neither called nor examined. Instead, the sheriff, the High Commission Court,¹⁵ or the Privy Council merely required the accused to declare, under oath, whether the accusations against him were true or false. If an individual refused to cooperate, guilt was presumed, and a fine was imposed. Another technique--this one was favored by the High Commission Court--was simply to offer an individual accused of nonconformity the oath of allegiance. If the accused agreed to take the oath, he was absolved; if he declined it, he was punished. Needless to say, such procedures were clearly arbitrary, and they were denounced by Alexander Shields, the author of The Scots Inquisition, Containing a Brief Description of the Persecution of the Presbyterians in Scotland, but the government made no attempt to change its policies.¹⁶

Fining was a serious affliction, and even the most cynical contemporaries had to admit that the presbyterians truly "suffered ... in purse"¹⁷ for their faith, but how large were the pecuniary penalties imposed for nonconformity? In the opinions of the presbyterians, the fines were enormous, and Kirkton claimed that they "cost the people of Scotland more

money" than the laws of "King Fergus." To be sure, the financial penalties for nonconformity were often imposed in a wholesale manner, and the records are clear on this point. The dissenters in the southwest, for example, were indiscriminately fined on the eve of the Pentland Rising (Sir James Turner and his troops, who were active in the region in the period before the "rebellion," imposed fines amounting to 30,000 pounds scots), and, in the years following the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion, when the harassment of nonconformists was at its worst, fines of 288,000 pounds scots were imposed on the dissenters in the shires of Clydesdale, Renfrew, Ayr, Galloway, Nithsdale, and Annandale. Other examples could be provided, from the fine of twelve pounds scots imposed on a nonconformist blacksmith on March 11, 1675, to the fine of 9152 pounds scots levied on the dissenters in the parish of Kells between 1666 and 1681 "upon accompt of their nonconformity to prelacie and the laws mad theranent."¹⁹

All of the above figures are more or less accurate--some of them were actually taken from government sources--but they are also misleading. Huge fines were indeed imposed on the presbyterians, but a fine imposed and a fine paid were two different things, for the government typically collected only a fraction of the monetary penalties it handed out.²⁰ Some fines, it is true, were paid in full. The burgh of Lanark was ordered to pay 4,000 pounds scots in 1682 for tolerating nonconformist activities, and in this case the authorities collected every last shilling. (The burgh paid the

last installment in 1697--not even the Revolution could eradicate its fine.)²¹ Yet, more often than not, the laws regarding fines were not strictly enforced. In many instances, for example, a fine was "discharged" after the victim had been frightened into a show of conformity. The laird of Balcanquhal was fined 15,000 pounds scots (three years valued rent) for his wife's nonconformity (he was legally liable for her), but the government rescinded the whole fine when Balcanquhal declared that he was "willing to deliver" his spouse up to the Privy Council.²² On other occasions, fines were imposed and then left uncollected to serve as an "awband" over the "heads" of the individuals involved. John Maxwell of Dargavel, from the shire of Renfrew, was fined great sums for "irregularities," but his fines were "sisted" by the Privy Council after he had been "regular" for a time.²³ And finally, on still other occasions the government mitigated the effects of its own laws by granting a "composition," a legal device which allowed a person to pay a part of his fine on the understanding that the rest would be overlooked. A composition was granted for a purely economic reason--the fact that the fined individual could not pay the whole sum--and it did not require the compromise of presbyterian principles. It was, as a result, commonly used by dissenters. Thus, when 274,737 pounds scots in fines were imposed on the nonconformists in the shire of Renfrew in 1684, "compositions"--in the words of Wodrow--"generally ... were made." Wodrow, unfortunately, neglected to mention how much money was saved by the process, but it is clear that the

government sometimes accepted sums substantially smaller than the original penalties. Jasper Touch,²⁴ a surgeon in Kilmarnock, was fined 228 pounds scots in 1683 for nonconformity, but in the end he paid only "27 rix dollars."²⁵

In addition to fining, another method of persecution was the quartering of troops on nonconformist households. Unlike fining, quartering was not authorized by special legislation. The government had traditionally quartered troops on dilatory taxpayers, and in the post-Restoration years the authorities decided to also use the procedure against ecclesiastical offenders who refused to attend their parish churches, pay a fine, or take a bond to "keep the peace."²⁶ Needless to say, the number of Scots in the last three categories was quite large, so the army was busy in the period.

The military forces involved in the quartering process were themselves rather interesting, for the post-Restoration army has been called the "first standing army in Scottish history." As a force, the army varied constantly in size. Between 1661 and 1666 it "consisted of a mere handful of troops," and in March 1669 Sir James Turner, the "oppressor" of the southwest, had only 120 foot guards under his command. Scotland's military forces were augmented in the summer of 1666, but they were reduced in 1667 when the Dutch war was concluded. Similar fluctuations continued throughout the period, but to give some idea of the numbers involved, the year 1677 can be used as an example. In 1677 the regular forces consisted of a troop of Life Guards (numbering 160 men and officers) and a

regiment of Foot Guards (numbering 1100 men and officers).

Presbyterian accounts of the conduct of troops who were quartered in nonconformist households were not flattering. According to one covenanter, the soldiers were "the scum and refuse of the nation: they bore the characters of wickedness on their foreheads, and their mouths were were filled with blasphemy and obscenity."²⁸ To support such accusations, the presbyterian writers detailed many atrocities. Wodrow, for example, alleged that when some soldiers were quartered in a house in Falkland parish they tore a child "from the mother's breast" and cast this child on the floor, "whereby his life was much endangered."²⁹ Wodrow may have been exaggerating, but it is certain that a seventeenth century soldier was a rough and underpaid servant of the king who could be a menace when quartered in a private home.³⁰ And, even when well-behaved, this same soldier could be a costly grievance. According to Wodrow, one man from Carsphairn had troops quartered on him because he refused to pay the five pounds scots he owed for the cess (an unpopular tax which helped to finance the "persecution"), and he ended up losing seven cows to pay the expenses of the troops.³¹

Quartering was used many times, but its most famous and most ruinous application occurred in the early part of 1678. In January of that year, the so-called Highland Host (composed of 6,700 Highlanders and militiamen together with 1300 regular soldiers) gathered in the town of Stirling and then moved through the shires of Ayr, Lanark, and Renfrew, taking free

quarters and despoiling dissenters as it went. The "Host's" purpose was to force lairds and masters to sign a bond guaranteeing the orderly and conformist behavior of their tenants and servants. (In the past, bonds forcing chiefs to guarantee the peace had often been imposed in the lawless Highlands.) This bond was generally refused, so another legal device, known as "law-burrows," was pressed in its place.³³ This "law-burrows," as interpreted in the post-Restoration period, obliged a person to "keep the king's peace."³⁴

The oppressive measures of the Highland Host are legendary, but how costly was the whole affair? The answer is elusive. The Host was only in the west for two months (King William's troops, in contrast, occupied Scotland in November of 1689 and "ruined many and irritated more" by taking free quarters for one year),³⁵ but during that time they seized a great amount of wealth. To quote one presbyterian source, the Host took the following:

money for every officer, according to his quality, and six pence for every common soldier, and besides this they ordinarily had billets for twice as many as came, and for the absents, they exacted double money, because their land-lords had not the trouble of quartering them, and, in case of non-payment, they would take the readiest moveables.³⁶

Wodrow described these oppressions at length, and he concluded that the value of the money and goods taken by the Host was 200,000 pounds scots for the shire of Ayr alone. Wodrow's estimate is not impossible, for supporting an armed force can be an expensive business. The covenanter army quartered in England during the civil war exacted 850 pounds sterling every

day (10,200 pounds scots), and the royal forces used to suppress the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion cost the treasury "the sum of fourteen thousand three hundred and twenty-five pounds sterling" (171,900 pounds scots).³⁷ But, these figures notwithstanding, Wodrow's estimate is probably inflated. Although he mentioned the sum of 200,000 pounds scots for Ayrshire alone, Robert Law, a presbyterian who was actually an eyewitness, wrote that the value of the money and goods taken from the people in all the affected shires was about "one hundred thousand merks and above."³⁸ The discrepancy between Law and Wodrow can be explained by the fact that Wodrow based his calculations on material collected after the Revolution (some ten years after the fact),³⁹ and the accuracy of such material was, to say the least, somewhat dubious. Consider, for example, a post-~~Revolution~~^{volu}tion document concerning the "sufferings" of the burgh of Lanark. The paper, written in 1692, claimed that the Host had taken "free and dry quarters" from the burgh to the value of 3,544 pounds scots and had maliciously destroyed the town's tolbooth. These charges sound serious, but they were manifestly untrue. Lanark only had to support a single regiment for three weeks, and it is doubtful that their "free and dry quarters" cost the town 1,200 pounds per week. As for the alleged destruction of the tolbooth, the records show that there were no major repairs performed on that structure until some twenty years after the Host had been in Lanark.⁴⁰

In way of a compromise, the cost of the Host was probably greater than Law estimated, but less than Wodrow

claimed. Yet, having made that point, it is important to note that financial losses were only one aspect of the Highland Host episode. Although Kirkton wrote that no presbyterians lost their lives in the affair, Wodrow claimed that there were several cases of murder, mutilation, and rape. Once again, Wodrow was probably guilty of some hyperbole, but it is certain that atrocities did occur. One Alexander Weddurburn, for example, was mortally wounded by a blow from the butt end of a Highlander's musket, and one "John Wallace in Crookes in Dundonald parish" had his hand cut off by a Perthshire trooper named Hunter. The latter case can be found in the records of the Privy Council, where it is discussed at some length. The Council, by the way, ordained that Hunter should be punished for his "cryme," and the Council also ruled that Wallace should be paid 117 pounds scots "to defraye the expenses of his cure and to help him to some maintenance."⁴¹

Other injuries were sustained by the nonconformists, but they gained some revenge by killing one Highlander and wounding several others. Clearly, the "invaders" were not invulnerable, and they sometimes suffered casualties when groups of "countrey people" "set upon small parties" of Highlanders to "recover" confiscated "goods."⁴² Fortunately, however, bloodshed was for the most part rare on both sides, and weapons were used more for coercion than for actual violence. This can be seen in the following entry from a presbyterian diary. The writer, James Nisbet, provided a description of what was probably a typical encounter between some members of the

Highland Host and a dissenter:

At their first coming, four of them came to my father's house, who was overseeing the making of his own malt; they told him they were come to make the fig (so they termed the presbyterians) to take with God and the king. This they came over again and again. They pointed to their shoes, and said they would have the brogue off his foot, and accordingly laid hands on him, but he threw himself out of their grips, and turning to a pitch-fork which was used at the stalking of his corn, and they having their broadswords drawn, cried "Clymore," and made at him; but he quickly drove them out of the kilne and chaseing all four a space from the house, knocked one of them to the ground. The next day about twenty of them came to the house, but he not being at home, they told they were come to take the fig and his arms. They plundered his house, as they did the house of every other man who was not conform to the then laws....⁴³

To say the least, Nisbet's narrative is certainly colorful, but it also has the ring of truth to it.

Whatever the cost of quartering--both in financial and in human terms--two other penalties inflicted on nonconformists, the forfeiture of estates and the "escheat" of moveable property, were potentially more serious. The former was imposed for the "crime" of "rebellion," and when enforced it could be disastrous for the individual or family concerned. Several nonconformists found this out to their cost, and forfeited properties included the estate of Caldwell (which went to Dalyell), Kersland (which went to Drummond), Freuch (which went to Claverhouse), Whyteside (which went to Nithsdale), and Finnarts (which went to Captain William Seton).⁴⁴ On the other hand, with forfeitures, as with most things, the government sometimes lacked diligence, and some dissenters managed to evade the force of the law. Thus, it was very characteristic of the times that some of the Bothwell Bridge rebels who had legally lost their estates were still living in

or near their houses and enjoying their rents as late as 1681 and beyond.⁴⁵

In regard to "escheats," the situation was about the same. The escheat of moveable property to the king--the price of a number of infractions, including "rebellion" and "noncompearance" before the Privy Council when called for conventicling--could prove costly, but there were ways to circumvent the law. Thus, although this penalty was commonly imposed in the period (in July of 1674 alone fifty-two members of the laity and forty-two ministers had their moveable property declared forfeit by the Privy Council),⁴⁶ individuals such as George Brysson were able to escape its effects. Brysson's memoirs indicate that he had been involved in the Bothwell Bridge rebellion, and his moveable property had been forfeited as a result. This fact notwithstanding, Brysson did not suffer, for his possessions were saved with the help of his friends and family. Two neighboring lairds (both of whom had fought for the king in 1679) and "a friend who lived on the earl of Winton's ground" first aided Brysson by concealing his livestock and goods on their lands. This provided temporary security. Long-term security was arranged by Brysson's uncle, who passed a "sum of money" to James Skene, the sheriff depute of Midlothian. Skene had been given "a gift of the escheats" of all that had been in arms in the shire of Midlothian (Brysson was a Midlothian "rebel"), and the payment to Skene effectively protected Brysson's property.⁴⁷

The state sponsored penalties discussed so

far--finings, quarterings, forfeitures, and escheats--were all designed to punish the nonconformist by depriving him of his wealth or property. There was, in addition, another class of penalties--penalties which were supposed to affect the liberty, health, and even the life of the nonconformist. Intercommuning, a kind of "secular excommunication," was one of the "persecutions" of the latter type. Intercommuning was widely used against dissenters who eluded the authorities and remained at large (on August 6, 1675, for example, letters of intercommuning were issued against scores of nonconformists), and in theory it was a grievous affliction. The intercommuned person was an "outlawed" person, and legally no one could legally "converse" with him, or give him food or shelter. In reality, however, this particular penalty was, in the words of Fraser of Brea, "powder without ball." Fraser, who was an intercommuned person himself, wrote that he never heard "of any inter-communed or conversers of inter-communed" who had been "in the least prejudiced thereby."⁴⁸

Intercommuning may have been a sham, but another mode of persecution, that of imprisonment, cannot be dismissed so lightly, for Scottish "gaols" were dreadful places, and they were used extensively. Only a few of the penal statutes, it is true, specified imprisonment as the penalty for dissent (to cite one example, a 1670 act of parliament ordained that a preacher at house conventicles should be incarcerated until he posted a bond obliging him either to leave the kingdom or refrain from conventicles), but imprisonment was widely used nevertheless,

for it was a simple and convenient method of dealing with ecclesiastical offenders. This was especially true because in Scotland there was no "act for habeus corpus," and a person could be detained without being formally charged.⁴⁹

In the post-Restoration era, nonconformists who were imprisoned were not confined for a specific number of years. Instead, they were always detained "during the king's pleasure." In real terms, this meant that once a dissenter had been apprehended and confined, he was only released for a reason (that is to say, because he was ill or infirm, or because he had "found caution" to keep the peace, to compear when called, to restrict his movements to a certain geographical region of Scotland, or to leave the country itself). Under such circumstances, long sentences were quite possible. John Dickson, for example, was sent to the Bass and detained there for six years. Dickson could have obtained his release at any time by simply agreeing to abstain from holding conventicles, but this he refused to do. At length, however, Dickson was liberated in 1686 when his petition to "take medicine" in his house in Edinburgh was granted by the Privy Council.⁵⁰

The long, unbroken term that Dickson served was not the norm. More commonly, a dissenter had to endure one or more short periods of confinement. John M'Gilligen, a northern conventicler, was a typical case. In 1668 M'Gilligen was apprehended and imprisoned in the tolbooth at Forres, but he was quickly liberated (with the help of the earl of Tweeddale) after posting a bond to compear when called. In 1674 M'Gilligen was

in fact summoned to appear, but, in spite of the bond, he did not. In 1676 M'Gilligen was captured in the shire of Cromarty by three servants of the earl of Seaforth and was eventually sent to the Bass for his nonconformist activities. M'Gilligen was released again after the Bothwell Bridge rebellion (the authorities, as an act of grace, liberated fifteen presbyterian ministers from the Bass and the Edinburgh tolbooth after the insurrection),⁵¹ and he again resorted to "conventicling." M'Gilligen was detained one last time in 1683, and he was not finally released until 1686.⁵² James Drummond, another nonconformist, also endured several periods of confinement. In 1674 Drummond was incarcerated in the tolbooth of Edinburgh, but he was straightaway released after he pledged not to preach at conventicles in the future. Drummond, however, quickly broke his "engagement" and began to preach again. He was apprehended a second time and sent to the Bass on January 28, 1677, but he was released on October 5, 1677 after "finding caution" to confine himself to Kintyre. Not unexpectedly, Drummond broke his second engagement as well (he apparently believed that an oath to an uncovenanted government was not binding), and he eventually returned to preaching. He did so with prudence, however, and he successfully eluded the authorities for the rest of his nonconformist career.⁵³

When individual dissenters did spend time in prison, they did not all experience the same "sufferings." Generally speaking, a prisoner's hardships were indirectly proportional to his wealth, for seventeenth century "gaols" reflected the

inegalitarian nature of the seventeenth century society. Thus William Porterfield, "sometyme of Quarrelton," was a man of substance, and he was placed in a rather comfortable room in Dumbarton castle when he was detained. (Actually, Porterfield only spent his nights in detention, for the Privy Council allowed him to leave the castle during the day.)⁵⁵ For the poor, on the other hand, the prisons were odious dens of iniquity. Everyone was supposed to pay the jailer for food, and, while this was no hardship for a laird or a wealthy merchant, it was a crushing burden on the average prisoner, especially when incarceration deprived the poorer person of his or her income. A minute from the Privy Council register illustrates the plight of the imprisoned poor:

