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ABSTRACT

This study aims to provide an account of the collapse of the established episcopal Church of Scotland following the Revolution of 1689, and of the gradual re-consolidation of the bishops and episcopal clergy as part of a church separate from the presbyterian establishment. The Restoration episcopate's close identification with the Stewarts' authority is discussed to show the political nature of the abolition of the bishops, and the importance of Jacobitism in shaping the episcopalian's resistance to the church settlement over the thirty years from 1689. Whereas widespread Jacobitism was used to justify the removal of the bishops and many clergy, a significant number of episcopalian were prepared to acknowledge the Revolution dispensation in the State, and some even accepted presbyterianism. As a result, schemes of comprehension and toleration were attempted in the period 1689-1703, which threatened to limit the presbyterians' ascendency. Although these failed they strengthened the sympathy felt for the episcopalian by Tory and High Church members of the Church of England, on account of their hard circumstances and religious witness. Patronage was bestowed on the Scots, and money was given which aided the episcopalian's own efforts to organise charitable relief. Moreover, it is argued that this sympathy, and the avowed loyalty of some clergy, enabled the legislative successes and consequent revival of Scottish episcopalianism, especially in the post-Union period, from which both the nonjurors and the complying clergy benefited. A factor which contributed to, and stemmed from English support, was the increased adoption from before 1707
of liturgical worship. This led to clashes with the Kirk, notably in the case of James Greenshields, and, aided by strong political backing, secured Toleration in 1712. Particular attention is paid to the achievements of the period 1709-15, especially the promotion of the English liturgy, which were largely, but not wholly, undone by the penal reprisals following the involvement of many clergy in the 1715 Rebellion. An assessment of the episcopalian's position by the 1720s argues that during the period from 1689 the nonjurors, influenced by their English brethren, constituted themselves into a separate church from the establishment, and, increasingly, a communion distinct from the episcopalian clergy and laity who acknowledged the Revolution settlement and the Hanoverian succession.
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Tristan Clarke
In July 1689 the Restoration episcopate was abolished by the 'convention' parliament in terms of the Claim of Right, which declared that

"Prelacy and superiority of any office in the Church above presbyters, is and hath been, a great and unsupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people ever since the Reformation."  

The removal of the bishops embodied the presbyterian revulsion against Stewart government in church and state which characterised the Revolution, and was designed as the first legal stage towards the re-establishment of presbytery, which followed in 1690. By contrast with the sudden collapse of the episcopate, the resistance of the established parochial clergy to the presbyterian ascendancy ensured that the settlement of the Church became a bitter and protracted struggle and an important element both in political affairs in Scotland, and in her relations with England, until after the Rebellion of 1715.

In 1689 the Restoration Church was poised uneasily between James's Catholicising policies and the flourishing of presbyterian dissent as an immediate result of the Toleration of 1687. Its predicament mainly arose from its subordination to the royal prerogative and secular control since 1660, its intermittent
espousal of harsh policies in co-operation with the state towards presbyterian dissent, and its consequent inability to establish lasting religious allegiances to the establishment among a significant proportion of the population in the south and west. In Scotland as a whole the government of the Church was not dramatically altered by the imposition of episcopal authority on the structure of church courts which normally obtained under a presbyterian system. The functions of presbyteries in discipline, visitations and the trial of candidates for orders, remained, the chief differences being that orders were now conferred by bishops and that lay elders did not attend presbyteries. The practical exercise of discipline by presbyteries and kirk sessions continued unaltered after 1660, and it has been argued that the restored episcopate had little impact on parish life. The bishops' power was, however, evident in the diocesan synods, which met on their authority and were subject to their veto. The clergy's capacity to regulate Church affairs was also hindered by the Court's refusal to permit a national synod to sit, though it had been one of Charles II's aims in the early 1660s. In 1674 proposals originating with Gilbert Burnet, and endorsed by Archbishop Leighton and Bishop Ramsay, were refused on the advice of Archbishop Sharp, who believed it would increase rather than diminish dissent, and would lessen royal authority. The absence of a national synod deprived the Church as a whole of a voice
and obstructed reform in ecclesiastical policy. Furthermore, it unwittingly facilitated the presbyterian coup at the Revolution by ensuring that the bishops and clergy had no means of joint consultation as the established church; the synods and presbyteries were left to shift for themselves.

Worship during the Restoration remained centred around preaching, extemporary prayer and the singing of psalms, which were all forms acceptable to presbyterians. Obnoxious elements of ritual, such as surplices, altars, kneeling at communion and the sign of the cross at baptism were absent. The Book of Common Order and the Westminster Confession were used, but the Scottish liturgy of 1637 was prudently eschewed. Nor despite a growing desire to adopt a liturgy, which was particularly marked in Aberdeen, was the English Book of Common Prayer used by more than a handful of clergy. Its use was probably mostly private, in order to avoid offence to presbyterians who regarded it as popish and superstitious. In the 1680s, however, Bishop Paterson envisaged the re-introduction of a liturgy, and its use at Holyrood was proposed in 1685 by the Earl of Perth, shortly before his conversion to Catholicism.

Communion was celebrated once a year, though in many cases less frequently, and catechising, preaching and distribution all followed earlier presbyterian practice. Episcopalian worship differed from presbyterian forms in the important respect that the
Lord's Prayer and the Doxology, and the Creed at baptism, were commonly adopted. Although these were not accounted by episcopalian apologists as sufficient reason for dissent, because the two persuasions shared common articles of faith, where used the prayers offended strict presbyterians' abhorrence of set forms. Some evidence points to this, and to the omission of the forms in the west and south-west. In any case, judged by presbyterian principles the ministrations of episcopally-ordained clergy were unacceptable.

The significance of the slight difference in worship in causing estrangement between the episcopal clergy and their hearers is difficult to assess, but conversely it may have smoothed the transition in the parishes when the Revolution settlement removed the episcopal clergy. An eighteenth-century episcopalian commentator observed:

'This so great affinity betwixt us and the Presbyterians as to what respected public worship... was without doubt the reason why our People so generally joined with the Presbyterians in the beginning of the Revolution, or (as they expressed it) went to the Kirk to hear them; as perceiving no other difference from what they had been frequently used to, save only in the Omission of the Lords Prayer, and Doxology... which had the Presbyterians been so wise as to have continued, their harvest had probably been still greater; for the Divine Right of Episcopacy, and the necessity of an ordination by Bishops was then very little known among our Laity, perhaps not by several of our Clergy themselves.'

Indifference as to elements of worship as well as to the divine right of episcopacy can therefore be seen as contributing to the episcopalian's loss of lay support.
from 1689, and perhaps also to the few cases of clerical
conformity to presbyterian church government.

The relationship of the bishops and the Crown was
the most important factor in the destruction of the
episcopate. From 1660 the prelates were regarded as
instruments of royal policy both by the King and by
opponents of the ecclesiastical settlement. The
supreme authority vested in the Crown by the Assertory Act
in 1669 was used to crush episcopal dissent, most notably
in 1686, when Bishop Bruce was deprived for opposing
the proposed toleration of Catholics, and again in 1687,
when Archbishop Cairncross was removed for laxness in
punishing Dr. James Canaries for an anti-Catholic
sermon. The opposition of four out of six bishops
in the vote in the Committee of Articles for the
Toleration of 1687 represented the height of the
episcopate's dissent. They made no direct protest
against the exercise of the royal prerogative in
favour of the Catholics, as the seven English bishops
did in 1688. Archbishop Paterson excused to
Sancroft the Scottish bishops' 'farr greater
tentations to yeeld to the importunities of Court'
because of the extent of the supremacy. As
Lauderdale's protégé, like Archbishop Sharp before
him, Paterson favoured strong measures against
presbyterian dissent, but with Archbishop Rose he
consented to the Toleration. He was one of the
few bishops who served on the Privy Council, and had
a bad reputation.
The Revolution attack on the established Church was undoubtedly motivated by lay hostility to the exercise of the royal prerogative over its affairs since the Restoration, and by some degree of anti-clerical feeling engendered by the bishops and clergy.\textsuperscript{19} Much of the resentment against the curbing, and latterly the repression, of presbyterian religious dissent stemmed from sincere scruples over joining in the established worship and church government; in the case of the covenanters their extreme theocratic beliefs and hostility to episcopacy made them irreconcilable even by indulgences.\textsuperscript{20} The 1687 Toleration prompted widespread withdrawals of presbyterian laity from parish churches in the west and south-west to meeting-houses, thus demonstrating the extent to which the established clergy's ministry was unacceptable to many common people as well as to presbyterian nobles and gentry. The young clergy who were planted in these areas to replace the 135 presbyterians deprived in 1662 did not enjoy popular support.\textsuperscript{21}

The clergy were also unpopular for their role as agents of the government in concurring with, or actively aiding, measures against dissenting parishioners. In 1684 they were ordered to delate absentees from their churches, and their informations were highly resented.\textsuperscript{22} The 'curates' in turn were harrassed, for instance during Argyll's rebellion in 1685.\textsuperscript{23} In 1688 and 1689 the rabblings served as
acts of revenge, irrespective of the degree of planning behind them. A presbyterian apologist bluntly told critics of the violence:

'it was procured by themselves who suffered; the People having been provoked by them beyond what can be easily expressed'.

Even the episcopal divine, John Sage, admitted that the western shires had suffered much for rebellions against the government. Specific instances of retribution against ministers who had helped the military authorities against the covenanters, for instance in the parishes of Ayr, Galston, Carmunnock, Keir, Lochmaben, Dryfesdale and Applegarth, were adduced to justify the presbyterian case.

The riots and demonstrations in Edinburgh and Glasgow which occurred soon after news of William of Orange's landing on 5 November reached Scotland were followed by some rabblings in Ayrshire in early December, but the systematic extrusions which occurred throughout the west and south-west did not begin until Christmas Day, a date which was probably chosen to express abhorrence of popery and increase the insult to the clergy. Parties of Cameronian 'hill-men', and parishioners threatened the clergy and their families, and though there were no murders, their forcible removal from manses in winter caused considerable physical hardship. In some cases the minister was charged to remove, and had his gown torn, and any copies of the prayer-book burned. The rabblers generally succeeded in possessing the parish churches, and intimidation was
sufficient to force the clergy to abandon their ministry altogether, or prevent attempts at return. By early 1689 rabblings had occurred in the presbyteries of Dumbarton, Glasgow, Paisley, Hamilton, Ayr, Irvine, Stranraer and elsewhere in the south, as well as in Biggar and Linlithgow presbyteries. Sage claimed that some 200 ministers were rabbled in the west and south-west, but there is no complete and reliable body of evidence to substantiate the exact scale of the illegal extrusions, in the absence of which the anecdotal evidence of contending propagandists provides vivid but partial accounts of the confused events. What can be established from lists compiled within about twenty years of the Revolution is that clergy in the troubled areas were in possession in 1688, but that by 1690 about 160 were no longer, having been rabbled, or having demitted their charges or deserted. However, the apparently voluntary actions of demission or desertion cannot be taken as objective descriptions in every case, just as in one list the clergy are noted as having been rabbled, while in another the phrase 'deprived by the people' is used, suggesting the legitimate exercise of popular rights in removing established clergy, akin to the expression of the people's will in the Claim of Right.

Indeed, the judicial actions taken against the episcopal clergy by the Revolution government, which are discussed below, were in many areas in
southern and central Scotland pre-empted or furthered by
organised or spontaneous violence against the clergy.
Threats, shows of force and rabblings continued after
William of Orange's declaration of 6 February against
disorders, were particularly marked from April in parishes
where clergy showed signs of compliance or actually
complied, and continued sporadically in 1690 and 1691.
Assertions of such violence appear not only in
pamphlets, but also in petitions by dispossessed
ministers to the Privy Council in the period 1689-1691.
A total of seventy-seven ministers sought redress for
being illegally removed, and in most cases also for
payment of bygone stipends. Typical of their
petitions was one from Thomas Ireland, minister of
Twynholm in Kirkend presbytery, which narrated that
in March 1689 he

'wes forced ... to retire himself by
reasone of the violence he and severall
others of his circumstances were
threatened with by the commons in that
country.'

He pleaded that despite this he had all along prayed for
William and Mary. The petitions incidentally suggest
that threats and attacks were often made by persons from
outwith the minister's parish, for in some forty cases
they are described as strangers. The overall importance
of the rabblings in winter 1688-89 was that they
prejudiced the course of the Revolution which followed
by striking a blow against the Church where and when it was
most vulnerable, damaging the morale of James's supporters,
and allowing the presbyterians to re-occupy parish churches. The extent to which the situation could be redressed was to depend largely on the response of the Scottish bishops to William's advent and his assumption of power.

Knowing of the Prince's intention of coming to England, the bishops reassured James of their loyalty in an address to him as 'the darling of heaven' in November, and despatched Bishop Rose to wait on him and to obtain the English bishops' advice and assistance. Archbishop Paterson also appears to have been in London in February, but the purpose of his presence is obscured by the fact that Rose's account makes no mention of it. In the confusion following James's flight and before William accepted the English crown, Rose remained in London, but apparently received no further instructions from his brethren. This hindered him from addressing the Prince for protection of the clergy in the west, because he was advised by Bishop Compton that it would be necessary to compliment him on 'his descent to deliver us from poprie and slaverie'. When Rose finally obtained an audience with William shortly after he had accepted the crown, it was to obtain leave to return to Edinburgh for the convention of estates and to make a final attempt in favour of the 'so sadlie persecuted' clergy. Rose had been clearly briefed by Compton as to the King's understanding of the Scottish ecclesiastical situation.
William had been disabused of his belief 'that Scotland generally all over was presbiterian', and now, stated Compton,

's he sies that the great bodie of the nobilitie and Gentrie ar for Episcopacie, and 'tis the trading and inferior sort that ar for presbiterie: wherefor he bids me tell yow, that if yow will undertake to serve him to the purpose that he is served here in England, he'le take yow by the hand, support your Church and order, and throw of the prespiterians.' 40

Rose gave Compton his private opinion that he and his brethren would not follow the English bishops' example 'that is (as I take it) to make him their King, or give their suffrage for being King'. 41 Their conspicuous failure to address William, which Compton argued excused him 'for standing by the presbiterians', probably prepared the King for Rose's pithy declaration, "Sir I will serve yow as far as law, reason, or conscience shall allow me'. 42

It has been assumed that when William literally turned his back on Rose at these words the bishops' cause was doomed. 43 In the sense that Rose was summarising the theological, political and legal beliefs which constituted their loyalty to the Stewarts, and to which they were to adhere, the interview was indeed fateful. The limitations and conditions of Rose's phrase evoked the doctrines of non-resistance, passive obedience and indefeasible hereditary succession which buttressed James's authority in Scotland and England until the Revolution. In Scotland the Assertory Act of 1669 gave the notion of supreme monarchical power
legal expression, and it was both this and the Test oath which bound the bishops and clergy to the Stewart Crown. By natural as well as by divine law the people owed obedience to divinely-ordained authority in the person of James VII, it was believed.

In England the doctrines of the subject's obedience and hereditary succession were being transformed by 1688 and, modified by the concepts of contractual obligations and divine providence, enabled most English churchmen and laity to accept William as de jure and de facto sovereign. The nine English nonjuring bishops and about 400 clergy who were deprived after the Revolution could not so acknowledge him, and maintained loyalty to James. Excluded from the establishment, their leading apologists further developed notions of the independence of the Church from civil supremacy which were already current in the seventeenth century. As the nonjuring communion dwindled it increasingly turned to the intrinsic rights of the church, and the subsequent influence of their leading divines on the Scottish nonjurors was to be particularly important from the second decade of the eighteenth century. It has been persuasively suggested that no transformation of the prevalent doctrines of kingship occurred among the episcopallans in Scotland at the Revolution. The bishops adhered to their cherished loyalty to the Stewart monarchy.
and no influential apologist for the providential or contractual justifications of the Revolution emerged among the episcopalian.

Immediately before the convention of estates, Archbishop Rose told the Duke of Hamilton

'that both by natural allegiance, the laws, and the most solemn oaths we were engaged in the king interest and that we were by God's grace to stand by it in the face of all dangers and to the greatest losses.'

Their conduct during and after the convention of estates and the convention parliament bore out their declared loyalty. The convention opened with an attack on the bishops' right to sit as a separate estate from the temporal lords, and they were subsequently excluded from the committee for settling the government which drew up the Claim of Right. Three bishops dissented from the convention's letter to William, and all seven who were present at the division on James's forfaiture on 4 April, allegedly joined five lay dissenters. On the opening day Rose had 'prayed God to have Compassion on King James, and to restore him', but after the forfauling vote one bishop was warned he would pray for James at his peril. 'The bishop discreetly said only the Lord's Prayer.' The bishops' resistance to proceedings against James's rights and interests were later noted by the Jacobite Earl of Balcarres, and by Archbishop Paterson, who pointed out their vulnerability to the armed Cameronians who guarded the convention. Only God's goodness gave them the fortitude.
to appear so avowedly and to reason so boldly as well as solildly for the right, the Intrest, and just prerogatives of the King of the Church, of the Monarchy in its due and lineall succession, as well as of the Laws, propertys and Libertys of the people, as they most fairly and yet undauntedly did in that dangerous and trying Juncture.'

If divine providence played a part it was in their merciful preservation

'to give their faithfull witness and testimony against the Amazing defection from Loyalty, and against the Injurys done to and the Invasions made upon the fundamentall rights of our Hereditary Monarchy and of our Royall Master.'  

Until James's military threat to William's régime was destroyed, the bishops could stand out in the fervent hope that their restoration was imminent, but the striking fact is that meanwhile they suffered the loss of office and benefice without compromising themselves.  

If Paterson's and Rose's accounts can be accepted as reflecting the real nature of policy-making and the course of events in the crucial period before the abolition of episcopacy on 22 July, the opportunities to compromise were offered to the bishops and the continuation of their order was hoped for by the King and his commissioner to the convention, the Duke of Hamilton. William held latitudinarian views, believing that forms of church government were indifferent and that religious uniformity should prevail where possible.  

In England he attempted to bring about a comprehension of the dissenters within the established Church, and in
Scotland, too, he aimed at comprehension of episcopalian and presbyterians even after the latter had replaced the former as the establishment.54 Political considerations, as Compton informed Rose, dictated that William should attempt to gain the support of the Scottish nobles and gentry by sustaining the bishops. Rose later reflected that William would thereby have deprived James of his principal support without risking the loss of his own presbyterian support, since they were too far committed to him to return to James's interest. Uniformity of church government in England and Scotland was also desirable, for William

'saw what a hardship it would be upon the Church of England, and of what bad consequence to the Episcopacie ruined in Scotland, who no doubt would have vigorously interposed for us if we by our carriage could have been brought to justify their measures.' 55

Shortly before the opening of the convention of estates on 14 March, Archbishop Rose and his nephew Bishop Rose were told by Hamilton

'that he had it in speciall charge from K[ing] W[illiam], that nothing should be don to the prejudice of Episcopacie in Scotland, in case the Bishops could by any means be brough[t] in to brefriend his interest, and prayed us most pathetically for our own sake to follow the example of the Church of England.' 56

The Archbishop's reply has been quoted above. Rose's narrative is corroborated by Archbishop Paterson's polemical account of the bishops' zeal for James, in refusing 'great and Charming temptations of worldly
Interest and advantage':

'they were offered by the Duke of Hamilton
in Name of the Prince of Oran' the
Order, Interest and honour of Episcopacy
should be Continuow and preserv'd
inviolable in Scotland and to some of
them (I can say upon certain knowledge)
he offered what they cou'd demand for
themselves in particular and to allow
them Chart blanc in which to write
down their own terms and price, so
desirous were they to wheedle some of
the Order and Estate of Bishops, to
favour and Concurr In this revolution.'57

Paterson venomously attacked the only Scottish bishop to
accept the Revolution, Alexander Cairncross, his
predecessor in the archdiocese of Glasgow, who became
Bishop of Rapho in 1693. He loaded Cairncross with
crypto-Catholicism and 'deep prevarication' over the
Canaries case which led to his deprivation in 1687.58

The particular cause of Paterson's resentment was that,
despite having acquiesced in his deprivation, Cairncross
twice petitioned and supplicated the convention to have
Paterson removed

'and himselfe, as being unjustly turn'd
eout receiv'd to sitt and Vote in that
Assembly as the true and rightfull
Arch Bishop of Glasgow.'59

It is certain that the first matter before the convention
was a protest in Cairncross's name that Paterson's
inclusion in the rolls 'might not prejudge the said
Alexander of his right to the said Archbishoprick',
against which Paterson protested.60 Paterson
claimed that he justified the legality of the
deprivation to the convention, who rejected the
petition and permitted him to continue to sit.61
Cairncross's pretensions to his former title may only have been concerned with its revenues, but Paterson observed that if they had been successful the convention would have secured one Scottish bishop in William's interest:

'Coud they have found the least shaddow of Pretence of Lower Justice to gett rid of him [Paterson]; they were sure of one Bishop to concurr in all their designes against King James and for the Prince of Orange had they admitted Cairncross to that post in their meeting.'

The bishops, he added, were happy that 'this unworthy man' had been deprived before the Revolution,

'least had he continowed one of them he shoud have prov'd a scandal and reproach to their Order.' 62

Cairncross may have received support in his claim from the Duke of Queensberry, his patron in the 1680s, who in early 1689 was seeking a post under William and, like Cairncross, emphasising his loss of office in the protestant cause at the hands of James.63

Taken together, William's plea to the bishops, even allowing that it was not the unconditional guarantee of support alleged by Paterson, and Cairncross's claim point to attempts to open the way for a Revolution episcopate. Given William's desire to accept loyal bishops, two factors were of importance. Firstly, support for the prelates in the convention and the parliament was very limited. The selection of Hamilton as president
of the convention, the reading of James's threatening letter to it on 16 February, the withdrawal from Edinburgh of Viscount Dundee and other nobles, and the failure to convene the estates in accordance with James's instructions, all served to isolate his supporters. The bishops themselves were increasingly absent from the convention, and refused altogether to sit in the parliament called by William and Mary as sovereigns. In late June Dundee, who was anxious to deliver a letter to Archbishop Rose, observed, 'the Bishops I know not where they are, they are become the Kirk Invisible.'

The convention was markedly anti-episcopalian from its first sitting, and on 11 May voted, as part of the Claim of Right, that episcopacy was contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people and a great and insupportable grievance, by some 106-7 votes to 32. This led to the introduction of an act for abolishing prelacy in parliament on 2 July. It was tabled by the Earl of Annandale, a member of the opposition group known as 'the club', which deliberately used the issue of church government as a means of facilitating both their attacks on the royal prerogative by seeking the abolition of the Committee of Articles and other reforms, and their attacks on those who had held office under the Stewarts by tabling an Incapacity Act. The commissioner was forced by the attack
on the Articles into a delay while he sought William's opinion, and proposed consideration of church government instead, in terms of the king's instruction that he was 'to pass an Act establishing that church government which is most agreeable to the inclination of the people.' The club countered by attempting a delay in considering the church; they apparently encouraged the presbyterian clergy to request Hamilton for a delay and draw up an address to parliament.  

Their specious justification for this tactic was 'an address from the conforme ministers in the diocie of Aberdeen for a Generall Assembly', which Hamilton had received by 27 June. The club's subsequent extreme demands for presbyterian church government showed that they had no principles in mind in advocating that the Aberdeen episcopaliens should be given a hearing. Hamilton, however, was obliged to take a different view, because he hoped, as Dalrymple advised him, that a church settlement would largely remove the club's animosities. He was also well aware of the King's desire, expressed in his instructions for the convention, that in settling presbyterian government 'the rules of discipline may be adjusted and all occasion for complaint for rigour be taken away.' Therefore, as Crawford reported,
'he plainly tells, that if overtures be made for the one syde, he will listen to them in behalfe of the other.' 73

The tabling of the draft act abolishing prelacy was thus countered on 2 July by the episcopalian Earl of Kintore who brought in the Aberdeen address.74 Hamilton laid himself open to presbyterian criticism by allegedly favouring the address and opposing the settlement of presbytery, and by recommending the address to the King 'as a thing fitt to be entertained'.75

Hamilton was criticised for obstructing the establishment of presbytery by not allowing the abolition of patronages, and in 'endeavouring those of the Episcopal, that are not vitious, should be continued.'76 However, no more was heard of the address, and from 2 July to 5 July debates on church government were held in which Hamilton successfully objected to the wording of a clause in the draft act abolishing prelacy which implied that presbytery was the best and only form of government.77 The Court's own later draft act for a moderate presbyterian polity provided for the re-establishment of the church courts on the lines of the 1592 settlement, the abolition of acts in favour of episcopacy, and the restoration of ministers deprived in 1662 for nonconformity and for refusing the Test in 1681. By implication patronages were to remain,78 which was unacceptable to presbyterians committed to popular calls. The provision for the Test
nonjurors was no doubt seen as allowing the proposed government by the sixty remaining 'ante-diluvians' to be polluted by the twenty-odd episcopalian incumbents who would thus be eligible.\(^7^9\) To confound Hamilton's draft, acts were tabled providing for the abolition of patronages, the full restoration of the 1592 government, and a restriction of jurisdiction to ministers presbyterially ordained.\(^8^0\) Crawford noted the absence of any voices in favour of episcopacy, and that few were for restrictions on presbytery.\(^8^1\)

Hamilton was further embarrassed by the club's call for a vote on an act rescinding the 1669 Assertory Act immediately the Act abolishing prelacy was voted on 5 July. William prudently intended the supremacy to remain intact until church government had been settled, so Hamilton's correct refusal to permit the vote enabled the club to scare the presbyterians with the bogey of an Erastian King.\(^8^2\) Hamilton's intention to 'do nothing anent Church Government in parcells, but must see the whole platform together'\(^8^3\) was abandoned when, on William's instructions, he touched the Act abolishing prelacy on 22 July.\(^8^4\) The passage of the act did not quell the club's opposition, the session disintegrated into 'heats, debaits, jealousies and divisions',\(^8^5\) and was prorogued on 2 August. The Articles had yet to be suitably regulated, the courts were closed, the Incapacity Act was not touched and the royal supremacy stood unrepealed. Above all, the Church was without a
legal government, resulting in an uncertain interregnum, during which the conflicting claims of both parties at a national and local level hindered the peaceful settlement of Scotland at which William had aimed when accepting the Crown.

Hamilton's ambition of becoming the successful architect of a moderate church settlement was wrecked by the club's political manoeuvres and the corresponding collapse of the episcopalian interest in the sessions of 1689. The success of the proposals to the bishops in March, and to a lesser degree those for a moderate presbyterian government in July, depended on another factor, namely the extent to which the episcopal clergy would come forward and declare allegiance to King William. The rabblings subsequent to William's landing and the absence of royal forces in Scotland appear to have compelled the western clergy to look to him for protection as the wielder of de facto authority. On 22 January 1689 the moderators and delegates of the presbyteries of Glasgow, Paisley and Irvine commissioned the Dean of Glasgow, Dr Robert Scott, to present their humble supplication to the Prince and 'a just account of the oppressions and injuries we groan under, which are daily increasing'. Scott was to seek the aid of the peers, and also of Archbishop Sancroft and his brethren, who were to be assured of
'our zeal for the protestant Religion, and for the Government of the Church by Bishops, as by law established in his national Church and our firme resolution to adhere to the same (being the only thing we suffer for)', 86

In view of James's flight and the uncertain status of William's presence they merely referred to the commission as 'presenting our grivances to thes in Authority'. 87

Scott took with him a petition from these presbyteries and those of Dumbarton, Hamilton, Lanark and Ayr. 88

Archbishop Paterson recommended him to Sancroft as the bearer of

'ane petition to the Prince of Orange from me, and the persecuted ministers of the western division of my diocese, for his Highness protection'

Paterson had already sent a personal petition to Gilbert Burnet to be presented to William, but he hinted at his real opinion of the Prince by pointing out that though he had come to preserve the protestant religion and restore laws and liberties,

'yet the ministers of the holie gospel are not protected in their persons, benefices, offices, goods, and families, from the most abusive and illegal affronts, insults and enterings.' 89

He urged Sancroft 'to interpose your power with the Prince of Orange for our present releef and deliverance', by a proclamation declaring his protection and preservation of all in quiet and peaceable possession of offices, especially the bishops and clergy, against whom injuries, violence and intrusions into their offices and benefices would be punished. Scott delivered an
account of the rabbling at Kilmarnock which featured the burning of a Book of Common Prayer, an incident which, Paterson pointed out, revealed

'how our Presbyterians are dispos'd towards the worship as well as the government of the most famous Church of England.' 90

Harping on presbytery's threat to the English establishment and worship was to become one of the commonest means used by the episcopalians to solicit support south of the border. The Kilmarnock rabbling was one of several incidents of which accounts were being compiled in December and late January by the clergy who commissioned Dr Scott. These accounts, and similar ones written shortly afterwards, were published in 1690. 91 In London Burnet introduced Scott to William, 92 and it was presumably to his representations that the proclamation of 6 February can directly or indirectly be attributed. It authorised those entrusted with the peace and quiet of the nation to suppress disorders and violence, and expressly prohibited 'all Disturbance and Violence upon the account of Religion, or the Exercise thereof, or any such like pretence', and interference with worship in churches and meeting-houses. 93 The proclamation was an ineffectual gesture of support which did not prevent rabblings continuing. 94

Until the convention of estates decided to offer the crown to William and Mary, no acknowledgement of their authority was required of the clergy. On 13 April the estates required all ministers in Scotland publicly to pray for King William and Queen Mary as
King and Queen of Scotland, and to read the proclamation from their pulpits; Edinburgh clergy were to do so on the following day, 14 April, those south of the Tay on 21 April, and those north of the Tay on 28 April. Failure to do so rendered the minister liable to deprivation. The proclamation also discharged any injury to ministers who were in possession of churches or meeting-houses on the day of the proclamation, who behaved themselves dutifully to the present government. Episcopalian apologists attacked the proclamation for its conspicuous failure to provide redress for ministers illegally removed before 13 April, and for its unfair requirement of prayers for William and Mary as sovereigns before they had accepted the crown. Moreover, the stringency of requiring obedience at short notice was seen as a deliberate means of ensnaring scrupulous clergy. Many clergy were to plead they had not received the proclamation at all, or had received it too late or by unauthorised channels. As a test of disaffection to the Revolution it was eagerly used by the government in 1689 to purge the Church of James's supporters. Reporting the parish clergy's predicament in June 1689, Dundee wrote, 'the poor Ministers are sorely oppressed overall they generally stand right'. The exceptions can be taken as those who had abandoned allegiance to James. Evidence of the existence of such clergy is inadequate for the period immediately following the
Revolution. The most substantial source is the series of ministers' petitions to the Privy Council in the period 1689-91. Of the seventy-seven clergy who claimed to have been illegally removed from, or forced to leave, their parishes, twenty-five also claimed to have read the 13 April proclamation, or to have prayed or been willing to pray, or both.97 The absence of such pleas from the petitions of many other rabbled clergy suggests that they were not regarded as an essential means of gaining the Council's favour by giving an impression of compliance with the Revolution. They cannot be taken as definitive evidence of a transfer of allegiance to William and Mary, but the case of Henry Walker at Mochrum satisfied the Council, and provides an example of an episcopalian who could survive in the covenanting heartland of Wigtownshire. He pleaded that his ministry was accepted by the people and that at the Revolution he

'did cheerfully give obedience to all the acts and ordinances of the Estates of Parliament and Privy Council and did not omit anything that concerned their Majesties King William and Queen Mary (whom God bless and preserve for the comfort of his Kirk and people)'. 98

In the majority of these cases the minister was rabbled after 13 April, which suggests that illegal means were being taken against clergy whom the law could not reach because of their obedience to the proclamation.
Claims were made in an episcopalian pamphlet of several such cases, including four clergy in Stranraer presbytery. A petition to the King in 1691 by four clergy, including Walker, made the same point.

Among other clergy cited before the Council for disobedience of the proclamation, twenty-one of the twenty-three assoilzied clergy can be identified as declaring they had obeyed the proclamation. Considering the rigorous examination the ministers were subjected to, it seems reasonable to assume that their claims were truthful. The ministers of Gamrie and Dornoch proved they gave obedience as soon as they obtained the proclamation; in the case of Dornoch neither the sheriff-depute nor the clerk of the shire had received it for distribution. John Blair's parishioners in Scoonie libelled him with declaring that Killiecrankie was 'the best news for him in the world' and that by Dundee's death 'the greatest bullwark for the protestant religione and against poperie was gone'. On his pleading that he had not found the proclamation on time, but would still pray for William and Mary, the Council assoilzied him and ordained him to read the proclamation and pray for them the following Sunday. He remained in possession until deposed in 1717.

A third group of clergy were those whom the Council deprived, yet who claimed to have obeyed the proclamation. Alexander Fowlis, minister
of Innerwick near Dunbar, was deprived on 3 September 1689, but in a subsequent petition he claimed that

'he is and ever was verie sensible of God Almightie mercy to these nationes in delyvering them from the danger of popery and arbitrary government by his present Majestie, the glorious instrument therof, for the preservation of whose persone and government he hes not ceased to pray both before and after his deprivatione.' 105

A similar view of William as the providential deliverer of the protestant cause was claimed by James Aird, minister of Torryburn, whom the Council deprived on 18 October 1689 for not reading the proclamation and uttering prayers against William as an invading tyrant, and on behalf of James as an afflicted prince. He asserted that immediately he heard of William's landing

'I thought and on every occasion said I look't upon him as ane angel drop't from heaven in such a crisis of affairs as we were in' 106

Aird's acceptance of William as an alternative 'darling of heaven' to James was significant because his case was taken up as an example of the Council's unfair proceedings. His case also illustrates the difficulty of using the hostile libels drawn up by patrons, heritors and parishioners as evidence of the clergy's actual words and deeds. He was said to have read part of the proclamation after being cited before the Council. 107 Likewise the minister of Scone was accused of praying for King James until he was cited,
when he made 'a kynd [of] famed submissione for fear of losing his benefice.'

Other scattered references to complying clergy occur. In Edinburgh eight clergy survived the deprivations of 1689, which in churches so close to the seat of authority can only be explained by their having prayed and read the proclamation. 

Dr John Robertson of Greyfriars and Alexander Malcolm of the Tron Kirk were noted in 1690 to have

'Preach'd once and again against the Pride of Prelates, and the Corruptions of the Church'

Robertson in particular complained that

'he has groan'd these twenty seven Years by-past under the Yoke of Episcopacy'.

In 1689 both men allegedly pursued Bishop Rose before the Edinburgh bailiffs for unpaid prebends, in order to 'ingratiate themselves with the Godly'. A reaction against the Restoration episcopate by the two was understandable, for Robertson, a complying presbyterian in 1662, had been deprived of his charge in 1674 for advocating a national synod, and Malcolm was deprived in 1686 for a calumny against the Earl of Perth. Revulsion against the excessive exercise of the royal prerogative and the strong Catholicising influences emanating from the Court in the 1680s probably helped clergy to come to terms with William's claim to the throne. Dr James Canaries, minister of Selkirk, accepted William and Mary and retained his charge for a period. Doubtless his
attitude to James was shaped by his own conversion to Catholicism and re-conversion, and his deprivation for preaching a strong sermon against his former faith, published as *Rome's Additions to Christianity* in 1686. His role as an episcopalian agent in the early 1690s was to be of crucial importance. Dr James Fall, Principal of Glasgow University, likewise acknowledged William and Mary, but was deprived of his post for refusing the required acknowledgement of presbyterianism. He was in London soliciting for protection for the clergy in February 1689, and in May was given permission to travel to Edinburgh and back, though the purpose of this journey is not known. Like Canaries, he continued to represent the clergy's interests in London, for which his friendship with Gilbert Burnet was probably helpful.

Had there been a national synod in existence during the Restoration, those clergy willing to declare allegiance to William and Mary would have been able to express their views jointly rather than in presbyteries or synods. Evidence for such local meetings is only slightly more adequate than for the clergy's individual response to the Revolution. In the south of Scotland meetings were being held in Edinburgh in 1690 to concert measures. In May eight ministers from the presbyteries of Stirling, Dunblane and Auchterarder acknowledged
'the loveing and seasonable attempts that are made to secure us in this juncture. We are very sensible how necessary such attempts are, and what obligations ly on us to concurr heartily for the strengthening and advancement of them. A considerable number of us have mett together, and are resolved cheerfully to contribut not only our endevors but, if need be, our shares of money also for carrieing on what Designes may have any rational tendencie for our preservation.' 118

Meetings of the clergy in Edinburgh and Stirling in December were prompted by urgent requests from Canaries in London concerning the necessity to be ready to

'to doe joyntly and speedily, what may be expected of wise and Good men.' 119

The allusion was probably to formal acknowledgements of William and Mary which would be a condition of royal favour towards complying clergy. The ministers gathering at Stirling were among the incumbents left in possession after the Council's purge of 1689 had removed six out of nine in the presbytery of Stirling, eight out of sixteen in Dunblane, and seven out of fourteen in Auchterarder. 120 None who had been deprived were invited to the December meeting. 121 Most of the clergy meeting together to secure their position remained in possession of their charges until removed by the church courts, and it can therefore be assumed they were Williamite in sympathy.

This is confirmed by an address to the King dating from about the spring or summer of 1691, which was signed by three of their number, along with more than five other clergy in East Lothian, Berwickshire, and
Selkirkshire, as 'delegates from their Brethren in the Southern parts of the Kingdom'. Thanking him for his letter to the Commission of the General Assembly putting a stop to unjust and unwarrantable proceedings, they hoped that injuries would be redressed and themselves continued in their ministry. They assured him of their grateful prayers for him and his undertakings, and of the performance of their duty 'to God and to your Sacred Majestie', always taking care to give his 'numerous subjects of our persuasian' just impressions of the duty and loyalty owed to him. Among the signatories of this explicit recognition of William's title were two important Williamite clergy. William Denune, the conscientious minister of Pencaitland, was a principal organiser and lobbyist for the complying clergy in southern Scotland. He kept contact with developments in London through Canaries and others, and acted as an agent for the Ross clergy, probably as a result of his friendships with John Mackenzie of Delvine, W.S., Roderick Mackenzie of Prestonhall and Viscount Tarbat.

Bernard McKenzie, who was called to be minister of Tranent in 1691, was another member of Tarbat's interest, having previously held the charge of Cromarty until the return of its former presbyterian incumbent in 1690. In petitioning for a grant of a vacant stipend that year, he assured the Council that he had obeyed the proclamation, and offered to prove
that he had showed his good affection to the government,

"appearing first and singularity for the
same both in public disputes and con-
ferrances and severall written remonstrances
to the cavills of the disaffected .. and ..
that he did still endeavor by his converse
and examples convince men at once also
weel of the lawfullness of the present
constitutions as of their dutie to submitt
thereto". 126

Like Denune, McKenzie was a lobbyist for the complying
clergy, and played an important role in moulding their
opinion in 1693 and 1695 at the behest of his patrons.

One further element in the emergent Williamite
interest among the clergy at the Revolution is worth
examining. The northern clergy included many
Jacobites, according to Major-General Hugh Mackay,
whose campaign experience lent weight to his
observation; however, he said, there were exceptions

"there being many ministers in the
northern countries well principled
and affected to your Majesty's
government, as the means whereof it
had pleased God to make use for the
defence of his truth against the
designs of France." 127

The earliest organised expression of loyalty, as well
as the most powerful one, came from the clergy of the
diocese of Aberdeen in their address to the commissioner
and parliament, tabled on 2 July 1689. It narrated
that they had recently testified against popery and

"have generally concurred in rendering
thanks to the Divine Majestie for putting
so seasonable a Stop to the designs of
that Antichristian partie and in praying
for King William the great instrument of
our deliverance" 128
The clergy requested the calling of a free general assembly, when and where the King and parliament should decide, to effect a union of protestant clergy which would secure mutual toleration in remaining points of difference. They suggested a conference of 'judicious and moderate ministers of different persuasions in matters of Church Government' to concert the differences and 'to propose overtures for the accommodation of them and the peace of the Church'.

The synod's commissioners were James Gordon and John Barclay, ministers of Banchory Devenick and Cruden respectively, two of the most senior Aberdeen clergy, who had both fallen foul of the authorities before the Revolution. Barclay had lost office temporarily over the Test, and Gordon over his controversial book *The Reformed Bishop*, which earned him a lifelong nickname but ruined his chances of promotion. Gordon's advocacy of a moderate episcopacy certainly fitted the type of church settlement being sought by William and his commissioner in June and July 1689, but the political temper of parliament, as has been shown, prevented any conciliatory solution, such as the Aberdeen clergy suggested, from becoming legislative reality. In any case, a general assembly called on the proposed lines would have been dominated by the episcopal clergy. The re-establishment of
'pure' presbytery therefore necessitated the framing of a narrow base of church government, and this was achieved in 1690. Paradoxically it led to further attempts to create a Church embracing episcopalian and presbyterian, which will be discussed in Chapter Two. Although the number of episcopal clergy who transferred their allegiance from James to William at the Revolution cannot be accurately determined, there were probably significant minorities in southern, central and northern Scotland, and a majority in the north-east. They included divines of considerable standing, such as the venerable Lawrence Charteris and James Gordon, and younger men such as Fall, Canaries, Denune and McKenzie. However, whether such clergy could have been incorporated into a Revolution episcopate on the lines which Archbishop Paterson feared must remain a matter for speculation.

Following the bishops' open refusal to accept William and Mary as rightful sovereigns it was natural for the presbyterians to assume that the body of the parish clergy would follow their lead. Reports of the response to the 13 April proclamation seemed to confirm their disaffection to the Revolution. In July the Earl of Crawford reported that only one-sixth of the episcopal clergy obeyed it or observed the 26 April proclamation for a thanksgiving for the Revolution.
'Yea, the most of the conformists have expressly pray'd against our King and for the late King, and have hounded out their people to rise in armes.' 132

The threat which they posed to the government was very serious and especially so when it faced armed resistance in the north. Crawford's correspondence provides an insight into the Council's insecure preoccupation with Jacobitism at parish level, which stemmed from the recognition of the power of the pulpit in shaping political allegiances. In the late seventeenth century preaching formed the largest element in worship, and was used not only to expound the Church's doctrinal teaching but also to 'preach up the times'. 133 Major-General Mackay noted that the Jacobite clergy

'preached King James more than Christ as they had been accustomed to take passive obedience more than gospel for their text.' 134

It was advanced as a reason for removing disaffected clergy in Perthshire that thereby

'it would be easie to reduce their seduced people to a better understand-ing of their Duety and to a more paceable temper.' 135

The libel by the heritors of the Angus parish of Cortachy against their minister, Alexander Lindsay, provides an example of the episcopalian espousal of non-resistance and passive obedience. It was alleged that in preaching he 'several tymes vented most treasonable and seditious doctrines', teaching
'that the government had made great wastes and devastationes in the kingdome makeing new lawes and repelling just ones formerly made, and that it was accompted religione of old to preach up obedience to the suprem magistrat but not so now, but on the contirar actually rebellione was accompted religione and to depose and dethron is accompted a dutie.'

If the libel can be accepted as broadly representing Lindsay's conception of religious and political duty, it is also interesting for alleging that 'he said he would never forgive nor forgett the evill the Presbyterian partie hade done in killing their king and murdering their high preists, and that they could never be the builders of the church that were the destroyers of it and layers of it wast'.

The episcopalian's belief in the divinely-ordained relationship of crown and mitre drew much of its strength in the late seventeenth century from the deaths of Charles I and Archbishop Sharp at the hands of, as they alleged, ungodly fanatics whose successors' allegiance to the Solemn League and Covenant would again bring disaster on church and state if not resisted by both. The renewed onslaught against episcopacy at the Revolution prompted portrayals of the presbyterians as unregenerate upholders of king-killing doctrines.

Most of the extant evidence of episcopalian Jacobitism in the immediate post-Revolution period is contained in the libels against the clergy for disobeying the 13 April proclamation and for other manifestations of disaffection, recorded in the registers of the Privy Council. Although prepared in most, if not all, cases
by hostile presbyterians, the essence of the charges was in most cases found sufficiently proved by the Council. Nor did the episcopal party in attacking the injustice of certain sentences question the justice of the majority. With the qualification that libels sometimes exaggerated or distorted the words and actions of the episcopal clergy, the evidence they provide can cautiously be accepted as broadly reflecting the Jacobites' views. Nonetheless, it is to be doubted whether, for instance, all the 172 ministers deprived by the Council for not reading the 13 April proclamation and praying for King William and Queen Mary were outright Jacobites. As has been suggested above, there were many deprived clergy who avowed allegiance to the new sovereigns. Of the 195 ministers cited before the Council, 103 were libelled with praying for King James, of whom eleven were assoilzied. This indicates either insufficient evidence or a false libel, because prayers for James amounted to a flagrant breach of the proclamation and were unlikely to have gone unwitnessed. The power of the patrons and heritors, on the other hand, doubtless affected the willingness of tenants and cottars to libel ministers. It was noted of Perthshire late in 1689 that there were

'but very, few Parishes in this Shire inclined to Cite their Ministers and if these few should be disappointed by Consequence the whole Shire should continow without reformation.' 139
The eagerness of presbyterians to help in this reformation led them to load their libels with charges not required by the Privy Council for probation of the main offences. Of the minister of Cortachy, it is

'nottourly knowen in all the shyre that he is ane ordinar drunkard and will sitt upon Saturday nights with baggypypes drinking and playing till day light.' 140

Such allegations were normally brushed aside, but more serious and apparently damning ones were sometimes found not proven. The two ministers of Dunfermline were reported to have pointed the moral of Mackay's defeat at Killiecrankie saying

'that better could not come of those who hade rebelled against a Lawful King such as King James was.'

Yet it turned out that both were willing to comply, and they were assoilzied.141 The minister of Killearn was libelled with praying for James VII and drinking his health, with vilifying King William by calling him a ciphered king (i.e. a pawn in the hands of others) and a usurper, with threats against parishioners, with a scandalous personal life, and with protesting at the selection of the commissioners for the convention for Dunbartonshire 'that nothing might be done by them in prejudice of the late King.' He was not libelled with disobedience of the proclamation; the Council found the libel unproven and declared him free of the charges.142

The libels record snatches of Jacobite avowals and invective which reflect the seriousness with which they took their sworn allegiance to James, and their view that William's usurpation did not remove or alter
James's rightful title to it. The minister of Carnock

'endeavours by all means possible to infusse and distil malicious principles into such with whom he converses, alleging that he could not comply with the times because of his oath of allegiance to the late King James.' 143

It could be implied, as with the minister of Rosneath, that scrupulousness was a cover for disaffection; he

'pretends that in conscience he cannot nor would give obedience to the said proclamatione.' 144

Similar avowals were made by three ministers in Dumbarton presbytery, one of whom

'does daily discourage people to dissoune the authority of his present Majestie, and does so far impugne the same that he affirmes seeing he had sworn allegiance to King James he cannot give obedience to King William's authority.' 145

John Semple, minister of Fintry, allegedly told his parishioners who asked him if he would pray for William and Mary;

'Lett the Whigs pray for them, he would not pray for them, for he never got good by them, and that he was five times sworn to King James and so would not pray for King William.' 146

All three were deprived. Diatribes against the presbyterians were frequently alleged, as against Henry Knox, minister of Bowden, who said that

'before the presbyterians should gain the day he would rather the papists should gain it.' 147

The minister of Comrie asked in the pulpit 'Are not our rullers as Soddom and our judges as Gomorah?' 148
In Edinburgh, David Guild of the West Kirk reproached several well affected parishioners,

'calling them whores and rogues, and wearing and shewing pistolls under his coat, things most unsuitable in a minister and contrary to the express acts of Parliament.'

He was deprived. 149

The clergy's prayers for King James were either explicit or couched obliquely but unambiguously. The minister of Kilconquhar in Fife prayed for all Christian kings

'but above all him whom in duty and gratitude they were bound to remember, and for those who had taken government upon them'

As the libel pointed out, his words

'insinuat usurpatione and tyrannie in their present Majesties; and to clear this assertione, in several of his sermones he expressed himself in these or the lyk words, "that it hath been frequently heard that kings and princes have been put from their right under colour of law, yet however tyrants and oppressors may go in their oppressiones and add dominion to their dominion, yet the justice of God will at last persew them."' 150

Prayers for James were naturally bound up with supplications for William's removal, as the minister of Ecford allegedly showed in praying for James, for the destruction of his enemies and 'that God would take the usurper out of the way.' 151 The role assigned to providence by the Jacobite episcopalian was to remove William and Mary, and it can only have
strengthened their belief in such a deliverance that conflict continued in the Highlands in 1689 and 1690.

Thomas Marshall at Carnock declared

'that when thrie hundred and some odd Presbyterians did give such a shaik to the government how easie ware it to the Episcopall partie who were so numerous to overturne the present government.' 152

The minister of Kettle

'trusted in God to see the late King James on his throne and that he would be in Scotland against the fourth of Junii nixt with a brave army.' 153

William's military fortunes in the continental campaigns of the 1690s affected the episcopal clergy's attitudes to his government, and there is little reason to suppose that the precarious hold he had in Scotland and Ireland in 1689-90 did not likewise encourage the Jacobite clergy to repudiate his claim to the throne. 154 It was libelled against Dr. William Gairns that he absented himself from the Tolbooth Church, Edinburgh, when he was due to obey the proclamation, 'appearingly waiting for the late King James his returne', and only returned when he did not appear; even then his prayers called for mercy on William and Mary and the Royal Family, 'as on would doe for a theif goeing to the gibbett.' 155

Crawford's justifications for the Council's proceedings against the disobedient clergy emphasised their active Jacobitism. He assured Melville that most of those cited or deprived had been in correspondence with Dundee or been instigators of their parishioners to join
Scattered evidence for his assertion can be found in the Privy Council's registers, mostly in the presbyteries of Dunkeld, Auchterarder and Perth, and along the south-eastern fringe of the Highlands. The minister of Auchtergaven was ready to provide meal for Dundee's forces, and the minister of Scone gave Dundee a horse. Alexander Lindsay at Cortachy went to the rebels in neighbouring Glen Prosen, probably to minister to them. John Lammie at Ecclesgreig kept constant correspondence and intelligence with Dundee and other rebels, and arranged for their forces at Brechin to be warned of an attack. The minister of Fowlis Wester was said to have sent a mounted servant to Colonel Cannon's forces, and was himself arrested after Killiecrankie and accused of conversing with the rebels. He was released under caution of £100 Scots, but evidently remained suspect to the government, for within a year he was under bail for the same amount to live peaceably and appear when called for.

Considering the alarm generated among presbyterians remarkably few ministers appear to have been punished for active rebellion, as distinct from the Jacobitism of disobedience of the proclamation, and none for leasing-making. As this was unlikely to have been due to lenience by the Council, it may have reflected the relatively small number who took an active part
in the armed resistance to the government. Of the rebels, most acted as chaplains to their fellow-rebels, as other clergy probably did where the forces happened to be. William Irvine, who had probably been forced from his parish of Kirkmichael in the presbytery of Ayr before the 13 April, allegedly preached to Viscount Dundee and his army. Captured after Killiecrankie, he subsequently escaped to France with the Earl of Dunfermline, returned and became a chaplain in the families of Foulis of Colinton and the Earl of Carnwath, and in the 1715 Rebellion once more served as a military chaplain. In 1718 he was consecrated bishop. His career is a significant illustration of the pedigree of the nonjuring episcopate in the early eighteenth century. Alexander Sutherland, who appears to have joined Dundee's and Cannon's forces, avoided punishment for rebellion, though he was deprived of his charge of Larbert and Dunipace in absentia. One minister stands out clearly as a militant Jacobite. Robert Stewart at Balquhidder was seen on the field at Killiecrankie, and later at Blair Castle and the house of the Duke of Atholl's chamberlain, with whose brother, Patrick Stewart of Bellechin, he had been in arms. Following the battle he appears to have returned to his parish and raised about sixty men for the rebel army. The minister of Comrie, who was deprived for disobeying the proclamation and praying for James, was also alleged to have been in
arms with Viscount Strathallan; two years later he was ministering illegally in the parish and was still outspokenly Jacobite, given to enquiring 'how Leuis le Grand prospers against his neighboures'.

Perthshire appears to have been the area of the most concentrated Jacobite activity by the clergy, presumably reflecting gentry support for Dundee. A libel in 1689 against Dr. John Nicholson, minister of Errol, asserted that

'he and the rest of the clergie of Pearth shyre did combine togerther not to pray for their said Majesties, wherin he was cheifly instrumentall being moderator of that presbytrie.'

The hostile presbyterian observer who noted reluctance of the Perthshire laity to cite episcopal clergy, commented

'it is evident that the Clergy of this Shire have been more instru- mental and active in promoting and carrying on the present Highland insurrection than these of any other Shires in the Kingdom.'

Further north a group of seven clergy in the parishes of Keith, Mortlach, Deskford, Rathven, Boyndie, Gamrie and Grange were libelled with disobeying the proclamation, and among other offences, persuading 'the poor ignorant people not only to rebellione but alsoe to wicked and unallowable principells'. Five of them were deprived.

In Inverness-shire it was reported that several ministers
'not only in privat and in publict doe
dayly pray for the late King James
but also doe make it their business
to ryde and goe up and doun the
country persuading the people to
adhear to their allegiance to the
late King and to ryse in armes
for him.'

A cavalry commander at Aberdeen was ordered to seize and
imprison such ministers, and to notify the Council of
their names and crimes.169

Plotting was another aspect of Jacobite activity
which was of especial concern to the government in
the politically and militarily insecure period of the
c convention of estates and the parliament. Captured
papers being secreted out of the Castle provided the
Council with evidence of intrigue in Edinburgh involving
some advocates, but nothing in its records substantiate
the rumour that disaffected clergy were also involved.170

The minister of the West Kirk was, however, charged
on 26 June with acting 'as a spie and intelligencer' by
directing the fire of the Castle guns on to the siege
positions.171 In July a warning of a plot involving
the surrendered garrison led to the arrests of Charles
Forrester, the minister of the Castle chapel, and George
Miln, the rabbled minister of Campsie.172 Forrester
only secured his release by enacting a bond for 500 merks,
conditional on his leaving Scotland before 1 October,
not to return or go to France or Ireland.173 Miln
attempted to plead his forced flight to Edinburgh
'for safity of his lyfe', his willingness to pray
for William and Mary, and his peaceable living,
'altogether free of any plotting or contriving against the present government'. The Council was unimpressed and ordained a 500 merk bond as the price of his release.\textsuperscript{174}

A report in July that several clergy were under arrest on suspicion of corresponding with James or Dundee is not confirmed by the official record.\textsuperscript{175} Letters were intercepted and one surviving example indicates the resilient Jacobitism faced by the Council. In June 1689 the minister of Canonbie, David Hedderwick was released after being imprisoned for harbouring opponents of the government, on his enactment that he would read the 13 April proclamation and pray as required, and produce proof of this to the Council by 15 July. In September he was cited for having neglected to do so, and a letter dated 20 June to a neighbouring minister was produced as evidence of his disaffection. It contained an attack on those who had libelled him and false rumours to discourage William's supporters about the size of James's fleet. Hedderwick was deprived in absentia and denounced rebel.\textsuperscript{176}

Crawford's verdict on the episcopal clergy shortly after Killiecrankie was typically caustic:

\textquoteleft\textquoteleft tho' some of them may be more reserved in their way than others, all of them are of the same inclinations and have dis-served our King's interest more than the army that hath been in the feelds in opposition to us.\textsuperscript{177}

In addition to growing evidence of their refusal to acknowledge the government the Council was aware of
cases where previous sentences had not silenced clergy.
In April and May the Committee for Securing Peace and the Committee of the Estates had deprived twenty-one ministers for disobedience of the proclamation, commencing on 26 April with three senior Edinburgh clergy, one of whom, Dr. John Strachan, was also Professor of Divinity in the College. Most of those cited were near Edinburgh, and none were more than fifty miles from the capital, though warrants for the citation of sixteen other clergy, including two in Dumbarton presbytery, were reportedly issued. Processes against a further three were not finished before the Committee of the Estates dissolved and was replaced by the Privy Council.

In June the Council learned that the minister of Inveresk, though deprived by the Committee of the Estates, employed deprived brethren to supply the parish church. Although he satisfied the Council that they were in fact un-deprived ministers who qualified for the government's protection, his was the first of many cases allegedly involving deprived clergy exchanging pulpits. Crawford's assertion that all episcopal clergy who exchanged pulpits had disobeyed the April proclamation is broadly corroborated by the registers of the Privy Council.

In October it was reported that deprived Fife clergy were publicly declaring that because they were deprived of benefice, but not of office, they could
lawfully preach in other parish churches;

'wherefore they go up and down the Countrey, and preach where they can be admitted, either in Churches or Conventicles, as opportunity is offered them.' 182

Crawford lamented that the clergy

'make little other than a sport of all the Council hes acted to them.' 183

Presbyterian ministers and congregations were forced in many cases to seek the interposition of the Council's authority in order to gain vacated churches. A steady flow of warrants ordaining deprived clergy to surrender church keys, church goods and manses to the patron or the heritors began in 1689. 184

The situation merely confirmed what Dalrymple and others foresaw in July 1689,

'that if the Parliament ryse without settling the Church Government, that ther will be tumults and confusions in holding and usurping pulpits.' 185

The disturbances were to last long after presbytery was re-established, for in an important sense the course of the Revolution church settlement, and the opposition to it, was a struggle for control of the parish pulpit. In summer 1689 part of the government's security was seen to depend on silencing its clerical opponents, and the cause of presbyterianism itself required an expeditious purge of the episcopalian in the parishes. The deprivations were largely overseen by the zealot Crawford, who presided over the Council from 21 August until 12 December and enjoyed the support
of a cadre of presbyterian councillors.\textsuperscript{186} A proclamation on 6 August reiterated the 13 April proclamation, provided protection for those in possession of churches and meeting-houses, and permitted those removed since that date to return and exercise their ministry without disturbance. This protective measure carried a sting in its tail which shows that the Council was determined to punish disobedient clergy; their parishioners were invited to cite them before the Privy Council, and to adduce witnesses to prove their libels.\textsuperscript{187} The response to the proclamation was limited,\textsuperscript{188} so on 22 August the Council, now headed by Crawford, issued another which extended the category of those entitled to cite non-complying ministers to include not only their parishioners and hearers, but also heritors, sheriffs and their deputes, and magistrates of burghal parishes. The signatories were all presbyterians and associates of Crawford; the episcopalians did not attend the diet.\textsuperscript{189}

The designations of the pursuers in subsequent libels against the clergy suggest that the 22 August proclamation speeded up the citation procedure, because they indicate many heritors and burgh magistrates taking action against the clergy. The number of citations increased rapidly. In the first month of its work, from 26 July until 25 August, fourteen ministers were deprived, two declared rebel, one gaoled and one assoilzied. On 27 August the Council removed fifteen more, and the same
number on the 29 August, and again on 3 September. The high point of the purge was reached on 4 September. Of twenty-nine compearing four were assoilzied and twenty-five deprived. On 5 September three were assoilzied and eight removed. Thereafter the rate of deprivations dropped, with only a handful of processes every few days. Of the ten before the Council on 10 September, seven were deprived and three assoilzied, and on 17 September fifteen were deprived and three assoilzied. This was the last busy day for the Council. Crawford's harvest of 172 ministers ended on 29 November 1689. No clergy were cited before the Council in 1690 for disobedience to the 13 April proclamation, and in 1690-1 the Council's role was largely confined to the enforcement of its previous enactments, especially in removing deprived clergy from manses and forcing them to surrender church keys and goods. It also played an important part in assigning stipends to episcopalian and presbyterian clergy.

The 172 deprived clergy were not the only Jacobite episcopalian, but they probably represented most of those who could be reached by the Council's procedures. Comparatively few in the north and northeast, and almost none in the west, were affected by the purge. By contrast, in the presbyteries of Earlston and Kelso there was virtually a clean sweep, and in Duns and Chirnside half the ministers were removed. In Dalkeith the six deprived by the Council, in addition to the three by the Committee of Estates, brought the
total to half the presbytery. In Edinburgh four were removed in addition to the eight previously deprived by the Committee. In Stirling the Council's six deprivations brought the total to seven out of nine, and in Dunblane eight deprivations brought the total to ten out of sixteen. Perth and Auchterarder lost about half their number. In Fife three-quarters of Cupar presbytery, over half of St. Andrews, and one-third of Kirkcaldy were deprived. Jacobite patrons' and heritors' influence in preventing citations may have caused the cessation of the purge by December, but another reason may have been the representations made at Court by the episcopalianists against the Council's proceedings.

Melville was concerned, before proceedings commenced, that purging the church of the conform clergy, which was Crawford's drastic prescription for ensuring the firm settlement of pure presbytery, was dangerous. His fears were confirmed by rising criticism of the Council's proceedings which were a serious embarrassment and jeopardised his position at Court. He knew there were many there ready to misrepresent the presbyterians. Even moderate presbyterians in Scotland grew alarmed at the scale of the deprivations in early September. Representations about the Council's procedures were sent by 5 September, followed a month later by a formal address to the King, carried to Court by Dr Fall. Crawford feared he 'is like to have many patrons at Court' for a favourable hearing, and might succeed in
obtaining an accommodation for the episcopal clergy.\footnote{194}

No other indication of the address's contents survive.

If such an address was a fight for survival by the episcopalians, Crawford, too, regarded the church settlement as a struggle, which could only be won by their removal from the Church:

'without the Church be once purged, the conforme clergy will be six to one, and would readily depose them of the Presbiterian way, after a pretence and shew of submitting to the Government.' \footnote{195}

Crawford's self-justification insulated him from Melville's cautions and the attacks increasingly being mounted on the Council's conduct from August.\footnote{196}

He argued that the Council acted with 'the utmost tenderness',\footnote{197} and did not deprive ministers who fell into three categories. None were deprived who prayed for William and Mary by name, but who had not read the proclamation, providing they had not refused to do so; none were deprived for not reading the 24 April proclamation for the fast, and not observing it; clergy who read the proclamation but only said indirect prayers were also acquitted. There were few who had not 'transgressed in all respects'.\footnote{198} Where the libel was proven the Council was unable to assoilzie, but they 'frequently shifted where there was any circumstance that pleaded favour'.\footnote{199} Examples of this type of leniency confirm Crawford's statement.\footnote{200}

No regard was had of the clergy's 'ignorance, scandalousness of their lives, or dislike of their people to them',\footnote{201}
though Crawford's own words betray his bias against their qualities as ministers. He pleaded other instances of scrupulousness and restraint, and only slightly exaggerated the number of ministers assoilzed.

Crawford's account is at least superficially convincing in matching the Council's records, which present the libel and the decreet but not the witnesses' depositions. If injustices were committed they probably resulted from the over-ready acceptance of depositions in what must at times have been extremely brisk hearings. Perjury was alleged in one case but never proved. Instances of deprived clergy who claimed to have prayed or shown a willingness to pray have already been referred to. Because obedience of the proclamation hinged on the distribution of copies of it through the sheriffs to all parts of Scotland within two weeks of its issue, the clergy were vulnerable to any hindrances. Although non-receipt was accepted as a valid excuse in some cases, it was not in others. Four deprived clergy petitioned the King because of this in 1689. In depriving James Aird, minister of Torryburn, on 18 October the Council stirred up a hornet's nest.

Aird had prayed for William and Mary, but had not read the proclamation because it had not reached him by public authority. Construing this as a refusal, the Council, apparently including his
friends, voted him out. Before the hearing there were 'manifold applications' for him by episcopalian of both sexes, on account of his ministerial reputation.

The news that he was being portrayed at court as 'a man of great pietie and turned out by a streach', elicited a damning comment from Crawford. His case evidently fitted the episcopalian's aim of exposing presbyterian bigotry and injustice in action, in order to persuade William to order a stop to proceedings, and even to implement a programme of reposing unjustly-deprived clergy. Aird's former association with Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, as one of Bishop Leighton's 'evangelists' in 1670, was fortunate, and perhaps helped enlist his support for the episcopalian lobby at Court.

Meanwhile Melville obtained a lengthy summary of the Council's processes, detailing the content of the libel, what was proven, and whether it was by judicial confession or witnesses. It was probably this which enabled him to convince the King of the falsity of episcopalian claims. Reports of the activities of Jacobite clergy probably damaged the episcopalian lobby at Court. Some were reported to be confident that Council proceedings had been stopped as a prelude to their being reposed to their parishes. An 'Address for restoring the Episcopal Clergie' appears to have been given to William around late October, requesting that all deprived clergy should be called
before the Council within six weeks and on their assurance of prayers for William and Mary, they were to be restored to their charges. Melville allegedly prevented William's assent to this at the last moment.\textsuperscript{213} The episcopalian lobby continued, and by December had enlisted the support of convocation, who were reported to be demanding consideration of 'their persecuted brethren in Scotland', that those willing to pray for the King and Queen who were not scandalous or insufficient, should be reponed; otherwise they would be less favourable to the nonconformists,\textsuperscript{214} for whom William desired a comprehension. The episcopalian lobby was anxious to have a printed account of the clergy's affairs since the convention of estates, with which to influence convocation and parliament. The English bishops were reported to have all joined in an address to the King on behalf of the Scottish clergy.\textsuperscript{215} Crawford's version of the processes was being contradicted in London, but he counted on pro-episcopalian agitation having less effect after convocation dissolved.\textsuperscript{216} In January 1690 Melville was reported to have answered Burnet, who 'indeed makes a great noise, but it is no great matter.'\textsuperscript{217} From this period the disputed justice of the Council processes became matter only for the pamphleteers on both sides.\textsuperscript{218}

The bitter reaction caused by the deprivations seriously alarmed the moderate presbyterians, but no review of the sentences took place. Nor was a joint
secretary to balance the presbyterian Melville appointed. The episcopalian lobby of winter 1689-90 failed in its objective of securing a reversal of the church settlement thus far. When presbytery was re-established on 7 June 1690 it tacitly endorsed the provisions of the 6 August 1689 proclamation by declaring vacant all churches deserted by their ministers, or from which ministers had been removed by 13 April 1689, or whose ministers had been deprived for disobedience of the proclamation since that date. Presbyterian ministers already occupying such churches were allowed to continue. This clause placed a seal on the legal and illegal extrusions of 1688-9, and gave the presbyterians a footing in most parishes in southern Scotland. Additional strength was also derived from an act of 25 April 1690 which restored to their former charges ministers deprived since 1661 for not conforming to prelacy. Between thirty and forty episcopal clergy in possession, for whom no provision was made, were affected by this.

The harshness of the measure indicated the overall tone of the 1690 parliament, in which episcopalian objections to acts were outweighed. Presbytery was re-established according to the Act of 1592 which provided for government by general assemblies, synods, presbyteries and kirk sessions, to be exercised by the presbyterian ministers deprived
since 1661 and by the ministers and elders whom they had admitted, or would admit. Together the ministers and elders were empowered 'to try and purge out all insufficient, negligent, scandalous and erroneous ministers'; those found guilty and suspended or deposed, or who did not appear when cited, were ipso facto suspended or deposed from their benefices. The act also established the Westminster Confession as the Church doctrinal standard. Patronage was abolished by a separate act, which vested the power of nomination in the protestant heritors and elders, with the presbytery having the power to settle calls disputed by the parish, and to fill vacancies jure devoluto where no suitable call was made. The Assertory Act of 1669 was abolished, which removed a means of royal control over the church settlement. A further important measure was the establishment of a parliamentary commission for visiting the universities. It was empowered to remove those who refused to subscribe the Confession of Faith or swear the oath of allegiance, which were now imposed on the principals and teaching staff of universities and schools.

The university visitations which sat in the period August to October 1690 removed a substantial proportion of episcopalian principals, professors and regents. At Glasgow, Fall and Dr James Wemyss, the professor of divinity, were both removed, though many others
complied. At Edinburgh the principal, Dr Alexander Monro, and Dr John Strachan, professor of divinity, were deprived, along with Dr David Gregory, professor of mathematics, a pre-eminent lay episcopalian who in 1691 took up the Savilian chair of astronomy at Oxford. At St Andrews a purge of the committed Jacobite principals and regents occurred under Crawford's presidency. At Aberdeen the visitation had the least effect, the only important deprivation being that of Dr James Garden, professor of divinity in King's College, effected in 1696 after procedural delays. Dr. George Middleton, principal of King's, remained in post, but although he subscribed the Confession of Faith and declared his readiness to submit to the established church government, his sympathies and his religious conviction remained episcopalian. King's and Marischal were important resorts of episcopalian students after the Revolution, and it was to their influence that the upkeep of Jacobitism among the gentry of the entire north-east was ascribed in 1715. The visitations were not overall a drastic purge, for David Gregory could observe in 1692 that at a general meeting of the universities the episcopal party balanced the presbyterian interest. The presbyterian General Assembly sat from 16 October to 13 November 1690 and passed several acts which directly affected the episcopal clergy. Presbyteries were
recommended to take notice of clergy who did not obey the
curch's fasts and thanksgivings; a fast was ordained
for 8 January 1691. Two commissions of visitation
were appointed, one for south of the Tay, the second
for the north. Other measures designed to facilitate
proceedings against episcopalian and to enforce
orthodoxy and uniformity, were the act enjoining
subscription to the Confession of Faith by all ministers,
probationers and elders, and an act forbidding private
communion for the sick and private baptisms. Outwardly,
at least, the Assembly acceded to William's injunction

'Moderation is what religion enjoins;
neighbouring churches expect from you,
and we recommend to you.' 228

Nonetheless, their promise to study the recommended
moderation belied a determination on the part of some
younger and more radical clergy to purge the episcopalian,
whom they regarded as enemies to God, the Church and the
King. 229

From the recommencement of presbyterian government
the episcopalian generally refused to accept the
authority both of the General Assembly and its delegated
commissions, and of the church courts, where its
exercise exceeded the provision of trying under the
'four heads' contained in the 1690 act. The claim of
the sixty ante-diluvians and their brethren to
constitute a true general assembly in anything more
than a legal sense, was clearly open to doubt when
at its first meeting only eight clergy and six ruling
elders from beyond the Tay attended. According to one episcopalian, 'the National Rendezvouze of the Presbyterian Clergie and supposts' lacked the 'universall delegation from a nationall Church' which was essential to a national synod.230 Episcopalian reactions to the January fast showed that the clergy were not prepared to endorse the Assembly's estimation of prelacy as a national defection. At Dirleton Laurence Charteris expounded an alternative view that the defection was 'from the life of God and the power of religion', and that neither episcopacy nor presbytery were essential to the fundamentals of Christian faith. Protests by the clergy in Aberdeen and elsewhere emphasised their scruples at the assertion of episcopacy's sinfulness. This reaction was precisely what was required to enable non-observance of the fast to be counted as negligence under the four heads, and therefore grounds for deposition.231

The established presbyteries began their work of trying episcopal clergy before the first Assembly sat. Offences under the four heads were judged in hearings before which the minister, and the witnesses for proving the libel, were called. Breaches of discipline were judged strictly and punished with deposition. Like the Privy Council's proceedings, the presbyteries' exercise of their new-found disciplinary powers resembled just procedures.
However, like them too, there was room for witnesses' perjury and malice to secure unfair verdicts even where fair judgement was intended. The partiality of the presbyterian church courts arguably rested on the different doctrinal, theological and moral standards which they espoused, but equally there can be little doubt that these were applied with especial rigour against the episcopalian, and that the presbyterians stood to gain by a harsh purge. Small lapses by incumbent clergy, or alleged scandals by elders or parishioners admitted to communion, justified the removal of clergy; the use of the English devotional work *The Whole Duty of Man*, and doctrinal standards other than those of the Westminster Confession, were regarded as erroneous. Libels were generally made up of transgressions under several heads, of which scandalousness was probably the most versatile, as it covered all aspects of a minister's life. Typically, it was used to cover drunkenness, which, to judge by the libels, was a besetting sin and frequent condition of the Restoration clergy. It was noted of John Keir of Roxburgh that he was deprived by the Synod of Merse and Teviotdale 'for drinking fighting etc. ... drank 17 bottles with Chatto.'

