Sectarian Religion in Scotland: The Impact of Cromwell's Occupation (1650-1660).

R. Scott Spurlock

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
The University of Edinburgh
2005

EDINBURGH UNIV. LIBR.

Abstract

Historically Oliver Cromwell's 1650 invasion of Scotland and the subsequent decade long occupation has been portrayed as a politically motivated response to the proclamation of Charles II as king of not only Scotland but of all Great Britain and Ireland. As a result, this purely political interpretation of events has diminished recognition of the religious impact and significance of England's final invasion of Scotland. This thesis seeks to address the Commonwealth government's fear of the intolerant Presbyterianism of the Scottish Kirk, which over the previous decade saw the Scots fight in two English Civil Wars alongside both the King and the Parliament on the condition that Presbyterianism would be imposed on England.

Through an analysis of the polemical tracts produced by both the Scots and the English army as it marched north in the summer of 1650 the mutual religious distrust of both sides is explored. The religious struggle which manifested itself in the intellectual disputations of the Westminster Assembly was militarily contested at the Battle of Dunbar where the English Army's belief in the providential success of the Commonwealth, heralded by the battle cry 'For the Lord of Hosts', was opposed by the Scot's cry 'For the Covenant'. The English army that invaded Scotland was not conscripted, but rather composed of volunteers. As a result, the army was filled with individuals religiously opposed to the Scottish Kirk and furnished with chaplains strongly opposed to Presbyterianism. The English regime, upon suppressing Scotland, imposed religious toleration and put forward a policy of promoting Protestant alternatives to the national Church of Scotland. Through public preaching, public disputes and control of printing presses the English regime sought to foster an atmosphere of toleration towards a wide variety of Protestant forms, whilst the soldiers of the army and their chaplains sought to proselytise the Scots.

The second half of this thesis analyses the achievement of the proselytising message of the English. It charts the successes and failures of the Independents, Baptists and Quakers among the Scottish people, and seeks to explain why the Quakers succeeded in remaining continuously in Scotland to the present day, while the Independents and Baptists largely disappeared before the Restoration.

This is to certify that I, Roy Scott Spurlock, have composed this thesis. It is wholly my own work, and no part of it has been submitted for any other degree or qualification.

Signature:

Date: 16/8/05

Acknowledgements

I would like to offer my heartfelt thanks to all those who have supported me over the past four years during the production of this thesis, particularly the following: my supervisors, Dr. Susan Hardman Moore and Dr. Jane Dawson, who have shown exceptional support, encouragement and patience; Professor David F. Wright, for his great kindness and guidance during my studies here at New College; the staff of New College Library, Edinburgh, for their many trips to special collections; the staff of the National Library of Scotland; the staff of the National Archives of Scotland; and the congregation of Morningside United Church to whom I owe a special debt of appreciation.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my parents; the unyielding faithfulness of Manders; and especially to my wife Amber, for whom words are insufficient to expresss my gratitude. Your love, patience, support and constant encouragement made this thesis possible.

Contents

Conventions and Abbreviations 1

Map of Cromwellian Garrisons 5

Introduction 6

Chapter I: 'The Covenant' vs. 'the Lord of Hosts': A Struggle for Public Opinion through the Printed Propaganda of War. 16

The Role of Religion in the Conflict 17

Polemic as Self Definition 20

Polemical Models for the Kirk 25

Polemical Warfare 28

Covenant versus Providence 50

Presbyterian Interpretations in the Wake of Dunbar 56

Chapter II: 'Go not to Gilgal nor Bethaven!': Presbyterian Resistance to the Polemics of Sectarian Occupation. 63

A Widespread Sectarian Presence 69

An Evangelical Occupation 73

Public Disputes 87

Chapter III: 'A *Dead-Man's Testament*' and '*A Litle Stone*': The Commonwealth's Campaign against the Scottish Presbytery. 116

External Calls for Reform 121

Mysterious Voices from Within 124

Settled Government and Overt Attacks on the Kirk 135

Softening Regulation and Presbyterian Response 147

The Protectorate and the Abatement of Anti-Presbyterian Works 151

Chapter IV: 'Neirer the patterne of the ghospell': A Season of Indigenous Scottish Independency. 160

The Fertile Soil of Discontent 167

Scottish Sectarians 175

Separation 185

The Aberdeen Independents 196

Gillespie's Protesters and Disciplinary Minded Independents 228

Institutional Support for Independency 234

The Twilight of 17th Century Scottish Independency 241

Chapter V: The 'Lamb's War' in Scotland: The Rise of the Quakers and the Fall of the Baptists. 255

Baptists and the Army 259

Quakers and the Scottish Populace 281

Sectarian Unity in the Closing Years of the Interregnum 301

Interpreting Divergent Experiences 319

Conclusion 325

Appendices

I. Pre-Dunbar Propaganda of 1650

1. List of Works produced in the run-up to Dunbar 333

2. Secondary Polemic Pertaining to the Invasion of Scotland 335

II. English Use of the Printing Press

1. Evan Tyler's Edinburgh Printing House 339

2. The English Use of the Press in Relation to the Protester-Resolutioner Dispute 341

3. Polemics against Charles II in 1650-1 347

III. English Garrisons in Scotland 1656-8 350

IV. Declarations of Separation 353

V. English Ministers Serving in Scotland 354

Bibliography 359

Conventions

All dates given in this thesis have been adjusted to the modern calendar, with January 1 marking the beginning of a new year.