Anent a petition presented by the provest and baillies of Glasgow, shewing that where there are severall old women and other silly women in their tolbooth, which take up and pester the same, and are a great charge to the toun, and therefore humbly supplicating the Councill would be pleased to give ordor to the petitioners to dismiss them upon whipping them for their bygain faults, or inflicting such other punishment as the Councill thought fitt, since if they ly any longer in prison they will dy or sterve in the petitioner's hands; the Lords of his Majesties Privy Councill, haveing heard and considered the forsaid petition, doe hereby give ordor to the petitioners to cause whipp and burn on the cheek severly such of the saids women as are guilty of harbor and resett of rebels, and such as are only guilty of ill principles to whipp them, and thereafter to dismiss them all.⁵⁶

A dissenter, whether rich or poor, could be confined in one of the many prisons at the disposal of the government, and a few of these places of detention can be described here. One such prison, for example, was the infamous Bass. The Bass was on an island in the Firth of Forth which the king had purchased in 1671 for 4,000 pounds sterling, and it was a prison

that, with few exceptions, held presbyterians alone. The Bass was in particular used to hold ministers caught in the act of "conventicling," but it also held laymen who were known to be especially active in the nonconformist cause.⁵⁷

The Bass was healthier than most prisons, but the lot of its inmates was still quite grim. Food was expensive, for it had to be imported to the island. Drinking water was also a problem, for there were no springs, and rain water had to be collected. Added to these difficulties, moreover, were the severe limitations placed upon the personal liberty of the prisoners. All letters to and from inmates were examined by the deputy governor, all conversations with visitors had to take place in the presence of a soldier, and only two inmates at a time were allowed "the liberty of the island above the walls." On the positive side, the prisoners were permitted to have servants, but many inmates could not afford this luxury.⁵⁸

A few other prisons can also be mentioned. In Edinburgh, there was the legendary tolbooth, a place which held many dissenters in the period. The tolbooth had a wretched reputation, and the "iron house" on its second floor (a room reserved for especially dangerous "felons," such as James Mitchell, a would-be bishop killer) was especially notorious.⁵⁹ Edinburgh was also the location of the "inner Greyfriars' churchyard," a makeshift "prison" that was used for five months to hold the hundreds of presbyterians captured after the Battle of Bothwell Bridge. Initially the presbyterians at "Greyfriars' churchyard" were kept out in the open, "without so

much as a covering," and they suffered horribly from exposure. After "several weeks," however, a "house of board" was built for them with "the duke of Monmouth's generosity and their friends' charity," and conditions improved dramatically.⁶⁰ Finally, still another place of detention--this one was outside Edinburgh--was Dunnotar Castle. Dunnotar Castle had a tragic history. It was used extensively as a prison for only two months (dozens of nonconformist prisoners were moved there during Argyll's Rebellion in 1685 for safekeeping), but during that brief period 7 of its 167 inmates became sick and died. Initially, all of Dunnotar's prisoners were crowded into a dark subterranean vault which had only one window, and conditions were so primitive that the inmates did not even have a place to "ease nature." The authorities would eventually show a little compassion by moving some of the other prisoners to other parts of the castle, but by then sickness had taken its toll of human lives.⁶¹

Incarceration in any seventeenth century prison was an unpleasant experience, but the inmates always had one hope: the early "gaols" were not secure places, and escape was always possible. It is true that no presbyterian was ever able to escape from the Bass,⁶² but in that respect the Bass was virtually unique. Dunnotar Castle, for example, failed to hold twenty-five of its inmates, and other prisons had similar records. The methods of escape varied, but a few can be mentioned. At Dunnotar Castle the prisoners simply climbed out of the one window in their "dark vault," but a favorite

technique was to dress up in women's clothing and walk out. One Alexander Smith used the latter trick to "break out" of the Edinburgh tolbooth in 1681, Alexander Shields used the same method to escape from the same prison in 1686, and literally dozens of nonconformist prisoners employed ladies' dresses to slip out of the "inner Greyfriars churchyard" in 1679.⁶³ Files and hacksaws were also effective in the seventeenth century, and no fewer than twenty-five nonconformists used these tools to cut their way out of the Canongate tolbooth in 1683. A description of the last adventure is especially interesting, for it illustrates the vulnerability of early modern Scottish jails:

The window of their prison was cross-barred with iron; one bar was cut, but the space was not large enough, and the other three had to be removed. This took them a long time and much labour, while they were constantly expecting to be discovered; but, although a sentry passed on the street below (they were on the third story), the noise of the sawing was never heard. About nine o'clock at night, when the first bar had just been cut, it slipped out of the cutter's hand, and fell on the street. They thought all was now over, but the bar lay on the street all night, till a friend coming past in the morning picked it up, and contrived to get it sent to them. When the preparations were completed, a beam in the floor above them was cut, and its inmates got down. As they were coming out from the window, two friends overpowered the sentinel, and threatened him with death if he spoke.⁶⁴

The authorities recognized the inadequacy of their prisons, and for this reason they often resorted to banishment.⁶⁵ Banishment, which was generally reserved for particularly troublesome dissenters, took several forms. Some nonconformists were simply sent to remote places in the realm. Thus Alexander Smith, the deposed minister of Colvend, was sent to Shetland in 1663 and then to Orkney in 1667. Other

individuals were banished from Scotland, but were allowed to live in the other "dominions" of the king. This happened to James Fraser of Brea. He was forced to leave Scotland in 1682 for holding conventicles, but he was permitted to go to London. Others were banished from all of the territories of the king. Robert MacWard, another minister, suffered this penalty in the early 1660's. MacWard went to the Netherlands, and he eventually ended his days there. Still others were sent into military banishment and forced to become soldiers in the Scottish regiments in France, Flanders, and Holland. This was supposed to be the fate of one group of nonconformists in 1676. They were sent across the English Channel to fight in the "French Warr," but the "captains" in charge (who apparently received generous bribes) released the Scottish dissenters as soon as they reached the French shore.⁶⁶

The last and most feared form of banishment was transportation to the king's English colonies. This penalty was applied sparingly before 1678. Two men were sent to Barbados for throwing stones at the curate of Ancrum, some others were banished to America for assaulting the curate of Kilmacolm, and there was some talk of transporting some of the captured Pentland rebels, but, by and large, most of those transported in the early years were "strong and idle beggars, Egyptians, common and notorious thieves, and other dissolute and lous persons," rather than presbyterians. In the decade between 1678 and the Revolution, however, there was a dramatic increase in the number of dissenters who were transported, and in the said period some

700 presbyterian men and women were sent to the colonies. The last figure includes the 250 "rebels" who were banished for their participation in the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion, and 21 Cameronian men and women who were sent to Barbados after the "toleration" of James VII had been issued.⁶⁷ The rise in the number of dissenters transported after 1678 is important, for it illustrates the politicization of nonconformity in the later years. Most of the 700 victims were accused of treason ("disowning the king" or "rebellion") in addition to religious dissent, and they were technically in danger of receiving the death penalty. But, because there were too many to execute, the government decided to banish the rank and file and hang the ringleaders.

The sentence of transportation was not an enviable one, and the worst part of the penalty was probably the voyage to the New World. Disease was a constant threat, and mortality rates on the ships were high. One vessel carrying banished presbyterians to east New Jersey in 1685, for example, was plagued by poor provisions and bad weather, and seventy people, including most of the "heathen" crew, died from a fever. (The fever had been brought on board by some presbyterians who had spent some time in Dunnotar castle.⁶⁸) Another ill-fated ship left Scotland at the end of 1679. This ship, which was carrying about 257 presbyterians to the New World, struck some rocks near its point of departure, and about 200 presbyterians drowned.⁶⁹

Life was hard for the banished presbyterians who

managed to reach the king's English colonies, but it was not as wretched as the covenanter tracts maintained. The authors of Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland, for example, wrote that the presbyterians were sold into "slavery," but that was not strictly true, for only Africans and Indians had to endure perpetual bondage (real slavery) in the English colonies. The Scots, it is more correct to say, entered into a state of indentured servitude, a temporary thralldom that lasted for a set period of time, usually five to seven years.⁷⁰ The years of service were imposed, ironically, to pay the cost of the banished person's transportation. Just as a prisoner had to pay for his food in the seventeenth century, so a banished individual had to pay the cost of his passage to the colonies. If the banished person had the necessary funds, it appears there was no period of servitude. Thus James Forsyth, a nonconformist transported to America in a ship hired by Scot of Pitlochrie,⁷¹ wrote that Pitlochrie declared that "if I would give him five pounds sterling for my passage, I would be liberated in America." Under the circumstances, most individuals would have paid the necessary money if they could, but Forsyth possessed strong and rigid scruples, and he told his "oppressor" that he would not pay money to one who had carried him out of his "native land." Then, after refusing to comply, Forsyth signed a protestation with other like-minded nonconformists on the ship against "Pitlochrie" and "all that paid for their passage."⁷²

Forsyth's inflexibility was not typical, however, and most banished presbyterians believed it was not wrong to pay

money to obtain their freedom. Thus one Gilbert Macadam, who was banished in 1684, purchased his liberty with a payment of twenty pounds sterling, and James Gray of Chrystoun, who was transported to Jamaica with 140 other nonconformists in 1685, paid fifteen pounds sterling for his freedom.⁷³ Other banished presbyterians made similar payments, including the members of the "United Societies." Given the rigidity of the Cameronians on most issues, their compliance on this point may seem remarkable, but the fact is that the members of the sect actually donated money to free their "brethren" from "bondage." Indeed, on one occasion the United Societies in Scotland raised 240 pounds sterling to purchase the freedom of fourteen Cameronians in Barbados.⁷⁴

The ability of transported persons to buy their liberty created problems for the government, for many banished nonconformists would return to Scotland immediately after being released in the New World. Technically, they were ordered not to return on pain of death, but many banished presbyterians, including Gilbert Macadam and James Gray of Chrystoun, did so nevertheless. In an attempt to reduce this traffic, the authorities tried a severe measure in 1685, and the Privy Council ordained that some of the more troublesome transported persons should be marked with a cruel stigmata. Specifically, the males were to have their left ears cut off and the females were to have their left cheeks branded with a hot iron. Such stigmata, it was hoped, would make it difficult for the victims to return to Scotland unnoticed.⁷⁵ It is unclear whether the

Privy Council's draconian measure worked, but it seems the Council only tried the mutilation process once.

Although "liberty" could always be purchased, a banished presbyterian who would not (or could not) pay the cost of his transportation had to endure years of servitude. The difficulties encountered during those years varied from place to place. In Barbados and Jamaica, the climate would make life difficult, but in those areas white servants would be treated as prize possessions. Planters on the islands feared an uprising by the nonwhite majority, and they clamored for white servants who, they reasoned, would help keep the nonwhites in line. As a result of such demographic and social factors, the covenanting servant could very well find himself supervising Africans rather than performing actual labor. This indeed was the case with Gilbert Milroy, a Pennⁿingham^aman who was transported to Jamaica in 1685. Milroy became a servant on a large plantation, and his "master" made him the "overseer" over all the "negroes" on the estate. According to Wodrow, Milroy's "sufferings" included being "mortally hated" by the African "savages" who once "struck him on the head with a long pole." The Scot survived his ordeal.⁷⁶

In the mainland colonies, the covenanting servant's life would be different. In Virginia, there was no shortage of whites, so a Scottish dissenter could very well end up as a field hand in the tobacco fields. On the other hand, in Virginia land was plentiful, and indentured servants often received free acreage from the colonial government when their

terms of service ended. (In Jamaica and Barbados, in contrast, there was already a land shortage when the transported nonconformists arrived, so freed servants did not enjoy a great deal of upward economic mobility.) Receiving free land for seven years of service may seem insignificant, but in many respects it was a substantial boon, for the chances of a commoner ever gaining a freehold in Scotland in the seventeenth century were quite remote.⁷⁷

Of all the colonies, however, those in the north, rather than those in the American south or in the West Indies, were the best for banished Scots. In the northern colonies there were no large plantations and no gangs of laborers in the fields, so the conditions of service were relatively benign. In the north, moreover, the inhabitants were often dissenters themselves, and as dissenters they were sympathetic to the exiled covenanters. The fate of the nonconformists on Pitlochie's ship is a case in point. The vessel landed in New Jersey on December 13, 1685 with a "cargo" of banished presbyterians, but none of those presbyterians--including the ones refused to pay the cost of their transportation--would ever have to serve as indentured servants. The settlers in New Jersey actually helped the exiled Scots regain their freedom, and when Pitlochie's heir (Pitlochie himself died of a fever as a result of the voyage to America) pursued the covenanters in a New Jersey court, the jury ruled that since the defendants had not boarded Pitlochie's vessel freely, Pitlochie's heir had no claim to their service.⁷⁸

Transportation to the colonies could be a severe and rigorous penalty, but this method of persecution, like most of the others, was sometimes inefficiently applied. In the case of the presbyterians on Pitlochie's ship, it is true, the Scottish government was really not at fault (Scotland had no control over the settlers in New Jersey), but on other occasions gross negligence was shown, and in fact some of the Scots sentenced to "transportation to the colonies" never in fact left Britain at all. Two examples can be given. In December of 1678, a noted field preacher named Alexander Peden, together with sixty other "fellow-prisoners for the same cause," were banished to the English colonies and ordered not to return on pain of death. The authorities engaged a ship captain named Edward Johnston to transport the banished Scots from Leith to London, and hired another captain named Ralph Williamson to carry them from London to the colonies. Johnston followed his instructions, but when he reached London with his human cargo he could not find Williamson, so he simply "set" the prisoners ashore "and left them to shift for themselves." The whole affair was clearly handled irresponsibly, and it is possible that one or both captains may have been bribed. The truth will never be known, but it should be noted that Peden and his comrades "generally got home safe after they had been absent from their houses about nine months."⁷⁹

A second case, this one involving ten banished presbyterians, was even more interesting. Hewison, the historian, alluded to the "sufferings" of the ten in the New

World, but none of them went any farther than Edinburgh. Arrested for their involvement in the famous Beith Hill conventicle, the ten were brought before the Privy Council, their sentences of banishment were read, and the Council then ordained that the men should be taken back to "their respective prisons" to await their transportation. In obedience to these instructions, five of the dissenters were escorted by guards back to "their respective prisons" to await banishment. As for the other five, they were supposed to be taken back to the Canongate, but through an oversight they had no guards assigned to them. The Canongate prisoners at first did not notice the mistake, however, because of the "throng of people" all around, and after the "dismissing of the Council" they "went on, supposing the guard to be following." One of them, "never knowing, went the whole length, and entered prison again." Two others "went the length of the cross, till a friend came and asked, 'with^her they were going?' They said to the prison. He said, 'will you prison yourselves, seeing there is none waiting to take you to it?'--which, they perceiving, made their escape." The last two "went the length of Nether-Bow; then, looking behind, and seeing none guarding them, they made their escape also." Thus, four of the ten men regained their freedom thanks to the incompetence that characterized seventeenth century law enforcement.⁸¹ As for the other six, they also were never banished, for they at length were liberated through "the interest of Hary Mackay, the chancellor's secretary."⁸²

Still another method of persecution was the application

of torture. Torture was not a penalty as such, but it was ostensibly used to extort information from nonconformists⁸⁴ in cases involving assassination, rebellion, and conspiracy. Torture was unknown to the common law of England, but it was legal in Scotland when it had been "evidently proved" that the "person tortured" was "guilty of the accession to the crime" and "knew the accomplices."⁸⁵ Needless to say, the words "evidently proved" were interpreted very broadly, especially by modern standards. To illustrate the latter point, one example can be given. In 1684, a Lanarkshire man named John Semple was accused of being a "contriver" of a "treasonous" Cameronian document called the Apologetical Declaration. To prove its case, the Privy Council did not call witnesses or examine evidence, but simply offered Semple an oath "disowning" the Declaration. The Lanarkshire dissenter declined the government's oath as a matter of principle, and from this alone he was judged guilty and tortured for information about his "accomplices."⁸⁶

When the Scottish authorities did resort to torture, they commonly used a device known as the "boot." The boot, it seems, originally came from France. It resembled "those short cases" used to guard young trees from the "rabbits," and it was composed of four pieces of wood fastened together in the shape of a box for the leg. Moveable staves were inserted into this box, and between the staves and the box a wedge was driven.⁸⁷ The boot was a fiendish mechanism, and it was employed against a number of nonconformists. Two men, for example, were put in the

"boot" after the Pentland Rising, James Mitchell was "booted" in 1676 (Mitchell was actually questioned about his involvement in the 1666 rebellion and not for his attempt on Sharp's life), and several others (including a field preacher named Kid and a Glasgow nonconformist named Sproul) underwent the same ordeal in the years following the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion.⁸⁸

The torturing of John Sproul, the Glasgow nonconformist, was typical. Sproul was "booted" in November of 1680 in the presence of the duke of York, Lord Hatton, and several other Scottish dignitaries. Before the boot was applied, Sproul was told that he would not be tortured if he made a full "confession," but the dissenter rejected the government's proposition with contempt and absolutely refused to "confess." The hangman then put Sproul's leg in the boot, and with every question five strokes were made on the device. Sproul was asked if he knew anything about a plot to blow up Holyrood Abbey and the Duke of York, and the dissenter was asked if he knew the whereabouts of Donald Cargill. Sproul insisted he knew nothing. The authorities present were angered by their prisoner's answer, and on the alleged grounds that the boot used was ineffective, another boot was brought in and Sproul was tortured a second time. His answer did not change.⁸⁹

In 1684 a second instrument of torture, the "thumkins," also came into use in Scotland. The "thumbkins," in the words of one contemporary, was a device designed "to squeeze and bruise the thumb." It was a new and larger version of the old Scottish "pilliwinks" (an instrument used on witches),⁹⁰ and

the introduction of the newer device was carefully noted in the register of the Privy Council:

The Lords of his Majesties Privie Councill, considering that the usuall way of torture hath been formerly by the boots for expiscateing of matters relating to the government, and that there is now a new inventione and ingyne called the thumbekins which will be very effectual to the purpose and intent forsaid, doe therefore ordaine that when any person shall be (by ther order) put to the torture, that the said thumbekins, or bootes, or both, be applyed to them as it shall be found fitt and convenient.⁹¹

Although the thumbkins was introduced rather late, it was used on a number of nonconformists. On November 13, 1684, for example, three presbyterians named Wat, Semple, and Thomson were tortured with the mechanism before the eyes of the individuals on the Privy Council. According to Fountainhall, the three "obstinately" bore "the torture of the thummikins. without shrinking till they ware taken out of them, and then they fell doun."⁹² William Spence, another dissenter, suffered the same fate about the same time. Implicated in the Rye House Plot and the earl of Argyll's seditious machinations, Spence was placed in the thumbkins and cruelly tormented. His suffering, moreover, did not stop there. In an attempt to extort information, the government also "booted" and "waked" Spence. The last term, it should be noted, refers to the ancient technique of sleep deprivation. Spence was placed in a cell and "kept from sleep by soldiers sent to watch him by turns."⁹³

Once the government had decided to torture an individual--to torture his body and mind with the boot, the thumbkins, or sleep deprivation--there were few ways to escape.