Aspects of such proceedings are illustrated by depositions by the united presbytery of Haddington and Dunbar, consisting of five presbyterian ministers, which prompted petitions to the Privy Council in 1691. The minister of Oldhamstocks was
deposed for drunkenness, though he claimed to the Council that some witnesses admitted they 'mistook the effects of the complainer's indisposition of palsy for the effects of drink'. He also alleged that he was not permitted to object to witnesses or question them, nor could he see the sentence or the grounds for it.

235 John Brown of Bara claimed for the stipend he had unwittingly missed by demitting shortly before Michaelmas 1690, when libelled with some misdemeanors. As he was over ninety years old he probably wished to avoid censure. George Lauder at Whitekirk similarly demitted before the presbytery sentenced him and ceased ministering, but he refused to surrender the manse keys, a minor example of a widespread reluctance to give presbyterians access to manse or church. In Dalkeith the case of Alexander Heriot, minister there, became notorious when he was deposed by the Synod of Lothian for offences including dancing round a bonfire on 14 October 1688. He claimed that one of his accusers, an elder, admitted there had been no bonfire that day. An additional claim that he was not shown the libel against him was one commonly levelled against the proceedings of all the church courts, who, it was complained, thus prevented the accuser from being known to the defender, and enabled the presbyterian clergy and elders to constitute themselves as accusers, witnesses and judges.
Nor were defenders allowed to question or object to witnesses, who were accepted even though they bore malice against the defender. These and other procedural irregularities were allegedly practised, of which the most important for the subsequent planting of the parish was the selection by the presbytery of elders for a new kirk session.  

The General Assembly of 1690 dealt with twenty-six cases which had been processed by presbyteries or synods, and either referred to the Assembly by them, or appealed against by the clergy. Two were referred back to presbyteries, and the rest to the commission for visitation south of the Tay, apparently without being considered in full Assembly. The few other cases before the Assembly received apparently equable treatment, and the nominal submission of two ministers to its authority prompted an assurance to the King that they had received some into the unity and order of the church. The Assembly's intention in referring cases to the commission was to facilitate the rigorous implementation of the four heads of discipline without the public scrutiny attendant on its own sessions. In the case of the commission for north of the Tay there were no cases in hand to refer to it. The commissions' proceedings attracted immediate criticism both for their summary depositions of clergy and for not receiving them in terms of the King's wishes, with consequences which will be discussed in Chapter Two. In general, disavowal of the Assembly's jurisdiction over them
remained the justification of episcopalian resistance throughout the 1690s. In June 1694 the Committee for the North met with protestations at Aberdeen and Inverness which reiterated the argument that the General Assemblies had not been

'the full and lawful representatives of this National Church, and consequently that no person or persons whatsoever by virtue of any Delegation from them can justly claim a power to be the judges of our Lives and Doctrine.'

Because this was tantamount to a denial of the powers vested in the established Church, the clerk who signed the Aberdeen protestation and two others were punished, but their queries to the Committee went to the heart of the troubled nature of the Revolution settlement from the viewpoint of episcopalian church principles.

From the Kirk's point of view the questioning of their authority was contumacious, an offence which was included in the scope of their jurisdiction by the 1690 Act, and which proved an effective means of securing depositions. Cases of disregard of ecclesiastical sentences were legion from 1690 onwards, thus often necessitating the interposition of the authority of the Privy Council or sheriffs to give them force. Moreover an act of 1690 forbade deprived clergy from preaching or ministering 'either in Churches or elsewhere upon any pretext whatsoever' until they took the oath of allegiance and engaged themselves to pray for William and Mary as sovereigns. The wording was evidently framed to
cover the activities of clergy in parishes other than those from which each had been deprived, and avoided the necessity of declaring such clergy as having been deprived from office as well as benefice, which would have been tantamount to Erastian control of spiritual orders.

Despite the act's provision for the further execution of the 13 April proclamation, and its aim of silencing deprived clergy, the problem of the Jacobite clergy tackled by the Privy Council in 1689 continued, apparently unabated, in areas where clergy were protected in their ministering by sympathetic lairds, as, for instance, at Auchtertool and Auchterderran in Fife in 1691. At Culross and Kinross, Sir William Bruce impeded efforts to settle presbyterians, and their attempts to be paid their stipends. Obstructions to planting of kirks, and the support of episcopal clergy, were common throughout Fife, Perthshire and Angus and Mearns. Continued ministering by baptising, marrying and preaching met with banishment from the parish where the Council could secure clergy in 1691. It was reported in 1692 that only three episcopal clergy in Perthshire observed public fasts and thanksgivings and prayed for William and Mary; only a few of the fifteen non-compliers were delated to the Council by the sheriff, who argued that he would not interfere in other jurisdictions.
within the shire. In Angus and Mearns seventeen clergy remained in possession but did not observe the above conditions, and eight deprived clergy continued to preach and to pray for King James either expressly or obliquely. In Dundee six clergy preached in the meeting-house and prayed similarly.\textsuperscript{251} In Perthshire during the reign of Anne the Duke of Atholl provided protection for nonjuring episcopalian who remained in possession and who were 'good men', while prudently aiding presbyteries in planting vacant churches, and serving as a ruling elder and commissioner to the General Assembly.\textsuperscript{252} A typical example of lay protection occurred in the parish of Buchanan in Stirlingshire, where Duncan Comrie was deprived by the Council in 1689. The tutors of the Marquis of Montrose and other heritors, however, succeeded in retaining the church keys until 1702, and then prevented a planting by making a series of calls to ministers whom they knew would not accept. Attempts by the presbytery to prove charges of drunkenness and fornication failed at first, but Comrie left the parish in 1707, to continue ministering in Edinburgh.\textsuperscript{253}

Lay support from the landed class and humbler people can reasonably be supposed to have been behind the activities of several clergy in the presbytery of Dalkeith in the early 1690s. Alexander Heriot, deposed minister of Dalkeith, was highly active, preaching in a meeting-house, 'imploying others deposed
for Immoralities' and ministers removed by the Council to preach with him, and attracting Jacobite hearers from neighbouring parishes. In Musselburgh Arthur Millar continued to minister in his dwelling house, two others were also active in the parish, while two more erected a meeting-house near Inveresk church. In Newton parish the heritors employed three ministers and obstructed a settled eldership. David Lambie, deprived minister of Carrington, was complained of as ministering in the Shank, where Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh's widow lived, while Andrew Don, deprived of his charge of Crichton, was frequently employed to preach by Viscount Oxfird at Cranstoun. Whereas Millar, Lambie and Don were local men, the others strikingly illustrate the migrations which necessity forced on some clergy after the Revolution. The three employed in Newton at various times were Henry Walker, noted earlier as the minister of Mochrum in Wigtown presbytery, forced to leave in 1691; Robert Bowes, who demitted his charge of Stoniekirk in Stranraer presbytery in 1689; and Richard Hislop, who appears to have been intended for Coylton in Ayr presbytery. Hislop also ministered in Musselburgh, near the Inveresk meeting-house of Thomas Ireland, rabbled minister of Twynholm in Kirkend presbytery, and James Nasmyth, rabbled minister of Kirkcolm in Stranraer presbytery. Lastly, another meeting-house was kept in Musselburgh by Samuel Mowat, forced from his parish of Kirkconnel in Lanark presbytery. The baptising, marrying and preaching of all these ministers was a source of considerable and persistent annoyance to the presbytery.
This high concentration of illegally-removed clergy reflected a trend for clergy to gather in Edinburgh, which will be discussed later. Many other individual instances of migrations occurred. Alexander Slirie, who assisted the sick minister of Falkirk after being forced out of Dalry in Ayrshire, was ministering in Linlithgow presbytery in 1692, and in 1712 had a meeting-house in Benholme parish in the Mearns. John White, ejected from Ballantrae in 1689, accepted a call to Aberdour in Deer presbytery in 1691, where he ministered for several years until deposed. Francis Ross left Renfrew on the return of the former presbyterian minister and in 1694 moved to fill the vacancy in St. Machar's, Aberdeen, created by his father-in-law's death. Such cases of succession were not uncommon, and provided an element of continuity in strongly episcopalian parishes. In Aberlemno in Forfar presbytery John Ochterlonie was succeeded on his death in 1695 by his namesake and nephew, who had been his assistant there and was to remain very active even after the 1715 Rebellion.

The religious, social and political resilience which this pattern represented continued throughout the period under study. The Kirk's difficulties in training up clergy and planting them in parishes were compounded by the widespread practice of exchanging pulpits which was complained of from 1689 onwards. A meeting-house at the Hirsel existed in the early 1690s under the Earl of Home's patronage,
'where all the deprived incumbents in the Mers have preached, and married persons not in the parish and baptised fourtie or fiftie Children not in the said parish to the great growth of Schisme.'

The Earl also patronised the ministry of John Cook, who ensured that his charge of Eccles near Kelso was supplied by his brethren after his deprivation.263

In Angus the clergy served vacant churches by 'circular preaching'.264 A statement of the Kirk's grievances in 1695 complained

'That many of the Episcopall Clergy outed for their dissatisfactione to the government are notwithstanding possessest themselves of the Manses and Gleibs doe exercise all the pairts of the ministeriall functione in the same parishes, invite and call uther dissaffected persons to preach in these Churches to the great hindrance of the planting of the same.' 265

At Foveran in Aberdeenshire, James Gordon was assisted at various times by some eight of his neighbouring brethren, and himself helped his father at Banchory Devenick.266 Gordon younger possessed Foveran by a call from a plurality of the heritors and elders in 1692, moderated by the episcopal presbytery or exercise; he managed to retain the charge until 1696, when he made a tactical demission to avoid the centure of the Privy Council. Moving to a meeting-house in Montrose, his ministry was again hampered by the presbytery's repeated efforts to silence him and finally stopped by Council decreet in 1699. A period as his father's assistant was brought to an end by pressure
against Gordon senior to cease employing him, and consequently he moved to England in 1702. Calls to episcopal clergy were frequently made despite the fact that they were illegal because not moderated by the established presbyteries. An active episcopal minister in Angus and Mearns from the 1690s was Gideon Guthrie, who, like James Gordon younger, left a first-hand account of his experiences. He received calls to Grange in Banffshire and Aboyne in Aberdeenshire, both of which were frustrated by the Committee for the North in 1694. The patronage shown to him in these instances by Sir John Forbes of Craigievar was also extended to Alexander Thomson, who possessed Fintray 'upon a call frae the Heretors and Parochiners therof', of whom Forbes was the most considerable. Thomson was deprived by a committee of parliament in 1695. Guthrie enjoyed the patronage of the Earl Marischal at Fetteresso, which he possessed on his presentation, despite counter-measures by the ecclesiastical and civil authorities to dislodge him, from 1703 until 1710; he then moved to a meeting-house in Brechin which became one of the most successful in Angus and Mearns in the period before the 1715 Rebellion.

The stubborn resistance shown by the episcopal clergy from 1689 onwards to the Revolution settlement was motivated by a powerful combination of Jacobitism and a refusal to accept the authority of the presbyterian
establishment. Especially north of the Tay this resistance hampered the planting of the parishes until after the Rebellion of 1715, and was made possible by widespread support by patrons, heritors and people. However, the general exclusion of the episcopal clergy from the Revolution Church went against King William's wish for a comprehensive settlement. In the circumstances of the political and confessional antagonisms outlined above, such a settlement seemed beyond practical possibility. Nonetheless, serious efforts were made from 1689 to create an accommodation of episcopalian within the national Church; these must now be examined.
CHAPTER TWO

COMPREHENSION AND TOLERATION, 1689-1703

The schemes for comprehension and toleration which were proposed from 1689 onwards were the product of the partisan settlement of church government in 1689 and 1690, and of the deeply divided nature of Revolution politics. Comprehension especially was advocated as an amelioration of, if not a solution to, religious and political strife. Observing the radical drift of the convention of estates before it declared prelacy a grievance, the presbyterian Sir James Dalrymple urged to Melville that

'A joynt comprehensione of all interests wer the only best which might in some measur satisfie all parties.'

This view, and the various forms in which it was adopted by episcopalian interests in the 1690s, have been regarded as unrealistic pursuits of the chimera of a unified church establishment embracing episcopalian and presbyterian. Yet the persistence with which schemes of comprehension, and also of toleration, were pursued, suggests that however small the likelihood of their success, the supposed delusions of large numbers of Williamite and Jacobite episcopal clergy and their political patrons, were of some significance. It was in the advocation and eventual failure both of comprehension and toleration that the contrasting attitudes of the episcopal clergy to the Revolution, which have already been described, diverged further and affected the whole course of the ecclesiastical settlement.
Severe difficulties faced any comprehension scheme because the moderation and compromise it entailed by definition were exposed to the abundant extremism of both ecclesiastical camps. The presbyterian party's aversion to the Restoration episcopate was such that it obliterated the hierarchy and attempted a radical purge of the 'conform' clergy who had served under it. Differences over church government, doctrine and worship were compounded by presbyterianism's almost complete identification with the Revolution and the deep and often justified suspicion of Jacobitism which attached to the episcopal clergy. These factors outweighed the benign view of the episcopate as taken by the episcopalian Robert Kirk, that

'The Scotish Episcopacy, having the Doctrine and Discipline intire, and wanting a Liturgy, Ceremonies and sole ordination and jurisdiction assumed by bishops, is upon the matter but presbyterial Government with a Constant Moderator.'

Although only moderate presbyterians could accept this position, there were episcopalian, such as the Aberdeen clergy who addressed parliament in 1689 for a general assembly, whose conception of episcopal authority in the church did not preclude their desire for 'ane union with all our Protestant brethren who differ from them only in matters of Church Government.' Presbyterians feared this prospect of a shared establishment because not only would it baffle the settlement of pure presbytery but also, as Crawford put it, the episcopal clergy would be 'three to one
The presbyterians' avoidance of a general assembly in 1689 and the subsequent baulkings of proposals for comprehension and toleration were tactical necessities for the re-establishment of presbytery, although they appeared hypocritical in view of their acceptance of toleration in 1687 and their stress on the assembly as the representative voice of the Church. After 1689 the episcopalian experienced the harsh fact that toleration was regarded even less favourably by the presbyterians than it had been by the Restoration episcopate.

A second obstruction to a church settlement based on comprehension was the political ambition of rival nobles, gentry and others, and the groupings which they formed. Lord Belhaven observed in 1689

'.. to my sad regraite, I see self interest is heavier in the ballance then the interest of either religion or country, and greide and invie predomins our Love and humilitie.'

In effect the episcopalian and presbyterian causes were espoused for expedient reasons by laymen whose religious sympathies, where they were evident, sometimes lay with the opposite persuasion. The club, whose extreme presbyterian demands in 1690 shaped the settling of church government, were in temporary alliance with 'episcopalian' led by Queensberry and Atholl, who epitomised the expedient adoption of Revolution sympathies. It was significant for the course of the comprehension lobby that Sir John Dalrymple as
secretary from January 1691 was, like his father, a presbyterian in the 'episcopalian' interest opposed to the truly presbyterian interest headed by Melville. The use of ecclesiastical issues as pretexts for political action arguably disguised the subordination of religion to politics, a trend reinforced at the Revolution by the apparent indifference of many of the political nation, whose pliant religious consciences facilitated political fluidity.

Certainly a marked lack of enthusiasm among the nobles and barons for a continued episcopacy reflected political as much as religious considerations. Yet the strong resistance to the presbyterian settlement in the localities was not merely a symptom of political disaffection but also of the confessional antipathy with which it was bound up. The broad regional pattern which emerged at the Revolution is well known; the south-west, west and much of the Border area was predominantly presbyterian; in the Lothians, Stirlingshire, Fife and the southern parts of Perthshire areas of presbyterian support were matched by resilient episcopalian interests. The Highlands were divided unevenly; the Campbells were the pre-eminent upholders of presbytery; and correspondingly their enemies tended to come out for James against the presbyterian threat; Catholics formed a significant minority both in the Isles and in the north-east. Restoration disputes reinforced
a strong presbyterianism among, for instance, the Monros, Brodies and Grants in Ross, Moray and Inverness; but overall the north and north-east remained predominantly episcopalian, and broadly Jacobite. Contemporary commentators attempted to estimate the scale of support for the two persuasions across this variegated spectrum in order to test the notion of prelacy's unacceptability 'to the inclinations of the generality of the people.' Episcopalians put support for presbytery as low as one in five in Scotland as a whole, or less than one in three in the south, while one presbyterian apologist argued that, excluding Jacobites, persons dependent on the Restoration government and bishops, and the 'many ten thousands' indifferent to religion, episcopacy could not even claim one in many hundreds or even thousands.

The rhetorical arithmetic of these claims could not and cannot be tested, because the religious persuasion of the majority of the population depended largely on a shifting balance of influence between the heritors, the ministers and their people, and the power of the Kirk and of civil authority to put into practice the ecclesiastical dispensation in each parish. However, calculations of party strength were not necessarily misguided, for they were based on the understanding that episcopalianism's strength lay with the nobility and gentry, whose social and political influence presented an obstacle to the presbyterians who had less landed support, though far more both among the common people of certain areas and
in the burghs.\textsuperscript{13} This corresponded with William's perception of the religious position in 1689, and it was precisely because it helped form his preferred solution to wider political problems, of striking a balance between the religious interests\textsuperscript{14} that the notion of a numerically and socially-superior body of episcopalian was important for proposals of comprehension and toleration. The course of the Revolution demonstrated the power of a dynamic presbyterian minority, aided by the political self-interest of erstwhile opponents, to topple the Restoration establishment. Yet, as Major General Mackay cautioned the staunch presbyterian Ludovick Grant in 1690,

\begin{quote}
'if I were as much ane ennemy to that intrest as I am a friend, I wold without difficulty ingadge to forme in Scotland a more formidable party against it even for their Majesties Government than can be formed for it.'\textsuperscript{15}
\end{quote}

Like other moderate presbyterians, Mackay was aware of the King's intention to maintain presbyterian government

\begin{quote}
'as the fittest for the nation but it is also his earnest desire that it may be made as supportable to those whom seem to dissent from it, that even they may fall in lyking with it, and so the Kingdom becum one body.'\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

To a great extent the church settlement of the 1690s represented the failure of the King's design for such an acceptable and balanced government.
William's disposition towards toleration and unity in religion has already been mentioned in the context of his attempts to retain episcopacy in Scotland, and to moderate the restoration of presbytery. His comments on the draft act for settling church government in 1690 plainly indicate that he envisaged a presbytery which would neither assert its divine right 'as the only Government of Christ's Church in this Kingdom', nor restrict its government only to presbyterian clergy. Instead, ministers willing to subscribe the Confession of Faith and Catechisms and to own and submit to the government of the Church, being sober in their lives, doctrinally sound, and qualified with gifts for the ministry, should be admitted. The King also wanted to ensure that the 'Visitors for purging the Church' were moderate men approved by his commissioner to the General Assembly, and that he himself was consulted over the Assembly's sittings. In addition to these remarks on actual proposals, he made clear his desire

'that such as are of the Episcopal perswasion in Scotland have the same Indulgence that Dissenters have in England, provided they give security to live peaceably under the Govern-ment, and take the Oath of Allegiance.'\(^{17}\)

This coda indicates William's hopes for a dual settlement similar to that attempted in England the previous year, when bills for comprehension and toleration were tabled together.

There the relationship of the dissenters to the establishment was closer than in Scotland because of a
partial rapprochement among those who accepted the principle of a national church, the royal supremacy, a set liturgy and a moderated episcopacy, and whose doctrines were increasingly Arminian. For their part, the bishops' resistance to James's Catholicising gained them great public credit, which helped the prospects of comprehension.\(^{18}\) In the event the Toleration Act of 1689 passed, with its provision of security from the penal laws for those dissenters who took oaths to William and Mary and subscribed certain of the Thirty-Nine Articles, as conditions of having their meeting-places registered by the bishop or archdeacon of the diocese.\(^{19}\) For the Scottish version William presumably envisaged subscription of the Confession of Faith, and a regulation of meeting-houses, perhaps by the civil authority, since the intention of the act was to tolerate those whose scruples prevented them from owning presbyterian church government. In England the Toleration Act's companion bill for comprehension was lost, principally because of parliament's fears about the presbyterians' intentions and influence when once comprehended,\(^{20}\) thus anticipating the harsher attitude of the Scottish parliament to the accommodation of episcopal clergy in 1689-90.

Although the provision for acceptance into the Church of England on condition of declared approval of its doctrine, worship and government was lost with the bill, a commission sat to examine ways of accommodating dissenters' scruples over the liturgy,
ritual and discipline. Its meetings in October and November 1689 resulted in a report to convocation which, partly aggravated by the failure to redress the Scottish episcopal clergy's grievances, could not agree to discuss it. The convocation dashed William's hopes for a comprehension in England, nor can his expectations of a Scottish settlement have been strengthened by the episcopal lobby's assertions of the Privy Council's injustice and the failure to repone illegally removed clergy. It is possible that assurances were made to the English bishops, or to Dr James Fall, of provision for loyal clergy in the impending church settlement. Certainly the outcry in London died down by January. The episcopalian themselves developed various schemes for the settlement. A brief one in a pamphlet of 1690 echoes the English commission of 1689 in its suggestion that a commission of 'learned and grave English Churchmen' could enquire into the literature and sufficiency of the ministers of both persuasions in Scotland in order to achieve a settlement. Even assuming the inclusion of dissenters in such a body, this recourse to the early church practice of one church helping its troubled neighbour with irenical measures, had little more chance of success than the national poll to determine the religious inclinations of the people also suggested by John Sage.

A more important and coherent programme, but one which also went unimplemented, was Viscount Tarbat's scheme for two parallel church establishments, each with
its own government and discipline in general assemblies, synods, presbyteries and kirk sessions. All clergy in parishes were to remain in possession under royal protection, subject to recognising William and Mary's government, and were to be allowed to meet in presbyteries and synods according to their differing convictions of church government and whether they owned the Confession of Faith or the Thirty-Nine Articles. Adherents of the latter, who disowned presbyterian government, were permitted to elect 'a constant Moderator or Overseer' in their synods, while the presbyterian persuasion could elect one at each annual meeting. Part of the bishops' rents, by now in the Crown's hands, were to be applied to the upkeep of the constant moderators at the rate of £800 Scots for those north of the Tay and £1,000 for those south of it, 'in consideration of expence and dignity.' Vacancies were to be filled under the existing system of patrons' nominations, though Tarbat forbore to suggest how the King should fill those arising in the very large number of livings now in his gift following the abolition of bishops. Detailed provisions, such as restraints on the acceptance of clergy and laity from one 'modell' into another, restrictions of the powers of synods and presbyteries to the disciplining of clergy only, of kirk sessions to ecclesiastical censures, and of ecclesiastical censure to no more than barring from the sacrament, all
show that Tarbat's scheme was intended for his cousin Melville's and the King's serious consideration.

In the extreme conditions prevailing at the end of the 'convention' parliament, which is perhaps when Tarbat composed the memorial, his proposals came too close to a continuation of episcopacy in presbyterian guise to be practicable. Yet Tarbat correctly foresaw that if the church settlement was placed in the hands of one party it would be unacceptable to the other; he expected his 'constitutiones' to satisfy everyone 'except such as will not only have their will as to themselves, but will lord over others, albeit they admitt none to Lord over them; and so by their humors continue and propagat the divisiones and animosities of the nation.'

His constant theme at this date was the need to halt the divisions by a settlement which would not provoke the episcopalian interest to retaliate. He envisaged the exercise of William's standing prerogative 'to regulate indifferent external Church policy', an advantage which proposers of comprehension, including the King himself, did not have after 25 April 1690. As an alternative means of managing church affairs in the ecclesiastical interregnum of 1689-90, Tarbat's proposals lacked the force which the Council under Crawford brought to the task, but they appear to have been the only programme for church government put forward in the troubled period before the 1690 session. A draft letter from the King to the Privy Council of about July 1689 shows that William was concerned
'that in the mean time disorders may not increase nor any detriment arise to the Church by want of dissiplin.'

A proclamation was proposed ordaining ministers to continue their ordinary established meetings until the church government was settled, but it does not appear to have been sent, perhaps because it was regarded as an encouragement to the Jacobite clergy.

Attempts to introduce a comprehensive element into the draft act for restoring presbytery were made in 1690 by clergy who had submitted to the government, at least some of whom can be identified with the Williamite clergy in southern Scotland whose organisation and contacts in 1690-1 were described in Chapter One. On 23 May an address was made to parliament by delegates of the clergy, declaring that the draft act, by restricting jurisdiction to presbyterian ministers, was prejudicial to the King's declaration of protection of them as loyal and peaceable clergy because it deprived them

'of all share and interest of Ecclesiastical Government, though we are upon every account as capable of that trust as they, as is offered to be proved, and do very far exceed them in number.'

They anticipated their subsequent refusal to recognise the authority of the church courts by declining 'them to be our Judges who are a Party', while stressing their willingness to undergo impartial enquiry into their ministerial conduct. Like the Aberdeen petition of 1689, they proposed that the clergy of
both sides should be ordered by parliament to consider means of settling differences over church government, and effecting 'a happy Union in the discharge of the Ministry', lest they should 'be oppressed in our Consciences and Interests.' Motions for an extension of church government to include conforming episcopal clergy were debated to no effect on 28 May. On 6 June the Earl of Linlithgow presented an act 'for Liberty and Toleration to the Late Prelates and others of that persuasion', which was laid aside for future consideration, but lapsed; it is not clear what relation it bore, if any, to the King's wish for an indulgence intimated shortly before.

The restoration of presbyterian government on 7 June ended immediate hopes for a comprehension, but the proceedings of the General Assembly's commissions for visiting north and south of the Tay opened the way for further representations to the King in winter 1690-1. By December Tarbat was advising good clergy acceptable to their parishes, who were willing to own the civil government, and either join with or 'abstract from' presbyterian government, to address the King for his protection. A minister who fell into this category was Alexander Leask, who lost his title to his parish of Turriff by the return of the ante-diluvian Alexander Mitchell
under the act of 25 April 1690. Leask refused to cease ministering or permit him access to church, manse and glebe, until forced to do so in November by the Privy Council, who upheld Mitchell's claim, as declared by the General Assembly in October; the Assembly also questioned the genuineness of a petition on his behalf from his parishioners. Sir John Dalrymple stated that nothing could be done to repeal the Council sentence of 28 October 'till commissioners are sent by his church to represent grievances', and he advised a joint address by nobility, gentry and clergy; the Earl of Nottingham and others, with the bishops, 'will espouse his interest'. In fact, although Tory peers were well-disposed, the English bishops were being kept out of Scottish church affairs at this date.

The Kirk's commissions soon provoked episcopalian anxiety. Tarbat repeatedly warned of the danger of permitting the 'hott Commission' for the north to remove ministers acceptable to their parishes. Meanwhile, the Williamite clergy, many of whom were on the southern commission's agenda, convened meetings in Edinburgh and Stirling, apparently encouraged by news from Dr James Canaries in London that they should be ready to act jointly and swiftly in their own interest. This oblique allusion probably signified conditional terms which might be offered for securing them in their parishes, for they were anxious not to spoil their 'former endeavours' by
neglect 'in such a crisis.'

The commissions' summary proceedings, including the removal of five ministers in one diet, prompted the Council to stop them. Canaries and Leask followed William to the Hague in January 1691 at his invitation, and continued the representation of episcopalian grievances, including the commissions' proceedings; in the honorific posts of royal chaplain and clerk of the closet, Canaries had the ear of the King.

In mid-February William instructed the Assembly to cease processes and not to meet in his absence abroad, and recommended that they unite with episcopalians who owned his government and were suitably qualified for the ministry, taking no account of their former compliance with episcopacy. Those summarily deposed or illegally removed were to be admitted to vacant parishes when called by a plurality of heritors and elders; cases in which clergy complained of harsh sentences were to be reviewed and redressed. Following this, the commissions eventually adjourned until June, at which point William declined to remove the stop to their processes because his first letter had not been fully obeyed. It was reported that after a delay in opening William's letter of February, the southern commission resolved to continue their processes, much to Dalrymple's fury. In March 1691 the commission for the north met with violence at Aberdeen from a mob of 'tradesmen, students of the
universities and a rabble of other sorte of persones',
after refusing to produce a warrant for their proceedings
for the provost's satisfaction. Both he and the
principal of Marischal College, who were alleged to
have been behind the riot, knew perfectly well that
the King had discharged all processes until his return
from Holland. 44

The commissions' harshness in judging the episcopal
clergy thus appears to have led the King to alter the
terms on which loyal episcopalians could enjoy their
churches. A delegation from the clergy of Angus 45
which waited on him in late April to request his
protection against the commission for the north, was
reported to have been assured

'that he would allow them his protection,
and that he was willing they should be
exempted from the jurisdiction of the
presbyterians'

Reports of letters to the commission enjoining this, and to
the Council to enforce it, and hopes for provision for
deprived clergy owning the civil government, 46 gave the
episcopalians heart, though they had no formal basis.
Back in Holland in June, the King assured the
commissioners that he did not intend them to receive
clergy guilty under the four heads, and proposed that
subscription of the Confession of Faith as the standard
of communion would remove the suspicion of error. 47

At the same time he arranged via Canaries for the
episcopal clergy to address the commissioners, stating
their willingness to own his authority, to join in
church judicatories with their presbyterian brethren, and to subscribe the Confession of Faith. These terms were personally approved by himself and the Queen. Consequently on 16 or 17 July two addresses were submitted to the southern commissioners in Edinburgh.

The first, from Leask for himself and several northern brethren, was deflected on the grounds that it should properly have been submitted to the commission for the north. The second was submitted by William Denune and Thomas Wood for themselves and twelve others, chiefly from East Lothian, and Berwickshire. The commissioners' answer of 22 July stated several objections in what was described by a hostile observer as 'a disingenuous cunning paper': a mere assurance of zeal against popery and firmness in the protestant religion was insufficient guarantee of orthodoxy, since the addressers did not have to own and subscribe the Confession of Faith; the addressers did not offer to own and submit to the established church government, or acknowledge it as required by the King's letter; they refused to explain 'dark and doubtful' expressions. At the root of their objections were a deep hostility to the King's Erastian prescription of changes to the scope of church government, and the fear that these would destroy presbytery by admitting episcopalianism. The addressers 'seem to desire allowance to set up a government independent of that established by Law' In refusing to accept the petition from ministers of the
'Episcopal persuasion' the commissioners could defend the purity of the Church against the claims of men, who were mostly, they conveniently found, under ecclesiastical process, while at the same time tacitly rejecting the King's wishes for union.

They drew added justification from the refusal to acknowledge their authority which was implicit in the address's title

'To the Reverend the Ministers and Elders by Law impowered to Establish the Judicatories of the Church of Scotland'

They argued that this was beyond their authority; but the receiving of clergy into the Church, as William intended them to do, was in effect the building-up of the judicatories. The presbyterians' sensitivity on their record of receiving clergy was indicated by Crawford's recital of the numbers by 23 July; the commission had received three, the Synod of Argyll four, and the presbyteries of Dunbarton and Glasgow two each.

The majority of the Williamite episcopalian clung to the terms prescribed by the King in June 1691. Canaries explained to his presbyterian friend Robert Wylie in November

'We are content to sitt with yow in Presbyteries, Synods and Generall Assemblies, and to join with you in every thing that tends to the advancing the Power of Religion, and Suppressing Scandall and Vice; which comprehends all the ends of Discipline.'
If a declaration of submission to presbyterian government were required of the episcopal clergy it would open them to the charge of having turned presbyterian,

'and that were not ane accommodation with us, but a total routing of us, and taking us captives.'

A union would depend on mutual forbearance over church government, the difficulty being

'the Presbyterians truely blue on the one hand, and the Episcopall clergy obstinate against saying or doing any thing against Episcopall Principles.'

Canaries claimed to have persuaded the episcopal side that 'they may yeild to the Union of the Petition', and laid the onus on the presbyterians to do the same. He was determined that no positive statement of their opinion of church government should be asked of the episcopal clergy. The strength of feeling was such that 'the whole North' was against submitting to presbyterian government, and were only prevailed upon to yield to the petition to the commission in July with great difficulty, 'so averse were they against all joining whatsoever.'

Canaries was sufficiently confident of wide support for a church settlement on the basis of the petition or address, that he assured Wylie that he (and presumably Leask)

'have the Individual subscriptiones to our Instructions of the whole dioceses of Aberdeen, Murray and Ross, and we are dayly expecting those of Perthshire, Angus and Mearns, Catness and Orkney, in all about 400 Ministers, if I calculate right with those of the south side of the Tay; a pretty good ballance for all yours.'
As a means of worrying the presbyterians such a claim was useful, but its truthfulness cannot be ascertained for lack of corroborative evidence. Certainly Canaries was lobbying for the clergy on the basis that episcopalian formed the larger proportion of the population. If the parishes had a free choice, he speculated,

'I would not fear but the Episcopall Ministers would at least get 600 of them.' 60

One of his objectives in a scheme proposed in 1691 was that all parishes should be allowed to exercise the liberty the law tacitly left to them of choosing 'what ministers they pleased with relation to the Church Government'. In his view the established church government's authority reached the episcopal clergy only as to disciplining under the four heads prescribed in the 1690 act,61 and he claimed that both Dalrymple and the King shared his belief that benefices were not tied by law to presbyterian clergy. 62

Throughout 1691 Canaries actively advocated the necessity of provision to protect the episcopal clergy in possession of their parishes, and adduced several individual cases to illustrate alleged presbyterian injustices. He was particularly critical of Selkirk presbytery for deposing his brethren James Adamson at Ettrick on 3 February, and James Murray at Yarrow on 5 February 1691.
Acting as a visitation of the two parishes, the presbytery heard testimony from the heritors, elders and parishioners that their ministers were grievous to them, and negligent in their ministry; Murray and Adamson refused to submit to the established church government. The presbytery found the breach between them and the parish to have been long 'irreparable', and the 'pastoral relation' thus dissolved. They declared the parishes vacant, upon which both Murray and Adamson protested.63

Canaries was outraged that the presbytery did not proceed by means of censures of suspension and deprivation, which the 1690 act prescribed as the form of process having legal force, and argued that none of the grievances or scandals alleged against them were sufficient, even if they could be proved, to justify deposition.64 Both sentences were in effect judgments on the character and conduct of episcopal ministers struggling to retain congregations in the difficult conditions of the 1680s. Canaries admitted that it was hard for a parish which inclined to presbytery to have an episcopal minister in possession, whose ministry they did not cordially accept. Yet the only remedy was the civil law, which had not made a parish's desertion of an episcopal minister a ground for the Kirk to exercise its authority.65
Murray was advised by Canaries to protest against the commission for visiting south of the Tay, to whom his case was passed, for declining to review it 'by a strange shuffle'. By August he had shown the presbytery's original sentence to Dalrymple and Carstares who acknowledged that it could not be defended, and that it was a scandal upon any Government in the world.'

He sent 'punctual accounts' to the King in Flanders, and with the support of 'the greatest in England' (probably Nottingham and Carmarthen), he was confident of redress. He continued to raise the case with Dalrymple during the autumn. The presbytery's 'calumnious misrepresentations' of him at Court only made him more determined to expose their proceedings, and those of the synod and the commissioners, if necessary in print. His necessarily prolonged absence at Court provided the presbytery with the pretext for declaring Selkirk parish vacant on 25 October; it had been easy for the Cameronians to scare off the neighbouring ministers whom Canaries arranged would supply his charge, and thus render his absence a 'desertion.' In order to hinder any attempt by the presbytery to elect a new eldership in Selkirk he requested the bailies to maintain the old and protest if a new one were chosen. He claimed to have the support of the King and Dalrymple for his case.
In addition to the cases from Selkirk presbytery others appear to have been brought to the King's attention. The case of John McKenzie, minister of Kirkliston in Linlithgow presbytery, resembled Canaries' own predicament in that his charge was declared vacant without a sentence of suspension or deposition passed against him. This had been effected by the 1690 Assembly, which had also found against Alexander Leask's claim to be rightful minister of Turriff. Since November 1690, when Leask had hopes of redress, the whole parish had petitioned the King 'to be rid of that Intruder', Alexander Mitchell, the presbyterian minister for whom they had, according to Canaries, 'an utter aversion'. Meanwhile Leask had received a call to Errol from Lord Kinnaird, and other heritors 'circumvented' by Kinnaird, which he presented to Perth presbytery in August 1691. The intention was to replace Dr John Nicolson, who had been banished from the parish in July for instigating an attack on the presbytery's supply minister and continuing to preach after being deprived. There was also the question of whether the presbytery would accept the call in terms of the King's letters, but it was rejected because Leask was not qualified by being received into ministerial communion.

Similar cases of rejected calls made according to the King's letter occurred in the parishes of
At Fossoway, Alexander Ireland, who was 'unwarrantably deposed', resumed his charge following the King's letter, and George Johnstone likewise returned to Burntisland, where scuffles broke out when the presbytery attempted to supply the church. Such cases underlined the need for measures to restore calm to the large number of parishes where the religious inclinations of the laity were being frustrated and would-be conforming ministers vexed by the established clergy.

Canaries ascribed most of the presbyterians' 'errours and injustices' to

'this fancy of acting absolutely as a Presbyterian Nationall Church over the Episcopall Clergy'

If such a power, he argued, had been conferred upon them, it would not have restricted their judicatories to proceeding against the episcopal clergy under the four heads only. Naturally Canaries placed his hopes on the furtherance of William's wishes for a settlement on the basis of this limited jurisdiction, and derived comfort from the King's reported answer to the presbyterian delegation which attempted to persuade him to end the stop to the commissions' proceedings:

'that it was his will they should live with those who would live with them, he did not mean under them.'

By autumn 1691 the presbyterians at Court were fully aware of the King's resolution to protect suitably qualified episcopal clergy, but were opposed to the union which he wished. They were therefore for the
episcopalian's 'to stand upon ane Independent foot', and in order not to displease him were 'all Moderation in the abstract', according to Canaries.77

This outward change was largely, if not wholly, the result of political pressure at Court exerted by Dalrymple and other supporters of the episcopalian interest against his rival Melville, who, as the head of the presbyterians at Court, was constantly at risk over English displeasure at the Kirk's excesses. The introduction of episcopalian's to balance the administration also threatened Melville.78 A few signs of moderation were evident. Tarbat, who was in the ascendant at Court, sponsored his kinsman Bernard Mackenzie's claim to the parish of Tranent, vacant since October 1690. Mackenzie's call by several heritors and parishioners in April 1691 was opposed by others and by the presbytery and synod, from which an appeal was made to the General Assembly.79 In December 1691 he was presented to the Queen, and, at the time he was formulating his policy for the Assembly, to the King, his petition was

'backed by some of my good freinds heir, the best of the other partie seem to favor my interest and profess their dislike of thes measures we have trysted with.' 80

In early January Tarbat received the King's assurances that the Tranent affair would be ordered to his own satisfaction before he left for Flanders. For this reason, and because of the King's instructions to his commissioner, Mackenzie was optimistic about the outcome
of the General Assembly not only for his personal circumstances but also those of his brethren. Presbyterian moderation was also evident in Carstares' approval of Canaries's suggestion of reparation to Murray and Adamson of 600 merks per annum until they should receive a call to another parish, in exchange for their demissions from Yarrow and Ettrick.

Carstares appears to have been a polite antagonist, but Canaries's activities as the clergy's agent prompted vicious character assassination by the presbyterians. It was alleged that he was 'guilty of all the sins that ever were done in Sodom and Gomorrah', and an unproven scandal dating from 1675 was brought to light. Among leading courtiers these charges seem merely to have increased his reputation for honesty. A similar weariness and disgust at presbyterian propaganda was apparent among several English bishops and clergy, with the writings of Gilbert Rule, the principal of Edinburgh University, being held in especially low esteem. Canaries was 'most basely' attacked by Rule in late 1691, as preparations were being made for the impending General Assembly. Rule alleged that the addresses to the Assembly's 'commission in July were the result of the failure to obtain addresses to the King from individual parishes requesting the continuation of their
ministers; following meetings in London Canaries allegedly informed the episcopal clergy via Leask 'That they should yeild feigned Obedience to the Presbyterians at present.'

In late December 1691 a conference of laity and clergy of both persuasions was held at Court to formulate acceptable grounds for a church settlement; it included Archbishop Tillotson, Portland and Carmarthen. The debates grew 'very warm'. The presbyterians tried to discredit their opponents as 'not sincere converts to the present Government', and put themselves forward as the only loyal and trustworthy party. The episcopalian counter-attack paradoxically argued

'that the present figure of presbytery is not truely presbyterian nor consistent with the act of Parliament ... and that the clause in the Act of Parliament upon which they found their exercise of Ecclesiasticall discipline must be regulated and interpreted by the principal design of the Act ... which was parity in its full extent comprehending all the presbyters of the nationall church.'

Individual cases were being represented to prove 'the shameless partiality' of the Kirk's sentences.

The episcopalian's terms remained broadly those agreed on in summer 1691. They offered to join in and concur with the presbyterians in church courts and assemblies, and to submit to the judicatures respectively
'for advancing Religion, Repressing Vice, their Majesties Service, and the Peace of the Nation'

They also offered to subscribe the Confession of Faith 'as a Standard of church Communion', but declined to give a declaration of church principles,

'because the King acknowledges that we cannot be touched for our Principles about that Point without Persecution; and because we are resolved to make no division among our selves; and never to own such Principles as might bring the Denomination of having turned Presbyterian upon us; as also we are not willing to declare such Principles as may be offensive to those with whom we deale.' 89

A declaration of episcopal principles would have prevented a division among the episcopal clergy, but it would also have provided the Kirk with grounds for refusing to accept clergy of contrary principles into the church courts.

As it was, their silence was dangerous, especially because by seeking a restriction of their participation in the church courts to the ends of discipline, they wanted to retain the liberty to concur or not in ordination. It can be inferred from this, and from Canaries's warning that they would refuse to subscribe a formula of submission and owning of presbytery as the lawful government in both an ecclesiastical and a civil sense, 90 that the episcopalian envisaged a role for episcopal authority. Their principles necessitated such a role, which could have been accommodated in a dual establishment as envisaged
by Tarbat in 1689. However, a single establishment was being aimed at by the King, and no provision for or against episcopal ordination or principles was made in the Formula which he approved in early January 1692. For their part the presbyterians appear to have admitted that their adherence to the divine right of presbytery meant that any union would be one of 'Peace and Accommodation' rather than of principle.91

The King's instructions to the Earl of Lothian as commissioner to the General Assembly, laid down a thorough programme for a 'union amongst ministers, that the Church may be planted and settled.'92 Lothian was to endeavour that the Assembly assume 180 ministers who served under episcopacy upon their application by addresses and upon the subscription of a test or declaration according to the prescribed Formula. The address recited their willingness to minister and to act as presbyters in the established church courts; the test contained a promise of submission to the presbyterian church government as established by law, and concurrence with them for the ends of religion and purging of erroneous and scandalous ministers; it also contained a promise of subscription to the Confession of Faith and the two catechisms as containing the doctrine of protestantism professed in Scotland.
The number to be received was probably chosen to balance the 180 or so presbyterians who attended the 1690 Assembly, and was apportioned between 150 in the northern shires, and 30 ministers in the south. That the latter were noted as being 'especially of the presbytries of Dunbar, Haddington, Stirling, and Dunfermline' confirms evidence noted above that it was in these areas that the Williamite clergy were strongest in the south. The influence of the episcopalian lobby at Court can also be read into William's express wish that the northern clergy should be assumed

'without further enquiry or trial; because these ministers in the north are generally acceptable to their people.' 93

The episcopal clergy, whose addresses the King acknowledged, were assured of 'the good effects of our protection'. They received the Formula from Canaries and Leask, who left for Edinburgh to offer themselves on its terms. 94

In his letter to the Assembly the King made plain his scepticism about the commission's 'fair assurances' of their willingness to receive episcopal clergy, and his disappointment at their progress, which he expected them to remedy by receiving those who should apply in terms of the Formula. A thinly veiled admonition that scandals were neither to be presumed nor lightly sustained against presbyters,
prefaced his direction that any applicants to the Assembly against whom a relevant accusation could be immediately brought, should be tried in open assembly; those not found guilty should be received before the Assembly rose. In case too many accusations were brought in, two commissions, for north and south of the Tay, were to meet immediately afterwards; to make their trials 'more Impartial, expedite and unsuspected' they were to be composed of equal numbers of old (presumably ante-diluvian) presbyterian ministers, and of conforming presbyters who were received by the Assembly without being accused. Each commission was to be of twenty-four ministers and, sitting continuously, should be finished by Whitsunday. William cautioned them against 'malice, and calumny' and

'some hot violent spirits who would carry you from moderation and charity upon designe to continue the whole Government of the Church in the hands of a part of the Ministers'

which would be inconsistent with presbyterian principles. No mention was made of his instruction to the commissioner, to have those ministers deposed since his letter of 13 February 1691 reponed by the Assembly, but there was enough to offend the presbyterians in his specifications for their proceedings.

His letter was passed to a committee but went unanswered. Most of the subsequent proceedings in open assembly were merely routine and were punctuated by
frequent adjournments. Meanwhile, the committee for overtures considered six addresses from episcopal clergy, almost all of which were only read at Lothian's desire, amid objections that they were not first submitted to the committee of bills. Similar obstructiveness was evident in demands for the authority by which the first address was presented to the Assembly. In the case of the Aberdeen address, the delegates were allegedly pressed hard on what they meant by calling themselves the synod of Aberdeen, and whether the address was absolutely unanimous, because the signatures of the moderator and clerk alone were unacceptable. Since other addresses were signed by delegates on behalf of other clergy this objection may have been applied to them also. As in July 1691 the Aberdeen clergy could not bring themselves to recognise the Assembly's authority, so ignored the wording of the Formula in addressing themselves 'To the General Assembly of the Presbyterians meeting at Edinburgh'.

Apart from one episcopalian who publicly confessed his error in being 'carried away for a Livelyhood with the spait and the current of the times' into accepting a benefice under episcopacy, no ministers were received into the church. On 22 January Robert Meldrum, minister of Yester, gave in an address subscribed by himself and other ministers, presumably from East Lothian and adjacent areas. On 2 February John Forbes and Robert Irvine presented the address
from the episcopal synod of Aberdeen, and another came from three ministers in the south,\textsuperscript{100} followed on 5 February by an address from eight clergy in and about Edinburgh.\textsuperscript{101} On 11 February Alexander Leask gave in an address subscribed by six delegates from the presbyteries of Inverness, Elgin and Forres,\textsuperscript{102} and an address by twelve clergy in the presbyteries of Dundee and Perth was also submitted.\textsuperscript{103} Thus thirty-three ministers can be identified as addressing, with an unknown number who were represented only by delegates' signatures. Subsequently the clergy informed the king that about 180 addressed, in person or by 'sufficient delegations', a figure which suspiciously matches the quota which had optimistically been set in the King's instructions; nonetheless, it is probable that, as they claimed, more would have addressed given more notice and better weather.\textsuperscript{104}

In addition to questioning the delegates' commissions for the addresses, the committee of overtures allegedly offered to receive delegates individually and to discuss the terms of the Formula before giving them an answer in full assembly. Questions were also put as to the addressers' view of the Assembly's lawfulness. The delegates appear to have resisted all attempts to ensnare them by pleading that they were not obliged to explain anything relating to the Formula, which was self-explanatory.\textsuperscript{105} However, it
was reported that Leask, whose head 'seems too narrow for so weighty an affair', had 'begun to quite his ground on the [Lord] Presidents fair insinuations.' Had Canaries not been in Edinburgh 'The business of the conformists had certainly gone to ruine.'

The difficulty experienced by the Aberdeen delegates in gaining hearings, which necessitated three applications to the commissioner, was typical of the frustrations forced on Lothian by the Assembly's prevarications for almost one month. On 13 February Lothian reproved the Assembly for failing in 'the principal design of calling this Assembly (of uniting with your Brethren)' and showing 'no great inclination' to comply with the King's demands, and promptly dissolved them without naming a date for the next Assembly. The members pressed the moderator to do so, which he did with the justification of their 'spirituall Intrinsick power' from Christ as the only head of the Church to meet in assemblies.

The dissolution, 'which was like a Thunder Bolt to the Brethren' in the words of an episcopalian commentator, was William's angry response to the radical presbyterians' outfacing him over his cherished scheme for church union. The opposition, which included Crawford, was aided by the knowledge that he could not realistically require more of the Assembly than he thought they would concede. His conception of
what constituted reasonable demands differed fundamentally
from those held by the majority of the Assembly. His
annoyance stemmed from the fact that he was misled
about the likely strength of their reaction, knowledge
of which would have prevented him from allowing the
Assembly. The dissolution crisis marked the
first major assertion of the divine right of
presbytery since the Erastian settlement of 1690
and soured relations between the King and the Kirk,
to the delight of the episcopalian in general. It
also prompted adjustments by which the episcopalian
tweeddale, Tarbat, Linlithgow and others were added
to the administration. In March James Johnston
was appointed secretary alongside Dalrymple. Although
presbyterian, his latitudinarian views of church
government placed him in sympathy with Tillotson
and Tenison and there was hope that he would bring civil
and ecclesiastical government to a balance. The
Court believed, and he agreed, that the King's
interest demanded the maintenance of presbytery 'within
just bounds', and that his episcopalian colleagues
should not contemplate changes in church government,
which the King had no intention of altering.

In the wake of the aborted Assembly the
episcopal clergy's credit at Court ran high. Canaries
reported that their conduct before the Assembly
committees and their answers were admired, and
'their reputation for a body of discreet rationall prudent and learned men, is now higher by many degrees than ever it was before in [this?] Nation. Whereas your Presbyterians may now lie in their beds all day, for their name is greate enough, as one said to me.' 114

The addressers wrote to the King acknowledging the royal letters of 11 January and assuring him

'that your majesty will find that the fault was not on our side, who cordially yeilded to the terms of union which your majesty adjusted, and who were not wanting in any thing for promoting it, unlesse we had betrayed our consciences before god, and rendered our selves unworthy of our character in the eyes of our people.'

They stressed that the ministers still in parishes, and those 'wrongously' removed by civil or ecclesiastical sentences or by the rabble, all relied on his protection. They assured Dalrymple of their gratitude that the stop on ecclesiastical processes was not yet removed.115

Canaries was preparing an account in English and Latin of affairs leading to the address, and of who addressed, at the request of Archbishop Tillotson,

'which the King expects from him since he is to have them in particular protection and that those who have not addressed for protection or will not by letter homologat what we have done seems not to regard his favour.'

William Denune observed in this 'a design to find out the Trimmers'. Consequently efforts were made to rally support for the Formula, a task made more difficult by the fact that although Canaries was still concerned in the clergy's affairs and was laboriously writing on their behalf, he had retired from being agent at Court
in order to take up a living at Abingdon shortly after the Assembly fiasco. From Pencaitland Denune urged the clergy of Ross in mid-April 'to hasten measures' which could be forwarded to Canaries, who would not act until Denune could instruct him. The clergy of Caithness and Sutherland were also to be contacted immediately to bring forward their meeting so that they could be represented at a general meeting of the clergy in Edinburgh about the end of May. To ensure a response, Bernard Mackenzie was commissioned by the southern clergy to travel through most of the north both to persuade clergy to comply with the government and to agree to a general address to the King. He claimed they had advice from Court for this, the first of its kind presented by all the clergy to William, and that as such it met with Archbishop Tillotson's approval.

In March Tarbat was confident that, despite or because of the Assembly's behaviour, the King was determined to

'lett none invade the parishes right to call, and will protect his good subjects in their possessiones.'

Johnston was in favour of a suspension of depending ecclesiastical processes on the practical grounds that they would cause too much episcopalian opposition.

Nor could the Privy Council act in church affairs without aggravating presbyterians, while its inaction would be used by the episcopalian party as an additional argument.
for a new parliament to settle church and state afresh.\footnote{119}

In the aftermath of Glencoe Jacobite hopes were raised, and with the scare of a French invasion from April to June, the government was forced to apply the oaths of allegiance and assurance to heritors. Despite many arrests this policy was badly weakened by William's defeat at Steinkirk in July.\footnote{120} The prevailing confusion meant that the settlement of the church remained out of the question, and even the reponing to their churches of episcopalian 'of the greatest moderation' was impossible. Part of this was owing to the fact that the episcopalian were in a minority on the Council.\footnote{121} Also of importance was the openly-admitted disaffection of the episcopal party, which they imputed to the presbyterians' harshness. Johnston was aware of the danger of pressing the clergy too hard, especially because of the power of the pulpit, for they

\begin{quote}
'have begott in those people such an alienation to the present Government that suppose them selves honest it will not be easy for them to remove.'\footnote{122}
\end{quote}

Johnston's letters do not, however, make it clear whether Jacobitism had emerged among the clergy who had addressed the Assembly. It is probable that he had in mind the actively Jacobite clergy in Perthshire, Angus and Mearns whose activities were noted in 1692.\footnote{123}

The rumoured invasion enabled representations to be made to the Privy Council that episcopal clergy
had ceased praying for the King's and Queen's 'preservation, prosperity and success in their Government, armies and navies'. Twenty-one ministers in the diocese of Moray assured the Council of the contrary and of their observance of authorised fasts and thanksgivings; they requested that the King and Queen be informed of this and took the opportunity to lament divisions in the Church, especially because they were not allowed to serve vacant parishes where Catholicism abounded, and because the want of church discipline was also permitting profanity. These hits at the pastoral damage being caused in an area prone to Catholic proselytising by the presbyterians' monopoly of the establishment were useful at Court. In October Tarbat was reported to be showing about

'signed documents of the Episcopall clergys Zeall in Scotland during the fears of an invasion.'

Johnston was highly critical of Tarbat's patronage of the clergy, complaining that

'he has turned them into a faction, and makes tools of them for privat ends.'

Tarbat's intention in producing the address was ostensibly part of his aim of showing the injustices suffered by the complying clergy, but it was reported that he and Breadalbane also sought to persuade the King that the restoration of episcopacy was in his best interest,
particularly because of the episcopalian majority among
the nobility. Because they were at Court in
defiance of the King's order he simply dismissed them without
a hearing. 126

During 1692 it became clear to Johnston that the
'two Clergies' were not generally disposed to a union
whatever they said, and that because the Assembly
could not again be approached, 'parliament must
moderate the pretensions of both partys'. Parliamentary
sanctions for a settlement would demonstrate the genuine-
ness of the episcopal clergy's wishes to be accommodated
and willingness to take oaths. 127 Meanwhile he felt it
reasonable for presbyteries to resume the assumption
of episcopal clergy, and to take in unexceptionable
men who applied; subsequently they could begin to
plant churches where heritors were agreeable, but
leave them vacant where opposition showed. Processes
against clergy should be omitted for a period and only
resumed against 'grossly guilty' episcopal clergy; the
presbyterians should, he advised, attempt

'to break that knot which the Episcopal
Clergy hath run into, and so to separat
the honest men amongst them from others
and to agregat them to themselves.' 128

Part of the government's immediate purpose was to
stop Jacobite intrigue involving Archbishop Paterson, who
had been under arrest in Edinburgh Castle since April 1691.
In early 1691 both he and Archbishop Rose were involved
with the Duke of Queensberry, the Earls of Arran,
Balcarres and Linlithgow, and with Tarbat, in a plot to restore James. Rose and Paterson had received money from France for distribution for his service, for which they were 'very zealous', and were about to send an invitation to him when Paterson was arrested. Rose was considered to be 'a simple foolish person and not so dangerous to the present government', and was accordingly allowed to stay free. Paterson's reputation as a dangerous Jacobite seemed justified by continued contacts with crypto-Jacobites such as Linlithgow in April 1692, when it was reported in Jacobite circles that Paterson and other prisoners had 'practiced the garrison' of the Castle. Johnston's intelligence reports indicated a conspiracy in late 1692 to coincide with a French invasion, again involving Arran and Paterson. The archbishop was offered the chance of voluntary banishment to Holland, which he accepted in January 1693.

As Johnston prepared his church settlement legislation for the 1693 session he predicted that Dalrymple's promise that if the oaths were administered both to presbyterian and episcopal clergy, the latter would all take them, would prove mistaken. On 22 May five ministers before the Council admitted they had never prayed for William and Mary, and would never do so; they were deprived. After the Council passed an act ordaining that only those who had taken the oaths could be granted vacant stipends, twelve episcopal clergy withdrew their petitions.
However, a petition to parliament from the complying clergy who addressed the Assembly for admission in 1692, suggested that a settlement based on the Formula would be acceptable to them. In the event, the acts which Johnston steered through parliament went further than the Formula and provided the clergy and their political mentors with pretexts for declining to comply with them.

A preliminary measure passed on 19 May was an act ordaining that the oaths of allegiance and assurance were to be taken by, among others, all preachers and ministers, all chaplains in families, and pedagogues and governors of children and youths. The act was made to apply even more comprehensively to the episcopal clergys' circumstances by a provision that preachers not provided with kirks who ministered without taking the oaths faced banishment. The deadline was set for 20 June.

On 12 June the second plank of Johnston's settlement was put in place. The 'Act for Setling the Quiet and Peace of the Church' ratified presbyterian church government established by law in 1690 and its doctrine and uniformity of worship, and prescribed the oaths as conditions of admission for preachers and ministers in the Church. The act then prescribed how ministers in possession of churches who were not yet admitted to the Church, were to be received in or after the next
General Assembly. Ministers qualified by taking the oaths should apply to the Assembly or other competent courts within thirty days of the first General Assembly. Those who did not qualify themselves or apply to the Church as specified, were liable to deposition from benefice and office by its courts. Ministers who offered to qualify and to apply to the Church were to have full royal protection until admitted. The benefit of the act was not allowed to ministers found guilty under the four heads within thirty days of their application. They, and all other clergy similarly guilty, were to be subject to the censure of the Church along with schoolmasters and teachers of youth. Provision was also made for the proportional representation of the presbyteries, rather than the existing equal number from each, to the General Assembly; this was to secure the presbyterians against an episcopalian majority.

The harsh certifications imposed by each act were deliberately framed to cut through Jacobite prevarication and presbyterian obstructiveness, which Johnston regarded as the difficulties among the clergy, and to expose the manipulation of the episcopal clergy by his colleagues Dalrymple and Tarbat. Johnston was soon aware that, despite his hopes that many episcopal clergy would take the oaths when they saw the government was in earnest, efforts were being made to dissuade them. These allegedly originated in London, presumably among Johnston's
Tory enemies, but were arranged by Tarbat, who despatched Bernard Mackenzie and Thomas Cravey northward. Ostensibly they were to persuade their brethren to comply with the act when it became law, but an account of a conversation Mackenzie had with a minister in the Mearns confirmed similar information relating to Cravey which Johnston acquired, that their activities were entirely contrary. In Edinburgh Leask was left to offer the excuse that the clergy refused the oaths on the grounds that the comprehension act was not made at the same time. Johnston exposed the episcopalian party's confusion by proposing in parliament the extension of the deadline for one month, but they did not take it up. By 30 June Johnston reported that only nine episcopal ministers had taken the oaths. A few more had come in by 10 July, but neither Bernard Mackenzie nor the Ross clergy had apparently done so, despite Tarbat's assurances. A presbyterian minister noted that no more than thirty took the oaths. Despite some objections the presbyterian clergy were reported to have generally taken them.

Meanwhile Dalrymple had enlisted Archbishop Tillotson against the Act for Settling the Church, which he dubbed 'an act of Exclusion' when shown what Dalrymple claimed was the act as approved in committee. The offending clause was the required acknowledgement
of presbytery as the 'only Government of the Church'; in fact the act passed with the words 'this Church', which did not require a surrender of episcopal principles by clergy applying to be received. Tillotson was angry at the deception, so when Leask approached him in mid-July with a letter from the clergy requesting advice on how to proceed now the 10 July deadline had expired, he was given short shrift. Answering his objections to the Church Act, Tillotson emphasised that in agreeing to the uniformity of the established Church's worship the episcopali ans would not be tied to unlawful particulars by their general agreement. Similarly their objection to the 'only' was ill-founded since it literally meant recognition of the fact of presbytery's establishment, not of a claim for its divine ordination.

Leask admitted that the clergy were free in conscience to take the oaths but would not do so, presumably because they would thereby be obliged to apply to the Church. This matched Dalrymple's claim in June that the clergy did not scruple the oaths but objected to the 'only'. Yet in mid-June on advice from England they were offering to take only the allegiance, which Johnston argued was inconsistent, because its promise to 'be faithful and bear true Allegiance to their Majesties' contained all that was stated explicitly in the assurance. However, he observed,

'If they mean only submission to an usurper as its plain they do by their refusing the assurance then they are knaves.'
This would especially be the case because of their previous addresses to the King 'in as full and ample manner as ever subjects did to their Lawful Prince.' However he observed that the clergy's refusal was the result of 'faction and Caball' by Tarbat and his associates, and that most were prepared to take the assurance.\textsuperscript{141}

The discrepancy between what the episcopal ministers felt able to concede in conscience and what they were apparently being advised to do by their patrons placed Johnston's church settlement at risk. He countered Bernard Mackenzie's influence by sending another minister north to assure the clergy that those of good lives applying in terms of the act would be received.\textsuperscript{142}

However, Dalrymple's misrepresentations of the nature of the Church Act caused the King to baulk at it temporarily, and the case for alternative conditions was being put. By early June an address to him for protection from the presbyterians was signed by about fifty Aberdeenshire ministers,\textsuperscript{143} possibly as a result of Mackenzie's mission. Leask's journey to London in July was reportedly to carry an address 'offering all the tests of loyalty that is required of the English Clergy'.\textsuperscript{144}

Since there was no explicit English equivalent of the Scottish assurance, which demanded recognition of William and Mary as \textit{de jure} as well as \textit{de facto} sovereigns,\textsuperscript{145} oaths on the English model were perhaps regarded as more acceptable to scrupulous
episcopalian not covered by Leask's admission to Tillotson.

In the Johnstonian interpretation it was merely another pretext for not complying, hatched by those who used the episcopalian as 'meer tools'. He perceived their tactic was to have the imposition of the assurance oath 'loaded with the odium of vacating Churches', which would have considerable weight with English opinion. Johnston regarded the entire episode as demonstrating that Tarbat and Linlithgow merely wanted to tie the clergy to themselves as a faction; their 'pertenaceous wrangling' against the Church Act showed plainly that 'they intend no settlement'. They were especially critical of the guarantee of the King's 'full protection' of qualified clergy who applied to, but were not received into, the Church. Johnston devised this as a means for the King to press the Assembly into receiving clergy by threatening to permit the episcopal clergy to erect their own synods and presbyteries. The presbyterians attempted to have the protection restricted to episcopalian parochial ministry, upon which Tarbat and Linlithgow pressed to have it explicitly extended to their presbyteries and synods. Since the erection of parallel church courts had been one of Tarbat's proposals in 1689 he had good reason to support a provision for them. However, the presbyterians immediately accepted the wording as it stood, leaving Tarbat and his associates in isolated opposition to the act. It remains unclear whether they intended, as Johnston believed,
deliberately to wreck the act.

The alleged removal of the royal protection by the Church Act, which exposed qualified clergy to the General Assembly, was one of the themes misleadingly used to gain English churchmen's support. This was apparent in a letter sent to Archbishop Sharp in about mid-June by clergy who had petitioned the parliament to be allowed a share of church government in terms of the Formula of 1692. They objected to the 'far different' terms of the Act for Settling the Church; the phrase the 'only Government of this Church' was scrupled at and they feared that the Lord's Prayer, the Doxology and reading Scripture were aimed at in the clause requiring uniformity of worship. A memorial by Sharp's Whig colleague, Thomas Tenison, Bishop of Lincoln, shows that the episcopalian's scruples, however much fostered by secular interests, were taken seriously by the English bench. Tenison appeared to think it reasonable that their scruples over 'obscure and dark' clauses in the assurance should be met by plain oaths, as put to English clergy, and that their scruples over the Confession of Faith and the uniformity of worship should also be solved.

He recommended to the King that the 400-odd clergy in possession of parishes who prayed for him and had taken the allegiance should be allowed more time to provide for themselves and meanwhile be 'protected and preserv'd'.
The effectiveness of episcopalian representations of the commissions' processes was evident in the recommendation that clergy should be fully heard in their own defence before being judged. Rabbled clergy who qualified themselves should be put into some of the approximately 200 vacant livings, which should anyhow be filled with good men as soon as possible; these suggestions were already desideranda as far as William was concerned. Tenison's additional suggestions for provisions from the bishops' rents were practical and fair-minded, for not only did he propose support for the bishops and rabbled clergy, but also wished to see funds given to the universities of Aberdeen and St. Andrews. The concern for a comprehensive church settlement in Scotland, or at the very least protection of, and help for, the deprived clergy, was an issue on which both Whig and Tory Churchmen could broadly agree.

Reaction in London to episcopalian representations encouraged the clergy to believe that the King would grant a dispensation from the oaths. Leask was allegedly responsible for this and seems to have travelled in the north by August along with two or three other clergy informing their brethren. Most clergy were not praying for William and Mary in Banffshire, and the juring clergy were being ridiculed by the nonjurors in Ross. Similarly the clergy who petitioned Sharp for his help complained that the Jacobite clergy
'insult and upbraid us for owning a Government without protection and a legal security.'

However, Dalrymple assured Tarbat in November that the King had

'a serious inclination to protect the northern clergy, and will not suffer bigotry to reign, if he can. The clergy are to be advised to signify all the dutiful sense of it imaginable, and compliance to his inclinations.'

William appears to have been sympathetic to the clergy's scruples about the terms of assumption, but, as Hamilton told Sharp, it was out of the question for the assurance to be removed, since parliament would not accept it. Breadalbane reported from Court that endeavours would be made to put clearer conditions, presumably of communion, to the clergy, 'to prevent the objections of former disappointments.'

The church settlement remained unresolved in 1693 because of the episcopalian's widespread non-jurancy, but also because the presbyterian clergy had not taken the oaths in sufficient numbers for there to be any pretext for acting against the episcopalian alone. The General Assembly which was to have been held in autumn 1693 was postponed and met only in March 1694, the requirement of the oaths being waived by the King. As in 1692 an ecclesiastical conference preceded it, held at Whitehall and involving several English bishops, Dalrymple, Johnston, Ormiston, the Justice Clerk, and Scots nobles of both parties. It
was agreed to preserve the episcopal ministers still in possession, pending the King's return, and also that none should be proceeded against by church courts or the Council for nonjurancy. This was the most that could be done without further acts of Council or parliament, because it was clear that the episcopal clergy would not take the oaths. 158

It was later claimed that the Whitehall agreement made no distinction between pre-Revolution clergy and those who had entered by calls since 1690. When the Committee for the North established by the 1694 Assembly began its work of purging the parishes in the summer there was therefore considerable opposition. It found and declared intruders into parishes some nineteen ministers from Angus northward to Moray. Most were in parishes in Aberdeenshire, 159 and had entered on calls from heritors and parishioners.

Notwithstanding the hostility it engendered by deposing clergy, and subsequent claims that it did not plant any churches, 160 the committee in fact received ten episcopal ministers, mostly from Aberdeenshire within a few days of the protest in Aberdeen. They brought the total by 1695 to about forty. 161 In the west the assumption of the clergy progressed with less acrimony. In May 1694 the minister of Lochgoilhead commented on the practical need of episcopal clergy to help the synod of Argyll, although they lacked 'any
standing in the presbyterian principles and way.' So many had been received that they equalled the number of pre-
Revolution presbyterians. After 1694 no clergy appear to have been received until the period 1698-1700 when about twelve, mainly in Orkney and Shetland, were taken in.

The immediate reaction to the Committee's progress came from the Aberdeen clergy, who, at a diocesan meeting on 5 June, commissioned delegates to submit 'some Queries or Proposals ... relating to the Ecclesiastick Authority and Jurisdiction of the said Committee', and to represent the clergy before the committees. Accordingly at Aberdeen on 29 June twelve clergy led by James Gordon protested against the Committee's ecclesiastical authority and sentences, and appealed to the King and Queen 'as supreme Judges under God' and to the next 'lawfully constitute and orderly called General Assembly'. A similar protest by fifteen Ross incumbents was submitted, specifically stating that they also acted in the name of clergy who had entered on calls since the Revolution. Ministers sentenced by the Committee also entered protests and appealed to the King and Queen and the Privy Council. In September another diocesan meeting was held, which commissioned two delegates to represent their circumstances to the King and crave his protection. However, too few clergy who were absent from the meetings could be persuaded to concur, so the commission lapsed.
Petitions and memorials were sent to several English bishops, representing the specific injustices of the Committee, and proposing remedial measures which broadly matched elements of the settlement proposed in the King's instructions to the Earl of Lothian in 1692 and Tenison's memorial of 1693 mentioned above. Stress was laid on the Committee's depositions against clergy called unanimously by parishes, and the by now customary complaint against procedural unfairness over the hearing of witnesses; the presbyterians' zeal for electing new elders was also criticised. One memorial went further in proposing the reponing of ministers deprived by the Council since March 1694, but in calling for reviews of the Committee's sentences merely repeated what the King had required of the Assembly's commissioners in 1691. More radical was the suggestion that the planting of parishes, and of calling and nominating ministers be placed in the hands of heritors and freeholders (thus excluding elders nominated by presbyteries) and that presbyteries should be obliged to receive nominees who were not exceptionable under the four heads; a committee of the Privy Council consisting equally of presbyterians and episcopalian could arbitrate in disputes arising from such calls. The most striking proposal was for an act of parliament placing all episcopal ministers in possession of parishes, who owned the civil government and prayed for the King, under his protection. In itself this was not new, but the memorialist proposed that they should not be
'lyable as to their Doctrine or Conversation, to the Tryall or Censure of any Ecclesiastick Judicature.' 167

This was the type of protection from the Kirk which the episcopal clergy had been seeking, and the Act concerning the Church passed on 16 July 1695 went some way towards meeting their needs. However, the medley of representations being suggested to the English bishops helps explain their indecision over whether the settlement should be achieved by comprehension or toleration. 168

The Church Act was obtained at the cost of other measures designed to curtail the ministry of deprived or deposed clergy about which the Kirk was complaining bitterly in 1694. 169 All 'outed Ministers' were forbidden to perform baptisms or marriages on pain of imprisonment. 170 The exercise of the ministerial function by clergy who did not have a legal call and admission to a parish by an established church judicatory was deemed to be intrusion, punishable by the minister being declared incapable of a benefice or stipend for seven years. 171 The two acts together provided an effective basis on which ecclesiastical and civil processes were thenceforward based. Measures taken by the committee for the security of the kingdom against some of the Aberdeen protesters of 1694 were similarly harsh. The Aberdeen diocesan clerk, Thomas Cravey, and two brethren lost their benefices and the freedom to minister for owning and adhering to the protestation before the committee, and
were obliged to remain south of the Forth; the sentences pleased the presbyterians. Another decision by the committee dashed episcopalian hopes that calls to episcopal clergy by majorities of heritors and elders might be made allowable. Bernard Mackenzie, who had sustained his claim to Tranent since 1691 with the help of Tarbat and episcopalian heritors, though latterly he only had a meeting-house, was ordained to remove from the presbytery of Haddington by 1 August.

The Act concerning the Church extended the deadline for nonjurors in possession of churches to take the oaths to 1 September 1695. Those who did so, and were worthy in doctrine, life and conversation, were to have the King's protection provided they ministered only within their parishes, and did not license or ordain ministers or act in church courts unless they were assumed into the established Church. The qualified clergy were left free to apply or not, and similarly the Church was at liberty whether or not to assume them. Those who did not qualify by the deadline were ipso facto deprived and their churches declared vacant; however, the Church was empowered to assume any clergy, whether in possession of a parish or not, after the deadline, provided they qualified. The provision for voluntary assumption into the establishment superseded the coercion of the 1693 acts and marked the limit of statutory efforts at comprehension in the Revolution settlement.
In practice the episcopalian response was to qualify and put themselves under the King's protection. However, the act deliberately left open who was to judge the clergy's worthiness for the ministry, to balance the conflicting claims by the presbyterians for jurisdiction and by the episcopalian for exemption from their authority. Johnston envisaged that the Council might be empowered by the King to have cognisance, a possibility with which the episcopal clergy seemed content. He noted that 'the one clergy is even as good as the other', and though each included bad men 'ther are few or none Scandalous or Erroneous'. The nonjurors were left at the mercy of the law by the act, but, as Johnston pointed out, they could continue to have their stipends paid to them by heritors in terms of the act for applying vacant stipends to pious uses.