Abbreviations

Acts of the General Assembly	Church of Scotland. General Assembly. *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638-1842.* (ed.) T. Pitcairn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing & Publishing Co., 1843).
APS	C. Innes and T. Thomson (eds), *The Acts of the Parliament of Scotland.* 11 vols (Edinburgh: Printed by command of His Majesty King George the third, in pursuance of an address of the House of Commons of Great Britain, 1814-44).
Abbott, *Cromwell*	W.C. Abbott (ed.), *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell.* 4 vols (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937-47).
Baillie, *L & J*	Robert Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, (ed.) D. Laing, 3 vols (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1841-2).
Balfour	Sir James Balfour, *The Historical Works of James Balfour.* 4 vols (Edinburgh,1824).
Baxter, *Synod of Fife*	C. Baxter (ed.), *Ecclesiastical Records. Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife, 1611-1687.* (Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1837).
Brodie	Alexander Brodie, *Diary of Alexander Brodie of Brodie (1652-80).* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1863).
Burnet, *Quakerism*	G.B. Burnet, *The Story of Quakerism in Scotland 1650-1850* (London: J. Clarke, 1952).
CSPD	M.A.E. Green (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series 1651-1660.* 13 vols (London,1877-86).
CUP	Cambridge University Press.
Clarke MSS	Microfilm copy of the William Clarke Manuscripts held in Worcester College, Oxford and NLS. G.E. Aylmer (ed.) Brighton Harvester Microfilm 1977-9. Listed by volume number.
Clarke Papers	C.H. Firth (ed.), *The Clarke Papers*, 4 vols (Camden Society, 1891-1901).
Cramond, *Elgin*	William Cramond (ed.), *The Records of Elgin, 1234-1800.* (Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1898).

Cramond, *Moray*	William Cramond (ed.), *Extracts from the Records of the Synod of Moray.* (Elgin, 1906).
DNB	*Dictionary of National Biography.*
Donaldson, 'Schism'	G. Donaldson, 'The Emergence of Schism in Seventeenth-Century Scotland' *Scottish Church History* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1985), 204-19.
Dow	Frances Dow, *Cromwellian Scotland: 1651-1660.* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1979; John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1999).
ESTC	English Short Title Catalogue.
EUL	Edinburgh University Library.
FES	H. Scott (ed.), *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae.* 7 vols (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1915-1928).
Fox	George Fox, *The Journal.* (ed.) Nigel Smith (London: Penguin Books, 1998).
Fraser, *Chronicles*	James Fraser, *Chronicles of the Frasers*, (ed.) William MacKay (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1905).
Gardiner, *C & P*	S.R. Gardiner (ed.), *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate 1649-1656.* 4 vols (London: Longmans & Green, 1903).
Grainger	J.D. Grainger, *Cromwell Against the Scots: The Last Anglo-Saxon War, 1650-1652.* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1997).
Henderson, 'Early'	G.D. Henderson, 'Some Early Scottish Independents.' *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society* 12 (1933-6): 67-79.
Holfelder	K.D. Holfelder, 'Factionalism in the Kirk during the Cromwellian Invasion and Occupation of Scotland, 1650 to 1660: the Protester-Resolutioner Controversy.' (PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1998).
Hoy	W.I. Hoy, 'Entry of Sects into Scotland: A Preliminary Study.' *Reformation and Revolution* (ed.) D. Shaw (Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press, 1967), 178-211.
Jaffray	Alexander Jaffray, *Diary of Alexander Jaffray.* (ed.) John Barclay, 3rd ed. (Aberdeen: George & Robert King, 1856).
JFHS	*Journal of the Friends Historical Society.*

Kinloch, *St Andrews & Cupar*	G.R. Kinloch, (ed.), *Ecclesiastical Records. Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of St. Andrews and Cupar, 1641-1698.* (Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1837).
Lamont	John Lamont, *The Diary of Mr John Lamont of Newton, 1649-1671.* (ed.) G.R. Kinloch (Edinburgh: The Maitland Club, 1830).
Laurence	Anne Laurence, *Parliamentary Army Chaplains, 1642-51.* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1990).
Maidment, *Historical Fragments*	James Maidment (ed.), *Historical Fragments, Relative to Scottish Affairs, from 1635 to 1664.* (Edinburgh: Thomas Stevenson, 1833).
Munro, *Old Aberdeen*	A.M. Munro, (ed.) *Records of Old Aberdeen.* Vol. 2 (Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1909).
Nicoll	John Nicoll, *A Diary of Public Transactions and Other Occurrences, Chiefly in Scotland, 1650-67.*, (ed.) D. Laing (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1836).
NLS	National Library of Scotland
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*
OUP	Oxford University Press
Penny, *Fox*	George Fox, *The Journal of George Fox*, (ed.) Norman Penney, 2 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1911).
Peterkin	Alexander Peterkin (ed.), *Records of the Kirk of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: John Sutherland, 1838).
RCGA	Alexander F. Mitchell and James Christie (eds), *Records of the Commission of the General Assembly*, 3 vols (Edinburgh: Scottish Historical Society, 1890-1909).
RCME	W. Stephen (ed.), *Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh and Some Other Brethren of the Ministry.*, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1921-30).
RHCA	C.H. Firth and G. Davies (eds), *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army.*, 2 vols (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940).
RSCHS	*Records of the Scottish Church History Society.*
Robertson, *Lanark*	J. Robertson (ed.), *Ecclesiastical Records. Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark, 1623-1709.* (Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1839).
Row, *History of the Kirk*	John Row, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland, from the Year 1558 to August 1637 by John Row, Minister of Carnock: With a*