Some methods were available, however. It was possible, for example, to avoid torture by making a full confession and revealing all "accomplices." A field preacher named King made such a confession to save himself from the boot in 1679.⁹⁴ A second way to escape torture was to procure the clemency of the government. A minister's wife by the name of Duncan received such a favor. Duncan was supposed to be tortured for information concerning the 1668 assassination attempt on Archbishop Sharp, but the authorities, on the advice of Rothes, decided it "was not proper for a gentlewoman to wear boots."⁹⁵ And finally, a third method was to follow the example of Alexander Gordon of Earlston, a laird who evaded the boots by "feigning himself mad." On November 23, 1663, just before the ordeal was supposed to begin, Earlston began to behave as if he had lost his reason (he struggled violently and made a ridiculous confession, saying the duke of Hamilton and "Generalls" Dalrymple and Drummond were the leaders of the "whiggs"), and the authorities, after seeking medical advice, concluded that Earlston was insane, and they rescinded the order sentencing him to the boot.⁹⁶ The laird, it should be added, would conveniently recover his "sanity" after the Revolution.

When the Privy Council inflicted torture, it was, as has been pointed out, acting within the limits of the law. Devices such as the boot and the thumbkins may have been "severe," but they were certainly not illegal. In the post-Restoration period, however, some of the minions of the government, in their zeal to suppress nonconformity, sometimes

used extralegal procedures, including the unauthorized use of torture. The army, the "shock troops" of the established church, were the chief offenders, and on occasion soldiers in the field tortured dissenters "without warrant." Troops under the command of Graham of Claverhouse, the earl of Hume, and Captain Inglis were all accused of engaging in such activities. Methods of torture included twisting "a small cord" "round the upper part of the head" with the end of a pistol," suspending a dissenter "by his thumbs," and putting lighted faggots "betwixt the fingers." Regarding the last method, Alexander Shields, George Ridpath, and Robert Wodrow all referred to it, and Wodrow specifically claimed that by 1685 burning a dissenter "betwixt the fingers" had become the "ordinary method of torture in the countryside."⁹⁷ Of course, Wodrow and his associates may have been guilty of some exaggeration, but there is no doubt that soldiers did abuse dissenters on occasion. James Nisbet, a presbyterian diarist, described what troops did to his younger brother:

1682. The cruel enemy got my dear brother into their hands. They examined him concerning the persecuted people where they haunted, or if he knew where any of them was, but he would not open his mouth to speak one word to them; they spoke him fair--they offered him money⁹⁸ to speak and tell them, but he would not--they held a point of a drawn sword to his naked breast--they fired a pistol over his head--they set him on horseback behind one of themselves, to be taken away and hanged--they tyed a cloath to his face, and set him on his knees to be shot to death--they beat him with their swords and their fists--they kicked him several times to the ground with their feet; yet, after they had used all the cruelty they could, he would not open his mouth to speak one word to them; and although he was a very comely proper child, going in ten years of age, yet they called him a vile, ugly, dumb devil, and beat him very sore, and went their way, leaving him lying on the ground, sore bleeding in the fields.⁹⁹

The whole business of torture was a horrific affair, but the ultimate sanction against nonconformity--worse than the boot itself--was the penalty of death. Human life was cheap in the post-Restoration period, and some statutes actually made simple nonconformity a capital offense. A 1670 act of parliament, for example, ordained that all who preached at field conventicles or convoked "any number of people" to such meetings were to be executed, and a 1685 statute ordained that all who preached at house or field conventicles or attended field conventicles were to be put to death.¹⁰⁰ Fortunately, however, there is truth in the maxim that "the savag^ery of the law inhibits its execution," and the above acts were not really enforced. One William Bell, a minister, was caught preaching at a field conventicle in 1676, and one Robert Dick, a merchant, was caught convoking people to that meeting, but both men, the law notwithstanding, were sent to the Bass, not the gallows.¹⁰¹ Those who were executed in the period were, without exception, ostensibly put to death for sedition or violence, not their religious opinions. On the other hand, it must be emphasized that the government did define sedition and violence in a rather comprehensive way, and the distinction between civil and ecclesiastical offenses was, to say the least, rather indistinct. Thus, in 1681, for example, the authorities hanged "a young unmarried woman" and "a servant maid" simply because these two Cameronians were guilty of "uttering treasonable words."¹⁰²

The total number of presbyterians "martyred"¹⁰³ for

their activities and beliefs is uncertain, but several estimates have been made. According to Alexander Shields, about 140 persons were "executed to death on scaffolds, under the collour of law, from James Guthrie, the first, to Mr. James Renwick," and another 78 "were killed in cold blood, without tryal, conviction, or any colour of law." George Ridpath, another presbyterian, estimated the numbers at 140 and 70 respectively, while Daniel Defoe, a sympathetic English observer known for his inaccuracy, claimed that 362 were judicially executed while another 498 were summarily dispatched in the fields.¹⁰⁴ Whatever the true totals,¹⁰⁵ the executions and killings were clearly concentrated in the 1680's. Before 1680, about 39 were executed for the Pentland Rising, 7 were executed for the Bothwell Bridge Rebellion, and several, including James Davie of Bathgate parish, were killed when soldiers opened fire on armed conventicles. Several other individuals (such as James Mitchel) gave their lives for the cause in the 1660's and 1670's, but most of the covenanter blood that was shed was shed in the decade before the Revolution.¹⁰⁶ In the latter period nearly 20 presbyterians were executed in 1681 alone (even though there had been no major rebellion in that year), and dozens more of the "Lord's suffering people" were "suddenly and cruelly murdered" by soldiers in the fields and other "desert places" during the "two bloody slaughter-years" of 1684 and 1685.¹⁰⁷

The penalty of death, whether inflicted on the scaffolds, under the "collour of law," or in the fields, "in cold blood," "without tral" or "conviction," was often imposed

with great ferocity. Dissenters such as Patrick Forman, who owned a knife "for cutting tyrants' throats," and James Smith, who killed a soldier, had their right hands cut off by the public executioner before being successively hanged and decapitated, and David Hackston of Rathillet, one of Sharp's assassins, had an even more violent judicial execution. First, Hackston's "right hand" was "struck off" and, "after some time," his left hand was amputated. Next he was hanged. He was then cut down before he was dead, and his bowels were taken out, followed by his heart. Hackston's heart was held up by the hangman for the spectators to see, and the covenanters' bowels were burned on the scaffold in a fire prepared for that purpose. Finally, Hackston's bloody corpse was quartered, and the parts were sent to various burghs for public display.¹⁰⁸ Regarding the quartering, Lauder of Fountainhall wrote:

Our old Scots way of quartering, was only the cutting of the legs and arms (as was done with the great Montrose), but did not divide the body, which severe practice we have only of late, since Rathillet's case, borrowed from the customs of England, whom we do not imitate in manie better things.¹⁰⁹

Of all the "martyrdoms," however, the killings in the fields during the "two bloody slaughter-years" of 1684 and 1685 were probably the most brutal. They occurred with great savag^ery--in 1685, for example, a soldier named Inglis "killed one James White, struck off his head with an ax, brought it to Newmills, and plaid at the foot-ball with it"¹¹⁰--and they occurred without a proper trial or the due process of law. Clearly, they showed the persecution at its worst. The whole ordeal began when the Cameronians, under the leadership of James

Renwick, drew up an "Apologetical Declaration" and "affixt" it to various market crosses and kirk doors on November 8, 1684. In their "Declaration," the Cameronians announced "unto all, that whosoever stretcheth forth their hands against us, while we are maintaining the cause and interest of Christ against His enemies,... shall be reputed by us, enemies to God, and the covenanted work of reformation, and punished as such, according to our power, and the degree of their offence."¹¹¹ These words caused the government to panic (even though the Cameronians were few in number and were hardly a serious threat), and the authorities immediately took steps to crush Renwick's little faction. The Court of Session declared that a simple acceptance of the "Apologetical Declaration" constituted an act of treason, and the Privy Council ordained that any person who refused to renounce the Apologetical Declaration by swearing an "oath of abjuration" would be summarily executed.¹¹² The oath of abjuration,¹¹³ which was drawn up with the Cameronians in mind, read as follows:

I, A. B. do hereby abhor, renounce, and disown, in the presence of almighty God, the pretended declaration of war, lately fixed at several parish churches, in so far as it declared a war against his sacred majesty, and asserts, that it is lawful to kill such as serve his majesty, in church, state, army, or country.¹¹⁴

The government pressed the "abjuration" on the people with great zeal. The overwhelming majority of presbyterians complied and took the oath, but "some of that gang," to quote one wit, would "not subscribe the Lord's Prayer" if the government "askid" them to,¹¹⁵ and this occasion was no exception. The Cameronians denounced the swearing of the

abjuration as "a step of compliance dishonourable to God" and "offensive to the generation of the righteous," and they refused to cooperate with the authorities. Alexander Shields, a Cameronian apologist, wrote at length on the "sinfulness" of the abjuration, and he argued that it was unacceptable because it prevented the faithful from inflicting "condign punishment" on the enemies of the covenants, and was therefore "contrary to the fourth article of the Solemn League and Covenant." Ironically, Shields himself had taken the oath of abjuration on August 6, 1685 in order to save his own life, but he did penance for this "defection" before he wrote his book.¹¹⁶

The intransigence of the Cameronians infuriated the government, and a bloodbath quickly followed.¹¹⁷ A few examples can be given. In January of 1685, a party of horse under Colonel James Douglas apprehended and shot six Cameronians. In February, Grierson of Lagg and a party of dragoons shot a laird, John Bell of Whiteside, in the fields. In May, Graham of Claverhouse and a detachment of soldiers executed John Brown, a noted Cameronian, near his home. Brown was with his nephew at the time of the execution, and Claverhouse, in an interesting letter, described the events in a dispassionate tone:

They had no arms about them, and denied they had any. But, being asked if they would take the abjuration, the eldest of the two, called John Brown refused it; nor would he swear not to rise in arms against the king, but said he knew no king. Upon which, and there being bullets and match in his house, I caused shoot him dead, which he suffered unconcernedly.

Brown's nephew, it should be noted, survived the ordeal. He

agreed to take the oath of abjuration and give information to the authorities, and Claverhouse spared the young man's life.¹¹⁸

Clearly, the abjuration oath and the penalty for refusing that oath were strictly enforced. This exactitude was untypical for the period, for other persecutions, from fining to banishment, were not consistently applied. Why the sudden change? The Cameronians, it would seem, genuinely frightened the authorities, and the latter resorted to unmitigated ruthlessness in an attempt to protect themselves. That, at least, is one explanation, and a passage written by Sir George Mackenzie, one of the defenders of the regime, seems to demonstrate that the above theory is the correct one:

As to the act made in Council, allowing soldiers to kill such as refused to own the king's authority; it is answered, that there being many proclamations issued out, by the dissenters, declaring, that the king had forfeited his right by breaking the covenant, and that therefore it was lawful to kill him, and those who serv'd him: many accordingly being killed [by Cameronians], it was thought necessary by some (upon the fresh news of murdering some of the king's horse-guard at Swyn-Abbey in their beds) to terify them out of this extravagancy, by allowing the soldiers to use in a war, in which, if any call, for whom are you? and the others owning that they were for the enemy; it is lawful then to kill: and thus they felt their folly, and the necessary effects of their principle' and yet still it was ordered, that none should be kill'd except those who were found in arms, owning that principle of assassination, and refusing to clear themselves of their having been in accession to the declaring of war, which they had begun; nor were those kill'd but when their deliberate refusal could be proved by two witnesses.¹¹⁹

Mackenzie's reasoning is interesting, but it must be pointed out that the above passage contains one factual error. Mackenzie wrote that "none" were "kill'd" "except those who were found in arms," but in reality unarmed dissenters were shot if they

refused the abjuration oath.

The "killing times" were unparalleled in the annals of Scottish history--some fifty individuals were shot in the fields in 1685 alone--but the orgy of "blood and persecution" could not continue indefinitely.¹²⁰ For a time Scotland was caught in a proverbial vicious circle--Cameronian excesses caused government oppressions, and the oppressions in turn incited further excesses--but by 1686 the radical presbyterians had been reduced to a shattered "bleeding remnant," and this made a "slackening" in the persecution possible. Further relief came in 1687 when James VII instituted a policy of religious toleration, a policy that brought peace to the vast majority of nonconformists.¹²¹ For the irascible "bleeding remnant," however, there was no peace, for they rejected the "erastian" toleration,¹²² and their sufferings continued. In the words of Alexander Shields:

Some of our brethren were murdered in fields and scaffolds, since that pretended toleration; many, both men and women, have been banished and sold for slaves in Barbados: other severe proclamations were issued against our ministers, intercommuning, and setting a pryce upon their heads, to encourage all to apprehend them dead or alive.¹²³

But, even to the radicals, the end of the persecution was in sight. James Renwick, the Cameronian leader, was hanged in February of 1688, and after him there would be no more "martyrs."¹²⁴ Indeed, by the time of Renwick's death, the "Revolution," and the victory of presbyterianism, were only months away.

Notes

¹See Daniel Defoe, Memoirs of the Church of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1848), pp. 96-97; Calder, Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed, p. 21. For some doggerel on the persecution, see Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 195, "The Scotts Lettinie."

²Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688; J. K. Hewison, The Covenanters, 2 vols. (Glasgow, 1908); Mathieson, Politics and Religion in Scotland, 1550-1695; Stewart and Stirling, Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland, p. 9; Archibald Stewart, History Vindicated in the Case of the Wigtown Martyrs (Edinburgh, 1869); Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians.

³"Rutherglen Kirk Session Register," February 28, 1675, April 15, 1677; "Peebles Presbytery Register," November 3, 1680.

⁴"Papists" and Quakers, however, were often excommunicated by the post-Restoration church. See Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, II:312, 313.

⁵During the Civil War period, all Scots had to endorse the covenant on pain of excommunication. See Garden, The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland Truly Represented; Mackenzie, A Vindication of the Government in Scotland, p. 4.

⁶For material on Spence's excommunication, see Records of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane, 1662-1688. For a reference to Robb's excommunication by the archbishop of Glasgow, see "Linlithgow's Presbytery Register," March 22, 1682, June 14, 1682.

⁷"Peebles Presbytery Register," March 16, 1681, May 11, 1681, June 8, 1681, July 3, 1681, September 7, 1681.

⁸Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:145.

⁹Gordon, The Reformed Bishop, pp. 189-190.

¹⁰"Rutherglen Kirk Session Register," November 18, 1677.

¹¹"Peebles Presbytery Register," May 27, 1674.

¹²The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671, October 26, 1664; Hill and Motherwell, Memorabilia of the City of Glasgow, Selected from the Minute Books of the Burgh, 1588-1750, p. 261. See also an interesting

letter from the bishop of Edinburgh in the "Linlithgow Presbytery Register," March 15, 1676.