The Church Act was passed during a session preoccupied with the Glencoe Commission's report and the possibility of blame attaching to the King as well as to Dalrymple and others. Johnston was anxious that the King's displeasure at proceedings should not be made known, since if the episcopal clergy believed the laws would not be executed, and had encouragement from London for their belief, they would fail to take the oaths as in 1693. He requested Archbishop Tenison not only to press William on this, but also to write to the episcopal clergy with arguments to
induce their compliance. Meanwhile he made his own arrangements to ensure a favourable response to the act. Bernard Mackenzie, now in need of employment, was recruited by the Secretary and ministerial colleagues to tour the dioceses and reason with his brethren. Starting on 9 August he travelled up the east coast to Aberdeen, passed over to Moray and covered Ross-shire by 1 September. En route he spoke with individual clergy and with groups gathered by presbyteries or synods, and reported overall success.

Predictably he encountered most opposition to his persuasions in Angus and Mearns. On the Angus coast the clergy were mostly either disinclined to take the oaths or actually disaffected. At Brechin the clergy advanced divine right, hereditary succession and passive obedience, as well as their obligation of loyalty by the Test oath, to justify their opposition to the oaths. Mackenzie countered with the providential justification for the Revolution, James VII's encroachments on his subjects' rights, the expedient nature of the royal supremacy, and the inconsistency of the unlimited obedience promised in the Test's second article, with the protection of the protestant religion promised in the first. The clergy promised to think it over. The Mearns clergy likewise espoused divine right and hereditary succession, and expressed concern that they would lose their
congregations by complying, and would anyhow not be exempt from the Kirk's judicatures. Mackenzie pressed the minister of Skene, who urged the divine right and the Test, yet had read the 13 April 1689 proclamation and prayed for William and Mary, into reconsidering his inconsistent position.\(^{181}\)

To the Aberdeen clergy he pointed out the inconsistency of not taking the oaths after addressing the King loyally and assuring parliament of their loyalty. He also urged them to consider the growing schisms and divisions of the church, and their pastoral obligations, for which they were answerable to God. Leaving Johnston and Sir James Ogilvy, who had also travelled north, to persuade the Aberdeen clergy, Mackenzie moved on.\(^{182}\) The correspondent of Moray diocese was against the oaths, apparently alleging advice from Tarbat and others to justify himself, but was convinced by Mackenzie's argument concerning his pastoral duties.\(^{183}\) The Inverness clergy were approached with the arguments used with the Aberdeen ministers, and again Mackenzie drew an analogy with the early Christians to reinforce the case for submission to the civil power.\(^{184}\)

Mackenzie's, Johnston's and Sir James Ogilvy's canvassing was without doubt responsible for the general compliance with the oaths in the north and north-east.\(^{2}\) In Caithness and Ross most complied; in Moray only two or three recusants stood out, while, for instance, all the ministers of Strathbogie presbytery came in, for which Mackenzie took some of the credit. In Aberdeen nearly
sixty complied. By contrast only nine ministers in Angus took the oaths. It was observed that the recusants were mostly in the larger burghs, and in the dioceses of Brechin, Dunblane, Dunkeld and St Andrews, where they continued preaching. In Edinburgh this prompted the closure of the meeting-houses by the magistrates. In East Lothian, Denune reported that about half the clergy complied, though 'all were clear for the allegiance', being satisfied that it comprehended the assurance. The inference from this statement is that the clergy scrupled at explicitly swearing the assurance but would take it implicitly in the allegiance. Yet Johnston was assured by some of the leading clergy that it was not conscience which prevented them from taking the oaths. Some clergy combined pragmatism with scrupulousness over oaths when it suited them, a combination which made them unreliable at times of crisis, particularly if, as in 1693, external pressure was brought to bear on them.

In 1695 reverses in William's campaign at Dixmunde and Deynzs prompted some who had taken the allegiance to 'make a quic turn to a contrary way'. Tenison inveighed: 'Conscience do's not rise and fall according to the weather of the state'. The news of the fall of Namur to William disappointed the Jacobites, but it is unclear if clergy trimmed and qualified themselves as
Some Perthshire clergy attempted unsuccessfully to qualify in Edinburgh in October. The total number of jurors in possession of churches was reported as 116 in October. Although they cannot all be identified, a large proportion of the ministers listed as being in possession in 1710 were those who qualified in 1695.

The northern clergy's statement of loyalty to William in an address received his assurance of protection, as Tenison told them, 'Whilst you remain Exemplary Christians and good Subjects.' He encouraged them to bear up under the reproaches of the disaffected. At Pencaitland, Denune alluded to attacks on him by 'the hungry and angry persons out of place and living.' Later he stated the philosophy of the complying episcopalian who put religious observance ahead of legalistic niceties:

'I am not dogmatick pro or con as to what law requires but contemplative quietist.'

Many clergy doubtless regarded nonjurancy as the obligatory course for Scottish episcopal clergy, and thus one of the effects of the 1695 Church Act may have been to create tensions between the jurors and the nonjurors. Since the jurors' justification for not applying to the Kirk was their episcopal beliefs, which they held in common with their nonjuring brethren, their differences over civil allegiance did not constitute an absolute divide. Nonetheless, the swearing of loyalty to King William by a substantial proportion of the active episcopal clergy
furthered the tradition of submission to the Revolution dispensation which lasted through Anne's reign.

The ambiguous element in the 1695 settlement was the question of the Kirk's power to try under the four heads those clergy who qualified and were under the King's protection. Although the Kirk proceeded warily at first, in the late 1690s strong efforts were being made to plant northern presbyteries, a process which inevitably entailed the purging of episcopal incumbents, as well as the assumption of a few. In 1698, apparently after being harrassed by an Assembly commission, the Aberdeen clergy sent two of their number to Edinburgh to seek a decision on whether the Kirk or the Privy Council had the power to judge them. The outcome was ambiguous, for the next year brought further cases. Tarbat complained to the Chancellor that despite reiterated assurances that qualified clergy would not be subject to the Church judicatures, the presbytery of Ross were proceeding against the minister of Kilmuir Easter for error and scandal, though the true cause was his being 'of the principles owned by the Church of England.' When he and the minister of Tain were deposed, Tarbat sponsored their complaints, but even the compromise of letting the processes fall, proposed by the Lord Advocate, was no solution. The Kirk complained that its jurisdiction was questioned, while the episcopaliens boasted the presbytery's proceedings.
were condemned. The decision also gave heart to clergy under sentence in the synod of Aberdeen. The Advocate proposed that the powers of trying should be vested in the Council. Nonetheless, the Kirk was not hindered from confirming sentences against the two Ross ministers in 1700 and 1701.

The position of the parish clergy was thus insecure at the close of William's reign. That of the dispossessed clergy was even more precarious. Bishop Cairncross depicted the plight of the 'loyall regular Clergie'
in and around Edinburgh in 1698:

'They ar slighted by the Jacobites for their loyalty and affection to the present Government, they ar hated by the presbeterians for their serving under episcopacy.'

Since they were not protected under the 1695 act and were not at liberty to preach in meeting-houses or private families, Cairncross suggested that the King might give them his protection on receiving assurances of loyalty. He pointed out that the presbyterians would never admit them to the Church

'not only from the knowledge they have of there parts and learning, but likewise from the continued jealousies of ther favourable thoughts and inclinations to Episcopacy.'

Comprehension was by then a dream, according to Cairncross, who probably encouraged the Edinburgh clergy he described to place an address to the King in the sympathetic hands of Bishop Compton. The episcopalian hopes now lay in an indulgence. In 1699 the Aberdeen, Moray and Ross
clergy petitioned the King's commissioner to parliament for an allowance of time for more clergy to take the oaths. That year an English divine visiting Edinburgh noted that few episcopalian despaired of seeing a return of episcopacy.

Their hopes were raised from March 1702 by the accession of Queen Anne, who was known to be a strong supporter of episcopacy. Many episcopal clergy seem to have ensured their continued protection by taking the oaths prescribed by parliament on 9 June 1702; for example fourteen parish clergy at Aberdeen did so in September. Other clergy who had been nonjurors during William's reign appear to have reconciled themselves to Anne's title to the throne, presumably by adopting a legitimist argument that it was rightfully hers by blood, and by her claim as the nearest protestant in line. One such nonjuror who took the oaths was John Skinner, minister of Brechin.

A more significant instance of this avowed shift of allegiance was Archbishop Paterson, who, shortly after William's death, told Archbishop Rose and Bishop Rose that the episcopalians' position was so altered that all should now 'owne and serve the Q[ueen]', and

'that the P[rince of] W[ales] being prisoner to the Fr[ench] King, and also a papist, wes therby become both morallie and phisicallie incapable of the Croune at present, and therfor the true right to it, did descend upon the person of the Q[ueen] as the next of the Royall blood, and so by our oaths to the Roy[all] family, all subjects wer now bound to owne and pay allegiance to her Ma[jes]ty.'
To him Anne's accession provided the best opportunity since the Revolution for relief to the church, and its bishops and clergy.\textsuperscript{207}

By contrast Archbishop Rose and his nephew were not prepared to own Anne's title, and it was later claimed that after her accession clergy were dissuaded from taking oaths, or offering express prayers for her. Instead they used general terms such as had been adopted in William's reign. Because the evidence for these expedient forms of prayer comes from hostile sources, it is unclear how widespread their use actually was.\textsuperscript{208} On encountering his brethren's resistance to explicit acknowledgements of Anne's title, Paterson sponsored the framing of an address to the Queen by about 100 clergy by January 1703.\textsuperscript{209} It was taken to Court by two of the organisers, Dr Robert Scott and Dr Alexander Skene, deprived principal of St Salvator's College, St Andrews, and presented in March. It congratulated the Queen on her accession, addressed her as 'a Nursing Mother to the True Church of God', and, after reciting the sad condition of the clergy, simply beseeched her 'Royal Bounty and Indulgence.'\textsuperscript{210}

The Queen's assurance to them of her protection repeated her wish expressed to the Privy Council in February. She instructed that the episcopal clergy in churches and meeting-houses acting submissively to the law and decently in relation to the Kirk should be protected in their worship.\textsuperscript{211} Her letter was prompted by the disturbance of a service in a private house in Glasgow on 30 January, and was followed by similar violence in March. It was widely believed that the episcopalian delibrate sought to provoke opposition in order to justify their claims for toleration.\textsuperscript{212} Although
parliament had secured presbyterian church government in June 1702, the new parliament in 1703 and the introduction of episcopalian sympathisers into the administration gave the clergy added hopes of statutory relief. Tarbat, now the Earl of Cromartie, contributed to a pamphlet war which was under way by spring 1703, in which the episcopalian began to justify the need for an indulgence because of their church principles and presbyterian injustice.213 The fierce debate engendered another dispute over the validity of the contending forms of church government,214 and left proposals for comprehension isolated.215

One draft act proposed a general indulgence of episcopal meetings, and an allowance for clergy to possess parishes and have full rights to stipend, manse and glebe, on calls from a plurality of episcopalian heritors, and liferenters; both categories of minister would be subject to the Privy Council as to their loyalty.216 This combination of a toleration with an unimplemented proposal from the 1690s for comprehension, was too sweeping to be acceptable to parliament, even assuming it included sufficient safeguards of orthodoxy and loyalty.217 As tabled, the act required all clergy admitted to parishes to take the oaths, and, as Queensberry pointed out for the Queen's benefit, it went further than provisions for English dissenters.218 The General Assembly's commission objected that this 'would be to establish iniquity by Law.'219

A minor concession to the episcopalian was made, but the Queen's letter to the Council seems to have been
used as a means of showing up the draft act for toleration as unnecessary, an argument which was used both then and later in 1711-12. Queensberry's interest opposed the act in order not to lose presbyterian support gathered in the Country party, and the Cavaliers, badly divided over Country measures, were blandished into not insisting on their measure for fear of damaging the Court's interest. During the postponement which killed the act, the possibility remained not only of toleration, but also of a comprehension act, something in which both the Cavalier Duke of Atholl and the Country luminary Fletcher of Saltoun were interested. This too evaporated. Although toleration was to be achieved within a decade, the political intrigue of the 1703 parliament, allied to the high claims of both religious persuasions, ruled out comprehension as a solution to the continuing unrest in the Church, thus putting an end to the hopes of the 1690s for unified establishment.
CHAPTER THREE

THE ORGANISATION AND LIVELIHOODS OF THE BISHOPS AND CLERGY

The accession of Queen Anne brought comparative peace to church affairs despite the failure of toleration. Under her protection the episcopaliains enjoyed greater freedom of worship in meeting-houses, in many of which the clergy did not take the oaths, or took only the allegiance, and prayed ambiguously for the Queen; others both took the oaths and offered nominal prayers. All were subject to the civil authorities, and occasionally, where offence was given or a political crisis demanded it, action was taken against them and their meeting-houses were closed, as will be discussed in Chapter Four. Alongside this slight consolidation, the deaths of several of the bishops and many of the ministers necessitated measures for the upkeep of the church. The increasing age and worsening circumstances of many of the survivors of the Restoration establishment also demanded material provision for them and their families. The episcopaliains naturally looked southward for support, and Anne's reign witnessed particularly intensive appeals for political and ecclesiastical patronage and financial aid from the Churches of England and Ireland. This Chapter will therefore examine the ways in which the episcopaliains organised themselves after the Revolution, the livelihoods of the dispossessed clergy and the nature of English patronage which they enjoyed.
The evidence for episcopal government and organisation, at least in the 1690s, is slender enough for the bishops and clergy to appear, in Dundee's phrase, as 'the kirk invisible'. Following the removal of the bishops there are glimpses of them in Crawford's hostile reports. In the later part of 1689, 'scarce believing themselves out of office', they 'subscribe still by their designations, continue to ordain Ministers singly, and give warrants for privat marriages', and the clergy readily obeyed them.1 A complaint in a similar vein against the Bishop of Moray was made in October.2 Subsequent complaints indicate that they continued to discharge these episcopal functions, and extant letters show that for the rest of their lives they styled themselves, and were addressed as, bishops of the dioceses they held until 1689. However, their formal relationship to their clergy is less clear, especially with respect to the many recorded meetings of ministers in the 1690s, some of which have been described in the preceding chapters.

Limited evidence indicates that the bishops endeavoured to call extraordinary meetings in early 1689, presumably concerning the Church's response to King James's flight and Prince William's advent. A meeting of clergy from the presbyteries in the dioceses of St Andrews and Dunkeld was held at Perth on 13 February 'anent ane important affair',3 and a similar meeting was called by the Bishop of Aberdeen for 12 February.4 This is the last recorded instance of the summoning
of a meeting by the bishops. No synod records for this period until the 1730s survive, and the few extant presbytery records present negative evidence of their own and the bishops' role from July 1689 onwards. They either broke off before that date or shortly after. In the case of Arbroath presbytery a meeting on 4 September brought forward its next diet 'in regard there are no hopes of a Synod about the ordinary tyme..', but the register ceases abruptly.\(^5\) The business conducted at these meetings continued as if nothing untoward was occurring in public affairs, though clearly the presbyteries were highly concerned. It was probably in the early part of 1689 that the presbyteries of Jedburgh, Kelso and Selkirk sent a representative weekly to Edinburgh to receive instructions from Archbishop Paterson, their ordinary.\(^6\) Although there was no legal hindrance to episcopal presbyteries meeting until the restoration of presbyterian government in 1690, because they convened on their own authority, the diocesan synods could only be called on the bishops' authority, and appear to have lapsed.\(^7\) An enemy of Bishop Rose in 1712 made the point that his clergy had not met with him in presbytery or synod for twenty years.\(^8\)

It is difficult to ascertain whether episcopal sanction was given to any of the meetings of clergy who owned William and Mary as sovereigns and who inclined, as described in Chapter Two, towards an accommodation with the established Church which would not compromise their
episcopal principles. The recognition of episcopal authority which this necessitated suggests that meetings were not held against the wishes of the bishops, although there is no evidence of authorisation. The address to parliament of June 1689, before the abolition of bishops, was from the synod of Aberdeen, but the Aberdeen clergy addressing the General Assembly in 1692 were convened by the synod clerk on receipt of the King's letter and Formula, as a meeting of presbyteries. The meeting was constituted by the moderator of Aberdeen presbytery, who was then voted to be moderator of the meeting itself. The clergy's commissioners justified their address as the synod by arguing that although there was no law to justify their meeting, 'yet they might meet by its connivance, for mutual advice and Counsell'. In 1694 the protestations in the north arose from a meeting of the clergy in the diocese of Aberdeen with delegates from Moray, Ross, Caithness and Orkney, which was neither a diocesan nor a provincial synod. The protesters explained to parliament in 1695 that

'they did not keep any authoritative Meetings, as Church Judicatories, but only for Consultation and Deliberation, how to demain themselves in their several Charges, for suppressing Sin and Vice, and advancing the Interests of the Gospel'.

Thus in effect they were continuing some of the functions of the pre-1690 church courts, and in the areas where most clergy retained their parishes the use of the terms
diocese, synod or presbytery reflected the ecclesiastical *status quo*, rather than any legal authority.

South of the Tay this was not the case, and it is likely that the many special meetings held in the 1690s were solely for concerting measures for self-preservation, as the limited evidence already discussed in Chapter Two suggests. Nowhere do remnants of the church judicatories appear to have functioned as such, and the bishops are not mentioned in connection with meetings. In his many letters relating to meetings of, and representations on behalf of, the clergy in Ross and in southern Scotland, William Denune mentions only one bishop, his 'Episcopa' or 'ordinary', as he called his wife. This apparent absence of episcopal authority may be owing to no more than a lack of direct documentary evidence, itself perhaps the result of necessarily discreet activity. Nonetheless, the clergy appear to have acted collectively with the permission of, or in consultation with the bishops, a relationship which was ruptured in 1702-3 by the general meeting of the clergy in Edinburgh in late 1702 to discuss the terms of addressing Queen Anne. The majority sought the approval of Archbishop Rose for their address after they had come to a decision. His nephew complained: 'now presbiters are acting independently upon their bishops', and were 'sadely rent and divided amongst themselves' over offering allegiance to the Queen.
Diocesan organisation was hindered by the non-residence of most of the bishops and the death of six by 1702. Nevertheless, many of the presbyteries continued to function, especially in the north-east. Alford presbytery was active in November 1690, and its clergy were meeting in 1710 and in 1716.

The presbytery of Ellon saw to the supply of the vacancy in Foveran parish in 1692 by order of a meeting of Aberdeen diocese in December 1691, and moderated the call by the heritors and elders to James Gordon in 1692. The Assembly's committee for the north in 1694 was clear that clergy were keeping meetings at which they licensed preachers, ordered the admission of ministers, supplied vacancies and 'doe other acts of order and discipline'.

Aberdeen diocesan meetings occurred occasionally in the 1700s, as in 1709 concerning toleration, but deaths and the removal of clergy seem to have caused the breakdown of the episcopal presbyteries.

In 1712 they were reorganised and revitalised, probably as part of the general revival then taking place. The presbyteries of Garioch, Turriff and Fordyce were combined to form one district, Kincardine and Alford another, and Ellon and Deer a third, while Aberdeen remained a single district. The four districts were to hold their own meetings for the traditional purposes of the old presbyteries, that is to say discipline and the trial of candidates for orders. In addition they
were to enquire into the principles and morals of ministers called to meeting-houses, and encourage the use of the English liturgy where acceptable, both of which reflect the particular circumstances of the episcopalian of that date.20 The arrangement was approved by the non-resident Bishop Haliburton, who nominated a 'preses' for each district, which he directed should meet monthly with all Circumspection and with as little noise as can be, lest the civil Government should take offence'.

All ministers either in churches or meeting-houses were to be 'examined anent their life and ministeriall deportment'. None should be admitted to trial in order to obtain a licence to preach or set up a meeting-house except those who have ample testimony of their qualifications and life and have their Warrand from you'. 21

This proviso indicates that, as before the Revolution, the presbytery put an expectant for the ministry through trials and recommended him to the bishop for a preacher's licence.

Ordinations were probably performed by bishops with the concurrence of presbyters, in line with Restoration practice, but the registration and issue of letters of orders were apparently haphazard.22 It was alleged in 1716 that some bishops obliged ordinands to take an oath to King James as a condition of receiving orders, although this did not prevent some from leaving Scotland to seek a living elsewhere.23 Bishop Rose was said to have imposed such conditions and to have
been careful not to ordain those whom he knew would comply with the government. He denied it, and instead suggested that if there were any clergy ordained under oath to James or the Chevalier they had been ordained by the two Archbishops. Bishop Haliburton was said not to have distinguished between Jacobites and compliers when conferring orders.

In the absence of episcopal registers it is impossible to be certain of the exact numbers ordained by the bishops after 1689. Recruitment tended to be high from clerical families, and was such that in 1720 there were about seventy clergy active who had been ordained since 1689, about half of whom were sons of episcopal clergy in 1689. However, as many as seventy other sons became presbyterian ministers, a fact which indicates an element of continuity of clerical dynasties within the established Church, notwithstanding changes of polity. This seems also to be evident in the marriages of daughters to clergy, who were evenly divided between presbyterian and episcopal. The attraction of obtaining a living in the post-Revolution Kirk was probably an important factor in reducing episcopal clerical strength. The lure of a more lucrative ecclesiastical career than meeting-houses could provide was presumably also a factor in the departure of an unknown number of ordained clergy, and laity seeking orders, who left Scotland after 1689.

Until his death in 1704 Archbishop Rose had primatial authority over the church, but his exercise
of it remains obscure. He seems to have relied on his nephew, the Bishop of Edinburgh, for advice and help. On matters concerning the whole communion the archbishops seem to have conferred. When some clergy approached them after Anne's accession for advice about addressing the Queen, they and Bishop Rose agreed on the advice that they should not address her yet. The subsequent dispute over their address stemmed partly from Archbishop Paterson's alleged irregularity in summoning the Bishops of Aberdeen and Dunblane, who were in Rose's archdiocese, to a meeting in Edinburgh of five bishops. It was again agreed not to act, yet within days Paterson was helping the preparation of an address, aided by Bishops Haliburton and Douglas. The Roses were not informed, and regarded the whole episode as 'an uncanonical and disorderly practise' conducted on the supposition that they were opposed to an address. Although Paterson appears to have acted against what the bishops collectively agreed, in practice his presumption that Archbishop Rose and his nephew were against an acknowledgement of Anne's title was correct. At Paterson's somewhat malicious suggestion, Compton wrung a confidential admission from Bishop Rose of his nonjurancy in April 1703. Unlike Paterson, Archbishop Rose retained his Jacobitism, though he was probably not involved in plotting after his narrow escape in 1691, when Paterson was gaoled and he was left at peace in his house, being regarded as less dangerous.
Although it would be unfair to accept one observer's characterisation of him as 'a simple foolish person' out of the context of Jacobite intrigue, Rose appears to have taken little part in the ordering of the episcopalian's affairs, and lived privately until his death.

As vicar-general of the archdiocese of St Andrews, the Bishop of Edinburgh adopted his uncle's metropolitical powers, which gave him precedence over the other bishops, except Paterson. As the other dioceses fell vacant by their bishops' deaths, Rose's authority gradually extended until in 1716 he was the sole diocesan bishop with responsibility for governing the entire episcopal communion. Meanwhile the decision was taken to perform secret consecration of bishops to maintain the episcopate, which had dwindled to five bishops in 1705. John Sage and John Fullarton were consecrated that year, John Falconer and Henry Christie in 1709, Archibald Campbell in 1711, and Arthur Millar and William Irvine in 1718. In addition James Gadderar was consecrated by Campbell, Falconer and the English nonjuror George Hickes in 1712. None of these bishops was assigned any diocesan jurisdiction because their consecrations were purely to maintain the order. To assign dioceses would have raised the issue of the Chevalier's prerogative, and drawn the attention of the government to the perpetuation of episcopal jurisdiction in an unwelcome manner. The first consecrations were even kept secret from Bishop Haliburton, whose discretion in
his dotage was not trusted, and remained unknown until about 1711. Falconer's revival of the episcopal power of confirmation revealed his elevated status in 1712.

Rose's vicarial powers were deferred to by the surviving diocesan bishops when they were outside their own dioceses, and all the new bishops neither ordained clergy nor performed any act implying jurisdiction without his 'special desire or permission'. From 1716 all clergy and laity 'recognised him as their ordinary'.

His metropolitical authority can be seen at work in 1715 in his advice to Gideon Guthrie concerning his criminal indictment for intrusion at Brechin, and his directions to the neighbouring clergy to supply the meeting-house after Guthrie was sentenced. At the level of church discipline, he requested the clergy to investigate a claim against a Fife heritor that he had fathered an illegitimate child.

During the aftermath of the 1715 Rebellion, Rose appears to have been kept informed of the deliberations of the Aberdeen clergy, who claimed his authority for their meetings, which were in connection with an address to the authorities.

His authority was not always heeded where applications to parliament by clergy for redress were concerned. In the period 1710-1712 he tried unsuccessfully to head off proposals for toleration involving several Scottish clergy. However, he was a shrewd and persuasive leader of the church for much of the first two decades of the century.

Of the other bishops far less is recorded after the Revolution, probably because most retired and lived
privately. Bishop Hamilton of Dunkeld, who was deprived of his charge of Meigle, died in late 1690 or 1691. Bishop Wood of Orkney moved to Dunbar, where he died in 1695. Drummond of Brechin was given shelter by the Earl of Errol at Slains Castle, where he died in 1695. The following year Ramsay of Ross died in poverty in Edinburgh. In 1699 Bruce of Orkney died in Fife, and Graham of the Isles died in Edinburgh in 1702. Bishop Hay of Moray was the only bishop to continue in his diocese, dying at Inverness in 1707. Douglas of Dunblane lived at Dundee, where he died in 1716. Haliburton of Aberdeen moved to Newtyle in Meigle presbytery, where he ministered first in the church, then in a meeting-house and latterly his own house, from about 1691 until his death in 1715.

Bishop Gordon of Galloway left Scotland in 1689 to join King James at Dublin, and followed him to St. Germain, where he ministered to James's protestant followers. In 1702 he was reported to have reached London on a secret mission for the French Court which involved contacts with Jacobites in Scotland. Gordon took Catholic orders in Rome in 1702, to the embarrassment of the Scottish episcopalians, and died there in 1726, the last of the Restoration episcopate. Archbishop Paterson was the only other bishop to become an active Jacobite, with the result that he was forced into exile in early 1693, as noted in the previous chapter. Although reported to be in correspondence with James that
year. Paterson attempted to gain King William's favour in 1694 by forwarding to Portland an invitation he had received from James requesting him to come to St. Germain, allegedly the sixth to have been sent to him. This had no effect, and Paterson was forced to remain in Hamburg and Leyden until autumn 1695, when he was allowed to live under surveillance first in London, then at Norwich and Yarmouth. Finally permitted to return to Scotland in 1697, he was obliged to live outside Edinburgh with limited freedom to travel, which prompted complaints about being kept under confinement contrary to a subject's rights. He was released from surveillance in 1701.

Much of his remaining energies were devoted to making interest, as he requested Tarbat to do on his behalf in 1702,'towards repairing of my great losses and damages by King Williams illegall oppressions of me .. in ane arbitrary manner for more than ten years without interruption'. Lockhart of Carnwath, who acknowledged Paterson's 'extraordinary parts and great learning', depicted him as indulging his overriding 'avaricious worldly temper'. He undoubtedly had private means with which to support his eleven children, and did not hesitate to press his own claim for special consideration, though Bishop Rose pointed out that his brethren had equally valid claims. He told Compton that with £1,000 sterling per annum Paterson was, at least while he enjoyed his rents, the wealthiest Scottish churchman since the Reformation. Paterson
admitted to having had means of no more than £1,000 sterling.\textsuperscript{55}

By contrast Bishop Hay of Moray lived a more meagre existence.

In 1696 he wrote to Tarbat from Ross-shire that

\begin{quote}
'Being reduced to this primitive way of subsisting, by tilling ane vther mans piece of ground, I am forced to pick up my crumbs'.
\end{quote}

He requested payment of a small bygone feu-duty of £16 Scots.\textsuperscript{56}

Bishop Graham of the Isles, who was experiencing difficulties in uplifting bygone rents in 1695, was ordered by parliament to be given military aid,\textsuperscript{57} but to what effect is not known.

Anne's accession gave the surviving bishops hope that their own, and the even more 'calamitous condition of our poor clergie', would be remedied.\textsuperscript{58} Their common complaint was that, unlike at all previous ecclesiastical revolutions, including the Reformation, no adequate provision for themselves as dispossessed clergy had been made. King William intended to allow the bishops half of their former rents for life, but this was not implemented despite representations to him by some English bishops.\textsuperscript{59} Even the prudential argument that such provision would help reduce episcopalian disaffection seems to have been ineffectual.\textsuperscript{60} This was applicable both to the bishops and the clergy; the latter, as one memorialist put it in about 1693,

\begin{quote}
'finding themselves pressed or insecure in their livings naturally desire and struggle for any alteration'.\textsuperscript{61}
\end{quote}

The only Scottish bishop who seems to have received payment from the bishops' rents was Cairncross.\textsuperscript{62} The Bishop of Dunblane was granted two precepts for £100 by William but these, and two granted by Queen Anne for the same
amount, were still unpaid in 1704. The collector of the bishops' rents refused to make payment, pleading the exhaustion of the fund, though payment was made to other bishops in Anne's reign. 63

In fact, payment to all the bishops of grants by Queen Anne were erratic, and apparently depended largely on the priority accorded to other claimants by the collectors of the rents. As newcomers, the bishops seem to have been regarded as less important, and the collector's presbyterian bias probably also played a part. William's grants to the universities from the rents were confirmed by Queen Anne, the established Church received £400 annually, and, as Rose was aware, the rents were also used by 'some great men ... to gratifie their freinds and followers', of whom there were many with claims. 64

In 1702 six precepts for £100 were issued for the six surviving bishops, and appear to have been adjusted to allow £300 each to the two archbishops, £150 to the three other bishops, and £180 to Bishop Rose. 65 Payments of at least some of these grants were made, but only after delays. 66

To expedite payments and to plead for a grant from the bishops' rents for the clergy, Paterson went to Court in winter 1703-4. Lockhart's scepticism about his motives seem justified by the Queen's gift of a collector's place to his son and a gift of £200 annually for his children after
his death. His journey seems to have sparked off more
rumours about his wealth, and to his chagrin the gift
to his children remained unconfirmed. According
to Lockhart, Paterson's appearance at Court also had
a political purpose, insofar as the Duke of Queensberry
wished to retain credit with the English Tories by
parading both Paterson and the Earl of Balcarres to
show 'his inclinations to save and protect the Tories
and Church party in Scotland'. Paterson played his
part by assuring the Queen that the Duke was the
episcopal clergy's best friend, and that he had only
failed to procure them a toleration because 'he found
they were so disaffected to her interest'; he hinted
at his own personal loss by the failure of the
tolerations. This blatant misrepresentation of the
Duke's role in blocking the 1703 toleration act, and
the way Paterson showed up his brethren as disloyal,
was reported to have bemused the Queen. In
his letters to the English bishops Paterson left them in
no doubt that it was to his efforts that the clergy's
address of 1703 and the avowed loyalty of so many former
nonjurors was owing; this in itself was a justification
for better treatment than his brethren. He was
also careful to make his case known in detail to the
Scottish secretaries by constant reminders directly
to Cromartie and via Balcarres to Queensberry.

In the flow of solicitous letters which Paterson
sent in the period 1703-7 provision for the lower
clergy took third place behind his own interests and those of the other bishops. In 1702 he, the two Roses and Bishop Graham approached Compton with a view to obtaining grants from their own former dioceses for themselves, and from the vacant dioceses for the clergy. A similar scheme devised by William Carstares after the Revolution had foundered on the sheer cost of maintaining the deprived clergy, and it is likely that the same consideration applied to the bishops' proposal. Nothing appears to have been done for the clergy. With the approach of the Union the bishops appear to have relied increasingly on the intervention of friendly English bishops such as Sharp and Compton to obtain financial aid, because of the continued disregard and disobedience of the Queen's precepts and repeated orders to the Treasury Commissioners. Rose foresaw that they would be reliant on the Queen's bounty unless provisions were made for them to receive the rents before the Union dissolved existing grants. In the event, the bishops fell victim to political indifference to their welfare, and were the butt of parliament's humour when they were ranked last for payments out of the Equivalent fund for their unpaid precepts, which was reckoned a guarantee of non-payment. In practice the three remaining bishops received some payment of the considerable amounts outstanding to them from the Equivalent, and had annual pensions of £100 from the Civil List. Rose enjoyed the royal bounty until
March 1716.  

Provision for many of the deprived clergy came from the vacant stipends awarded to them by the Privy Council, usually only for the terms which they had served in full. If they had almost served in full before being deprived or otherwise removed, heritors sometimes consented to payments. The Council seems occasionally to have erred on the side of charity where a minister pleaded 'extreain poverty', The minister of Twynholm, who was forced to cease ministering in March 1689 and had a large family, was granted the whole 1689 stipend, as were others in similar circumstances. Some received two years' stipends, and some heritors in the west appear to have favoured this. About 140 were thus provided for in the short term, during 1690 and 1691. In the same period about 120 presbyterian clergy and their relicts were granted rights, usually to a half-year's stipend. The first year of the appropriated bishops' rents was likewise awarded to deprived presbyterians, their relicts and families. In 1693 the Treasury Commissioners were failing to obey the King's command that the vacant stipends be collected. The result, James Johnston reported, was that many outed episcopal clergy willing to comply and their families were starving for want of vacant stipends. Others who were Jacobites and who did not need them, gained the best ones available; a clause they inserted in their bonds salved their
consciences over recognition of William's title. Where sympathetic patrons agreed, vacant stipends could be paid by connivance to episcopal clergy. The Marquess of Montrose bestowed a half-year's stipend on James Craig, rabbiel minister at Killearn in 1692, and Duncan Comrie enjoyed manse and stipend until 1707 under his protection. As an act of charity to George Graham, who quit his charge of Lochmaben in 1689, Montrose gave £5 sterling, on hearing in 1691 that he was 'very poor and in great straits'; Graham had been his father's governor. At Fetteresso in the Mearns, where Gideon Guthrie ministered, he possessed the manse and glebe by a tack from the Earl Marischal, from 1707 until he left the parish in 1710. In the north the practice of episcopal clergy uplifting the vacant stipends was probably widespread. It was complained against John McKenzie by the presbytery of Dingwall and Chanonry in 1711 that for several years he had uplifted the stipends of the parishes of Killearnan and Kilmuir Wester by virtue of a tack. Many, if not most, of the clergy who ministered in vacant parishes where episcopalian heritors resided, might expect to subsist on part or all of the stipend. Provision for clergy who ministered in parishes settled by the Kirk necessarily placed a greater strain on the heritors, but the emergence of episcopal meeting-houses during Queen Anne's reign indicates that it was a burden which could be sustained, at least for the period until the Rebellion of 1715.
The position of many dispossessed clergy was considerably less fortunate than those who managed to make a living by continuing to minister. Several were forced onto the charity of the kirk sessions, as, for instance, the deposed minister of Portmoak, who received help from Scoonie parish shortly before his death in 1695. Scoonie, and the parishes of St Madoes and Kettins, all gave help to George McGruther, the deprived minister of Collace, in Perth presbytery.

James Gillespie, who was deposed from Drymen for drunkenness, was allowed part of the stipend annually by the presbytery of Dumbarton on account of his age. Likewise removed for drunkenness, William Crawford at Ladykirk was allowed 200 merks yearly out of his successor's stipend, on account of his age and infirmity. The parish of Logie, in Stirling presbytery, gave help to several ministers and heir relicts in the period 1704-1725, which indicates that the poverty of ministers and their families continued long after the Revolution. Some were fortunate enough to be able to live, at least temporarily, 'upon the charity of freinds', as the rabbled minister of Ratho and his family did in 1689. John Murdoch fled from the 'inraged multitude' in his parish of Glassertown, in Wigtoun presbytery, in 1689, and lived for at least eighteen months 'upon the benevolence and kyndnes of freinds' in Edinburgh. Inevitably
some clergy ended their days in tragic or pathetic circumstances. John Barclay, deprived of his parish in Kettle in Fife in 1689, was found dead in a well in Edinburgh in 1690, which suggests suicide. The oued minister of Ruthwell hanged himself in 1697. In 1705 a minister called More was arrested by the Edinburgh town constable for falling drunk in the street, and died in the guard house. It emerged that he probably collapsed from hunger and fatigue rather than drink. It was noted that he was 'no verie good or prudent man' and had not been 'own'd for some years past either by his superiors or brethren'.

Efforts to relieve the episcopal clergy in straitened circumstances began immediately after the Revolution. Collections in England can be regarded as part of the intensive appeals to the bishops and courtiers for redress of the episcopalian's grievances over the rabblings, the Council's deprivations and the actions of the Church courts. By making collections the episcopal agents probably created wider public sympathy for the clergy's plight, and may have helped to strengthen the political support of English churchmen and laymen alike. This support was important not only in the 1690s, as has been suggested in the preceding chapters, but was of crucial importance to the episcopalian's fortunes in the reign of Anne, as will be discussed later.

Collections were made in Oxford between July and September 1690, which gained about £300.
In 1692 donations by the London city clergy were being distributed by Dr Robert Scott, who was authorised as collector and distributor. In 1693-4 collections were made in London by George Lauder, who was empowered by the Scottish bishops to collect for the benefit of clergy who, like himself, owned the government. In sixteen months he gathered only some £80, which was partly due to his ineptness or inexperience in approaching potential sympathisers, partly to suspicions aroused by fraudulent collections for the clergy by imposters, and partly to the concentration of English sympathy on the victims of the Warwick fire of 1694. The handful of Tory and Whig grandees whom he successfully approached included Portland, Nottingham (the most generous, in accordance with his political sympathies), Pembroke and Halifax. Among others who gave money for the clergy in London and Scotland were Princess Anne, Bishop Tenison and Bishop Stillingfleet. Lauder's alleged parsimony to the clergy in London and personal gain from the collections were investigated by the Bishop of London, and apparently led to his abandonment of the collection and a severance of ties with his brethren.

His work was evidently part of an overall scheme devised by the Scottish bishops by early 1693 for charitable collections. In Scotland a 'Gentleman of Integritie' in each presbytery was to be requested to collect money from 'persones of qualitie, and others', to be sent to Dr William Gardyne and Dr John Cockburn, who were
to act as public receivers of the charity. Lists were compiled of the 'suffering clergie' in order for an equitable distribution to be made. The charity's administrators were to consist of 'six or seven reputable clergy' and 'some ingenuous gentlemen lauers phisitians and burgeses', who were to make 'ane impartiall distributione at the sight and by the approbatione of' the archbishops and bishops living in Edinburgh. The workings of the charity organisation are not known in any detail for the period before the earliest extant administrators' minute book which commences in 1711, but other evidence indicates that considerable efforts were made to gather and distribute funds.

By 1700 the two clergy appointed as receivers were active in raising funds from sympathetic laity. In Edinburgh the Incorporation of Surgeons made annual donations, for instance in 1700, 1709 and 1710, and the Writers to the Signet were regular and generous supporters of the fund from at least 1700. The guildry and the magistrates also gave money. Contributions could be regarded in a political light as a statement of support for the fallen episcopal establishment. This is perhaps why a representation in 1690 by members of the Faculty of Advocates 'anent the great indigence of severall ministers thrust out by the rable' caused 'a great contest and some protestationes'. Private benefaction was
probably the main source of income, and was boosted by legacies to the fund. The staunch episcopalian Sir William Bruce left money in 1710, as did the Earl of Bute the following year, and the minister of Kinglassie in 1712. Bishop Cairncross in 1698 left one-tenth of his estate to the fund. Encouraged perhaps by this bequest from Raphoe, in 1700 the administrators looked to Ireland for support by commissioning Arthur Millar to make collections there. After considerable initial success in collecting £452 in 1700-1 with the help of Archbishop Marsh, he encountered difficulties, but nevertheless a total of £980 was remitted to the administrators by 1705. Opposition to the collections arose among Whig clergy and laity, especially in the northern dioceses, who refused to support Scots clergy, whom they regarded as Jacobite. Their views were given substance by complaints that money collected both in Ireland and England was not distributed to ministers who prayed for Queen Anne. In 1702 a declaration from one who did so was necessary to lift a stop put to the Irish collections. After Millar's return to Scotland, occasional sums were remitted by the primate with the priviso that distribution should be only to poor clergy who obeyed the government.

Allegations of partiality persisted and became the basis for a public controversy between the administrators and George Barclay, who pursued them
before the Lords of Session in 1712-13, alleging that he and other clergy were struck off the rolls for acknowledging Queen Anne's title.\textsuperscript{116} To prove their impartiality the administrators produced declarations by fourteen ministers and the relicts of ten others, who had been supplied from the fund notwithstanding their compliance with the government.\textsuperscript{117} Considerable damage was done to the administrators' reputation, which was exploited by the clergy's Whig enemies in London in 1712.\textsuperscript{118}

The collections in England were sponsored by many of the bishops, and can be seen as another phase in the Church of England's provision for suffering or refugee protestants, such as the Huguenots and the protestants from the Palatinate, during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{119} As one of their brethren, Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, could write movingly that the Scottish episcopalian's 'miseries were great even to the last extremities' in winter 1698-9. He reported to Sharp in 1699 that he had unsuccessfully attempted to persuade the Scottish ministers of state to allow collections in England. As a private act he sent £200, half of which was for distribution among the clergy and widows by Laurence Charteris, his friend at Dirleton.\textsuperscript{120} Burnet later turned against the episcopalian's for their Jacobitism and Toryism, but his English brethren Sharp and Compton did not allow the evident nonjurancy of many to deflect them from the provision of needed charity for
clergy loyal to the government. They were the most forward and consistent patrons of the Scottish episcopalian. In a certificate in favour of Dr Robert Scott in 1705, they recommended the episcopal clergy

\[\text{'who have been turn'd out of their Livings (but yet own her Majestie and Government) as very great objects of Compassion and Charity'.} \]

In soliciting donations, Scott was said to have used the names of the clergy who addressed the Queen in 1703, to show that such men were the beneficiaries of the fund. Urgency was given to his collecting from 1704 because of a reduction in donations in Scotland, owing to 'the scarcity of money here and the Poverty of this Nation', as Paterson and Rose informed Tenison.

In 1705 Scott was a successful collector, receiving about 150 guineas from seventeen bishops, £328 from the Oxford colleges, and £110 from various deans and chapters and colleges. Cambridge University granted a 'grace' of £100 in 1705. In summer 1706 a Lincolnshire cleric gathered almost £120 for Scott, and was continuing to collect. The fund was being recommended as far afield as Exeter. In London, Compton encouraged his clergy to propose and gather charity discreetly and zealously in 1707, but two years later he had to urge collections again because they had fallen off, at a time when the Scots' needs were especially great because of imprisonments. One clergyman who needed no encouraging was the curate of Stepney, who was
actively collecting in 1707-8, and again in 1718-9. Collections in the latter years brought £259, mainly in donations from the lower clergy and sympathetic commoners. This fact reflects the altered attitudes of the English establishment towards the Scottish episcopalian after the 1715 Rebellion. The only bishops to contribute were the Tories Atterbury and Hooper.  

The English nonjuring community was a fruitful source of moral and financial aid. It can be assumed that while sharing the concern shown by members of the established Church of England, they felt a special affinity with the Scottish nonjurors, and did not have scruples over distributions to those who did not own Queen Anne. In fact their supply was probably a priority, a consideration which explains the funds which Bishop Rose received from England for private distribution 'to people of respect and credit that were in want'; these were sorely missed when Rose's death interrupted them. Robert Nelson, the religious writer and nonjuror, donated £140 to the clergy, half of which was for the public fund, the other half for distribution at Rose's discretion. Nelson was a channel for the generosity of another sympathiser with the Scottish episcopalian, the Earl of Thanet, who was giving money in the years 1705-7. Thanet's sister, the Countess of Coventry, was a donor of private funds, as was the Countess of Torrington. Rose used these funds to supply Jacobite clergy such as James Gadderar,
Similarly, John Falconer, who lived in Fife and corresponded with his English nonjuring brethren, was allotted a share of Thanet's legacy of £200 to them in 1715.

The number of clergy and their relicts and children supplied by the charity fund throughout this period is not known. The earliest roll of recipients, dating from 1721, lists sixty-seven ministers and seventy relicts, but is unrepresentative because it includes a large number of northern clergy who were forced to apply for a share after being deprived of their parishes following the Rebellion. The administrators decided that unless these clergy organised collections in the northern shires, they could not be supplied, considering that nothing was sent from thence, and that while enjoying possession of churches they 'had shewn themselves little Concerned in the Necessities of the Bretheren'. This indicates that the geographical scope of the fund was limited before 1715. The fund was especially low immediately after the Rebellion, but even in previous years payments soon depleted income. Only occasional remittances came from Dr Scott in England in the later part of Anne's reign, which contrasts oddly with the strongest political support the episcopalianists had enjoyed there since the Revolution. It was perhaps due to a combination of the temporary hindrances mentioned already, and the concentration of money and effort into the prayer-book project described in Chapter Six.
The administrators were keen to limit disbursement to those in genuine need, and made appropriate enquiries through local contacts to ascertain the personal circumstances of applicants. John Lammie, deprived minister of Ecclesgreig, who was fortunate enough to receive a pension of £40 sterling from the Queen in 1711, asked to be removed from the roll, only to be restored in 1716, having lost it. When the Dean of Dunblane was reported to have 'a sufficient competency for his subsistence as a single man' he was suspended pending enquiries; this seems to indicate that his Edinburgh meeting-house provided a living. Payments were also suspended to clergy who were found acting uncanonically, for instance by irregular marrying.

The number of ministers' relicts added to the rolls in the period 1711-21 seems generally to have been greater than that of the clergy. This probably reflects not only the reduced circumstances of women at least partly dependent on their husbands, but also the overall mortality pattern of the ministers. This cannot be ascertained precisely, because the dates of death of about one-third of the 950 parish clergy are not firmly established. Of the 600-odd whose deaths are recorded, about one quarter were dead before 1696, half before 1706, two-thirds before 1716 and almost five-sixths before 1721. This dramatic reduction in the number of episcopal clergy seems to have placed a considerable burden on the charity fund by forcing widows to seek financial aid, but it is beyond the scope of this study...
to examine even the limited evidence of the dire circumstances in which many found themselves.

Some clergy probably never had recourse to the fund, whether because their parish or meeting-house provided sufficient income, or because they had private means. Several ministers owned or leased land, which, when unencumbered by debt, and when its produce was not spoiled by poor harvests such as occurred in the 1690s, supplied a means of existence denied to others. The ministers of Hutton and Caerlaverock retired to their estates after being extruded. 144 John Fullarton, minister in Paisley and Glasgow, and Bishop of Edinburgh from 1720, partly lived on his estate of Greenhall in Argyll. 145 Some ministers, either in possession of parishes or deprived, were able to purchase estates after 1689. 146 Ownership of lands was, however, no guarantee of well-being, as is shown in the case of Beroald Innes, who owned land in Moray, yet was obliged to receive charity payments until his circumstances improved in 1711. 147

An unknown number of clergy found places in noble and gentry households after the Revolution. Sir William Bruce gave shelter to the deprived minister of Kinross, and in 1693 to John Sage, the Glasgow minister who became the episcopalian's most learned champion after the Revolution. Sage later became chaplain to the Countess of Callendar and governor to her son, the Earl of Linlithgow, and afterwards chaplain to Sir John Stuart of Grandtully. 148 At Glamis, Francis Rait acted as salaried chaplain to the
Southesk family for twelve years until 1718, having earlier taught in Lord Kinnaird's family. These cases typified the twin functions of governor and chaplain which clergy were able, and in some cases probably expected, to perform. Those who had taught in families or parish schools before taking orders, like Sage, were merely resuming a former occupation in joining private households. From 1693 the obligation on chaplains and governors to take qualifying oaths necessitated discretion, but the social standing of their patrons probably shielded nonjurors. The deprived minister of Kelso was employed by the Countess of Roxburghe to teach her sons in 1694. Andrew Fraser, deprived of Rothesay in 1689, was employed from 1692 in teaching the Earl of Winton's children. Governors and chaplains were also recruited from men ordained after 1689. Bishop Rose told Archbishop Wake in 1716 that he had performed many ordinations, 'being sollicit by some Noblemen and Gentlemen of quality to furnish them with Chaplains for the use of their families and those in the neighbourhood'. The demand for chaplains and governors was recorded by Gideon Guthrie.

Other clergy attached to landed households acted in a factorial capacity, such as Dr Richard Waddell, deprived Arch-Dean of St Andrews, who acted as Winton's chamberlain in the 1690s. John Ochterlony, minister of Aberlemno, acted for Sir David Dalrymple at Melgund,
and Patrick Ochterlony for the Earl of Panmure after being deposed from Redgorton. Patrick Middleton, deprived of Leslie in Fife, was a factor for Strathmore in about 1700-2, and for Lord Kinnaird from 1702 until about 1707. A later factor for Southesk was John Davie, ordained after 1689. Several others are also recorded as chamberlains and factors.

A few kept schools, such as Henry Hay, assistant to the deprived minister of Peebles, who set up a school there by 1693, and David Anderson, who likewise set up a private school in Perth, where he had been minister until deprived. In Argyll, Robert McGruther became a schoolmaster at Ardchattan and later at Tiree, after being deposed. In Edinburgh, William Smart, rabbled from Ecclesmachan, found a living teaching mathematics and related subjects when he was not keeping a meeting-house. The common practice of schoolmasters acting as parish precentors seems to have been maintained in at least two episcopal meeting-houses in Edinburgh, and probably helped provide recruits for the ministry as it had done before 1689.

Despite the misgivings of some clergy over taking up a secular livelihood it is clear that many did so. Edinburgh attracted large numbers of clergy after the Revolution, who sought refuge there and hoped to make their livings in the city. The poll tax returns of 1694 reveal the households of over thirty ministers in Edinburgh, and by about 1730 approximately 120 deprived clergy had resided there either permanently or for a short
Many probably eked out an existence by ministering privately. Twenty-eight clergy were noted as officiating irregularly in about 1691, and about the same number came to the attention of South Leith kirk session between 1697 and 1720 for irregular marriages. Their reputation for laxness over testimonials and banns was well-established in the 1690s and was maintained by post-Revolution clergy, but it is clear that irregularities scandalised many episcopalians and were disciplined where possible. The number of meeting-houses probably fluctuated in accordance with factors such as legal pressures and the hearers' loyalty. Financial considerations were important, for by the late 1690s it appears that the numbers of clergy living in Edinburgh had been reduced by the departure of those 'necessitat to seek for bread among ther friends'. By the 1700s the number of meeting-houses was fairly constant at about twelve. A number of small congregations were served by single ministers, sometimes in their own houses, with a few larger ones served by two, three or even four clergy, a pattern revealed by the prosecution in 1716 of twenty-six clergy in Edinburgh, Leith and Musselburgh, who had thirteen meetings between them.

Edinburgh also provided secular employment for several ministers. Some, such as Alexander Ramsay, deprived of the Old Kirk there, had 'affairs and business' in the city. Norman Mackenzie and George Henry, removed from Midcalder and Corstorphine respectively, set up a
brewery in the suburbs. 174 Henry Knox, deprived of Bowden parish, became a bookseller by 1693, 175 as did David Freebairn, a nonjuror who kept a meeting-house at the same time, and was consecrated bishop in 1722. 176 Freebairn's son Robert, ran a separate bookselling and printing business which was among the largest in Edinburgh. His Jacobitism emerged at the Rebellion, during which he operated a press for the Pretender. 177 Also of some importance as a bookseller-cum-printer was the extruded minister of Douglas, Andrew Symson, who set up in 1689 and received the patronage of some leading episcopal laity, including members of the Faculty of Advocates, despite his poor printing standards. 178 Knox, the Freebairns and Symson were among those who supplied the Faculty with books, an apparently lucrative part of the trade. 179 Among Symson's patrons was Sir Robert Sibbald, the physician and antiquarian, to whose projected Scottish Atlas he had contributed in the 1680s, and whose works he helped print from 1701. 180 Their relationship was one element of the cultural life of pre-Revolution Scotland which survived into the eighteenth century. A specifically episcopalian and Jacobite culture was evident also in the output of Robert Freebairn, of the rival printer James Watson, and of Thomas Ruddiman, the author, publisher and librarian. 181

Symson's son, Mathias, also published books, among which were the mathematical works of the rabbled minister of Kilmaurs, George Brown, who in 1698 obtained a sole privilege from the Privy Council to make and sell his
calculating device, the 'Rotula Arithmetica'. Brown sold a few examples, but probably made his living mainly from teaching and writing, and moved to London by 1717. Another ingenious minister was George Barclay, who came to Edinburgh after being deprived of Sprouston parish, and set up as an optical instrument-maker. He made telescopes and microscopes, including a set for the Advocates, spectacles, and other glasses. He succeeded in the small and highly specialised instrument-making trade, and his business was continued by his sons after his death in 1712. The most unusual of the clergy who showed scientific and mechanical talents was Robert Stewart, minister of Killin. He enjoyed the patronage of the Earl of Breadalbane, who paid for a model of his perpetual motion machine which he advertised to the public in 1707-9, along with a design for a water pump. The Writers to the Signet agreed to make a collection to further his project for the perpetuum mobile, but the Advocates shrewdly declined to judge its scientific merits and decided instead that 'his present circumstances required some charitable supply'. Stewart's pursuit of this mechanical chimera earned him the nickname 'Mobile', by which he was appropriately known when ministering in different locations in Perthshire in 1724.

A firmer link between the dispossessed clergy and the intellectual, artistic and scientific culture which survived the Revolution, is evident in the case of the Edward family. Robert Edward, minister of Murroes, had
strong scientific, topographic and musical interests fostered under the patronage of the Panmures, while one of his sons, Alexander,

'acquired much fame by his skill in Architecture and drawing plans of houses and gardens'. 186

After being deprived of his Fife parish, Alexander Edward continued to occupy Kemback church and to pray for King James until 1693 at least. He also became more closely involved with the architect and Jacobite patron, Sir William Bruce, for whom he had worked in the 1680s. He acted both with him and on his own account in designing a series of houses and gardens for the nobility and gentry, including the presbyterian Earl of Melville. It was on behalf of a group of mainly episcopalian and Jacobite nobles and gentry that Edward made an architectural field trip to the continent in 1701-2, carrying cipher letters for the Court at St Germain. He returned safely, to continue work until his death in 1708.187 But in 1696 his brother Charles, who assisted their father at Murroes, was arrested on arrival in England from France. It emerged that under the alias Douglas he had been Viscount Dundee's chaplain in 1689, and (presumably the reason he offered for coming to London) that he 'Intended to have printed Lauderdale's Translation of Virgil'.188 Neither the real purpose of his journey, nor his fate, are known.

Jacobitism was so prevalent in the circle of episcopalian agents, pamphleteers and other clergy involved
in the episcopal cause, that most lived under the threat of retributive action by the government, and several were subjected to it. Dr Alexander Monro had his papers seized in Edinburgh in 1689, in London in 1693, and in 1696, at the time of the assassination plot against William, he was gaoled for several months. He constantly reported presbyterian or Whig enmity against him, which was stimulated by his writings against them. Ostensibly he lived privately as a 'house-keeper' in Westminster, though in fact he was one of the leading episcopalian apologists, closely associated with Gilbert Crockatt and others. His arrest in 1696 occurred on the strength of a false accusation extracted by 'unworthy and base arts' from a fellow-clergyman, Simon Wyld, who confessed as much before his death. Wyld, who was described in a presbyterian pamphlet as Monro's 'Journeyman', was the rabbled minister of Wauchope, who had carried letters to James in Ireland in 1689. Arrested in October 1694 in London, he provided testimony of seditious remarks by Monro, and incidental references to fellow Scottish nonjurors in London. Among them were Robert Eliott and James Johnston, with whom he was in Newgate prison in early 1695. Eliott, deposed from Lessudden in 1690, was moving in nonjuring circles in London by late 1692, and some time before 1700 earned money as a copyist or clerk, like Wyld. In Scotland, episcopalian pamphleteers and apologists were similarly harrassed for their activities, which often crossed the divide between passive and active Jacobitism. Sage defied a Privy Council act of
banishment from Edinburgh and consequently had to flee literally to the hills in 1696. Hostility towards him cannot have been diminished by his two works of 1695, *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, which hacked at the roots of the presbyterian establishment by examining the Church's history since the Reformation, and his *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, which argued for the existence of diocesan bishops in St. Cyprian's day. These, and the *Vindication* of the latter work, were very highly regarded by the Scottish episcopalian and also by English High Churchmen and nonjurors.194

Two other episcopalian apologists who produced more polemical work were acted against in 1693. As a direct result of the search of Monro's papers in London, Robert Calder, the deprived minister and 'manifesto maker', was imprisoned and interrogated concerning his own papers. They included a manifesto for a northern insurrection penned in 1691,195 and letters and drafts which showed that he was 'a great traffiquer alswell for the Composeing as for the publishing' of pamphlets. He narrowly escaped a full trial for treason, and was released in December 1693, to resume ministering in 1694.196 The search of Calder's papers revealed he had received £18 as part of a bounty of £200 sterling sent by James to Archbishop Paterson for the outed episcopal clergy, and disbursed by Dr John Cockburn, one of the two collectors of the clergy charity fund. Cockburn admitted to being the collector and distributor, refused to take the oaths of allegiance and
assurance, and was ordained to leave the King's dominions by August. The revelation that the clergy fund was helped by James may have caused it to cease for a period. Cockburn crossed to the continent for a period before returning to England, only to be obliged to leave again in early 1698 by the act against corresponding with King James. He spent his exile profitably, first by establishing an English episcopal congregation at Rotterdam, where he stayed for four years, and then by repeating his exertions at Amsterdam. In 1709 he was allowed to return to England, and was rewarded by the Queen with two livings in Somerset, and in 1714, with the larger benefice of Northolt, Middlesex, where he remained until his death in 1729. In recognition of his work he was admitted Doctor of Divinity at Oxford in 1709.

Cockburn's transition from an active nonjuror in the 1690s to a submissive subject under Anne, was accomplished differently and at greater speed by John McQueen, deprived minister of the Trinity or College Kirk in Edinburgh. Both he and his colleague there, Andrew Cant (who was also deprived in 1689 for not reading the 13 April proclamation), were acting as agents in connection with Arran's and the archbishops' plot in 1690-1. McQueen even journeyed to St Germain to seek help for the clans, returning in 1691. Yet by 1697 he had secured the living of Daventry in Northamptonshire, and in 1698 moved to St Mary's, Dover,
where he ministered until his death in 1733. Andrew Cant, on the other hand, remained part of Jacobite circles during William's reign. In 1693 he was imprisoned along with Calder, but because he had destroyed his papers no proceedings could be made against him. Later that year he was in London, but returned to Edinburgh; there he was one of the leading clergy in favour of the address to Anne in 1703, but his nonjurancy seems to have hardened, for ten years later he was against doing so.

The ecclesiastical patronage conferred on McQueen indicates that he abjured the Pretender, and possibly performed some service to redeem himself. However, by no means all the episcopal clergy who acted as agents or representatives were rewarded, despite recommendations. Dr Robert Scott was perhaps regarded by Archbishop Sharp as too useful as the episcopalian's agent when the Archbishop of Glasgow recommended him in 1704; certainly he was not given an English living, for which he hoped. Bernard Mackenzie also failed to be given a living by Sharp, to whom he was recommended by Breadalbane in 1696, but the Court honoured its promise of reward for his services over the oaths in 1695, by granting him an annual pension of £100 from the bishopric of Ross in 1697. Alexander Leask's work as agent was rewarded by Bishop Compton in 1696 by institution to a vicarage in Essex, where he died about 1701. Compton appears also to have favoured the episcopalian pamphleteer, Gilbert Crockatt, a former regent of St Andrews, with a living in 1694.
The two principal episcopalian agents immediately after the Revolution, Dr James Fall and Dr James Canaries, were given special consideration. Canaries and his wife, Lady Anne Erskine, received William and Mary's personal kindness in 1691, and in March 1692 the doctor was presented to St Helen's, Abingdon, in Oxfordshire. The King's intention of finding him a better living was not realised, and Canaries remained at Abingdon until his death in 1698, facing the particular difficulties of English parish life. His friend Fall was instituted as Precentor of York Minster in January 1692 after consultations between Tillotson and Sharp, and he soon became immersed in the religious and intellectual life of the archdiocese. It was with heartfelt relief that he described his post as 'a comfortable retreat to me in this storme and tempest of our countrey'.

The Churches of England and Ireland provided refuge for many Scottish episcopalian after the Revolution, on account of the sympathy felt by the bishops for their sufferings at the hands of the presbyterians. About thirty ejected or deprived clergy are known to have gone to England, and about the same number to Ireland, which represented about one-twentieth of the total strength of the establishment in 1689. Traditionally close links between the west and south-west of Scotland and Ireland help explain the predominance of clergy from
parishes in these areas who moved to Ireland. Almost without exception those who left Scotland came from south of the Forth, which suggests that they abandoned any hope of continuing to make a living in areas rapidly being taken over by the presbyterian clergy.

Although the enforced migration was sudden, the movement of Scottish clergy, to English livings at least, was established well before the Revolution. But the flow was quickened after 1689 not only by the deprived clergy, but also by young men either in orders or hopeful of receiving them, who sought English preferment.

Henry Compton, Bishop of London, was one of the Scots' most constant patrons. In addition to aiding them at Court and in facilitating charity collections in his diocese, he appears to have placed a considerable number of them in livings. Of clergy removed at the Revolution only a few can be identified positively, but Compton's register of preferments contains many Scottish names, especially in the 1690s. Some, such as Francis Fordyce and Alexander Burgess, were perhaps in possession at the Revolution, while others were put in orders after it. Compton's pastoral oversight of the American colonies also proved a fruitful source of preferment for Scots, through the sympathetic zeal of his Commissary in Virginia, James Blair. So many Scots were ministering and teaching in Virginia by 1697 that Blair, himself a Scot, was accused of favouritism. He, and the quality of the Scots whom he chose for parishes and schools, were defended by Compton, who believed it was a useful charity that they
were appointed there, considering 'the circumstances of these poor men in their own Countrey'. Archbishop Tenison's comment illustrates his sympathetic attitude to the episcopalian:

'We know there are some of the best men of that Countrey that are not permitted access to the Ministry in their own Countrey'. 217

Scotsmen were also among the missionaries sent by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts to other American colonies and some Caribbean islands. 218

Clergy also found livings in other dioceses. James Williamson, deposed from Kirkcaldy, was settled in Kent, apparently fleeing a Scottish Privy Council warrant for his arrest. 219 Archbishop Sharp placed clergy such as Alexander Dunlop and James Gordon, sons respectively of the ministers of Skene and Banchory Devenick, in neighbouring Yorkshire parishes. 220 Clergy also received orders from Sharp, and he showed fatherly concern for their subsequent welfare. 221 The diocese of Durham received a particularly high concentration of dispossessed clergy, some of whom did not move far to take up their new livings. James Gladstaines, deprived of Yetholm, in Kelso presbytery, became a curate at Alnwick, where another Border cleric, John Langlands, also went early in Anne's reign. 222 The curacy of Holy Island was served between 1695 and 1711 by two deposed episcopalian. 223 Several other cases of refugee episcopalian are recorded. 224
The diocese of Carlisle attracted its share of them. Bishop Thomas Smith, and especially Bishop William Nicolson, who succeeded him in 1702, were patrons of Scottish episcopalian. In their episcopal registers, more so than in Compton's, the Scots are not readily distinguishable in every case (as English clergy often had common Border names) though most had degrees, unlike their southern brethren. Some were ordained on behalf of the Bishop of Durham.225 A few are identifiable as dispossessed ministers, and others as their relations226 or those recommended to Nicolson for ordination. He did not always accede to such requests, as he showed when he refused to ordain Mathias, the son of Andrew Symson the Edinburgh bookseller, whom he knew, until he was of sufficient age.227 Generally, however, he looked on the Scots kindly, and being aware of the superior academic attainments of many,228 was keen to patronise them.

This engendered the same type of nationalist hostility which was shown against Commissary Blair. The rector of Penrith complained to Archbishop Sharp that Nicolson encouraged Scots, and men educated in Scottish universities, 'with a visible Partiality', and that the Scots clergy could not or did not practise 'any Exact Conformity to Rubrick or Canon'.229 Scots who moved to England certainly had to adjust themselves to unfamiliar ritual and liturgy, and also to overcome the differences of language and accent. However, there is little evidence to show that such difficulties were serious, or that they
caused a stop to the ordination and employment of Scottish episcopalian. On the contrary, those who left Scotland seem generally to have been successful in obtaining ecclesiastical preferment. The attraction of more lucrative employment outwith Scotland was especially strong after the 1715 Rebellion, when the Scottish bishops noted that several clergy

'[after they were Diaconate and Presbyterate did abruptly run away out of this Nation].

The solution adopted was to impose a formula on ordinands, obliging them to receive a licence from two bishops before leaving Scotland.

Overall, the English bishops did much to alleviate the material hardships suffered by the dispossessed bishops and clergy and their families by aiding charity collections. In addition, the ecclesiastical patronage offered by the most eminent sympathisers, such as Compton, Sharp and Nicolson, to those who were prepared to acknowledge the civil government, supplied the needs of a considerable minority of the deprived parish clergy, and provided opportunities for many other episcopalian in the decades after 1689. At the level of ecclesiastical politics, the bishops' successes in the early 1690s in putting pressure on William to produce a settlement favourable not only to the Scottish episcopalian, but also to the Church of England, had not been furthered at Anne's accession by the hoped-for statutory relief for the clergy. Later events, however, provided the Tory church
interest, which was always hostile to the presbyterian establishment, with the opportunity to express their religious and political sympathies with their brethren in the north.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE KIRK IN DANGER

The vulnerability of the episcopalian to government action, even during a period when they enjoyed the support of the Church of England as described above, was shown in 1706. Following a representation of the Kirk's grievances, a Council proclamation was issued on 20 March, which prohibited all persons who did not have authority from the Church from ministering, and forbade bishops to grant licences.

Consequently the ministers of meeting-houses in Perth, Dundee, Montrose, and St Ninians were summoned before the Council. Shortly after, the meeting-houses at Elgin and Moray were ordered to be closed by the Sheriff. A meeting-house at St Andrews had already been closed. Particular resentment was caused among the episcopalian because the ministers at St Andrews, one of those at Elgin, and probably also the minister at Keith, were qualified in terms of the law. Rose declared that it was clear 'by this equal dealing with qualified and unqualified persons that the matter is not founded (as was hitherto pretended) upon non compliance with the law but that there is a plain design to root out and destroy in this nation the Episcopall interest.'

"In practice the authorities found it difficult to silence the clergy in the north," but the Council's action was a severe blow despite the episcopalian's attempts to turn it to advantage.
Rose hoped that Compton and Sharp might be able to interpose for them, and advised that a treatment of the episode in print should notice 'that at Elgin the people there made use of the English Liturgie'. This was to become a main plank in the episcopalian's argument for a toleration. Elgin was among the first of the public congregations to adopt the English liturgy after Anne's accession, and had attempted unsuccessfully to justify to the Privy Council its call to an episcopal minister in 1703. By 1706 increasing use of the prayer-book was evident. In Edinburgh, it can be traced from the Restoration practice of private use in noble households, through its good reception in private services held by Dr Alexander Monro and others in 1689-90, to its more open use in meeting-houses by 1699, witnessed by William Nicolson. In 1704, three congregations were using the English prayer-book, in addition to many in the north, which prompted a group of visiting English clergy to donate 1,000 copies for Bishop Rose to distribute to those who could not afford to buy them. At Oxford there was talk in 1705 of sending books, and a High Church London cloth merchant, William Bishop, was collecting money for books with Rose's blessing. This anticipated the larger project of 1711. In April 1707 Rose reported that he had despatched consignments of prayer-books to Aberdeen, Moray, St Andrews and elsewhere, and declared his willingness to advance and encourage 'that pious work.'
The adoption of liturgical worship thus ante-dated the Union, rather than following it, but if it was intended to gain overwhelming English support for the episcopalian at the time of the Union negotiations, it failed. A range of proposals for the re-settlement of the Church was aired in print, including the full restoration of episcopacy, and schemes for a comprehension which could accommodate the opposed polities of episcopalian England and presbyterian Scotland. As one of the commissioners in 1702, Archbishop Sharp had privately proposed the restoration of episcopacy, but in the second series of negotiations such an inflammatory notion was ruled out by the need to pacify presbyterian hostility to the Union. This was largely effected by the Act for securing the protestant religion and presbyterian church government, which was declared an integral part of the Treaty. English Tories such as Nottingham made obligatory objections to the surrender of episcopal church principles in accepting a treaty which provided that the worship, discipline and government of the Church of Scotland should remain unaltered in perpetuity. Neither English Tory opposition, nor the Scottish opposition, headed by the Jacobites, was strong enough to prevent the enactment of the Treaty. The episcopal clergy seem to have remained silent during the negotiations. They no doubt saw hope for themselves in a closer relation with England, while the nonjurors were presumably unwilling to expose themselves to legal measures by openly supporting Jacobite opposition.
In the period following the Union, both the complying and the nonjuring clergy attempted to exploit their well-established relationship with the English Church in order to regain the ground lost by the legal consolidation of the presbyterian establishment written into the Act of Union and the Act for the Security of the Church. Their efforts to gain some form of toleration during the negotiations had failed and it has been argued that as a result of sharing 'the discredit of the defeated opposition' they were forced to renew their eloquent appeals for English sympathy. At the same time that they were soliciting with some success for charity in England, many of the clergy were continuing the war of ecclesiastical attrition which was marked by their stubborn resistance to the Kirk's application of ecclesiastical and civil authority in its attempts to settle the parishes. Although most of the clergy's sympathies were Jacobite, many evinced loyalty to Queen Anne without expressly abjuring the Pretender's claim. Such was the success of the presbyterian and Whig characterisation of the episcopali ans as Jacobites, however, that their reiterated pleas of persecution were not necessarily credited at Court, even by the Queen. The prevailing government shared the Kirk's belief that complaints of injustice at the hands of civil and church courts were vitiated by the complainers' non-compliance with authority, and that even those who
prayed for Queen Anne were crypto-Jacobites.

The legal actions of which the episcopalian complaine were partly a continuation of the settlement of the parishes but also came about in response to the episcopalian increased use of the Book of Common Prayer in the years following the Union. In devotional terms the wider adoption of liturgical worship was of great significance for the episcopalian, but it also provoked such marked presbyterian reaction that its use became one of the most bitterly argued issues between the two parties in the years 1702-1715. The substance of the Kirk's objections to the prayer-book was set out in its Act of 1707. This asserted that liturgical worship was an innovation unwarranted by Scripture, and which therefore had no place in the Church's worship as set forth in the Confession of Faith. It was used by disaffected persons, was a violation of the purity and uniformity of worship and 'tended to the fomenting of schism and division'. The General Assembly discharged all such innovations, enjoining its commission to 'use all proper means by applying to the government or otherwise, for suppressing and removing all such innovations'. Ministers were encouraged to speak out against the liturgy, and the laity to dissuade those who practised its use from doing so.\(^{13}\)

The Church's fear that liturgical innovations were 'dangerous to this Church'\(^{14}\) was realised in the apparently rapid growth in the number of meeting-
houses where the prayer-book was used, especially in Inverness, Elgin, Montrose and Aberdeen. 15

Correspondingly the period 1708–1709 saw an increase in civil and ecclesiastical measures against episcopal ministers which touched on their nonjurancy and Jacobitism but which were also aimed at suppressing their form of worship. A number of cases, culminating in James Greenshields's protracted battle with the provost and magistrates of Edinburgh, can be picked out as significant events in the process by which Tory and Jacobite support, aided by the revitalised High Church lobby, secured for the Scottish episcopalian the Toleration Act.