	Continuation to July 1639, by His Son, John Row, Principal of King's College, Aberdeen. (Edinburgh: Printed for the Wodrow Society, 1842).
Row, *Life of Blair*	W. Row, *The Life of Mr Robert Blair.* (ed.) T. McCrie (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1848).
Rutherford, *Letters*	Samuel Rutherford, *Letters of Samuel Rutherford*, (ed.) A.A. Bonar (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1984).
S & C	C.H. Firth (ed.), *Scotland and the Commonwealth.* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1895).
S & P	C.H. Firth (ed.), *Scotland and the Protectorate.* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1899).
SHR	*Scottish Historical Review*
Spalding, *Memorialls*	John Spalding, *Memorialls of The Trubles in Scotland and England. A.D. 1624-A.D. 1645.* 2 vols (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1829-51).
Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*	D. Stevenson, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Scotland, 1644-1651.* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977; John Donald Publishers Ltd, 2003).
Stuart, *Aberdeen*	J. Stuart (ed.), *Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen.* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1846).
Stuart, *Strathbogie*	J. Stuart (ed.), *Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie. 1631-1654.* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1843).
Thurloe	Birch, T. (ed.) *A collection of state papers of John Thurloe.*, 7 vols (London, 1742).
Wariston, ii	Sir Archibald Johnston, *Diary of Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston*, (ed.) D.H. Flemming, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1919).
Wariston, iii	Sir Archibald Johnston, *Diary of Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston*, (ed.) J.D. Ogilvie, vol. 3 (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1940).
Weare, *Doctrines*	George Weare, *The Doctrins & Principles of the Priests of Scotland, Contrary to the Doctrine of Christ and the Apostles Here All May See, the Priests of Scotland, and Their Church, and Their Persecution, Against the Saints, and Lambs, Servants, and Children of God, Which the Lord Moved to go among Them, to Visit the Seed of God, in That Dark Wildernesse Country, Who Has Been as Sheep among Wolves.* (London: printed for Giles Calvert, 1657).
Whitelocke	Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs.* 4 vols (Oxford: OUP, 1853).

Cromwellian Garrisons Occupied for a Minimum of Three Months



1. Kilcreggan(?) Castle
2. Dumbarton Castle
3. Craigbarnet (Campsie)(?)
4. House of Kilsyth
5. Kinneil House
6. South Queensferry
7. Craighouse
8. Dunfermline
9. Burntisland
10. Kirkcaldy
11. Wemyss
12. Struthers Castle
13. Inchkeith
14. Inchgarvie
15. Anstruther
16. Crail

?- denotes uncertainty of location.

Introduction

In 1982, John Morrill reviewed three recently published works which together he lauded for their great strides in charting the religious history of seventeenth-century Scotland.[1] Two of the works were primarily focused on the religion of the country, while the third was not. Frances Dow's *Cromwellian Scotland* is an academic work *par excellence* primarily dealing with the political and military history of Interregnum Scotland. The focus of her work meant she dealt with the religious issues of the period in so far as they related directly to the political climate. So in terms of ecclesiastical history, Morrill professed 'there is still a thesis to be written on the Scottish Church in the 1650s'.[2] K.D. Holfelder's 1998 PhD thesis took steps in this direction by deciphering the complexities of Presbyterian polity during the turbulent decade that witnessed a dramatic schism within the Kirk.[3] Yet, while this work addressed the internal Presbyterian religious discourse within the Kirk, a large gap in the story of Interregnum Scottish religion and its most distinctive aspect remains untold. The intention of this thesis is to help fill the void in studies of seventeenth-century Scottish religion in what was one of its most dynamic decades.