¹³Stewart, History Vindicated in the Case of the Wigtown Martyrs, pp. 14, 20; Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, pp. 14, 16; Hewison, The Covenanters, II:231; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 12; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II: 169, 174; Alexander Cunningham, Some Questions Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, p. 17; Alexander Shields, The Scots Inquisition, Containing a Brief Description of the Persecution of the Presbyterians in Scotland (Edinburgh, 1745), p. 9.

¹⁴Graham of Claverhouse, in a letter dated March 1, 1682, described how he enforced the laws anent fining:
The way that I have seen taken in other places is to put laws severely against great and small in execution; which is very just; but what effects does that produce but to exasperat and alienate the hearts of the whole people? For it renders three desperate where it gains one; and your Lordship knows that, in the greatest crimes, it is thought wisest to pardon the multitude, and punish the ringleaders, where the number and quality is great; as in the case of whole countries. Wherefore, I have taken another course here. I have called two or three parishes together at one church, and, after intimating to them the power I have, I read them a libel narrating all the acts of parliament against the fanatics; whereby I made them sensible how much they were in the king's reverence; and assured them he was relenting nothing of his former severity against dissenters, nor care of maintaining the established government; as they might see by his doubling the fines in the late act of parliament, and, in the end, told them that the king had no design to ruin any of his subjects he could reclaim; nor to enrich myself by their crimes; and therefore, any who would resolve to conform, and live regularly, might expect favour--excepting only reseters and ringleaders. (Quoted in Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, I:130.)

¹⁵A Court of High Commission, consisting of nine prelates and thirty-five other members, was established on January 16, 1664. The court dealt with a number of offenses (including withdrawing from the services of the established church), but its commission was allowed to expire after its second year. See Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 206; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 8; Stewart and Stirling, Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland, pp. 35ff; Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 59.

¹⁶Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church

of Scotland, p. 206; Shields, The Scots Inquisition, Containing a Brief Description of the Persecution of the Presbyterians in Scotland, p. 19.

¹⁷Cunningham, Some Questions Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, p. 17.

¹⁸Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 167.

¹⁹See "Exchequer Manuscripts," E57 12, E57 13 (in the Register House in Edinburgh); Law, Memorialls, p. 236; Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 30; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 22; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 62, "Gordon of Largmore's Account of the Fynes of the Parish of Kells from the Yeir 1666 to the Yeir 1681 upon Account of Their Nonconformity to Prelacie and the Laws Made Thereanent"; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, March 11, 1675. See also Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 150, "A Note of What Was Suffered by the Honest People of the Parish of Strathmiglo during the Late Persecution Merely for Nonconformity to Episcopacy and Hearing Presbyterian Ministers"; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 144, "Extracts of the Fynes from the Sheriff Books of Fyfe, Years 1682, 1683, 1684."

²⁰See Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 143, "An Account of the Suffering of the People in Kinross Shire." See also Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, III: 197, IV:194.

²¹See Robertson, Lanark: The Burgh and Its Councils, 1469-1880, p. 117. The total income of the burgh was about 1500 pounds scots per year.

²²Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:47, 54.

²³Ibid., IV:2, 47.

²⁴Ibid., IV:52, 212, 425.

²⁵It should also be mentioned that some presbyterians were in positions of authority in post-Restoration Scotland, and these individuals sometimes imposed "sham" fines that they did not plan to collect. Agnew of Lochnaw, the sheriff of Galloway, and Campbell of Cadell, the sheriff of Nairn, were two presbyterians who used the above technique to undermine the penal statutes. See Andrew Agnew, A History of the Hereditary Sheriffs of Galloway (Edinburgh, 1864), p. 351; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, February 1, 1677. See also Hewison, The Covenanters, II:373-374.

²⁶Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, I, p.

LIX.

²⁷Charles Dalton, The Scots Army, 1661-1668 (London, 1909), pp. XIII, 1, 29; Hewison, The Covenanters, II:190; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 222; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 98; J. R. Elder, The Highland Host of 1678 (Aberdeen, 1913), p. 14.

²⁸A Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, Occasioned by the Episcopalians since the Year 1660, p. 10.

²⁹Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:406.

³⁰John Cheisley of Dalry accused a party of troops of invading his house, wounding and beating him and his servants, and damaging his property. The soldiers involved were tried by the government on July 6, 1682, and one was sentenced to banishment and another was degraded. Punishing soldiers for injuries they inflicted was not, it should be noted, typical in the post-Bothwell Bridge period, but Cheisley of Dalry was an influential man, and he had the necessary political connections. See Hewison, The Covenanters, II:367.

³¹Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:170.

³²Elder, The Highland Host of 1678, p. 82; Law, Memorialls, p. 136; A True Narrative of the Proceedings of His Majesties Privy Council in Scotland, for Securing the Peace of That Kingdom (Edinburgh, 1678), p. 7; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXX, no. 194, "Draught of the Account of the Highland Host"; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 217; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:127; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 222; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 12.

³³Elder, The Highland Host of 1678, p. 82; Law, Memorialls, p. 136; Lang, Sir George Mackenzie, King's Advocate, p. 152; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 182, "List of the Subscribers of the Band at Glasgow, January 1678"; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXX, no. 194, "Draught of the Account of the Highland Host"; Mackenzie, A Vindication of the Government in Scotland, p. 12.

³⁴According to a 1685 act of parliament, all "masters, heritors, and liferenters" would eventually have to insert in all "tacks" a clause obliging the tenant to conform. See Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:279.

³⁵Lang, Sir George Mackenzie, King's Advocate, p. 153; Mackenzie, A Vindication of the Government in Scotland, p.

³⁶Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 12; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXX, no. 194, "Draught of the Account of the Highland Host"; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 217.

³⁷Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 191, "Losses of the different Parishes of the Shire of Air, February and March 1678"; John Thomson, ed., A Cloud of Witnesses (Edinburgh, 1871), p. 45; Elder, The Highland Host of 1678, pp. 130, 132; Guthry, The Memoirs of Henry Guthry, p. 85; Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, II:236.

³⁸Law, Memorialls, p. 136; Elder, The Highland Host of 1678, p. 132. One merk was equal to 13s 4d scots money.

³⁹Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 191, "Losses of the Different Parishes of the Shire of Air, February and March 1678," p. 69.

⁴⁰Robertson, Lanark: The Burgh and Its Councils, p. 161. See also Elder, The Highland Host of 1678, p. 69.

⁴¹Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland; Crichton, Memoirs of the Reverend John Blackadder, p. 217n; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:127; Elder, The Highland Host of 1678, pp. 127-128; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, V:558.

⁴²Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 194, "Draught of the Account of the Highland Host"; Elder, The Highland Host of 1678, p. 97; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, March 22, 1678.

⁴³Nisbet's diary is quoted in McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, pp. 518ff.

⁴⁴Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:393; Hewison, The Covenanters, II:119.

⁴⁵Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:247-248.

⁴⁶Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, III:538ff.

⁴⁷See McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, pp. 284ff.

⁴⁸McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 20; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 175; Law, Memorialls, p. 79; Wodrow, The History of the

Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:286.

⁴⁹Mackenzie, A Vindication of the Government in Scotland, p. 11; Christopher Hibbert, The Roots of Evil: A Social History of Crime and Punishment (Boston, 1978), p. 132; Michael Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (London, 1979), pp. 114ff; Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 11; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:169.

⁵⁰Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, April 2, 1673; McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 344; Mackenzie, A Vindication of the Government in Scotland, p. 11.

⁵¹Law, Memorials, p. 151.

⁵²Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:244, III:151, 153; McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, pp. 238, 245; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, February 1, 1677.

⁵³McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, pp. 200ff; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:270; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, June 28, 1676.

⁵⁴Scottish prisons were not the only inegalitarian places of confinement in the early modern period. Christopher Hibbert, in his Roots of Evil: A Social History of Crime and Punishment, mentions that while one prisoner in the better part of England's Newgate prison rarely had fewer than eight guests for dinner, another prisoner was disfigured (and nearly killed) by rats.

⁵⁵Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, III:610.

⁵⁶Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, II:220n; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, July 14, 1685.

⁵⁷McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 9.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 114.

⁵⁹Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses, p. 274.

⁶⁰Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:123; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 13; Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, II:131; Crichton, Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder, p. 230; Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 192.

Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:321; Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 20.

⁶²Jacobite prisoners were placed in the Bass after the Revolution, and these individuals were apparently more resourceful. An account of an escape from the Bass by Jacobites can be read in a pamphlet entitled A True and Faithful Relation of the Particulars of the Surrender of the Island of the Bass ... on April the 20th 1694 (London, 1694).

⁶³Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:126, IV:321; Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses, p. 281; McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 377.

⁶⁴Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses, p. 401; Law, Memorialls, p. 257; Hewison, The Covenanters, II:410.

⁶⁵In addition to the formally banished, there were those who were forced to live a life of self-imposed exile to escape persecution. Thus, James Ure of Shargarton was allegedly able to spend only three nights at home during nine years of "wandering." See Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:406. See also Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 33.

⁶⁶Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, part II, p. 39; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, pp. 208-209; McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, p. 94n; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:353; Hewison, The Covenanters, II:96-97; Law, Memorialls; Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, II:44.

⁶⁷Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, part II, p. 36; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, III:178; Chambers, Domestic Annals of Scotland, II:304; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 29; Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 240.

⁶⁸Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 117, "James Hutchcheson's Account of Those Who Died at Sea Going to New Jersey"; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 115, "Letter from 28 Banished in Pitlochrie's Ship August 28, 1685; McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 157.

⁶⁹Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, I:54; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:131; Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 192.

Honyman, A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali, part II, p. 36; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:131; Abbot Smith, Colonists in Bondage (New York, 1975).

⁷¹Ironically, this Scot of Pitlochrie had been fined and placed in the Bass in the 1670's for engaging in nonconformist activities. See McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 157.

⁷²Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:329; Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 111, "Letter from 28 Banished in Pitlochrie's Ship, August 28, 1685."

⁷³Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:327, III:391.

⁷⁴Shields, Faithful Contendings Displayed, p. 344; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:462-463; Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, II:230-231.

⁷⁵Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:391, IV:218, 221, 222, 329.

⁷⁶Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 112, "Testimony of James Murray to Seven Others Banished to Jamaica, August 10, 1685."

⁷⁷Smith, Colonists in Bondage.

⁷⁸Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:221; McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, pp. 161ff.

⁷⁹Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, I:47, I:52, II:131; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:476.

⁸⁰Hewison, The Covenanters, II:234.

⁸¹Crichton, Memoirs of the Reverend John Blackadder, p. 152.

⁸²Important Scots were constantly undermining the penal laws by using their influence to help nonconformists who were relatives or friends. The first time Donald Cargill was apprehended, for example, he was, "by the interposition of some persons of quality, his own and his wife's relations," set free. See Thomson, A Cloud of Witness, p. 504.

⁸³As Sir George Mackenzie pointed out, although the Convention after the Revolution declared that "torture" was a "grievance," it also declared that cases with "matters of high importance relating to the government" should be "exempted" from any ban on torture. Needless to say, in effect the Convention

changed almost nothing, and "subjects" were "expos'd" to "as much danger as formerly." See Mackenzie, A Vindication of the Government in Scotland, p. 11.

⁸⁴The authorities were always interested in facts about nonconformist activities, and torture was not the only method they used to procure those facts. The government also, for example, used paid informants. Who were the informants? According to Wodrow, in the 1680's "many" people who "had once professed to be presbyterians" "apostatized" and lived "upon this base and malicious trade of informing against presbyterians." Noted informers included Robert Cannon of Mardrogat (a former Pentland rebel), who was "singularly useful to soldiers in discovering the haunts and hiding places of the wanderers"; John Dick, an erstwhile Cameronian who broke with Renwick in 1685 and then "furiously followed the informing trade" (he at length became a soldier in the army of James VII); and Andrew Watson, an apostate presbyterian who had a "sham sentence of death" passed against him so that he could mingle with the "rebels in Galloway and Nithsdale" and gather information on their "lurking places." See Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:224, III:248, IV:243; Shields, The Life and Death of ... Mr. James Renwick, p. 86; Shields, The Scots Inquisition, Containing a Brief Description of the Persecution of the Presbyterians in Scotland, p. 7; The Memoirs of Captain John Creichton from His Own Materials, Drawn up and Digested by Jonathan Swift, pp. 70ff.

⁸⁵Mackenzie, A Vindication of the Government in Scotland, p. 11. See also Sir George Mackenzie, A True Account of the Forms Us'd in Pursuits of Treason, According to the Law of Scotland; by Which the Justice of That Nation May Be Known to Misinformed Strangers (N.P., 1690).

⁸⁶Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses, p. 415.

⁸⁷Morer, A Short Account of Scotland, p. 32; McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 69; Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses, p. 99.

⁸⁸Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, II:100; Lang, Sir George Mackenzie, King's Advocate, p. 77; Law, Memorials, p. 85; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, January 6, 1676; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:133; Hewison, The Covenanters, II:317.

⁸⁹Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses, p. 98.

⁹⁰Morer, A Short Account of Scotland, p. 33; Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses, p. 100; Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 250n; Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Notices of Scottish Affairs, II:557.

⁹¹Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the

Church of Scotland, IV:33; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, July 23, 1684. Wodrow, by the way, garbled the wording of the Privy Council entry in his book, and he blatantly distorted its meaning. He was, it seems, not above such "pious frauds," and one contemporary claimed that Wodrow's work contained "some plain forgeries in fact," as well as "many things true at bottom" which were "wholly disguised" by Wodrow's "way of relating them." See Alexander Bruce, The Scottish Behemoth Dissected, in a Letter to Mr. Robert Wodrow, Concerning the Publishing of a History of the Church of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1722). See also W. J. Couper, "Robert Wodrow and His Critics," Records of the Scottish Church History Society 5(1935): 228-250.

⁹²Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:150; Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, II:219; Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Notices of Scottish Affairs, II:570.

⁹³Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:95; Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, II:414; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 17; Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses, p. 415.

⁹⁴Mackenzie, A Vindication of the Government in Scotland, p. 11; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:133.

⁹⁵Kirkton, The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, p. 283.

⁹⁶Law, Memorials, p. 258.

⁹⁷Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:122, 388, IV:184; Ridpath, A Continuation of the Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 20; Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 235; Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 16; A Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, Occasioned by the Episcopalians since the Year 1660, p. 15; Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, I:295.

⁹⁸In the post-Restoration period, the authorities often tried to use money to help them procure information or apprehend criminals. On June 4, 1674, for example, the Privy Council placed "bounties" on the heads of twenty ministers, including John Welsh and Gabriel Semple, and in 1686 a reward of 100 pounds sterling was offered to anyone who could bring in James Renwick, dead or alive. See Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:270; Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses, p. 479.

Quoted in McCrie, Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves, p. 522.

¹⁰⁰Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:169, IV:272; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 19; Ridpath, A Continuation of the Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 5; Cunningham, Some Questions Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, p. 17; Mackenzie and Mackenzie, A Memorial of His Highness the Prince of Orange, p. 7; Stewart, History Vindicated in the Case of the Wigtown Martyrs, p. 20.

¹⁰¹McCrie, The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History, p. 110; Law, Memorials, p. 97.

¹⁰²Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Observes of Memorable Occurrents in Church and State, from October 1680 to April 1686, p. 26; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:275; Hewison, The Covenanters, II:346.

¹⁰³By "martyred" I mean those presbyterians who were either judicially executed or killed in cold blood. This category would not include the 400 or so presbyterians who were killed in battles or skirmishes with government troops. See Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 34.

¹⁰⁴Ibid.; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 29; Defoe, Memoirs of the Church of Scotland, pp. 96-97. See also Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, I:37 and Hewison, The Covenanters, II:512. Hewison, by the way, suggested that Defoe's estimates were "probably too great."

¹⁰⁵All estimates must be accepted with some caution, for the records (and the authors who interpreted them) were quite fallible. Wodrow, for example, claimed that one William Keagow was executed in December of 1684, but in reality Keagow was only sentenced to death and was never in fact executed.

¹⁰⁶Lauderdale Papers, III:77; Lamont, Diary, p. 195; Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 3; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:132.

¹⁰⁷Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, I:27; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, II:274; Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 34.

¹⁰⁸Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses, pp. 38, 200;

Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, III:222, 274, 286; Law, Memorials, pp. 159, 200; John Erskine of Carnock, Journal, 1683-1687 (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1893), p. 5; Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 233; Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 34.

109Lauder of Fountainhall, Historical Observes of Memorable Occurrents in Church and State, from October 1680 to April 1686, p. 192.

110Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 37; Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, I:114, II:221.

111Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, II:422; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:148.

112Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses p. 478; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:154; Stewart, History Vindicated in the Case of the Wigtown Martyrs, p. 29.

113A 1685 act of parliament endorsed the opinion of the Court of Session and the Privy Council that it was an act of treason to refuse the oath of abjuration. See Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:279; Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 20.

114Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:160.

115Lauderdale Papers, II:107.

116See Shields, A Hind Let Loose, pp. 595-617. See also Alexander Shields, A True and Faithful Relation of the Sufferings of Mr. Alexander Shields, Minister of the Gospel (N.P., 1715).

117The alleged drowning of two female "martyrs" at Wigtown would have occurred in 1685--if it indeed did occur. For material on this controversial case, see Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, I:329; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:247; Mark Napier, The Case of the Crown in re the Wigtown Martyrs Proved to be Myths (Edinburgh, 1863); Stewart, History Vindicated in the Case of the Wigtown Martyrs; Mark Napier, History Rescued in Answer to History Vindicated (Edinburgh, 1870).