The threat of the French invasion in February 1708 prompted the Edinburgh magistrates to cite seventeen episcopal ministers in the city and suburbs before them on 13 March, to answer for preaching publicly since January 1706 without taking oaths of allegiance and assurance, praying for Queen Anne, or observing fasts and thanksgivings ordained by authority. Their meeting houses were closed and they were discharged from exercising any part of the ministerial function again. Five resumed their ministering and after being brought to the bar, were gaoled on 17 July 1708. 16 A further three were gaoled in October. It was claimed in a memorial that several prayed continually for Her Majesty and had given repeated proofs of zeal for her government by signing a loyal address, swearing the allegiance and signing the assurance. Moreover,
it was alleged, there was no express law against meeting-houses, nor could a minister be legally obliged to give it under his hand not to preach or exercise his ministry in the place where he lived. This had been done, according to another partisan account, in the case of four episcopal clergy who were gaol in Edinburgh Tolbooth for refusing to sign an obligation never to preach again in the city, despite all along praying for the Queen publicly in their meeting-houses. To reinforce the impression that they were loyal subjects, it was pointed out that they were 'visited in the prisson by great numbers of the best sort of people there'.

It was presumably in response to a letter from Bishop Rose describing the alleged persecution of these ministers that Archbishop Sharp wrote to the Queen on 10 August 1708, enclosing a transcript of Rose's account and leaving it to her 'wisdom and goodness' to decide what orders to give with relation to this affair of the distressed clergy. Sharp acted again on their behalf while at Court during the winter of 1708-9. As a result of the Queen asking pointedly why the Lord Advocate, Sir James Steuart, advised measures against the clergy which were felt to be wrong, the Archbishop undertook to concert with the Earl of Mar to issue a letter under the signet to oblige Steuart to suspend the prosecution of 'the late orders' until further direction was given. Heavy-handed measures by the Advocate were noted in the 'Memoriall
concerning the persecution' which probably reached Sharp at about this date. It alleged he had overstretched his authority by ignoring a suspension granted by the Court of Session of the Sheriff of Lothian's decreet shutting a meeting-house in Leith, and by preventing similar bills of suspension passing the Court; the memorialist suggested that if the Queen knew of these outrages she would order them to be stopped. Although Steuart's zeal was to have been curbed it appears that by February 1709 he had issued a 'circular letter for shutting up all the episcopal meeting houses' in which he claimed to have the Queen's written order. The Queen denied this to Sharp, who then pressed her to order a stop to the persecution.

The Archbishop was evidently the principal channel through whom the nonjurors put their case in the winter of 1708-9, but other lay sympathisers were also approached. It was to have 'the oppressions and severities which we presently suffer' represented 'unto those that have Interest with the Queen, or who are in any Capacity to befriend us, either in parliament or otherways', that six ministers (including three of those discharged from ministering in March) approached John Mackenzie of Delvine in December 1708 on the eve of his departure for the court in London. They requested him that, having 'observed the more secrete Springs against us', he would advise them how to move for their own 'Relief'.

19
'Tis probable you may penetrate into the Reasons of State, which move the Queen and her Ministers to abandon so many of our order, who Love, honour, and pray for her Majestys person and Government, to the rage of those, who under the direction and Influence of her Majestys Advocate, are taking effectual methods to Ruine and extirpate us... Sir The distressed Clergie expect you'll try the source of this persecution and earnestly entreat your account thereof.'

It is not known what effect this personal plea to the Clerk of the Session had, but it is clear disquiet was being felt elsewhere at this date about action being taken against the clergy. The Presbytery of Aberdeen had taken steps to deprive James Gordon, minister of Banchory Devenick, of his episcopally-ordained assistant, Robert Jamieson, by prohibiting him from further ministering on the grounds that he held a licence from an exauctoritate bishop, did not pray for the Queen and was not qualified by law. Jamieson's procurator claimed before the presbytery that he was 'canonically ordained by those who had power to confer holy orders, and never prohibit by any law' to minister in the parish, and proved that he had prayed for the Queen and sworn the allegiance and assurance. In support of Jamieson's appeal to the Privy Council, Gordon wrote to the Earl of Cromartie, Lord Justice General, craving protection from 'that turbulent presbytery' and that a stop should be put to such actions. The presbytery, knowing that Jamieson's assistance in the parish was essential because of Gordon's advanced years, threatened the old
man with a visitation of his parish if he kept Jamieson on. Faced with two choices, both of which would very likely result in both himself and his assistant being deposed, Gordon requested his son James (then Rector of Hawnby in Yorkshire) to give an account of the presbytery's action to Dr. James Fall, who, as Archdeacon of Cleveland, knew him well.

Accordingly the younger Gordon wrote to Fall at London on 11 January 1709:

>'and beg'd of him to apply to the A[rch]B[ishop] of Y[ork] the D[uke] of Queens B[erry] or any other to interpose with her Majestie to procure a stop to be put to such proceedings . . . .' 22

Fall 'gave no encouragement at all to medle against the Pr[esbytery]' but meanwhile James Gordon elder had joined with his brethren in the diocese of Aberdeen who were qualified by law in an address to the Queen. The thirty-three signatories also empowered two of their number to give a commission to James Gordon younger

>'as their Representative to Carry it up with their Grievances, with some Letters to some of the Nobility and Bishops to be good Instruments with her majesty to procure protection against presb[yterian] judicatures.' 23

Gordon met with discouragement in London where he arrived on 23 March. The imminent sitting-down of the General Assembly, he was told, meant that the Queen would not receive an address until it was over or nearly so.

Archbishop Sharp was suffering from gout, and the Duke of Queensberry, on whom Gordon's hopes were pinned as
Secretary for Scotland and Dr. Fall's former pupil, displayed marked reluctance to procure the desired audience with the Queen. On 19 May, frustrated by the Duke's prevarication, Gordon persuaded Bishop Compton to present the address and grievances when the Queen would allow it. 'Being thus sure of a fitt hand where I should lodge it', he threatened Queensberry that he would 'leave it at the broad side' unless he dispatched his business that day or the next. On 25 May the Duke introduced him to the Queen's closet where he read and submitted the address and received 'a gracious answer'.

The Queen issued an indemnity at this date, which dampened some of the effects of the Northern Circuit Court's sentences against the clergy in May. Gideon Guthrie, indicted for intruding in Fetteresso parish, not qualifying by law and being disaffected to the government of church and state, was ordered to remove, but the judges instructed the Sheriff subsequently not to implement their sentence. He had been found not guilty of intrusion, on his plea that he preached in his own house and possessed the manse and glebe by virtue of a tack. 'For qualifications I told them I was in no post that required them'. He was, however, proved to have baptised and married persons and it was on this that the Justices based their sentence. Both he and William Dunbar, intruder at Cruden, who were the only two convicted by the Northern Circuit, appealed to the House of Lords; no more is heard of this, nor does
Guthrie record the fact in his autobiography. None of the thirty-three addressers from the Diocese of Aberdeen were proceeded against in May, although some of them were referred to the next circuit in October, according to James Gordon younger. However, according to Gideon Guthrie, the harshness of the Circuit resulted in further concerted action by the clergy.

'So it was unanimously condescended by all the North Country Clergy who were then present that first there should be a delegation drawn and signed by them all to me to go to Perth, where the Justices were next to sit, and confer with the Clergy of that district that they might concur with them in sending me to Court, where, by the assistance of some friends there, I might represent the case of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland.'

In Perth on 20-21 May he found the clergy who had been summoned in as panels, along with several of their lay patrons and hearers. The Queen's indemnity 'which came out exactly at that time' was cited by the Justices as their reason for remitting their causes to the next circuit, but Guthrie recorded that

'the Angus, Fife, and Perth Noblemen and gentlemen made such a brisk and warm appearance for their Clergy, and addressed the Judges so daringly and concernedly, that the Judges did not think it convenient to meddle with them any farther than to take them obliged to answer at the next Circuit.'

The royal indemnity seems to have cut short the projected commission to Guthrie to go to court, as he remained in Fetteresso, but in late June James Gordon senior and some other clergy requested Gordon younger to give advice and instructions as to whether a general address for toleration would be successful. Gordon
dutifully wrote to Dr Fall, who informed Archbishop Sharp of the design. Soon, however, the more pressing problem of the impending Circuit stimulated a lobby which demonstrated that even if the episcopalian were struggling under presbyterian oppression they could still muster powerful support. On 7 September 1709 Gordon younger requested James Chalmers, who had been episcopal agent in London since 1701, to endeavour to divert the danger of the Circuit, and asked Fall to request Sharp to send letters to London to the same effect. One week later, in response to Gordon's personal request that Sharp would desire Queensberry 'to use his endeavours to divert the danger the clergy at Aberdeen were like to fall in from the ensuing Circuit', the archbishop agreed to sign a letter which Fall and Gordon drew up on 14 September. As a result, Gordon learned on 13 October from Robert Jamieson,

> 'they at Aberdeen were assured none of the Episcopal Clergy would meet with trouble from the Circuit all their names who had been put into the Rolls being scor'd out by some secret influence from Court.'

Although the Duke of Queensberry was to have been this influence, it is unclear whether he or Sharp actually performed the favour. It was to the Archbishop that Gordon wrote on behalf of the Aberdeen clergy to give him

> 'their humble & hearty thanks for your great favour & goodness in interposing so seasonably & successfully in their behalf, of which they are exceedingly sensible,'
These episodes illustrate the severe difficulties facing the presbyterians in attempting to silence the episcopal clergy. From the case of the clergy in the Mearns and Aberdeenshire, among whom the Book of Common Prayer was beginning to find wider favour, and whose lay supporters were prepared to express resentment of anti-episcopalian legal action, it is clear that the presbyterians were to some extent justified in seeing the liturgy as the badge of disaffection. The difficulties experienced by the Edinburgh magistrates in 1708 serve to underline the fact that even close to the centre of executive power the juring and nonjuring episcopaliains proved remarkably elusive. The number of meeting-houses in the city remained fairly constant throughout this period. In September 1705 an English visitor to Edinburgh was informed 'there are about 15 Episcopall meetings very much frequented',33 and at least seventeen ministers were active in March 1708. When recalling his visit to the city in April-May 1709, the nonconformist divine Edmund Calamy believed he had been told there were eleven meeting-houses, a figure which roughly corresponds to the thirteen referred to in a presbyterian pamphlet of early 1710. Calamy's information came from 'a grave and elderly' episcopal minister called Moncrief, with whom he had a discussion concerning his own and his brethren's attitudes to nominal prayers for the Queen. Moncrief claimed
to pray for the Queen and implied that none of the others, including his own brother, prayed for her, an assertion which contradicts the claims of some of the ministers cited before the Magistrates in March 1708, but which confirms the presbyterian view that the general prayers for the Royal Family were screens for private intentions for the exiled Stewarts.

Of great interest in the context of the presbyterians' measures against the episcopalian's remarks that the established clergy were 'very friendly and brotherly' towards him, and that he had no complaint against the city, 'for that the magistrates and the common people carried it with great respect to him upon all occasions.' Such respect was probably based on shared doctrinal and moral beliefs which transcended differences over ecclesiastical polity, and made possible the connivance at episcopal meeting-houses where no overt religious or political offence was offered. The increasing adoption of liturgical worship altered this state of affairs and, whether according to a Jacobite plan or not, provoked a strong reaction from the Kirk. In 1709 there were so many nonjurors using the liturgy that the Presbytery of Edinburgh reported the situation to the Commission of the Assembly, which had already received similar reports from other presbyteries. On 5 August 1709 the Commission issued its 'Act Against Innovations in the Worship of God' which was a
modified version of the 1707 act. It stated baldly that the acts enshrining the purity and uniformity of worship 'are manifestly violated by Persons of known Disaffection to the present Establishment in Church and State.' Liturgical worship was thus a relatively recent, though very emotive, addition to the endemic problems of illegal marrying and baptising, and because all three activities undermined the presbyterians' authority over ministerial acts their practitioners were treated with especial rigour.

Two such episcopal ministers appeared before the presbytery of Edinburgh on 7 September 1709. One was Mr John Barclay, the deprived minister of Cockburnspath, who had been a thorn in the presbyterians' flesh since at least 1705, and had suffered imprisonment in the Tolbooth in 1705-1707 as a result of celebrating irregular marriages. The presbytery heard that he had been charged before with gross irregularities, marrying clandestinely and giving false testimonials, and referred his case to a committee. The other minister was Mr James Greenshields, whose activities the presbytery had considered some days previously when they were informed

'that of late one Mr James Greenshields a stranger reported to be come from Ireland pretending to be a Minister hath without the authority of any Judicatory presumed to Exercise the office of the Holy Ministry publickly on the Lords day and conveens people for hearing him.'

They cited him to comppear on 7 September, which he duly did, at the same time producing his letters of orders,
letters of cure and testimonials. On being asked to explain on what authority he ministered, he dictated a prepared declinature of their authority over him. This was a familiar episcopalian tactic and the presbytery brushed it aside in customary fashion. Basing their sentence on the grounds that he declined their jurisdiction, ministered without their authority and used innovations in public worship, the presbytery discharged Greenshields from ministering within their bounds. They applied to the city magistrates for civil sanction, and accordingly on 10 September he was warned by them against preaching on pain of imprisonment. The next day Greenshields held service as usual, and consequently on 15 September was gaoled in the Edinburgh Tolbooth until he should find caution either to leave, or to desist from ministering within, the liberties of Edinburgh.

His next action was to appeal against the sentence of imprisonment to the Lords of Session, who refused his bill of suspension twice. They rested their decision mainly on the supposed invalidity of his orders at the hands of a deprived bishop. At this point Greenshields might reasonably have given in and obtained his release by complying with one or other of the magistrates' terms. Instead he appealed to the House of Lords, where his petition and appeal were first heard on 13 February 1710, and, after deferral to the following parliament, heard in full on 1 March 1711. The Lords' decision was to overthrow the sentences both of the magistrates of Edinburgh and of the Lords of
Session, and to make the respondents in the case, the magistrates, pay costs. It was the first appeal successfully lodged by the episcopalian, though several had previously made attempts to do so. 43

The outcome of the case was staggering in its implications, because it undermined the Kirk's ascendancy over the disestablished episcopal communion and necessitated clarification of the law, which took the form of toleration in 1712. By contrast, James Greenshields's defiance of the presbytery in 1709 appears an unremarkable and unpromising origin for such a significant chain of events. His arguments were not for the most part new, nor was his stubbornness in the face of the presbytery unprecedented, and it is therefore in other aspects of the case that clues as to his surprising importance must be found. On the one hand the Kirk's growing hostility to the episcopalian's liturgical pretensions outlined above, goes far to explain the swiftness and vehemence of the presbytery's reaction. On the other hand, these pretensions both precipitated the Greenshields conflict and were furthered by it, to the extent that the entire episode reveals strikingly the methods and motives not only of Greenshields himself but also those of the other episcopalian interests which were involved.

Until a few months before his imprisonment Greenshields had been, in Defoe's phrase, 'a poor curate of 15 lib. a Year', 44 of Tynan in the arch-
diocese of Armagh. He was a Scot, born near Edinburgh, the son of Luke Greenshields, a minister, and Elizabeth Hamilton, a relation of the Earl of Panmure. He attended the universities of Edinburgh and of Glasgow, where he graduated M.A. in 1687. After the Revolution, during which his father lost his living of Ardrossan, the young Greenshields was ordained presbyter in 1694 by James Ramsay, the deprived Bishop of Ross, taking, it was later asserted, 'the oath to the same King for whom the Bishop professed to suffer'. Because his prospects of earning a living in Scotland were poor he immediately crossed to Ireland and took up a curacy in the diocese of Down and Connor, which he held until his appointment to Tynan in 1697. In January 1709 he was granted leave by the Archbishop to leave his cure for three months, and in February he returned to Scotland, 'chiefly in order to make some interest with my Relations here to procure Recommendations to our Lord Lieutenant the Earl of Wharton' presumably for ecclesiastical preferment in Ireland.

During his absence the Rector of Tynan died and was succeeded by a nephew who intended to reside in the parish. Abruptly finding himself without his curacy, Greenshields chose to remain in Edinburgh in order to support his wife and family (who later joined him there) by holding services by the Book of Common Prayer. In a subsequent account of his motives for starting his services he told the Bishop of London that
it pitied me to see the miserable state this once flourishing Church was reduced too by the Indefatigable industry of the presbyterians on the one hand, & the passiveness of the Episcopal party on the other hand . . . and seeing a great many of her Majesties Servants in this City from South Brittn that could not hav the exercise of their Religion in this place, there being no meeting House in Town that keeps the English Service that prays for the Queen, which made me at the desire of some of them set up the English Service in a House that I have taken for my family. . . .

The presbyterians did not publicly accept that Greenshields's principal reason for commencing English services was, in addition to earning his bread, a warm concern for the spiritual deprivations of English civil servants in Edinburgh. They argued that he was a tool of the Jacobite party and was deliberately employed to use the liturgy in order to provoke a prosecution, which would in turn give ground for the government's enemies to plead for a toleration. One partisan told Carstares that

'it is not a matter of conscience in itself with these who peruse it, and that they are known to be disaffected to the present constitution of the state'.

Daniel Defoe's hostile account, based on his observations as Harley's agent, stated that Greenshields came to Edinburgh

'to mend his Commons; and having taken the Oaths, he falls in with this Party, who finding him a Person of prostituted Morals, a large Stock in the Face, and ready, if well-paid, to do their Work, they promise him Fourscore Pounds a Year, and accordingly begin a Subscription for it.'
Although Defoe's comments were a succinct expression of the presbyterians' attempt to discredit Greenshields's cause by calling into question his moral integrity and his political allegiance, the vehemence of much of the printed polemic aimed against him was not matched by substantial evidence of the nature of his links with, or unintentional services to, the Jacobites.

One pamphlet declared:

'It can be proved he has spoke in Defence of the Pretender's Right, by running down the Abjuration of him: And when question'd for it by some Gentlemen, who ask'd him how he could reconcile that Practice with his taking the Oaths to the Government in Ireland, and the Abjuration of the Pretender; he answer'd with a Levity peculiar to Men of his Kidney, That that was on one side the Water, but this on another.'

In the light of the oath which he probably took at his ordination it is clear that his conscience was pliant in one direction or another, but it is notable that throughout the episode no accusation of Jacobitism more substantial than this was made. He was palpably a sincere episcopalian, and a telling indication of his beliefs is that while still a divinity student at Glasgow in January 1689 he had been among those who helped the Provost disperse a presbyterian mob which was harassing Alexander George, the minister of the Barony kirk. However, even supposing Greenshields to have been a sincere exponent of the English Liturgy, the allegations that he was a tool of the Jacobites make it worthwhile examining the nature of his congregation, his links with other episcopalian in Edinburgh and the
development of events in 1709, in order to gauge the purpose and effect of his ministry.

If his claim that 'the English under the same Circumstance as myself . . . almost all joyn with me' can be accepted as accurate, he must have been preaching and reading prayers to members of the Customs, Excise and Exchequer departments which had been established in Scotland at the Union. Each was staffed in this period by English officials, and although reductions of the English complement occurred by the departure of officers once native Scots had been trained up, many remained behind, particularly in the Exchequer office. Given Greenshields's stress on the approbation which these civil servants had shown him, it is not surprising to find one presbyterian source emphatically contradicting him by asserting that

', . . the English Barons of the Exchequer, ' and Commissioners of Excise and Customs, deny they gave him any Invitation, and forbade their servants and inferior Officers to own him, and none of them express any doubt concerning the validity of the publick Administration there; so that most if not all of them go to Church, and carry very respectfully to the publick Ministers as they do to them.'

The disapproval of Greenshields by the ministry, and particularly by the Queen, who in autumn 1709 was anxious not 'to suffer anything to be done that might give any disquiet to those of the established religion in Scotland', made it easier for presbyterian propagandists to discredit his alleged support by government officers, and in the absence of further documentary evidence it is impossible to confirm or deny their assertions.
Notwithstanding this inconclusive evidence from pamphlet accounts, other evidence weighs against the presbyterians' claim, notably Wodrow's description of those who had invited Greenshields to officiate as '... the English Managers of the Excise Customhouse officers, and such cattle.' George Lockhart of Carnwath, who shared Wodrow's nationalist contempt for these officers, referred to them as 'generally speaking, the very scum and canalia of that country'.

However, the most senior Exchequer official, Chief Baron John Smith, was a pious Anglican who helped Greenshields in the summer of 1709, and appears to have been one of his hearers. The presence of government officials in his congregation is confirmed in a letter to Greenshields of October 1711, reporting that

'Mr Blair has sett upp in your place and prays for the Queen, and is like to have a very topping Congregation by the English who were your Hearers frequenting him.'

Greenshields's own accounts of his activities and those given in sympathetic pamphlets all agree with Wodrow that his congregation included English officials, but others whom he described as 'Scottish gentlemen' or 'some other well Affected persons' also attended.

In the absence of any register which he may have kept, or other manuscript records of his meeting-house, such references and the chance recording of one name connected with him, provide the only clues as to the type of person who attended his services. The single
name is that of William Allan, a writer who gave Greenshields legal advice. It is likely, however, that other professional men, particularly those whose occupations necessitated taking the abjuration oath, and those disinclined to hear nonjuring ministers, also worshipped with Greenshields. The Dowager Countess of Lauderdale, who may have been a hearer, told Archbishop Sharp in August 1709 that Edinburgh had

'two very flourishing houses wher the service was very regularly performed and the same was attended by many Good people of Good quality and good sense.'

Almost certainly one of these was Greenshields's meeting-house, and the inference is that his claim to have had a respectable congregation seems a plausible one.

His presbyterian opponents argued that this outward respectability was a cloak for Jacobitism, and there is evidence to show that Greenshields did indeed have dealings with the nonjuring party then headed by Bishop Rose. But contrary to presbyterian assertions these contacts only served to highlight the different political stances adopted by the nonjurors and the complying episcopali ans. When Greenshields began officiating in his house in the Canongate (in which burgh Rose also lived) to his own family and 'a good company of strangers also', he did not, to the Bishop's relief, apply to him for his licence. But soon 'being (it seems) incuraged by his Auditorie to
remove himself into the citie for their greater convenience' Greenshields told Rose of this invitation to perform divine office by the English liturgy and to preach in some meeting house to be taken in the city 'and that he would doe nothing in this without me'. The bishop, 'not expecting any application to have been made by him to me & being surprised with it', prevaricated to avoid 'a positive answer' by requesting Greenshields to give him an account of whether Baron Smith and others would be his hearers, and what allowance they would give him. ⁶³

Rose was thus spared the immediate embarrassment of being asked formally to give his licence to a chapel where prayers for Queen Anne and Princess Sophia would be said. As he later told Archibald Campbell,

'whither Mr Greenshields might mistake this dilatorie answer for a licence, was diffident to obtain it, or indifferent about it, I know not but after this he went on in his business without making me any report or asking any further licence.' ⁶⁴

But the interview was to cause him concern later, when he heard that Greenshields, in appealing for English support, gave it out that he 'made no step in any affair here but by the Bishop of Edinburgh his advice.' He also affirmed that Greenshields sent written memorials to Archbishop Shart and Bishop Compton 'saying that he set up here by the Bishops privacy and allowance'. ⁶⁵ Although Greenshields in fact made no mention of Rose in his
letter to Compton of 2 August 1709, he did tell Sharp that he began officiating not only at the desire of the Scots and English gentlemen, but also 'with the advice of my Lord Bishop of Edinburgh, & others of the Clergy, who thought it might be of advantage to the Church to have one qualified who could read the service in this City as it ought to be.' Greenshields was in contact with Bishop Rose both before and after his imprisonment, describing him as 'very assistant to me in this particular, as knowing how much what I have done may conduce to the advancing the interest of our Church, seeing their persecuting me will we hope open the eyes of the Church of England'.

Nowhere, however, does Greenshields seem to have claimed Rose's sanction for his meeting-house, and his allusions to the bishop's attitude correspond to the guarded support which Rose offered him in his extant letters to Sharp, in which he refers to the 'common caus' in terms which indicate that, although he was pleased to support the wider use of the Book of Common Prayer, he was opposed to pleas for a toleration which would bind the nonjurors. Greenshields's English patron, Bishop Nicolson, writing with typical forcefulness in March 1710 of the 'gross misrepresentations' under which the prisoner lay, pinpointed the differences between him and his Scottish brethren:

"He's so far from being a Tool to the Jacobite Clergy of that part of the Kingdom, that they are visibly the most inveterate Enemies he has; as being conscious that the Opening a Door to Civil Conformity, by allowing prayers for Her Majesty and the Princess Sophia in our English forms, would break their strength."
Thus Greenshields associated with the Bishop of Edinburgh in the full knowledge of his nonjurancy, with the triple aim of persuading the nonjurors of the need for toleration, of using Rose's contacts with the Church of England to further his own case and of thereby promoting the wider cause of loyal episcopacy. The exact means by which he attempted to do so must now be examined, because it is in the detail of the sequence of events that his purpose can be discerned.

In about July 1709 Greenshields requested the Archbishop of Armagh to give an account of him to the Bishop of London, but the earliest known account from his own hand is his letter to Compton of 2 August. In it he introduced himself and his circumstance, requested the bishop's interest with the Queen to obtain a royal proclamation protecting qualified ministers in their meeting-houses, suggested means of provision for their support and accommodation and argued the case for a toleration act. He was rehearsing arguments which were already familiar to Compton through his correspondence with Bishop Rose, but the letter crucially reveals the pattern of Greenshields's activities to date and the programme of lobbying which he envisaged would result in a toleration act. Probably in the previous month he had given in a 'memorial' 'to that eminent and worthy Gentleman Lord Chief Baron Smith' concerning the possibility of providing salaries for qualified ministers from the Bishops' rents, and his hope that if the Queen
'would bestow her chappell of Hollyroodhouse, which is now going to ruin for the use of her servants here it would mightily advance the design this being the fountain of all.' The scheme held some attraction because both the Bishops' rents and Holyrood Abbey belonged to the Crown and could be given over to private Anglican worship without recourse to the civic or ecclesiastical authorities. On the other hand, leaving aside the opinion of the whig ministry, it could not have been overlooked that the refitting of the Abbey as a Chapel Royal for the Roman Catholic James VII in 1688, and the presence of the Jesuits there were the principal reasons for its being wrecked by the mob in 1688, and why it now stood as an empty shell. A report that the Abbey was to be repaired 'for the English service' appeared in June, only to provide a means for Sir David Dalrymple, the newly-appointed Lord Advocate, to impress the presbyterians by applying to Queensberry to settle the affair. But although it was reported that the Queen declared she had never given ground for it and urged a way 'to expose the falsity and absurdity of such a suggestion', Chief Baron Smith approved of the scheme enough in late July, according to Greenshields, to speak of it in his favour both to the Provost and the Advocate, and to intend to take up the matter with Bishop Compton when he left Edinburgh for court on 1 August. Greenshields, however, in reporting all this to Compton, pointed out that the presbyterians had already written to London concerning the business, and that counter representations had to be made quickly if the scheme were to succeed. Some disingenuousness can be
read into his apology that 'this sudden persecution coming
upon me has made me give Your Lordship this trouble
myself', because his actions in the preceding weeks
had provoked the presbyterians considerably. His
first meeting-house was in the Canongate, where he
officiated for a few Sundays 'to a few Gentlemen'
before quitting it for a more convenient house in the
High Street opposite the Great Church. Once there,
according to a hostile source, he was

'. . . so insolent, as to begin and
dissolve his Meeting at the very same
time, and his Hearers when they
dissolv'd stood impudently on the
other side of the Street to affront
and out-brave those who frequented the
Establish'd Worship.'

The alleged insults coincided with provocations caused by
Roman Catholics and by 'the Enthusiastical False Prophets
that came down from England', a group of French protestant
refugees who were active in Edinburgh from March to July
1709. Faced with simultaneous assaults on the
establishment, a large number of presbyterians addressed
the Commission of the Assembly against these disorders,
which resulted in the Act against Innovations in Worship
on 5 August. In anticipation of this prohibition,
action had been taken to padlock a house in Musselburgh which
had been prepared for prayer-book worship by the chaplain to
an English regiment stationed there. This prompted an
immediate complaint to London by the colonel and the incident
was publicised in August.
Meanwhile other measures aimed particularly at Greenshields had been attempted. The presbytery of Edinburgh met about the end of July and applied to the magistrates to put a stop to meeting-houses using the prayer-book, but in Greenshields's case this apparently failed because informants could not report anything exceptionable either in his doctrine or worship. In his petition to Sharp, Greenshields told how a clerk of the presbytery signified to his friend William Allan that no episcopal minister, even though a nonjuror, would be disturbed so long as he refrained from liturgical worship. This may be no more than a sly misrepresentation of the facts, to contradict presbyterian assertions that the prayer-book was tolerated and that Greenshields was the trouble-maker. Faced with Greenshields's continuing use of the prayer-book in his second meeting-house, the Edinburgh brethren threatened him that a mob could not be prevented. In about the week 10-16 July the Lord Advocate sent for him and attempted to dissuade him from continuing to officiate, warning him that he would be rabbled if he did so. Greenshields refused, 'being satisfied in his Conscience that he acted nothing contrary either to his Loyalty, or to Religion', submitted a petition to him, and promptly requested the provost's protection as he resolved to continue to officiate, only to be told that 'he design'd to give him no Trouble, but
fear'd he might meet with it'. The provost later told the Earl of Sunderland:

'We endeavoured to restrain him by all soft and easy methods but the man being poor and forward and set on by others he would set up and practice his Innovations.'

When dissuasion had failed, a petition was presented to the dean of guild representing that Greenshields had broken the terms of his lease and acted without his authority in altering the internal layout of his house to form a meeting-house 'and, by bringing in Crowds, did endanger the Falling of the House'. Using this technicality the dean issued a warrant, which was executed on 3 August, for the demolition of the desks and seats which Greenshields had installed. He had officiated for three Sundays after his interviews with the Advocate and the provost before the forcible breaking-up of his house and its closure occurred, which a hostile pamphleteer saw as:

'evident Proof of his mutinous Temper, and of his design to create a Disturbance, from which the Advice of two such eminent Persons had been enough to divert him had he been endow'd with the least Loyalty to the Queen and Government.'

While appearing to turn Greenshields's claim to be a loyal subject against him, this line of argument reflects the constant reassertion of the presbyterian status quo which characterises all the pamphlets which attempted to answer his challenge. For his part Greenshields asserted the alleged legal rights of the loyal episcopal clergy, but it is clear that even taking into account the support he received, it was his
confessional antipathy to presbytery which helped him sustain his resistance to the many pressures brought to bear on him. Certainly the letter he wrote the day before the demolition of his house implied that he was prepared to accept the unforeseeable consequences of presbyterian hostility, less for the sake of conscious martyrdom in the cause of the liturgy than to prevent the presbyterians from using defeat of him as a precedent in actions against other episcopal clergy, since the successful promotion of a toleration would depend on his impunity from the law. Thus, although he could declare to Compton on 2 August that his original reason for commencing his ministry in Edinburgh was his desire to provide English worship for expatriate English persons and sympathetic Scottish episcopalian, and to argue the case for toleration,91 he declared to Sharp on 20 September that the advancement of a toleration by opening the eyes of the nonjurors 'was realy the reason of this my Undertaking'.92 Arguably this shift in his declared aims directly reflects the increasingly harsh means used against him, but it is not inconsistent with the argument that from the beginning of his time in Edinburgh Greenshields's aim was to make his ministry a test of the Kirk's defences.

By now, in early August, unmistakeably determined to force his opponents to concede the legality of his ministry, Greenshields opened a third meeting-house in Trinity College parish with a larger congregation.93 This naturally came to the attention of the kirk session,
who on 11 August appointed three elders 'to attend the magistrates and acquaint them therewith That the foresaid Intrusion may be tymously suppressed'. Probably for the same reasons as before the magistrates took no action and for a fortnight nothing happened to prevent Greenshields's hearers from meeting. However, the reading of the Commission's act against innovations, in the city churches on 21 August, opened the way for the magistrates to lock the doors of several meeting-houses in which the prayer-book was used, and to forbid their ministers from using it in future on pain of imprisonment. Greenshields's particular case was sent up by the kirk session to the presbytery, who on 24 August considered it and duly cited him to compear before them to answer for his behaviour. During this direct confrontation of the presbytery, in which he was helped by the lawyer William Allan and other members of his congregation who accompanied him, Greenshields's provocative defiance of the established Church reached its first climax. On being told by the brethren that they regarded the protestation which he dictated and submitted to them as a declinature of their authority, 'he answered it is so and I stand to it, that yow have no Jurisdiction or authority over me in any Spirituall concern.' The magistrates' prohibition of his further ministry in accordance with the presbytery's formal application of 7 September was issued on Saturday 10 September, and that evening, it was later alleged,
he received an anonymous letter very articulately threatening violence against his person unless he left Edinburgh. This notwithstanding, he officiated the following day and on 15 September was gaoled.

Once in the Tolbooth, Greenshields lost no time in intensifying the lobbying which he had commenced several weeks before with his letter to Bishop Compton. In that letter he had presented himself as the first person who had forced the presbyterians to reveal unequivocally their prejudices against episcopacy and liturgical worship, precisely because he was not a Jacobite but an avowedly loyal subject of the Queen.

'I am the first that prayed for the Queen by it, which they have more resented than if I had not'.

He developed this theme by arguing that protection for, and ultimately toleration of, loyal episcopalian would strengthen them at the expense of the Jacobites of the same communion, by preventing the presbyterians from using political disaffection any longer as a pretext for religious persecution. The best means to combat Jacobitism was to support the qualified clergy in the use of the liturgy, and to encourage the lay episcopalian who were, he argued, superior to the presbyterians both in quality and quantity.

Now, in his first known letter from prison, dated 17 September, he restated for the benefit of the English readers at whom it was pitched, what were to become the key notes of his case: the legality of his actions, his avowed loyalty to the Crown, and the open attack on
Anglican worship which his wrongful imprisonment represented. Given his determined courting of presbyterian wrath in the preceding two months, it was now more logical for him to seek legal redress, even if that meant remaining in jail, than to secure his immediate release by giving bail not to minister in Edinburgh again, which would involve an acceptance of the fait accompli and an implicit acceptance of the justice of the presbytery's sentence. On the other hand, concern for his wife and six children who had recently crossed from Ireland, prompted him to admit that '. . . really, for my own part, it were much more for my Interest to comply than to hold out.' This explains in part the earnestness of his appeals from the Tolbooth for help. In the event, his financial worries until his departure for London a year later were partly solved by the support he received from Bishop Rose and episcopalian clergy and laity in and around Edinburgh, who afforded him

'very considerable Supplies by which not only I my self, but my Family have been enabled to subsist in this place and in some measure to fit my self for, and to prosecute my intended Journey, and for the defraying the extraordinary Charges I have been put to, by reason of the hard Usage and Treatment I have met with and the process that has been made against me far above my expectation'.

Bishop Rose's greatest contribution, however, was in using his contacts with sympathetic English churchmen to further Greenshields's cause. It may have been Rose
who suggested that Greenshields should apply to Compton for help in obtaining the protection of the Queen, which he did on 2 August. Four days later, after the breaking-up of Greenshields's meeting-house, Rose wrote to Archbishop Sharp enclosing, at the earnest desire of its author, a memorial concerning 'this harsh treatment of our poor brother', who can confidently be identified as Greenshields. This opened the way for Greenshields himself to request the Archbishop on 20 September 'to undertake the patrimony of me & my design' because

'now the whole state of the English Church in this North Brittain depends upon the event of this, for if they gett me to give over, then there is non that can expect favour, there being none so qualifyed nor what has such pretensions as I have'.

He followed this up by writing on 29 September to Dr. James Fall, who had been a fellow student with his father at Edinburgh University, and whom he himself had met while studying at Glasgow when Fall was the Principal of the University. As an intimate of the Archbishop, Fall was a useful channel through whom Greenshields could reiterate his plea for an order from the Queen to the Advocate that no qualified episcopal ministers were to be disturbed until a toleration could be procured in parliament. Not only did Greenshields request Fall 'to consult with his Grace what is fittest to be done to stop our persecution here', but also that he 'would use your interest with His Grace the Duke of Queensberry to give a true representation of it to her Majesty'. The latter request was made at 'every ones desire',
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a fact which reflects both Fall's close friendship with the Duke, and Queensberry's importance as one of the few potentially sympathetic members of the ministry. Queensberry had, albeit reluctantly, helped the clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen over their address to the Queen in May, and Sharp displayed an apparently perpetually benevolent interest in the Scottish episcopalian. It is therefore clear that Greenshields's letter to Fall was a shrewd application to a well-disposed clergyman who had the ear of one of the Scottish episcopalian's most powerful patrons, and was intimate with another potential supporter. By early October he was gratified to have Sharp's assurance 'of the utmost of his endeavours with Her Majesty in my case, and for a Toleration', and to hear that Fall assured 'me of his good offices with the Duke of Queensberry, whom He is going to visit'.

Meanwhile he was careful to exploit other channels of influence, reporting to Fall that 'a great many persons here of good note have represented my case to their friends in Court'. He requested his relation Harry Maule of Kellie 'to discourse the Earl of Seafield who is now in Town, and to recomend my case to him', and hoped to engage the Earl of Eglinton 'to befriend us' with the help of Maule's recommendation. His lobbying continued in early October with the despatch of a lengthy account of his case to William Nicolson,
Bishop of Carlisle, containing 'such circumstances as are most fitting to be considered by the English Bishops'; a fuller version was then in the press in London, and other pamphlets followed preparatory to the hearings in the House of Lords in 1710 and 1711. The approach to Nicolson was likewise well calculated to benefit Greenshields, since, owing to his residence close to the border, the bishop had a clearer idea of the Scottish ecclesiastical climate than the rest of the episcopal bench, with the possible exception of Sharp and Compton, both of whom were privier to the activities of the Scottish episcopaliens. As a low Tory, Nicolson was no friend to the nonjurors or their High Church sympathisers in England, but was equally averse to the high-fliers in the Kirk, of whose crude intolerance he received many reports in 1709. His viewpoint makes him a particularly valuable witness to the entire span of the Greenshields case. The furious outbursts from Scottish parish pulpits against the use of the English liturgy and Greenshields himself only convinced him further that a toleration such as was enjoyed by English dissenters should be created for Scotland. This commonsense argument for a reciprocal toleration was echoed in episcopalian pamphlets and was to have considerable influence in shaping English attitudes to Greenshields's appeal.

Insofar as the case was being presented as the denial of the right of worship by the Book of Common
Prayer, Greenshields and his friends by the winter of 1709 could count on the support not only of high Tory prelates such as Sharp and Compton but also a moderate Tory such as Nicolson and his Whig friend William Wake, Bishop of Lincoln. The disposition of the ministry was altogether a different matter. The Queen was determined not to disturb the Church of Scotland 'which it is her Majesty's fixed resolution to support and maintain', an attitude which may explain why Greenshields's energetic lobbying in the autumn came to nothing. The court also stonewalled an attempted address by the episcopal clergy which had been agreed at a meeting in Edinburgh in September, after Greenshields's imprisonment. Two commissioners failed successively to engage Bishop Compton, the Duke of Ormond and finally Queensberry, and were said to have returned without getting the address (which was reported to be for a toleration 'upon the foot of the English Dissenters') presented to the Queen. It was widely reported that she had thanked the magistrates of Edinburgh for their action against Greenshields.

It is clear that the prisoner did not expect to remain in the Tolbooth for long. According to Bishop Nicolson 'This Confessour (for such he takes himself to be) writes as Confidently as is possible of his being shortly released in Triumph'. A petition from the 'chief' inhabitants of Edinburgh 'in Quantity and Quality' to the Queen was being framed, setting forth the state of
religion in Edinburgh, and requesting the allocation of salaries for a number of 'well qualify'd Episcopal Divines' to carry on the work which Greenshields had successfully begun. They hoped to procure a toleration in the next session of parliament. Nicolson's scepticism proved more accurate than the optimism displayed by Greenshields and his supporters, since nothing further is heard of the address, and the passage of a toleration act lay over two years in the future. Nor does Sharp seem to have obtained any shift in the ministry's attitude when he was in London in early December. It was little wonder that the Aberdeen diocesan clergy decided to postpone their address for toleration until a peace was settled abroad and a new parliament returned at home. Meanwhile the Lords of Session had twice refused Greenshields's bills of suspension in November and December. Bishop Rose complained in November 'the tide runs violently against the interest of our church here'.

In England, however, a shift in favour of the Tory church interest was occurring with the increasing reassertion of the doctrine of passive obedience by High Church clergy and more aggressive preaching against the nonconformists and the whig ministry. Dr. Henry Sacheverell's impeachment for his scandalous and libellous sermon of 5 November 1709 backfired against his Whig prosecutors in the House of Lords, and to
their dismay his sentence was so light as to amount to
an acquittal in the eyes of the populace. His
virtual apotheosis in the spring and summer of 1710
boosted the High Church revanche, and paved the
way for the change of ministry which brought Harley
to power in August and precipitated the return of a
Tory majority to parliament in November. Renewed
confidence among Tory Anglicans was a powerful factor
in the eventual outcome of Greenshields's case, but in
March 1710 his supporters were frustrated that
Sacheverell's trial had obstructed his appeal to the
Lords. Bishop Nicolson admitted to Wake that his case
'comes before you under great Disadvantages; and as
gross misrepresentations'. Reiterating his desire for
a toleration of the liturgy, he added,

'I confess this is a nice Juncture for
the obtaining of such a distinctive piece
of Right; and I have frequently wish'd
(since Sacheverel's Matter was brought
upon the Stage) that the Claim had been
made of it in a more Seasonable minute'.

The problem in Nicolson's eyes lay not only in the
fact that the impeachment was engrossing the Lords' time, but that Whig hostility to Tory clergy would prevent a just review of Greenshields's case. Having enraged the English Whigs' Scottish allies, Greenshields would be seen as a Jacobite and therefore not likely to be well received at a time when Sacheverell was being impeached for, among other offences, attacking the religious liberties of English dissenters. Greenshields's appeal, penned in the Tolbooth on 29 December 1709, had
been read in the House on 13 February, the same day as a petition of Sacheverell, and on 16 February after a lengthy debate as to whether the case was ecclesiastical, the House ordered all relevant papers to be submitted, which was duly done on 17 March. Meanwhile Sacheverell's impeachment, having begun on 27 February, seemed about to conclude in the Whigs' favour. The submission of Greenshields's papers to the House by Lord North and Grey was therefore seen by one hostile observer as a Tory expedient 'that finding Sacheverell lost, they would stir up this in order to raise a Rebellion in Scotland'. When the papers were considered on 25 March the House ordered Greenshields's 'Petition and Appeal' to be received and the respondents (the Edinburgh magistrates) to answer on or before the first day of the next session of Parliament. Nicolson could not restrain his disgust at the way in which the light escape of the 'poor Spiritual Muckworm' Sacheverell had eclipsed Greenshields's appeal:

'Tis not now Twopence matter what becomes of the Cause of Greenshields. All the Noise that this made amongst us is drown'd with Huzza's on Dr S's Triumph'.

In Scotland, the coincidence of the cases gave rise to Greenshields's nickname, 'the Scots Sacheveral'.

Although overtaken by the doctor's trial, the lodging of Greenshields's petition was not without effect. Proceedings against at least two episcopal ministers in the Court of Session were stopped, although threats of fresh prosecutions
against them were made in June, which in the event were not implemented, allegedly because with the interposition of some peers the Lord Advocate 'allay'd the Heat of Persecuting the Episcopal Ministers'. In addition the presbytery of Aberdeen's attempts to press charges in the Justiciary Court against episcopal clergy using the liturgy within their bounds failed. The presbyterian clergy in general were under some pressure from the Earl of Sunderland to avoid 'unnecessarily asserting of their authority and privileges, which is what their enemies desire above all things they should'. Far from heeding this politic advice, the 'High Church' element in their ranks made increasingly vociferous attacks on the English liturgy. Reports of furious denunciations of it as idolatrous, superstitious and ungodly had been filtering south in growing numbers since Greenshields had made his stand the previous summer, and continued to be a staple of both private communications and published accounts until after the Toleration Act in 1712. Reports of the more excessive examples of presbyterian pulpit oratory, as Carstares and his English allies knew, were perfectly suited to alarm the Church of England and to arouse their sympathies for their co-religionists.

Amidst the Kirk's aggressive preaching against the Book of Common Prayer and the English mobs' attacks on dissenting meeting-houses, arrangements were being made to
have Greenshields released from the Tolbooth. Archbishop Sharp informed him in April that several of the Scots peers had agreed that if he gave his word to the provost and magistrates of Edinburgh not to read prayers nor preach within their jurisdiction during the dependence of the appeal, he would be released 'without either giving bond or finding baill'. Sharp's own opinion, and that of 'your friends here', that he should not scruple to make the promise, put Greenshields in a quandary which reveals the way in which during his imprisonment he depended on the Bishop of Edinburgh for advice. As he explained to Harry Maule,

'some of my friends here are for my Complying with it and others are against it, if your conveniency could allow you I would gladly conferr with you about it The Bishop is to consult with his Clergy what I shall do in it sometime tomorrow'.

Bishop Rose's conference with his clergy on 14 April 1710 reveals in turn that they implicitly trusted Sharp's judgement that if the terms on which Greenshields was offered his liberty would have wronged his cause, he and Greenshields's other friends in England would have warned him. They reasoned that because

'it is not safe either to suspect the Archbishops being imposed upon, or to act contrary to his advice, that therefore I ought to comply with it'.

The clergy were anxious that he should try to obtain the best conditions from the Magistrates, preferably, he wrote to Maule,
'a general assurance that either I will leave
the Town (as you advised) untill my cause be
decided, or that I will act as I will be
answerable to the House of Lords; The
reason that makes them unwilling I should
make an express promise is lest the
magistrates should exact the same of any
of my brethren if they should chance to
persecute them at the litigation of the
Presbytry'. 130

The prisoner seems to have made some promise to the Edinburgh
magistrates because they liberated him from gaol on 21 April
1710, but apparently without taking a bond of caution. 131

Nothing is heard of him until late August, a fact
which suggests his prudent withdrawal from the public
eye, perhaps out of Edinburgh, while he awaited, like
other ministers of both persuasions in Scotland, the
expected changes in the administration. Bishop Rose
and his circle were uncertain as to whether Sacheverell's
triumphant progress round England was the precursor to a
change. On the presbyterian side, with the talk of a
dissolution of parliament 'their apprehensions of
Favours to the Episcopals, raise their activity and
uneasiness'. 132 The advent of Harley's ministry was
soon followed by Greenshields's departure for London
at the beginning of September. Significantly he
spent almost one week with Bishop Nicolson at Rose
Castle near Carlisle, showing him 'his Narratives,
Letters &c.', and preaching before him on 17 September
1710 on the 'Beauty of the Lord in Uniformity of
prayer'. 133 Nicolson provided him with a letter of
introduction to his friend Bishop Wake couched in
terms which help explain how Greenshields's lobby in
the ensuing months drew such support from Nicolson
himself, Wake and their friends. Alluding to the apparent attempt of some Scottish Tories to elicit High Church support by portraying Greenshields as the Scottish Sacheverell, the bishop wrote:

'His case is widely different from that of a daring and seditious Incendiary, as it has industriously been represented by some of his Countrymen; who, notwithstanding their seeming good wishes to our Episcopal Church, are utter Enemies to such use of our Liturgy as may probably draw great Numbers of the Pretender's friends to join in Common prayers for Her Majesty. This is the true Cause for his having met with so much Opposition from one sort of people... In a word, I have conversed with the Gentleman for almost a week together; and I cannot find but that he's a person of great Modesty & Humility, notwithstanding the Temptations he's under of boasting; and that both the Man himself and his Cause have a just Title to our Compassion. I doubt not but you will be of the same Sentiments herein with.'

Greenshields met Wake armed not only with this warm introduction, but also a letter from Mr Richard Dongworth, the incumbent of Owersby in the diocese of Lincoln, whom Wake had permitted in October 1709 to act as chaplain to the Duchess of Buccleuch. Dongworth had been sending him reports of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland, and having made a 'personal and Intimate Acquaintance' with Greenshields from December 1709, was able to assure Wake that he had not acted

'with design to affront the Kirk, Ministers or Magistrates; or disturb the People, or the Government, but to oblige and serve great Numbers that were well affected to the Church of England'.

Dongworth reminded the bishop of the episcopal clergy's
poverty, which 'makes him come up, not so well provided
as he ought to be, for the Costly Management of his
Affair, before the Parliament', and requested Wake's
own assistance and recommendation to others on
Greenshields's behalf. Wake's diary shows that
Dongworth followed his friend to London and that
together they conferred with the bishop in preparation
for the hearing of the appeal.

The newly-elected Scottish peers and commoners
who assembled for the first session of parliament in
November 1710 were predominantly Tory and episcopalian and
most supported the Court at the outset. They included
an unprecedented total of some sixteen more or less
discreet Jacobite M.P.'s, for whom George Lockhart
of Carnwath, John Carnegie of Boysack, Sir Alexander
Areskine (the Lord Lyon), Sir Alexander Cumming of
Culter, and Mr James Murray formed an active nucleus.

The 1710 election programme has been described as
combining public promises of a toleration with resolutions
to restore the Chevalier, which were such an open secret
that it is unsurprising that the Scots presbyterians
believed toleration was a deliberate step to facilitate a
restoration. In August 1710 it was confidently speculated
that the episcopalian members of a new parliament would all
present addresses from the place where they lived or
which they represented, for a protection to the episcopal
clergy and the use of the English liturgy. This strategy,
which was conceived by April 1710, revived attempts to gather shire addresses for toleration in 1702-3.

It seems to have been put into effect that autumn, though not without preliminary difficulties in shaping the scope and form of the addresses, precisely at the time Greenshields was lobbying in preparation for his appeal.

According to Dongworth the scheme, as it stood in August, envisaged not only addresses sponsored by the Scots in parliament, but also an abundance of parochial ones 'if this Bishop and the Clergy here will allow them'. The allusion to Bishop Rose and the Edinburgh clergy indicates that a distinction was being drawn in lay or clerical circles there between what might be expected by well-affected and qualified clergy, and what by nonjurors. Although the precise nature of this distinction is not stated, the juring episcopalian s apparently hoped that, presumably as a condition of some form of indulgence, the nonjurors would be content to represent their 'Desires' and obtain the security of men of Estates and Quality in the Government' for their good behaviour. The evidence for the addresses which were sent to London is insufficient to indicate whether the nonjurors requested conditional protection along these lines, but in October 1710 Bishop Rose reported that two addresses and petitions to the Queen were coming from Orkney and Aberdeen
'praying to be allowed and protected in
the use of the English Liturgie, but non
of our Bishops so far as I know have been
advised with in that matter'. 142

Others followed, for on 11 December Greenshields reported
to Nicolson 'that some Adresses for the complyers are
comed up, and more may be had'.143 He can perhaps be
identified as the anonymous episcopalian writing from
London at about this date, who mentions the receipt of
forty-two addresses with more arriving daily, 'and
most of them are a direct reflection upon the whig
party and their prints, which vexes them exceedingly'.144

This salvo of addresses was to be followed by a
barrage of petitions, which was required by the
episcopalian lobby in parliament in order to add weight
to the claim for royal protection. They sanctioned the
distribution of a formula for such petitions which, in
supplicating the Queen's protection for her dutiful
episcopalian subjects to worship freely by the English
liturgy in private meeting-houses, presented both a
'high' belief in orthodoxy and true devotion of such
worship, and a disavowal of the presbyterian communion.
Significantly, the formula skirted the question of
oaths, but promised that

"'withall we shall take care that the
ministers to be employed to officiat
in the H[oly] Service be men of
Examplary lives, good literature
peaceable behav[io]r & well affected
to Your Ma[jesty]'s person and
Government'." 145

The members of each parish or congregation where the
English liturgy was in use, and in addition, heritors
and others who might meet for such worship in the future, were to be asked to subscribe. The maximum number of petitions were aimed at, rather than fewer ones with more subscribers, and a calculated emphasis was placed on the inclusion of the signatories' territorial designations to impress the court. While the plan for widespread petitioning arose in the context of Greenshields's impending appeal and of fresh cases demanding redress, the episcopalian lobby hoped that royal protection would

'likewise be a good skreen and fence to any of the Episcopal Clergy who are yet in churches, and will in a good measure allay the opposition many of them have hitherto met with, when it is seen what numbers, and that of the best sort are yet of their communion in this long depressed state of the Church'. 146

Little evidence survives to suggest that any petitioning of the Queen resembling the intended scope of the project was organised in practice, although, as the episcopalian agent wrote,

'it was the earnest desire of some of the greatest of our best friends in both Houses to have such petitions as soon as possible from Scotland'. 147

The difficulty, which bedevilled the attempts of the episcopalians' supporters and sympathisers to gain redress for them during the period 1710-1712 (as it had done in 1703), may have lain in the reluctance of the nonjurors to countenance a toleration enacted by parliament. The proponents of the petitions argued that they were necessary to secure both royal protection and statutory relief, which together, it was implied, would save the church.
'There are some among you and a few of their abettors here who dislike these petitions, because say they it will undoubtedly procure a Toleration in Scotland, and so divide and ruin us, as if it were not already done. This has been the darling and comon policie of some for several years past, and I shall not determine with what advantage to the Church, but others who are alike zealous for the comon charity and the interest of the church are of a quite different thought. So that the said petitions would not only ward of a blow from the Episcopal clergy in the mean time, but that also the forward humour of addressing every day here in behalf of the Church and its Apostolical doctrines of ordinances (for so are the words of most of these adresses...) may give the Court a favourable turn towards us in a parliament that suits so exactly with the present humor'. 148

An explicit appeal to the peers to enact toleration was published in January 1711, requesting them to make existing laws

'more Effectual and sacred for the future; that no Magistrate, or other person, may dare to disturb the Episcopal Ministers in the Exercise of their Pastoral Function'.

The pamphlet made the point that the Greenshields case 'is the concern of all the Clergy and Laity of the Episcopal communion in Scotland'. 149

Such arguments did not impress Bishop Rose and his circle, who pursued their own cautious tactics during 1710 and 1711, by which they hoped to control the extent to which the cases of grievances being brought to the court's notice could be used to justify a toleration. Rose's friend Bishop Sage put it succinctly to Archibald Campbell:
'No Law obliges us to be of the Presbyterian Communion, no Law forbids Meetinghouses, Nay no Law obliges those who officiate in meeting-houses to qualify. There was One, indeed, made Anno 1693 but it expired with King William and was never renewed in this Reign. All therefore that we want is an Equitable Connivance, and that we shou'd be allowed to enjoy what the Law allows us, at least till we turn insolent, and offer trouble to the Government. Let our Judges here be directed by their sovereign not to meddle with us, at least; not to stretch the Laws to make them reach us, and then we have all we can reasonably demand'.

Sage argued that this would suit the prudence of the government and be far less inflammatory to the Kirk than a formal toleration, for which he knew some might still press

'and none more readily than Mr Greenshields, and his Party may perhaps such, tho' they may see the Destructive Consequences of it, may yet continue to press it... By all means, therefore, I humbly think that party shou'd be overrul'd if possible'.

Already, however, Greenshields's lobbying was causing the nonjurors embarrassment.

His frequent insistence that he had established his meeting-house in Edinburgh with the Bishop of Edinburgh's permission seems to have necessitated the self-justificatory account of events (discussed above) which Rose penned for the use of Archibald Campbell in November. He wrote that even if he had allowed Greenshields's meeting-house this could not be used to great advantage by the jurors because it could not imply
'his being on their side or of their partie... and that nothing less can doe than a frequent practise or a formed judgement given in in favors of their principle, neither of which I am like to be untill I see a little further into that matter than hitherto I have don'.

Nonetheless, the question of the nonjurors' relationship not only with their complying brethren, but also with the Church of England, was thrust upon Rose. This perhaps occurred as the direct result of the arrival of episcopalian addresses in London about this date, but it can also be traced to the 'great & materiall' controversy current among the English nonjurors, which centred on the return to the establishment of several leading figures following the death of the nonjuror William Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich, in January 1710.152 At any rate the question was put to Rose by

'a gentleman at Oxford... whither I and the rest of our Bishops wer in communion as matters now stand with the established church of England and its bishops'.

His characteristically oblique answer that he and his brethren had not considered the issue fully, 'our circumstances among ourselves not affording such difficulties',153 can be read as a tacit admission that communion between the nonjuring and juring Scottish episcopalian had not yet been prevented by their division over civil allegiances.154 On the other hand, by refusing to admit whether or not the Scottish nonjurors objected to communion with the established Church of England on the same grounds as their English brethren, Rose begged the question to which English
sympathisers felt entitled to an answer at a time when
the lobby for a measure of relief was so strong.

Observers in Scotland held Rose's overbearing
influence since Archbishop Paterson's death in 1708
to blame for the shift from a conciliatory desire
to procure a toleration, to the present opposition to
one that was 'clogged with the Oaths'. 155 In his
appeals to Archbishop Sharp and Dr Fall in September
1709 Greenshields had tempered his gratitude for
Rose's advice and assistance with regret that the
bishop's Jacobitism prevented him from espousing
the true interest of the episcopal church in Scotland.
In autumn 1710 he reiterated this view when
recommending Eglinton and Balmerino to Bishop
Nicolson, as having this true interest, unlike the
other Scots in parliament. Nicolson noted that he

'commends the Earl of Eglinton and
Lord Balmerinoch as truly Episcopal;
but doubts the Bishop of Edinburgh
has too much influence over the
rest'. 156

At the same time it was reported that the nonjurors
have 'writ up to their friends at Court, not to move
for a Tolleration', 157 and that Patrick Dunbreck, a
nonjuror closely associated with James Gadderar, 'is
here solliciteing a Conivence for his Brethren'. 158

Rose's policy of extreme caution showed itself
in the cases of two ministers other than Greenshields
who sought redress in London that year. Alexander
Denune, the episcopal incumbent of Petty, had been deposed by Inverness presbytery for swearing and drunkenness in 1706 and had resisted subsequent attempts by the presbytery to gain his church. Denune travelled to London in March 1710 'to complain upon the hard usage he has met with from the presbyterians', but although he was qualified by law, Bishop Rose advised him against going because he believed he would not gain redress. Similar circumspection was shown in the more important case of the nonjuror George Hay, whose ministry at Aberlour was terminated in October 1710 by a sentence of banishment before the Lords of Justiciary at Aberdeen. In a typical conflict between lay episcopalian and the kirk, Hay's evident popularity as successor to the episcopal incumbent Robert Stephen, who died in 1705, had been brushed aside by the presbytery of Elgin, who regarded him as an intruder and deposed him. In order to prevent Hay from continuing to minister in the parish, in which Robert Stephen's son was settled in 1707 despite protests, criminal letters were raised against him for illegally baptising and preaching. His case became notorious because one of the judges, Lord Minto, was alleged to have blatantly compelled the jury to change its initial verdict of not guilty to guilty.
In obedience to the sentence, by which he had to leave Scotland by 1 February, Hay was in Edinburgh by early January 1711, but the prospect of his travelling to London alarmed the Bishop of Edinburgh, as he explained to Campbell:

'becaus the comming up of mor complaints may give occasion to what we ar so little fond of I have advised him and set him at work to attempt his being repaired here but I am affrayed that will scarce doe tho there be nothing to hinder it save the reflection it most needs cast upon the honour of the judges who sentenced him, but tho Mr Hay come up he'le be inteerly manageable either to give in his complaint, delay or drop it as shall be most expedient for the common interest, for he is awar of all consequences we dread, being a person who has made no step of complyance'. 162

Although Bishop Rose and his correspondents in London attempted to exploit the case later in 1711 for their own aims, as will be discussed in the next chapter, they could not prevent Hay's arrival in London from perhaps helping to convince Greenshields's patrons that this fresh example of presbyterian bigotry provided an opportune moment to move the hearing of his appeal.

On 6 February Bishop Nicolson noted

'Lord Eglinton persuaded that (after tomorrow) Mr Greenshields's Bill may be seasonably moved. Mr Dungworth of the same mind for new Reasons of fresh Banishments'. 163

In view of his close association with Greenshields throughout this period, Dongworth's opinion further demonstrates that there was some readiness on the part of Greenshields's supporters to use the circumstances of the nonjurors to
press both his cause and a toleration for all episcopalian
who would show a measure of loyalty to Queen Anne. The
wording of the proposed petition of autumn 1710 also
reflected a willingness to accommodate the nonjurors' scruples, but it was against the background of their refusal to join wholeheartedly in Greenshields's appeal that the case came to be heard.

The final phase of Greenshields's case in the session of 1710-11 perhaps proved more frustrating than both his imprisonment and the preliminary hearings of the previous session. While in the Tolbooth a network of interest in his favour had been created, which had resulted in the successful lodging of his appeal in the Lords. But now that his appeal was due to be heard, and notwithstanding both his influential friends and the Tory majority in Parliament which is generally supposed to have clinched his eventual success, party political considerations began to obstruct his pursuit of justice. Lockhart and other Scots M.P.'s thought the new parliament was 'a seasonable opportunity to push Mr Greenshields's affair and have his appeal discusst'. On the other hand, the ministry led by Harley, mindful of the need to placate not only the presbyterian interest and their Whig allies who formed the majority in the Lords but also the Scots peers attached to the court, 'at the same time did all that in them lay to have this affair put off, on the old pretence
of waiting till a more proper season'. Harley's argument for a postponement, which according to Lockhart had convinced most of the Scots peers excepting the Earl of Eglinton and Lord Balmerino, was that the pushing of the case would necessarily have bad consequences, 'as the Church party in England woud take it ill if he was not protected, and the Scots Presbyterians wou'd highly resent any favour he mett with'.

The Earl of Mar, a leading Court Tory, made this case to Harley in December 1710, stressing that if Greenshields's appeal was successful 'it will be the same as giving a toleration without any qualification or restriction, which I suppose will never be thought reasonable'. Although he believed it 'very reasonable and necessary too that there be a toleration in Scotland as here', he argued that the only way to postpone it until the next session was to persuade Greenshields to withdraw his appeal,

'and that can only be done by the Queen's speaking to Greenshields herself or ordering the Archbishop of York or some such to speak to him and Doctor [Robert] Scot whose advice he much relies on. If the Queen think fit to order some money to be given him to defray the charges he has been put to by this affair, and to order him some little living in Ireland upon his not insisting in his affair, I humbly think it will be the best way of taking it off and much better than its being determined either way'.

He also suggested that the Queen should discreetly dissuade some of the 'Scots people', which perhaps
refers to Greenshields's supporters among the Commons.

Mar's frank advocation of bribery gives credence to Bishop Nicolson's report in January 1711 that the earl's Court associate, Argyll, was offering £200 and Irish preferment to Greenshields to drop his appeal. It was also noted by the Oxford diarist, Thomas Hearne, that 'He had 700 libs offer'd by the Kirk of Scotland if he would not make such Complaints' to parliament.166 Lockhart, too, reported the opinion of an English peer who opposed the hearing of the appeal until a better moment, wishing that Greenshields 'were gratifyed with some equivalent, provided he would drop his appeal'.167 The credit for persisting was Greenshields's, but Lockhart and his four associates among the Scots M.P.'s, along with the earls of Eglinton and Balmerino,

'buoy'd up Mr Greenshields and prevaild with him to stand his ground and not yeild in an affair which might be of so much use to those of his profession'

In particular, according to Lockhart,

'the Scots Commons exerted themselves with the utmost vigour, supplyd Mr. Greenshields with money to defray the charge of his process, and encouragd him not to submitt or yeild on account of the money that was offerd and the promises of more money and preferment in case he'd drop his appeal'.168

Much of the preparatory lobbying of the Lords was carried out by the Scots members. Lockhart gave himself credit for cutting through Harley's expedient prevarications by arguing that the Scots Tories did not intend any 'bad consequences' by supporting Greenshields, and that the
presbyterians were not anyhow strong enough to give any disturbance. Harley's ministry therefore had the best possible opportunity 'to relieve the episcopal party without any apparent danger or inconvenience', and provide justice for Greenshields. The hearing of the appeal could not be construed as an act of this ministry as it had commenced under the previous administration, but it would draw support from both the clergy and laity of the Church of England.

The mobilisation of English support in the Lords was also pursued by Greenshields's allies on the episcopal bench and among the Scots peers, and perhaps also by Scottish episcopalian agents in London. Its impetus was not provided solely by the Jacobite lobby led by the Earls of Eglinton and Balmerino, and Lockhart of Carnwath. The Whig Bishop Nicolson was one of his leading English patrons, and afforded him considerable help by frequently consulting with Greenshields's other noble patrons and his own brother bishops. He discussed detailed points of the appeal with Eglinton and Balmerino, whom Greenshields had enthusiastically commended to him 'as truely Episcopal'. On 27 February, shortly before the hearing, the bishop held a meeting with Lord Somers, Lord Cowper, Bishop Wake and the Bishops of Bangor and Norwich, at which they shrewdly concerted on the treatment of the appeal, 'which is to be restrain'd to the Civil part, without touching on the Authority of
the Kirk'. 171 It is clear too, that politically disparate groups were prepared to support the common cause. At the instance of Greenshields's Tory patrons, Archbishop Sharp and the Earl of Eglinton, Nicolson agreed 'to undertake Lord Ilay in the Law-part of Mr Greenshields's Case', and spoke with Lord Halifax on the crucial question of the regularity of his appeal. 172 Nicolson's influence among the Whig peers was thus probably influential not only in marshalling support but in damping potential hostility. His friendships with Whig clerics were also useful to Greenshields, enabling an introduction to Dr Edmund Gibson, the Archbishop of Canterbury's chaplain, who was in turn to introduce him to Tenison. Nicolson had already recommended him to Tenison, arguing that his single crime was his 'perfect Conformity .. to our established Government in Church and State', and that disaffected nonjurors were still permitted to use the liturgy. 173 Meanwhile, Greenshields had obtained a recommendation from his former diocesan, the Archbishop of Armagh, and probably submitted his bland testimonial at Lambeth about this date. 174

It is likely that among the Tory prelates Sharp played an important role in mustering support for the appellant, but his role is obscure. The aging Compton seems characteristically to have lent his weight to the cause for it was reported that

'Greenshields affair has hitherto been keepd back both because that the Bishop of London who is his great friend could not come to the house, and that they waited till Argyle were gone who is his great Ennemy.' 175
Among the English peers, Greenshields's supporters included Lord Somers, Lord Ferrars and the Lord Steward, the Duke of Buckingham, who was reckoned to be his 'chief Champion'.

Another high Anglican who was approached in the lobby was the Earl of Anglesey, whose ally William Bromley, M.P. for Oxford, patronised Greenshields. Given such Tory patronage it is not surprising that the procedural niceties involved at all stages of the appeal were scrupulously observed, and that Dr Humphrey Henchman, a Tory lawyer who had acted for Sacheverell's defence, was one of three counsel for Greenshields on 1 March 1711. Although the Tories can be seen as natural promoters of a case which promised to bolster the claims of protestant episcopalianism in Britain, Greenshields received help through Nicolson's agency from quarters where he might have found it difficult to lobby successfully as a seasoned opponent of the Kirk. The expected opposition of the Whigs did not materialise and it was even suggested 'that the Lou Church in England, wer very heartily at the bottome of Greenshields affair, though they suffered the Torys to cary it on above board'.

This support appears to have been achieved at the cost of loosening himself from his potentially damaging association with the Scottish nonjurors. He told Nicolson in December 1710 that he was being 'censur'd by his friends for being too Low', which suggests that his broad-based support sullied the image of the Scottish Sacheverell which was expected of him by Tory
and High Church partisans. Moreover, the aims and tactics of Greenshields's party were by late 1710 distinct from those of his nonjuring brethren, so that a cooling of relations can be observed. In January 1711 Rose received from Campbell some unspecified news of Greenshields, which he claimed he had expected 'tho I must say I and others ar badly requitted considering the kindness we have shown and how usefull we have been unto him'. 181

The difficulties between members of the episcopalian lobby which centred round Greenshields's political stance and the vexed question of a toleration bill may have added to the court's obstructiveness in delaying the hearing of the appeal. Eglinton was persuaded of its seasonableness on 6 February but it was Lord North and Grey who finally moved its introduction unopposed on 19 February. 183 Lockhart and his associates performed an organised and comprehensive lobby of the Upper House before the hearing. Each member 'was assigned a certain number of English Lords on whom they waited and gave a true and clear representation of the case, which had so much weight and produc'd such good effects, that the underhand dealings of the Ministry were intirely baffled'. 184

The vote in the House on 1 March was unanimously for the reversal of the sentence of the magistrates. As Nicolson recorded,

'the Cry was so loud for Reversing (20 Bishops present & Concurring) that the Curate prevail'd against the Ld Provost & Magistrates of the good town of Edinburgh, who were undeniably in the wrong'. 185
In establishing that an episcopal congregation could exist without legal hindrance, provided the cleric qualified himself, Greenshields’s case ruptured the ecclesiastical status quo in Scotland and helped to precipitate the episcopalian revanche which took the form of the Toleration Act, the restoration of patronage and the increased adoption of the Book of Common Prayer. Before discussing these it is necessary to examine the legal basis on which Greenshields mounted his challenge to the establishment, not only because it further revealed his motivation and support in seeking redress, but more importantly because it undermined the statutory supports of the revolution church. Greenshields’s significance lay in his exploitation of his circumstances to demonstrate as a legal fiction the Kirk’s assumption that it was defended by a comprehensive set of laws which allowed only narrowly-defined opportunities for episcopalian conformists to participate in it, and no opportunities at all for any minister to function legally outwith the Kirk.186

If the arguments derived from this assumption had been upheld in the Lords, the appeal would have foundered in the face of the acts of 1689, 1690, 1693, 1695 and 1707 which, it was believed, provided a solid buttress against all episcopalian attacks. In the event the Lords accepted the appellants' argument, which derived from the diametrically opposed
supposition that the established church's authority, expressed in these laws, extended only to those of the presbyterian communion. Greenshields argued simply that his ministering, which consisted of the private use of the Book of Common Prayer, was not prohibited by the acts establishing and ratifying uniformity of worship in the established church, which were 'no ways inconsistent with another form of Worship, being used by others out of her Communion'. There was no law, he argued, obliging the laity to be of the communion of the Church of Scotland, nor prohibiting ministers of the communion of the Church of England from ministering, or which gave magistrates jurisdiction to inflict penalties on such laity and clergy. Thus in the case of the 1693 Act for Setling the Quiet and Peace of the Church, the phrase 'within this Church' which was intended to signify the established Church of Scotland, and therefore to include all ministers and preachers in Scotland, was open to a different reading if the assumption was abandoned that the Church of Scotland was synonymous and co-extensive with the Church in Scotland.

It was this thinking which underlay Greenshields's confident outfacing of the Kirk and which enabled him to prove to the satisfaction of the Lords that the Edinburgh magistrates, however justified they believed themselves to be in putting the presbytery's
sentence into execution, had imprisoned him unlawfully.\textsuperscript{191}

A crucially important circumstance which enabled Greenshields to evade the Kirk's statutory reach, seems to have been that although he read prayers and probably also preached to his flock, he did not perform any baptisms or marriages. That he did not do so can be inferred from the silence of presbyterian commentators on this point, and that it was a deliberate tactic on Greenshields's part can be inferred from his own and his supporters' emphasis on his use of the liturgy, which distracted attention away from this peculiar gap in his ministry. To have baptised and married persons would have placed Greenshields along with his complying and nonjuring brethren in danger of falling within the scope of the law against baptising and marrying, and intruding into parishes.\textsuperscript{192} It is therefore a measure of Greenshields's determination not to provide a pretext for the presbyterians to invoke the civil arm, that he exercised his ministerial function in this limited fashion, and it reinforces the notion that from his early days in Edinburgh he adopted a stance which he believed, perhaps with Jacobite encouragement, would be impregnable. As he told Dr Fall, he was 'better qualifyed than any of our Church in North Brittain'.\textsuperscript{193}

The appeal procedures which Greenshields and his lawyers adopted were likewise designed to evade rather than to confront the legal defences of the Kirk. The fact that the appeal to the Lords was against the civil
sentence of the magistrates rather than the sentence of the presbytery itself, enabled the appellants to counter the respondents' claim that the appeal should have been made to a higher church court rather than to the Lords. Furthermore, the fact that the magistrates, rather than the Lords of Justiciary, had interposed their authority, meant that appeal was made to the Court of Session in the first instance and then to parliament. Events might have been different had Greenshields attempted to make an appeal from the High Court. Once the appeal was accepted after preliminary debate as to its regularity, the peers judged the presbytery's sentence in all but name, while technically only considering the magistrates' case. The issues at stake of course remained ecclesiastical, so that the Lords' decision undermined the presbytery's sentence without actually overturning it.