Ecclesiastical studies of seventeenth-century Scotland have often focused primarily on the Covenanters' struggle against Episcopacy. Such an interpretation has understandably been forged by the persecution and martyrdom of Presbyterians during the 'Killing Times'. This has, however, unfortunately tended to overshadow the earlier part of the 17th century and resulted in the subscription of the covenants in 1638 and 1643 being viewed primarily as setting the stage for the brave stand against the King later in the century. As a result, historians have often treated the Interregnum 'as little more than a parenthetical break' in an otherwise seamless

---

[1] John Morrill, 'Seventeenth-Century Scotland,' review of Walter Makey, *The Church and the Covenant* (1979), Frances Dow, *Cromwellian Scotland* (1979), J. Buckroyd, *Church and State in Scotland 1660-1681* (1976), in *JEH* 33.2 (April 1982), 266-71.
[2] Ibid, 268.
[3] K.D. Holfelder, 'Factionalism in the Kirk during the Cromwellian Invasion and Occupation of Scotland, 1650 to 1660: the Protester-Resolutioner Controversy.' (PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1998).

struggle.[4] Thus, the modest research produced on Scottish religion in the 1650s has placed too much emphasis on the Protester-Resolutioner conflict. For instance, Beattie's *History of the Church of Scotland during the Interregnum* is little more than a study of the Protester-Resolutioner schism.[5] Other more general histories of Scotland have tended to merely gloss over the decade altogether, focusing instead on the covenanting periods before and after.[6] There are some noticeable exceptions to this generalization, which will be discussed below. However, the traditional emphasis on how a national covenanted Presbytery should interact and engage with secular authorities has overshadowed the degree to which Presbyterianism and its covenants themselves came under scrutiny during the Interregnum.

In contrast to previous works on the Interregnum,[7] this thesis will focus on the backlash against the Kirk and the covenants brought about by Scotland's engagements with the English Parliament and subsequently with the King during the English Civil Wars. The policies of the Kirk during the 1640s engendered a deep seated antipathy among nonconformist religious groups in England who anxiously embraced the 1650 invasion of Scotland as a crusade against the domineering Kirk. For this reason the English army which crossed the Tweed into Scotland on July 22, 1650 was in general more religiously radical in its disposition than any in the preceding decade. Their conquest and occupation led to the introduction of an unprecedented degree of Protestant variations into Scotland, all of which desired to proselytise Scots away from the intolerant Kirk.[8] It is the motivation of the invading English and the success of their missionary endeavours that are the focus of this thesis.

---

[4] Ibid, 8.
[5] J. Beattie, *History of the Church of Scotland during the Commonwealth* (Edinburgh: William Whyte and Co., 1847).
[6] G. Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*. 4 vols (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1861); J. Cunningham, *The History of the Church of Scotland.*, 2 vols (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1882); J.H.S. Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland* (London: OUP, 1960), 231-9.
[7] Holfelder; Beattie, *History of the Church of Scotland During the Commonwealth*.
[8] In 1660 the Protester ministers of Fife and Perthshire lamented the introduction of a wide variety of heresies during the previous decade: 'Atheism, Antiscripturism, Arrianism, Scepticism, Socinianism, Popery, Pelagianism, Familism, Arminianism, Antinomianism, Libertinism, Anabaptism, Erastianism, Prelacy, Separatism, Independency' and 'Quakerism'. *A Testimony to the Truth of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh: Society of Stationers, 1660), 22, 27, 30.

What is most exceptional about Interregnum Scotland, from the religious perspective, is that for the first time religious toleration became the official policy of the government in Scotland.[9] In turn, the debate between Presbyterians and Independents which took place in England during the 1640s penetrated the popular Scottish consciousness for the first time. While Kirk ministers like Robert Baillie and Samuel Rutherford fired volleys against English Independents from the presses in London during the 1640s, prior to the Interregnum the dialogue between Presbyterians and Independents had been tightly censored in Scotland. From December 1638 the General Assembly took the initiative in controlling the religious products of Scotland's presses by declaring all pieces referring to the Kirk or religion required pre-approval from the Clerk of the Assembly and Advocate for the Kirk, Archibald Johnston of Wariston.[10] In August 1643 the Assembly ordered ministers, 'especially...upon the coasts', to 'search for all books tending to separation'. All such works and their distributors were to be referred to the local presbyteries in an effort to 'hinder the dispersing thereof'.[11] By 1647 the censorship of the Presbyterian-Independent debate further escalated when the General Assembly passed an act prohibiting the printing, importing or distribution of literature 'maintaining Independencie or Separation'.[12] The act served as a response to what Scottish representatives to the Westminster Assembly had witnessed in London. The Kirk intended to prevent 'the errours [which]...have (in our neighbour kingdome of England) spread as a gangraen' from doing the same in Scotland.[13] These efforts effectively prevented the general populace of Scotland from being familiar with the nuts and bolts of the debate taking place England, but they may have done even more than that. Although some ministers and intellectuals in Scotland kept abreast of the developing dialogue, especially those directly involved in it, there is evidence suggesting the bans

---

[9] R.B. Knox, 'A Scottish Chapter in the History of Toleration', *Scottish Journal of Theology* 41 (1988), 57.

[10] Church of Scotland. General Assembly, *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638-1842* (ed.) T. Pitcairn (Edinburgh, Edinburgh Printing & Publishing Co., 1843), 30.

[11] Ibid, 75-6.