118Walker, Six Saints of the Covenant, I:86, II:135; Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past

and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, pp. 24, 25; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland IV:241; A Elegy of That Valiant Champion Sir Robert Grierson of Laq; or the Prince of Darkness His Lamentation for and Commendation of His Trusty and Well-Beloved Friend, the Laird of Laq, who Died December 23d, 1733 (Glasgow, 1733); Napier, Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, I:141.

119 Mackenzie, A Vindication of the Government in Scotland, p. 15.

120 Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland III:274; Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 34.

121 Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV: 357, 417, 424, 425, 440.

122 James Renwick, The Testimony of Some Persecuted Ministers of the Gospel unto the Covenanter's Reformation of the Church of Scotland, and to the Present Expediencie of Continuing to Preach the Gospel in the Fields, and against the Present Antichristian Toleration in Its Nature and Design (N.P., 1688).

123 Shields, A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them Called by Nick-Name Cameronians, p. 28.

124 Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:445; Thomson, A Cloud of Witnesses, p. 481.

Chapter XIII

The Triumph of Presbyterianism

In seventeenth century Scotland, every "revolution" in the state was followed by a "revolution" in the church. This happened after Charles II triumphantly regained power in 1660, and it happened again after William and Mary displaced "a vassal of Anti-Christ"¹ named James VII in 1688-1689. On the former occasion, "presbytery" was the casualty of the "revolution" in the state, but on the latter occasion "presbytery" was the beneficiary, for in 1690 William and his parliament reestablished the presbyterian form of church government, restored the presbyterian ministers who had been "outed" after January 1, 1661² (and placed the management of church affairs in their hands and such as should be admitted and approved by them), sanctioned the Westminster Confession of Faith, and authorized the meeting of the first General Assembly since 1653.³ This triumph of presbyterianism under William of Orange was, to say the least, nothing short of remarkable. As late as 1686 "presbytery" had seemed like a lost cause--the mass of its supporters, the moderates, were conforming to the "prelatical" establishment, while the main radical wing of presbyterianism, the Cameronian sect, was tarnishing the movement with violence and schism--but four short years and a fortuitous "revolution" changed everything, and "presbytery," which "in all ages" had been "opposed" by the "malice of Sathan and the wickedness of men,"⁴ was reinstituted as the official

polity of the established church.

The presbyterian victory, it is true, was not altogether satisfactory--the covenants were ignored and some vestiges of erastianism remained (General Assemblies, for example, would still be subject to the wishes of the crown and parliament⁵)--but it was complete enough. All mainline presbyterians supported the 1690 settlement, and many radicals also endorsed it for "the union and peace of the church." The submission of a large portion of the Cameronians, the most significant radical group, was especially noteworthy. Thomas Lining, Alexander Shields, and William Boyd, the only remaining Cameronian ministers, all joined the established Church of Scotland on October 25, 1690, and six weeks later, at a "general meeting" of the "society people" at Douglas, Lining, Shields, and Boyd urged their former "brethren" to do the same.⁶ Many Cameronians followed this recommendation, but they entered "unto communion" with the Church of Scotland only after drawing up a "testimonial" "against" the "sins and all other defections" in that kirk. The testimonial, which the erstwhile Cameronians prepared so that their "present joyning may not be interpreted as an approveing of ... sins, nor a condemning of, or receding from," their "former or present testimony," is an interesting document, and it is given below. In their declaration, the signatories gave

testimonie against the wrongs done to Christ and this reformed covenanted Church of Scotland by the popish prelatical malignant faction in their wicked overturning its blessed ancient reformation and rescinding the righteous laws and breaking and burning and burieing the holy covenants that fenced it and established upon the ruins thereof abjured prelatie supremacie and tyrannie and by all

ye defections of ministers in compliance or submission to the same such as their hearing the curats taking any oaths and bonds repugnant to ye covenants imbracing the indulgences and indemnities of tyrants adressing for and accepting of ye late popish toleration and owning a popish king and praying for him and his government contrar to ye laudable laws and covenants of this kingdome, likeways paying and advising to pay sinfull impositions professedly imposed for bearing down the faithful and free preaching of the Gospell and also their lying by from or unfaithfulness in the exercise of their ministerie in times of abounding snares and their present offensive ommissions in not renewing the covenants not purging out all the episcopall clergie and particulary we cannot forbear to testify so with all reverence and respect to their ministerie in which we now offer and promise subjection in the Lord thir sin of admitting any to remain members of church judicatories who have taken bonds and oaths as elders in sessions or the like till they give publick satisfaction therefor and likeways of admitting any to ye sacrament of baptism who have taken bands and oaths till they give publick satisfaction therefore.⁷

The above testimonial was signed by many "society" people (thirty from the bounds of the presbytery of Paisley alone),⁸ but it should be pointed out that a few Cameronians (and most of the Russellites) did refuse to make their peace with the established kirk, and the radical wing of presbyterianism did survive the Revolution.⁹ The radicals would never flourish, however (they would be plagued by schism, and they would be divided into eight small sects by 1725),¹⁰ and for all intents and purposes the established church became a more or less comprehensive presbyterian church.

The presbyterian triumph in 1690 marked the beginning of an important epoch in Scotland's ecclesiastical history, but why did William and his parliament reestablish presbyterianism? Strangely enough, William's own religious inclinations were really not a factor in his decision. It has been suggested that

his Calvinism made him look favorably on Scottish presbyterianism, but that is unlikely, given the differences between Dutch and Scottish Calvinists in the seventeenth century. The former, for example, observed "other holy-days besides the Lord's Day," they used "organs" in the "Divine Service," and they possessed "a grave liturgy" or set forms of prayer--things the Scottish presbyterians denounced as "superstitious fooleries."¹¹ But if William's doctrinal preferences were not the reason, what was?

At the time of presbyterianism's reestablishment, it was alleged that "presbytery" was the "church government in this kingdom" which was "most agreeable to the inclinations of the people,"¹² and that was the reason "given out" for William's decision. To be sure, the presbyterians themselves usually claimed that the people were "all generally inclined to the presbyterian government" (with the exception of "papists and some remote, wild, and barbarous Highlanders"),¹³ and these same observers claimed that if Scotland were "left to free choice, of three parts two would be presbyterian,"¹⁴ but of course the issue was never submitted to a plebiscite. John Sage, a pro-episcopal writer, actually issued a challenge "craving a poll," noting that the best method to determine the inclinations of the people was "just to ask the people about their inclinations," but the presbyterians, to use the words of Gilbert Rule, called the above suggestion an "impracticable fantasy."¹⁵ Sage, however, was undaunted, and he declared:

Who sees not that this was plain fear to put it upon such an issue? What imaginable impossibility ... could make polling on this account impracticable? Was it not found practicable

enough in the days of the covenant when the veriest child, if he could write his own name, was put to subscribe it? What should make it more impracticable to poll the whole kingdom for finding the people's inclinations about episcoapcy and presbytery than it was to levy hearth-money from the whole kingdom? Is it not as practicable to poll the kingdom about church-government, as it is to poll it for raising the present subsidy which is imposed by poll?¹⁶

In point of fact, the presbyterians had solid grounds for being opposed to a "poll," for their alleged majority support was dubious at best, a "mere sham"¹⁷ at worst. To be sure, the "industry and faction" of the presbyterians "on the south side of the Forth" made them "appear numerous,"¹⁸ but appearances were very different from reality. The evidence indicates that the group was a minority, and a few presbyterians, such as a soldier named Mackay and a minister named Veitch, were candid enough to admit the truth. Mackay confessed that it was possible "to form a more formidable party against" presbyterianism "than could be formed for it," while Veitch lamented that "an unanimous call of all or the greatest part of the parishioners" could "be expected in very few places of the country to a presbyterian minister."¹⁹ A third presbyterian observer, the indomitable Gilbert Rule, was less direct, but even Rule, his protestations notwithstanding, practically conceded that the presbyterians were outnumbered in Scotland, for he insisted that a poll on the issue would produce a presbyterian majority only if the following groups were excluded: those who were apathetic, those who liked episcopacy because under it they were not censured for their

immoralities, those who liked episcopacy because their interests were tied to the prelates or the Stuarts, those who were only "protestants in masquerade," and those who were the enemies of King William and his government. Needless to say, Rule's categories of exclusion probably included the greater part of the population of Scotland.²⁰

The minority status of presbyterianism is perhaps best illustrated by observing the effects of the "ample toleration" that was in force on the eve of the Revolution. In 1687 James VII, in a fruitless attempt to help his fellow Roman Catholics, issued three "proclamations for libertie of conscience" which gave all subjects the right to "serve God after their own way" in "private houses," "chapels," and "places purposely hired or built for that use,"²¹ but, when given the freedom to do so,²² most Scots did not show presbyterian "inclinations" by attending or supporting presbyterian establishments. Radical groups like the Cameronians were, it is true, overtly hostile to the toleration (they declared "that our Lord Jesus Christ is no friend of toleration," and they called James VII's proclamations a "preservative brewed in hell" for the "cup of the whore's fornications" because the proclamations were favorable to "papists" but hostile to field conventiclers²³), but the vast majority of presbyterians supported the scheme (on July 21, 1687, several leading presbyterians drew up an address of thanks to the king for the toleration²⁴), so the number and success of the presbyterian meetinghouses was a general indicator of presbyterian strength--or the lack thereof. It is

therefore significant that "in the years 1687 and 1688, when the schism was at its elevation," and there was "an absolute and unperplexed liberty" and "much notorious encouragement given by the government to separate from episcopal communion," that presbyterian congregations were established in only a fraction of Scotland's parishes, and these meetinghouses "scarcely" managed to attract "a fifth or sixth part of the nation." In 1687-1688 those "who so pleased" could have joined the "presbyterians" with "safety and without the least prospect of worldly hazard," but the fact is that relatively "few" chose to do so, and in some areas "there was not above two meeting-houses in the whole shire, in others none at all."²⁵ The situation was especially bleak in the north: half the population lived above the Tay, but only three or four meetinghouses were organized to serve this vast region, and they were "very little frequented or encouraged."²⁶ In the west and southwest, the presbyterian heartland and "the great nests of fanaticism,"²⁷ the situation was brighter, but it was still less than satisfactory. The synod of Glasgow and Ayr boasted thirty-six meetinghouses on the eve of the Revolution,²⁸ but ten of these were concentrated in one shire (Renfrewshire),²⁹ and in 1688 the (presbyterian) synod of Glasgow and Ayr found it necessary to complain about "how slack people are in calling of ministers." (The same synod also suggested that the presbyterian ministers should "stirr up the paroches" so that more meetinghouses could be organized.³⁰) In Galloway synod, meanwhile, there was a similar lack of zeal.³¹ In Galloway's

presbytery of Kirkcudbright there were no meetinghouses established before the Revolution,³² and although Galloway's presbytery of Stranraer had two such establishments, one of these apparently floundered until the "presbyterian" lairds "forced" the farmers in the district to contribute money for its support.³³

Why did presbytery, to use the words of one contemporary, rest on "so slender a bottom"?³⁴ The evidence indicates that presbyterianism faced opposition from several quarters,³⁵ both before and after the Revolution. Some of the hostility, it is clear, came from people who were indifferent to all religion. These "debauched persons" were not an inconsiderable group, and Gilbert Rule noted that there were "many ten thousands" in Scotland who were "unconcerned about religion, both in the greater and lesser truths of it."³⁶ Indeed, William Strachan, a contemporary observer, argued that the majority of Scots were impious, and he suggested that the religion most agreeable to the inclinations of the people was actually "heathenism."³⁷ One Joseph Minto, in the parish of Coldingham, was one of those "debauched" "heathens" described by Strachan. According to one post-Revolutionary kirk session entry, Minto

was found in time of Divine Service idling away his time, lying upon a heather stack or turf; and being interrogated by the elders what he was doing there, and why he was out of church, answered--what was that to them? The elders told him that it was not the first time they had found him breaking the Lord's Day. He answered, that it shall not be the last time neither. Being further reprov'd for the sin, and exhorted to repentance and reformation, he answered, that it was an ill world since the like of them were reprov'g folks for sin.³⁸

Other opposition came from Scots who were Christian in sympathy, but indifferent to the issue of church government. The members of this group, who were "not a few" in number,³⁹ were critical of both "presbytery" and "episcopacy" because, to quote one contemporary, "whoever wins it's to our cost."⁴⁰ This "plague on both yours houses" attitude was best expressed by the anonymous author of A Letter from the West to a Member of the Meeting of the Estates in Scotland. The said author, who was writing in 1689, condemned "presbytery" because under it the people were "disciplined with cruelty and whipt with scorpions," and he condemned "episcopacy" because under it there were "the great inconveniences of conge d'elires, and the looseness of the clergy arising from thence." Neither system, he declared, had redeeming values, and together they had given Scotland nothing but trouble, for they had been "justling each other by turns" for supremacy "these hundred years bygone." "You will doubtless accord with me," he concluded with some confidence, that it would have been "happy for this kingdom, if the Reformation here had not been big at one and the same time with twains, the strife of whose primogeniture has cost us so dear."⁴¹

A third group opposed to presbytery was the episcopal party itself. Gilbert Rule, a self-appointed presbyterian "vindicator," claimed that the people who were "conscientiously for prelacy" were "not one of a thousand in Scotland,"⁴² but the evidence in fact suggests that the episcopal party was quite strong. Indeed, some individuals actually claimed that the "episcopalls" were the largest faction in the nation. Thomas

Morer, the chaplain to an English regiment in Scotland, wrote that the episcopal "church party was predominate in this nation for both numbers and quality," Viscout Tarbat, a Scottish observer, declared that the pro-episcoapl group was "more numerous and powerful" than the presbyterian faction, and Alexander Carlyle, a Scottish presbyterian from the eighteenth century, wrote that at the time of the Revolution "more than two-thirds of the people of the country and most part of the gentry were episcopall."⁴³ Of course, the above reckonings may have been distorted versions of the truth, but it is nevertheless certain that prelacy did have a substantial amount of support. To be sure, the episcopal system was not popular in the west and southwest, and the "rabbling" or expulsion of some 200 curates (after the "sudden and ill-judged withdrawal of all the Scottish horse to London") from the "shires of Air, Renfrew, Clidsdale, Nidsdale, and most of Annandale and Galloway" in December, January, and February of 1688-1689 bore witness to that animosity,⁴⁴ but it is not "reasonable to judge a whole kingdom by a corner of it."⁴⁵ Half of the population of Scotland lived north of the Tay (this fact cannot be repeated too often), and this area was so firmly in the episcopal camp that it was virtually unrepresented in the presbyterian "General Assembly" of 1690.⁴⁶ And support for prelacy, it should be emphasized, was by no means confined to the far north. Gilbert Rule maintained that the people only "clave" to "episcopacy" when "the law stood for it,"⁴⁷ but in reality many Scots south of the Tay continued to support prelacy even after it had been

disestablished. A great number of post-Revolutionary occurrences illustrated this loyalty. In the town of Methven, in the presbytery of Perth, a presbyterian had to be ordained in the kirkyard because the supporters of episcopacy would not allow him to enter the church.⁴⁸ In the parish of Cupar, in Fife, the "presbyterian preacher" had only "forty or fifty" people in his congregation because many "waited on" the sermons of two former curates who had set up a meetinghouse in the bounds.⁴⁹ In the burgh of St. Andrews, also in Fife, the presbyterian ministers experienced a similar problem, for the deposed curates in the town established a place of worship and a considerable portion of the population participated in the services held there.⁵⁰ In the parish of Muthill, in the synod of Dunkeld, a presbyterian minister appointed to succeed the ejected curate was kept out of the church by individuals armed with "swords and staves," and when several people tried to hear the presbyterian minister preach they were wounded and beaten.⁵¹ In the town of Linlithgow, in the presbytery with the same name, when the new church establishment tried to depose Alexander Seton, the episcopal incumbent, because he had "persecuted ... the presbyterians of this place," seven "heritors" came forward and declared that "we are satisfied and willing that Mr. Alexander Seton continue our minister and that we disown any libell given in against him."⁵² In the parish of Tranent and Seton, in the presbytery of Haddington, when a presbyterian minister tried to preach to some people he found a "great disturbance and a rabble throwing stones at those

assembled to hear him." In the town of Peebles, in the presbytery of Peebles, when William Veitch, a former conventicle minister, tried to take over the parish church, the leading members of the community issued a protestation on the curate's behalf, and Veitch at length decided to retire to Dumfries.⁵⁴ In the parish of Coldingham, in Berwickshire, the presbyterian minister needed a military force for protection during his induction, for the deposed curate (who held worship services in a barn) enjoyed substantial support in the district.⁵⁵ In the parish of Glenorchy, in the synod of Argyll, when an "antediluvian" presbyterian minister tried to return in 1690 (he had been deposed from Glenorchy in 1662), he received "very undutiful entertainment" from the people (who by then supported his episcopal successor), and the dejected presbyterian had to practice his ministry elsewhere.⁵⁶ And finally, there was even an episcopal party in Glasgow, the chief city in the presbyterian west. Although Gilbert Rule claimed that the episcopalians were "very few" in Glasgow, there were enough to sustain a meetinghouse in the burgh, and this meetinghouse attracted "the greater number of citizens of the best quality."⁵⁷

Given the relative strength of the pro-episcopal party, and given the large number of Scots who were indifferent to religion in general or the issue of church government in particular, why did William II reestablish presbyterianism? Why did he revive a system that stood on "so slender a bottom"?⁵⁸ The answer is simple: it was all a matter of politics. Prelacy

was the only possible alternative to presbytery (Roman Catholicism was not seriously considered), and prelacy was unacceptable because "the episcopal party" "went almost universally into King James's interests."⁵⁹ There was no necessary connection between episcopacy and jacobitism--in England only seven of the bishops remained committed to James Stuart after the Revolution⁶⁰--but in Scotland the episcopalians were zealously loyal to James⁶¹ (in October of 1688, when the Scottish bishops first became aware of William's premeditated invasion, they drew up a fulsome address proclaiming their devotion to James), and they obstinately refused to "give their suffrage" to William of Orange (in April of 1689, after the Convention of Estates had proclaimed William and Mary the new king and queen, the vast majority of curates--five out of six was the earl of Crawford's estimate--refused to pray for the new monarchs by name, and some of them, such as the curate of Eckford, instead asked "God" to "take" the Dutch "usurper" "out of the way").⁶² Such behavior by the "episcopal party"⁶³ clearly demonstrated that Scottish episcopacy was not "agreeable" to William's rule, and he and his parliament therefore abolished "prelacie" (July 1689) and reestablished "presbytery" (June 1690) in its place.⁶⁴ Why presbyterianism? The presbyterian party had "appeared" "warmly" for William right from the start (a presbyterian ecclesiastical convention declared for the Dutch invader as early as January of 1689), and it was obvious to everyone that the presbyterians supported William "both from inclination and interest."⁶⁵

Presbyterian allegiance to the invader may have been self-serving--as one wit remarked, "their great boasts of loyalty ... amount to no more than this, "No Presbytery, No King William"⁶⁶--but it was real nevertheless, and the Dutchman knew that since "the presbyterians were the only party"⁶⁷ solidly behind him in Scotland, it was logical that the possession of the church establishment should go to the presbyterians.