Although they were outmanoeuvred in the case by a combination of boldly applied argument and persistent lobbying, the presbyterians made some acute criticism of parts of Greenshields's case. It was pointed out that his letters of orders were conferred by one of the bishops who had addressed King James in November 1688. This hit at Bishop Ramsay's overt Jacobitism and Greenshields's alleged crypto-Jacobitism was close to the mark, to judge by Barclay's assertion. An attack on his episcopal orders had been mounted in the Court of Session where his bills of suspension were
refused on the grounds that an exauctorated bishop 'had no more Power to Ordain, than a deposed Colonel or Captain of Horse has to give Commissions to Subalterns'. Much capital was made by both sides on the question of the remanent episcopal powers of a deprived prelate, but the presbyterians, in making a logical distinction between the intrinsic spiritual authority conferred on a bishop and the temporal authority vested in him by the civil power, nonetheless exposed themselves as enemies of episcopal orders. Greenshields's apologists shrewdly played up the intrinsic validity of his ordination and thus avoided the embarrassing extrinsic circumstances of Bishop Ramsay's nonjurancy.

His critics were on stronger ground in exploding the claim in his declinature of the presbytery's authority, "I do believe that the Episcopal Church of Scotland is now Incorporat with the Church of England", as 'one of the most absurd Propositions that ever was utter'd by Man', designed to gain Anglican support by 'a pretended Veneration' for the Church of England's ceremonies and worship. Greenshields's claim raised many questions of the exact relationship of the dis-established Scottish episcopalian to the English establishment, particularly the degree of recognition which each could give the spiritual offices of the other. These are discussed elsewhere, but in the context of the case, however, it is significant that his claim
revealed the presbyterian loathing of set liturgical forms and their great fear that the security of the Union was to be destroyed.

Their apprehensions were to be raised even higher than they had been by the spread of liturgical worship, when a toleration for the episcopalian became a likelihood as a result of the Lords' upholding of Greenshields's appeal. Whether or not the key to its success lay with any one of the powerful lobbies which took up the case, with Greenshields's own stubborn perseverance, with the High Church resurgence or with the indefensibility of the magistrates' position, the case, like Sacheverell's in England, provided the occasion for a reappraisal of the fundamental basis for the Revolution church. Moreover, despite the disturbing implications it could have for the Scottish nonjurors, it was with evident relief that Bishop Rose wrote

'this being the first and only victorie since the revolution we have obtaind over our enimies, I pray God it may prove a prologue to a totall overthrow'.
The verdict of the House of Lords was not only regarded as a personal victory for James Greenshields and a defeat for the Kirk, but also, because of the circumstances which had elevated it to a test case, it was widely expected to effect radical changes in the episcopalian's relationship with the presbyterians. The episcopalian lobby in parliament hoped to pursue a programme of legislative reform which would include a toleration bill, while the nonjurors hoped at least for tolerance without impedimentary oaths. Inevitably the Kirk reacted strongly to the perceived breach of its security under the Union, and sought to head off further weakening by a toleration. However secular political considerations and the fluctuating pressures of ecclesiastical events, as they unfolded in the localities in the wake of the Greenshields case, served to complicate the collision of these contrary forces and to shape the resultant legislation of 1712. Toleration was therefore not simply the result of a grand debate on the merits of the episcopalian's claims set against the Kirk's. Nor was its enactment the inevitable product of a dominant Tory interest, except perhaps in the eyes of optimists and pessimists on either side.

On the episcopalian side, as Greenshields reported after a round of formal calls, the peers that 'were for us' were 'all very forward to do what further service
is in their power to serve the Church.' However, from the beginning differences occurred in the private meetings of the Scots Tories in London over the tactics to pursue their agreed general aim of relief for the episcopal clergy.

They disagreed over the implications of the case:

'some thinking that the decision is as good as a toleration, others alleging the contrary because there is an act of parliament discharging their Baptizing by which they are liable to Banishment, and so are for repealing that act.'

Balmerino believed that

'we have it in our hand to get presently a Toleration - or the act against Baptizing rescinded - or patronages restored - But our Courtiers are for no more at this time - and I am heartily of that mind.'

Many others, including Cromarty and Lockhart, wished to proceed 'at least to patronages', but it was Balmerino's attitude, 'to have patience and wait till they should see how matters was carried in Scotland', which was supported by Archbishop Sharp. Although they declared they would not 'differ from the Generality or Majority' of the clergy's friends, they prevailed over those who sought immediate action.

The Scots Tories' acceptance of the Court's policy of caution and postponement resulted in part from Mar's attempts to dissuade the group of M.P.'s led by Lockhart from introducing a toleration bill. Mar was also trying to quash a patronage bill in March, which was reported to originate from them 'in Concert' with certain members of the October Club and the Convocation.
'to bring about a Revolution in the Church of Scotland, ... they have laid down a Scheme of the graduall attacks upon its Constitution, the first of which is said to be the restoring of patronages in Scotland...' 7

Patronages were still being discussed in late March, 8 by which time extreme presbyterian reaction in Scotland and London necessitated further action by the Court. 9 Mar succeeded in blocking Lockhart's and the Lord Lyon's determination to pursue toleration by a drastic bargain. They were secretly assured that obedience to the Queen's wish for a deferral of toleration to the next session would be rewarded then with a command to her ministry to assist them 'in obtaining not only a toleration, but also the restoring of patronages.' 10

In any case, deferral of such a bill accorded with the views of the leading Scottish episcopal clergy. Bishop Rose left his London correspondents in no doubt that the nonjurors hoped for relief without legal encumbrances. Writing to Campbell on 8 March the bishop stressed 'that by all means a tolleration must be avoided & I hop our friends will take a care of it.' 11 In May he elaborated on the practical reasons for limiting the scope of any bill offered that session.

'I am of opinion (that if possible another thing can be avoided) both patronages should be restored, & the acts about baptisms rescind, even in this session of parliament, & my reason for this; if these things be left undon till a new session of parliament, then of necessitie they must be brought in then, so tis on to many but these may occasion the bringing in of som thing els with them, but if now our lay men be satisfied by the restoring of patronages, & we secured by taking of the act against baptisms & marriages, there shall be no need to mention either us or our affair in the next session of parliament, which is (as I think) the best security we can have against something.'
Even as he wrote, letters from Balmerino and Campbell announced the imminent end to the parliamentary session and therefore to the possibility of legislation. Although the bishop believed that Balmerino would 'not easily be induced' to differ from the Court by promoting any of the measures, Balmerino had in fact been willing if necessary to table a 'short and substantiall' bill to rescind the Act against irregular baptisms and marriages of 1695, but 'without any more - that is the point.' He was thus prepared to attempt at least one measure to relieve the episcopal ministers which might be enacted without introducing the vexed question of oaths, exactly as Bishop Rose desired. If congregations supplied by nonjurors like Hay, or complying clergy like Greenshields, were to have any future the freedom to baptise and marry was clearly a necessity. Consequently the episcopalian lobby in 1711-12 represented a common need for an unfettered ministry, although deep division persisted over the conditions on which the clergy would accept a statutory indulgence.

The Court's dissuasion of the Scots peers and their allies from tabling toleration in 1710-11 blocked Greenshield's principal aim in appealing to the Lords. His personal scheme of promoting the English liturgy by resuming his ministry in Edinburgh and his alternative hopes of English preferment were also frustrated. After initial encouragement he was warmly received at Oxford in May 1711, where Tory enthusiasm for his cause opened the way for the colleges' later contributions to the prayer-book project. An immediate result was that while
at Oxford some friendly nobles and others perceived that his return to Scotland 'might do good service to the Church and to her Majesty.'\textsuperscript{16} By May the Earl of Anglesey and Viscount Weymouth agreed to provide £200 sterling yearly for Greenshields to resume his ministry in Edinburgh, and a further £100 was proffered by his congregation,\textsuperscript{17} Rose deployed his customary shrewdness to head off this development which, like toleration, threatened to compromise the nonjurancy of the majority of the episcopalians. On the one hand he tried to steer Anglesey's and Weymouth's intended support for Greenshields 'towards the keeping up of the English service wher it is like to fail for want of incurgement', pointing out they had no need of him in Scotland 'and if ther was need of a Missioner he behoved to [be] a man of much more metall and merit than Mr Greens[hields].'\textsuperscript{18} On the other hand to Greenshields himself he pointed out that

\begin{quote}
'Our Magistrats would consider his comming here as on desiring to triumph and crow over them which would provock them to fall upon measures of severity toward those of the clergy here who ar not in condition to stand their ground so well as he and would readily bring upon us a new prosecution.'
\end{quote}

He argued that although he might be safe from public violence he would not be 'from insults and secret attempts' and the presbyterians' increased malice, and any settlement in a congregation 'would be but precarious and uncertain.'\textsuperscript{19}

Advice against returning also came from Archbishop Sharp, Chief Baron Smith, and his family and Edinburgh friends who warned of personal danger, but he shrugged them off:
'now after all the Hardships that I have gone through I shall be ready to spend and be spent to advance true Religion amongst my Countrymen, and to carry on my first undertaking, so that it shall not lye at my door.'

Even after Bishop Compton relayed the Queen's wish that he would not go because he 'would do her the greatest disservice that could be', Greenshields hoped that she and the Treasurer could be told of

'the true state of the affair, that unless Ministers that are qualified to the Government be encouraged all our fair prospects will be ruined, I know the policy proceeds from fears of disturbance, but if they knew them [presbyterians] as well as I do they would not be afraid of them.'

But the Queen's will prevailed and Greenshields was rewarded with her promise 'to provide for him in a living here and subsist himself and family in the meantime.'

Thus having caused Oxford so much trouble by defying the Kirk he spent the period 1711 to 1714 tied to his coat-tails as his client, intermittently desperate for payment of the royal bounty.

Despite, as he put it, 'the tedious time I have had of fruitless attendance of levees', Greenshields put his involuntary stay in London to good use, as will be described in Chapter 6.

The caution which tempered the enthusiasm of episcopalian for the outcome of Greenshields's appeal and prevented immediate action by the end of the 1710-11 session, prudently took account of the widespread and deep hostility which the case engendered in the Kirk. Many, however, believed the reversal of the Edinburgh magistrates' sentence to have broken the presbyterians' hold over them at a stroke and provided a de facto toleration for episcopal worship which they could exploit. A presbyterian commentator noted this as the prevailing attitude:
'The Party, who triumph in this Victory, are mighty willing to have it called a Victory over our Church and to Possess our People that the Sentence of the Church against Greenshields in this case, is Effectually Revers'd, That the Episcopal People have from hence a Tacite Unlimited Liberty to set up what forms of Worship, and bring in what Innovations they please, and that the Church Judicatories are hereby forbidden to meddle with them, an Article which would by the same Parity of Reason Disarm the Discipline, and Unhinge the Constitution of our Church.'

This sweeping view of the legal implications of the Lords' judgement was shared to some extent by the presbyterians, though for different reasons. According to the Earl of Ilay

"There stands at present a toleration in Scotland, decreed by a sentence, and unlimited either in point of faith, or other qualifications whatsoever;" 27

Wodrow believed the damage went deeper.

"This affair, in some respects, is worse than a Tolleration, for it is a tacite rescinding of all our laues for the security of our worship." 28

Ilay and Wodrow perceived that the danger to the Kirk lay in the interpretation, both by its members and its episcopalian enemies, of the judgement as an abrogation of the laws providing for its security, and that it was precisely because no such abrogation had been enacted that the episcopalian's efforts to obtain statutory relief would be redoubled.

The presbyterians at court and the more astute clergy in Scotland, particularly Carstares, argued that the disaffected episcopalianians would deliberately misrepresent the peers' judgement and further promote the English liturgy, in order to provoke presbyterian measures which would justify a
toleration. A pamphlet which echoed Annandale and Loudoun in enjoining moderation on the General Assembly of 1711, asserted that

"There is no Question the Party who have set Greenshields to work, and have from the beginning encouraged and supported him, would be very willing to have us take things in this Sense, because they hope it may tend to the Enraging and Exasperating some Spirits among us, who may be forward to take wrong Measures, in this case, upon such a Supposition."30

As a restatement of the classic presbyterian argument which identified all episcopalian as Jacobites this did not essentially differ from the view of Greenshield's ministry expressed in 1709 by Defoe, except that the awkward fact of the nonjurors' opposition to Greenshields and to toleration was not explained. Nevertheless, the same arguments in essence were extended to refute claims for toleration in the 1711-12 session.

It is important to stress that during the parliamentary recess no precise implications could be drawn from the Lords' decision over Greenshields, despite the extreme views advanced by either side. Defoe noted that there seemed to be a tacit prohibition of the magistrates from similar proceedings, but it was no more than that because the law remained unaltered until the Lords should offer to change it, 'that we may know how far our Liberty may be asserted, and how far not.'33 Meanwhile, he warned the Church that although '..we have no more occasion to run into Excesses Violence, or popular Heat, than we had before..', any action in Scotland similar to the destruction of English dissenting meeting-houses, would, although
deliberately provoked by the Jacobites,

"be infinitely to the Disadvantage of the Presbyterian Interest, and might in time be improved to their Destruction." 35

The safety of the establishment itself was therefore dependent on moderate behaviour towards the episcopalians, but Defoe was clear that all judicial means should be used to contain them.

"If they think by this that they are Tollerated to Insult the Church and Ruffle the Magistrates, contemn the Authority of the Laws, and Defy the Executive Power of the Magistrates, you may in a legal way let them see they are mistaken." 36

The events of 1711 provided ample illustration of Defoe's words.

Under the anxious scrutiny of the Court the General Assembly of 1711 proved a moderate one, fulfilling the Earl of Loudoun's hope that the church 'will shew their prudence in not giving any tokens of their being alarmed' at the result of Greenshields's appeal. 37 Thus, while the judgement, in Lockhart's words, 'did very much exasperate the Presbyterians', 38 and the instructions given by presbyteries to their commissioners to the Assembly reflected widespread concern at innovations in worship, irregular baptising and marrying, and above all at the possible return of patronages, 39 the Assembly's enactments avoided contention. The Kirk's loyalty was affirmed in an act recommending to ministers express or unambiguous prayers for Princess Sophia and the protestant succession in the house of Hanover, and its religious orthodoxy was provided for by a qualifying formula to be taken by probationers and ministers. 40 Nor did the Assembly's
instructions to its commissioners exceed previous provisions for the seeking of redress and assistance both from civil magistrates in Scotland and at Court, albeit the issues at stake were now of greater moment. This is remarkable in the light of the fears which the Kirk experienced in spring 1711, when reports of a patronage bill fuelled the 'Jealousys and surmizes,' which the Presbytery of Edinburgh claimed had been raised by the Greenshields decision. The Court seems to have dampened such fears with assurances that Greenshields would be prevented from returning to Edinburgh, and that it would block the Scots members' patronage bill.

The Assembly's restraint was also severely tested by several cases of episcopalian resistance to the establishment which occurred in April 1711. Wodrow noted

'This spring the Ministers of the North have had a very heavy pull of it... The success of Greenshields put all the party aloft, and they were very uppish, and marred all settlements of vacancys; hence the rables and inhumanitys in Rosse and Sutherland.'

Some of the violence fell on members of the presbytery of Chanonry and Dingwall, which in 1711 was still attempting to plant the vacant parishes in its bounds.

At Avoch, vacant since the death of the episcopal incumbent in 1710, access was denied by the heritors who abstracted the church keys. In the parish of Gairloch in February 1711 tenants of the principal heritor, Sir John Mackenzie of Coul, forcibly prevented a minister from reaching the kirk to serve the edict for the admission of Mr John Morrison,
and in April detained Morrison and his servants for three
days when they attempted to go to Gairloch. Morrison was
told by Coul

'that it would be the Queen's forces after
application to the British parliament that
would get me or any other presbyterian minister
a footing in that or any other place, where he
had either interests or influence, and that he
disowned the authority of the presbytery that
admitted me.' 46

Although Coul's lawlessness and the rough treatment the
ministers received were represented to the Assembly and by it to
the Queen, no punitive action was taken during the summer. 47

A second striking instance of episcopalian violence
was reported from the presbytery of Deer in Aberdeenshire.
Like their brethren in Chanonry and Dingwall, the presbyterian
clergy had been struggling to gain a footing since the
revolution and by 1711 had legally settled nine of the
presbytery's thirteen parishes, although in at least
three of these possession of the church was either
prevented by the heritors or challenged by the presence
of episcopal clergy and their meeting houses. In Crimond
parish a meeting house was held by an apostate from the
establishment, William Law. In Fraserburgh, Alexander
Moore, who succeeded his father James, the last legally
established episcopal incumbent, was aided by a colleague,
Alexander Craig; the interest both of Lord Saltoun and of the
burgh magistrates, and the ineffectual measures taken by the
presbytery, ensured that they both enjoyed more or less
continuous use of the parish church until 1717.
Peterhead the deprived incumbent Alexander Barclay held a meeting house in opposition to the settled presbyterian minister, helped by John Barclay, deprived minister of Edrom, Berwickshire, and Alexander Hepburn, who had also ministered in the neighbouring vacant parish of St. Fergus since 1703. Moore, Craig, John Barclay and Hepburn were reported in May 1708 to be employed to preach in the pulpits of the three remaining episcopal incumbents in the presbytery, Alexander Robertson at Longside, William Swan at Pitsligo and George Keith at Old Deer.

These clergymen survived largely because of the protection and support of leading episcopalian heritors, particularly former patrons whose lands in several parishes provided them with considerable interest. Pre-eminent among them was the Earl Marischal, the principal heritor in Longside, Peterhead, Old Deer and St. Fergus, where episcopalian ministers flourished. The vacancy caused by the death of George Keith, minister of Old Deer, in July 1710 demonstrated, however, that support for William Livingstone, an episcopalian in deacon's orders who subsequently occupied the parish church, was not unanimous among the heritors, some of whom concurred with the presbytery in settling the charge with a presbyterian. Nevertheless the majority of the heritors prevaricated and, following well-established practice, the presbytery were prevented from declaring the church vacant, from serving it by preaching and even from holding their meetings there. The abuse and physical violence
visited on the presbytery\textsuperscript{55} culminated in a pitched battle in March 1711 when it attempted to serve the edict for the call to its appointee. The presbyterian party of about forty men, including a Justice of the Peace and constables, were ambushed in the village by its inhabitants and forced to retreat after wounding some of the rabblers.\textsuperscript{56} A protestation by several heritors makes it clear that they resented the presbytery's attempts to force on them a presbyterian called by a minority of the heritors, while rejecting their own call to the episcopalian minister of Inverkeithnie, Mr James Maitland.\textsuperscript{57} The presbytery rejected these objections and resorted to the raising of criminal letters against the rabblers, but soon agreed to an accommodation proposed by the Lords of Justiciary on the northern circuit who 'did encline to take up the affair of old deer in ane amicable manner.'\textsuperscript{58} The heritors engaged to give the presbyterian minister possession of the church, manse and glebe, while four of the chief rabblers were to 'acknowalge before the Congregation of Old Deer there offence done to God and the Presbytery in opposeing Mr Gordon's ordination.'\textsuperscript{59}

Neither of the rabblings in the parishes of Gairloch and Old Deer seem to have been used immediately against the episcopal party to demonstrate their lawlessness, although in the Assembly Carstares 'fell very Brisk upon the dreadfull Barbarities in the north to the ministers in Rosse.'\textsuperscript{60} A policy of preventing such conflicts from becoming \textit{causes célébres} can be detected behind the Lord Justice Clerk's handling of the Old Deer riot and of another case which threatened the established
church at this date. The West or Old Church of Aberdeen fell vacant in March with the death of its presbyterian incumbent, which prompted 'the Jacobite and Malignant party, in and about Aberdeen' and Dr Andrew Burnet, the former episcopalian incumbent, to reclaim the charge. Burnet had been deprived in 1695 for nonjurancy and for protesting against the committee for the North, but having since taken the oaths at the Queen's accession, his supporters argued, the deprivation was nullified ipso facto and 'soe they reason he comes in as legall pastor of that flock.' The Aberdeen magistrates refused in early May to permit Burnet access to the church, which led, according to Wodrow's information, to a threat by the Aberdeen Trades 'to put him in nixt Lords day by a mobb into a Church.' The Lord Advocate's order for the pulpit and doors to be secured and Sir James Steuart's legal opinion, which controverted Burnet's interpretation of the act of deprivation,

'coming up to Aberdeen tymously, they prevented a mobb, and the Justice-Clerk when he came up, he disuaded these concerned from medling any more in that affair.' This decisive action quelled the episcopalians in Aberdeen temporarily.

After the Assembly the Lord Advocate attempted to satisfy the presbyterian clergy by instructing justices of the peace and sheriffs in some northern shires 'to quicken the execution of the laws for preventing the growth of popery and planting of vacant Churches..'. He included the J.P.'s of Ross-shire in view of the 'very hard usage' of John Morrison in Gairloch,
and was answered, in an unmistakeable allusion to Sir John
Mackenzie of Coul, that some of their number 'were the
occasion of some of the Disorders complained of.'

The fact that nothing further was done can perhaps be
attributed to the Court's overriding concern during the remainder
of the session to prevent either a toleration or patronage bill
from being tabled, an attitude which seems to have persisted
afterwards. The Earl of Loudoun, while disclaiming knowledge of the
Government's thoughts, told the Advocate in June:

'The Consequence of wryting to Magistrats,
or pursuing the Episcopall Clergie in
Scotland will probably be the drawing on
of a Tolleration the Nixt Session of
parliament with a condition of having
the oaths taken by the Ministers of the
Church and these who are tolerant.'

By spring 1711 it was clear to both sides that the main issue
at stake was whether or not magistrates would or could take
action against meeting-houses where no overt offence to
government was given, and what action was possible where
rabbling of presbyterians had occurred. The striking
absence of episcopal clergy and their supporters from the
Justiciary Dittay Rolls for the May and October circuits
indicates the Court's deliberate restraint from criminal
proceedings. Lockhart alluded to the 'peace and
security' enjoyed by 'the Church party' in summer 1711.

While the Court and the moderate Kirk leaders sought
to head off any excess of zeal by the established clergy
in recoursing to the civil magistrate, the leading
episcopalian nonjurors attempted to continue the tactic
of redress of individual grievances used during the winter
of 1710-11 as part of the strategy to avoid a lobby for toleration. As mentioned in the previous chapter the most important case next to Greenshields's was the banishment of George Hay, episcopal minister at Aberlour, by Lord Minto at the circuit in Aberdeen the previous October. In 1711 not only was redress for Hay successfully achieved, apparently as the result of a growing episcopalian assertiveness, but also the case was made a pretext for forthright attacks on the Lords of Justiciary.

In January Bishop Rose advised Hay to seek remedy in Edinburgh, but was sceptical of his chances because of 'the reflection it most needs cast upon the honour of the judges who sentenced him.' Nor was he surprised that the journey Hay made to London in deference to the opinion of unnamed 'advisers' and in defiance of his warning that there was 'a great difficulty in finding out a proper & effectual remedie to his case', proved fruitless. Hay despondently reported to the bishop that the solution suggested by the Scots peers in London was either 'to remit, or to suspend the sentence for some limited time'. To remit would either have meant obtaining remission by paying a fee, virtually acknowledging the sentence and probably also qualifying by law, or remitting the case for the Lords of Justiciary to reconsider. Rose concluded that neither of these was satisfactory, and therefore the suspension of the sentence for some time was preferable, although even this would be less than Hay hoped for.
'Mr Hay sayes in a postscript, [that all he desirs is to be taken under the royall protection & not further molested upon that hard sentence] these in his case ar words to me without a meaning, we all no doubt heartily wish that wer don but the matter is in what method & by what means & I wish with all my heart that som means might be falm upon for effectuating of this both upon the accompt of the common concern as also upon the accompt of the kindness I have for Mr Hay for I consider him as an ing[e]nowus & honest man'.

Despite such professions Bishop Rose declined Hay's request that he write to Archbishop Sharp 'who he sayes is very zelous for him', because it would

'import as if I thought his grace cool or negligent would it not lessen my credit with his grace to be found indiscreet or officious.'

Concern about the tabling of a toleration bill which might include unpalatable oaths perhaps underlay Rose's unusual refusal to approach Sharp on a matter concerning redress for a sufferer at the hands of a hostile authority.

Campbell, however, was bolder, for in a memorandum considering more fully the likely consequences of a remission of Hay's sentence, he concluded that the Queen's protection had to be sought. He argued that a remission would be too costly, and would necessitate acknowledgement of the justice of the sentence, but it would also be troublesome to the Queen 'to be dayly giveing Remissions to each who shall need them for to be relieved from the Oppression of Presbytery'. This in turn would encourage the bigoted presbyterians in the judiciary to extreme measures, because
they will be glad how easily they can afflict the Orthodox Clergy & that it must Coast each of them a Journey to London and the Charges of Remission to gett rid of their sentences. 73

The remedy therefore lay in stopping measures against the clergy by means of a royal command discharging the Lord Advocate and other magistrates from further executing the sentence of banishment against Hay and protecting him, or at least allowing him liberty from it during her pleasure. 74

An address to the Queen which aimed at relief both for Hay and his oppressed brethren was prepared by a group of forty-three Banffshire heritors and seven clergy, probably during summer 1711. Like the proposed addresses and petitions of late 1710, this pleaded for royal protection in the exercise of religious conscience. 75 Unlike them, however, it argued on the basis not only of the intrinsic merits of freedom of worship but also of bold allegations of ecclesiastical and secular persecution, particularly in Hay's case. The language of the address was also markedly different from the temperate phrasing of the earlier representations, and no doubt reflected the strong resentment generated by Hay's banishment. Presenting themselves as zealous, loyal and dutiful subjects 'who adhere to the doctrine and worship of the Church of England', they asserted that:

'... this our Misery is occasioned by Phanatical fury and Tyrannical Usurpation of the presbyterian party over our persons and Consciences who after the disappointment of all their sinistrous and wicked designs to engross and betray us into Complyance with their prevailing and detestable schism, have now, as their Last Effort, hitt on this method of Conveening Clergy before the Circuit Courts.' 76
The damage done to the spiritual life of their hearers by such disruptions was stressed, and it was further argued that the very existence of the episcopal communion was threatened in the persons of indicted ministers.

The address is significant for the manner in which the high rhetoric of confessional struggle obscured the sole offence of illegal baptising and marrying for which Hay was banished, and emphasised the plea that the Queen would 'put a stop to the Course of such rash and violent proceedings.' 77 Like the addresses and petitions of the 1710-11 session, the Banffshire address asserted the episcopalian's loyalty and religious suffering, while at the same time avoiding the question of oaths, in this case by making no reference to Hay's loyalty to the Queen or otherwise. This notwithstanding, it is reasonable to suppose that either this address or similar representations contributed to the royal pardon which Hay received. A complaint to the Queen concerning Lord Minto's alleged misconduct of his trial was known to be imminent in August 78 and a pardon followed by October. The text of the latter demonstrated the truth of Bishop Rose's observation that any redress would necessarily reflect on the probity of the Commissioners of Justiciary, but their dubious procedure is only obliquely stated. 79 It is clear, however, that doubts about Hay's loyalty to the Crown were set aside as the result of persuasive lobbying, and that he was granted an explicit freedom from future molestation in his ministry by any magistrate or minister of law, providing he behaved
dutifully and without breach of the peace. An immediate effect of the pardon was that by late December 1711 Hay returned to Aberlour, where the presbyterian incumbent, uncertain as to whether he had obtained a remission, had qualified or had 'encouragement', reported that 'he has again openly set up the English Service in this parioch.'

The permissive protection which Hay enjoyed went beyond the reversal of the sentence which Greenshields had obtained, but the precise implication of his legal freedom to minister, unique among the unbeneficed episcopalian, remains obscure. Although it may not have been materially caused by it, the pardon undoubtedly justified retrospectively the episcopal attack on the lack of integrity and impartiality in the judiciary which was mounted in 1711. Resentment had been building up since the re-introduction of the Circuit Courts and was not lessened significantly by the change of ministry in 1710, for, as Lockhart of Carnwath observed early in 1711, the new Lord Justice Clerk, Lord Grange, 'seem'd more violent than his predecessour against the episcopal clergy.' Hay's case provided a focus for dissatisfaction. A memorandum putting the case for the wholesale reform of the criminal and civil benches which was composed at about this time can perhaps be ascribed to Archibald Campbell or an associate in London. The paper alleged that the judges in general displayed anti-monarchical principles and that some had interfered in the 1710 election. Sir Gilbert Eliot, Lord Minto, was singled out as 'an avowed enemy to Monarchy and
Episcopacy', and his 'partiality and injustice' in sentencing George Hay was given dishonourable mention. This explicit attack was repeated and developed by two polemics published in August and November 1711. Both cited Minto's alleged praise for the good service which the rebels at Bothwell Brig had done their country, as an example of his disloyal principles, pernicious influence and improper conduct during a Circuit Court; references to Hay's case reinforced the point. Lockhart of Carnwath's pamphlet took special delight in demonstrating that the persecuting temper shown by Sir James Steuart, as Lord Advocate from 1689 to 1709, and on his return to office in 1711, was rooted in his fanatical antipathy to the crown and the mitre when he was 'the chief contriver and promoter of rebellion during King Charles seconds reign.' Lockhart's purpose was clearly to discredit both Minto's and Steuart's measures and to justify the conduct of the episcopalian against whom they were aimed, in order to influence English opinion during the coming parliamentary session. He hoped that the Queen and parliament would 'provide effectually for the security and protection of the oppressed and distressed Episcopall clergy and Church party in Scotland, and think it reasonable to call the advocat general and the aforesaid judge to account for their illegall, irregular and unwarrantable proceedings.' By providing specific examples of these actions and implicitly endorsing the doctrine of passive obedience in his outright attack on Steuart and his Revolution principles, Lockhart's
account held obvious appeal for Tory perceptions of the Scots presbyterians, but it is nonetheless difficult to gauge the impact on Court or parliament either of this or of earlier attacks other than as a cumulative picture of confessional oppression. Certainly the episcopalian's aim of changes in the judiciary was not fulfilled, but on the other hand the presbyterians' claim to be even-handed in the commission of justice was now palpably damaged.

Paradoxically, the significant change among the Crown's law officers during 1711 was said to have occurred as a result of an insufficiency rather than an excess of zeal displayed by the Lord Advocate in failing to prosecute the Jacobite members of the Faculty of Advocates. A scandal arose over the reported acceptance by the Faculty at a meeting on 30 June of a medal symbolising the Pretender's claim to his father's dominions, which was intended by the Duchess of Gordon for the advocates' cabinet of rarities. Despite the Faculty's official repudiation of the medal, the reported remarks of individual advocates in favour of accepting it caused outrage in the Whig press and embarrassment to the Court. Boyer interpreted the episode as the Jacobites' attempt to balance the General Assembly's recent declaration in favour of the Protestant succession, by a deliberately staged 'publick and treasonable Affront to Her Majesty; A tacit Arraignment of Her Title, and a striking at the Settlement in the most Serene House of Hanover.'

The Lord Advocate's circumspect zeal in awaiting instructions from Court before issuing warrants was cut short when in late
September 1711 he was replaced by Sir James Steuart, whose return to office marked a new phase in the treatment not only of the medal affair but also of other cases involving Jacobites and episcopalian. The removal of Dalrymple was said to have been the result of Carstares's influence with Oxford, and may therefore have reflected the Kirk's fear that both lay Jacobites and nonjuring clergy were escaping the reach of law. Wodrow hoped that Steuart's return would be

'... a happy turn for the Ministers in the north, who are under very great difficulty, this summer, from the English Service being set up almost everywhere beyond Tay.'

Viewing the appointment from the opposite perspective, Lockhart of Carnwath asserted that it effected a sudden and unaccountable change, because Steuart immediately

'... began, as he left off when formerlie in that station, to persecute the Episcopall clergy with all the violence in his power.'

Steuart without doubt tackled the problems posed by the episcopalian with fewer scruples as to the effect of policy than Dalrymple, but Lockhart's account of a period of calm shattered by resumed oppression is questionable on the grounds that neither before nor after the crucial change were the episcopalian behaving entirely in the manner he portrayed.

He argued that the presbyterians had resented the Greenshields decision not only because it put a stop to their 'despotick, arbitrary and illegall dominion over the Episcopall clergy', but also

'... because the Episcopall clergy and laity behaved themselves soberlie and discretlie under this sunshine and gave them (ther enemies) no occasion to misrepresent them to the Goverment.'
This account misleadingly ignored the contradictory instances of violence in Garioch and Old Deer by focusing attention on the rapid growth during 1711 of meeting houses erected by the clergy at the invitation of the laity, and asserted that

'... during these last six months the Church party in Scotland have enjoyed more peace and security than they have done for twenty years before.' 94

In fact the comparative freedom enjoyed by the episcopalian stemmed more from care both at Court and on Dalrymple's part not to precipitate the probable result of the Greenshields judgement in the form of a toleration, as well as from the inherent difficulties of implementing the law by means of unco-operative sheriffs and justices of the peace, than from a deliberate tolerance by Dalrymple. Lockhart conceded that he was 'Whigishly enuff inclin'd.' 95

Just as the period from March to September 1711 cannot be convincingly represented as an interlude of blameless consolidation by the episcopalian, so the period following Sir James Steuart's resumption of office cannot be seen only in terms of unjustified persecution. Existing difficulties such as the Pretender's medal and the disorders in Garioch had to be resolved, while fresh problems arose in which the Advocate felt obliged to interpose his authority. The most significant of these were episcopalian activities in Aberdeen, where the presbyterian establishment was challenged on several fronts, not least by the arrival of the Earl Marischal's chaplain Patrick Dunbreck, whose ministry in the burgh rapidly became a practical test of the Greenshields judgement. Dunbreck, formerly the Earl of Erroll's chaplain, came to Aberdeen by
September armed with 'a signed warrand of the Late Bishop of Aberdeen Impowering him to come & officiat here .. daited in the end of August last'. The magistrates learned that he 'was going to sett up the liturgy of the Church of England in the Earles Marishall lodging within this burgh and to preach and administer the sacraments there And for that end was causing wrights erect a pulpit, communion table and severall dasks and seats for hearers'.

At the presbytery's request the magistrates summoned Dunbreck on 4 October, required him to forbear from setting up the prayer-book or ministering without a legal call and the presbytery's authority, and observed that he did not appear to be in orders. Dunbreck denied their authority on the grounds that he lay under the Earl Marischal's protection, and that the Earl's lodging in the barony of Altrie was held blench of the Crown and was therefore independent of and exempt from the town's jurisdiction. Secondly, he asserted that contrary to the Provost's claim that worship by the prayer-book was illegal, the House of Lords had found in Greenshields's case that there was no law prohibiting Church of England worship in any meeting-house or family. Lastly, he produced his letters of orders from Bishop Hay and his licence from Bishop Haliburton, and argued that the invitation from a great many of 'the most considerable People' to read prayers by the English liturgy proved 'he came not officiously nor without a call.'
In a draft reply to Dunbreck the magistrates conceded that although ministering only to the Earl Marischal's family would be legal, holding a congregation as he intended would not be. Besides, they argued, his use of liturgical worship, his letters of orders and his alleged call were all unlawful. Sir James Steuart's letter of advice reinforced the magistrates' stance with the standard argument that the acts of 1690, 1693 and 1695 made Dunbreck's attempt 'unwarrantable and unlawful', and that if he actually set up his meeting house he could be required to find caution to desist or remove, on the grounds that he was not authorised by the Church. Mindful of the need to proceed correctly, Steuart added:

'and when you have proceeded thus far against him I would have you tender of putting him actually in prison until a complaint be first offered to the Presbyterie and they first find him to be an intruder in the terms of the act of parliament 1695:'

If he persisted they would be entitled to imprison him. Steuart's firmness derived from his belief that Dunbreck's purpose, like Greenshields's, was to subvert the established Church under the cloak of religious scruple; as he explained to the magistrates:

'I must tell you, that if I could possibly judge that Mr Dumbreck and any Company with him were cited by [Conscience] I should be verie tender of them But since its viseable that Conscience is not concerned but a plain designe of Schism and disturbance intended I am sure your executing of the Law in this case is Good service both to God, to the Queen, and to the Countrie'

Suspicion of Dunbreck was probably the result of suspicion of the Earl Marischal, whose role as a vehement patron of episcopalian
in Deer presbytery, and of the troublesome episcopalian Gideon Guthrie at Fetteresso, was well known. Dunbreck also received material help from Bishop Rose who gave him £10 at his going to Aberdeen.

The Advocate was moved to intervene directly in the affair after the magistrates twice requested that he write to Dunbreck and pointed out the falsehood of his claim that the Earl Marischal's lodging was outwith their authority. Accordingly he wrote admonishing Dunbreck to desist, on the grounds that his intended meeting house was not authorised by the Church, that he did not possess legally valid orders and that he could not claim immunity from the town's jurisdiction. The knowledge that the Earl Marischal and his family were not actually resident, and that other laity were concerned, perhaps reinforced the Advocate's view that Dunbreck intended to conduct public worship, but it also served to avoid the question of the rights a chaplain could expect to enjoy. The Advocate merely told Dunbreck that being Marischal's chaplain did not authorise him to be a public minister. Dunbreck answered that 'till he heard from his patron about it he thought not fit to make a return but thanked the Advocate for his admonitions.' Neither his appearances before the magistrates and the presbytery, nor the Advocate's letters both to him and to the Earl Marischal, prevented him from reading prayers, commencing on 14 October, and from preaching from 1 November, All Saints Day. It was reported to Greenshields in London that Dunbreck 'is resolved after your Example under God to stand his ground.' Although the presbytery took a hand in putting pressure on Dunbreck, they seem
not to have censured or disciplined him formally.\textsuperscript{112}

His ministry was not their sole concern at this date, for they believed that two vacant churches in the city were under threat of intrusion by Dr Andrew Burnet, who renewed his claim to his former charge of the West Church. In an attempt to stop the plantation his supporters obtained a suspension of the magistrates' act appointing ministers, and Burnet protested against the presbytery's edict for admitting one and appealed to the Privy Council or the House of Lords.\textsuperscript{113} A similar tactic was used by Dr James Garden, former Professor of Divinity at King's College, to reclaim his chair. He revived the argument by which, like Burnet, he had claimed in 1703 that the Act of Indemnity removed his incapacity for office and automatically restored his right to it, and summoned the incumbent Professor as an intruder.\textsuperscript{114} Wodrow remarked in November, 'The case of Aberdeen is very sad at present,' and noted that Professor Thomas Blackwell had gone to Court 'to give right impressions of matters there anent these intrusions.'\textsuperscript{115}

The Aberdeen troubles, especially Dunbreck's case, became, along with cases from other localities, important elements in a conflict between the episcopalian and presbyterian lobbies and the Court over the extent to which episcopali ans were being unjustly pursued and denied freedom of worship. Carstares decided to remain in London in early October in order that 'the affair of Aberdeen and Orkney and some other particulars of the like importance' might be 'fairly represented.'\textsuperscript{116} Among these important affairs the question of the Kirk's authority over English regiments had come to a head in the
summer and prompted complaints which threatened to weaken its hand against episcopalian promotion of the English service. The problem was twofold, involving on the one hand the freedom of chaplains of English regiments to use the prayer-book in services for the soldiers, and on the other, the power of the church courts to discipline soldiers for immorality. Resentment of restrictions on regimental chaplains had been smouldering since at least 1709, but it was allegations of harsh disciplining by kirk sessions in Glasgow which prompted the complaints to court by September. Fearing that desertions would result from such actions, commanding officers were reluctant to give full co-operation to the Kirk despite the Earl of Leven's assurances to the General Assembly in 1710 and 1711, and his subsequent orders.

Continuing scandal and avoidance of punishment by soldiers in 'diverse places', together with complaints to court, led the presbytery of Edinburgh to suspect that 'the pretended Severitie of the discipline of this Church' was merely 'a plausible argument to prevail with her Majestie to allow them Chaplains of their own, who may set up the English Service, and protect them from the Exercise of our Church discipline.'

Carstares communicated Oxford's assurance that the complaints were not regarded at court, and confirmed 'that the design was, that Chaplains should be sent down to the Regiments', but that it had been prevented by a minister of State. His knowledge of the plan came also from Major General Wightman, who 'informed him that Mr Greenshields was doing all he could to promote the sending down of the Chaplains.'
reported that in order to dissuade Wightman from moving to have chaplains permitted to troops in Scotland, Carstares undertook that the kirk would not prosecute soldiers for immorality. The consequent declaration by a commander that he would instruct his officers not to submit themselves or their soldiers to ecclesiastical discipline led an episcopalian memorialist to point out in autumn 1711 that the English regiments would thus be 'abandoned to all manner of wickedness', and would therefore need chaplains to 'prevent Immorality among the soldiery.' The memorial, which came to Archbishop Tenison's hands, denied the truth of the argument Carstares had used with Whig peers, as an antidote to Greenshields's 'poison', that the English regiments could not reasonably have English chaplains because the Scots regiments were not permitted their own; he pointed out that the Scots serving in Flanders had presbyterian chaplains.  

Although the issue of the army's relationship to the Kirk presented a channel through which the episcopalian's aims of establishing the liturgy, if necessary by law, could be pressed by persons whose political loyalty was not in doubt, it does not appear in significant form after about November, while other contentious issues came to the fore. In late October Bishop Rose represented to the Lord Justice Clerk that Patrick Dunbreck had complained of being troubled by the magistrates and clergy with the Lord Advocate's approval, and that two other ministers in Perth and Crail were also being proceeded against for using the prayer-book. Rose claimed that the presbyteries were encouraged by a letter from Carstares 'telling his brethren they need not be afraid for a great man is their friend.' It is clear that
Carstares had received through Oxford notice of the Queen's orders for the encouragement of the ministers and judicatories in their duties and for prosecuting all who affronted or insulted them in the exercise of their lawful authority, and that such orders were enough to justify proceedings in general both by the Kirk and by the Lord Advocate. As a result of his interview with Bishop Rose the Justice Clerk voiced his own disquiet to the Advocate about the treatment of Dunbreck in particular, and confided to his brother the Earl of Mar his misgivings about policy towards the clergy in general.

His argument concerning Dunbreck centred on the similarity of his circumstances to those of Greenshields; ordained by an exacterated bishop', he had 'likewise taken all the oaths to the Government required by law', and was not acting illegally in holding a meeting house. The Advocate, who 'still seems to think that the procedure here against Greenshields was right, and that no Episcopal meeting house can by law be allowed..', only reluctantly agreed not to prosecute ministers when the Justice Clerk argued

'how imprudent it was to proceed against these men .... I told him that if the Magistrates proceed and give sentence against him, he would certainly offer a suspension either to the Session or Court of Justiciary which would bring all these matters again in dispute as much as if he did prosecute him.'

Uncertain as to whether the Advocate would refrain, the Justice Clerk suggested to Mar that he could be
cautioned from Court as to the Episcopal clergy who take the oaths and have only meeting houses and plainly told how to treat them, and at the same time be desired to support the Established Church in her just rights.' 125

The practicability of a policy which distinguished between peaceable ministering by qualified clergy and the activities of nonjuring clergy was, however, threatened by reports of disorders received by the Assembly's Commission, which were in turn sent by the Advocate to be laid before the Queen on 3 November. 126

The catalogue of 'disorders and rabbles' was striking. Dunbreck headed the list because his case 'contains the sum of all alleged by others in the like cases.' Representations from Elgin, Inverness, Orkney and especially from the Synod of Angus and Mearns, reported 'how these Dissenting meeting houses are increased and the English service set up therein and all on purpose to create disturbance to the present Establishment.' 127

The second group of complaints consisted of instances of 'open and violent oppositions to ministers and Presbyterys specially in planting and supplying of Churches.' In Orkney the J.P.'s, who according to Wodrow were 'all Malignants and Jacobites', used illegal and 'violent practices' against the presbyterian clergy, and supported intruding episcopal clergy. 128 In Ross-shire the activities of Sir John Mackenzie in Gairloch parish noted above were recounted, as well as a more recent instance of episcopalian violence in the parish of Kilmuir Wester, to which the presbytery of Dingwall had appointed John Grant. In September the presbytery disregarded a protestation against his settlement by several Mackenzie heritors.
'disclaiming Presbyterian government and all the proceedings of the Presbytery as being contrary to the inclinations of that people, thus manifestly opposing our standing laws and endeavouring to ridicule our claim of right.'

Although Grant's ordination, accomplished with the protection of the Sheriff Principal and twenty to thirty armed men, passed off peacefully, he and the small party of his supporters in the parish were ambushed and beaten up by Mackenzie tenants when he first attempted to preach. Grant reported that

'Mr John McKenzie (who preaches in the Episcopal meeting-houses in that and the neighbouring parishes) and his Elders, did at Session concert the Rable,'

and used their influence and threats to get people to rabble;

'The Gentry did warn all their Tenants to the same Effect.'

The cases of blatantly illegal conduct in Kilmuir Wester and Orkney only served to weaken the episcopalian lobby seeking redress against alleged presbyterian misconduct, for the Queen's letter encouraging the Kirk in October was said to have been procured by Carstares 'upon the representations made to him of the English Service, and barbarous attempts, in the North, upon Ministers.' The Advocate's forceful account of these and other disorders was intended to secure a royal proclamation taking note of them, declaring the Queen's 'firm purpose to maintain our present Church Establishment as settled by law', and recommending to all magistrates and others concerned the execution and observation of these laws. However, although his draft for such a proclamation was submitted to the Lord Treasurer on 27 November by the Kirk's delegation to court, it was overtaken by the toleration bill. The Advocate also suggested that the Queen might
'review and give us a better set of Justices of Peace specially in such parts where the defect is not ours', because although public justice could punish the cases of violence they 'are often managed by such contrivances as quite frustrate the discovery.' Despite these difficulties, bills of criminal letters were drawn against the rioters in Gairloch and Kilmuir Wester in November and December, although the processes were later dropped.

To counter the Kirk's portrayal of the episcopal clergy and laity as disaffected and lawless, Lockhart of Carnwath published his Letter from a gentleman in Edinburgh about late November, in which the savage attack on Sir James Steuart and assertions of persecution discussed above served to distract attention from disorders in the north. Thus, while instances of presbyterian harshness in Perth, Crail, St. Andrews and Orkney were mentioned and George Hay's banishment given particular treatment, no account was given of Burnet and Garden, a fact which reflected episcopalian embarrassment over their claims. Dunbreck's case, on the other hand, was emphasised as a recent and paramount example of alleged persecution, which resembled Greenshields's case in two important respects. Lockhart stressed the presbyterians' assault on freedom of conscience, which would ruin the 'Church partie' in Scotland unless the Queen and their brethren in England acted 'in behalf of men oppressed for no other reason than that they believe it their duty to worship God after the same manner that they do themselves.' Attempts to silence Dunbreck were therefore, as with Greenshields,
depicted as an assault on the religious liberties of his congregation. Worse was the Advocate's presumption that the law forbade episcopal meeting houses and the English liturgy, despite the House of Lords' judgement of Greenshields. Lockhart instanced the Provost of Edinburgh's refusal to obey the Advocate's order of 4 November for shutting all the meeting houses in Edinburgh unless he had the Queen's 'particular commands for it.' In addition to these arguments which attempted to isolate the Advocate's extreme stance, a unique feature of Dunbreck's case, his position as a private chaplain, was used to emphasise both the Advocate's and the Aberdeen magistracy's disregard of the Earl Marischal's privilege as a peer 'by summoning his domestick chapline to appear before them for officiating as such in His Lordships house.' Lockhart cleverly linked this to a more recent threat against such privileges which, it was implied, had occurred because of the Advocate's example. The Earl of Carnwath had been threatened by some Cameronians 'that if His Lordship did not put away his chaplane Mr Irving, and refrain from having the English service performd in his house, they would come and burn him, his Lady, family and house. This is an extraordinary insult, upon a person of His Lordships worth and quality, and I need make no inferences from it.'

Lockhart's polemic was deliberately calculated to portray both the episcopalian's danger from 'the mad extravagant Presbyterian mob' and from Advocate, the 'origo mali.' The impact of this and other pamphlets cannot be accurately judged, but by late November the Aberdeen cases were being widely
discussed in London. Blackwell reported that Dunbreck's affair 'is one great branch of the news of the city amongst all ranks, and his friends hath not been wanting to guard all posts that I can attack.'\textsuperscript{142} Despite the episcopal clergy who 'are inexpressibly active against us at this present time', Blackwell received the Treasurer's assurance that he would try to resolve the matter, and reported to the Provost of Aberdeen 'how obliging it is at court, that nether you nor we proceeded to sentence in Mr Dunbrecks affair. Our adversaries are much chagrined at our cautiousness in this matter.'\textsuperscript{143} Added difficulties for the episcopalian lobby emerged in the guise of the other Aberdeen cases. Oxford's condemnation of the claims of Dr Burnet and Dr Garden 'as the most unaccountable thing they can project' was shared, according to Blackwell, by 'persons of all parties, even who are not our friends'; the episcopal party were ashamed and 'endeavouring to make an apology for it.'\textsuperscript{144} Their predicament showed that Aberdeen's reputation as an episcopalian centre could be turned against it.\textsuperscript{145} Although importance was attached to events in Aberdeen it is nonetheless unclear whether the presbyterians' view that Burnet and Dunbreck, for example, were merely tools of the Jacobites was accepted by peers and M.P.'s, or whether the magistrates' and presbytery's restraint towards Dunbreck outweighed the arguments for toleration, either as a practical necessity or as a desirable principle, which might be based on his circumstances.

Whatever the merits of the cases for and against toleration which were drawn from the ecclesiastical conflicts of 1711, the
relative strength of the opposed parties was an important factor in the outcome of the Toleration and Patronage Acts. Whereas the Kirk's delegation drew some comfort from Court approval in the autumn, it was thrown on the defensive by the Tories' introduction of the toleration bill in January 1712, and despite forceful protests and lobbying failed to halt its passage. Having gone to London to represent the Kirk's grievances, Carstares, Blackwell and Baillie found themselves fighting for 'the preservation of our national Church', with belated direction from the Commission of Assembly, limited experience of the type and scale of lobbying required, and in the final analysis, too few committed supporters in parliament. Nevertheless, with their Scottish and English patrons, particularly among the Lords, they restricted the extent of the damage to the Kirk.

Episcopalian support in parliament was more fragmented than it had been for Greenshields. Most Scots peers deliberately absented themselves from the House in protests first against Oxford's treatment of them, and later against the Committee's decision in the Hamilton case. None were present for the bill's first reading on 8 February and only a few returned to the House to support it in subsequent debates. Among the English peers the same High Church partisanship which prevailed in the previous session outweighed the strong opposition registered by Whig stalwarts such as Halifax, Somers and Cowper, but the bishops were noticeably more divided, with important consequences.
the Tory majority ensured strong support for the reintroduction of a toleration bill by the same five Scots who had proposed it and sponsored Greenshields in the 1710-11 session. Lockhart, Carnegie, Murray, Sir Alexander Cumming and the Lord Lyon planned both toleration and patronage bills at the start of the session, and in securing their passage were aided by other Jacobite M.P.'s and English Octobrists, such as Sir Simeon Stuart, who was responsible for initiating the attack.151

Oxford still regarded toleration as a divisive measure which would further weaken his support among Low Churchmen and Dissenters in the wake of the Occasional Conformity Act, but his delaying tactics were overcome by the Scots members. They obtained the Queen's agreement and forced him to fulfil the promise she made in the previous session by giving 'his helping hand to the bill'.152 Oxford's attempts at delay therefore became covert. Greenshields, dependent on him for the royal bounty and for preferment, was employed to convince the Scots members and the Duke of Hamilton of the need for delay,153 but took the opportunity to plead the 'expediency and necessity' of toleration on the five occasions on which he spoke to his patron about the bill. He reported that Oxford was 'very zealous in it' and that 'The whole Court Lords were also very cordial'.154 Although Greenshields had not been consulted on, or informed of, the drafting of the bill, he became an active lobbyist among the Lords whom he knew.155 He renewed his acquaintance with Bishop Nicolson, with whom he concerted in visiting
If the bill's supporters in parliament were helped by small-scale lobbying, such as Greenshields could perform, its extent and influence is not very apparent. By contrast, the episcopal nonjurors' opposition became clear when the measure was introduced. As with the threatened bill earlier in the year, it was especially Bishop Rose's opinion which was noted by contemporaries and which survives to represent the feelings of the clergy, whose dread of the measure was necessarily expressed to well-placed individuals, rather than by open addresses such as the Kirk presented. In early January Rose hoped that the ferment created by Oxford's creation of twelve peers to ensure the success of his peace plans would 'serve to divert the motions of a tolleration at least a while.' Preparing for the worst he wrote to Balmerino, and on learning that Nottingham was concerning himself in the bill, abandoned his care hitherto not 'to be seen openly against it', by explaining the episcopalian's view; he had sanguine hopes of Nottingham's sympathy. Greenshields recorded that there was 'a vigorous opposition made by the Bishop of Edinburgh to the Archbishop of York, and others of his acquaintance or Correspondents here against it, upon the account of the oaths..'. Rose's vehement eleventh-hour opposition was also well known among the presbyterians in Edinburgh; one reported to Wodrow:

'the Bishop of Edinburgh has sent a letter to the Bishop of London Balmarino Carnwath begging them for Gods sake to stope the passing of that Bill for it wad ruine their Interest here.'
During its first passage through the Commons Rose bemoaned to Archibald Campbell:

'I am not only afflicted but almost utterly sunk with the news of that unhappy Toleration for goe as it will in all human probabilitie it will put us to vast disadvantages.'

Not surprisingly he was 'not so much affrayed of a miscarriage' of the bill in the Lords, although it would also have bad effects.  It was clear that if the bill fell the nonjurors especially would be subject to another phase of presbyterian stringency.

Bishop Rose attempted not only to enlist support against toleration among known sympathisers in England but also to head off a move to present a further case of episcopalian suffering being brought to public attention in England. On 10 January 1712 the Presbytery of Perth deposed Henry Murray and his young assistant, a deacon named Walter Stewart, for intruding in the parish of Perth, introducing innovations in worship, and baptising. Murray quickly sent a copy of his process and sentence to Bishop Rose, who attempted, as he explained to Campbell, to dissuade ' . . . the making any further use of it well knowing what a handl the publishing of it would give for promoting a certain design of som people, but it seems some of our clergy & partie here ar like som others with yow not so wise & advertant as officiously & preposterously zealous, & ar not to be convinced how much detriment we shall sustain by whats on the anvil.'

Rose was unable to stop an element among the clergy and their lay supporters from taking the case to London, where it was seized on by the Scots M.P.'s and their allies as a pretext for introducing their bills for toleration and for repealing the 1695 act against
irregular baptisms and marriages. On 22 January Sir Simeon Stuart, supported by the Lord Lyon, Lockhart of Carnwath and Carnegie, obtained leave to introduce them, and was reported to have made 'a long harangue upon this occasion and produced a process of the Presbytery of Perth against an Episcopal Minister there.'

A pamphlet on the case appeared, which sought to refute the Kirk's recent representation to the Commons of their great lenity towards episcopalian. It enumerated several well-publicised cases, then turned to the troubles of Murray himself, 'an Episcopal Divine, of Eminent Learning and Exemplary Life.' By juxtaposing the presbytery's libel and sentence with Murray's declinature of their authority, the author persuasively presented a confrontation between, on the one hand, an intolerant presbyterian judicatory attacking both Murray's sacerdotal character and the very heart of the Church of England's worship enshrined in the prayer-book; and on the other, a confessor who justified the liturgy on the grounds of scriptural and historical validity, and defended his ministry by virtue of the Lords' decision in the Greenshields case. Thus the Presbytery's conscientious abhorrence of Murray's innovations, including kneeling at communion, observing saints days and using the liturgy, even at burials, was made to seem rigidly bigot-ed beside the devout and legal ministrations to 'a willing People' of a minister who prayed for the Queen's person and government. The libel's reference to Murray's non-jurancy was carefully omitted from the version published for the benefit of opinion in London.
His was apparently the last case the episcopaliains pressed into use for the parliamentary struggle, and its themes reflect the considerations which were uppermost in their minds. First, the House of Lords had established that no legal hindrance existed to meeting houses in which the English liturgy was used by ministers who had taken the oaths of allegiance and assurance. The Advocate's contrary opinion and the representations of the Kirk to parliament notwithstanding, this position does not seem to have been seriously threatened. Secondly, the Book of Common Prayer was now being held up as a desirable, if not indispensable, element of worship. Its increasing adoption in Scotland, of which English churchmen and the statesmen were well aware, and which is examined in more detail in the next chapter, probably helped to convince the legislature that in supporting the episcopaliains they would be strengthening the English Church. A third element in the cases reinforced the episcopaliains' claim to toleration. Their defiance of the established church's authority was articulated in stronger terms during 1711 than at any time since the immediate post-revolution period, and in parishes with a preponderance or a sizeable minority of episcopaliains it was possible to turn the Claim of Right on its head. In Kilmuir Wester, for instance, the heritors objected that

"the imposing of a Presbyterian minister upon us is a grievous encroachment upon our consciences, and against the inclinations of us and our people, which by our law is declared the foundation of Church government in Scotland." 173

At the same time there was a growing assertion of an exclusively
episcopal view of the nature of the Church. Henry Murray told the Presbytery of Perth

'.I cannot own any spiritual Jurisdiction in you, without Schismatically separating from the Christian Catholick Church, both Ancient and Modern, whose Government, viz. Episcopacy, hath descended with Christianity itself from the Apostles Days to the present time.' 174

However, it is unclear how far such a rhetorical gesture in the direction of English High Church opinion was either used or accepted as part of the episcopalian's case for toleration. Restraint of the freedom of liturgical worship was apparently the dominant theme in the episcopalian's case.

The Church's defence against the bill consisted both of legal and practical arguments. They invoked the laws which established the presbyterian church in the full jurisdiction and exercise of church government, and which would be subverted by toleration of episcopalian and the liturgy. Above all they argued that toleration would breach the fundamental and essential condition of the Union which secured the Church unalterably in its government, doctrine and worship. 175 However, the Lords' implicit limitation of the Kirk's jurisdiction in the case of Greenshields, demonstrated how this legal panoply could be penetrated, and neither the court nor parliament acted as if they accepted that any unjustifiable abstraction from the Kirk's authority would result from toleration. In addition to arguments derived from interpretation of their statutory powers, the presbyterians sought to expose the majority of episcopalian in meeting houses as factious nonjurors, whose 'late unnecessary and unaccountable affectation to introduce and set up in this Church a Foreign
Service almost unknown therein even when Episcopal much more when Presbyterian was proof that they acted not from religious scruple, but from a desire to subvert the established church. It would indeed have been difficult for the adherents of liturgical worship to argue that their zeal did not contain any element of political calculation of English sympathy. However, a distinction, such as the Advocate advanced, between the Kirk's allegedly charitable view of the liturgy per se, and its abhorrence of 'the innovation and affectation of it', was not credible when strident condemnation of the prayer-book as idolatry and will-worship were being reported in London.

The Kirk also attempted to refute the assertion of its persecution of the episcopal clergy which was contained in the bill's preamble, with the argument that it was disaffection to the Revolution and to the Queen's government which was 'the Principal, if not the only cause for these few Prosecutions that occasion'd so loud and unjust a Clamour.' The Commission claimed that far from being excessively rigorous, the Church had been moderate, and since the Revolution had accepted into the Church or permitted to remain in their charges 'Hundreds of Dissenting Ministers upon the Easiest Terms.' The argument that the Kirk's forbearance towards meeting-houses rendered toleration unnecessary had been deployed in 1710, but as a result of Greenshield's case and the events of 1711 it lacked conviction. The failure of the Commission and the bill's opponents in parliament to have the offensive preamble removed indicates the limited credence which was placed on their claims by a legislature which was readier to listen to episcopalian pleas of unjust treatment.
However, the Kirk's supporters ensured that the passage of the bill was rough, and over the questions of Church discipline and the oaths their attempts to limit the damage to the established church had important consequences. The bill as first tabled exempted all who were not of the presbyterian communion from being subject to church judicatories, which satisfied the episcopalianas as much as it alarmed the presbyterian lobby. However, at a meeting on 4 February the Earls of Anglesey, Illy and Nottingham, together with Lockhart and his four Scots associates 'adjusted the clause to Yla's satisfaction how the Episcopal people should do penance.' This was presumably the compromise agreed at another meeting involving the Scots members, Illy and Carstares, Blackwell and Baillie, which replaced the offending clause with the provision that the civil magistrates should not interpose their authority to compel any person to submit to the sentences of the Church judicatories. The amendment was intended to prevent scandalous persons from avoiding church discipline merely by declaring themselves episcopalianas, which the original clause would have encouraged. It was thought the presbyterians would still have 'sufficient powr over those of their own communion,' who were conscience-bound to obey their sentences. The absence of civil sanctions was important to episcopalianas for the Kirk 'often harass'd and plagued many innocent people on groundless pretences and false accusations, whilst the real reason was that they were not good Presbyterians.'
The Kirk delegation vehemently opposed the amended clause from the start. Carstares inveighed that it 'leaves the Church of Scotland no more Power than a Philosopher' and 'the bare name of Discipline.' In a striking phrase he pointed out that the clause was contrary to the main intention of the bill, which 'pretends to set Men at Liberty in point of Conscience, and this to enlarge them in point of Immorality.' The point was also made in another pamphlet which was circulating in February, containing a desperate attempt to expose the motives of 'those People whose vicious Lives will not bear an exact Discipline faithfully executed' in supporting the pulling-down of presbyterian government, with particular reference to Lockhart's associate Sir Alexander Cumming of Culter, the member for Aberdeenshire. Dissatisfaction with the clause was shared by the nine bishops, including Nicolson, who voted against it because of the precedent they feared it might create for the removal of civil sanctions in England.

Even greater difficulties arose over the question of the oaths to be taken by the clergy in order to qualify for toleration. The bill was first tabled with a clause obliging episcopal clergy to take the same oaths in the same place and manner as the presbyterian clergy were normally obliged. A presbyterian threat to insert the abjuration was countered by Lockhart, first with his proposed clause for the abjuration of the Solemn League and Covenant, and then by using the episcopalian party's concession over the church discipline clause to
extract a promise from Carstares that he and the presbyterians' supporters would not propose the abjuration. However, a requirement that clergy pray expressly for Queen Anne, Princess Sophia and the Hanover family was immediately pressed in the Commons, causing some Scots members to abstain, and was followed in the Lords by the insertion of an abjuration clause in all but name by Ilay and his associates. Lockhart believed this breach of the agreement not to introduce abjuration was a risk calculated on the likelihood that the clause could not be removed once inserted, and that although it would displease scrupulous presbyterians, it would be 'harsh and uneasy to the Episcopal Clergy', whom they knew would refuse the abjuration on account of their principles. Whether or not the amendment was deliberately framed to wreck the entire bill, Lockhart's and his associates' response was to propose a further amendment which made the oath 'as uneasy to the Presbyterians as the Episcopalians'. In lobbying for support for this move among Tory Lords, Lockhart candidly argued that no episcopal ministers would take the oath and they would thus be exposed to persecution by the presbyterians who had. The bill's passage with the full abjuration in place forestalled such a critical disadvantage for the episcopalian by placing the established clergy at an equivalent disadvantage over their scruples. The uneasy balance which resulted was an important factor in episcopalian fortunes until the oath was modified in 1719.

The Toleration Act included additional enabling clauses, chiefly the obligation to pray for Queen Anne, Princess Sophia and the Royal Family which was reinforced by penalties for failure.
The minister's letters of orders, which had to be from a protestant bishop, were to be registered by the clerks of the Justices of the Peace. Provision was also made for regulating the baptisms and marriages which, by the abolition of the 1695 Act, the episcopal qualifiers were now permitted to perform, along with using the English liturgy, preaching, and dispensing the sacraments. Parents of children baptised by episcopal ministers had to register the baptisms in the parish registers, and banns of marriage were to be published both in the episcopal meeting house and the parish church, whose ministers were now obliged to publish them. Further provisos were that the doors of meeting houses were to remain unlocked during worship, that the attenders of meeting houses were not exempted from tithes, and that the laws against profaneness and immorality were to remain in force. By observing these conditions episcopal clergy and their hearers were permitted to establish congregations wherever they chose except in parish churches, and to worship without hindrance. Sheriffs, magistrates and justices of the peace were required 'to give all manner of protection and assistance' to them, and any who forbade their meetings were liable to a penalty of £100; disturbers of worship were liable to a penalty of £50. The obligations of the magistrates to protect episcopalian, and at the same time not to compel a person cited before a church judicatory to compear or to obey a sentence, together with the removal of civil penalty arising from excommunication or prosecution in order to it, completed the provisions of the Act.
The royal assent to the Toleration Act on 3 March was soon followed by the introduction of its companion pieces in the Tory-Jacobite programme, first a bill to restore the Yule Vacance in the Court of Session, and secondly the long-expected bill to restore lay patronages. A further measure, probably intended to allocate at least parts of the Bishops' Rents for the use of the episcopal clergy was not tabled separately, but a provision was made for the Commissioners empowered by the Grants Resumption Bill to consider the rents. The Yule Vacance and lay patronages had been abolished at the same time in 1690, so their restoration together signified the Scots Tories' and Jacobites' rejection of these planks in the Revolution platform, and emphasised their ability to inflict damaging reversals on the Kirk with English support. The reintroduction of 'The Christmas Vacation' was of symbolic importance, for whereas the Act of 1690 found it a hindrance and the repealing Act described the long law term as inconvenient and burdensome, the unwritten issue was whether civil authority should recognise Christmas Day, which the Kirk did not observe, but which many episcopalianians, especially those who used the Prayer Book, kept as a feast day. While the Yule Vacance was merely an irritant to the presbyterians, the restoration of lay patronage was a deliberate blow whose importance for the Scottish episcopalianians as a concomitant to toleration had been evident in the previous session. Greenshields, who appears to have been in tune with the broad aims of Lockhart and his allies (who were responsible for tabling the patronage bill) reported to Harry Maule when the Toleration Act passed the Lords, '.. now I reckon one of
the leggs of Presbytery cutt off, and if our friends with
you make a right use of it, they may very soon have the other
cutt of.' 203  If the restoration of patronages was an
assault on the Kirk's establishment under the Revolution
settlement and its security under the Union, it also served
the interests of those who could claim the rights of patronage.
Attempts were made to justify it by an appeal to their
sense of grievance over the Kirk's management of calls to parishes since
1690, as Wodrow noted in April 1712:

'It's pretended that the grating of heretours,
by popular calls, and Presbitrys their topping
with Patrons, have been the occasion of this
bill;' 204

Greenshields perhaps expressed a prevailing Tory view of the
root cause of the grievance when he noted the imminent bill 'to
restore the Patronages to the Crown, and to the nobility and gentry,
which have been unjustly wrested from them by the mobb.' 205

This argument, which was consistent with the view of the
Kirk as a persecuting body hostile to the religious persuasion
of many heritors, formed the basis for assertions of disregard of
even the heritors' wishes which were provided for in the 1690
Act. Thus an anonymous polemic noted the growing dissatisfaction
of episcopalian over the persecution of loyal and honest
clergy using the prayer-book, and presbyterian usurpation of
the patronage of the church and intruding of hundreds of
ministers on parishes against the people's inclination; it
concluded that abolition of patronages was

'founded on a Mistaken politic; as if thereby
Tumults would be prevented in planting of
Churches, whereas that Law hath occasiond more
Tumults than ever was in Scotland formerly.' 206
A less extreme form of the case was advanced in another pamphlet, which rhetorically asked the Scots peers and M.P.'s

'if the little regard the Church has shewn upon all Occasions to the Nobility and Gentry, in the Choice of their Ministers and their Arbitrary Proceedings in these Matters, has not bred a general Discontent, and will give as general a Satisfaction, to see the Church put under some Restrictions in the Exercise of a Power they have so much abused.'

The core of the episcopalian case was that by manipulation of the elders, who were their nominees and often neither residents of the parish nor worthy persons, presbyteries had imposed their will on parishes. The Lord Justice Clerk admitted in 1715 that the 1690 Act 'begott many abuses.'

However, the attempt to explode the notion that elections to parishes were by popular vote was questioned by Sir David Dalrymple, who called for 'the numerous Instances or mighty Evidences of these Divisions complain'd of', and suggested that it could be proved that they 'arose from such as are Disaffected to the Civil Government.'

The point was cogent because no body of evidence readily substantiated the episcopalian argument, notwithstanding well-publicised instances of disregard of the alleged wishes of heritors and people in parishes where episcopalianism were in the majority, such as Aberlour, Old Deer and Kilmuir Wester; they were precisely places where Jacobitism might also readily be suspected. The heritors' grievance was, however, not merely that episcopal clergy could not be appointed in the terms of the Revolution settlement, but that presbyterian clergy of an unacceptable character could in effect be forced on them. Episcopalian heritors in particular must have found asserters...
of the Church's intrinsic authority distasteful, and the social status of some was perhaps weakened by zealous application of public church discipline and by the formal necessity to share their power to call ministers with social inferiors. Even in the west of Scotland there were reports of the gentry's plan to restore patronages in 1709, and it may have been one of the elements in the Scots episcopalian's programme for the 1710-11 session. The Kirk itself was aware of disputes over voting rights in calls, although its proposed solution that presbyteries should establish who had rights, naturally underlined its own authority. In the circumstances of 1711-12 it was therefore possible for episcopalian to argue that just as toleration was necessary to halt presbyterian harassment, so restoration of patronages was vital to restore an unjustly abolished orderliness in calls to parishes.

The passage of the bill was not all to the episcopalian's advantage because of vigorous opposition by Cowper, Somers, Halifax, Loudoun, Ilay and the Bishop of Salisbury in the Lords, and by Sir David Dalrymple and others in the Commons. However, the Court's initial encouragement of the Kirk and its desire to delay the measure were overcome by the Scots members, so that on 18 March the Kirk's delegation was told by the Queen that the consideration of patronages was for parliament alone, and the Commission of Assembly's address against patronages had the hopeless task of dissuading a Tory majority in the Lords from their natural political and religious inclinations. The breach of protocol in the delegation's petition for a hearing, the wording of which omitted the
bishops, offended the Tories and may have strengthened their support for the bill, which was also supported by the Treasurer and the Court in the important debate and committee on 13 April, following the hearing of the Kirk's counsel on 11 April. The Commission's arguments that the patronage bill was a grave breach of the laws establishing presbyterian church government and as such a breach of the Union, or that popular election rather than patronage was the historic and authentic form approved by the Kirk and parliament, fell on deaf ears, as opposition to Toleration had. Nonetheless, the bill's supporters were frustrated, to the extent that amendments were approved which obliged protestant patrons to take the abjuration and Roman Catholic ones to sign and take the Formula, and stipulated that the presentee had to be a presbyterian. In instances where the £33 compensation which the 1690 Act ordained to be paid by heritors and others to patrons surrendering their rights had been paid, these rights were not to be restored to them. However, this limitation was probably of far less significance if the episcopalian's claims were true that only in a very few parishes had such compensation been paid since 1690. Dalrymple dismissed the arguments which advanced the patrons' proprietary interest in church patrimony and which pointed to the failure to compensate, as justifications for the restoration of patronages, but it is unclear how far these, rather than the attack on the Kirk's use of the elders and its discretionary powers in moderating calls, were used to justify the bill. Most significant of all the limitations to the restored power of the patrons were the continuance of the congregation's right to approve or disapprove the patron's nominee, and
the presbytery's power to determine and implement the call and entry of the minister; similarly the presbytery's power to proceed to planting vacancies *tanquam jure devoluto* if patrons failed to present a minister within six months, was also retained. 219

With the Lords' approval of the Act to restore the Patrons' on 28 April and the royal assent on 22 May, the parliamentary Jacobites and Tories achieved a demoralising victory over the Kirk closely following the Toleration Act. It was clear to both sides that these successes could be turned to further advantage. Wodrow observed of the patronage bill that

'It's plain enough, that both it and the Toleration bill have come from the October Club, with a designe both to thwart the Church of Scotland, and to stirr up confusions and disgust at the Government, and pave the way for the Pretender.' 220

The strategy of the parliamentary Jacobites, who included Lockhart and his associates, was not aimed so much at inciting an armed rebellion as at legislation designed to increase support for the Chevalier and to weaken it for Presbytery and the Union. 221 The undermining of the established Church was of crucial importance, and was an aim shared by supporters of the Scottish episcopalian, who cannot be firmly identified with the Jacobite clergy and laity. Thus Greenshields, in praising the episcopalian Scots M.P.'s on 1 April 1712, envisaged toleration and patronage as merely a way to the elimination of presbytery:

'they are realy Zealous & Couragious in the concerns of the Church, & I hope it will not fail them until they have putt an end to Fanaticism, & schism in our Church.' 222
CHAPTER SIX

REVIVAL, 1711-15

The final years of Anne’s reign in Britain witnessed intermittent Tory successes in ushering in a new order in church and state. In England the Occasional Conformity Act and the Schism Act reinforced the authority of the Church of England against the dissenters, while in Scotland the restoration of patronage in 1712 was calculated as part of a reconstruction of the pre-Revolution ecclesiastical polity, and was expected to be followed by further measures to weaken presbyterian rule. Preaching in Edinburgh in September 1714, an episcopal minister spoke of the restoration of patronages

'as the first Step of restoring the Rights of the Church, and reviving our Primitive Constitution, as appeared by the violent Struggle our Enemies made against it.'