[12] *APS*, 610; *Acts of the General Assembly*, 160; William Orme, *Memoirs of the Life...of John Owen* (London, 1820), 487; R.B. Carter, 'The Presbyterian-Independent Controversy with Special Reference to Dr. Thomas Goodwin and the Years 1640-1660.' 2 vols (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1961), ii:10.

prevented Scotland's universities from attaining Independent works. In 1653 John Row, the principal of King's College Aberdeen who signed a declaration in favour of Independency, not only denied being influenced by the writings of John Cotton, but claimed he had never even seen any of Cotton's works. As a result of the General Assembly's strict censorship, the arrival of Cromwell's forces in 1650 initiated a fresh controversy in Scotland. Irrespective of the fact that the nature of the religious arguments was not new, because its rhetoric reflected the recycled debates of the previous decade in England, for the people of Scotland this represented an utterly new discussion.

Anne Hughes has contributed important research into what she calls in England a religious 'fluid marketplace' wherein alternative forms of Protestantism vied for popular support during the 1640s and 1650s.[14] She discusses how the growth of radical sects forced 'Orthodox' ministers to engage in public debates with radical opponents in an attempt to curb sectarian growth and to defend their parishioners.[15] This thesis will explore how the introduction of sects into Scotland, under sweeping toleration imposed by the English Commonwealth regime, drew ministers of the Kirk into a struggle for the hearts and souls of Scotland's population against an occupying army with an evangelical agenda.

Older studies of different aspects of the religious diversity of the period predominantly focus only on particular sects.[16] Only two attempts have been made to address the overall breadth of what took place and to provide an overview of how the various sects engaged with the Scottish

---

[13] *Acts of the General Assembly*, 160.
[14] Ann Hughes, 'The Pulpit Guarded: Confrontations Between Orthodox and Radicals in Revolutionary England.' *John Bunyan and His England, 1628-88*. (eds) Anne Laurence, W.R. Owens and Stuart Sim (London: Hambledon Press, 1990), 49.
[15] Ann Hughes, '"Popular" Presbyterianism in the 1640 and 1650s: the Cases of Thomas Edwards and Thomas Hall.' *England's Long Reformation: 1500-1800*. (ed.) Nicholas Tyacke, The Neale Colloquium in British History. (London: UCL Press, 1998; UCL Press, 2000), 235-260; Ann Hughes, 'Public Disputations, Pamphlets and Polemic, 1649-60.' *History Today* 41 (February 1991): 27-33.
[16] J. Scott, 'Baptists in Scotland During the Commonwealth,' *RSCHS*, 3 (1929), 174-85; J. Scott, 'Baptist witness during the Commonwealth,' *History of the Baptists in Scotland*. (ed.) G. Yullie (Glasgow: Baptist Union Publications, 1926), 24-39; R.B. Hannen, 'Cupar, Fife, 1652-1659.' *Baptist Quarterly*, 10(1940-1), 45-9; G.B. Burnet, *The Story of Quakerism in Scotland 1650-1850* (London: J. Clarke, 1952); J. Torrance, 'The Quaker Movement in Scotland,' *RSCHS*, 3 (1929) , 31-42; J.

populace.[17] G.D. Henderson's 'Some Early Scottish Independents' offers a deluge of citations providing snapshots of particular individuals or places, while briefly touching on the presence of the English Army and making a few observations about Quakers in Scotland.[18] The bulk of the article focuses on the personas of the leading figures among the Aberdeen Independents. Although it provides good information, it does little to tie events together. W.I. Hoy's 'Entry of Sects into Scotland' is significantly more holistic in its approach and brings to light important sources that provided a welcome jumping off point for beginning this work.[19] However, Hoy also presented challenges for my work because of his inaccuracies and incorrect citations.[20] Beyond these exploratory works, little has been done to draw the various strands together.

This thesis will set out to establish the fundamental role of religion as a motive for England's conquest and occupation of Scotland from 1650 to 1660. Religion served not simply as a tool used by the English government to divide and conquer Scotland. From the outset of their campaign the English army, largely comprising Independents, Baptists and members of other nonconformist religious groups (or sects), rallied behind the task of bringing down the intolerant national Church of Scotland, which under the guise of the Solemn League and Covenant had intervened in both English Civil Wars. The resentment English nonconformists felt towards the rigid Presbyterians north of the border is not difficult to understand when Scotland's sole stipulation for involvement in each war was that religious uniformity be agreed upon by both nations in the form of the Presbytery. The Scots fought with the Parliament in the First Civil War, believing Parliament had agreed the uniform pattern of ecclesiastical

---

Torrance, 'The Early Quakers in North-East Scotland,' *Transactions of the Banffshire Field Club* (Aberdeen, 1936), 67-87.

[17] G. Donaldson also briefly touched on the influence of English sects during the Interregnum ('The Emergence of Schism in Seventeenth-Century Scotland.' *Scottish Church History* (ed.) G. Donaldson (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1985), 204-19. However, as his contribution totals only three pages (217-19) it will not be addressed in the introduction, but noted where applicable within the thesis.

[18] G.D. Henderson, 'Some Early Scottish Independents,' *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society* 12 (1933-6): 67-79, and reprinted in G.D. Henderson, *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland.* (Cambridge: University Press, 1937), 100-16.