The triumph of "presbytery" in 1689-1690 was, to say the least, something of an anti-climax. Generally speaking, it was simply a mirror image of 1661-1662. In 1661-1662 Charles II radically altered the church for political reasons, and William II did the same thing for the same reasons in 1689-1690. Needless to say, a Melville or a Rutherford would have been disappointed. These men and others like them had fought for a presbyterian establishment, but when their dream was finally realized, it was brought about by a king, rather than God, a parliament, rather than a General Assembly, and for political reasons, rather than scriptural ones. Yet, if the presbyterian triumph was a bit tarnished, it nevertheless opened an important new chapter in Scottish history. The presbyterians had been guilty of "open rebellions under every reign since their entrance into Britain,"⁶⁹ but now their days of sedition and treason were over, and they would become the advocates of loyalty and peace. As for the episcopalians, their involvement in rebellion and blood was just beginning. But that, of course, is another story.

Notes

¹Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 387.

²There were about "sixty" "antediluvian ministers," the "old men" deposed in 1662 who survived the Revolution and were restored by a 1690 act of parliament. Most of the sixty decided to return to their old parishes, but some, such as John Scott (presbytery of Jedburgh), Thomas Thomson (presbytery of Kirkcudbright), and Robert Fleming (presbytery of Glasgow), declined to do so. See The Causes of the Decay of Presbytery in Scotland, In Answer to a Letter from a Clergy-Man of That Persuasion (Edinburgh, 1723), p. 2; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, II:113, III:237.

³Alexander Monro, A Collection of All the Acts of Parliament, with Public Papers and Declarations Relating to the Clergy and Ecclesiastical Affairs within the Kingdom of Scotland since the Revolution (London, 1693), pp. 1-7; John Sage, An Account of the Late Establishment of Presbyterian Government by the Parliament of Scotland (London, 1693); John Cockburn, A Short History of the Revolution in Scotland (London, 1717); The History of the Affaires of Scotland from the Restauration of King Charles the 2d; Cockburn, An Historical Relation of the Late Presbyterian General Assembly, Held at Edinburgh ... in the Year 1690, p. 1; Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 137; William Ferguson, Scotland: 1689 to the Present (Edinburgh, 1978), p. 1; Patrick Riley, King William and the Scottish Politicians (Edinburgh, 1979).

⁴Stewart and Stirling, Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland, p. 135.

⁵Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 137; Thomas Maxwell, "William III and the Scots Presbyterians, II," Records of the Scottish Church History Society 15 (1966): 184.

⁶Thomas Lining, Alexander Shields, and William Boyd, An Account of the Methods and Motives of the Late Union and Submission to the Assembly (Edinburgh, 1691); Cockburn, An Historical Relation of the Late Presbyterian General Assembly, Held at Edinburgh ... in the Year 1690, pp. 28ff; William McMillan, "The Covenanters after the Revolution of 1688," Records of the Scottish Church History Society 10 (1950): 141-153; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae, III:314.

⁷"Paisley Presbytery Register," December 23, 1690.

⁸Ibid.

⁹The Gibbites, however, were apparently extinct by the time of the Revolution.

¹⁰McMillan, "The Covenanters after the Revolution of 1688," pp. 141-153.

¹¹Mackenzie and Mackenzie, A Memorial of His Highness the Prince of Orange, p. 10; Alexander Monro, An Enquiry into the New Opinions (Chiefly) Propagated by the Presbyterians of Scotland (London, 1696); Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 1.

¹²Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to a Paper Intituled, Some Questions Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, p. 35; Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets; George Ridpath, Plain-Dealing, or, a Moderate General Review of the Scottish Prelatical Clergy's Proceedings in the Latter Reigns (N.P., 1689), p. 27; Craven, Records of the Dioceses of Argyll and the Isles, 1560-1860, p. 158.

¹³Ridpath, Plain-Dealing, or, a Moderate General Review of the Scottish Prelatical Clergy's Proceedings in the Latter Reigns, p. 27;

¹⁴Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:435.

¹⁵See Thomas Maxwell, "Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688," Records of the Scottish Church History Society 13(1959): 29. See also Morer, Monro, and Sage, An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, in Several Letters; Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets.

¹⁶Maxwell, "Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688," p. 29.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Mackenzie and Mackenzie, A Memorial of His Highness the Prince of Orange, p. 20.

¹⁹Craven, A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness, p. 181; Memoirs of Mrs. William Veitch, Mr. Thomas Hoq of Kiltearn, Mr. Henry Erskine, and Mr. John Carstares, p. 38; Cockburn, An Historical Relation of the Late Presbyterian General Assembly, held at Edinburgh ... in the Year 1690, pp. 38, 65-68.

²⁰Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to a Paper Intituled, Some Questions Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, p. 35; Sage, Works, I:326.

²¹The "toleration" came in the form of three "indulgences" granted by James VII on February 11, 1687, March 31, 1687, and June 25, 1687. See Sage, Works, I:325; Wodrow, The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, IV:435; Memoirs of Mrs. William Veitch, Mr. Thomas Hoq of Kiltearn, Mr.

Henry Erskine, and Mr. John Carstares, p. 28n; Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 131.

22The "toleration" had some curious effects on the discipline of the established church. Thus, a certain "fornicator" named "John Symson" "refused to satisfie for the scandall before the prelatick incumbent" in the "paroch of Stobo" (the woman had already given "satisfaction") because he attended a meeting house and was therefore a presbyterian "fornicator." Strangely enough, the above case was not unique, for in Paisley presbytery another fornicator "alleadged that the king's royall proclamations for libertie of conscience did free him from obedience to the discipline of the Church," and in Peebles presbytery a "most scandalous" drunkard declined to give "satisfaction" because he supported a "presbyterian preacher" named "Mr. Fythy." (See "Peebles Presbytery Register," March 22, 1688, September 14, 1687; "Paisley Presbytery Register," May 4, 1687.) For information on a less colorful "problem" caused by the "toleration," see William Hector, ed., Selections from the Judicial Records of Renfrewshire (Paisley, 1876), pp. 26ff.

23Shields, A Hind Let Loose, p. 202; Shields, The Life and Death of ... Mr. James Renwick, pp. 114-115; Shields, Faithful Contendings Displayed, p. 308; Renwick, The Testimony of Some Persecuted Ministers of the Gospel unto the Covenanter's Reformation of the Church of Scotland, and to the Present Expedience of Continuing to Preach the Gospel in the Fields, and against the Present Antichristian Toleration in its Nature and Design.

24Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 131. This address of gratitude is especially interesting, for it shows that the traditional opposition of the moderates to separation and "schism" was definitely a thing of the past: moderate presbyterians were quite willing to withdraw from the established church and establish meeting houses by 1687.

25Sage, The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, as It Has Been Lately Established in the Kingdom of Scotland, p. 322; Morer, Monro, and Sage, An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, in Several Letters, p. 4; Sage, Works, I:325; Maxwell, "Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688," p. 28.

26Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 134; Sage, Works, I:325; Morer, Monro, and Sage, An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, in Several Letters, p. 58; Cunningham, Some Questions Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, pp. 29ff.

27Morer, Monro, and Sage, An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, in Several Letters, p. 11.

28Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae; Register of the Provincial Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, 1687-1690 (Glasgow:

Maitland Miscellany, 1847), p. 215, 248, 250.

²⁹See "Paisley Presbytery Register." The first post-Toleration meeting of the (presbyterian) presbytery of Paisley was on December 27, 1687, for between "August" 1687 and the "first of December of the said year " the "presbyteries of Glasgow, Paisley, and Dunbritton did joyne together and made up one presbytery by reason of the paucitie of ministers." The (presbyterian) presbytery of Paisley grew rapidly after its establishment, but it did not deal with its first case of discipline until February 13, 1689, and it did not have elders participating in its work until October 23, 1689. The much smaller (presbyterian) presbytery of Linlithgow, in contrast, was administering discipline by March 7, 1688 and was welcoming elders to its meetings by January 9, 1689. (See "Linlithgow Presbytery Register.")

³⁰Register of the Provincial Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, 1687-1690, October 1688 entry.

³¹Cameronian hostility to the toleration was one reason for Galloway's dearth of meetinghouses, but the Cameronians were too few (it will be recalled that the curates reported only fifty-four "withdrawers from the kirk" out of a total population of 9276 in the mid-1680's) to be the only reason. Lack of interest, it must be assumed, was also a factor, for well into the 1690's, after many of the Cameronians had submitted to the new presbyterian establishment, the churches in Galloway remained "almost all shut up." See Parish Lists of Wigtownshire and Minigaff-1684, p. 5; Cockburn, An Historical Relation of the Late Presbyterian General Assembly, Held at Edinburgh ... in the Year 1690, p. 8; John Cockburn, A Continuation of the Historical Relation of the Late General Assembly in Scotland, with an Account of the Commissions of That Assembly, and other Particulars Concerning the Present State of the Church in that Kingdom (London, 1691); Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae.

³²Ibid.

³³See A Late Letter Concerning the Sufferings of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland (London, 1691), p. 6. Gilbert Rule called the charge "a shameless lie" (See Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, being an Answer to Five Pamphlets, p. 19), but the records indicate that the people were not always generous when it came to donating money to the "cause," and the register of the (presbyterian) synod of Glasgow and Ayr mentions one meetinghouse minister who was receiving only 200 merks for his "yearlie maintenance." See Register of the Provincial Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, 1687-1690, p. 248.

³⁴Leslie, Gallienus Redivivus, quoted in Maxwell, "Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688," p. 27.

³⁵"Papists," who were not numerous, are not included

in this discussion.

³⁶Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to a Paper Intituled, Some Questions Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, p. 35; Maxwell, "Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688," p. 32.

³⁷Strachan, Some Remarks upon a Late Pamphlet Entitled, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 30.

³⁸"Coldingham Kirk Session Register," quoted in John Parker Lawson, History of the Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Day (Edinburgh, 1843), p. 146.

³⁹Sage, The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, as It Has Been Lately Established in the Kingdom of Scotland, quoted in Maxwell, "Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688," p. 32.

⁴⁰Archibald Pitcairn, Babell, a Satirical Poem, on the Proceedings of the General Assembly in the Year 1692 (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1830), p. 6.

⁴¹See A Letter from the West to a Member of the Meeting of Estates in Scotland (Edinburgh, 1689), p. 1.

⁴²Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to a Paper Intituled, Some Questions Concerning Episcopalian and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, p. 35; Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets.

⁴³Morer, Monro, and Sage, An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, in Several Letters; Craven, Records of the Dioceses of Argyll and the Isles, 1560-1860, p. 159; Alexander Carlyle, Autobiography, ed. L. Hill Burton (Edinburgh, 1860), p. 249; Maxwell, "Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688," p. 26; Lawson, History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Day, p. 79.

⁴⁴The significance of the "rabblings" should not be distorted out of proportion, for they were largely the work of a faction, rather than the people as a whole. Alexander Monro, an episcopalian writer, noted that the curates "were not generally rabbled by their own parishioners," but were attacked by Cameronian "firebrands" who "concerted their measures with their own societies," and Gilbert Rule, a presbyterian writer, told roughly the same story. The Monro-Rule version of the rabblings does seem rather simplistic, but there is some evidence to support it in the church records. In the Ayr kirk session register, for example, it is written under January 14, 1689: no session this day, nor sermon, nor collection last sabbath, both the ministers being discharged to preach by an armed party of hillmen upon their perill. For material on the "rabblings," see Garden, The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland Truly Represented, p. 5;

Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to a Paper Intituled, Some Questions Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, p. 18; Monro, An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland; Morer, Monro, and Sage, An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, in Several Letters, p. 15; Shields, Faithful Contendings Displayed, p. 370; Alexander Monro. A Letter to a Friend, Giving an Account of All the Treatises that Have Been Published, with Relation to the Present Persecution of the Church of Scotland (London, 1692); Napier, History Rescued in Answer to History Vindicated, p. CXXXL; Annie Dunlop, The Royal Burgh of Ayr (Edinburgh, 1953), p. 114; Lawson, History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Day, p. 63.

⁴⁵Sage, Works, I:314.

⁴⁶The 1690 General Assembly, which had 116 ministers and 47 elders in attendance, "was no more a General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, than that of Trent can be called a General Council of the Catholic Church." There were "no commissioners from the shires of Angus, Merns, Aberdeen, or any of the more northern parts of the kingdom; and even several places on the north side of the Tay had none; only here and there in a corner, where the presbyterians had seated themselves, and assumed the name of a presbytery, there were one or two chosen and commissioned to represent them in the Assembly." See Cockburn, An Historical Relation of the Late Presbyterian General Assembly, Held at Edinburgh ... in the Year 1690, p. 22.

⁴⁷Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to a Paper Intituled, Some Questions Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, p. 36; Sage, Works, I:326; Monro, The Spirit of Calumny and Slander Examined, Chastised, and Expos'd, in a Letter to a Malicious Libeller, More Particularly Addressed to Mr. George Ridpath.

⁴⁸Lawson, History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Day, p. 141.

⁴⁹Morer, Monro, and Sage, An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, in Several Letters, p. 59.

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Lawson, History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Day, p. 144. Violence against the presbyterian clergy became a serious problem, and at length the government found it necessary to pass a "rabbling act" "for preventing of disorders in the supplying and planting of vacant churches." See Frederick Goldie, A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland from the Restoration to the Present Time, p. 35.

"Linlithgow Presbytery Register," July 16, 1690, July 29, 1690.

⁵³Scot, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, I:397.

⁵⁴Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch, Mr. Thomas Hoq of Kiltarn, Mr. Henry Erskine, and Mr. John Carstares, p. 38; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae, II:38; Cockburn, An Historical Relation of the Late Presbyterian General Assembly, Held at Edinburgh ... in the Year 1690, pp. 38, 65-68.

⁵⁵Memoirs of Mrs. William Veitch, Mr. Thomas Hoq of Kiltarn, Mr. Henry Erskine, and Mr. John Carstares, p. 140; Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae.

⁵⁶Craven, Records of the Dioceses of Argyll and the Isles, p. 167.

⁵⁷Rule, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets, p. 11; Morer, Monro, and Sage, An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, in Several Letters, p. 59; James Cleland, Annals of Glasgow, 2 vols. (Glasgow, 1816), I:130.

⁵⁸Leslie, Gallienus Redivivus, quoted in Maxwell, "Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688," p. 27.

⁵⁹Gilbert Burnet, quoted in D. H. Whiteford, "Jacobitism as a Factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland, 1689-1690," Records of the Scottish Church History Society 16(1969): 137.

⁶⁰Lawson, History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Day, p. 39.

⁶¹The behavior of the Scottish episcopal clergy demonstrated the effectiveness of two pieces of legislation from 1681, the Act of Succession and the Test Act. These two acts were designed to secure the succession of the Roman Catholic James to the throne, and their implementation purged the established kirk of disloyalty by forcing the removal of about fifty ministers of questionable allegiance from the parish churches. For a discussion of the above legislation, see Cowan, The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688, p. 108.