By excluding the episcopal clergy from the scope of the act the presbyterians ensured that the strengthening of episcopalianism envisaged by both its English and Scottish supporters could only continue legally in meeting houses sanctioned by the Toleration Act. The crucial issues, therefore, after the passage of toleration were the limited extent to which the episcopal clergy availed themselves of its benefits, the manner in which retributive action against them was precluded by widespread presbyterian nonjurancy, and how these and other factors affected the Tory and Jacobite capacity to further the episcopal cause in parliament.
The Toleration Act was passed amid optimism from its supporters that it would be widely embraced by the episcopal clergy. An observer in Edinburgh sensed that 'a great many Episcopal Ministers will comply' despite initial scruples which some would have over the abjuration:

'because (say they) the Abdication was not made use of here, as in England, but the King was forestalled and deposed.'

This view assumed that only a limited number of clergy would cling to the central nonjuring tenets regarding the Revolution, and was broadly corroborated by the news Greenshields was able to tell Dr Charlett in April 1712 that our Episcopal friends in Scotland of the Laity were all very well satisfied with our Toleration, and all the young men of the Clergy, and that the old men express themselves very christianly, that however they could reap no advantage by it, yet their particular Interest was not to be laid in the balance with the concerns of the Church.'

It was soon clear that no such amicable distinction between conscience-bound senior clergy and their younger brethren willing to qualify themselves and carry forward the interests of the church was occurring in practice on any significant scale. No formal meetings of the clergy appear to have been held, and Wodrow noted in March that they 'wer resolved to sit still, and doe nothing anent the Oath, till they see what we doe.' The episcopalian derived satisfaction from the established clergy's public discomfiture over the Abjuration oath enjoined in the Toleration Act (which stated that the sovereign should always be of the Church of England), and although
they gained time to comply with the act in June by the extension of the limit until 1 November, it was evident that presbyterian nonjurancy was a transparent cloak to hide their own failure to qualify.⁵ A correspondent of Greenshields typified the episcopal clergy who could recognise Anne as sovereign but refused to abjure James's claim; he was

'very zealous for the Queen, & has taken all the former oaths, but he says he will not take the oath of abjuration, nor does he believe one of his brethren will, several presbyterian ministers will be nonjurors also, & the Impunity they expect is to overlook one another.' ⁶

However, the episcopalian's sympathisers in the Church of England were alarmed at the prospect of a negligible response to the Act, which could in turn damage the High Church interest in England. Bishop Compton and Archbishop Sharp spurred the episcopal clergy to qualify themselves promising the Queen's favour if they did so, and help for those who would use the English Liturgy, to the extent that it was reported in Edinburgh by early October that 'the whole of the Episcopal clergy will go into the oath.'⁷ To Wodrow it seemed that the combined influence of their two most influential Anglican friends would bring them into line, but by the end of the month, according to the episcopal minister who was his informant, they were set against qualifying. Bishop Rose, described as 'peremptorily against the Oath, and all over French', refused to call a meeting which the clergy wanted, with the result that their
discussions took place in the Edinburgh coffee houses, where 'they generally agreed, that the Toleration, in thir circumstances, was noe favour to them.' Echoing Bishop Sage's words they reasoned that 'a bare connivance did them more service, and therefore they would never venture upon ane Oath that might have ill consequences, as to them, and little advantage.' The refusal to forswear James was in the event more widespread than anticipated. South of the Tay Wodrow knew of William Cockburn in Glasgow, two clergy in Perth and one or two in Edinburgh, while Greenshields listed only Cockburn, Blair (his successor at Edinburgh) and David Hedderwick in Aberdeen, all of whom had previously demonstrated their political loyalty, together with about ten episcopal ministers still in possession of parish churches. It was reckoned that of the parish clergy some 400 qualified themselves and about 300 did not; the total of 700 included about 100 episcopal clergy, but the proportion of episcopalian jurors to nonjurors is not stated; Greenshields later reported that eleven clergy still in parish charges in the north had qualified.

The limited number of clergy prepared to take the abjuration oath was turned to advantage in the Whig and presbyterian press, for instance, by George Ridpath in The Flying Post, as part of a general attack on the allegedly Jacobite intentions of the Oxford ministry. The clergy's parliamentary supporters displayed increasing unease at the prospect of political isolation when parliament sat again after the peace negotiations of winter 1712-13. By late December it seems to have been hoped that even if the abjuration was not palatable, the
clergy could demonstrate their loyalty to the Queen by praying for her as sovereign. Greenshields sceptically reported a conversation with Lockhart:

'Mr Lockhart tells me that I may depend upon it that all the Episcopal Ministers in Scotland will pray for the Queen, which will be a very great length considering how they were for the most part disposed when I left Scotland, and also how little Countenance they will have from the Bishop of Edinburgh for so doing.'

By February Greenshields was reassuring Charlett that most of the nonjuroring episcopalian 'pray for the Queen', but nonetheless the majority were not also praying expressly for Princess Sophia and the Royal Family as enjoined in the eleventh clause of the Toleration Act; in November 1712 he only knew of one minister prepared to offer this explicit prayer for the Hanoverian Succession, although there was at least one other. The widespread refusal even to pray for the Queen was admitted by the Scots peers and M.P.'s to their English allies, who were very apprehensive

'that this nicety of our Clergy may be of more fatal consequence than we are aware of, and wish it may not prove a means to undo all the steps that have been taken to revive the Episcopal interest among us.'

Out of the shared concern felt by English and Scottish Tories that the episcopalian's affairs had reached a critical juncture emerged a proposal to persuade them to a partial compliance.

The ministry made it clear by mid March 1713 that any further protection of the episcopal clergy would depend solely on whether they would
'Come in immediately to pray for the Queen, and to sign an Address to Her which will att once give the Lye to some storys which have been propagated with great industry in order to ruine their cause and to fix a reflection upon us who have endeavoured to recover and support it.'

Thus the clergy's supporters among both the Scottish Court Tories and the Jacobites of the previous two sessions wrote to David Erskine, Lord Dun, requesting him to represent to the non-complying clergy the likely consequences of their continued refusal to offer nominal prayers. Not the least were the 'violent attacks on us on the head of our clergy's disaffection' which they anticipated in parliament, but they also foresaw that the ministers' claim not to be disaffected would no longer be sustainable, that the presbyterians' nonjurancy would no longer provide a defence for their own, and consequently that not even royal protection, let alone the benefits of full toleration, could be expected. It was probably as much a reflection of Bishop Rose's Jacobitism and his earlier refusal to convene his clergy, as of Lord Dun's apparent influence with the clergy, that the parliamentary laity chose him rather than the bishop as the means of 'serious exhortation' to the nonjurors concerning the effect 'their scrupulous behaviour may have with respect to the Episcopal Church in general.' The question of Rose's stance on the Hanoverian Succession and the Queen's title de jure could be avoided by a direct approach to the clergy through Dun, although it is clear that the bishop was at least informed of the proposed address.
The need for an address was all the more pressing because of the ministers' conspicuous failure to match those sent to Court in the second half of 1712 by the burghs and shires (where majorities of episcopalian magistrates and justices prevailed, or where vocal groups of episcopalian laity existed) which thanked the Queen for laying the peace preliminaries before parliament and for granting toleration to the episcopalians. They were composed to express party loyalties, so the Tory and episcopalian stress on the Queen's prerogative in making peace with France and her conferral of the freedom of liturgical worship, was offset by opposition and presbyterian addresses thanking her for the assurance of the Hanoverian Succession and the security of the Church of Scotland. It was naturally felt that the episcopal clergy too should express some form of gratitude for the toleration, particularly because, as the Scots peers and commoners pointed out, the Queen, the ministry and parliament were all willing to support them, and the imminent settlement of peace would strengthen the government's hand.

As a result of their letter hurried meetings of the clergy took place in and around Edinburgh, presumably at the request of Dun, and other laity, such as Harry Maule, on whom James Murray impressed the need for quick, secretive action to persuade the clergy to pray and to address. Maule doubted the wisdom of the attempt in view of the clergy's scruples, only to be told that if they would not agree
'to that slender compliance all their friends here expect from them ... there is an end to all projects either for them or against the presbyterians.' 26

At a decisive meeting on 30 March in Edinburgh about thirty ministers divided over the issue of nominal prayers and the proposed address, with an overall majority in favour.27 The meeting occurred with the bishop's connivance but in his absence, he 'being stiff for the Pretender', and several presbyters in and around Edinburgh 'would not soe farr oun the meeting and Adresse designed as to hear reasoning upon it, and came not.' Among the twenty-seven who were definitely present there were 'very long debates and reasoning against all application to the Government',28 with twelve declaring they would always pray expressly for the Queen in public prayers, against ten who refused outright. Taking into account absentees whose opinions are recorded29 and clergy who subsequently changed their minds,30 out of forty-seven clergy only twenty-four actually signed the address,31 a third of whom were post-Revolution men. Allowing for absentees who were presumably hostile to the project, the number of clergy on whose declared loyalty to the Queen the government's attitude would partly depend was unimpressive in view of the optimism of the previous summer.

Their parliamentary supporters believed the clergy should put the Church's interests before their own and 'beware of extending their genuine scruples over nominal prayers 'to too great a nicety, in so critical a juncture.' They argued that those who had not hitherto prayed, or who refused to because they saw no personal advantage in it, should regard it as
'their indispensible duty to do all that in them lies to procure to themselves a free exercise of their pastoral function, and to their fellow Christians a freedom and security to meet and assemble together for religious worship.'

Compliance might not only procure government protection, 'but likewise may be of greater advantage to them in other respects than they at present apprehend.'\textsuperscript{32} This hint at attainable advantages accords with evidence that the episcopalian parliamentarians were planning further legislation in 1713, and explains their frustrated view of clerical scruples as an 'obstacle, which our own people, not our enemies, have thrown in the way of restoring us to the free and full exercise of our religious worship.'\textsuperscript{33}

It was even reported that some clergy who had prayed for William and Mary and Anne 'have of late given it over when they ought only to have begun.'\textsuperscript{34} There is some evidence for a shift away from compliance on the part of the Edinburgh clergy.\textsuperscript{35} Feelings ran high against the Toleration Act, which they regarded as a potential trap, and against brethren abandoning long-held nonjurancy.\textsuperscript{36} Considerations of James's cause probably also played their part, for his conversion from Catholicism was eagerly expected at this period, and relations with France remained unsettled. The king's restoration was therefore uncertain, so the clergy were cautious about committing themselves. Bishop Nicolson observed in 1712 that a quandary would face them in the event of James's death over where to place their
allegiance, 'tho' their Leaders will not be long wanting in rais­ing up new Claims of Hereditary Right.' But while Jacobite prin­ciple was evidently a factor, the self-interest disparaged in the peers' and commoners' letter was an important enough consideration for Harry Maule to doubt the success of the address project, because it would not necessarily guarantee the clergy security. They might be tempted if taking the oaths were

'to make them in a capacity to be presented to Benefices . . . but if they be but to be continued upon the charity of their hearers during her Majesty's Reign or her present ministry its no great encouragement.'

Maule was also reluctant for them to be exposed further over nominal prayers and oaths.38

In the event the address produced the necessary forestalling of opposition counter-attacks on the parliamentary episcopalian. Its arrival at court was reported to give the 'utmost satisfaction' to the Queen who, unusually, ordered it to be printed, and 'desired My Lord Mar who presented it to make her Compliments to these Gentlemen, which is a token of her favour which she very rarely expresses.'39 It was hoped others would follow Edinburgh's example;40 an address may have been sent by clergy in Fife, where Bishop Falconer was said to have helped promote it successfully with 'several of our brethren', a report he denied.41 Mar certainly had the satisfaction of intro­ducing an address from the Aberdeen clergy which was presented by the brothers Dr. James and Dr. George Garden.42

Both the Edinburgh and Aberdeen addresses praised and thanked the Queen for her endeavours for peace, and expressed with elegant circumlocution their gratitude for toleration
and their willingness to pray for her. Despite their patent failure to qualify for the benefits of the 1712 act, the Edinburgh signatories stressed that the 'legal Protection and Security for the free Exercise of our pastoral Function' bestowed on them by the Queen enabled them to join in worship with the souls committed to their care and to instruct them in true Christian principles and liturgical worship. The Aberdeen clergy acknowledged 'the greater freedom we now enjoy' in pastoral care over a willing people' and the use of the English liturgy. They assured the Queen of their prayers for her person and government, and on the delicate matter of the Hanoverian succession assured her 'that your royal diadem may fall upon the head of a Protestant successor, is the sincere wish and fervent prayer' of the clergy. The absence of any reference to abjuration of the Pretender only served to emphasise the implied preference for a protestant Stewart succession, which until March 1714, when James formally rejected all calls for his conversion, was widely hoped for in Jacobite circles. By contrast the Edinburgh address avoided any explicit reference to the succession, preferring instead to hope that the Queen would be God's instrument to unify the island, 'that as we are now become one People, we may for the future have only one Interest, one Priesthood and one Altar...', and to pray that she would gain 'an eternal Crown of Glory' in due time. Implicit in these hopes were fundamental changes in favour of
episcopacy and Toryism, which reflected the current High Church vision of a rejuvenated Church of England.

The episcopalian's parliamentary programme in 1712 had been largely successful, but the difficulties over the abjuration and nominal prayers threatened the toleration, and, along with two other factors, governed further pursuit of patronages and grants from the bishops' revenues. First was the extent of presbyterian recusancy over the abjuration oath, which caused bitter and widespread divisions both among the clergy and within parishes. The profound crisis of conscience unexpectedly forced on the ministers left them confused and unable to exploit the episcopalian nonjurors' obvious weakness over the oaths. In many presbyteries there were large enough numbers of presbyterian recusants and like-minded laity to pose problems concerning the conduct of discipline and pastoral functions. Although secession or schism on a significant scale was prevented in the General Assembly in 1713 by the compromise Act of Forbearance, the Kirk was already exposed to stinging attacks by its enemies for the divisions over the abjuration. These compounded the continuing embarrassment caused by the Cameronian congregations, whose open avowal of the Solemn League and Covenant, it was feared, would be a pretext 'to bring on matters upon this Church yet more greivouse.' Worse still, the restoration of patronage faced the church courts with the problem of whether to
accept patrons' presentations as valid; in the absence of guidance either from the Assembly or its Commission, compromises such as retrospectively seeking popular approval for a presentation or simple acquiescence by presbyteries began to be practised, often satisfying neither party. Wodrow expressed the Kirk's bewilderment:

"But really we are nou gote into a neu world, and it's hard to knou hou to cary in thir affairs that we are strangers to."

A second important factor influencing the episcopalian's position was the political strength of their Tory and Jacobite supporters. Although they remained strong overall during 1713-14, the 1713 election marked a reduction in the numbers of Scots Tory M.P.'s, the effect of which the increased number of English High Church Tories did not counteract insofar as measures to further the episcopal cause were concerned. In 1713 rifts occurred over the discriminatory Malt Tax Bill between its English supporters, the October Club and the Hanoverian Tories, and its opponents among the Scots peers and commoners, which led directly to the unsuccessful attempts to dissolve the Union. These efforts, and the heated debates on the French Commercial Treaty, weakened pursuit of the episcopalian's interest in parliament, but it remains unclear how far the clergy's belated addresses to the Queen had already weakened the cause, and how much was due to a deliberate avoidance of ecclesiastical issues by the Jacobites in order to gather broad opposition support for the attempt against the Union.
The unity between the Court Tories and Jacobites in pressing the clergy to offer nominal prayers and to address the Queen was damaged by the Malt Tax issue. Lockhart's and his associates' defiance of orders from the exiled court in opposing the ministry was matched by the refusal of the Court group headed by Mar to support outright attacks on the Malt Tax and the Union. Nonetheless a boost was given to the episcopalian's morale by the Lords' decision on an appeal by the magistrates of Elgin in July 1713. In the 1714 session the Jacobite M.P.'s were further isolated by the defection of former associates to Bolingbroke's interest and the emergence of a stronger opposition, both of which prevented legislative success on behalf of the episcopalian.

Prominent among their champions remained Lockhart and the Lord Lyon, who backed the attempts to dissolve the Union, to exploit the Patronage Act and to secure funding for the episcopal clergy. Although the terms of the Patronage Act permitted only persons submitting to presbyterian church government and doctrine to be presented to parishes, the Jacobites took an active role in securing presentations, in order to influence the character and attitudes of the established clergy and thereby excercise a form of political control in the localities. The means of effecting change lay to hand in the rights vested with sympathetic patrons, some of whom such as the Earl of Seaforth, had extensive rights,
although their precise extent was not necessarily clear even to the putative patron. In the case of the Crown's rights, local and party interests were not automatically known and it was therefore natural for the Jacobites to seek to influence the Crown as the most powerful single patron. The number of parishes in the Queen's gift varied greatly between presbyteries but the total represented a substantial proportion of patronal rights over the Church.

In the presbytery of Haddington, only two charges out of seventeen fell under the Crown, in Duns three out of eleven, while in Kirkcaldy there were as many as eight out of fifteen.

Action was obviously only possible when vacancies arose. One in the parish of Dunsyre gave Lockhart the opportunity by October 1712 to draft a warrant for a presentation by the Queen, which, after amendments to soften its form, was duly passed under the Privy Seal on 3 November 1712.

In the case of the second Court presentee, William Dugud, whose warrant of presentation to Burntisland passed on 11 November 1712, the Tories feared the loss of the burgh on top of losses elsewhere in the recent burgh elections. If the wishes of 'all the honest people' there were not met by a Crown presentation the presbytery would present jure devoluto. The Lord Lyon, member for Fife, had been requested to procure Dugud's presentation by the heritors, magistrates and town council, who were anxious to see him settled in the charge after earlier unsuccessful
attempts in competition with a call to another minister. The presentation, apparently the first from the crown to be submitted to a church judicatory, resulted in a protracted sequence of processes, appeals and referrals in the church courts, during the years 1712-1714, from which neither party emerged well.

His patrons both within the parish and beyond, wanted to force the reluctant presbytery of Kirkcaldy and Synod of Fife to accept his presentation, and in Dugud they chose someone who, like Greenshields, would stubbornly serve others' interests where they represented his own. The presbyterians claimed that he was merely 'a Tool of the Jacobites' in the parish, that he showed manifold disrespect for the Kirk's authority and that he

'did palpably abuse and mistake Her Majesty's Presentation when thereby he endeavour'd to Screen himself from a Fair and Orderly Trial of his Life and Practice.'

Conversely Dugud claimed that the presbyterians composed calumnious personal libels against him

'to Ruin my Reputation with the People, that so I may, the more easily, fall a Sacrifice to their resentment, for accepting of her Majesty's Presentation.'

It is not possible to judge the truth of the *fama clamosa* which attached itself to Dugud by summer 1712, nor of the articles of the libels which, as the object of personal and party malice, he was called to answer in 1713. Some of the alleged scandals probably took place, although in other circumstances they would perhaps have been ignored,
while others were proven to the Synod of Fife's satisfaction but not to Dugud's. He alleged both perjury and procedural irregularities on the presbyterians' part, for instance in calling inadmissible witnesses. But following the General Assembly's withdrawal of his licence, Dugud was over-eager both to protest against the referral of the case to its Commission (whose authority he denied, in common with the episcopalian) and to decline the authority of the Synod to proceed in examining the libels against him. He could thus be portrayed as both guilty evasive and contumacious, and the emphasis placed on his unsuitability for the ministry.

The failure to place Dugud in Burntisland was largely due to the Kirk's procedural adroitness and was reflected in the difficulties which private patrons faced, for instance by Viscount Stormont at St. Martin's, where disputes over the validity of a popular call, already pending, as at Burntisland, drove Stormont to appeal to Parliament. At Kilsyth in January 1713 Viscount Kilsyth's baillie pressed the presbytery to accept the Viscount's presentation without an additional popular call, and overawed the tenants to ensure none subscribed one; ironically the presentee was a local man anyhow acceptable to the parish. The presbytery feared that the Viscount, whom Wodrow described as 'bigot Church of England', 'and his set above' would use the case to have popular calls forbidden, and so acquiesced in the presentation. In the months preceding the 1713 session the episcopal party was reported to be planning to extend the
patrons' power by permitting the presentation of episcopal ministers provided they took the oath. Certainly the clergy were being told that they would have to be saved from the penalties of the Toleration Act, perhaps by an easier act, or that they could be made eligible for presentation, or expect financial support. In March 1713 Harry Maule reported his hopes of making

'a perfect scheme about prosecuting the Act restoring patrons and obliging the presbitiries both to admit ministers and probationers presented but I perceive that our Scots members ar rather inclined to try what lengths our Episcopal Clergy will come rather than straitn the other.'

Maule was only prepared to approve the proposed address if it rendered the ministers eligible for presentation to benefices, but the political conditions of the 1713 session outlined above ruled out pursuit of the issue. Dugud's brush with the Assembly in May compelled the Kirk to assure the court that he had been fairly treated, and the Commissioner, the Duke of Atholl, took advantage of the general resentment and confusion over presentations and university appointments to suggest himself to Oxford as manager of nominations within the Queen's rights of patronage. The conflicts over royal presentations seem to have been removed by reducing the numbers of warrants passing the seal, although the episcopalian remained hopeful of favourable action. In about June 1713 the parishioners of Banchory Devenick petitioned Archbishop Sharp to apply to the Queen to nominate an episcopal successor for the aged James Gordon; consultations as to the best candidate took place.
The final element in the episcopalian programme in Anne's last parliament was their attempt to gain the benefit of part or all of the appropriated bishops' rents. During the 1712 session plans were afoot for resuming the rents and disposing them 'for the support of the protected meetings', but the attempt to introduce a Grants Resumption Bill to facilitate such an arrangement failed. Nevertheless some benefit was gained by the granting of part of the rents for the support of the episcopal clergy to balance a grant for two Scottish universities. The 1713 session proved unfavourable, although in December the Queen was to take the rents into consideration. The following year saw the Scots Jacobites' second failure to dissolve the Union, over which Lockhart and the Lord Lyon separated from their allies of the 1711 and 1712 sessions. By May 1714 Mar and his court allies decided to persuade Lockhart to manage, and the Lord Lyon to second, a bill

'for resuming the Bishops revenues in Scotland and applying the same toward the releif of the Episcopal clergy and the support of such ministers as should accept of and lay claim to the benefit of the Toleration act.'

They assured him of the Queen's hearty support, but Lockhart was sceptical and reluctant to expose himself to the revenge of those enjoying grants from the revenues should the bill fail. Giving in to the ministry and several 'particular friends', Lockhart insisted that his draft bill prepared in
1713 should be tabled without the exceptions sought by the court in order to pacify the presbyterians and satisfy its own interests.  

On 22 May, the day after the introduction of the Schism bill, and against the Court's wishes, he moved the introduction of a bill on the lines of his existing draft, 'to which the Speaker and Tories of all designations gave a hearty concurrence.' The Commons also resolved that the Queen be addressed to order an account to be laid before them of the bishops' rents and revenues presently vested in the Crown, and the considerations behind, and uses of, all grants from them since 1689. Approval for a bill appointing commissioners to enquire into the rents and their allocation followed on 7 June, but the resumption bill was strangled by representations to the Queen of its bad consequences. She decided to withhold her assent if it passed and commanded her ministry to oppose it, despite strong counter-representations by Secretary Bromley, and by Eglinton, who argued that the presbyterians were not powerful enough to make violent protests. Lockhart and the Lord Lyon acceded to the Queen's request, and to Bromley's arguments for a tactical delay on the grounds that opposition would prevent its passage that session but that in the next the Queen would be better disposed. The bill appointing commissioners on the bishops' rents passed the Commons and was carried to the Lords on 5 July, but failed to be considered before the proroguement on 9 July. The chance of further
action was ruled out by the Queen's death and the new parliament. The episcopali ans and their Jacobite supporters thus had to swallow their failure to secure beneficial legislation in a session which witnessed successes by their High Church allies in England, most notably the Schism Act, and which was the last opportunity, as they soon realised, before the disintegration of Tory power following George I's accession.

These disappointments in Parliament were offset, though ultimately not outweighed, by the jurors' and nonjurors' vigorous promotion of liturgical worship, which was to have been forwarded by the proposed resumptions of the bishops' rents, which in effect were ambitious extensions of the pleas for Crown support for well-affected clergy such as that advanced in October 1709. Indeed, the proposed bill in the 1712 session can perhaps be linked to a draft scheme which survives among Archbishop Tenison's papers entitled 'Some proper Methods to propagate the English Liturgy in Scotland, together with Loyalty to Her Majesty and security to the protestant succession.' Taking it for granted that such propagation was desirable, the memorial considered the problems of how many meeting houses should be established and could be maintained, and what qualifications should be required of the officiating clergy. On the latter it anticipated the provisions of
the Toleration Act by suggesting that such ministers should
take the abjuration oath along with the presbyterian clergy.
It also suggested that only an express toleration could
protect the episcopalian, and that to draw the presbyterians' fangs they should be made to renounce the Solemn League and Covenant. In addition to these Tory prescriptions, detailed suggestions were advanced for establishing meeting houses for the use of the Prayer Book. There were to be six for Edinburgh and one for each chief town in the shires and each 'Episcopal seat', totalling about 40.\(^{97}\) The salaries would be £40 per annum for the Edinburgh clergy and £20 for the rest, thus providing 'a good allowance' together with the congregations' contributions. The necessary sum of £920 could come from the undisposed element of the bishops' rents, amounting to about £700, which could be increased by a resumption of the rents, and the balance made up by the collections in England for the support of the clergy. It was pointed out that the Queen could hardly refuse a grant since the Irish dissenters received £1,200 yearly despite not being legally tolerated. Orders for chaplains to attend English regiments in Scotland were also suggested as 'one good method to propagate the Liturgy and prevent Immorality amongst the soldiery.' References to difficulties over the latter and to a report that 'Mr Greenshields was doing all he could to promote the sending down of the Chaplains',\(^{98}\) indicate that the memorial was penned during the controversy over military chaplains in autumn 1711, a date confirmed by other internal evidence.\(^{99}\)
The authorship of the scheme is also significant because the traditional attribution to Archbishop Tenison is questionable on the grounds of content, style and diplomatic. The prescriptive programme fits between the episcopalian's schemes of 1709 and their practical achievements in promoting the liturgy from 1711, and is emphatically hostile to the Kirk in a way calculated to persuade English church opinion; together with his known attitude discussed below, this makes the Low Church primate Tenison an unlikely author. Since the manuscript is in James Greenshields's hand the scheme can more plausibly be attributed to him as part of his general aim for promoting use of the Book of Common Prayer in Scotland. By late 1711 he had been actively forwarding his own cause in London for a year, and unashamedly linking it to the interests of the church, both in the broad terms of the significance of his case and in smaller details. Thus this scheme implicitly included employment for him either as a salaried minister or as one of 'the Scots Episcopal Clergy who can be confided in to oversee that men duey qualifiyed shall be employed', and it emerged in the context of the blocking by the Court of his zealous desire to resume his ministry in Edinburgh during 1711. The important consequence of his personal predicament was that he remained in London from 1711 until 1715 importuning for his promised allowance from the Queen, seeking preferment and increasingly devoting his time to the promotion of the prayer-book in Scotland. The programme of Crown support
for the qualified clergy, so essential both to the 1711 scheme and to later ones based on the resumption of grants, went unimplemented owing to the ministry's fear of presbyterian hostility, and was made more unlikely still by the episcopal clergy's continued nonjurancy from 1712. The ambitious project to strengthen the episcopalian communion by distributing English and Gaelic prayer-books and fostering episcopalian education which evolved from 1711, therefore proceeded along different lines from those already discussed, which depended on the formal support of the crown or parliament.

Both before and after his successful appeal, Greenshields and other episcopal clergy were actively paying court to the church's sympathisers in London, representing its condition and enlisting their support. The three clergy most closely associated with him as agents and lobbyists at this time were James Gadderar, James Gray and Richard Dongworth. Gadderar's role as a pamphleteer and his association with Archibald Campbell in representing the nonjurors' interests in London remain obscure, but in spring 1711 efforts were made to have him appointed episcopal agent following the death of James Chalmers. Recommended by Campbell and Archbishop Sharp and supported by Bishops Rose, Douglas and Haliburton, Gadderar received a commission from the Aberdeen clergy's representatives, Blair and Burnet, to act as their agent. Some northern clergy dissented from this choice, apparently because of Gadderar's nonjurancy, and showed support for James
Gray, who, as Balmerino's former chaplain, was successfully recommended by Mar to the Queen in May. Gray's appointment, at an annual salary of £100, signified the Court's deliberate avoidance of an episcopalian of suspect political loyalty, but it is unclear how far it impeded the representation of the nonjurors' interests in London. Gadderar had to be content with his secret consecration as bishop in 1712.

In addition to aiding Greenshields during the winter of 1710-11, Dongworth sent copies of the Book of Common Prayer and The Whole Duty of Man to Edinburgh, and prayer-books and copies of Wake's Catechism donated by the bishop, to Dr. Middleton at King's College, Aberdeen. Thanking them and other friends to the cause, Middleton alluded to the long-established use of the liturgy in the College and to its popularity in Aberdeen itself, where 'Such great Numbers of People of all Ranks thereabouts are in Love with, & do resort to the English Service...', that another minister was to commence a meeting-house. Dongworth pointed out to Wake that Scotland's poverty and the expense or unobtainability of books prompted the Scots to hope that well-disposed English nobles and gentlemen would encourage liturgical usage by contributions to send books.

Meanwhile Greenshields's personal efforts were bent towards gathering support from the universities and from members of Convocation for his intended return to Edinburgh. Oxford was particularly receptive on his second visit in May 1711
following his introduction to Charlett by the Vice-Chancellor and Tory member for the University, William Bromley.  

Although hardly matching the triumphal High Church celebrations accorded to Sacheverell in 1710, his reception was very satisfying. From a collection in the colleges, which when complete he calculated would amount to 200 guineas, he expected to have sufficient to pay off his debts and to 'enable me I hope to subsist until I be provided for.' He was awarded an honorary M.A. degree after a representation to the Chancellor that he 'suffered very much for adhering to the Episcopall Church in reading the English Service in the City of Edinburgh.' This phrase echoed Bromley's description of him as 'a great Sufferer in a very good Cause,' and suggests that Greenshields's sympathisers in the University Convocation applauded him as a confessor for the true apostolic tradition which they believed reposed in the Church of England. Moreover, it seems that Greenshields presented his proposed return to Scotland as an essential element in the propagation of liturgical worship, and that already collections were being made among the nobility for his design, which Charlett noted was for 'Collections for establishing the Episcopall Church in Scotland.'

Probably through the offices of sympathetic heads of colleges like Charlett, Oxford subsequently contributed to collections for prayer-books in addition to giving the project symbolic support by favouring Greenshields. Cambridge University likewise conferred an honorary degree
The combined activities of Dongworth, Greenshields and Gray seem to have resulted in the despatch of some prayer-books, for in late December 1711 it was reported that none were available in Edinburgh but that Bishop Rose expected a shipment from London. Such shipments may help to account for the increasing number of congregations adopting the liturgy during 1711, but some may have been paid for out of funds in the Bishop’s hands and distributed by him independently of the London agents, and on previous occasions distributed gratis, so there was nothing intrinsically new in substantial supplies being sent north. What differentiated the project executed by Greenshields, Dongworth and Gray from earlier efforts were its initial exclusion of Bishop Rose from a formal share in proceedings, and its organisation and objectives, which became more apparent in spring 1712.

The passage of the Toleration Act on 3 March prompted renewed efforts to supply urgent demands from Scotland for more prayer-books. Greenshields reported to Charlett on 1 April

'I have every post Melancholy accounts of the want of prayer books, which mightily retards the good [of] that act, the propagating of which as my Corespondent observes will be [the] true way to propagate true Religion, and overturn Enthusiasm, Phanaticism and Schism.'

The majority of the English bishops whom the three agents approached for subscriptions to purchase books for poor
episcopalians approved of the design, but cautiously advised a formal approach to Archbishop Tenison first, which was managed through Bishop Nicolson in late March. The primate shrewdly reserved his position by replying 'that it was soon enough to think of that when they knew what effect the Toleration would have in Scotland.' Greenshields commented frustratedly 'as if it could have any without having prayer books,' which expressed his cherished belief that the use of the liturgy would wean the nonjurors from their Jacobitism. It also reflected the reasoning which led to assurances of royal favour to those who adopted the liturgy, and which added political urgency to the project. The extent of compliance with the Toleration Act and of adoption of the prayer-book were perceived by their advocates to be mutually dependent.

As feared, Tenison's example hindered Whig bishops. Whereas supporters of the toleration responded favourably, including Archbishop Sharp and the Bishops of London, Durham, Chester and Exeter, and were joined by the bill's opponents, including the Bishops of Peterborough, Carlisle and Norwich, there was notable opposition from others, as Greenshields recorded:

"York gave 20 lib, Winchester 10, Durham 5, London 5. Sarum gave us ill language and said we was carrying on faction, and we would soon see the effect of it ... Ely would not admitt us to speak to him." 124

Bishop Burnet's 'fiery expressions' were consonant with the Whig view that the Jacobites were using the adoption of the
liturgy to strengthen their position, a view to some extent shared even by the sympathetic Nicolson. They were probably also due to allegations of the Jacobite bias of the charity fund managers, particularly the Bishop of Edinburgh, which were being revived by George Barclay. An article in *The Flying Post* in February 1712, in which he claimed to be the principal victim, seems to have worsened a trough in the level of charity collections. Certainly Burnet was ready to believe, and convince others of, Barclay's stories of hard usage which he retailed again in 1713 and which Campbell was at pains to refute. Another apologist pointed to Burnet's 'honest and pious Intention to put a stop to that Charity' in the face of the facts, and asserted that since his intemperate outburst against the factious prayer-book project 'by his Advice and Example he has kept back a great many good Men from Lending their helping hand.' In May 1712 Greenshields claimed to be 'pretty successfull' in collections for prayer-books, 'tho' they have made it a party business by your Low Bishops refusing to join in it.' He omitted to mention that the attempts to gain episcopal subscriptions in England coincided with the Tory and Jacobite efforts to push through the unpopular restoration of patronages and allied measures designed to weaken the Kirk.

An important result of the threat to the prayer-book project 'just when the Toleration opened up opportunities for it, was the creation of a formal structure to place its finances beyond reproach and to ensure efficient distribution of books to qualified clergy and their congregations. Fellows from
Oxford and Cambridge along with others were appointed in March 1712 'to inspect that the money be laid out according to the intention of the subscribers.' Soundings were made as to trustees in Edinburgh and Aberdeen willing to receive the books, distribute them to congregations and render accounts to the trustees in London. Bishop Rose recommended David Drummond, Treasurer of the Bank of Scotland and John Mackenzie of Delvine, Clerk of Session, as 'very zealous for the church' and very willing to do the work in Edinburgh. When the project's promoters requested Harry Maule to act as third trustee instead of him, the bishop's disappointment only expressed itself as concern that matters would not go in their 'naturall channel', through his hands. The three nominees accepted their trust. At Aberdeen there was less difficulty in selecting three men; the nonjurors Drs. Blair and Burnet, who had some claim as diocesan representatives, were ignored in favour of Dr George Middleton, Principal of King's College, Patrick Dunbreck and Commissary Paterson.

Since it was required of the Edinburgh trustees that they send to the three managers in London accounts of 'what Books they receive from us, or shall be bought from Mr. Freebairn, and to whom and where they are dispers'd', a policy was established on the advice of the project's 'best Friends.' Books were to be distributed at first only

'to those Congregations whose Ministers are Qualified by Law. This will remove Obstructions, and certainly make way enough afterwards to supply all without Distinction; and our Trustees have engag'd us to take Care about it.'
The extension of the abjuration deadline in June may have forced the realisation on the English trustees that too few ministers were technically qualified to accept the 3,000 prayer-books being distributed. Greenshields noted that 'what we are collecting will furnish more than all our communion will use.' The English trustees decided in late June, as Greenshields informed Maule,

\begin{quote}
'...that you do all by the advice and concurrence of the Bishop of Edinburgh, and in regard that dispensing Prayer Books is no party bussiness, that they may be given to all congregations in-differently that will use them.'
\end{quote}

Although Bishop Rose was thus to be allowed to aid the project, possibly at Maule's insistence, the managers insisted that he should not be named as a trustee or send up receipts and accounts. He was told by Campbell and Dongworth that if he had been named 'our collections had turned to no account.'

The Bishop's involvement was logical insofar as his position at the head of the government and administration of the church in Scotland and his management of the charity funds gave him contacts with the scattered congregations and knowledge of their liturgical practice which were well-suited to the trustees' purpose.

Nonetheless, as Dongworth told Delvine, prudence dictated the necessity of continuing to distribute to the qualified ministers first,
'and then we make no Distinction, but leave it to your Discretion. For now since all the Episcopal Meetings are Tolerated, it is to be Presum'd until the Contrary be made to appear, that all the Ministers are Qualif'd to hold them according to Law.'

Such a favourable interpretation of the act was made possible by the immunity conferred on the clergy by presbyterian nonjurancy and the extension of the adjuration deadline on the one hand, and on the other by assurances of crown favour to loyal users of the liturgy. Dongworth reported:

'I have it from good Authority that if the Queen (for she knows and approves of this affair) shall see the Episcopal Ministers affected to the English Liturgy, and her Person and Government also, they shall not want her Encouragement for these Books, and for their own Maintenance also, and whatever Kindness she can do them.'

Observing increasing liturgical usage among the clergy, Greenshields believed that only doubts about political loyalty obstructed its ultimate success; if insufficient compliance with the Toleration 'do not putt a stop to it it will universally prevail here, and that without any opposition.'

Thus the limited response to the Act among the clergy by 1 November discussed above, threatened to strangle the very project which promoted the Act's aims. It forced from the managers defensive statements as to the clergy's loyalty, with the stress laid on their prayers for the Queen, and assertions of the liturgy's continuing success. To 'remove the Objections some raise against us', the Aberdeen trustees were to have a fourth colleague who both ministered in the district and was qualified by law; the choice fell upon David Hedderwick both because of his long use of the liturgy and because his case was
Greenshields argued that the clergy would be encouraged to comply by the provision of settlements from the Bishops' rents. The addresses of March 1713 were thus important enough to the project's fortunes for all three managers to attend the Garden brothers and Mar when the Aberdeen address was presented at court. They appear to have smoothed over the crisis as far as collections were concerned, but nevertheless the Crown's benign view of the episcopal clergy in this period was due less to their unequivocal expression of political loyalty than to their manifest and growing approval of the Common-Prayer.

In summer 1712, as favourable reports of its reception came south, the project began in earnest. In June 1712 contributions were 'daily encreasing amongst our Nobility, Gentry, and Clergy', so that by mid-July some £700 had been gathered, and the managers were prepared to pay for 4,000 - 5,000 books in addition to the 3,000 sent in June.

The liturgy's burgeoning popularity surprised even the managers in London. Their original intention of meeting the existing demand and if possible increasing it by providing a free supply, succeeded to the point where, in October 1712, Greenshields declared they could not supply even half of what was requested from 'all quarters.' A list of fifty meeting-houses 'most of whom have very lately sett up the service' was sent south by the Edinburgh trustees, who
believed that the liturgy was so popular that 'if they get
due Encouragement, that all of the Episcopal Communion in
Scotland will join in it.' In February 1713 Greenshields
reported that church affairs were 'prospering there
beyond expectation', with about one hundred places, including
many churches, where the liturgy was used, 'and indeed their
number so increases that we can hardly get them furnished
with Common prayer books.' One year later the Scots
members assembling for parliament 'give surprising accounts of
the Success of the Liturgy', which lent urgency to the
gathering of money to pay for 3,000 copies ready for
delivery.

This success fulfilled Dongworth's promise to Maule,
in 1712, that if episcopal congregations accepted and used
the prayer-books

'great Numbers will be continually sent
from hence; for as the Books take with
you the Contributions here will be more
General, as they are now going on very
fast in this City and in both
Universities.'

In practice the cumulative flow of money and books was very
considerable and its irregularities seem to have been due more
to the inherent difficulties of organising collections and the
physical problems of printing and despatching thousands of
volumes, than to opposition to the project in England.

Despite the problems caused by the Whig bishops and the
abjuration crisis, contributions continued to be made on a
significant scale. An episcopalian polemical source of
about September 1713 referred to money given for prayer-books
in the 'last session of parliament by the Lords and Commons' which had resulted in the distribution of 16,000 volumes 'to the poorer sort of People.' In fact parliament's contribution seems to have come through individuals rather than by formal enactment, but the figure accords with a later source, which noted

'the generous charity of many pious and well-disposed persons of all ranks of the Church of England, particularly of the famous University of Oxford, at whose charge and charitable contributions, without any brief to further it, above nineteen thousand Common Prayer Books, and other devotional edifying books relating to it, were remitted from London in the space of two years.'

In the absence of the trustees' and managers' working papers, the details of the collections, the numbers of books purchased and their eventual destinations cannot fully be known, but something of these and of the project's aims and methods, and the problems it encountered, can be gathered from other evidence.

The Oxford colleges' support for the promotion of the liturgy in Scotland from 1711 was significant in several respects. As a principal centre of the ascendant High Church movement, their endorsement of the project doubtless influenced general opinion. In Oxford itself the occasional collections probably reflected the overall pattern of activity during the parliamentary sessions and the university terms. Oxford's support was also significant because, in contrast to the main purpose of providing free copies for poorer episcopalian, it designed its benevolence 'in books for the better sort.' In part this reflected an existing
pragmatic consideration that for the liturgy to become firmly established, the nobility, gentry and the better-off and better-educated in the burghs needed to be encouraged to take the lead. Bishop Rose sought in 1710 to have octavo books sent from London 'for those com to years and of better condition than the vulgar', and in August 1712 a request came from Aberdeen for books 'of a larger and better size which will greatly encourage the better sort to join with our Communion.' Part of the demand for octavo volumes was met by the despatch in October of 1,500 copies printed at the Oxford University Press, and an understanding was reached that Charlett could purchase more at his discretion. An additional 500 copies went to Aberdeen in January 1713.

A large proportion of the prayer-books distributed during this period were printed by the Edinburgh episcopalian Robert Freebairn, who satisfied the managers' requirements for the same quality and price as copies shipped from London. Greenshields informed Maule that 'for Encouraging to print them in Scotland we are resolved to buy as many from Mr Freebairn as he can sell.' An initial order for 2,000 copies by July 1712 was to be followed by another for 2,000 or 3,000, subject to the trustees' approval of sample volumes. Encouraged by the managers, Freebairn produced 6,500 duodecimos and octavos, of which they bought 3,000 in December 1712 and 1,000 the next month; Freebairn sold the remaining 2,500 by February and prepared to start a new edition. The significant proportion he sold accorded with the managers' view that those 'able and willing' to buy them should do so, 'those we buy
being only given to those that are not able', and it represented an encouraging commitment to the liturgy.

In addition to the smaller volumes, larger ones were distributed for pulpit use. Freebairn's prolific production was apparently supplemented by James Watson, who produced 1,500 duodecimos in 1712, at a competitive price which perhaps encouraged the managers to buy more copies in Edinburgh. Additional works sent with the prayer-books included an episcopalian favourite, The Whole Duty of Man, and a volume of growing importance for the nonjurors, Wheatley's The Church of England Man's Companion, or a Rational Illustration of the Harmony and Usefulness of the Book of Common Prayer, first published in 1710.

Of greater significance, however, were two further versions of the liturgy which formed parts of the episcopalian's general programme: the reprint of the 1637 Scottish prayer-book and an Irish translation of the Book of Common Prayer. The publication of both was evidently one of the aims of the most prolific liturgical apologist at this date, Robert Calder, but while the Gaelic project met with the approval of episcopalian circles in London, the reprinting in 1712 by James Watson of the 1637 liturgy was regarded as divisive and 'of very ill consequence.' Greenshields believed it would spoil the successful collections by stirring memories of the tumults which followed its introduction in 1637, and he argued cogently that its use
would not be covered by the Toleration Act. Nor would it receive 'any countenance or encouragement here, which is so necessary now in its infant state', if only because the demand for the liturgy was already being met by the managers' supply of English books. The issue was not the merit of the liturgy, but its reappearance at a time when the prayer-book project, which was almost entirely reliant on English support, was in danger of foundering on the episcopalian's nonjurancy. Thus it alarmed not only Bishop Compton but also Archibald Campbell and the English nonjuring divine Robert Nelson, 'tho' at the same time they commend the liturgy as a very good one.'

Calder's sponsor for the reprint was the Earl of Winton, in whose chapel or meeting-house at Tranent the new edition was said to have been used. Greenshields was initially sceptical of the notion that Winton would go to the trouble and expense of an edition of 1,500 copies merely 'for a piece of curiosity', but later assured Charlett that it was 'to show that the Liturgy is no Innovation in Scotland', and added, it 'is not used by any.' However, the failure to use it in preference to the English one offended the liturgical views of a minority among the episcopalian, whose eucharistic doctrine later expressed itself in the 'Usages' movement discussed in the next chapter. For the moment expedience dictated that refinements of liturgical expression were secondary to the prime task of propagating the English form as widely and as quickly as possible in a manner calculated to create maximum support in England.

The Lowland burghs and landward parishes were the principal objects of the project's attention, but an awareness
of the need also to provide for the Gaelic-speaking population, led to the distribution of an Irish version of the Book of Common Prayer and plans to establish a share for the episcopal communion in the education of the Highlanders. These twin movements were supported by diverse episcopalian interests in England and Scotland which drew not only from the precedents of the production, financing and publication of the Gaelic Bible by Robert Kirk, Robert Boyle and James Kirkwood from the 1680s, and the latter's promotion of libraries and schools for the Highlands, but also from the educational programmes and proselytism which characterised the Church of England in this period. The schemes differed greatly from the policy adopted towards religious ministration and education in the Highlands by the Kirk and its associated instrument, the Scottish Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, which aimed at the eventual elimination of Gaelic, which was seen as an obstacle to the religious instruction, elementary education, and political control of the Highlanders. The use of Gaelic, particularly catechisms, was only intended as a temporary means of religious instruction while the teaching of reading and writing English was accomplished. By contrast the provision for the Highlands envisaged by certain episcopalianists accorded with Kirkwood's belief that the foundations of proper religious instruction and literacy in English lay in the use of Gaelic scriptural and catechetical texts, but their open advocacy of the liturgy in Gaelic
and an explicitly episcopalian education went beyond his avowedly even-handed ideas.

Interest in a Gaelic liturgy seems to have emerged during the genesis of the English prayer-book project in 1711. Greenshields forcefully argued the case for providing Highlanders with Gaelic scriptures and the liturgy on the basis of his experience in Ireland, where the feeble effects of attempts to abolish Irish contrasted with its efficacious use by Catholic and presbyterian clergy. He exaggerated Gaelic literacy and the extent of the distribution of the Boyle bibles in Scotland, probably to strengthen claims for the Irish translation of the prayer-book being prepared by his friend John Richardson in the face of episcopal opposition in Ireland. Greenshields's acknowledgement of the cultural separateness and the special spiritual needs of Gaelic speakers places him beside Kirkwood and Richardson.

In Scotland practical measures were being taken to rally the episcopalian's dwindling Gaelic ministry and to introduce the vernacular liturgy. By autumn 1711 Robert Calder, 'the great promoter of it', was training Gaelic speakers, 'three of whom he has gott in Deacons orders', and had explained to the Highland clergy and gentry the projected translation 'which mightily rejoyceth them.' In March 1712 Dongworth, Greenshields and Gray were busy with 'projects for plenty of English and Irish Common prayer-Books',
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and 'the project for the highlands' was recommended
to Mackenzie of Delvine who had numerous contacts
there. However, severe doubts were raised by Aeneas
Morison, minister of Contin, who controverted the Lowland
projectors' optimistic belief that once distributed, a
Gaelic liturgy would take hold; few ministers could read
Gaelic and even fewer read it well, though they preached
and prayed in it. The managers hastily consulted
Delvine as to whether the Highlanders were willing to
receive the translation and have 'Ministers and meetings
for that purpose', and whether the common people could
read the 'Saxon Character'. In practice the response
was limited; 500 copies of Richardson's translation were
sent north in July 1712, but only a further 200 by
January 1713. Calder was using it in Edinburgh with
a young assistant, and several Highland ministers were
intending to follow suit. Among the laity Sir
Donald Macdonald of Sleat was already 'a great promoter
of the Liturgy in Glasgow, and who designs to sett it
up in the Isle of Skye.'

Richardson proceeded with his project and in
February 1713 his prayer book was cautiously endorsed
as useful for promoting Christian knowledge in Ireland
and Scotland by the SPCK, which held books ready for
despacht pending good reports of the 700 already sent
by the managers. The Society was caught between
the Treasurer's opposition to Richardson's solicitations
and the corresponding enthusiasm shown by Whig bishops
and laity, which was at odds with the predominantly High
Church and Tory support it then enjoyed. Moreover, its relationship with the Kirk and with the SSPCK, with which it corresponded, was laid open to question on this and the related issue of proposals for the sponsoring of charity schools in the Highlands, which were tabled at this time, starting with a suggestion for a school to serve Fort William and Maryburgh.

Inquiries from London in 1712 about the extent of the SSPCK's planting of schools in the north, and the 'properest' method of propagating the English liturgy in the Highlands generally, had elicited a proposal for three schools to instruct people in English and Gaelic, especially in the use of the liturgy, to be funded from the bishops' rents. An ambitious proposal for six schools divided between the west and the north, and located to facilitate inroads into predominantly Catholic areas, was tabled by Bishop Campbell in February 1713. He argued that only when the Highlanders were made 'fond of instruction' by Gaelic teaching, could English be introduced gradually and imperceptibly. He also envisaged Latin teaching so that the schools might become 'a nursery for schoolmasters and indeed for Clergy also for the Highlands.'

The SPCK's support was crucial to episcopalians' plans to promote the liturgy and establish Highland schools in order to strengthen their hold at the Kirk's expense, particularly because of the uncertainty over grants from the
bishops' rents. The Society considered them carefully and sympathetically. Enquiries revealed that the obligation for schoolmasters to sign the Confession of Faith was an obstacle in the way of employing well-affected and qualified men. Anxiety was also expressed that the establishment of schools 'would be Construed as an Invasion of the Province' of the SSPCK, 'as if they were designed to undermine the Established Religion of North Britain.' The Society's scruples remained unresolved and the project fell into abeyance, leaving only minor contributions to the English liturgy. The episcopalians' failure to gain support for the programme of charity schools and the distribution of the Irish liturgy and other devotional and instructive works left the field open to the SSPCK to consolidate further its own schools. It represented a lost opportunity to establish schools which, by accommodating themselves to the Highlanders' language, might have achieved some of the genuine popular influence of the Welsh charity schools, and helped to sustain, then and for the future, episcopalian congregations by planting at the SPCK's expense schoolmasters who doubled as ministers.

The problems besetting the episcopalians during this period can be illustrated in the case of those within the bounds of the presbyteries of Chanonry and Dingwall, and Tain, in and near which it was hoped to erect some of the charity schools. Violent instances of strong resistance organized by lay episcopalians against attempted plantings at Gairloch,
Avoch and Kilmuir Wester in 1711 were reflected in the high proportion of episcopalian who retained their charges or kept meeting-houses. The refusal to accept the presbyterians' authority and ministration undoubtedly delayed the settlement of the parishes, but it placed an increasing strain on the episcopalian communion. In 1713 John Mackenzie was not only serving his two meeting-houses at Kilmuir Wester and Killearnan, but also sharing the supply of a congregation at Dingwall (which was unable to maintain its own minister) with the minister of a house at Urray, and with Aeneas Morison of Contin. Morison noted

'We are not able to keep up this correspondence long, because we are obliged to attend at other vacant parishes, for our old men are dying very fast and the presbytery falls on any vacancy where we are not able to attend.'

Only the presbyterians' failure to match sermon for sermon in such places and the continuing 'honest principles' of the people had restricted the episcopalian losses to two parishes.

Nonetheless financial and other pressures could result in the reduction or collapse of lay support, as at Avoch and Cromarty in 1713. Within the parish of Rosemarkie, then settled with a presbyterian, the episcopalian in the burgh of Portrose sought the Queen's bounty in 1711 to provide for their minister, who was poor enough to need eight crowns from the clergy fund. In 1713 the continuance of his meeting-house was uncertain, although the presence of 'some Mackenzie Gentlemen' was 'fortunate.' Against these gradual losses must be set the success with which the English
liturgy was used at Contin, Urray, Killearnan and Avoch, and at Cromarty before the meeting-house closed. This justified Morison's optimism in 1712 about the prospects for the English as distinct from the Gaelic version. He reported that his use of the liturgy on Sundays and litanies, together with the altar he installed in Contin parish church:

'putt the presbyterians to a wonderfull rage against me and threaten all vengeance upon me upon that head, alleaging that I have encroached upon the Laws. I confess indeed it may be the first parish Church in the Kingdom where it is so planted, and it is possible they may also putt me to trouble.'

In the event Morison was not harmed.

Both the confidence and the impunity with which he and his brethren in Ross-shire used the liturgy were common to significant numbers of clergy in churches and meeting-houses elsewhere, which reflected both overall confidence among the episcopalian laity and the stimulus and aid provided by the prayer-book project. The introduction of the liturgy into parishes by incumbent episcopalianins represented precisely the outcome which presbyterians feared would result if patronal rights were extended to enable presentation of episcopalianins. But they were likewise alarmed by the increased use of the liturgy in meeting-houses during the period 1711-14, which threatened the ministry of the established clergy not only everywhere that episcopalianism had survived since the Revolution, but also in places where it had virtually been eliminated. In the north-east significant numbers had adopted it, for instance in Banffshire, where at least eight
clergy supported it in 1711, and in Aberdeen, Fraserburgh, Peterhead and elsewhere in the diocese of Aberdeen. Following the Toleration Act the clergy in parishes and meeting-houses began meeting in four districts comprising the eight former presbyteries of the diocese, with the purpose not only of enforcing discipline and putting candidates for the ministry to trial, but also 'for encouraging the English Service in parishes where it will be acceptable.' The bishop's blessing conferred on this renewed presbyterial activity refreshed his 'drooping and languishing clergy' and perhaps stimulated liturgical usage in the cause of the unanimity and harmony enjoined by Haliburton. In August 1712 the liturgy was reported in four parish churches and three meeting-houses, and in 1713 it was noted in at least five parishes. Of the thirty-nine clergy in the 1712 district list, at least fifteen were users of the liturgy, and the majority were non-jurors; some resistance by clergy is hinted at. Lay disaffection was allegedly rife in Cruden, where many parishioners would hear the sermon but not the prayer-book service. The question of the liturgy in parish churches arose over its introduction by James Gordon at Banchory Devenick in about July 1712. Opinion in London was divided between those who believed the presbytery could depose him, and those who, like Greenshields, argued that there was no law prescribed to episcopal clergy in churches which could be applied, because those in possession since the
Revolution were not intruders. Nor would the Kirk be able to apply its power of disciplining them. Like Aeneas Morison, Gordon appears to have used the liturgy unhindered. It was the need to secure the future of his flourishing congregation after his death in 1713 which led to speculation that the Queen's patronage might be applied in favour of an episcopalian. Gordon's son who took over the charge reported the people's affection for the liturgy.

In Angus and the Mearns the impact of the prayer-book was very evident in strong lay support in the burghs and the shire. This was symbolically expressed by the Justices, who ordered the Synod's order for a fast to be observed on 8 July 1712 for averting God's judgement on innovations on worship and the recent toleration, to be burned by the public hangman at Montrose. In 1713 the Synod complained of the Justices' attempts to prevent the minister of Dunnottar from processing scandalous persons, while they encouraged a nonjuror in the meeting-house there to exercise discipline and continue his ministry. In addition to sapping the presbyterians' power of censure, the episcopali ans publicly demonstrated the strength of their continuing local power and their commitment to the liturgy by boldly occupying churches in settled parishes in order to conduct burial services according to the prayer-book. Thus at the burial of the Earl Marischal in 1712, the Synod complained, 'a great Body of Curats and episcopal meetinghouse people being gathered together from the several
parts of the Countrey intruded into the Church of Dunnottar...'
where they heard a funeral sermon.\textsuperscript{232} This practice occurred
on a lesser scale for the families of Angus heritors, and
for the clergy themselves.\textsuperscript{233} It caused offence both because
of the contempt of the Kirk's authority and burial practices,
and the dubious legality of saying prayers outside a meeting-
house.\textsuperscript{234} The situation was bad enough for the presbytery
of Dundee and Forfar to suggest that ministers should inform
those ruling elders 'of whatever quality that joyns in and
countenances the English Service' of the evil of it and the
offence it gave.\textsuperscript{235} Open opposition to burial by prayer-
book occurred, but it is difficult to gauge whether this
came from presbyterians alone, or also from conservative-
mined episcopalians. At Auchterarder in 1712 a burial
party including Lord Rollo, several heritors, 'a great
throng of Country people' and four clergy, was assaulted
by 'a Crowd of fellows', upon which a general mêlée ensued.\textsuperscript{236}
It was reported that not only presbyterians were involved,
but all the common people who 'behoved to bury in their
wonted manner.'\textsuperscript{237} It was noted that in the north the first
burial by the English service occurred in St. Machar's
churchyard, Aberdeen, as late as 1713,\textsuperscript{238} a fact which
must reflect the strength of traditional practice.

The spread of the liturgy to a country meeting-house
is well-documented in the case of Blairgowrie, where the
minister and elected managers regulated a prosperous
congregation which included twelve heritors and attracted
worshippers from neighbouring parishes.\textsuperscript{239} Consignments of
prayer-books between early 1712 and February 1713 were purchased by better-off members and distributed free to others, including servants and many tenants of subscribing lairds. This provision probably supplied a sizeable proportion of the congregation. However, elements of worship were slow to change. In Newtyle, to the south-east across Strathmore, the episcopalian, who formed the majority of the parish, were supplied with prayer-books in the years 1712-1714.

Support for episcopal meetings was evident further to the west in Logierait, vacant from 1714. Several heritors whom the Duke of Atholl had ordered to hear a presbyterian supply the church 'were so free as to tell him that after that sermon they should never hear another from one of that sect', and refused to allow him a free choice of a candidate. While Atholl contested the patronage rights with Stormont the people attended a meeting-house at Killiechangie established with Jacobite support, where George Robertson, a nonjuror, preached bilingually to his congregation, which included 1,400-1,500 Highlanders. The help afforded to Robertson by Atholl's brother Lord Nairne, Struan Robertson and others spurred the Duke to silence him. Nairne's role in encouraging the episcopal cause was also evident in the incorporation into the House of Nairne of a chapel for the accommodation of his familie, and such others of his neighbourhood who join with him there in worship by the English service. In October 1713 Bishop Rose performed the consecration, 'at which were present some persons of quality, several gentlemen and ladies six or seven presbiters and many peopl.'
Support for the liturgy was marked in several burghs, especially in the north and east, which addressed the Queen with thanks for toleration.\textsuperscript{248} The magistrates of Forfar declared the burgh's unanimity in worshipping under their 'old Episcopal Minister' still in possession.\textsuperscript{249} The Brechin magistrates by contrast expressed gratitude for the freedom to use the liturgy but lamented the presbyterians' oppressive removal of their beloved minister John Skinner.\textsuperscript{250} In fact the loss had already been made good by the arrival in 1710 of Gideon Guthrie who, with the patronage of the Earls of Panmure and Southesk, introduced the English liturgy on 18 October 1711 in a meeting-house built by the congregation. Preparations had been made by preaching and discoursing to answer the objections which the people put forward as a result of the presbyterians 'daily disclaiming and inveighing against it from their pulpits.'\textsuperscript{251} The number of communicants allegedly increased, but certainly did not fall, as a result of the liturgy's introduction\textsuperscript{252} which was sustained by the supply and purchase of books; significantly, the illiterate members did not quit the congregation.\textsuperscript{253} Guthrie's almost complete support from heritors, burgesses and common people to the detriment of the presbyterian congregation, led to attempts to remove him in 1713 and 1715.\textsuperscript{254} In Dundee in 1712 the meeting-house was supported both by many inhabitants and 'a good many of the neighbouring parochians who cannot otherwise be served'. They needed at
least 100 prayer-books to supply their fondness for the
liturgy, which had emerged after difficulties over its
introduction involving the senior minister, Robert Norrie.
Bishop Rattray later recorded that 'his Congregation
(which was indeed one of the most considerable in the
Kingdom) rather increase upon it, than diminish.

The 'fine Congregation' included 1,200 communicants in
1714. In 1713 the magistrates and town council all
publicly attended the meeting-house, and passed an act
to provide the congregation with the Cross Kirk as a place
of worship by the English liturgy. This bold move, which
naturally prompted the kirk's opposition, immediately
followed a successful appeal in 1713 by the episcopal
magistrates of Elgin against judgements by the Court of
Session denying them the right to dispose for holy uses
part of St. Giles' Church there, and a sentence of the
Lords of Justiciary compelling them to put the established
ministers and kirk session in possession and inflicting
costs and a fine on them. The Elgin magistrates
had habitually attended the meeting-house 'in their
Formalities, with all their Insignia', and occupied
the Little Kirk from May 1712 in similar style, claiming it
as a church belonging to the burgh, distinct from the
adjacent parish church. The alleged intrusion so soon
after the Toleration Act incensed the presbyterians, but they could not prevent a defeat by a powerful Tory attack
in the Lords in July 1713. It provided a redeeming
feature for an otherwise unproductive session.

In Perth an unsuccessful application to obtain the disused East Church from the town council was made by a battalion of English troops quartered in the town, who were encouraged, the Lord Advocate believed, by the episcopalian in the burgh who wanted to gain the church, and were motivated by 'Emulation.' In Aberdeen where attempts to regain parish churches had failed in 1711, forcible intrusion was resorted to by Dr. John Sharp, who performed the English Liturgy in St. Machar's Cathedral in April 1714 following an irregular presentation by the masters of King's College, which caused the episcopal party embarrassment at a time when the liturgy was prospering. Overall, the Elgin case did not open the way to the legal occupation of disused churches and it was more significant for demonstrating the continuing strength of burghal support for the church.

Burgh congregations like Brechin and Dundee drew support from local heritors, but as in Ross-shire the increasingly common desire for the liturgy did not guarantee success for a meeting-house. The heritors and gentlemen of Dunblane parish who intended to establish a congregation for English worship in 1712 were encouraged by Bishop Douglas to obtain 'a fixed man' with 'some honest Competency', because their plan to be supplied from the neighbouring meeting at Doune was unsatisfactory.
He indicated candidly that if the congregation was only supplied every third Sunday, 'the other two they most either stay at home or they will return whence they came.' Elsewhere in the Lowlands the liturgy was making good ground. At Stirling the deprived incumbent's ministry received vocal support from a section of the community, which angered the town council and the established church by thanking the Queen for toleration and the peace in high-flown episcopalian terms. Despite his nonjurancy he attracted powerful patronage.

In September 1712

'the Earls of Marr, Wigtown Lithgow and Weems, with My Lord Areskin Elcho and Lord Lyon went from Alloway ... in 2 Coaches with 6 through Stirling to Mr Hunters meeting House, to the no small Mortification of the Kirk there, where they joyned with the most Excellent service of the Church of England to their great satisfaction and pleasure both forenoon and afternoon and heard 2 sermons.'

Similarly demonstrative support was given by Mar and Sir Hew Paterson to a new meeting-house which opened in Glasgow in the same month, attracting Wodrow's cold scrutiny by its use of the liturgy. The lack of a meeting-house there since 1710, and the religious requirements of English troops since that date together seem to have ensured that attendance rose from about 140 (excluding soldiers) in September to some 400 in November 1712. Although William Cockburn, who was qualified by law, numbered several heritors and some
merchants among his hearers his salary remained insufficient, perhaps because, as Wodrow noted, 'the most substantial of the old Episcopal way refuse to join C[ockburn] because of the Liturgy, and others stumble at him for his qualifying.' Plans to consolidate the congregation by bringing in as his assistant the nonjuror John Fullarton, 'the man of that party in most repute in this country', fell through, probably on both counts. He continued to minister, though prevented from liturgical burials. He had a vision of the church in common with the nonjurors; in his 30th January sermon exposing 'the base Principles that cutt off the Royal Martyr' he advocated prayers that God 'would build up the Walls of our ruinous Jerusalem, in a glorious Restauration of Episcopacy in this Part of Britain.' The efforts of 'this unnatural Scotsman', as Wodrow dubbed him, were wrecked along with his meeting-house in August 1714 and he left for Dundee. Glasgow was not the only presbyterian burgh to receive the liturgy, for subscriptions were successfully made for maintaining 'Episcopal Readers' in Dumfries in summer 1712.

The reception accorded to the prayer-book in Edinburgh was naturally of crucial importance because its large concentration of episcopal clergy lay under closer scrutiny than others in Scotland. By October 1711 it was reported that the English who had been Greenshields's hearers were likely to form 'a very topping Congregation' under Robert Blair, who prayed for the Queen, and that this 'does in no ways diminish any other Congregation, but all
are full, to the no small mortification of the presbyterians here.281 September 1712 saw William Abercromby introduce the liturgy to over 100 hearers, while his fellow-nonjuror Andrew Cant read prayers ‘extremely well’ for the first time to his congregation, the largest in Edinburgh. With the abjuration oath deadline of 1 November approaching, others were preparing their congregations for the prayer-book.282 All the subscribers of the address to the Queen in March 1713 presumably adopted it, along with some non-subscribers,283 so probably most of the twenty-odd meeting-houses284 were served by the liturgy in some form.

The adoption by many of the congregations throughout Scotland in Anne’s last years cannot only be explained as part of an episcopalian stratagem to unseat the Kirk, for the liberal supply of books stimulated a change in attitudes to worship far exceeding mere expediency. The essential change was described by Greenshields’s wife who, while making converts to the English liturgy, noted

‘that the distributing them to private persons is of very great use to bring them to a good liking of it, tho they have not formerly used it, for they are made believe by their Teachers that ‘tis all black popery, which their reading of them confutes.’ 285

The good reception of large numbers of books in Edinburgh also helped convince sceptics that ‘if it were of such a nature as their teachers would fain make them believe it to be, it could not make such a progress of a sudden’,

and 'finding the prayers contained in it better than those they have from there gifted teachers, they instantly are in love with it.' Even allowing for exaggeration in these and other reports circulating in England, it is clear that anti-liturgical prejudice among episcopalian and even some presbyterians was being eroded and a fondness for formal prayers and reverent ritual was growing, which the Kirk was unable to prevent either from the pulpit or in print.

Much of this was due to the example of episcopalian nobility, gentry and better-educated people whose growing taste for aspects of English culture included the polished sermons of Anglican divines and English periodical literature, and whose increasing use of the liturgy was matched by a tendency to mock the excesses of presbyterian sermons and prayers. Attendance at parliament exposed even presbyterians to English influences and pointed up the deficiencies of customary worship, of which the Kirk's omission of the Lord's Prayer was especially being questioned by independent-minded laity and clergy. Apologists in both camps pointed to the alienation of the established clergy from the nobility and gentry, whose 'no small contempt' for the presbyterians contributed to the reclaiming of patronal rights and the revival of the episcopal communion. If this revival was due to a perceived provincialism it was chiefly in the sense
that the episcopalian looked to the Queen and the Church of England both for the model of their worship and for the means to use it freely. But this relationship antedated the Union, and the flourishing of the prayer-book after it owed as much to the influence of its Tory and Jacobite supporters as to cultural affinities with England. And though the episcopalian were seen to be, and saw themselves, using the same form of worship as the Queen herself, yet its prayers and rubrics were often adapted to accommodate existing practice and the nonjurors’ scruples, thus giving it a peculiarly Scottish character.

Long-instilled prejudices against set prayers and reverent ritual in worship were less easy to maintain as spreading liturgical usage dispelled ignorance. An episcopalian observed in 1712 of efforts to introduce it to country parishes

'it takes mightily with the Commons, who think they never had before any real worship, its too true the old Episcopal way of worship was too much akin to the rhapsodical presbyterian gargon.' 294

But the presbyterian ascribed this apparent desire for the liturgy to pressures by episcopalian lairds:

'it is notour that some of the Patrons of these Innovations in this Church, have forced their poor Tenants and servants to take on this Yoke'

of close alliance with the Church of England. 295 The truth of this remains unclear, though tenants certainly
did worship along with their lairds, \(^{296}\) as was natural in an agrarian society dominated by them. But a similar influence can be detected for instance in the case of Murroes parish, where the Jacobite laird of Powrie allegedly prevented the presbyterian minister's elders from performing their function. \(^{297}\) Undoubtedly not all episcopal clergy were able to convince their hearers and others of the liturgy's merit, perhaps because traditional episcopalian practice was at odds with it and because of the Kirk's attempts to vilify it. Of individual perceptions of the liturgy we know little, but a bitter quarrel between an Edinburgh writer 'bigot' towards it, and his 'pious, knowing, strict presbyterian' wife, over their children's worshipping with him stands as a metaphor for the condition of Scottish protestantism at this period. \(^{298}\) A rump of conservative episcopaliars resisted the overall trend to regularise worship, according to Bishop Rattray:

>'some few of our older Clergy showed some backwardness to it, as looking upon every Alteration, how much so ever to the better, from what they had been accustomed to, as a culpable Innovation.' \(^{299}\)

John Fullarton was reported to have used it occasionally but to have opposed it because

>'it was not the way of this Church, and it was nou gone into, to gratify the fancys of some that would have it sett up.' \(^{300}\)

On the other hand a significant handful of presbyterian clergy and laity were attracted to the episcopal communion,
because, among other reasons, they perceived a validity in uniform liturgical worship and episcopal government. Their well-publicised apostasy occurred during the critical period when the Kirk was suffering the attacks and gains made by the episcopalian, the activities of the Cameronian congregations, and within its own ranks, deep divisions over the abjuration and emergent doctrinal controversy, and was therefore even more damaging than the few earlier defections to, and associations with, the episcopalian. In 1710 Bishop Rose hoped that a recent conversion would be 'a mean to turn others into righteousness.' Certainly a formerly 'bigot presbyterian' given priest's orders by Bishop Compton showed the convert's zeal in preaching in an Edinburgh meeting-house 'upon the divine right of episcopacy, to the surprise of many here.' Likewise, Thomas Rhind who had received episcopal orders in about 1703-4, published his 'most forcible Conviction' of the necessity for uniform worship in 1711, and justified his conversion in 1712. Both he and Walter Stewart, another convert with 'high' episcopalian beliefs, were libelled with intrusion, use of the prayer-book and apostasy by Perth presbytery in 1710 and 1711 respectively. Not all apostasies made such positive contributions to the episcopal cause. Adam Glass, who quit his charge of Aberlady and was reordained by Bishop Compton in London, achieved notoriety in 1712 when presbyterian accusations that he
was fleeing bad debts cast a shadow over his recognition of episcopal authority as the true order of the church.  