[19] W.I. Hoy. 'Entry of Sects Into Scotland: A Preliminary Study,' *Reformation and Revolution* (ed.) D. Shaw (Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press, 1967)

[20] See pp. 95n, 173n, 269n below.

government for the two kingdoms would be the Presbytery. When this expectation failed to be met the Scots joined the King in the Second Civil War on the condition he impose, for a trial period, a national Presbyterian church in England. As a result, Scottish meddling set the stage for Cromwell's 1650 invasion of Scotland.

The first part of this thesis focuses on the motives for England's invasion of Scotland and enquires to what degree an anti-Presbyterian sentiment existed within the English regime and army. Chapter one evaluates the literature produced by both sides to establish that Scotland's state Church and its narrow interpretation of the covenants were among the most important, if not indeed the most important, motivations for England's campaign against Scotland. Furthermore, it establishes that the Scots understood the threat posed to the Kirk by an 'army of sectaries' entering Scotland. Hence the invasion represented a battle for the souls of the Scottish people and the outcome would resound as a providential declaration of God's favoured form of church government. Chapter two explores the efforts and means of Englishmen to promulgate their own particular religious views in Scotland. Under the religious toleration imposed by the regime in February 1652 many religiously radical members of England's army viewed the country as 'a field white with harvest'.[21] This study seeks to examine the efforts of the English to proselytise Scots away from Presbyterianism, the lengths the government and military regime were willing to support and foster their endeavours, as well as the reaction of the Kirk to the challenge of competition. The third chapter gauges, by analysing the use of Scotland's strictly controlled presses, the regime's changing policy regarding religious settlement, the promotion of congregational autonomy over that of national hierarchies, and the establishment of religious toleration in Scotland in the manner exhibited in England.

The second part of this thesis, in chapters IV and V, addresses the results of different religious groups planting themselves among the Scots. Chapter four investigates the separation of Scots from the Kirk, by means of the formation of wholly indigenous Independent congregations.

---

[21] B. Evans, *The Early English Baptists.* 2 vols (London: J. Heaton & Son, 1862-4), ii:190; Hoy, 181.

Moreover, it inquires into the Kirk's own culpability for the backlash against the policies of the 1640s. The testimony of Scots who left the Kirk demonstrates how the events of the previous decade not only antagonised their southern neighbours but sowed seeds of discontent among some parishioners and clergy. As a result, the policies of the Kirk prepared the way for the message of separation preached by English missionaries during the Interregnum. The fifth and final chapter compares the experiences of Baptists and Quakers in Scotland and seeks to establish why they experienced varying degrees of success. It considers the factors that enabled the Friends to be the sole sectarian religious group introduced during the Interregnum to survive and grow through the Restoration period.

To avoid covering the same ground as K.D. Holfelder, the Protester-Resolutioner conflict is not directly discussed in what follows. However, where divisions between the Protesters and Resolutioners were fostered or indeed engendered by the English as part of their efforts for achieving a religious settlement, it will be addressed, or, as is the case discussed in chapter four, when the distinction between particular groups of Protesters and Independents became blurred. Essentially this thesis is an attempt to bring to light the oft forgotten and dynamic religious open market instituted by the Commonwealth/Protectorate during the occupation of Scotland in the wake of what many contemporaries considered to be the reign of an oppressive Presbyterian Kirk. The Interregnum represents a decade in which formerly rigid supporters of the covenants and opponents to toleration came to heed Cromwell's desire that God would 'make all Christians of one heart'.[22]

A number of the sources used in this study have been utilised in previous works, such as the letters of Archibald Johnston of Wariston to the Aberdeen Independents[23] and the debate between James Guthrie and the General Baptist James Brown.[24] In these cases this study delves

---

[22] Abbot, *Cromwell*, i:283-8.
[23] These letters have only briefly been referred to in the work of Hoy (186-7), but not mentioned at all in Donaldson 'Schism' or Henderson 'Early'.
[24] Hoy committed a large portion of his article to the debate, but did little to place it into the larger context of what such debates meant in Interregnum Scotland or Revolutionary England (Hoy, 190-7).

deeper into these works as source material than they have preciously been used. For example, Wariston's extensive replies to Aberdeen, which he produced after multiple private conferences with Alexander Jaffray and John Menzies, are drawn heavily upon as important sources for identifying the particular doctrinal position of the Aberdeen Independents. This is important because previous studies have relied almost completely upon the Aberdonians' initial declaration in favour of Independency which they produced months before separating.[25] Likewise, the debate between Guthrie and Brown is not used just to identify the doctrines disputed between the two ministers, but also as a case study for how public disputes were carried out and how they fit into the overall policy of the English regime.[26] In other cases this thesis utilises material to produce wholly new information neglected by earlier studies. For instance, I have identified several of the signatories to a Scottish petition for religious toleration and subsequently been able to ascribe to them their proper religious affiliation. As a result, this study demonstrates how Baptists, Independents and Quakers joined together in the closing months of the Interregnum to request mutual toleration for one another at a time when their English counterparts had little sympathy for one another.[27] Additional material in this thesis is utilised for the first time. Where this occurs it is duly noted, but probably the most intriguing instance is the identification of an anonymous manuscript as a forgotten work of Samuel Rutherford.[28] Consequently, this thesis identifies the context of the paper and ascribes a relatively precise date for an important, but long ignored manuscript.