⁶²Keith, A Large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland, pp. 65ff; Whiteford, "Jacobitism as a factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland, 1689-1690," p. 132; Lawson, History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Day, p. 38; Craven, Records of the Dioceses of Argyll and the Isles, 1560-1860, p. 157; Garden, The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland Truly Represented, p. 15; Skinner, An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, II:534; Riley, King William and the Scottish Politicians, p. 81; An Account of

the Proceedings of the Estates in Scotland, ed. E. W. M. Balfour-Melville, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1954), II:534.

⁶³Jacobitism would remain a strong force in the Scottish episcopal movement for several decades after the Revolution. Indeed, some of the episcopalians would carry their devotion to the "king over the water" to fantastic lengths, and by the early eighteenth century the zealots were excommunicating fellow episcopalians who refused to support James Stuart and his line. See Whiteford, "Jacobitism as a Factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland, 1689-1690," p. 146.

⁶⁴Monro, A Collection of All the Acts of Parliament, with Publick Papers and Declarations Relating to the Clergy and Ecclesiastical Affairs within the Kingdom of Scotland since the Revolution, p. 1.

⁶⁵Keith, A Large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland, pp. 65ff; Lawson, History of the Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Day, p. 80; Whiteford, "Jacobitism as a Factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland, 1689-1690," p. 136.

⁶⁶Calder, Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed, p. 79.

⁶⁷Gilbert Burnet, quoted in Whiteford, "Jacobitism as a Factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian relationships in Scotland, 1689-1690," p. 137.

⁶⁸Possession of the Church establishment brought many benefits, one of which was financial. To illustrate the latter point, it is interesting to note that one John Bannatyne was paid 60 pounds scots per year while serving as Lanark's presbyterian meetinghouse minister during the "toleration," but after the Revolution Bannatyne was paid 720 pounds scots per year for serving as Lanark's parish minister. See Robertson, Lanark: The Burgh and Its Councils, 1469-1880, pp. 125, 130.

⁶⁹Ridpath, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, p. 36.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

"An Account of the Proceedings of the Brethren at Edinburgh with Mr. Richard Cameron, Mr. John Kid, and Mr. Thomas Hog." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 213.

An Account of the Proceedings of the Estates in Scotland.
Edited by E. W. M. Balfour-Melville. Edinburgh:
Scottish History Society, 1954.

"An Account of the Suffering of the People in Kinross Shire."
Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 143.

Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland,
1638-1842. Edited by T. Pitcairn. Edinburgh, 1843.

Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland. Edited by T. Thompson and
C. Innes. 12 vols. Edinburgh, 1844-75.

Baillie, Robert. Letters and Journals. Edited by David Laing.
3 vols. Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1842-3.

"Blackadder Memoirs." Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto XCVII.

A Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of
Scotland, Occasioned by the Episcopalians since the
Year 1660. London, 1690.

Brodie, Alexander. Diary. Edited by David Laing. Aberdeen:
Spalding Club, 1863.

Brown, John. An Apologeticall Relation of the Particular
Sufferings of the Faithful Ministers. N.P., 1665.

_____. History of the Indulgence. N.P., 1678.

Bruce, Alexander. The Scottish Behemouth Dissected, in a Letter
to Mr. Robert Wodrow; Concerning the Publishing of a
History of the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1722.

Bruce, Michael. The Rattling of Dry Bones: a Sermon Preached in
the Night-Time at Chapel-Yard, in the Parish of
Carluke, Clydesdale, May 1672.

Burnet, Gilbert. History of His Own Times. Edited by O. Airy.
3 vols. London, 1897.

_____. A Memorial of Diverse Grievances and Abuses in this
Church. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1904.

_____. Modest and Free Conference Betwixt a Conformist and a
Non-Conformist. Ediburgh, 1669.

- _____. A Vindication of the Authority, Constitutions, and Laws of the Church and State of Scotland. Glasgow, 1673.
- Calder, Robert. Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed. London, 1692.
- Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1660-1690. 31 vols. London, 1860-1972.
- "Cambuslang Kirk Session Register."
- Cargill, Donald. Torwood Excommunication, Being the Lecture and Discourse Going before, and the Afternoon Sermon Following after; with the Action of the Excommunication Itself, Pronounced at Torwood, September, 1680. N.P., 1741.
- Carlyle, Alexander. Autobiography. Edited by L. Hill Burton. Edinburgh, 1860.
- Clark, William Nelson, ed. A Collection of Letters Addressed by Prelates and Individuals of High Rank in Scotland ... to Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury. Edinburgh, 1848.
- Cockburn, John. A Continuation of the Historical Relation of the Late General Assembly in Scotland, with an Account of the Commissions of that Assembly, and other Particulars Concerning the Present State of the Church in that Kingdom. London, 1691.
- _____. An Historical Relation of the Late Presbyterian General Assembly, Held at Edinburgh ... in the Year 1690. London, 1691.
- _____. A Short History of the Revolution in Scotland. London, 1717.
- _____. A Specimen of Some Free and Impartial Remarks on Publick Affairs and Particular Persons, Especially Relating to Scotland; Occasioned by Dr. Burnet's History of His Own Times. London, 1724.
- "A Coppie of a Letter Sent to a Friend, Containing the True Narration of the Progress of That Party Defeat at Bothwell, for the Preventing of Misreports and Calumnies raised upon Them." Wodrow Manuscripts, Octavo IV.
- Crichton, Andrew, ed. Memoirs of Reverend John Blackadder. Edinburgh, 1823.
- Cunningham, Alexander. Some Questions Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland. London, 1690.

Cunningham, William, of Craigends. Diary and General Expenditure Book. Edited by James Dodds. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1887.

"Descriptions of Linlithgow's Covenant Burning." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, nos. 34, 35.

Dickson, John. A Letter Written by Mr. John Dickson ... from the Bass Prison. Edinburgh, 1710.

A Dismal Account of the Burning of Our Solemn League and Covenant. N.P., 1662.

Douglas, Robert. "A Brief Narration of the Coming of Prelacy again within This Kirk." Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto LXIII.

_____. A Sermon Preach'd at the Down-Sitting of the Parliament of Scotland, January 1661. Edinburgh, 1661.

"Draft Supplications of the Synod of Galloway." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, nos. 29, 30, 31, 32.

"Draught of a Memorial to the King and Lauderdale in Favour of the Presbyterian Ministers Cast Out." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 33.

"Draught of a Supplication by the Ministers Imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle to the Committee of Estates." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 6.

"Draught of the Account of the Highland Host." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXX, no. 194.

Edinburgh's Joy for His Majesties Coronation in England. Edinburgh, 1661.

An Elegy of that Valiant Champion Sir Robert Grierson of Laq; or the Prince of Darkness His Lamentation for and Commendation of His Trusty and Well-Beloved Friend, the Laird of Laq, who Died December 23d, 1733. Glasgow, 1733.

Erskine, John, of Carnock. Journal, 1683-1687. Edited by Walter MacLeod, Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1893.

"Exchequer Manuscripts, E57 12, E57 13." Edinburgh: Register House.

Extracts from the Burgh Records of Dunfermline. Edited by Andrew Shearer. Dunfermline, 1951.

Extracts from the Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland, 1651-1676. Edited by J. D. Marwick. Edinburgh, 1878.

- Extracts from the Kirk-Session Records of Dunfermline, 1640-1689. Edited by E. Henderson. Edinburgh, 1865.
- Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 1665 to 1680. Edited by Marguerite Wood. Edinburgh, 1950.
- Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Glasgow, 1663-1690. Edited by J. D. Marwick. Glasgow: Scottish Burgh Records Society, 1910.
- Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Peebles, 1652-1714. Glasgow: Scottish Burgh Records Society, 1910.
- Extracts from the Records of the Kirk Session of Elgin, 1584-1779. Edited by William Cramond. Elgin, 1897.
- Extracts from the Records of the Synod of Moray. Edited by William Cramond. Elgin, 1906.
- "Extracts of the Fynes from the Sheriff Books of Fyfe, Years 1682, 1683, 1684." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 144.
- Fleming, Robert. The Church Wounded and Rent by a Spirit of Division, Held Forth in a Short Account of Some Sad Differences ... in the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1681.
- Fraser, James. Chronicles of the Frasers. Edited by William Mackay. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1905.
- Fraser, James. , of Brea. "An Argument Showing that by the Covenant We Are Bound Not To Hear Conform Ministers." Wodrow Manuscripts, Octavo XXII.
- _____. The Lawfulness and Duty of Separtion from Corrupt Ministers. Edinburgh, 1744.
- The Full and True Account of All the Proceedings in Scotland since the Rebellion began. London, 1679.
- Garden, George. The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland Truly Represented. London, 1690.
- Gordon, James. The Reformed Bishop. N.P., 1679.
- "Gordon of Largmore's Account of the Fynes of the Parish of Kells from the Yeir 1666 to the Yeir 1681 upon Account of Their Nonconformity to Prelacie and the Laws Mad Theranent." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 62.
- Guthry, Henry. The Memoirs of Henry Guthry. Edited by George Crawford. Glasgow, 1748.
- Hay, Andrew, of Craignethan. Diary, 1659-1660. Edited by

Alexander George Reid. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1901.

Hector, William, ed. Selections from the Judicial Records of Renfrewshire. Paisley, 1876.

Hickes, George. A Caveat against Fanaticks ... with a Relation of the Barbarous Murder of the Archbishop of St. Andrews. London, 1717.

_____. Ravillac Redivivus: Being a Narrative of the Late Tryal of Mr. James Mitchel ... to which Is Annexed an Account of the Tryal of ... Major Thomas Weir. London, 1682.

_____. The Spirit of Popery Speaks out of the Mouths of Phanatical Protestants. London, 1680.

Hill, James, and Motherwell, William, eds. Memorabilia of the City of Glasqow, Selected from the Minute Books of the Burgh 1588-1750. Glasgow, 1835.

The History of the Affaires of Scotland from the Restauration of King Charles the 2d. London, 1690.

The History of the Late Proceedings of the Students of the College of Edinburgh. London, 1681.

Honyman, Andrew. The Seasonable Case of Submission to the Church Government as Now Re-established by Law. Edinbugh. 1662.

_____. A Survey of the Insolent and Infamous Libel Entitled Naphtali. Edinburgh, 1668.

Howe, John, ed. A Collection of Letters and Sermons, Preached upon Several Subjects, Mostly in Time of the Late Persecution. Glasgow, 1779.

"Humble Address of the Synod of Aberdeen, 1661." Edinburgh: Register House, CH8/1333.

James VI. The Basilicon Doron. Edited by James Craigie. Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society.

"James Hutcheson's Account of Those Who Died at Sea Going to New Jersey." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 117.

Jameson, John. Rebellio Deballata, et Scotia Rediviva: or the Downfall of Rebellion, and Scotland's Resurrection, as It Was Represented in Two Sermons. Edinburgh, 1661.

"Jedburgh Presbytery Register."

"John Matthewson's Account of the Murder of the Curate of

Carsphairn, 1685." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 102.

Johnston, Archibald, of Wariston. Diary. Edited by James Ogilvie. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1940.

Kirkton, James. The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland. Edited by C. K. Sharpe. Edinburgh, 1844.

Laetitiaie Caledonicae, or Scotland's Raptures upon the Return of ... Charles II. Edinburgh, 1660.

The Lamentable Estate and Distressed Case of the Deceased Sir William Dick in Scotland, and His Numerous Family and Creditors for the Commonwealth. London, 1657.

Lamont, John. Diary. Edited by R. Kinloch. Glasgow: Maitland Club, 1830.

The Last True and New Intelligence from Scotland, Being a True and Perfect Account of the Overthrow of the Rebels, with the Number of Slain and taken, on Both Sides. London, 1679.

A Late Letter Concerning the Sufferings of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland. London, 1691.

Lauder, Sir John, of Fountainhall. Chronological Notes of Scottish Affairs from 1680 to 1701. Edinburgh, 1822.

_____. The Decisions of the Lords of Council and Session, from June 6th, 1678 to July 30, 1712. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1759-61.

_____. Historical Notices of Scottish Affairs. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1848.

_____. Historical Observes of Memorable Occurrents in Church and State, from October 1680 to April 1686. Edited by A. Urquhart and D. Laing. Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1840.

_____. Journals, 1665-1676. Edited by Donald Crawford. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1900.

Lauderdale Papers. Edited by O. Airy, 3 vols. London: Camden Society, 1884-5.

Law, Robert. Memorialls. Edited by Charles K. Sharpe. Edinburgh, 1818.

"Letter against Paying the Cess." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 209.

A Letter Containing an Humble and Serious Advice to Some in Scotland, in Reference to Their Late Troubles and Calamities, by a Person of That Nation. N.P., 1661.

A Letter from the West to a Member of the Meeting of Estates in Scotland. Edinburgh, 1689.

"Letter from 28 Banished in Pitlochie's Ship, August 28, 1685."
Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 111.

"Letter on James Mitchell." Wodrow manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 115.

"Letter Sent from Curates to the Archbishop of St. Andrews."
Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXVIII, no. 38.

Letters from the Lady Margaret Kennedy to John, Duke of Lauderdale. Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1827.

Letters of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, with Illustrative Documents, 1678-1689. Edited by G. Smythe. Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1826.

Leven and Melville Papers: Letters and State Papers Chiefly Addressed to George, Earl of Melville, Secretary of State for Scotland, 1689-1691. Edited by W. L. Melville. Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1843.

Life of James Sharp. N. P., 1719.

Lindsay, Colin. Memoirs Touching the Revolution in Scotland, 1688-1690. Edited by A. W. C. Lindsay. Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1841.

Lining, Thomas; Shields, Alexander; and Boyd, William. An Account of the Methods and Motives of the Late Union and Submission to the Assembly. Edinburgh, 1691.

"Linlithgow Presbytery Register."

"List of the Subscribers of the band at Glasgow, January 1678."
Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 182.

"Losses of the Different Parishes of the Shire of Air, February and March 1678." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 191.

McCrie, Thomas, ed. Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch and George Brysson, Written by Themselves. Edinburgh, 1825.

Mackenzie, Sir George, of Rosehaugh. Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland. Edited by Thomas Thomson. Edinburgh, 1821.

_____. Religious Stoic. London, 1693.

- _____. A True Account of the Forms Us'd in Pursuits of Treason, According to the Law of Scotland; by Which the Justice of That Nation May Be Known to Misinformed Strangers. N. P., 1690.
- _____. A True and Plain Account of the Discoveries Made in Scotland of the Late Conspiracies against His Majesty and the Government. Edinburgh, 1685.
- _____. A Vindication of the Government in Scotland. London, 1691.
- Mackenzie, Sir George, of Rosehaugh, and Mackenzie, Sir George, of Tarbat. A Memorial for His Highness the Prince of Orange. London, 1689.
- MacWard, Robert. The Case of the Accomodation Lately Proposed by the Bishop of Dunblane. N.P., 1671.
- _____. The Poor Man's Cup of Cold Water. Edinburgh, 1678.
- _____. The True Nonconformist. N.P., 1671.
- The Memoirs of Captain John Creichton from His Own Materials, Drawn up and Digested by Jonathan Swift. London, 1827.
- Memoirs of Lord Viscount Dundee ... by an Officer of the Army. London, 1714.
- Memoirs of Mrs. William Veitch, Mr. Thomas Hoq of Kiltearn, Mr. Henry Erskine, and Mr. John Carstares. Edinburgh, 1846.
- Mercurius Caledonius, Comprising the Affairs Now in Agitation in Scotland, 25 January - 1 February, 1661.
- "Minutebook of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale."
- Minutes of the Synod of Argyll. 2 vols. Edited by Duncan Mactavish. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1943, 1948.
- A Modest Apology for the Students of Edinburgh Burning a Pope, December 25, 1680. London, 1681.
- Monro, Alexander. An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland. London, 1693.
- _____. A Collection of All the Acts of Parliament, with Publick Papers and Declarations Relating to the Clergy and Ecclesiastical Affairs within the Kingdom of Scotland since the Revolution. London, 1693.
- _____. An Enquiry into the New Opinions (Chiefly) Propagated by the Presbyterians of Scotland. London, 1696.

- _____ . The History of Scotch Presbytery: Being an Epitome of the Hind Let Loose. London, 1692.
- _____ . A Letter to a Friend, Giving an Account of All the Treatises That Have Been Publish'd, with Relation to the Present Persecution of the Church of Scotland. London, 1692.
- _____ . Presbyterian Inquisition; as It Was Lately Practiced against the Professors of the College of Edinburgh. London, 1691.
- _____ . The Spirit of Calumny and Slander Examin'd, Chastis'd, and Expos'd, in a Letter to a Malicious Libeller, More Particularly Addressed to Mr. George Ridpath. London, 1693.
- Morer, Thomas. A Short Account of Scotland. London, 1702.
- Morer, Thomas; Monro, Alexander; and Sage, John. An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland, in Several Letters. London, 1690.
- Nedham, Marchmont. The True Character of the Rigid Presbyter. London, 1661.
- Nicoll, John. A Diary of Public Transactions and other Occurrences, Chiefly in Scotland, from January 1650 to June 1667. Edited by David Laing. Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1836.
- Nimmo, James. Diary, 1654-1709. Edited by W. G. Scott-Moncrieff. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1889.
- "A Note of What Was Suffered by the Honest People of the Parish of Strathmiglo During the Late Persecution Merely for Nonconformity to Episcopacy and Hearing Presbyterian Ministers." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 150.
- "Paisley Presbytery Register."
- "Paper from a Meeting at Beath Hill." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio LX, no. 99.
- Parish Lists of Wigtownshire and Miniqaff-1684. Edited by William Scot. Edinburgh: Scottish Record Society, 1910.
- Paterson, John. A Brief Resolution of the Present Case of the Subjects of Scotland. N.P., 1661.
- _____ . Post Nubilia Phoebus, or a Sermon of Thanksgiving for the Safe and Happy Return of Our Gracious Sovereign. Aberdeen, 1660.