Enemies also argued that the Church of England gave 'Sanctuary to men of bad character because, as in the case of William Dugud, it discounted adverse reports as the effect of Prejudice against his Desertion.' Dugud claimed he 'was forc'd to fly to England from their Persecution' in 1714, and to examine the nature of presbytery, from which he concluded 'I now detest their Principles as having no foundation in the Holy Scriptures, nor in Primitive Christianity.' In September Dugud was ordained deacon by Bishop Nicolson following a request by his supporters in Burntisland parish, and he soon accepted their call to return to his meeting-house there. Greenshields was pleased to have recommended Dugud to his patron, and reported, in words applicable to the whole communion, that Dugud was 'doing very good service there, he has about 800 Communicants, so that if the Church of England which I am sure 'tis their Interest they should would support that Church they would be able to gain ground, and indeed it is a matter of wonder that under such discouragements that they should have kept what they have.'
CHAPTER SEVEN
THE REBELLION AND ITS AFTERMATH

The revitalised episcopalianism of the post-toleration period as expressed in liturgical usage and as presented to its English supporters, seemed to augur badly for the presbyterian establishment, but the political crises following the Queen's death in 1714 eclipsed the achievements of the preceding four years by drawing out the nonjurors' Jacobitism. Both clergy and laity paid heavily for their involvement in the Rebellion, but such was their resilience that they remained active, and by the 1720s the distinctive features can be distinguished of the eighteenth century episcopal church as a body in its own right.

The Queen's death on 1 August 1714 did not immediately destroy the Tory interest on which much of the episcopalian's successes had been built, but Bolingbroke's failure to construct a ministry after Oxford's dismissal left them divided. His flight and Mar's removal from the secretaryship compounded their difficulties. In Scotland anti-Union feeling led to Jacobite-inspired petitions for its dissolution in the winter of 1714-15, which continued after the elections of 1715 returned a Hanoverian majority. The episcopal clergy's prospects were dramatically signalled immediately the news of the Queen's death was received in Glasgow, by the breaking up of William Cockburn's
meeting-house. Although less violent and more restricted than the rabblings of 1688-9 the action ended episcopalian pretensions in the city for 35 years, and starkly underlined the loss of a sovereign whose political and religious sympathies had benefited the communion since 1702. The precognition ordered by Mar failed to extract solid testimony from about 97 witnesses as to the perpetrators, although 'the thing is notour', and as neither Cockburn nor the proprietors pursued the matter it lapsed. The Commissioners of Justiciary and the city magistrates pleaded their zeal for public order, but the fate of the qualified meeting-house caused alarm. Cockburn soon moved to the Dundee magistrates' congregation. He carefully made the Duke of Montrose, the new Secretary, aware of his loyalty by congratulating him fulsomely and requesting directions both as to the correct form of offering thanksgiving for the King's accession, so 'that Publick Authority may screen me from all manner of Malice', and also of prayers for the King and the Royal Family, over which he was experiencing difficulties with his congregation. His call to Dundee was apparently an expedient devised by episcopalian of Hanoverian leanings, who placed him alongside a nonjuring colleague. It was reported that when the notoriously Jacobite magistrates, who 'feign subjection .. to the King', attend worship, they 'sit down and are mute' while Cockburn read prayers mentioning the King. This unfortunate complier's attempts to curry Montrose's
favour by reporting Jacobite news failed, and he returned to Edinburgh by 1716.\textsuperscript{10}

Among the nonjurors George's accession produced an even less dignified scramble to make interest with his ministers of state. As Bishop Rose put it in applying to Montrose for a continuation of the bishops' pensions granted by Queen Anne:

'ewry new Reign dissolves the provision, which the formar had made for us, and puts upon the necessity of finding out both new measurs and patrons.'

As an existing patron Mar was approached with more candid self-interest by the bishop,\textsuperscript{11} and the octogenarian Haliburton pleaded pathetically with Montrose for

'the continuance of this favour to us who are but few and verry old and consequently can be no long burden upon the government.'\textsuperscript{12}

Some payment was made before the Rebellion. Other clergy, such as Greenshields and James Gray, sought arrears of pensions allotted by the Queen.\textsuperscript{13}

It appears to have been the episcopalians' fear of governmental or popular reaction against them which prompted a series of addresses to Montrose in autumn 1714. One pleading the duke's protection is known to have come from the clergy and was presented by Gray in late October.\textsuperscript{14} Gray was 'heartily in the government' and his suggestion for an address from the Edinburgh clergy can perhaps be linked to the interest Archbishop Dawes took in their situation. At a meeting on 18 November permitted by Rose,\textsuperscript{15} 35 ministers petitioned Montrose for his protection
in the event of attempts to disturb the quiet exercise of their ministry, and frankly admitted their nonjurancy:

'And tho we cannot come up to all the measures required yet we humbly beseech your Grace to believe that it is not humour but conscience.' 16

Among these conscience-bound signatories were thirteen men who had refused to sign the address to the Queen the previous year.17 Other refusers, who were mostly pre-Revolution clergy, remained aloof from the petition.18 They were joined by about ten clergy who had signed the address; they, too, were mostly older men,19 a pattern which suggests a hardening of Jacobite attitudes towards the beneficent Anne's Hanoverian successor.

Their promise to behave as became ministers was endorsed by Bishop Rose in a covering letter, though he stretched a point in claiming that since the Revolution their enemies had not successfully accused them of riot or disorder;

'neither has any single person among them been attacked for having write, spoke, preached or acted any the least thing in prejudice of the civil government.' 20

Clearly the bishop discounted breaches of the law which stemmed from his clergy's refusal to recognise the established Church, or which amounted only to passive disobedience such as peaceable nonjurancy. Montrose politely made it clear that both royal protection and 'the favour and good Will of all unbyassed Men' depended on the clergy's strict adherence to their ministerial function and their efforts 'to make the people sensible of the happiness and quiet they enjoy.' 21
The Secretary was personally well-disposed to the clergy, who regarded his favour as their 'sanctuary', and reminded him of the first Marquis's heroic royalism.

Their attitudes were also evident in an address to Montrose from all the Aberdeen clergy - totalling about forty - which was sent up at the same time as the Edinburgh one. They pleaded that their enemies considered they now had the chance to impose 'yet greater hardships than we have hitherto suffered', hoped for Montrose's disposition 'to protect the Innocent and oppressed from rigorous and severe usage', and assured him of their quiet and peaceable behaviour. Whereas this tacit withholding of acknowledgement of George's title contrasted markedly with their assurance of prayers for the Queen in 1713, when they again approached Montrose in March 1715 they informed him that just as they had unanimously addressed King George, 'so we pray for his person & Government, the Prince of Wales and all the Royal Family'. This change seems to have been prompted by indications from Court via the agent James Gray, that the clergy's position would be more acceptable if they did not meddle with anything which might offend or make the government uneasy; in return Gray secured the dropping of 'many vexatious processes' commenced in the church courts on the four heads. The clergy hoped that Gray would continue to be paid as the clergy's agent, so that he could guard against misrepresentations: 'some of us may have our faults but these are sometimes agravated.'
If there was any rapprochement between them and the
government it was because the clergy could not afford to
expose themselves to civil and ecclesiastical processes
sanctioned by a hostile ministry, while for its part the
latter was unwilling to exacerbate Jacobite disaffection.
Mutual distrust between committed Hanoverians and Jacobites
was not diminished by the clash between the Edinburgh
clergy's declared nonjurancy and the Aberdeen clergy's
initial declaration of abstention from political matters
followed by assurances that they prayed for George as
King. As in 1711-12 the nonjurors' attempts to convince
the civil power of their peaceable loyalty were contradicted
by overt Jacobitism. Even before Anne's death, and
especially after it, increasingly open demonstrations of
Jacobitism heightened political and ecclesiastical tensions
and underlined the questionable nature of the clergy's
loyalty. Resistance to the Kirk's authority continued,
in the north and north-east with occasional violence.
The Synod of Ross complained in 1714 of the many 'erroneous
persons' taking advantage of the toleration. That
year the presbytery of Aberlour was assaulted in attempting
to settle the parish of Aberlour, where the majority of
the people attended liturgical services conducted by an
episcopalian. Apart from evincing the far from peaceable
side of episcopalianism, the case is significant for the
manner in which the presbytery successfully undermined
popular support for the meeting-house by threatening the
episcopalian heritors with criminal prosecution for their
part in the rabbling. It was also the occasion for representations about the activities of the papists there and throughout Glenlivet, the need to counter their schools with a charity school, and the fact that 'our Protestant Jacobites concur with them in everything that hath the least tendency to weaken our hands and advance their Interest.'

An equally troublesome but contrary position was evident in Rathven where 'the intruder is professedly Jacobite and keeps the heritors and people up to their obstinacy against the Civil and Ecclesiastick Government.' But George Hay was also successful in regaining people from Catholicism, a fact which at first restricted the Advocate's action to extracting a renunciation of his right to the church and manse, and an assurance that thenceforward he would only act as a private heritor. An attempt to convict him of nonjurancy failed when the diet of the High Court was deserted in January 1715. Even when a rabble of women stoned the supply minister, the presbytery had great difficulty in having Hay indicted before the Circuit, only for its diet to be deserted also. These failures to sustain processes against a conspicuously troublesome minister were not isolated cases, for most of the libels brought against delinquent clergy and their supporters in winter and spring 1714-15 failed, whether for lack of probation or because of juridical policy. Thus serious incidents in autumn 1714, such as the forceful barring of Edzell church against the presbytery and an intrusion into Crimond church by the proselyte William Law
on a pretended call by some of the masters of King's College, went unpunished.  

When in May 1715 rumours were circulating in London that Montrose was 'a great countenancer of the Episcopal Intruders' in Angus, the ministry appeared to be dividing and weakening in the face of Jacobite confidence. Nor did the Northern Circuit succeed in overcoming the problem much better than it had done in Aberdeen. A lengthy libel against an intruder in Kirkden parish seems to have failed because of an informality. More hinged on the trials of Gideon Guthrie and George Robertson, two nonjurors whose successful congregations in Brechin and at Killiechangie (noted in Chapter Six) were especially irksome to the presbyterians. In Robertson's case the Duke of Atholl prudently demonstrated his own loyalty to King George by ensuring that he was brought before the Circuit for not praying for the King. Robertson's usual prayer 'That the Lord may bless and preserve Our Soveraigne and all the Royal Family' typified the transparent ambiguities practised by the nonjurors, and earned him a £20 fine. Guthrie's trial for several displays of disaffection, created a damaging public row on the bench over alleged informalities in the enrolling of the information, and ended in the deserting of the diet when it passed to the High Court. A second trial resulted in penalties of a 100 merk fine, a discharge from ministering in Brechin and being declared incapable
Doubts as to the validity of sentencing him for not praying for King George led the Lord Justice Clerk, according to Guthrie, to offer him protection from his pursuers if he would promise to pray for the King. Lord Dun argued that the penalties attached to not praying for the Queen by the Toleration Act could not be applied until parliament specified that prayers must be said for King George. The disarray in the ministry's handling of Guthrie's case and its public disrepute, to which Dun contributed, was also evident in the concurrent trial of the Jacobite magistrates of Dundee. Political as well as religious disaffection was being expressed in several burghs in 1714-15. During the Northern Circuit in June 1715 the Inverness magistrates snubbed the Commissioners by openly attending English worship performed by a nonjuror, while in Aberdeen the Hanoverian magistrates were harassed by disaffected gentry, merchants, tradespeople and students, especially on the Pretender's birthday.

The extent of such disorders was deliberately exaggerated by the Jacobites, assisted by the Whig press's emphasis on mobs and disturbances. It was reported that the Jacobites

'conclude that thes high Church tumults will at last turn to an open declaration in favour of the pretender, or at least will soon occasion of necessity a change of this ministry.'

Anti-Union feeling was being whipped up to create popular support for these eventualities. Jacobite confidence
was matched by the government's inability to attack the episcopalian nonjurors so long as presbyterian nonjurancy persisted. The need was perceived, but not fulfilled before the Rebellion, for an explanatory act to satisfy presbyterian scruples over the Abjuration, and to

'pave the way for purgeing the country of those Jacobites who keep up meeting houses only under ye cover that there are so many nonjurors of the Establisht Church.'

The latter were mostly Hanoverian, but James and John Maitland, who showed Jacobite tendencies, were deposed in an emphatic show of loyalty by the Assembly in May 1715. Like Dugud they soon received episcopal orders.

The Lord Advocate later claimed that the number of ordinations at about this time seemed to have been performed

'on purpose to encrease the number of those disaffected preachers, in order to trumpet abroad their Rebellious principles, to make way for the Rebellion, then designed, and which that very year broke out..'  

While there is no direct evidence for this claim, Bishop Rose was keeping a close watch on affairs, for instance by advising and assisting Guthrie. Doubtless in his capacity as a member of James's secret council in Edinburgh he was well aware of the contribution to the cause which the clergy would be expected to make and seem already to have been making.

To some degree preparations for a rising were made under the cloak of declared loyalty; it was observed that in Fife 'the Greatest Jacobites are those who have Abjur'd the Pretender.' When James's standard was raised on
6 September such dissimulations became less important as the real loyalties of both the episcopal clergy and their hearers began to emerge, although, as in 1689, the clergy's contribution was made more from the pulpit than in the field. Mar's raising of the standard was sanctioned by the presence of the Bishop of Aberdeen, which the cynical George Barclay attributed to his desire to make interest with James. In fact it appears to have been a courageous defiance by an old and loyal Jacobite, who died shortly afterwards. Among the suspect Jacobite nobles, gentry and others whom the government ordered to be swept into preventive custody was Bishop John Fullarton. Oddly, Bishop Rose remained at liberty, though probably under surveillance, and Bishops Douglas and Falconer also remained free. He later assured James that only illness had prevented him from waiting on him at Scone in January.

By then the Aberdeen clergy had made a forthright declaration of loyalty and obedience in an address presented to James at Fetteresso on 29 December by Dr George and Dr James Garden, Dr Andrew Burnet, Patrick Dunbreck and another. In praising God for James's return to his kingdom the clergy were enthusiastic, but careful to make only general allusions to his faith and to their hopes that their 'religion, liberties and property' would be secured and that true primitive Christianity would unite all
An explicit statement of protestant beliefs was not perhaps practical at this juncture, although their unconditional obedience to James was used to demonstrate a lack of zeal for them. In the sense that both the clergy's loyalties and the imminence of a Jacobite attempt were well understood by the government in 1715, the fulsome tone and content of the address are unsurprising. Yet they contrast starkly with the qualified approval of Anne accorded in the 1713 Aberdeen address, and in a superficial sense with the same degree of loyalty to George declared in March 1715, which covered 'his person and Government', but by implication not his title to the throne de jure. Occupying the pulpit of the high church in Aberdeen in 1715, Dr George Garden asserted that those who had abjured the Pretender were not bound by their oath, because James, as their political parent, had not consented to the oath. This neat casuistry could thus be used to free all the clergy who had acknowledged or prayed for Anne and George.

The episcopaliens' enemies claimed in 1712 that acknowledgement of Anne would stem from the Jacobites' unscrupulous desire to place 'politick Interest' above principles by publicly abjuring but privately acknowledging the Pretender, and that in using the prayer-book Collect for the Queen some clergy 'barefacedly, and avowedly, turn'd over the Leaf and wholly omitted that Prayer.' Prayers were also said either explicitly for the Pretender or ambiguously.
The omission of the Collect was denied, but it was evidently practised even in 1710, when Bishop Nicolson's chaplain witnessed the way prayers for the Queen and Royal Family were 'mangled and curtail'd in a very gross and scandalous manner'; a proposal for the Collect to be used as a partial recognition of her title caused bitterness among the nonjurors in 1713. Evidence for the years 1715-16 shows that the English liturgy was being used in a truncated form to suit the nonjurors' political, and perhaps also liturgical, needs. It was libelled against some thirty Edinburgh clergy before the High Court in 1716 that they kept meeting-houses without being qualified, and 'wilfully and contemptuously omitted every prayer, petition or part of the said Liturgy and Service of the Church of England' where prayers for George and the Royal Family were ordained, but instead used 'Certain General and Equivocal words.' Witnesses' depositions indicate that parts or the whole of some prayers were omitted. This confirms a contemporary statement that most Edinburgh clergy observed the prayer-book rubrics, except in omitting the prayers for the King and the Royal Family, for whom they prayed in terms which signified the Pretender. About one third of those indicted had addressed Anne, which demonstrates that only a few clergy acknowledged Anne and then baulked at her Hanoverian successor; most could accept neither. Not surprisingly
the majority of the Edinburgh petitioners to Montrose in 1714 re-appear in the criminal letters against the disaffected city clergy in 1716.  

North of the Tay where the rebels held control, the episcopal clergy were more explicit in praying for James and observing the fast for success of his arms and thanksgiving for his safe arrival, in accordance with Mar's proclamations. However, prudently oblique forms persisted. Two clergy in Muthill meeting-house

'Did disingeniously pray in General terms, for the King or Soveraign, Leaving their hearers to apply that General expression To that person who hath taken upon him the Stile and Title of King of our Dominions'  

One of them pleaded that because the collects he used were really parts of his sermon, it was incumbent on his colleague who conducted prayers after him to fulfil the obligation to pray, a division of functions which was practised in the Kirk. Such expedients were perhaps behind the use of abridged prayer-book forms in Edinburgh, and were matched by other means designed to evade certification under the Toleration Act. Prayers and collects were said from memory, presumably so as not to highlight omissions from the liturgy.  

In Angus and the Mearns in 1717 two ministers substituted 'discourses' read from printed sermons for their own sermons, in an attempt to disclaim that they conducted a service. Depositions against indicted clergy demonstrate that for political and religious reasons the use of the English liturgy was by no means uniform
where it was adopted, and that traditional forms survived. Thus in one meeting-house in Edinburgh worship in 1716-17 was 'by preaching, praying and singing of Psalms in the manner used before the Revolution', while in Angus and the Mearns in 1717 some clergy combined the prayer-book with psalm-singing, or used extemporary prayers. Such instances serve to qualify the picture of loyalty and uniformity with the Church of England which served the episcopali ans so well until the Rebellion.

In general the episcopali ans appear to have fulfilled the promise the Aberdeen clergy made to James at Fetteresso, to take care 'to instill into the minds of the people true principles of loyalty to your majesty.' A presbyterian polemic pointed out that of all the Jacobites it was those who kept meeting-houses and used the liturgy who

'had appeared most violently against the government, and who had most inflamed the minds of the people with rebellious principles ... some of them had avowedly proclaimed the Pretender, sword in hand, and others of them consecrated (so far as their prayers could go) his standard...'

Others 'conjured the people of their congregations to join the king's army.' They included Dr George Garden and Patrick Dunbreck, both active in Aberdeen, and John Alexander at Kildrummie, who probably helped by exhorting Mar's reluctant tenants there to join his arms. The clergy were thus open to reprisals. Other instances of the active advocacy of rebellion are attested in Perthshire
and Angus. This type of influence on the laity was expressed by Bishop Nicolson's observation that the paternal training of the rebel sons of Bishops Rose and Douglas was as clear 'as if the two Prelates had gallop'd before them into Battle.'

A few clergy did join the rebel forces, such as George Hay in Rathven and Alexander Smith in Bellie. William Irvine, who had been out with Dundee and Kenmure in 1689, and was chaplain to the Earl of Carnwath, preached to Mackintosh of Borlum's forces at Kelso, and was subsequently captured and imprisoned in the Fleet. John Pearson, minister of Kirkmichael, not only exhorted people to rebel but armed himself to escort Mar. Most clergy seem to have confined their activities to their own parish, and forcible intrusions into churches from autumn 1715 until about February 1716 were widespread. In Angus and the Mearns at least twenty-four were occupied by nonjurors, who, it was libelled against them, did

'Pray in express terms openly publickly and audibly in the respective Congregations there assembled, for the person pretending right to His Majesties Dominions, and to be King thereof.'

At Benholm, Andrew Slirie 'preached upon the lawfulness of obedience to him as such, and endeavoured to prove the legitimacy of his Birth and his being Protestant of which he said he had given good proofs. All this to persuade the people to obey him as King... He spake publickly in the Church disrespectfully of Our Sovereign King George calling him ane Usurper and representing King William as a Tyrant.'
Intrusion was also widespread in the north-east, mostly in parishes where episcopalian were not already in possession; in Aberdeenshire and Banffshire alone more than forty clergy were involved in the Rebellion.

By giving their allegiance to James and occupying parish churches, the Jacobite clergy ended twenty-seven years of attempts to accommodate themselves to the Revolution dispensation either by sincere gestures, or to survive under it by insincere or qualified ones. More particularly the Rebellion cut short the considerable episcopalian revanche of Anne's last years and ensured that the opportunity for a political revolution in favour of the Stewarts would not easily recur. The clergy's part in the Rebellion made them 'justly amenable to the laws', which were applied vigorously. The church courts were quick to seize the opportunity to remove ministers and schoolmasters who had supported or joined the rebels, in order to effect the planting of vacated parishes and to incapacitate intruders and meeting-house keepers. In the north-east the presbyteries allegedly attempted to persuade them that processes, which could lead to criminal trials, could be prevented if they undertook to minister only in their own households, but were refused. Processes were commenced there and elsewhere on the grounds that compliance with or participation in the Rebellion were sinful and scandalous. They had broken their engagements
on receiving orders as protestant ministers to uphold the reformed religion, by acknowledging and praying for James, 'a most bigotted papist', as king, and by observing the fast and thanksgiving for his cause. These were measures 'evidently tending to the subversion of the reformed religion', and their scandalousness was compounded by the perjury of the few clergy who had taken the oaths of Allegiance and Abjuration and subscribed the Assurance, or who had prayed for King George.

Large numbers of clergy were duly cited, libels against them proved to the presbyteries' satisfaction, and sentences of deposition passed. The episcopalian complained that by using irregular processes and armed force, the presbyterians in Aberdeenshire were, by 1717, in the course of depriving what would amount to twenty-four parishes and a further twelve meeting-houses of their ministers, and that this persecution 'is carried on with equal Fury and Injustice in all the Shires.' The presbyteries of Fordoun, Brechin, Dundee and Forfar, and Dunkeld, and presbyteries in Moray and Ross all commenced processes against intruders as soon as the Rebellion collapsed. About sixty episcopal clergy still in possession of parishes in 1715 were deposed, and sentences were also passed on numerous post-Revolution clergy who had intruded into churches or kept meeting-houses. Care was also taken to depose Jacobite schoolmasters, who were often clerks and precentors in episcopal congregations, and whose dangerous power to educate their pupils in erroneous ecclesiastical and political principles alarmed the Kirk.
A third element in the post-Rebellion purge was the visitation of King's and Marischal Colleges, Aberdeen, by a royal commission. In 1717 it deposed the Principal of King's, Dr. George Middleton, who had been active in promoting the English liturgy, along with other episcopalian clerics in both colleges; the Earl Marischal's patronage was forfeited to the Crown. Significantly, the Synod of Angus and Mearns was among those who lobbied for the commission, knowing the effects which the colleges had in inculcating and sustaining Jacobitism. In 1715 an observer of the poisoned education of the majority of the gentry of Angus and Mearns, Aberdeenshire and northward shires, affirmed that 'Jacobitism owes its being kept alive in Scotland to no one thing more than to the zeal and industry of the masters of the colleges here in its favour.' The 1717 deprivations denied the episcopalian clerics this source of strength, and like the removals from the parishes, dramatically weakened what remained in their hands of the pre-Revolution establishment.

The planting of the parishes was resisted; in parts of Aberdeenshire stone-throwing mobs countered the parties of troops escorting presbyterian clergy. The episcopal clergy believed themselves justified in continuing to officiate where possible, because they did not recognise the presbyteries' jurisdiction, as they indicated in their declinations. 'Duty and conscience' bound them to read prayers, preach and minister to their people 'who
zealously adhered to them', in their own houses or manses which they still occupied. A handful of clergy who had not rebelled remained in legal possession, including the ministers of Udny, Monymusk and Monquhitter. A group of seven or eight who claimed they had qualified themselves and 'lived inoffensively' commenced attempts to address ministers or bishops at Court for redress or mitigation of their sufferings from the Kirk's illegal proceedings. At a more general meeting of seventeen clergy on 30 October 1716, which was sanctioned in some form by Bishop Rose, the recognition of the Hanoverian regime which a particular address would imply was rejected in favour of a 'General Representation'. Details of individual cases were quickly compiled into publishable form, to attract English sympathy.

The clergy's continued ministrations necessitated further measures which were executed by magistrates and sheriffs from 1717 to enforce ecclesiastical sentences and prevent the episcopalian from retaining a hold in the parishes. Renewed activity by nonjurors was evident in Moray, Aberdeen and Angus and Mearns in 1716, with the Jacobites reported 'as uppish almost as ever.' However, Crown lawyers noted that after the Rebellion was suppressed some Aberdeen clergy 'found it convenient to behave themselves somewhat more submissively' until the Act of Grace was published on 28 July 1717. Criminal processes were therefore begun in May 1717 in the first Northern Circuit held since
the Rebellion, but failed to secure convictions against
the rebellious and intruding clergy, mainly because they
failed to comppear. A process commenced in the High
Court against ten clergy in Angus and Mearns for intruding,
ministering without calls and praying for the Pretender
was dropped in July 1717 when the Indemnity appeared.
The Act was taken by the clergy to absolve them from the
criminal acts of intrusion and praying for the Pretender,
and thus several returned to their parishes. Consequently eight clergy were indicted for ministering after
deposition from office and exercise of ministry, and
for occupation of churches, manses and glebes since
the Indemnity. Seven were convicted and decreed to
quit the latter, fined £25 sterling, discharged from preaching
or ministering again in the respective parishes, and ordained
not to trouble established ministers in possession of
churches, manses and glebes, under penalty of 500 merks.
The pursuers protested against the lenity and inadequacy of
the sentences, which left disaffected clergy free to
'Disseminate their Rebellious Doctrines' in parishes in
which they had not been discharged to preach; in accordance
with the Kirk's sentences they should have been discharged
from ministering in general.

Heavier and more sweeping sentences along these
lines were passed against six clergy from Angus and
Mearns in February 1718, including discharges from
ministering until qualified, fines of £500 sterling each
for ministering without taking oaths, and additional fines of £20 sterling against three.\textsuperscript{117} The process is significant for evidence that the clergy were again resorting to equivocal forms of prayer for the king,\textsuperscript{118} and that efforts were being made to forestall certification under the Toleration Act for holding meeting-houses without qualification. When ministering in their own or other private houses the clergy attempted to restrict the number of hearers in addition to the family to ten in order to maintain a plausible pretext that services were only family worship. Nonetheless, depositions indicate that often there were more present, thus partially confirming the Crown's assertion that such gatherings were in effect numerous congregations, frequently 'more than the house can hold', and were 'Nurseries of Sedition.'\textsuperscript{119} With clergy moving between lairds' houses and their hearers eavesdropping outside windows and doors, the episcopalianarians were devising expedients which were soon to become a common part of their religious life. The Lords of Justiciary were not moved by commonsense definitions of private worship advanced in the nonjurors' defence, such as the absence of desks and pulpits, collections for the poor and contributions to the minister,\textsuperscript{120} so even house meetings were interpreted as congregations in the terms of the Toleration Act.\textsuperscript{121} Lay hostility made the meeting-houses less easy places to worship. In 1718 the Duke of Roxburgh was determined to expel any tenants who attended the ministrations of 'the Episcopal tartuffe' in a meeting-house in Dunbar;
he believed that all such houses 'are only kept up upon the account of Jacobitism.'

Penched in by legal and social restraints but with loyal hearers still needing their ministry, the clergy faced conflicting pressures which made their function more difficult after the Rebellion.

Conversely the dogged persistence which many displayed put both the ecclesiastical and civil courts to considerable difficulties in securing convictions against them. Those whom the Justiciary Courts tried had mostly already been processed by presbytery or synod, and in turn most were indicted at least twice before the Lords. Thus of the six Angus and Mearns clergy sentenced in February 1718, three were previous offenders whose process had been stopped in July 1717.

A far higher proportion of continuing offences was evident in the High Court’s processes against the clergy in Edinburgh and its environs. In 1716 twenty-nine were discharged from further preaching until they produced letters of orders, of whom twenty-three were fined £20 each for not praying for King George. Twenty-three of them were indicted before the Court again in 1717, but a third of the processes were dropped or failed.

Significantly, most of the clergy had registered their letters of orders with the magistrates according to the 1716 sentences, thus effectively forestalling further penalties, despite the contention in the criminal letters
that orders granted by the deprived bishops or their colleagues were invalid because the episcopal office had no existence according to law.\textsuperscript{126} The magistrates and the Lords of Justiciary were placed in the awkward position of appearing less than zealous to punish the nonjurors, just as in 1716 the King's order to shut all episcopal meetings summarily and proceed against the nonjurors had to be tactfully deflected by the Lords because the meetings could not be closed without due process of law.\textsuperscript{127} The invalidity of episcopal orders was not admitted as a relevant charge,\textsuperscript{128} and when it recurred in later libels it met with spirited opposition.\textsuperscript{129}

The processes against the Edinburgh clergy in 1716 and 1717 were the most successful managed by the Crown pursuers in the years to 1720. In other areas fewer delinquent clergy were brought to trial with less success. In burghs such as Aberdeen where the magistrates fined clergy\textsuperscript{130} there was probably less need for justiciary processes, but it is by no means clear that nonjuring activity had been satisfactorily reduced in landward parishes by the J.P.'s and Sheriffs. Three northern clergy escaped trial in 1718 because of imperfect citations; the process of a fourth was postponed,\textsuperscript{131} as happened with the sole indicted minister in 1719.\textsuperscript{132} On the South Circuit that year only one successful and one unsuccessful process were heard.\textsuperscript{133} In 1720 only the North Circuit dealt with episcopaliens; two processes were postponed and one minister sentenced.\textsuperscript{134} That the clergy were still active and that the government was willing to move against them is shown
in the case of the 1721 Circuit, before which sixteen clergy, predominantly from Aberdeenshire, were cited for ministerial activities; the diets against fifteen of them were deserted, mainly on technical grounds.

The collapse of Crown prosecutions on such a scale could only encourage the nonjurors and their supporters, whose worship was formally restricted by a penal act passed in April 1719. The Act in effect defined a congregation or meeting-house as a gathering of nine or more persons in addition to members of the household; to be able to minister to such a congregation a minister had to pray expressly for King George and the Royal Family and take the Abjuration Oath contained in the act. The Oath was modified so as to be palatable to the established clergy, among whom most of the nonjurors took it, thus all but ending an important source of legal immunity for the episcopalian. The harsh penalties for disobeying the law perhaps reflected governmental dismay at the clergy's continued activity. The small gatherings for worship noted in 1717-18 now became a necessity, and together with the removal of the majority of the episcopalian still in parishes in 1715, compelled the episcopalian to meet either in private or in meeting-houses.

It has been argued that the proceedings against the clergy after the Rebellion in effect broke the episcopal clergy's last connections with the state, and that the 1719 Act, as the last important statute
dealing with both the established clergy and the episcopalian, marked the point after which they can be said to have adopted separate existences. Certainly the Act furthered the effects of imprisonments, fines, forcible ejections and ecclesiastical and civil processes in fixing the episcopalian's view of themselves as a persecuted communion suffering at the hands of an establishment whose religious principles and ecclesiastical polity they could not accept. Nonetheless some specific differences which separated them were evident well before 1715, while others were precipitated by the effects of the Rebellion. It is therefore worthwhile examining the various features which marked the episcopalian out as a body distinct from the Kirk by 1720, and to trace briefly their impact from that date.

The theme of confessional suffering, though almost perennial since 1689, was given added intensity by the measures taken by the Kirk and the civil authorities to root out the nonjurors. For, although the clergy mostly remained active their position was always under threat. Thus Patrick Dunbreck rejoiced to find that most of his Aberdeen congregation 'kept free of the Infection of the Damnable prevailing Schism' during his 'forc'd Secession', and that the principal object of the presbyterians' enmity, the English liturgy, had actually gained popularity in city and country. There were reported to be seven meeting-houses active in Aberdeen. Yet he lamented
that 'our Case at present is almost parallel to that of the Jewish Church during the Babylonish Captivity.'

Appeals for English support stressed the latter aspect and repeated the familiar pleas that the Kirk aimed to extirpate the liturgy used by episcopaliands, who remained peaceable until driven by necessity or force to comply with the Rebellion. In one pamphlet the clergy's long 'Temptations of Poverty and Want' and resultant disaffection were blamed on Scottish presbyterian bigotry. By contrast King William's moderation towards the nonjurors, which implied their good behaviour in meriting it, was played up, no doubt to humour the work's Whig dedicatee, Archbishop Wake, whose favour the episcopaliands needed.

Wake was successfully persuaded by Bishop Rose to apply for clemency on behalf of his son, awaiting trial with Bishop Douglas's son and other rebels at Carlisle, although Nicolson deplored Rose's tacitly unrepentant Jacobitism. On his own behalf Rose pleaded unsuccess-fully for the resumption of his discontinued pension. Later the clergy's agent approached Wake for relief for Rose and his clergy 'who are now reduced to the last extremity', assuring him that no money would go to offenders against the government. Meanwhile, representations of unjust treatment apparently had little effect in comparison to those made in 1711-12, insofar as the 1719 Act could not be resisted by an
enfeebled Tory interest, and the clergy's Jacobitism was too blatant to be defended. Political support for the episcopalian was at a low ebb. Though measures against them were complained of, there were clear attempts to turn them to good account on a spiritual level. This was already evident in 1714 when one minister reminded his hearers that however grievous accusations against them were, 'our Rejoycing is this, that we are hereby made Partakers of our Saviour's Sufferings.' The same response was rhetorically expressed in an Information laid before the High Court in 1718 on behalf of nine indicted clergy and laity. It represented their afflictions, such as the accusation of Jacobitism, as being sent by God 'as a bitter portion for purifying and purging off the distemper of their Souls, and that those who occasion them are only the Instruments in his hands for their advantage.'

The theme of spiritual purgation through temporal suffering had become an integral part of the episcopalian's perceptions of their communion and, though difficult to gauge, its effect in strengthening their spiritual resolve should not be underestimated.

A second aspect of the post-Rebellion period was the emergence on a significant scale of congregations whose clergy were qualified in terms of the 1712 and 1719 Acts. Because the prescribed qualifications were in the last analysis unequivocal, notwithstanding previous episcopalian shifts, the chapels became places where clergy and laity loyal to the Hanoverians worshipped, or where Jacobites
of pliant consciences went as a means of preserving public position. They arose mainly in the burghs of the eastern seaboard. Edinburgh's unique concentration of nonjuring meetings was balanced by the chapel where government servants had continued to worship since Greenshields's day. Donations were sought for a new chapel in 1720, which was opened in 1722, and on being endowed by Chief Baron Smith, adopted his name. In Glasgow the only legal services were conducted by an English regimental chaplain. To the north a combination of aversion to the established church and deprivation of public ministrations by episcopali ans drove laity to establish qualified meetings. At Forfar in 1719 the covertly Jacobite magistrates and neighbouring gentry hoped to do so with Bishop Rose's permission, but were probably dissuaded. In Montrose a qualified congregation gathered under the management of leading councillors and burgesses, who engaged James Gordon, formerly episcopal minister there, in October 1718. Strenuous fund-raising led to the building of a new chapel from 1722, opened in 1724. A similarly vigorous initiative was evident in Aberdeen in 1720 where a group of merchants and tradesmen agreed to settle a qualified minister, and a new chapel dedicated to St. Paul was begun in January 1721 with great ceremony. Aid was sought by appeal to parliament and personally to Archbishop Wake, stressing the obstructiveness of the presbyterian magistracy.
In Banff, too, an agreement between the merchant guildry and trades in 1722 led to the building of a chapel dedicated to St. Andrew, which was also reserved for trades' meetings, but from whose use 'all Dissenters and Presbyterians' were debarred.  Other chapels may have arisen from individual benefaction, such as one at Linlithgow Bridge founded by Lady Ann Callendar by about 1723.

The qualified chapels represented the determination of episcopalian's in burghs and landward parishes to evade the presbyterians' repressive measures. The ambitious scale on which some were conceived resulted from the necessity of building afresh where existing structures were no longer available or were inadequate for their purposes, and was perhaps augmented by the laity's desire to demonstrate visibly that neither they nor their liturgy could be downtrodden. In the absence of specific evidence for the size of the congregations, the fact that sales of the Book of Common Prayer were buoyant in about 1720 suggests a demand related to the requirements of the 1712 and 1719 Acts. The prescribed acknowledgements of King George's title did not at this date necessitate a breach by all the laity or clergy in such chapels with their nonjuring brethren, in the sense that there were precedents of political compliance since the Revolution. Such compliance had, however, generally been frowned upon except when used as an expedient to further the episcopalian and Jacobite cause, as may have been the aim of sections of the post-Rebellion qualified congregations. It was also the case
that political differences in the early 1720s had not yet been widely compounded by radical alterations in the nonjurors' liturgical practices and more rigid notions of communion, though changes were occurring. \footnote{161} Qualified clergy in Aberdeen seem to have been allowed a voice as part of the diocese in 1725, \footnote{162} but by 1730 nonjuring disapproval of attendance at St. Paul's Aberdeen was evident. \footnote{163}

The emergence of the qualified congregations was an essential part of wider changes, which, coinciding with the death of Bishop Rose in 1720, altered the inward and outward face of the episcopal communion. Changes in its government were also of profound importance. In the aftermath of the Rebellion the church was headed by Bishop Rose in the manner discussed in earlier chapters, with Bishops Fullarton, Falconer, Millar and Irvine exercising episcopal functions with Rose's consent, but without claiming any diocesan jurisdiction. \footnote{164} Rose agreed with Falconer that measures were necessary to place the four post-Revolution bishops on a proper footing with the church, instead of allowing them to continue as bishops at large. However, having 'sat so long at the Helm in very cloudy and stormy weather', he died suddenly in March 1720, leaving 'no Directions how matters were to be mannaged after him.' \footnote{165} The unexpected removal of his metropolitical authority precipitated a bitter conflict over the inter-related issues of government and liturgy which contrasted
strongly with the relatively peaceful period to 1720.

James's trustees, on whose appointment Rose had advised, were led by Lockhart of Carnwath, who took on the troublesome responsibility of managing the non-jurors until his flight in 1727. Difficulties over church government immediately became apparent at Fullarton's election as Rose's successor in Edinburgh. The 'Ante-Diluvian' or pre-Revolution presbyters made 'wild work' at first by insisting that the four bishops at large lacked diocesan 'power or Jurisdiction through defect of Election', and in attempting to exclude both them and the clergy ordained since 1689 from a voice in the election. After a delay, proofs of consecration were produced and the bishops recommended that the clergy elect one of them to supervise Edinburgh and its environs, provided that the post-Revolution clergy had a vote. The clergy met on 29 April 1720 and all agreed they had a right and authority to elect their bishop, as the bishops had acknowledged, but after a sharp debate a narrow majority referred the nomination to the bishops, who chose Fullarton.

The trustees recommended his appointment as the fittest and most senior of the bishops with the intention that James would ordain that, as primus, Fullarton be given the same regard by the church as Rose had enjoyed, so as to be able to 'take the chief government of the Church upon him' from his residence in Edinburgh.
Rattray and others who supported the electoral rights of the clergy interpreted the election merely as a devolution of such intrinsic rights to the bishops, and, like Lockhart, understood that his electors intended Fullarton to be 'in the proper sense Bishop of Edinburgh with the same ecclesiastical Privileges that his Predecessors in that see had enjoyed.' 171

The consideration that the bishop would exercise metropolitical authority rather than merely supervision of Edinburgh and neighbouring clergy explained the permission to vote accorded to clergy from other dioceses and districts who happened to be in Edinburgh. 172 However, the four bishops there informed Campbell and Gadderar that they did not think it prudent that Fullarton should succeed Rose

' in his Vicarious Metropolitical powers but onlie have a facultie to call National Convocat [ions] when the exigencie of the Church makes that needfull'

and to preside in all general meetings. 173

The office of primus thus introduced was not in itself a difficulty, for it had already been conferred on the English nonjuror, Jeremy Collier in 1716, thus creating him presiding head of the province on the primitive model. However, the definition of Fullarton's authority was significant because conflict between bishops and presbyters was carried a stage further by Millar and Irvine's 'scheme of governing this whole national Church in common under the name of the College of Bishops.' 174 Fullarton, who had intended to carry out a division of Scotland into
districts (a scheme approved of by Campbell and Gadderar), acquiesced in the College scheme and in the reduction of his authority to that of primus, which was necessary because metropolitical authority, like diocesan authority, presupposed precisely the territorial episcopate which was being avoided. Considerations such as the bishops' and laity's poverty, the need to obtain James's sanction for a re-organisation of the dioceses, and the possibility that some clergy, with lay support, might elect diocesans unacceptable to the bishops because of their churchmanship, all justified the existence of a College of bishops without districts or dioceses. Because the proponents of the College regarded the royal prerogative highly their method of governing gained the trustees' approval, although the latter were said to have stated even after the inception of the scheme that Fullarton's authority was to be like Rose's. Bishop Falconer, who also acquiesced in the scheme, believed that clergy in the districts would elect the bishops to supervise them and that the scheme 'would be thereby extinguished of it self without any noise or opposition', to be replaced by a division of the former dioceses into five or six 'large contiguous Districts.' He himself was chosen to have inspection of Angus and Mearns with his colleagues' approval in autumn 1720, and soon after of the three Fife clergy also.

From the moment it was proposed in an Edinburgh clergy meeting on 22 March 1720 that the four post-Revolution bishops in Scotland
should be recognised as the College its real nature
was doubtful and became the subject of conflict
throughout the 1720s. Objections were made to the
alteration of its traditional meaning, collectively
signifying diocesan bishops, to a description of

'a set of Bishops at large acting
in Common, which made this Church
no better than a monster with a
multitude of Heads.' 182

The 1720 proposal excluded Bishops Campbell and Gadderar,183
who were regarded as being outwith the province, having earlier
declared they were not in communion with those of their
Scottish brethren of whose liturgical practices they
disapproved.184 Their right to be consulted as bishops
of the province185 about future consecrations was, however,
recognised in the case of three nominations by James
in 1720-21. Campbell voiced his dread of the Erastian
use of the prerogative in nominating David Freebairn by
writing both to James and the Earl of Mar, but acquiesced
for peace'sake.186 Falconer also was 'so affraid of the
rights of the Church' that he scrupled at the nomination,
but the bishops were reassured that they would be
consulted before future nominations.187 Freebairn's
consecration was put off until October 1722.188

Lockhart's management of the bishops and clergy was
essentially on the basis of the royal supremacy as
exercised before 1689.189 At a meeting of the College
in late 1724 to settle the dispute among the Angus and
Mearns clergy and laity over Falconer's successor, he
blocked the case advanced for seeking the concurrence of
a majority of the presbyters and the laity's approval before appointments to dioceses. He bluntly asserted the King's right to issue a *congé d'éliire*, and the necessity for the College 'to assert and maintain their authority' on which the presbyters pretended to encroach. Tighter controls on elections and appointments followed in order to preserve James's rights. Lockhart used his commission to obstruct the advancement of presbyters' electoral rights and of liturgical changes which were both mainly being advocated by those opposed to the College party. In the case of his recommendation of John Gillan as a bishop and successor as *primus* to the ageing Fullarton, he successfully acted without the other trustees' knowledge.

The blatant use of lay influence to secure Gillan's consecration prompted eighteen Edinburgh clergy to petition the College for a delay. They argued that God had provided the opportunity of rescuing their intrinsic rights 'by withdrawing from this afflicted branch of his church all the ensnaring baits as well as the protection of the secular arm.' The late bishops, especially Rose, they argued, had acted and governed according to the catholic principle of the intrinsic rights since the Revolution. This statement may reflect the degree of participation in church government accorded to the Edinburgh clergy by Rose. It was not surprising that the revolt against a system which did not fully recognise the right of
the lower order to be consulted over elections occurred where the highest concentration of them was gathered. Their action drew the plaudits of Bishop Gadderar and twenty-four of his Aberdeen clergy, who thanked them

'for your so strenuously and seasonably asserting and vindicating the Just Rights of our Common Order; and your own unquestionable privileedge in duly electing for yourselves a proper and Acceptable Bishop.'194

Ironically their choice fell on Bishop Millar, whose previous violent opposition to the diocesan scheme, to the vesting of metropolitical powers in the Bishop of Edinburgh and to liturgical changes did not prevent him from nurturing and achieving an ambition to become primus with metropolitical authority. On Lockhart's evidence he furthered his election by exploiting the not uncommon fault of the Edinburgh clergy of marrying irregularly and other 'indecent practices.'195

The Gillan controversy was not merely a collision between the pre-Revolution conception of the prerogative and the conflicting one which asserted the church's intrinsic rights, although the clergy's demands for a voice and Lockhart's opposition were more open than ever before. Lockhart was especially angered by the clergy's complaint that James had broken his promise of always consulting the bishops before recommending a man for an episcopal chair.196 The episode had the important effect of deepening the schism between the diocesan and College parties, who strove to maintain their strength by consecrations performed
without general consent. Secondly, the leaking of the fact that Lockhart received the _congé_ from James,\textsuperscript{197} and subsequent discoveries by the government which caused Lockhart's flight, showed how the elaborate process of maintaining the prerogative depended on secrecy so much that it was spoiled by the indiscretions of disaffected clergy. More importantly it demonstrated that a secular vice-regal authority far removed from the King was no substitute either in principle or in practice for the respected metropolitical authority which Bishop Rose had wielded.

Its absence goes far towards explaining how the 1720s witnessed a period of unparalleled party conflict within the church. Even the phlegmatic Lockhart could not

\textquote{\textquote{but observe and regret how unaccountable it is for men that are at, under, and in a state of persecution, to be so factious and divided amongst themselves.}}\textsuperscript{198}

His caustic opinion of the bishops' incapacity to lead the church and serve James's interest\textsuperscript{199} was justified by their bitter divisions. As discussed so far, these centred on secular versus ecclesiastical authority, but they also concerned liturgical changes which, like the wider issue of church government, stemmed from the nature of the post-Revolution church, but only became critical after 1720.

In large part the difficulties arose from the close involvement of Campbell and Gadderar in moves by
the English nonjurors to implement what they regarded as essential changes to the liturgy. The ensuing dispute was the most striking example of the English nonjurors' influence on their Scottish brethren which was facilitated by friendships between leading English usagers such as Hickes, Collier and Brett, and the Scots most sympathetic to the recovery of primitive church practices, Campbell, Gadderar and Falconer. In 1718 the English nonjurors published a communion office drawing on early liturgies and on the prayer book of 1549, which was held to embody in words and ritual the reality of the eucharistic sacrifice more perfectly than the 1662 prayer book in general use. Certain 'Usages' were prescribed, including the mixed cup, prayers for the faithful departed, express invocation of the Holy Spirit and a prayer of oblation. Opponents of the changes argued that they were only desideranda and not essential, and that the church was bound to observance of the 1662 liturgy until royal authority permitted otherwise. When appeal was made to Bishop Rose he declined to adjudicate because he was not convinced of the necessity of the Usages and believed them to be inexpedient. He was especially concerned that by declaring them necessary for communion the Scottish church would be divided by schism like their English brethren and would suffer 'a grievous defection also of multituds of owr people.' Besides there were few
or none who were 'any way fond of those usages', and 'our people' were entirely averse to them. Yet Rose prudently tolerated the practice of the Usages 'by several of our most intelligent clergy', including Falconer, and Rattray's use of the 1718 communion office in private worship. The mixed cup had in fact been long practised in the north and by 1720 was becoming more widespread,

'several of our younger Clergy especially beginning to acquaint themselves with the Principles and Practices of the Primitive Church and to pay a great regard to them.'

Communion continued to be given in both kinds where the cup was mixed.

At the same time Campbell pressed Rose harder to sanction the Usages as some of their English brethren had, and warned him that while he avoided ecclesiastical and political schism by not doing so, he risked a schism with the Usagers by continuing in communion with their opponents, whose offices were unprimitive, administrations imperfect and sacraments defective. The usages were necessary because 'it is Essential to offer a Perfect Sacrifice to God', and the changes 'might very easily, nay almost Indiscernably be Engrafted in the Scotch Liturgy', particularly because of the great freedom used in extemporary prayers.

Relations between Campbell and Rose were distinctly cool during the latter's last years, presumably because Campbell had declared he was not in communion with non-Usagers. Among the Scottish bishops
Falconer agreed with Campbell and Gadderar and by 1714 held that the bishops possessed an intrinsic right to alter or not alter modes of worship without reference to secular superiors. Fullarton adopted a non-committal conciliatory position after Rose's death which failed to contain either the Usagers' radical thrust or the pragmatic conservatism of their opponents led by Millar and Irvine and aided by Lockhart. The encouragement they received from English anti-Usagers also helped to intensify divisions.

In May 1720 the four bishops in Scotland ordained that any additions or omissions to the Book of Common Prayer would be regarded as schismatic, and at the same time sanctioned the use of the 1637 liturgy by those who wanted it. It became clear that the bishops would not consider alterations to the rubrics of the latter despite Campbell's plea that it would prevent all 'occasion of Differences among us.'

An open breach resulted from Campbell's election by a majority of Aberdeen clergy as their temporary superintendent in May 1721. His liturgical opinions were well-known to his fellow bishops, whose suspicions were perhaps increased by the simultaneous publication of his *Doctrines of a Middle State between Death and the Resurrection*, which examined the doctrinal justification of prayers for the dead. The bishops insisted that before approving of his election he should undertake 'to bring in no Innovations in to the
Doctrine or Worship of this Church nor suffer any under his Inspection to do it', and should own their communion and receive the sacrament as they gave it to their hearers by the Scots liturgy. Campbell did not accept that their authority prevented him from propagating the Usages, because the governors of the church were not entitled to dispense with what God ordained. He was prepared to suffer the consequences even if the adherents of the Usages were 'reduced to a very few'.

His belief in the overriding prescription of the Usages by their divine institution and early church history clashed with his opponents' argument that change was inexpedient and that existing liturgical forms were justified by their own historical pedigree. He espoused his beliefs, which he epigrammatically summarised as 'Purity without Puritanism', so forcefully and with such little sympathy for the episcopalian's hard-won liturgical practices that opposition and conflict was inevitable. Lockhart temporarily blocked moves to permit the Usages by invoking the need to serve James's cause by obedience to the College in late 1722, but a report that Bishop Irvine was planning to visit the north-east to oppose the Usages prompted Campbell, who held himself to be canonically-elected Bishop of Aberdeen, to arrange for Gadderar to act as his suffragan there.
A formula issued by the College against the Usages in February 1723 was signed by forty-three clergy in and around Edinburgh, had some support in Angus and Mearns, but failed in Aberdeen, where Gadderar commenced his first visitation in Lent and a second in June 1723.

The College brought Gadderar to submit to its authority in July 1724, when he agreed to communicate by the unmixed cup, not to use it publicly and to ensure his clergy did likewise, nor to introduce Usages without the College's authority. In return he was recognised as bishop, not by virtue of Campbell's delegated authority but by the clergy's election and the College's authority.

The rupture between Gadderar and Campbell which this caused was healed when, by a volte-face, Gadderar declared in March 1725 his intention never to omit the Usages, which he declared to be necessary. Campbell thereupon resigned his title to the diocese, and Gadderar's election followed in May.

His episcopate marked an evident return of strength and confidence to the beleaguered communion in the north-east. He set a new standard of pastoral care by visitations during which he ordained, confirmed, baptised and preached, and by his exercise of discipline, all of which brought him to the attention of the General Assembly as well as of the College of Bishops. He was active throughout the north-east and westward into Moray, where nine clergy elected him to exercise supervision.
over them in 1725. He noted of his first tours in 1723 that he and a colleague

'were receiv'd with respect and hospitality equal to the Character in better times by the Nobility, Gentrie, Borrows and People as well as by the Clergy. We laboured very hard, preaching wherever we came, and confirming great Numbers from the first quality to the beggar, and making Proselites to the Church, Refreshing the Desolate places with Ministers.'

By August 1723 almost twenty men had been ordained.

Thus in one sense the importance of his episcopate lay more in its pastoral success than in the additional divisions it caused among the bishops. Besides his willingness to defend the church's intrinsic rights alongside Campbell, Gadderar was a practical bishop, who could observe of their brethren that

'none of them, the Bishop of Edinburgh excepted, Labour to any good purpose in their proper Function.'

Following Falconer's example he laid great stress on confirmation and performed it extensively. His pastoral oversight came at a time when there was a great need for fresh ordinations to replace the pre-Revolution men who were dying off. Efforts were being made elsewhere, though probably not on diocesan lines, in particular by the sending out of 'missioners' from Edinburgh who 'made a good Crop of it for the Church, all of them using the Churches Liturgie.' It was perhaps no coincidence that in 1723, when the diocesan-Usager Party was striving with their anti-Usager College opponents for dominance, that meeting-house activity was once again reported to be
strong in the north, especially in Angus. The clergy in general were probably assisted by the resilience of the Jacobite laity despite forfeitures and exiles after the Fifteen, and by their entrenched antipathy to the Kirk. Also, in the north-east, unforeseen consequences of the 1717 visitation of the Aberdeen colleges were making themselves felt by the 1720s in the schools run by expelled regents which helped sustain episcopalian Jacobitism.

Gadderar's episcopate was also important for giving further impetus to liturgical change. The majority of the Aberdeen and Angus and Mearns clergy were receptive to the Usages in 1723; Gadderar anyhow left them free to choose and did not impose a formula, which helps account for the absence of evidence of dissent. Campbell's influence on Gadderar is evident in the report in 1727 that he and 'his Subalterns' 'promote with much keenness the Doctrine of a middle State and others tending to Popery.' He was said to have commissioned 100 copies of the 1637 communion office to be reprinted. This was perhaps all or part of James Watson's edition of 1722, which is known to have been used in modified form in the diocese in 1727. The Aberdeen arrangement probably set the pattern for the use of the Scottish communion office by scrupulous clergy until the effect of Rattray's Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem of 1744 was felt. The widespread adoption
of the Book of Common Prayer from about 1710 thus prepared
the north-east for a second wave of change which was
running strongly during Gadderar's episcopate. Elsewhere, apart from in Angus and Mearns, the impact
of the Usages was minimal. The English liturgy
perhaps remained the dominant form, but it is unclear
how far the Scottish liturgy was adopted as permitted by
the 1720 ordinance and the 1731 Concordat. However, most
episcopalians were worshipping by one or other form by the
1720s, and what the Usages dispute incidentally demonstrated
was that a liturgy had become an indispensable element in
their worship in a way which would have been unthinkable
in 1689.

The issues of church government and the Usages
emerged in 1720 as two parts of the single problem of how
to accommodate the claims of the exiled King and the bishops,
presbyters and laity to have a voice in the church. Their
conflicting needs were not fulfilled by the 1727 Canons.
These incorporated a recognition of the church's intrinsic
rights including presbyters' electoral rights, but were
framed by the diocesan party to establish the system of
diocesan bishops recognising the metropolitical powers
lodged in the Bishop of Edinburgh, which had been avoided in
1720.240 The College party did not accept the Canons,
whose provisions were superseded by the Concordat of 1731.
The agreements reached between the diocesan and College
parties included the definition of the elective office of
primus as 'for convocating and presiding only', a prohibition against the introduction of the Usages, the allocation of territorial jurisdictions known as districts, and a secret clause that while James would not recommend anyone for consecration he was to be informed in advance of consecrations. While bringing some peace over the exercise of the royal prerogative the Concordat did not prevent continuing difficulties over the Usages and diocesan appointments.  

The conflicts described above show that in 1720 no cohesive system of church government existed which Bishop Rose's successors could continue to operate unaltered. Diocesan jurisdiction independent of secular authority and the elective office of primus, which became two of the distinctive characteristics of the Scottish episcopal communion, were not yet established. In an organisational sense, therefore, the 1731 Concordat, and the 1743 canons which embodied its principles, marked the inception of a church whose clerical and, to a limited extent, lay members regulated its external affairs and fixed its liturgical and doctrinal standards. Viewed as a separate communion from the established church, however, the episcopalianists constituted a distinct ecclesiastical body before Rose's death precipitated the division of the 1720s. Their resistance to the presbyterian establishment from 1689 was conducted largely on the basis of their claim to be the true Church of Scotland, and increasingly drew
on 'higher' notions of the nature of the Christian church which stressed the necessity for bishops, and regular liturgical worship. As a corollary a stricter conception of communion emerged.

The use of a liturgy was one of the episcopalian's most distinctive features by 1715 yet its apologist Robert Calder argued that owning the Book of Common Prayer as lawful worship and preferring it to extemporary prayer 'is not enough to denominate a Man Episcopal.' Nor was the use of the Lord's Prayer an adequate distinction between episcopalian and presbyterian. Rather the distinction rested on the presbyterians' denial of jurisdiction and ordination by diocesan bishops and their assertion of the divine right of presbytery. Thus liturgical worship cannot be used as the sole index of the emergence of 'high church' conceptions of what set the episcopalian apart, although it was doubtless a powerful stimulus. In Cabrach parish, Aberdeenshire, in Anne's last years the episcopalian did not use the liturgy, yet declared that by accepting presbyterian ordinances whose validity they doubted, they would

'abandon our ancient Communion which we judge agreable to the word of God and thus Cutt our Selves off from the whole Catholick Church.'

It was the espousal of such principles, including the divine ordering of the Church under bishops and the apostolic succession, which solidified the foundation of post-Revolution episcopalianism. High notions of
episcopal government with a greater or lesser stress on the intrinsic rights of the church can be traced back through the influential work of John Sage to English writers of the seventeenth century, who in turn looked back to the primitive church as their model. St. Cyprian's vigorous belief in the essentiality of bishops, his exclusive definition of communion, his combatting of heresy and schism and his martyrdom, combined to make him an attractive authority

English High Churchmen such as Dodwell who influenced Scottish episcopalianists in search of justificatory and prescriptive precedent. Cyprian was quoted approvingly in condemnation of non-episcopal churches:

-One thing ye are to know, that he that is not with the Bishop, is not in the Church.'

The appeal to the authority of the early church held obvious attractions to churchmen who regarded the hostility of the establishment as conferring a confessional status on their communion. They pointed to the virtual ignorance of patristics and early church history among the presbyterians.

The Toleration Act which provided for the separate existence of the episcopal communion was of no consequence in the sense that the episcopalianists already held themselves to be a distinct church. It merely provided the opportunity for them to espouse, as for instance the Stirling episcopalianists did, 'the undoubted Priesthood' and 'the Primitive Doctrine and Apostolick Government of the Church'.

High
conceptions of the church were evident in declinatures of the authority of the established Church. Three nonjurors protested before Perth presbytery in 1711 that

'We cannot own any spiritual jurisdiction in you without separating from the Catholick, Christian Church, both ancient and modern, whose government — namely, the Episcopal — has descended to us from Apostolick days. And, as we have hitherto lived, so we hope to continue in the unity of the Church.'

Furthermore, as has been mentioned, the validity of episcopal orders was defended both in church courts and before civil and criminal tribunals. It was under Rose's 'auspicious direction' that clergy pleaded the intrinsic power of the church before the secular courts.

The spread of the conception of the divine right of episcopacy was probably quickened by legal pressures and by the clergy's awareness that such ideas were likely to gain English sympathy because they reflected High Church theory on the question of the necessity of bishops. On the other hand on questions such as the royal supremacy and schism they had more affinity with the English nonjurors. It was in this context that the Scots attempted to underpin their position by 'Church principles'. These were also intended to bind the laity to the communion by a fuller understanding of its essential points and thereby refute the latitudinarian beliefs which, Falconer lamented, were still prevalent in 1712. A pamphlet of 1718 advocating
the re-adoption of the Usages advanced a conception of the church far removed from latitudinarian indifference over the apostolical order of episcopacy, and placed episcopal authority and the liturgy at the centre of the church's existence. 251 Fear of the growth of latitudinarian principles and the consequent need to espouse 'Church Principles' was expressed by the bishops after Rose's death. 252 Some confidence was expressed about the acceptance of such principles during the period of the prayer book project before the Rebellion:

'Church Principles and Communion, and the Sinfulness and Danger of Schism, began now to be better understood by the generality of People, even such as had little notion of it before.' 253

The addition to the communion of presbyterian apostates who espoused the divine ordering of bishops undoubtedly helped to strengthen the episcopalian's sense of being the true church. The influence on converts of apologetic writings was important. 254

The strengthening of the belief in the divine right of episcopacy necessarily entailed a stricter and more exclusive view of the communion of the church. Questions of whether and how to admit persons baptised by presbyterians to the sacrament, the necessity for re-baptism and other provisions to ensure the purity of the communion, exercised the nonjurors increasingly and caused strong feelings. In about 1703 a meeting-house kept by Dr. Robert Scott, former Dean of Glasgow, was split in
two when he avowed the validity of presbyterian baptism. 255 This type of latitudinarianism probably died with the pre-
Revolution clergy, for episcopalian apologies increasingly
began to incorporate the view of the presbyterians as
heterodox schismatics among whom 'no Ministry, nor
Church-Power, nor Valid Sacraments, can be found.' 256
Corresponding scruples began to emerge over communion
with the established Church of England, following the
English nonjurors' lead, and were given added weight
by the claims made by Greenshields and other compliers
to be in full communion. 257 With the rise of eucharistic
doctrines centring on the Usages, further means of
defining and limiting the communion of the church were
to hand. The notion of defective fundamental
elements of worship which vitiated eucharistic sacrifice
and prevented communion was a powerful but divisive weapon
in the hands of the Usagers in the 1720s.

By 1720, therefore, signs of inflexibility in
government, worship and doctrine were evident, but it
is not clear that differences of political opinion were
considered grounds of not communicating among the
episcopalian at this date. However, Wodrow noted a
supposed incident in Glasgow in 1721, when a nonjuror
refused to give a dying Hanoverian officer the sacrament
until he repented of the sin of accepting a commission
and pay 'to serve against his naturall and rightfull
soveraigne King James.' 258 Accommodating to the Kirk
remained a grave offence against episcopalian principles, but in the post-Rebellion church the clergy, and perhaps many laity, can be assumed to have made conscious choices to disavow the establishment. Pressures were allegedly applied, however, in order to maintain the communion in the north-east by extracting promises from communicants that they would not hear a presbyterian minister again. It was also reported of Gadderar's clergy in 1727 that

'They Artfully Endeavours to impress the people, that not only the Church of Scotland but that of England, is in a damnable State of Schism and Rebellion.'

If extreme views of this type were prevalent it would indicate that ecclesiastical relations between the nonjuring and the qualified sections among the Scottish episcopalian had been broken off.

The predicament of the nonjuring church in the 1720s was largely the product of the episcopalian's response to events at and since the Revolution. The establishment-in-waiting, which the episcopalian believed themselves to be as long as hopes of a Stewart restoration lasted, underwent a sea-change in the three decades from 1689 until 1720, and in the ensuing decade evolved further still. Noting in 1720 'the many Pressures of Persecution' which the church had undergone, Bishop Campbell exclaimed 'may she come out as Gold tryed in the fire seven times, pure and undefiled, in God's own time.' The theme of suffering in God's cause was also reflected in Falconer's vision of the episcopal
communion as a depleted but orderly church militant which
was nearer to being a true Christian church than one
without primitive standards:

'I be one of thos who reckon a small weel
disciplin'd and Obedient army much preferable,
and far more Comfortable to the Generall,
than a confused aggregate of Wilfull
disorderlie voluntiers. The ane by the
blessing of God, may Come to endure
hardship for, and fight the good Fight
of Truth. The other not being acted
so much by principle, as by Humour, are
not liklie to stand any severe assault."263

From this perspective the sloughing-off by successive
secular and ecclesiastical attacks of temporising and
weak elements within the episcopal communion may have
diminished nonjuring episcopalianism as a religious,
political and social force over the thirty years
from 1689, but it strengthened the faithful Jacobite
clergy's and laity's witness to the divine ordering
of bishops in the church and to the royal house of
Stewart's title to the throne.
CONCLUSION

This study has attempted to trace the transformation of the Scottish episcopalian from a displaced element of the established Church in 1689, to an independent communion in their own right by the 1720s. The episcopalian communion as it stood at Bishop Rose's death in 1720 was markedly different from the establishment which faced the onslaught of the Revolution. Diocesan government had disappeared, new liturgical standards had emerged, and doctrinal shifts away from the predominant Calvinism of the late seventeenth century were occurring. Increasingly the divine right of bishops and the intrinsic rights of the church were being asserted.

The Revolution was largely a political phenomenon which saw the strong presbyterian opposition to the Stewarts combine with the Restoration régime's erstwhile supporters in order to overthrow bishops. The Church settlement displayed the signs of a struggle for power dressed as the justified removal of Jacobite clergy. The rough justice of the illegal rabblings was followed by deprivations by the secular courts, based on harshly-framed shibboleths. Both in the speed and the scope of these purges the episcopalian fared worse than contemporary English nonjurors, and in overall numbers, worse than the presbyterians in the 1660s. By late 1689 up to 400 clergy out of 950 had been removed, a figure which depositions by the church courts brought to over 660 after the 1715 Rebellion.
The majority of the episcopal clergy were passively or actively Jacobite, and found support throughout the period under study from disaffected nobles, gentry, burgesses and common people. Their activities were especially marked in Angus and Mearns, throughout the north-east, and in many areas of Moray and Ross, and posed lasting difficulties for the Kirk in gaining control of parishes, for instance in the presbytery of Deer. Even in parishes planted by the Kirk, illegal ministering by episcopalian was a frequent and troublesome occurrence, which weakened the presbyterians' hold by keeping laymen from the parish churches. There was also a widespread refusal to accept the Kirk's authority. This confirms the broad conclusion of other studies of the episcopalian, that theological and political Jacobitism were integral to the Scottish episcopalian's hostile response to the Revolution.3

The refusal by the bishops and most of the clergy to acknowledge William and Mary as king and queen was the most important factor in shaping the Church settlement, because it enabled the presbyterians to promote themselves as the loyal supporters and guardians of the Revolution. However, insufficient attention has been paid to the relatively small but highly influential groups of clergy who avowed loyalty to William and Mary, and who were willing to remain, were the establishment to allow them to retain their episcopal church principles. The King's political insecurity in Scotland in the 1690s and his wish for a unified Church, led him to countenance attempts
to create such a polity after it became clear that his initial desire in 1689 for a continued episcopate would not gain political support. Successive attempts to forge unity from 1689 failed. In 1689 and 1691-2 presbyterian intransigence prevented comprehension, but in 1693 episcopalian scruples, fostered by secular political interest, were responsible for the failure of the act providing for acceptance of episcopal clergy into the established Church. Strenuous canvassing of the clergy in 1695 was necessary for the success of the 1695 act, which provided for the episcopalian protection in parishes, but as they were to be outwith the Kirk, it marked the end of serious proposals for comprehension. Thereafter toleration was to be the episcopalian's chief goal.

For the presbyterians this represented a different form of attack on their position, and they therefore resisted it both in 1702-3 and in 1711-12. The episcopalian's attitudes to toleration were more complex, because protection from what they regarded as presbyterian persecution of their religious practices, necessarily entailed some form of recognition of the sovereign's title, which nonjurors could not give. The Toleration Act of 1712 was not entirely welcome for this reason, but in practice it caused the nonjurors less harm than anticipated, because of presbyterian nonjurancy. The Act was an important part of the legislative programme conceived during the period 1710-14 by the Scottish and
English Tories, among whom High Church principles and a degree of Jacobitism strengthened their sympathy for the episcopalian. Three other factors helped foster support among members of the Church of England. First, some episcopalian seem to have been able to accept Anne's title at least de facto, if not de jure, and though doubts remained about the genuineness of their loyalty, their pleas of submissive behaviour lent colour to their claims. The evidence records frequent instances of ambiguous expressions in prayers, which were intended to satisfy conflicting loyalties: towards James on the one hand and Queen Anne on the other. As Nicolson observed of those actively involved in the episcopalian revival in 1712, they

'are for calling home a Defender of their most Christian Faith; whom they abjure in the morning and whose health they drink in the Evening.'

The degree of recognition which legitimist argument could accord to Anne's title could not be transferred to her Hanoverian successor. Jacobitism thus seems to have emerged more clearly from 1714, but, as some Edinburgh clergy showed in 1713, hard-core Jacobitism persisted throughout the period.

So long as the presbyterian reaction to Jacobitism could be shown to be bigoted and intolerant the episcopalian were sure of a sympathetic English hearing, because the Kirk's ascendancy alarmed the Church of England. It had provided charity and patronage since 1689, and it was left in no doubt in Anne's reign of the continuing need for material and political aid. Whereas in the 1690s
Tenison and others were involved in advising on the best way of reconciling the two religious persuasions in Scotland, in Anne's later years Tory prelates were instrumental in securing toleration. The act was achieved by the persistent representation of presbyterian hostility and injustice, in a number of instances, especially in the Greenshields case.

The strength of English support for the measure was indicative of the power of a third factor in the episcopalian's relationship with the Church of England. From the late 1690s there were signs of a growing fondness for the English liturgy. The trend was well established by the time the Union gave the episcopalian an additional incentive to draw nearer their sympathisers, and it prompted violent presbyterian denunciations, which merely served to strengthen the case for toleration. To a great extent the major cases of Anne's last years centred on use of the prayer-book by clergy whom the authorities claimed were unqualified to minister by virtue of their Jacobitism. Yet the issue of Jacobitism was successfully subordinated by the parliamentary lobby to the claim of avowedly loyal clergy for the freedom to use the English liturgy.

Thus the period 1711-14 saw a remarkable consolidation of episcopalianism, particularly as a result of the prayer-book project. The basis was being laid for the restoration of episcopacy, but the Queen's death was crucial in causing a collapse of political support and in precipitating
Jacobitism. However, the likelihood of further gains was anyhow uncertain because of Tory divisions over the succession, domestic issues and control of the Tory interest itself. The failure to secure financial and patronage provision for qualified clergy after 1712, like the unsuccessful efforts to allocate the bishops' rents in the 1690s, showed how consideration of the episcopalian interests was limited by secular concerns. General religious sympathy was not always translated into support in the political arena.

This study has concentrated on efforts to represent the episcopalian collective interests during the thirty years after the Revolution, in order to show how particular circumstances related to the broader ecclesiastical picture. Because no single episcopalian clerical party existed, a study of the clergy shows how the conflicting aims and interests of ministers who accepted the Revolution and the majority who refused to do so, were linked to political movements, and produced the division of the communion into distinct qualified and nonjuring parts during the 1720s. This outcome was not merely the inevitable result of episcopalian Jacobitism, though as a creed it undoubtedly bolstered resistance to the presbyterian settlement. The nonjurors' ambiguous relationship with the Church of England, and the more certain position of the loyal clergy, was of prime importance in sustaining support in England.

Account has been taken of important local events and their relationship to the episcopalian lobby, for
instance in the 1690s and in the period 1709-15. However, because this study has attempted to utilise extant episcopalian sources it has not been possible to make a systematic study of the extensive records of the established Church in order to provide a detailed account of the Revolution settlement throughout Scotland. Rather, the concentration has been on episcopalians in Perthshire, Angus and Mearns, Aberdeenshire, Banffshire, Moray and Ross, areas where they continued to flourish even after the penal law of 1719. Nor has it been possible to examine more than briefly episcopalianism's character at congregational level, though it is clear that the ministers commanded considerable loyalty in parishes long after the Revolution. Following the collapse of their political support after the Rebellion it was chiefly in the landward parishes of the north and north-east that nonjuring episcopacy drew its strength.