Finally, a word about the terminology used in this thesis. The term 'sectarian' is a loaded phrase within modern Scotland in relation to Protestant-Catholic bigotry. This is not the sense in which it is used in this thesis. For our purpose a sect 'is a subdivision or splintering off from an already established religion'; for the present study Protestant Christianity.[29] Perhaps an important distinction to keep in mind in relation to the political situation in which sects were

---

[25] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX(24, 26). See chapter four, below.
[26] EUL, La.I.368; NLS, Wod.Qu.XVII. See chapter two, below.
[27] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX(27). See chapter five, below.
[28] NCL, MSS Box 28.5. See chapter four, below.

introduced into Scotland is provided by Benton Johnston. Although an older source, Johnston's distinction is particularly relevant for this study. He defines a church as 'a religious group that accepts the social environment in which it exists' while 'a sect...rejects the social environment in which it exists'.[30] Werner Stark took this argument one step further and declared that often sectarians 'are *in* their country rather than *of* their country...they are even, as a rule, *against* it'.[31] It is by this definition that the religious groups who entered Scotland as part of Cromwell's army and their Scots proselytes are referred to as 'sectarian'. This is because they stood against and were a response to the expansionist policies of the established Church of Scotland. More importantly, the use of the word sectarian rests not on a modern interpolation thrust into the 17th century, but rather upon the prevalent use of the term in the period of study itself. Repeatedly Scottish writers referred not to an 'English' army invading, but an 'army of sectaries' or to the army of 'the publicke enemy Cromwell, and the sectarian traitorous rebels of England'.[32] The journal *Perfect Passages* stated that the Scots' clergy continued to preach against the 'English as Sectaries and Schismaticks' long after their arrival.[33] Consequently, Scots who accepted the religious alternatives advocated by the English army were termed 'sectaries'. William Dundas lamented, when looking back upon the Interregnum, that the Kirk called him a

---

[29] David B. Barratt, *Sects, 'Cults' and Alternative Religions* (London: Blandford, 1996), 16, 38.
[30] B. Johnson, 'On Church and Sect,' *American Sociological Review* 28 (1963), 542; W. Stark, *The Sociology of Religion.* Vol. 2, *Sectarian Religion* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), 1.
[31] Stark, *The Sociology of Religion*, 2.
[32] Sir James Balfour, *The historical works of Sir James Balfour* (Edinburgh, 1824), iv:309; Alexander Peterkin (ed.), *Records of the Kirk of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: John Sutherland, 1838), 640; John Nicoll, *A Diary of Public Transactions and Other Occurrences, Chiefly in Scotland, 1650-67.*, (ed.) D. Laing (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1836), 18, 19; Henderson, 'Early' 104, 269.
[33] *Perfect Passages* (Nov. 5-12, 1652), 567.

'sectary' for 'my looking one step further then their publick Faith'.[34] Thus the Scots defined their enemy less by nationality and more by their divergent religious practices. As a result, they naturally identified the introduction of radical Protestant groups as 'sects' and Scottish proselytes as 'sectarians'.

[34] William Dundas, *A Few Words of Truth from the Spirit of Truth* ([London: s.n.], 1673), 5.

Chapter I:

'The Covenant' vs. 'the Lord of Hosts': A Struggle for Public Opinion through the Printed Propaganda of War.[1]

Nor must it be forgotten what hazard our own nation hath run of late, through the malice, falshood, and Factions of the late *Presbiterian Drivers*. He that will remember what they did in the year 1647, 48. 49. 50. and 51. must needs confesse, that great hath been the deliverance of this Commonweal, and the manner of it almost incredible, considering the waies and meanes whereby we have been rescued out of the Claws of the old Tyranny; which (through their faction and fury) was at the very point of returning in again upon us. From hence therefore let us conclude, that no Error is more dangerous, no Treason more pernicious to a Commonweal then the driving of Faction.[2]

– *Mercurius Politicus*, June 1652.

Even before the English army crossed into Scotland on July 22, 1650, the production of propaganda had begun in earnest between the Scottish Kirk and the English Parliamentary Army. The intensity of its composition led J.D. Ogilvie to dub it 'a combat in itself, although one in which only ink was spilled'.[3] As the inevitability of conflict came to be apparent polemical works became fundamentally important as both nations attempted to galvanise support. In Scotland, the imposing threat of the battle-hardened and well-oiled military machine of the Parliamentary Army made Scottish national unity essential for any successful defence against an English invasion. With the nation's religion, monarchy and sovereignty at stake Scotland's civil and ecclesiastical governments (who were largely the same group)[4] rallied the nation under the banner of the Covenant and published against the evils of the English 'Sectarian army'. They hoped by convincing Scotland's populace of the blasphemous and heretical nature of the English, that they would ensure opposition to the invasion. The Scots were not alone in their urgency to rally supporters. Many of those who had backed the English

---

[1] John Rushworth, *A True Relation of the Routing the Scottish Army near Dunbar, Sept. 3. instant: The Particulars of the Fight, Numbers slain, and Prize taken. With an exact List of Names of the Prisoners.* (London: John Field, Sept. 9, 1650), 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15.