- _____. Tandem Bona Causa Triumphant, or Scotland's Late Misery Bevailed. Edinburgh, 1661.
- Paterson, Ninian. The Fanatick Indulgence Granted, 1679. Edinburgh, 1683.
- Peden, Alexander. The Lord's Trumpet Sounding an Alarm against Scotland. N. P., 1682.
- "Peebles Presbytery Register."
- "Perth Presbytery Register."
- A Phenix, or, the Solemn League and Covenant. Edinburgh, 1661.
- Pitcairn, Archibald. Babell, a Satirical Poem, on the Proceedings of the General Assembly in the Year 1692. Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1830.
- The Queries and Protestation of the Scots Episcopal Clergy against the Authority of the Presbyterian General Assemblies and Committees, Given in to the Committee of the General Assembly at Aberdeen June 29th, 1694. Together with the Committee's Answer.
- The Records of Elgin, 1234-1800. Compiled by W. Cramond and Stephen Rae. 2 vols. Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1903-1908.
- Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688. Edited by T. Bell. Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1897.
- Records of the Presbyteries of Inverness and Dingwall, 1643-1688. Edited by William Mackay. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1896.
- The Records of the Proceedings of the Justiciary Court, 1661-1678. Edited by W. G. Scott-Moncrieff. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1905.
- Register of the Diocesan Synod of Dunblane, 1662-1688. Edited by J. Wilson. Edinburgh, 1877.
- Register of the Privy Council of Scotland. Third Series, XVI vols. Edinburgh, 1908-1976.
- Register of the Provincial Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, 1687-1690. Glasgow: Maitland Miscellany, 1847.
- The Register of the Synod of Galloway from October 1664 to April 1671. Kirkcudbright, 1856.
- "A Relation of What Past at Edinburgh the 11 of December 1662 ... in the Lowe Counsell House Where Mr. John Livingston Minister of Ancrum Was before the Lordes of

His Majesties Secret Counsell." Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto XXXIV, no. 1.

Renwick, James. The Testimony of Some Persecuted Ministers of the Gospel unto the Covenanter's Reformation of the Church of Scotland, and to the Present Expediencie of Continuing to Preach the Gospel in the Fields, and Against the Present Antichristian Toleration in Its Nature and Design. N.P., 1688.

Renwick, James, and Shields, Alexander. An Informatory Vindication of a ... Remnant of the ... Church of Christ in Scotland. Edinburgh, 1744.

Ridpath, George. An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence. London, 1693.

_____. A Continuation of the Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence. London, 1693.

_____. Plain-Dealing, or, a Moderate General Review of the Scottish Prelatical Clergy's Proceedings in the Latter Reigns. N.P., 1689.

_____. The Queries and Protestations of the Scots Episcopal Clergy against the Authority of the Presbyterian General Assemblies and Committees, Given into the Committee of the General Assembly 1694, Together with the Committee's Answer London, 1694.

_____. The Scots Episcopal Innocence, or the Juggling of That Party with the Late King, His Present Majesty, the Church of England, and the Church of Scotland, Demonstrated. London, 1694.

Row, William. The Life of Mr. Blair. Edited by Thomas McCrie. Edinburgh, 1848.

Rule, Gilbert. A Defence of the Vindication of the Church of Scotland, in Answer to an Apology of the Clergy of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1694.

_____. A Further Vindication of the Present Government of the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1691.

_____. A Just and Modest Reproof of a Pamphlet, Called the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence. Edinburgh, 1693.

_____. A True Representation of the Presbyterian Government; Wherein a Short and Clear Account Is Given of the Principles of Them That Owne It, the Common Objections against It Answered, and Some Other Things Opened That Concern It in the Present Circumstances. Edinburgh, 1690.

- _____. A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to a Paper Intituled, Some Questions Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland. London, 1691.
- _____. A Vindication of the Church of Scotland, Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets. London, 1691.
- _____. A Vindication of the Presbyterians in Scotland from the Malicious Aspersions Cast on Them in a Late Pamphlet Written by Sir George Mackenzie. London, 1691.
- "Rutherglen Kirk Session Register."
- Sage, John. An Account of the Late Establishment of the Presbyterian Government by the Parliament of Scotland. London, 1693.
- _____. The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, as It Has Been Lately Established in the Kingdom of Scotland. London, 1690.
- _____. Works. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Spottiswoode Society, 1844-46.
- "A Satyr against the Present Episcopall Clergie." Wodrow Manuscripts, Quarto L.
- "Satyr on the Bishops." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 41.
- "The Scotts Lettinie." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 195.
- Scrougie, A. Mirabilia Dei ... a Congratulatory Sermon. Edinburgh, 1660.
- Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife, 1611-87. Edited by Charles Baxter. Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1837.
- Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen. Edited by John Stuart. Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1846.
- Selections from the Records of the Regality of Melrose, 1662-1676. Edited by Charles Romanes. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1915.
- Selections from the Register of the Presbytery of Lanark, 1623-1709. Edited by John Robertson. Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1839.
- The Session Book of Kingarth, 1641-1703. Edited by Henry Paton.

Edinburgh, 1931.

The Session Book of Penningham, 1696-1724. Edited by Henry Paton. Edinburgh, 1933.

The Session Book of Rothesay, 1658-1750. Edited by Henry Paton. Edinburgh, 1931.

Shields, Alexander. A Hind Let Loose. Edinburgh, 1797.

_____. A Letter Concerning the Due Boundaries of Christian Fellowship Written to the Prisoners for Conscience, in Dunnotar Castle ... 1685. N.P., 1726.

_____. The Life and Death of ... Mr. James Renwick. Edinburgh, 1724.

_____. The Scots Inquisition, Containing a Brief Description of the Persecution of the Presbyterians in Scotland. Edinburgh, 1745.

_____. A Serious Inquiry into the Nature and Method of Praying for Tyrants, Kings, or Magistrates, That Are Anti-Covenanters. Glasgow, 1770.

_____. A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, Past and Present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly Those of Them called by Nick-Name Cameronians. Edinburgh, 1690.

_____. A True and Faithful Relation of the Sufferings of Mr. Alexander Shields, Minister of the Gospel. N.P., 1715.

Shields, Michael. Faithful Contendings Displayed. Edited by John Howie. Glasgow, 1780.

A Short Compend, or, a Description of the Rebels in Scotland, in Anno 1679, by a Well-Wisher of His Majesty. N.P., 1681.

Simson, David. A True and Impartial Account of the Most Reverend Father in God, Dr. James Sharp. N.P., 1723.

Smith, Hugh, and Jamieson, Alexander. An Apology for, or Vindication of the Oppressed Persecuted Ministers and Professors of the Presbyterian Reformed Religion, in the Church of Scotland. London, 1677.

"Some Verses on Bishops' Consecrations." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 38.

South Leith Records, 1588-1700. Edited by D. Robertson. Edinburgh, 1911.

Stewart, James, and Stirling, James. Naphtali, or the

- Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland. Glasgow, 1721.
- Strachan, William. Some Remarks upon a Late Pamphlet Entitled, an Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence. London, 1694.
- "Testimony of James Murray to Seven Others Banished to Jamaica, August 10, 1685." Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXIII, no. 112.
- Thomson, John, ed. A Cloud of Witnesses. Edinburgh, 1871.
- A True Account of the Rising of the Rebels in the West of Scotland. London, 1681.
- A True and Faithful Relation of the Particulars of the Surrender of the Island of the Bass ... on April the 20th 1694. London, 1694.
- A True and Impartial Account of the Examinations and Confessions of Several Execrable Conspirators against the King and His Government in Scotland. London, 1681.
- A True Narrative of the Proceedings of His Majesties Privy Council in Scotland, for Securing the Peace of That Kingdom. Edinburgh, 1678.
- A True Relation of the Inhuman Cruelties Lately Acted by the Rebels in Scotland, with the Manner of Their Taking Glascough, Rifling the Archbishop's House, Digging the Bishop of Argyles Children out of Their Graves, and many Other Barbarities. London, 1679.
- Turner, Sir James. Memoirs of His Own Life and Times. Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1829.
- Violant, William. A Review and Examination of a Book Bearing the Title of the History of the Indulgence ... To Which is Added a Survey of the Mischievous Absurdities of the Late Bond, and Sanquhar Declaration. N.P., N.D.
- Wilson, William. A True and Impartial Account of the Persecuted Presbyterians in Scotland, Their Being in Arms, and Defeat at Bothwell Briqq. N.P., 1697.
- Wodrow, Robert. The Correspondence of the Reverend Robert Wodrow. Edited by Thomas McCrie. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842-3.
- Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 62.
- Wodrow Manuscripts, Folio XXXII, no. 195.

Bibliography

Secondary Sources

- Agnew, Andrew. A History of the Hereditary Sheriffs of Galloway. Edinburgh, 1864.
- Aldis, Harry. A List of Books Printed in Scotland before 1700. Edinburgh, 1904.
- Andrews, William. Bygone Punishments. London, 1899.
- Bell, W. F. "South Perthshire and the Covenanting Stuggle." Records of the Scottish Church History Society 1(1926):57-74.
- Beveridge, James. Linlithgow at the Scottish Reformation and in the Seventeenth Century. Linlithgow, 1914.
- Brown, Hume. History of Scotland. 3 vols. Cambridge, 1909.
- Buckroyd, Julia. Church and State in Scotland, 1660-1681. Edinburgh, 1980.
- Burns, Thomas. Church Property: The Benefice Lectures. Edinburgh, 1905.
- Carslaw, W. H. Exiles of the Covenant. Paisley, 1908.
- _____. The Life and Letters of James Renwick. Edinburgh, 1893.
- Chambers, R. Domestic Annals of Scotland. 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1858-60.
- Clark, I. M. A History of Church Discipline in Scotland. Aberdeen, 1929.
- Cleland, James. Annals of Glasgow. 2 vols. Glasgow, 1816.
- Couper, W. J. "Robert Wodrow and His Critics." Records of the Scottish Church History Society 5(1935):228-250.
- Cowan, I. B. The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688. London, 1976.
- _____. "Worship and Dissent in Restoration Scotland." Scotia: American-Canadian Journal of Scottish Studies 2(April 1978):61-69..
- Craven, J. B. History of the Church in Orkney, 1558-1688. 2 vols. Kirkwall, 1893.
- _____. A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness. Kirkwall, 1908.

- _____. History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Moray. London, 1889.
- _____. Records of the Dioceses of Argyll and the Isles, 1560-1860. N.P., 1907.
- Dalton, Charles. The Scots Army, 1661-1668. London, 1909.
- Defoe, Daniel. Memoirs of the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1848.
- Donaldson, Gordon. Scotland, James V to James VII. Edinburgh, 1965.
- Dow, F. D. Cromwellian Scotland, 1651-1660. Edinburgh, 1979.
- Dowden, John. The Bishops of Scotland. Glasgow, 1912.
- Dunlop, Annie. The Royal Burgh of Ayr. Edinburgh, 1953.
- Easson, D. E. "A Scottish Parish in Covenanting Times." Records of the Scottish Church History Society 9(1947):111-126.
- Elder, J. R. The Highland Host of 1678. Aberdeen, 1912.
- Ferguson, William. "The Problem of the Established Church in the West Highlands and Islands in the Eighteenth Century." Records of the Scottish Church History Society 18(1972):15-32.
- _____. Scotland: 1689 to the Present. Edinburgh, 1978.
- Ferrie, William. Notices of the Life of the Reverend John Carstares ... with a Number of His Unpublished Letters, and the Letters of Other Scottish Worthies. Edinburgh, 1843.
- Foster, Walter. Bishop and Presbytery: The Church of Scotland, 1661-1688. London, 1958.
- Goldie, Frederick. A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland from the Restoration to the Present Time. London, 1951.
- Grub, George. An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1891.
- Henderson, G. D. "The Exercise." Records of the Scottish Church History Society 7(1941):24-31.
- _____. Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland. London, 1935.
- Hewison, J. K. The Covenanters. 2 vols. Glasgow, 1908.

- Hunter, John. The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689.
2 vols. London, 1918.
- Irving, Joseph. The History of Dumbartonshire. Dumbarton,
1840.
- Keith, Robert. A Large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the
Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland.
Edinburgh, 1824.
- King, R. The Covenanters of the North. Aberdeen, 1846.
- Knox, R. A. Robert Leighton, Archbishop of Glasgow. London,
1930.
- Lang, Andrew. A History of Scotland. 4 vols. Edinburgh,
1900-07.
- _____. Sir George Mackenzie, King's Advocate. London, 1909.
- Lawson, John Parker. The Episcopal Church of Scotland from the
Reformation to the Revolution. Edinburgh, 1844.
- _____. History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the
Revolution to the Present Day. Edinburgh, 1843.
- McCoy, F. N. Robert Baillie and the Second Scots Reformation.
Berkeley, 1974.
- McCrie, Thomas. The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical
History. Edinburgh, 1847.
- Mackenzie, William. The History of Galloway from the Earliest
Period to the Present Time. 2 vols. Kirkcudbright,
1841.
- McMillan, William. "The Covenanters after the Revolution of
1688." Records of the Scottish Church History Society
10(1950): 141-153.
- _____. The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church,
1550-1638. London, 1931.
- MacPherson, Hector. "Alexander Shields, 1660-1700." Records of
the Scottish Church History Society 3(1929):55-68.
- Matheson, Cyril. A Catalogue of the Publications of Scottish
Historical and Kindred Clubs and Societies, 1908-1927.
Aberdeen, 1928.
- Mathieson, W. L. Politics and Religion in Scotland,
1550-1695. 2 vols. Glasgow, 1902.
- Maxwell, Thomas. "Presbyterian and Episcopalian in 1688."
Records of the Scottish Church History Society

13(1959): 25-37.

- _____. "William III and the Scots Presbyterians, I." Records of the Scottish Church History Society 15(1966):117-140.
- _____. "William III and the Scots Presbyterians, II." Records of the Scottish Church History Society 15(1966):169-172.
- Maxwell, William. A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland. London, 1955.
- Meickle, James. An Old Session Book: Being Studies in Alyth's Second Session Book. Paisley, 1918.
- Napier, Mark. The Case for the Crown in re the Wigtown Martyrs Proved to be Myths. Edinburgh, 1863.
- _____. History Rescued in Answer to History Vindicated. Edinburgh, 1870.
- _____. Memorials and Letters of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee. 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1859-62.
- Orem, William. A Description of Old Aberdeen. Aberdeen, 1830.
- Riley, Patrick. King William and the Scottish Politicians. Edinburgh, 1979.
- Robertson, A. D. Lanark: The Burgh and Its Councils, 1469-1880. Lanark, 1974.
- Ross, John. Four Centuries of Scottish Worship. Edinburgh, 1972.
- Scott, Hew. Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticanae. 8 vols. Edinburgh, 1915-50.
- Sinclair, Sir John, ed. The Statistical Account of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1915-50.
- Skinner, John. An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. 2 vols. London, 1788.
- Smith, Abbot. Colonists in Bondage. New York, 1975.
- Smout, T. C. The History of the Scottish People, 1560-1830. Glasgow, 1969.
- Stephen, J. The Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp. London, 1839.
- Stevenson, David. Revolution and Counter-Revolution in

- Scotland, 1644-1651. London, 1977.
- _____. The Scottish Revolution, 1637-1644. London, 1973.
- Stewart, Archibald. History Vindicated in the Case of the Wigtown Martyrs. Edinburgh, 1869.
- Story, R. H. Life of Carstares. London, 1874.
- Terry, C. S. A Catalogue of the Publications of Scottish Historical Clubs and Societies, 1780-1908. Glasgow, 1909.
- _____. The Pentland Rising and Rullion Green. Glasgow, 1905.
- Thomas, Keith. Religion and the Decline of Magic. London, 1971.
- Thompson, Bard, ed. Liturgies of the Western Church. New York, 1979.
- Walker, Patrick. Biographia Presbyteriana. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1827.
- _____. Six Saints of the Covenant. Edited by D. Hay Fleming. 2 vols. London, 1901.
- Warrick, John. The Moderators of the Church of Scotland, from 1690 to 1740. Edinburgh, 1913.
- Whiteford, D. H. "Jacobitism as a Factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland, 1689-1690." Records of the Scottish Church History Society 16(1969):129-150.
- Willock, J. A Scots Earl in Covenanting Times, 1629-1685. Edinburgh, 1907.
- _____. "Sharp and the Restoration Policy in Scotland." Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 20(New Series): 149-169.
- Wodrow, Robert. Analecta. Edited by Matthew Leishman. 4 vols. Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1842-3.
- _____. The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland. Edited by R. Burns. 4 vols. Glasgow, 1823-30.