Compared with the nominal size of the establishment in 1689, this shrinkage to traditionally episcopalian areas represented a dramatic reduction of numbers and influence, but it was not conceded without considerable resistance.
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CHAPTER FIVE
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159. Loc. cit., ff. 138v, 146r, 149r, 156r, 161r, Greenshields to Charlett, 11 October, 29 November 1712, 7 February 1712/13, 6 February, 2 October 1714. In February 1713 6 Oxford Colleges contributed £76. Os. 9d. (BL Add. MS. 22,908, f. 95r, same to Colbatch, 21 February 1712/13). Wake recorded Greenshields's visit 'about Collections for the Episcopall Clergy in Scotland' (LP MS. 1770, f. 139v, diary entry for 25 January 1714).

160. Registrum de Panmure, cxxxiii, Greenshields to Maule, 12 July 1712.

161. SRO CH 12/12/1814, Rose to Campbell, 10 October 1710.

162. Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, ff. 130r, 136v, Greenshields to Charlett, [c. 23 August], 27 September 1712. A related consideration was that the standard duodecimo was difficult for older eyes. It was perhaps books from 'the first Parcel' sent in June, whose print was considered too small, which prompted complaints from Aberdeen (NLS MS. 1260, f. 192, Greenshields to Mackenzie of Delvine, 3 July 1712).
163. Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 138v, Greenshields to Charlett, 11 October 1712. Accounts of collections in Oxford were to be scrutinised there by Dr. Smalridge in February 1713 (loc. cit., f. 149r, Greenshields to Charlett, 7 February 1712/13), which suggests that the trustees and managers allowed their application for books from the University Press to continue. However, efforts to locate relevant records in the Press's archive have proved fruitless.

164. SRO CH 12/12/8, Dongworth, Greenshields and Gray to Dr. George Middleton, 24 January 1712/13.

165. Freebairn produced an impression in 1710 (SRO CH 12/12/1814, Rose to Campbell, 10 October 1710); NLS MS. 1260, f. 190r, Dongworth to Mackenzie, 16 June 1712.

166. SRO GD 45/14/349/12, Greenshields to Maule, 28 June 1712, printed with misleading punctuation in Registrum de Panmure, cxxxii. Freebairn's father David, the bookseller, helped with distribution (NLS. MS. 1260, ff. 190-1, Greenshields to Maule, 16 June 1712).


168. SRO GD 45/14/349/18, Gray, Dongworth and Greenshields to Maule, n.d. [c. August 1712].

169. Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 147r, Greenshields to Charlett, 13 December 1712; SRO CH 12/12/8, Dongworth, Greenshields and Gray to Dr. George Middleton, 24 January 1712/13; BL Add. MS. 22,908, f. 95, Greenshields to Colbatch, 21 February 1712/13. In September Greenshields noted that Freebairn had printed his 7000th copy of the 'lesser sort', i.e. duodecimo (Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 136v, Greenshields to Charlett, 27 September 1712).

170. Registrum de Panmure, cxxxii, Greenshields to Maule, 28 June 1712.

171. Ibid.: Greenshields sent a folio and a quarto for the use of his successor at Edinburgh, Robert Blair and his clerk; SRO GD 45/14/358, Robert Norie to [H. Maule], 19 August 1712.

172. Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 147r, Greenshields to Charlett, 13 December 1712. Watson charged 9d. per copy, as against the 1Od. the London bookseller Sare charged Dongworth. (Wake MSS Letters, Vol. 17, f. 272v, Dongworth to Wake, 27 March 1711). The managers later paid 1s each for 1,000 prayer-books being distributed (Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 161r, Greenshields to Charlett, 2 October 1714). Greenshields reported that Watson had printed 1,500 copies of a duodecimo Book of Common Prayer, but perhaps confused this with the / 1,500 /
172 1,500 copies of 'Bishop Lauds Common prayer book' which contd. he also noted had been produced (Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 147r, Greenshields to Charlett, 13 December 1712). As discussed below Watson was responsible for the reprint, but he is not known to have printed the English liturgy that year (D. Wyn Evans, 'James Watson of Edinburgh...', Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions V, Part 2, (1976-80), passim).

173. Along with 22 prayer-books distributed in Blairgowrie meeting-house, 10 August 1712, were 4 copies of the Whole Duty (NLS Dep. 251 (30), Register of Blairgowrie episcopal congregation, 1711-62 [penultimate folio].

174. To accompany 2,000 prayer-books, reckoned at 100 per congregation, a copy of the 'Rationale' was sent for each minister (Registrum de Panmure, cxxxii, Greenshields to Maule, 28 June 1712).

175. The Book of Common-Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments; And other Parts of Divine Service for the Use of the Church of Scotland. With a Paraphrase of the Psalms in Metre by King James VI. (James Watson, Edinburgh, 1712).

176. Registrum de Panmure, cxxxi, Greenshields to Maule, 21 June 1712. Bishop Rattray argued later that one of the greatest obstacles to a revival of the 1637 liturgy was the 'want of Books, whereof so great a number as was requisite to be distributed among the Commons could not have been so provided (SRO CH 12/12/227, p. 21. Account of the Scottish nonjurors, 1688-c.1720 by Rattray).

177. Registrum de Panmure, cxxxi-cxxxiii, Greenshields to Maule, 21 & 28 June, 12 July 1712.

178. Craven, Moray, 188-9. George, Earl of Winton was described as 'a zealous Protestant, but his Family are Enemies to England' (Memoirs of the Secret Service of John Macky (London, 1733), 252).

179. Registrum de Panmure, cxxxiii, Greenshields to Maule, 12 July 1712; Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 147, same to Charlett, 13 December 1712. Some indication of Winton's motives can be seen in an advertisement for a compilation of liturgies 'particularly those of the Protestant Churches; to shew, that in all the Churches and Ages of Christianity, Liturgies have been us'd,' it noted a small octavo reprint of the Scottish liturgy [Watson's] (The Scots Courant, 1084, 15-20 August 1712).

180. William Smart, A Short Discourse ... Recommending the Service and Prayers of the Church; Delivered in a Meeting-House in Edinburgh, September 28th, 1712 (Edinburgh, 1712). 8. Smart argued there was a sufficient supply of English prayer-books, and insufficient Scots ones, and that the differences between them were anyhow immaterial.


183. M.G. Jones, The Charity School Movement (Cambridge, 1938), 111-3. In addition to educational provision Anglican attention was also directed at pastoral needs in the Fifty New Churches Act (1711), and towards evangelising, in the shape of translations of the prayer-book into many languages.


185. The Kirk's patent reluctance to distribute the Irish Bibles in the 1690s was followed by its failure to produce a corrected edition and its refusal to permit their use in school; this was reinforced by the SPCK's avoidance of instruction in Gaelic (Durkacz, art. cit., loc. cit., 30; Withers, op. cit., 118, 122-3; Jones, op. cit., 194-5).

186. Kirkwood argued that grammars, dictionaries and vocabularies were also necessary for proper English instruction (Durkacz, art. cit., loc. cit., 33-5; cf. Withers, op. cit., 118-20).


188. Ibid. Richardson's proposals for supplying literate Irish speaking adults with vernacular bibles, catechisms, prayer-books and religious works were endorsed by an Irish Commons Committee in 1711, but were stifled by the bishops, whose attitudes on the language issue resembled the Kirk's (Jones, op. cit., 224; DNB, XVI, 1114-5; Abel Boyer, The History of the Reign of Queen Anne Digested into Annals X (1712), 184-5; Bodl, MS. Ballard 36, f. 125v, Greenshields to Charlett, 1 April 1712). Richardson's's translation set in Irish or 'Saxon' type was published as The Prayer Book in the Irish Character (London, 1712) and issued with his The Elements of the Irish Language (London, 1712).
189. Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 117r, Greenshields to Charlett, 19 May 1711, declaring 'that to the utmost of my power I would be willing to encourage the reprinting the Scriptures and Prayer Book into Irish for the use of the Highlanders.'

190. Loc. cit., ff. 118v, 121r, same to same, 2 June, 3 November 1711.

191. Nic. Diary, 596-7, 24 March 1712; SRO CH 12/12/1829, Rose to Campbell, 3 April 1712.

192. Loc. cit./816, copy Aeneas Morison to Dr. George Middleton, [post Whitsunday] 1712, printed in The Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal 7 (1857), 25. Morison later stated that he knew fewer than six 'that can read the Irish without loss,' and perhaps not 'twenty in all Scotland' (SRO CH 12/12/817, Morison to Patrick Dunbreck, 7 September 1713). The predicament was the result of long emphasis on preaching and extemporary prayer, and a concomitant lack of Gaelic texts. Morison believed the continuance of the language to be 'unprofitable' (loc. cit./816, copy Morison to Middleton, 1712).

193. NLS MS. 1260, f. 190v, Dongworth to Mackenzie of Delvine, 16 June 1712, whose response is not known. The Earl of Cromartie was also consulted.

194. Loc. cit., f. 192, same to same, 3 July 1712; SPCK Archive. Standing Committee minutes, vol. 1 (1705-13), p. 202, 24 February 1712/13. Distribution of the translation was effected in Edinburgh, and in Aberdeen where the trustees were set to receive 250 copies in January 1713 (SRO CH 12/12/8, Greenshields and Gray to Dr. George Middleton, 24 January 1712/13).

195. Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 133v, Greenshields to Charlett, 6 September 1712.

196. Loc. cit., f. 142r, same to same, 28 October 1712. Presumably the Richardson translation was to be used.

197. His translation of The Church Catechism explain'd ... and confirm'd by Scripture Proofs, collected by J[ohn] Lewis was published in 1712 and an edition of the prayer-book with parallel English and Irish text was in preparation (loc. cit., f. 133v, same to same, 6 September 1712; NLS Wodrow Letters Quarto VI, f. 278v, James Hart to Wodrow, 27 December 1712).

Richardson received £20 from the Earl of Thanet for prayer-books for Scotland, and £100 from Sir Thomas Parker, Lord Chief Justice, and another (Registrum de Panmure, cxxxii, Greenshields to Maule, 28 June 1712; SPCK Archive. Society minutes, vol. 6, p. 47, 15 January 1712/13). He was also supported by the Duke of Ormonde and Robert Southwell (DNB XVI, 1115).


SRO CH 12/12/816, copy Aeneas Morison to Dr. George Middleton, [post Whitsunday] 1712. He attacked the presbyterians' use of the bishops' rents for Gaelic-speaking bursars, their bigoted anti-episcopalian schooling and the specious nature of the SSPCK's propagation of Christian knowledge 'which with them is presbytry'. He suggested the schools should be at Contin, in Skye, and in Glengarry or Maclean country.

SPCK Archive. Standing Committee minutes, vol. 1, pp. 196-7, 9 February 1712/13; SRO CH 12/12/815, Proposals for establishing schools in the Highlands, 9 February 1712/13, printed in full in The Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal 7 (1857), 25-6). Kirkton of Lochiel, or Kilmally in Lochaber; Uist; Beauly and Fochabers were proposed because they were in or near Catholic areas. Mull or Morvern, and Ruthven in Badenoch were chosen because their Protestant populations needed education.

Ibid. Similarly Morison argued the need for young Gaelic speakers to be trained to instruct people in 'better principles then those presbyterian teachers do' (SRO CH 12/12/816, copy Morison to Middleton, 1712; cf. Craven, Ross, 92).

Greenshields believed the Society 'are resolved to sett up a School or 2 in the Highlands' (Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 150v, Greenshields to Charlett, 14 February 1712/13).


207. *Loc. cit.*, CR1.4 Abstract Letter Book, p. 186, no. 3605, Drummond to Dongworth, 14 July 1713. The SPCK supplied books to James Gordon younger at Banchory Devenick (*loc. cit.*, ref. cit., p. 330, no. 4163, Secretary to Gordon, 22 January 1714/15). Gordon was a member of the SPCK.

208. There were 11 by June 1713 (*Withers, op. cit.*, 122), 17 by May 1714 (SPCK Archive, CR1.5, Abstract Letter Book, no. 4051, copy list of Schools, 7 May 1714), and 25 in 1715 (*Jones, op. cit.*, 179).


210. See chapter 5.
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212. *SRO CH 1/2/33/2, f. 136, Complaint of presbytery of Dingwall and Chanonry, 1713*; *SRO CH 12/12/817, Morison to Dunbreck, 7 September 1713*.
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214. At Avoch opposition to the presbyterian led to protracted and expensive processes in the Court of Session against the episcopalian Sir Kenneth Mackenzie of Scatwell, which threatened to force the episcopal minister to quit; his other meeting-house at Cromarty had already given up 'for want of maintenance' despite a zeal for the liturgy (*SRO CH 12/12/817, Morison to Dunbreck, 7 September 1713; *Fasti vii*, 2).


216. *SRO CH 12/12/817, Morison to Dunbreck, 7 September 1713*. George Strachan occupied the former cathedral church by c. spring 1713 (*SRO CH 1/2/33/2, f. 136*).
217. Aeneas Morison, Duncan Murchison and John Mackenzie seem also to have received some prayer-books for the use of the Dingwall congregation (ibid.).

218. SRO CH 12/12/816, copy of Morison to Middleton, 1712; cf. Craven, Ross, 92-3. Morison introduced the liturgy at Contin on Whitsunday 1712 with 'good success' after less preparation than anticipated, but he does not state whether in English or in Irish, in both of which he normally preached. Richardson's translation did not appear in time, but Morison was in any case dissatisfied with it and stated in 1713 that he had not introduced it for fear of doing more harm than good to the Church; (SRO CH 12/12/817, Morison to Dunbreck, 7 September 1713).

219. SRO CH 12/12/1853, copy of an address from the gentry, clergy and other episcopalians in the shire of Banff, n.d. [October 1710 - October 1711].

220. Loc. cit. /1855, unidentified to unidentified, n.d. [November 1710 - March 1711].
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222. SRO CH 12/12/6b, Bishop George Haliburton to John Alexander, 25 August 1712; loc. cit., 6c, John Alexander, preses of presbytery or district of Alford and Kincardine, to Haliburton, 15 April 1713.


224. SRO CH 1/2/34/2, ff. 115-6, 'A List of the Episcopall Ministers living in the bounds of the Synod of Aberdeen, who qualified, who not', n.d. [c. November 1713]. Parishes: Banchory Devenick, St. Fergus, Keig, Forbes, Kildrummie. The list was not completed and the numbers are thus probably underestimated. In 1716-17 five parishes out of 24 with episcopal incumbents had the liturgy: Alva, Cruden, Gamrie, Kildrummie and St. Fergus; in ten out of 12 meeting-houses it was also used (A Representation of the State of the Church in North-Britain (London, 1718), 71).

225. SRO CH 1/2/34/2, ff. 115-6, 'A List of the Episcopall Ministers Living within the bounds of the Synod of Aberdeen' [c. November 1713]. William Swan, of Pitsligo, is designated as 'Calvinist' and was perhaps a non-user. His neighbour Alexander Robertson at Longside was said to have been averse to feast days (John Ramsay, Scotland and Scotsmen in the Eighteenth Century, ed. A. Allardyce (1888), II, 552).

226. 'An Apology for the Aberdeen Evictions' (1718), Miscellany of the Third Spalding Club III (1960), 80.
227. Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 128v, Greenshields to Charlett, 30 August 1712; Registrum de Panmure, cxxxiv, Greenshields to Maule, 12 July 1712.


231. SRO CH 1/2/33/2, f. 138, Grievances of the Synod of Angus and the Mearns, 28 April 1713. Complaints of the irregular admission of scandalous persons to the sacrament, and irregular baptising and marrying, were made of the ministers in meeting-houses in Arbroath and Benholm (ibid.).

232. Ibid.

233. The use of the liturgy at the burials of the lairds of Balmakewan, Powrie and Duntrune, the children of the lairds of Eassie and Nevoy, and Drumlochy, and of Sylvester Lamie, minister of Eassie and Nevoy, c. 1712-13, were complained of (ibid.).

234. Wodrow Correspondence I, 362, Wodrow to James Hart, 31 December 1712, giving account of burial of a soldier in the High churchyard, Glasgow, by William Cockburn which went undisturbed despite 'many spectators'.

235. SRO CH 1/2/33/2, f. 121, Instructions to commissioners from presbytery of Dundee and Forfar to the General Assembly, 23 April 1713.

236. SRO GD 220/5/277, William Graham of Orchill to Duke of Montrose, 24 March 1713. 'The Country people fought on not knoweing whom or why they struck ... the mob ended every one complaining they were beat and knew not why.' As Montrose's baillie of regality, Orchill fined those of his vassals involved in the rabble.

237. Analecta II, 30. The disturbance perhaps originated with the express wish of the deceased, 'a keen meeting house man', that his two brothers should have nothing to do with his funeral because they were 'Rank Camaronians', and that he should be buried after the form of the Church of England. The coffin was tumbled 'heels o're head in the Grave' (SRO GD 220/5/277, Orchill to Montrose, 24 March 1712).

239. NLS Dep. 251 (30), Register of Blairgowrie episcopal congregation, 1711-62, passim. The meeting-house appears to have been re-built in 1714.

240. Twenty-four books were sent in [early 1712?], 40 in April 1712, 22 in August 1712, and an unspecified number in February 1713 (ibid., [penultimate folio], Distribution lists, 1712). The size of the congregation is difficult to gauge from the incomplete evidence, but it included some 54 heads of families whose children were baptised, 1712-16 (and of whom some twenty-one received one or more copies of the prayer-book) and about 100 others whose names are recorded in connection with it; an approximate minimum figure would be 200 communicant members. Of the 30-odd in receipt of charity from the congregation's fund only two received a prayer book (ibid., Distribution lists, 1712). It was presumably not favoured by pure Gaelic speakers in the upper parts of the parish (cf. Withers, Gaelic in Scotland, 39, 57-8).

241. Communion was held regularly (e.g. in April and October 1713) but at traditional communion tables erected specially, rather than kneeling at altar rails (ibid., Accounts of collections and distributions). The use of the English service in Blairgowrie parish church at a funeral was complained of by the Synod (SRO CH 1/2/33/2, f. 138).

242. Some 93 prayer books and seven copies of The Whole Duty of Man were distributed by Alexander Mackenzie, who ministered to a meeting at Halltown or Hatton (SRO CH 2/284/1, ff. 172-3, distribution lists, 1712-14, & n.d., in session minute book).

243. SRO GD 38/2/2/32, James Scot to Lady Nairne, 22 June 1714. Atholl was in favour of removing Scot, school-master and clerk, because 'I have been so long in the place that I could not but influence the people.'

244. John Hunter, Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, II, 117, 412, n.4; NRA(S) 2706, Holy Trinity Episcopal Church, Pitlochry: Transcript from Edradynate papers of letter from Viscount Stormont to George Robertson, 25 March 1715; SRO CH 12/12/1834, Rose to Campbell, 5 July 1715; Robertson preached one English and one Gaelic sermon each Sunday (Atholl MSS. 42/1/61, Account of how Mr George Robertson prays for the royal family, April 1715).

245. SRO GD 220/5/454/29, copy Atholl to Lord Justice Clerk, 5 April 1715.
246. The House of Nairne, about two miles west of Stanley, was probably completed to designs by Alexander McGill in about 1713 and included a chapel in one of the side ranges (John Dunbar, Sir William Bruce (Edinburgh, 1970), 20).

247. SRO CH 12/12/1833, Rose to Campbell, 22 October 1713. Bishop Christie also attended, and noted that there was also preaching, baptism, confirmation and the Lord's supper (loc. cit., 412, Christie to Falconer, 15 October 1713).

248. These included Inverurie, Kintore, Inverbervie, Montrose, Brechin and Forfar; unofficial addresses came from Aberdeen, Stirling and Edinburgh, August 1712-March 1713 (The Scots Courant, 5 September 1712 – 20 March 1713).

249. Ibid., 1082, 5-8 September 1712, Address by magistrates and town council to the Queen, presented 24 August 1712.

250. Ibid., 1137, 22-24 December 1712, Address by magistrates and town council of Brechin, presented 12 December 1712.

251. GG, 71-3. The meeting-house contained pulpit, pews and lofts, including two built by Panmure and Southesk.

252. At Easter 1711 before the prayer-book was used there were over 1,200 communicants, at Easter 1712 no fewer, and at Easter 1713 probably more (GG, 72, 74). At Easter 1715 there were 1,300 (SRO GD 220/5/494/2, Earl of Southesk to Duke of Montrose, 21 April 1715).

253. In 1711-12 Panmure gifted 100 prayer-books, and Bishop Rose 320; in November 1712 and at Easter 1713 Rose sent batches of 120. This total of 660 free books, together with copies purchased by the better-off, was sufficient in 1713 for all the literate members of the congregation (GG, 73-4). The copies sent in 1712-13 probably came from the prayer-book fund.

254. Ibid., 74; SRO GD 220/5/494/2, Southesk to Montrose, 21 April 1715. The established congregation was said to have had 60 communicants to Guthrie's 1,300 in 1715 (ibid.).

255. SRO GD 45/14/358, Robert Norrie to [Harry Maule], 19 August 1712.

256. SRO CH 12/12/227, p. 15, Account of the Scottish nonjurors, 1688-c.1720, by Thomas Rattray. He gives an account of the opposition [c.1710-11?] by Norie and his obsequious assistant James Goldman to the congregation's wish for the liturgy. They were only made to agree by Bishop Rose's order to Norie to use it, and by subsequent threats from the gentry to call another minister when Norie administered the sacrament without the liturgy. Cf. Norie's claim that 'our people were not very fond of them at first and many of them would scarce take them when they were offered to them.' (SRO GD 45/14/358, R. Norrie to H. Maule, 19 August 1712).
257. Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 164r, Greenshields to Charlett, 13 November 1714.

258. The Scots Courant, 1150, 9-11 February 1713.


261. David Robertson, Reports of cases on appeal from Scotland (London, 1807), I, 25-9; Craven, Moray, 167-171; A.J. MacLean, 'The House of Lords and Appeals from the High Court of Justiciary', Juridical Review 1985, part 2, 195-7, considers the case as establishing the Lords' appellate jurisdiction over the High Court of Justiciary.

262. A Letter Concerning the Affair of Mr Greenshields (London, 1711), 1-2.

263. D. Robertson, Reports of cases on appeal from Scotland, I, 27. The disputed structure was the chancel of the pre-Reformation church of St. Giles, separated by an inserted wall from the transepts and nave used as the parish church. The Little Kirk contained seats erected by the burgesses before the Revolution, and the right to dispose of it both as a church, as had been done in 1704 in favour of an episcopal minister who enjoyed it briefly, and for secular purposes, was claimed by the magistrates (ibid., 25, 27, 28). Likewise the Dundee magistrates justified their gift of the Cross Kirk on the grounds that within memory it had always been 'keeped for prophane use' (Christie IV, 6, citing Dundee Town Council minutes, 28 July 1713).

264. Analecta II, 74.

265. The Scots commons lobbied for the case, while Findlater and Seafield, Balmerino, Linlithgow, Northesk, Rosebery and Home, and the English Tories Abingdon and Guernsey supported the appeal in the House (Craven, Moray, 170; Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 153, Greenshields to Charlett, 11 July 1713). Wodrow noted the Whig peers' reluctance to lose interest with the Church of England, which forestalled their opposition, and the episcopalian party's active raising of funds for processes (Analecta II, 225; cf. NLS MS. 1454, f. 90, Rose to Mackenzie of Delvine, 17 February 1713, recommending a fund for the Elgin appeal, whose issue 'is of great consequence to the common interest. '..').
Farquhar, Perth, 88; PRO SP 54/4, f. 232, Lord Advocate to Dartmouth, 29 July 1712. Greenshields proposed a royal grant of the empty chapel at Holyrood again in 1714, though it had been unsuccessful when he revived the idea in 1712 as part of his scheme for his return to Edinburgh, sponsored by the Dukes of Leeds and Buckingham and Bishop Compton (Registrum de Panmure cxxxiv, cxxxv, Greenshields to Maule, 12, 26 July 1712). The 1714 proposal was prompted by the magistrates' refusal to grant an English army chaplain a place of worship (Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 158v, same to Charlett, 6 July 1714).

Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 158, Greenshields to Charlett, 6 July 1714; A Practical Essay ... By W[illiam] M[ilne] (Edinburgh 1714), 33-4, pointing out that the masters had acted without the bishops' advice or authority; Records of Old Aberdeen II (New Spalding Club, 1909), 125-7.

NLS MS. 3186, ff. 49-50, Bishop Robert Douglas to gentlemen and heritors of Dunblane parish, 21 February 1712. Supplies of books for Crieff and the meeting at Dunblane which was not yet started, were being organized by James Inglis, minister of the Muthill meeting. (Loc. cit., ff. 65-6, James Inglis to Macgregor of Balhaldie, 16 January 1713).

Alluding to the burgh's historic loyalty to the Stewarts, 'the unquestionable Heirs to the Imperial Crown of Great Britain', they thanked her as the instrument for settling the Church and Monarchy, that the Truths of Christianity, with the undoubted priesthood' may be preserved (The Scots Courant, 1126, 26-28 November 1712). The text was alleged to have been written by James Hunter, the episcopal minister, and signed by corrupt and indigent former magistrates (The Flying-Post, 3359, 7-9 April 1713).

Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, f. 136r, Greenshields to Charlett, 27 September 1712. Mar's intention of establishing a meeting near his seat at Alloa was achieved by 1715. Its minister, Patrick Barclay, also enjoyed Mar's patronage as a chaplain at Stirling Castle (ibid., loc. cit., f. 170r, Greenshields to Charlett, 7 May 1715; SRO GD 220/5/478/1, Moderator of Stirling presbytery to Duke of Montrose, 10 January 1715).

Analecta II, 100. The first minister was a Mr. Robison. Wodrow's close scrutiny of William Cockburn, who succeeded him in October 1712, provides more information, even if partisan, on differing episcopalian attitudes to the liturgy than survives for congregations in strongly episcopalian areas during this critical period.
In July 1710 the magistrates forced a Mr. Hay to quit his meeting-house (Wake MSS. Letters vol. 17, f. 262r, Dongworth to Wake, 10 August 1710). For the English troops see chapter 5.

Bodl. MS. Ballard 36, ff. 136r, 144r, Greenshields to Charlett, 27 September, 15 November 1714.

William Cockburn, A Sermon upon the XXXth of January 1713 (Edinburgh, 1713), 3, Dedication: the gentlemen and other members of the episcopal congregation at Glasgow. Wodrow disputed his inclusion of Cochrane of Kilmarnock and Crawford of Jordanhill among his hearers as false (Wodrow Correspondence I, 404, Wodrow to Hart, 10 February 1713).

Ibid., 362, Wodrow to Hart, 31 December 1712, noting that even the zealous liturgical supporter Sir Donald McDonald of Sleat was wearying because of the expense. Resistance to the liturgy perhaps explains why the intended sacrament (at Christmas) was not held (ibid.). Cockburn was reported in January to be staying in Glasgow only until he could find a bigger salary than his £20-22 sterling (ibid., 275-6, Wodrow to Hart, 21 January 1713).
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CONCLUSION


2. Chapter 5.


APPENDIX I

Episcopal clergy tried by the Committee for Securing Peace, the Committee of the Estates, and the Privy Council, 1689.

Clergy are listed chronologically by the date of the hearings against them, followed by parish and presbytery, the date and the sentence. The following abbreviations are used:

- **D** = deprived;
- **Ass.** = assolzied of the libel;
- **O** = minister claimed to have obeyed proclamation;
- **PWM** = he did so in respect of prayers for William and Mary;
- **PJ** = libelled with praying for King James.

Sources: April - May: APS ix, Appendix, except where indicated; July - November: RPC XIII, XIV, XVI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee for Securing Peace</th>
<th>26 April 1689</th>
<th>[APS ix, 68]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Strachan, Tron Kirk, Edinburgh.</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Cant, Trinity Church, Edinburgh.</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McQueen, Trinity Church, Edinburgh.</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee of the Estates</th>
<th>2-17 May 1689</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Waugh, South Leith.</td>
<td>Edinburgh. 2 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Barclay, Mordinton.</td>
<td>Chirnside. 6 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Ireland, Fossoway. Auchterarder.</td>
<td>7 May.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Alexander Irvine, Inverkeithing. Dunfermline. | 8 May | D. [14] |
| Andrew Auchinleck, Newbattle. | Dalkeith. 8 May. | D. [ibid.] |
| James Hunter, Stirling. | Stirling. 10/11 May. | Dismissed2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Richard Waddell, St Andrews</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>D. [18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wood, St Andrews</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>D. [ibid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wright, Culross</td>
<td>Dunblane</td>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>D. [ibid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Young, Culross</td>
<td>Dunblane</td>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>D. [ibid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Cuming, Liberton</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>14 May</td>
<td>D. [ibid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mathers, Ceres</td>
<td>Cupar</td>
<td>16 May</td>
<td>D. [27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Scrimzeour, Currie</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>17 May</td>
<td>D. [31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Taylor, Dron</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>17 May</td>
<td>D. [ibid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Auchinleck, Largo</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>22/23 May</td>
<td>Dismissed³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total deprived by Committees: 21

Privy Council 26 July - 29 November 1689

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Jasper Kellie, Lecropt.</td>
<td>Dunblane</td>
<td>26 July</td>
<td>D. [RPC XIII, 577-8 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wemyss, Dunblane</td>
<td>Dunblane</td>
<td>26 July</td>
<td>D. [ibid.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Fraser, Rothesay</td>
<td>Dunoon</td>
<td>26 July</td>
<td>D. [558-60 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Thomson, Benvie</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>26 July</td>
<td>D. PJ [560 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Murray, Blackford</td>
<td>Auchterarder</td>
<td>15 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ.[48-50 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Trent, Linlithgow</td>
<td>Linlithgow</td>
<td>15 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [50-1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Nimmo, Colinton</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>22 Aug.</td>
<td>Ass. PJ.[79-80]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Auchinleck, Largo</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>27 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [101-2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Barclay, Strathmiglo</td>
<td>Cupar</td>
<td>27 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [102-4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barclay, Kettle</td>
<td>Cupar</td>
<td>27 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [105-7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Melville, Ewes</td>
<td>Middlebie</td>
<td>27 Aug.</td>
<td>D. [107-8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Darling, Stichill</td>
<td>Kelso</td>
<td>27 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ [108-10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Somerville, Cavers</td>
<td>Jedburgh</td>
<td>27 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [110-1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Scot, Hassendean or Roberton</td>
<td>Jedburgh</td>
<td>27 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [111-3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Pitcairn, Logie</td>
<td>Cupar</td>
<td>27 Aug.</td>
<td>D. [120-1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Balfour, Logie</td>
<td>Cupar</td>
<td>27 Aug.</td>
<td>D. [ibid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Cockburn, Ormiston</td>
<td>Dalkeith</td>
<td>29 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [127-8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Lundie, Cupar</td>
<td>Cupar</td>
<td>29 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [129-31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wilson, Cupar</td>
<td>Cupar</td>
<td>29 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [ibid. ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Norie, Dundee</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>29 Aug.</td>
<td>D. [131-3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Naughley, Stow</td>
<td>Earlston</td>
<td>29 Aug.</td>
<td>D. O. PJ. [133-4; XVI, 530]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles McKinnon, Orwell</td>
<td>Dunfermline</td>
<td>29 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [140-1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cameron, Kincardine</td>
<td>Dunfermline</td>
<td>29 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [142-4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Don, Crichton</td>
<td>Dalkeith</td>
<td>29 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [145-7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Gordon, Kirkcaldy</td>
<td>Kirkcaldy</td>
<td>29 Aug.</td>
<td>D. [147-9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Shiell, Prestonhaugh</td>
<td>Haddington</td>
<td>29 Aug.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [149-51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ogilvie, Colesseie</td>
<td>Cupar</td>
<td>3 Sept.</td>
<td>D [163]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Barclay, Sprouston</td>
<td>Kelso</td>
<td>3 Sept.</td>
<td>D. [165-6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cook, Eccles</td>
<td>Duns</td>
<td>3 Sept.</td>
<td>D. [166-7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wright, Alloa</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>3 Sept.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [167-8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Speed, Ednam</td>
<td>Kelso</td>
<td>3 Sept.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [168]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chisholm, Lilliesleaf</td>
<td>Selkirk</td>
<td>3 Sept.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [171-3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Gellie, Airth.</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>4 Sept.</td>
<td>D. PWM. PJ. [182-3; XVI, 190-1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Couper, Dunfermline.</td>
<td>Dunfermline.</td>
<td>4 Sept.</td>
<td>Ass. PWM [185-7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Graham, Dunfermline.</td>
<td>Dunfermline.</td>
<td>4 Sept.</td>
<td>Ass. O [ibid.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Freebairn, Dunning.</td>
<td>Auchterarder.</td>
<td>4 Sept.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [188-90]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Grant, Fala.</td>
<td>Dalkeith</td>
<td>4 Sept.</td>
<td>D. [204]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Stirling, Baldernock.</td>
<td>Dumbarton</td>
<td>4 Sept.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [204-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Arbuthnot, 6 Cranston.</td>
<td>Dalkeith</td>
<td>4 Sept.</td>
<td>D. [206]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Flock, Cameron.</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>4 Sept.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [206-7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr James Wemyss, St. Leonards.</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>4 Sept.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [212-3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Sutherland, Larbert &amp; Dounipace.</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>4 Sept.</td>
<td>D. [215]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Falconer, Carnbee. St Andrews. 5 Sept. D. [219]
John Barclay, Cockburnspath. Dunbar. 5 Sept. D. PJ. [221-2]
John Barclay, Edrom. Chirnside. 5 Sept. D. [223]
Archibald Buchan, Spot. Dunbar. 10 Sept. D. [242-3]
James Lautie, Chirnside. Chirnside. 10 Sept. D. [244]
James Gordon, Roseneath. Dumbarton. 10 Sept. D. [244-5]
Alexander Ramsay, Old Church, Edinburgh. 10 Sept. D. PJ. [248-50]
Dr John Middleton, Markinch. Kirkcaldy. 10 Sept. Ass. O. PJ. [250-1]
John Park, Carriden. Linlithgow. 10 Sept. Ass. O. [251-2]
William Thomson, Bo'ness. Linlithgow. 12 Sept. D. [258]
Andrew Hardie, Forgandenny. Perth. 17 Sept. D. [282]
John Stewart, Wilton
Dr William Gairns or Gardyne, Tolbooth Church.
George Maitland, Moffat.
James Chalmers, Kirkpatrick Fleming
Robert Junkin, Abernethy.
John McQuhorn, Dalmellington.
John Wilkie, Linton.
George McGruther, Collace.
Thomas Strachan, St. Martins
Dr James Canaries, Selkirk.
James Murray, Yarrow.
William Allison, Kilbucho.
John Philip, Comrie.
William Murray, Crieff.
David Young, Monzievaird & Strowan.
David Hedderwick, Canonbie.
Alexander Arbuthnot, Arbuthnot.
Alexander Fouls, Innerwick.
James Adamson, Ettrick.
Robert Rait, Dundee.
Thomas Blair, Lennel.
David Drummond, Kilmadow.
Alexander Burnet, St. Monans.
Hugh Gordon, Cardross.
John Kerr, Roxburgh.
Gideon Brown, Smailholm.
John Keir, Cults.
Alexander Bainaves, Kinloch.
Gilbert Blair, Blairgowrie.
John Lawson, Alyth.
David Rankin, Rattray.
John Semple, Pintry.
William McKechnie, Bonhill.
Charles Ross, Crailing.

Jedburgh. 17 Sept. D. [286-7]
Lochmaben. 17 Sept. D. [288]
Middlebie. 17 Sept. D. PJ. [288-9]
Perth. 17 Sept. D. [289-90]
Ayr. 17 Sept. D. [290]
Kelso. 17 Sept. D. [290-1]
Perth. 17 Sept. D. PJ.[291-3]
Selkirk. 17 Sept. Ass. O. PJ. [296-7]
Selkirk. 17 Sept. Ass. O. [297-8]
Biggar. 17 Sept. Ass. O. PJ. [298-9]
Auchterarder. 19 Sept. D. PJ. [304]
Auchterarder. 19 Sept. D. PJ. [305]
Middlebie. 19 Sept. D. O. PJ. [XIII, 441-2; XIV, 306-8]
Dunbar. 24 Sept. D. O. [330-1; XVI, 94-5]
Selkirk. 24 Sept. Ass. PJ. [XVI, 331-2]
Dundee. 26 Sept. D. [353-6]
Chirnside. 26 Sept. D. [356-7]
Dunblane. 26 Sept. D. [357-8]
Dumbarton. 26 Sept. D. [359-60]
Kelso. 26 Sept. Ass. O. PJ. [360-1]
Earlston. 26 Sept. D. [362-3]
Cupar. 1 Oct. D. [365-6]
Dunkeld. 1 Oct. D. PJ. [366]
Meigle. 1 Oct. D. [367-8]
Dunkeld. 1 Oct. D. [368]
Dumbarton. 1 Oct. D. [368-9]
Dumbarton. 1 Oct. D. [369-70]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Bell, Port of Menteith</td>
<td>Dunblane</td>
<td>3 Oct.</td>
<td>D. [374-5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Strachan, Maxton</td>
<td>Selkirk</td>
<td>8 Oct.</td>
<td>D. [384]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Forsyth, St. Ninians</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>18 Oct.</td>
<td>Ass. O. [423-5; XVI, 222-3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Lindsay, Cortachy</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td>29 Oct.</td>
<td>D. [447-9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir James Strachan, Keith</td>
<td>Strathbogie</td>
<td>7 Nov.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [466-8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Strachan, Mortlach</td>
<td>Strathbogie</td>
<td>7 Nov.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [466-8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John or James Henderson, Deskford, Fordyce</td>
<td>Fordyce</td>
<td>7 Nov.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [ibid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hay, Rathven</td>
<td>Fordyce</td>
<td>7 Nov.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [ibid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Chalmers, Boyndie</td>
<td>Fordyce</td>
<td>7 Nov.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [ibid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Innes, Gamrie</td>
<td>Turriff</td>
<td>7 Nov.</td>
<td>Ass. O. PJ. [ibid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Kerr, Grange</td>
<td>Strathbogie</td>
<td>7 Nov.</td>
<td>Diet deserted. D. PJ. [ibid.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ross, Dornoch</td>
<td>Dornoch</td>
<td>7 Nov.</td>
<td>Ass. O. [468-9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dempster, Lairg</td>
<td>Dornoch</td>
<td>7 Nov.</td>
<td>D. PJ. [469]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stewart, Cromdale</td>
<td>Abernethy</td>
<td>14 Nov.</td>
<td>D. [497-8]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
James Grant, Abernethy. Abernethy. 14 Nov. D. [498]
Duncan Stewart, Dunoon. Dunoon. 29 Nov. D. PJ. [528-9]

Total deprived by Privy Council: 172
Total deprived by Committees and Council: 193

Notes:
1. APES i, 73.
2. Ibid., 82. See also 4 September.
3. Ibid., 100.
4. Cameron employed another minister on the required date, who prayed for King James (RPC XIV, 143).
5. Sic. for James Adamson, who allegedly came from Kelton, from which he was rabbled, in 1689. (Fasti ii, 62).
6. Cited for 5 August for harbouring a rebel, and denounced rebel for not compearing (RPC XIV, 16).
APPENDIX 2

Episcopal clergy who took qualifying oaths, 1693, 1695.

All dates are 1695 except where indicated. The list is incomplete.
Source: New College Library MSS.X 156 3/1, ff. 47-91, 'Ane
Account of the state of the Kirk of Scotland quhen Episcopall
at the late revolutione in the years 1688 and 1689'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presbytery of Dundee</th>
<th>Abernyte</th>
<th>n.d. [1693?]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Shepherd</td>
<td>Abernyte</td>
<td>n.d. [1693?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Brown</td>
<td>Foulis and Lundie</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presbytery of Brechin</th>
<th>Montrose</th>
<th>n.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Lyall</td>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presbytery of Aberdeen</th>
<th>New Aberdeen</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr William Blair</td>
<td>New Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gordon [elder]</td>
<td>Banchory [Devenick]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr George Innes</td>
<td>Belhelvie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Seton</td>
<td>New Machar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George White</td>
<td>Maryculter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Maitland</td>
<td>Nigg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Alexander] Gray</td>
<td>Footdee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presbytery of Kincardine O'Neill</th>
<th>Tarland and Migvie</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Abercromby</td>
<td>Tarland and Migvie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Thomas] Alexander</td>
<td>Colstone and Logymar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[William] Idle</td>
<td>Coull</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Leith</td>
<td>Lumphanan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Robertson</td>
<td>Crathie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Burnett</td>
<td>Midmar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Thompson</td>
<td>Kinairney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ord</td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbytery of Alford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Jaffray</td>
<td>Alford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Seton</td>
<td>Leochel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Patrick Copland]</td>
<td>Cushnie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Robert Miln]</td>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Livingstone</td>
<td>Keig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Robertson</td>
<td>Clatt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walker</td>
<td>Tullynessle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Alexander</td>
<td>Kildrummie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Robertson</td>
<td>Strathdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presbytery of Garioch</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Watson</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Shand</td>
<td>Premnay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sir John Turing]</td>
<td>Insch ('intruder')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Garioch</td>
<td>Culsalmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Burnett</td>
<td>Rayne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Strachan</td>
<td>Oyne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Clark</td>
<td>Logie Dornoch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Urquhart</td>
<td>Bethelnie [Meldrum]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Sharp</td>
<td>Bourtie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[William Keith]</td>
<td>Monkeggie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Murray</td>
<td>Inverurie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Burnet</td>
<td>n.d. [1695]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presbytery of Ellon</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Gordon [younger]</td>
<td>Foveran ('intruder')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Miln</td>
<td>Udny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Clerk</td>
<td>Methlick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presbytery of Deer</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Robertson</td>
<td>Longside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Keith</td>
<td>Old Deer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sibbald</td>
<td>Auchreddy or New Deer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John White</td>
<td>Aberdour ('intruder')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Swan</td>
<td>Pitsligo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Moore</td>
<td>Fraserburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Dalgarno</td>
<td>St. Fergus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbytery of Turriff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Chalmers</td>
<td>Drumbladie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Dalgarno</td>
<td>Fyvie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Jaffray</td>
<td>King Edward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Hay</td>
<td>Monquhitter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Harvie</td>
<td>Forgue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Innes</td>
<td>Gamrie</td>
<td>1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Campbell</td>
<td>Alva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[John] Dunbar</td>
<td>Forglen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presbytery of Fordyce</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Gellie</td>
<td>Fordyce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

Episcopal clergy active in Edinburgh, Leith and Musselburgh, 1708-17

The former parishes of clergy, or the term 'post-Revolution' for clergy ordained after 1689, are given in brackets; followed by the known locations of meeting-houses with dates referring to the sources noted in the right hand columns. Where a minister occurs in a given source its number is entered opposite his name. Additional notes are given at the end. The data and their sources are as follows:

1. Ministers forbidden to officiate and meeting-houses closed by magistrates, 1708. Source: The Scot's Narrative Examin'd: or, the Case of the Episcopal Ministers in Scotland .. stated, And the late Treatment of them in the City of Edinburgh Enquir'd into (London, 1709), 28-41.

2. Ministers so treated who claimed to pray for 'the whole Royal Family', 1708. Source: A Narrative of the late Treatment of the Episcopal Ministers within the City of Edinburgh since March last 1708 (London, 1708), 29.


4. Signatories of address to Queen Anne, c. April 1713. Clergy in meeting-houses (MH) or not in them (NMH) are indicated. Source: SRO GD 124/10/483.


6. /


8. Irregular ministering (sample only). See notes as appropriate.

William Abercrombie (Maybole). 1, 2, 5
James Adamson (Kelton). NMH, 1713; d. 1713. 1
John Alexander (Durisdeer). d. 1716. 2
William Angus (post-Revolution) 5
George Barclay (Mordinton). 1, 2
John Barclay (Cockburnspath). d. 1711. 8
David Blair (post-Revolution). MH, 1713. 3, 4
Robert Blair (post-Revolution). 4
Robert Bowes (Stonie kirk). MH, 1713. 3, 4, 8
Robert Calder (Nenthorn). Toddricks Wynd and Tranent, c. 1713. 5

John Cameron (Kincardine). 5
Andrew Cant (College Kirk, Edinburgh). MH, 1712; Skinners Close, 1716. 1, 2, 6
Robert Cheyne (Girthon). 1, 2, 3, 5
William Cockburn (post-Revolution). Assisted R. Blair, 1712. 7 Blackfriars Wynd, 1716. 2, 6
Robert Coult (post-Revolution). Musselburgh, 1716-7 5, 6
James Cruickshanks (Dolphinthorn). 8
Alexander Cuming (Liberton). d. 26 Apr. 1713 9 3
George Erskine (post-Revolution). Musselburgh, 1717 7
William Fife (Pettinain). 1, 2
Henry Foulis (post-Revolution). 5
David Freebairn (Dunning). Bailie Fyfe's Close, 1716-7 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7
George Gra hame (Lochmaben). 10 1, 2, 3, 5, 8
William Grant (Newburgh). d. 1715 11 3, 5
James Greenshields (post-Revolution). MH's, 1709 12 2
Alexander Guthrie (Keir). MH, 1713. 13 1, 2, 3, 4
Henry Henderson (Inverkip, or post-Revolution). MH, 1713. 14 1, 2, 3, 4
George Henry (Corstorphine). MH, 1713. 1, 2, 3, 4
Alexander Heriot (Dalkeith). Musselburgh, c. 1708-9 15 1
Patrick Home (post-Revolution). MH, 1713. Toddricks Wynd, 1716 3, 4, 5, 6
James Hunter (Stirling). Musselburgh, 1716. Toddricks Wynd, 1717 6, 7
George Johnston (Burntisland). MH, 1713 3, 4, 6
Robert Keith (post-Revolution). Barringer's Close, 1716 6, 7
Dr Jasper Kellie (Dunblane). M H, 1713. Below Fountain-well, 1716-7 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Robert Kincaid (Walston). NMH, 1713 4, 5
Henry Knox (Bowden). NMH, 1713. d. 1716. 16 3, 4, 5
David Lammie (Carrington). Skinners Close, 1716-7 3, 5, 6, 7
Andrew Lumsden (Duddingston). Barringer's Close, 1716/7 3, 5, 6, 7
Archibald Mair (post-Revolution). MH, 1713 17 3, 4
Robert Marshall (post-Revolution). Bailie Fyfe's Close, 1716-7 5, 6, 7
Patrick Middleton (Leslie). MH, 1712, 1713, 18, 1713, Skinner's Close, 1716-7 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
William Miln (post-Revolution). MH, 1713 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Robert Moncrief (Heriot). MH, 1709. 19 1, 2, 3, 8
Thomas Nowbray (post-Revolution). back of Bell's Wynd, 1716-7 3, 5, 6, 7
Samuel Nimmo (Colinton). NMH, 1713. d. 1717 20 3, 4, 5
Adam Peacock (Morebattle). MH, 1713. Bailie Fyfe's Close, 1716-7 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
George Purvis (Glencorse). d. 1710 21 1, 2, 8
David Rankine (Rattray). Skinners Close, 1716-7 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7
Thomas Rhind (post-Revolution). Sandiland's Close, 1716-17 6, 7
back of Bell's Wynd, 1716
James Scot (Galashiels). d. 1715 23 5
William Scott or Scotland (post-Revolution). MH, 1713. 3, 4
James Shand (post-Revolution?). NMH, 1713 4, 8
Robert Skene (Dunsyre). MH, 1713 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
William Smart (Ecclesmachan). MH, 1712, d. 1715 25 1, 2, 3, 5
David Spence (Kirkurd). 3
Thomas Strachan (St. Martins). 26

Alexander Sutherland (Dun'ipace and Larbert). Niddry's Wynd, 1713. back of Bell's Wynd, 1716 [2], 3, [5], 6, 7

Alexander Sutherland (post-Revolution). Blackfriars Wynd, 1713, 1716-7 [2], 3, 4, [5], 6, 7

Daniel Taylor (Kingussie?). 28 Hart's Close, 1716 5

Henry Walker (Mochrum). 29 MH, 1713. Toddrick's Wynd, 1716-7 2, 8

James Walker (Buittle). MH, 1713. Dickson's Close, 1716-7 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

Thomas Wilkie (Beith). NMH, 1713 3, 4

William Willie (post-Revolution). Bailie Fyfe's Close, 1716-7 5, 6, 7

John Wingate (Denny). d. 1712. 30 1, 2

John Wood (Thurso). 31 8

George Young (Kirkmaiden).

NOTES:

1. SRO GD 124/10/483.

2. Fasti ii, 313.

3. J.S. Marshall, Calendar of Irregular Marriages in the South Leith Kirk Session Records 1697-1818 (Scottish Record Society, 1968), 5-8, irregular marriages by Barclay, 1703-11; Chapter 4, n. 37; Barclay died c.26 Sept. - 17 Oct. 1711 (SRO CH 2/121/8, pp. 138-9, 150).


5. Fasti ii, 84.

6. Chapter 6, n. 282.

7. Ibid., n. 281.

8. Irregular marriages 1709-23 (SRO CH 2/121/7, pp. 151, 406, Edinburgh presbytery minutes, 1709-10; Calendar of Irregular Marriages in South Leith, 8-21).


10. NLS Adv. MS. 34.7.9, f. 34, noting his irregular marriages c.1707-8.

11. Fasti v, 171.

12, /
12. Chapter 5, passim.

13. Noted in source 4 as having moved to Arbroath meeting-house.

14. Fasti iii, 210; Wake MSS. vol. 19, f. 189r, Account of Bishop Rose's Jacobitism, 1716, noting ordination of a Henry Henderson after 1689.

15. Meeting-house closed (GRO D 3549/77a/H/29, Memorial concerning persecution of episcopal clergy, n.d. [c. 1708-9]).


17. Noted in source 4 as having 'removed to ye Weemyss'.

18. Chapter 6, n. 282.

19. Chapter 4, n. 34; Calendar of Irregular Marriages in South Leith, 9-16:1712-8.

20. Fasti i, 3.

21. Ibid., 321; irregular marriage, 1709 (SRO CH 2/121/7, pp. 152-3).

22. Alexander Robinson, who appears in source 3 (Appendix 4), is noted in source 4 as having 'removed to Dunkell'. He may or may not be the Mr Robertson active in Edinburgh in 1716.

23. Fasti ii, 177.

24. Perhaps the Mr John Shand, formerly assistant at Barra, Haddington (RPC XVI, 218), and the minister of that name marrying irregularly 1713-17 (Calendar of Irregular Marriages in South Leith, 10-16).

25. Chapter 6, n. 283; Fasti i, 203.


27. Unclear if Alexander Sutherland elder or younger was signatory.

28. Possibly came to Edinburgh after being forced to quit ministering in Avoch (chapter 6, n. 214).

29. Perhaps the Mr Walker who prayed nominatim for the Queen (SRO CH 12/12/1821, Rose to Campbell, 5 June 1711); Calendar of Irregular Marriages in South Leith, 15-16; 1717-8.

30. Fasti iv, 304.

Account of meeting of episcopal clergy, Edinburgh, 30 March 1713.

The former parishes of clergy are supplied in square brackets where they are not given in the Ms., and clergy ordained from 1689 are noted as 'post-Revolution'. See also Appendix 3.

Source: SRO CH 12/12/1849.

Edr March 30 1713

The Names of those Ministers conveen'd this Day at ye Meeting-house in Skinners-Closs, who have declard it is their Resolution always to pray expresly for the Queen in the public Prayers.

Mr Gaspar Kelly Dean of Dumblane
Mr Geo. Johnstone Minr of Bruntisland
Mr Rot. Skeen -- -- Dumsyre
Mr Adam Peacock -- -- Marbottle
Mr Henry Walker -- -- Mochram
Mr James Walker -- -- Bootle
Mr Alexr Guthrie -- -- Keer
Mr James Adamson -- -- Kettletown
Mr Robert Bows -- -- [Stonykirk]
Mr Thomas Wilkie -- -- Abbotrule [Beith?]
Mr Patrick Midletoune -- -- Lesly
Mr Patrick Home [post-Revolution]

Names of those who were not att the Meeting, but declare they will do it.

Mr George Henry [Corstorphine]
Mr Robert Moncreif [Heriot]
Mr Alexr Sutherland - Black-frier-wynd [meeting-house; post Revolution?]
Mr Wm Scot alias Scotland [post-Revolution]
Mr John Alexander [Durisdeer?]
Mr David Blair [post-Revolution]
Mr Henry Henderson [Inverkip or post-Revolution?]
Mr Thomas Strachan [St Martins]
The Names of those that have declin'd to declare their Resolution at the meeting.

Mr David Ranken [Rattray]
Mr Wm. Smart [Ecclesmachan], who said publicly he had no Scruple if all were willing to do it.
Mr Robert Cheyne [Girthon]
Mr William Milln [post-Revolution]
Mr Andrew Cant [College Kirk, Edinburgh]

It is not doubted but Mr David Spense [Kirkurd] and Mr [Alexander?] Robison [Fortingall or post-Revolution?] will do it, if they are spoken to by my Lord Dun.

Names of those at the Meeting who down right refuse to do it.

Mr Alexr Sutherland Nithries wynde [Larbert and Dunipace]
Mr Alexr Cummin [Liberton]
Mr David Lamy [Carrington]
Mr David Freebairn [Dunning]
Mr Robert Wright [Culross]
Mr Robert Caddel [Nenthorn]
Mr William Grant [Newburgh]
Mr Andrew Lumsden [Duddingston]
Mr George Gr[a]name [Lochmaben]
Mr Thomas Moubray [post-Revolution]

Mr [Arthur] Millar in Leith has often declar'd his Freedom, but waits the unanimous Concurrence of his Brethren. [Inveresk]

Mr [Archibald] Mair in Leith, always names the Queen in Prayers. [post-Revolution]

Mr Henry Knox on all Occasions declares it is his mind that all should do it. [Bowden]

Mr [Samuel] Nimbo is of the same Mind [Colinton]
A List of Episcopal Ministers who enjoy Churches or Benefices in Scotland, March 1710'

The list has been modified to indicate presbyteries, and errors in personal and place names have been corrected in square brackets. The title 'Mr.' has been omitted; n.j. = nonjuror.

Source: The Case of Mr. Greenshields, as it was printed in London, with remarks upon the same (London, 1710), 59-60.

[George] Dunbar, Haddington
Thomas Wood, Dunbar
[George] Smith, Dawick
Robert Smith, Longformacus
John Brown, Ellem
Adam Waddel, Whitsome
William [Carmichael], Makerstoun
Alexander McCalman, Lismore
Aeneas McDonald, South Uist
Donald McQueen, Snizort and Uig
Allan Morison, [North Uist]
Mungo Murray, Logierait
Alexander Comrie, Kenmore
Francis Pearson, Strathardill
[or Kirkmichael]
Robert Stewart, Killin
Alexander Robertson, Fortingall
Robert Gordon, Clunie
John Skinner, Bothkennar
William Campbell, Balquhidder
Patrick Lyon, Kinghorn
John Blair, Scoonie
David Paton, Kettins
Thomas Ogilvie, Lintrathen
William Rait, Monikie

Haddington
Dunbar
Peebles
Duns
Duns
Chirnside
Kelso
Kilmore
Skye
Skye
Skye
Dunkeld
Dunkeld
Dunkeld
Dunkeld
Dunkeld
Dunkeld
Dunkeld
Dunblane
Kirkcaldy
Kirkcaldy
Meigle
Meigle
Dundee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Peddie, Lunan</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Maul, Panbride</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Balvaird, Kirkden</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Guthrie, Guthrie</td>
<td>Arbroath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Small, Forfar</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester Lyon, Kirriemuir</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lindsay, Dunnichen</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Lyon, Tannadice</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Miln, Inverarity</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lyon, Kinnettles</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td>(intruder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Balvaird, Glamis</td>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td>(intruder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lindsay, Old Montrose [Maryton]</td>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>(n.j.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Simson, Logie-Pert</td>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Murray, Careston</td>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>(n.j.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Lindsay, Careston,</td>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>(n.j.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Thomson, Lethnot</td>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ochterlony, Fordoun</td>
<td>Fordoun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Robert] Irving, Glenbervie</td>
<td>Fordoun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Reid, Durris</td>
<td>Fordoun</td>
<td>(n.j.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr George Middleton, Principal of</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's College, Aberdeen</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hedderwick, King's College Chapel,</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>(intruder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr William Blair, [N. St Machar's,]</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Gray, Footdee</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Maitland, Nigg</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gordon, Banchory Devenick</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George White, Maryculter</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Ramsay, Dyce</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Thomas] Alexander, Colstone and Logymar</td>
<td>Kincardine O'Neill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Leith, Lumphanan</td>
<td>Kincardine O'Neill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[William] Idle, Coull</td>
<td>Kincardine O'Neill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Jaffray, Alford</td>
<td>Alford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Miln, Forbes</td>
<td>Alford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Livingstone, Keig</td>
<td>Alford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Walker, Tullynessle  
John Alexander, Kildrummie  
John Robertson, Strathdon  
William (Garioch), Culsalmond  
Alexander Lunan, Daviot  
William Murray, Inverurie  
John Burnet, Monymusk  
Alexander Miln, Udny  
Walter Stewart, Ellon  
William Dunbar, Cruden  
Alexander Robertson, Longside  
George Keith, Old Deer  
William Swan, Pitsligo  
Alexander Hepburn, St Fergus  
George Dalgarino, Fyvie  
Adam Hay, Monquhitter  
John Innes, Gamrie  
John Dunbar, Forglén  
Alexander Gellie, Fordyce  
John Hay, Rathven  
Hector Fraser, Inverness  
Hugh Fraser, Kiltarility  
Michael Fraser, Daviot  
Thomas Fraser, Dores  
Alexander Denune, Petty  
George Dunbar, Nairn  
Alexander Fordyce, Rafford and Altyre  
Patrick Grant, Ardclach  
Adam Harper, Boharm  
John Scot, Dipple  
Robert Cuming, Urquhart  
George Cuming, Essil  
George Chalmers, Botriphnie  
Alexander Ross, Botarie  
William Hay, Rothiemay  
James Gordon [Rhynie]  
Alexander Alexander, Glass  
Lewis Gordon, (Dunbennan & Kinmoir}

Alford  
Alford  
Alford  
Garioch  
Garioch  
Garioch  
Garioch  
Ellon  
Ellon (n.j.)  
Ellon (intruder)  
Deer  
Deer  
Deer  
Deer (intruder)  
Turriff  
Turriff  
Turriff  
Turriff  
Forde  
Fordyce (intruder, n.j.)  
Inverness  
Inverness  
Inverness  
Inverness  
Inverness (deposed, i.e. intruder)  
Nairn  
Forres  
Forres  
Aberlour  
Elgin  
Elgin  
Elgin  
Strathbogie  
Strathbogie  
Strathbogie  
Strathbogie  
Strathbogie (intruder)  
Strathbogie  
Strathbogie
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Fraser, Suddie</td>
<td>Fortrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick Mackenzie, Avoch</td>
<td>Fortrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Mackenzie, Logie</td>
<td>Tain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mackenzie, Rosskeen</td>
<td>Tain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mackenzie, Fodderty</td>
<td>Dingwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeneas Morison, Contin</td>
<td>Dingwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Ross, Urquhart</td>
<td>Dingwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Fraser, Kilmorack</td>
<td>Dingwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Mackrah, Kintail</td>
<td>Dingwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mackenzie, Lochbroom</td>
<td>Dingwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick Mackenzie, Gairloch</td>
<td>Dingwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Ross, Rogart</td>
<td>Dornoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Hector] Paip, Loth</td>
<td>Dornoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Gray, Assynt</td>
<td>Dornoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Beaton, Latheron</td>
<td>Thurso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 110

Notes:

1. Given as Cuninghame. Carmichael was deprived of Athelstaneford in 1681, and was admitted to Makerstoun in 1692 (Fasti ii, 78).

2. Campbell allegedly intruded in 1687 and continued after the deprivation of Robert Stewart, the legal incumbent in 1689 (Fasti iv, 337-8). It is not clear he was episcopalian.

3. A similar list of about 1707 gives the names of 161 clergy (Daniel Defoe, An Historical Account of the Bitter Sufferings and Melancholy Circumstances of the Episcopal Church in Scotland (Edinburgh, 1707), 34-8).
APPENDIX 6

Ministers of the diocese of Aberdeen divided into four districts, 1712.

Source: SRO CH 12/12/6a

A List off the Ministers off the Diocese of Abd divided into four districts.

Aberdeen
Dr [George] Midletoun [Principal of King's College]
Dr [William] Blair [active in Aberdeen]
Mr Ja: Gordon att Banchrie
Dr [Andrew] Burnett [active in Aberdeen]
Mr George Whyte att Mary-culter
Mr Gilbert Ramsay att Dyce
Mr Alexr Gray att Footy
Mr Patrick Dunbreck in ABD
Mr David Hedderwick in Old ABD
Mr Wm. Law att Greenburn

Kincairden & Alford
Mr Will: Idle at Coul
Mr Thos Alexr att Colstein
Mr Patrick Leith att Lumphanan
Mr Ja: Wa[l]ker att Tillinessle
Mr Alexr Barclay Kinnethmont
Mr Andrew Jeffrey att Alford
Mr Jo: Alexander att Kildrummie
Mr And: Livinstoun att Keeg
Mr Robert Miln att Forbess
Garioch, Turreff & Fordyce

Mr Jo: Burnett att Monymusk
Mr Alexr Lunan att Daviot
Mr Wm Murray att Innerourie
Mr Adam Hay att Montwhiter
Mr George Campbell att Alva
Mr John Dunbar att Forglen
Mr Alexr Gellie att Fordyce
Mr John Innes att Gemrie
Mr George Dalgardno att Fyvie

Ellon and Deer

Mr All: Miln att Udny
Mr Wm Dunbar att Cruden
Mr Wm Lesly att Ellon
Mr Alexr Rotson att Longsyde
Mr Wm. Swan att Pitsligo
Mr Jo: Barclay att Peterhead
Mr All: Hepburn att St Fergus
Mr All: Moor att Fraserburgh
Mr Wm Livingstoun att Deer

[verso]

It is thought expedient that these severall districts meet (att such times and places as shall be judged convenient) for the following ends.

1mo for mutuall assistance in discipline
2do for tryall of candidates for the Holy Ministry
3tio for enquiring into the principles and morals off such as shall be called to Meeting-houses.
4to for encouraging the English Service in parishes where it will be acceptable.

That a letter be written to our Ordinary, the Bishop of Aberdeen to procure his authority for the foresaid meetings, that he would appoynt Preses for them, and give what furder instructions he thinks fitt.
1. MANUSCRIPTS

Aberdeen City Archives
ACL. Press 18, bundle 8  
Miscellaneous ecclesiastical papers

Aberdeen University Library
Montcoffer papers, A/309  
Sir Alexander Cumming of Culter.

Berkshire Record Office
(Marquess of Downshire)
Trumbull MSS vol. LIV  
Sir William Trumbull
Miscellaneous XXXI, Add.
MSS. 116

Carlisle Record Office
DRC/1/5, 6  
Episcopal registers of Bishops
Thomas Smith and William Nicolson

Scottish Record Office, Edinburgh
CH 1  
Registers and papers of General Assembly
CH 2  
Minutes of Aberdeen, Arbroath, Deer, Dunkeld, Edinburgh and Selkirk presbyteries; Trinity kirk session, Edinburgh; Newtyle kirk session.
CH 8  
Miscellaneous ecclesiastical papers
CH 12  
'Episcopal Chest' (formerly in The Scottish Episcopal Theological College): miscellaneous episcopalian papers.
CH 23  
'Jolly Kist' (formerly in Episcopal Theological College): papers of Bishop John Alexander.
GD 26  
Leven and Melville papers
GD 38  
Stewart of Dalguise papers
GD 45  
Dalhousie papers
GD 124  
Mar and Kellie papers
GD 220  
Montrose papers
HH 11/10  
Edinburgh Tolbooth Warding Book
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC 2, 3</td>
<td>Books of Adjournal of High Court of Justiciary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 11</td>
<td>Minute books of North Circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 12</td>
<td>Minute books of South Circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 17</td>
<td>Dittay rolls of North Circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC 26, 27</td>
<td>Small papers (main and supplementary series)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 1</td>
<td>Acta of Privy Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC 14</td>
<td>Oaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH 2/4</td>
<td>State Papers: letters and papers (copies of PRO SP 54/4, and cited as such)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 3/1</td>
<td>Letter-book of James Johnston, Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adv. MS. 13.1.4</td>
<td>Perth Hospital Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv. MS. 23.3.24</td>
<td>Panmure genealogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv. MS. 29.2.10</td>
<td>Bishop Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv. MS. 34.7.9</td>
<td>List of clergy at Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. 1260, 1454</td>
<td>Letters to John Mackenzie of Delvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. 1668</td>
<td>Memoirs of John Brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. 3186</td>
<td>Macgregor of Balhaldie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. 3650</td>
<td>Dr James Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. 14407</td>
<td>Marquess of Tweeddale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. 16502</td>
<td>Fletcher of Saltoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodrow Quarto V, VI</td>
<td>Correspondence of Robert Wodrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodrow Quarto LXXXII</td>
<td>Memoirs of John Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodrow Octavo XII</td>
<td>Church and State papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodrow Folio XXVI</td>
<td>Letters to Robert Wylie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep. 251</td>
<td>St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth: register of Blairgowrie meeting-house; diary of W. Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR. 41, 117</td>
<td>Accounts and registers of Faculty of Advocates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Edinburgh University Library (Special Collections)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laing MS. III. 545</td>
<td>Note book of Robert Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laing MS. III. 644</td>
<td>William Nicolson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New College Library, Edinburgh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X 156 3/1</td>
<td>List of clergy at Revolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Edinburgh City Archives

Burgh Court Register of Bonds of Caution
Burgh Court Act Book

Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh

MSS. 93/11, 19, 25 Receipts for charity donations

Gloucester County Record Office

D 3549 Lloyd-Baker-Sharp papers: Archbishop John Sharp

Lambeth Palace Library, London

MSS. 806, 929, 930, 941, 954, 1029, 2020 Archbishops Tillotson and Tenison
MS. 1770 Diary of Archbishop William Wake
SPG. vol. 10 Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts
Fulham Papers vol. XI Clergy in Virginia

British Library, London

Stowe MSS. 305 Scottish episcopal clergy
Add. MSS. 22,908 Dr John Colbatch
Add. MSS. 22,911 Dr John Covel
Add. MSS. 29,588 Earl of Nottingham

Public Record Office, London

SP 8/14 King William's Chest
SP 34/19 State Papers Domestic, Anne: Secretary's papers
SP 34/30 Petitions
SP 44/150-1 State Papers Domestic, Anne: Entry Books (ecclesiastical)
SP 44/338 Domestic Warrant Book
SP 54/3, 4 State Papers, Scotland (series II): Letters and papers (copies in SRO RH 2/4)
SP 55 Letter books (Scotland)
SP 63 State Papers, Ireland: Letters
Secret Service Receipts
Treasury Money Book

Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London
Minutes of SPCK, and of Standing Committee of SPCK
Letter-books

CR 1. 4, 5

Guildhall Library, London
MS. 9531/17
Register of Bishop Henry Compton

John Rylands Library, Manchester
Crawford and Balcarres
Muniments, 19/2
Earl of Balcarres: Archbishop John Paterson

Bodleian Library, Oxford
Ballard 8, 24, 31, 36
Arthur Charlett: James Greenshields and others

Cherry 22
Dr John Cockburn

Carte 181
Viscount Dundee

Eng. Th. c.27, 28
Thomas Brett: Archibald Campbell

Rawlinson C 985
Bishop Henry Compton

Rawlinson J
Dr John Cockburn

Smith 48
Dr John Cockburn

Wood F. 44
Arthur Charlett

J. Walker C. 3
John Walker

Oxford University Archives, Bd. 31 NEP
Acts of Convocation

Christ Church Library, Oxford
Wake MSS vols. 17, 19-22
Archbishop William Wake

Scottish Episcopal Church
References are to surveys circulated by the National Register of Archives (Scotland)

Aberdeen Diocesan Office
Miscellaneous papers
NRA(S) 2697
Aberdeen Diocese
NRA(S) 2698
St. Andrew's Cathedral, Aberdeen; St. John's, Aberdeen; St. Andrew's, Banff; St. Congan's, Turriff.

Brechin Diocese
NRA(S) 2701
St. Peter's, Montrose

Edinburgh Diocese
NRA(S) 2702
St. Paul's (qualified), Edinburgh

Moray, Ross and Caithness
Diocese NRA(S) 2705
Miscellaneous bishop's papers

St. Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane Diocese
NRA(S) 2706
St. John's, Forfar; Holy Trinity, Pitlochry.

Other collections

Earl of Annandale
NRA(S) 2171, Bundles 389, 391
Dr James Canaries; episcopal clergy

Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry
NRA(S) 1275, vol. 128
Duke of Queensberry

Marquess of Bute
NRA(S) 631, Bundle A/247
Earl of Loudoun

Home of the Hirsel
NRA(S) 859, 34/2
Alexander Douglas

Duke of Roxburghe
NRA(S) 1100, Bundles 771-2, 790, 802
Duke of Roxburghe

Earl of Strathmore
NRA(S) 885, p.31 (survey only)
Patrick Middleton

Wardlaw-Ramsay
NRA(S) 227, Section 1A/130-1, 181-2, 217, 219; Section 8A
Bernard Mackenzie and others; diary of Sir John Ramsay of Whitehill.

Dr Hugh Todd
NRA(S) 2787
Dr Hugh Todd
2. UNPUBLISHED THESIS

Cheyne, A.C., 'The political relations of England and Scotland under William III and Anne, with particular reference to the religious factors', B.Litt. (Oxford University, 1954).


3. PRIMARY PRINTED: CONTEMPORARY PUBLICATIONS

Some long titles have been abbreviated.


An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland (London, 1692).

An Apology for Mr Thomas Rhind, or an account of the manner how, and the reasons for which he separated from the Presbyterian Party, and embraced the communion of the Church (Edinburgh, 1712).

An Apology for Such of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland as are Nonjurors (London, 1717).


Act and Commission by the general meeting of the Episcopal Ministers at Aberdeen, for presenting some Queries to the Committee of the Late General Assembly (Edinburgh, 1695).

(Barclay, George), A Full Answer for Mr George Barclay Minister of the Gospel to a Scurrilous Pamphlet Published against him in Vindication of the Bishop of Edinburgh, and the other Administrators of the Money Collected; for the Relief of the Distressed Episcopal Clergy in Scotland (Edinburgh, 1712).
A Bill to prevent Disturbance to those of the Episcopal Communion, in that Part of Great-Britain called Scotland, in the Exercise of their Religious Worship, and in the Use of the Liturgy of the Church of England; and for repealing ... 1695 ... Act anent irregular Marriages and Baptisms (n.p., n.d.) (1712).

The Book of Common-Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments; And other Parts of Divine Service for the Use of the Church of Scotland, With a Paraphrase of the Psalms in Metre by King James VI (Edinburgh, 1712).

Boyer, Abel, The History of the Reign of Queen Anne, Digested into Annals X (1712).

Calder, Robert, Miscellany Numbers. A Continuation of an Answer to Mr John Anderson ... No. V. (n.p., n.d.).

[Carstares, William], The Case of the Church of Scotland with relation to the Bill for a Toleration to the Episcopal Dissenters to set up Meeting-Houses, and use the English Service in Scotland (n.p., n.d.) (London, 1712).

The Case of Mr Greenshields Fully Stated and Discuss'd In a Letter from a Commoner of North Britain to an English Peer (n.p., 1711).


Cockburn, William, A Sermon upon the XXXth of January 1713 (Edinburgh, 1713).

A Copy of My Lord Bishop of London his Letter to his Archdeacon with the Archdeacon his Letter to the Clergy of London (London, 1708).

Dalrymple, David, An Account of Lay-Patronages in Scotland, And of the fatal Differences they have occasion'd betwixt the Church and Lay-Patrons, With Observations on the Arguments for restoring them (London, 1712).

Declaration by the Administrators of Collections for the Support of Indigent Episcopal Clergy and their families (1710/11).
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