[2] *Mercurius Politicus*, July 15-22, 1652, p. 1739-40 [E671:12]. The italics are mine.

[3] J. D. Ogilvie, 'Papers from an Army Press, 1650', *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions* 2(1938-45), 420.

[4] What David Stevenson has called 'The Kirk Party' came to power in 1648 through the Whiggamore raid. See Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 103-49; J.D. Grainger, *Cromwell Against the Scots: The Last Anglo-Saxon War, 1650-1652.* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1997), 8.

Parliament during their campaigns against Charles I in England and their invasion of Ireland needed reassurance before they would take part in any invasion of Scotland. England's Parliament and Army were forced to justify their invasion of an independent nation which practised a 'rightly reformed religion' to the significant number of moderates and Presbyterians among their own ranks.[5] While initially both the English and Scots focused their propaganda on rallying support, as the English invaders approached the Tweed, their attentions turned towards undermining the support of the enemy, the Scots. Thus the propaganda of both nations served a two-fold purpose: firstly, to rally popular support for their own cause; and secondly, to wage a war of propaganda against their opponents both at home and abroad.

The Role of Religion in the Conflict

Between June 25, 1650, and the autumn of 1651, polemical works were produced to establish the political stability of their positions, but the language of the polemics was religious.[6] The reason for this was simple. For both sides this military and political conflict was underpinned by religious differences. Despite the fact Scotland had proclaimed Charles II as King of all of Great Britain and Ireland on February 5, 1649, Charles' presence in Scotland was only partially responsible for the English invasion.[7] In fact even this declaration of temporal authority had an underlying religious function recognised by the English regime. Scotland's declaration of Charles II as King of all Great Britain did not represent simply a pro-monarchy sentiment, but a declaration of Scotland's intention to pursue the archetypal models of both ecclesiological and secular government illustrated in the Kirk's interpretation of the Solemn League and Covenant.[8] Hence the invasion of Scotland by the English Parliament represented a backlash against the pattern of religious and secular society plotted by the Kirk. Certainly, many Scots recognised

---

[5] Evidence for the discontent among English moderates can be found in: William Prynne, *Sad and Serious Political Considersations, Touching the Invasive War Against Our Presbyterian Protestant Brethren in Scotland, ...Against Their Covenant, for the Great Slaughter of Those Their Brethren in Covenant.* (London,1650). For a more broad definition of 'Presbyterian' see p. 19.

[6] For a list of the tracts produced in this polemical dialogue see Appendix I.

[7] J.D. Douglas has argued the proclamation of Charles II as king of England and Ireland represents the sole legitimising factor for Cromwell's invasion (J.D. Douglas, *Light in the North* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1964), 61).

the underlying purpose of England's army marching north. 'This pairtie,' wrote the diarist John Nicoll, 'eftir thai haif actitit such thinges in England and Yreland, conceaving that thai can not be establisched and eat the fruit of thair awin devyces without contradictioun, als long as the Kirk of Scotland standis in thair way'.[9] Nicoll rightly recognised that by 1650 the Kirk represented the greatest obstacle to the Commonwealth, not the King. The English Army knew the score as well. Cromwell had declared in 1648 that 'our brothers of Scotland—sincerely Presbyterian—were our greatest Enemies'.[10] In that year he attempted to solidify the relationship between the English Independents and the Scottish Kirk by aiding the settlement of the extreme party of the Kirk into power through the Whiggamore Raid. He hoped they would be more amenable to his own Independent party in England.[11] Cromwell's involvement was, according to C.H. Firth, recognition that any future peace between the two nations depended upon 'creating a good understanding between English Independents and Scotch Presbyterians'.[12] However, the Scots Kirk had proven on more than one occasion that they would only settle for one arrangement and it would have to be wholly on their terms.

Throughout the 1640s, Scotland, under the guise of the National Covenant (1638) and the Solemn League and Covenant (1643), repeatedly intervened in English affairs solely on the basis of establishing Presbyterianism in England through 'a religious union' in order to secure the Kirk.[13] Moreover, the Commissioners of the General Assembly had declared against the 'Army of Sectaries' in 1648 and sent the Parliament of England a testimony to Scottish abhorrence of toleration in February 1649.[14] Many in the English Parliament and Army believed the Scots, having invested so much wealth and blood in promoting Presbyterianism (under the guise of the covenants), would be unlikely to sit idly by and watch England lie either under a vast religious

---

[8] John Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London: Longman, 1993), 116-17.
[9] Nicoll, 17.
[10] Abbott, *Cromwell*, i:268; C.H. Firth, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England*, The World's Classics: 536. (London: OUP, 1956), 202.
[11] Ibid, 201; Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 95-6.
[12] Firth, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans*, 201.
[13] Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution*, 35,115.
[14] *RCGA*, ii:22-5, 189.

toleration or under a 'sectarian' Parliament and Army. For England's Independents, explains Allan Macinnes, the defeat of the Scots became imperative for the security of a free state.[15] As a result, the invasion of Scotland may have been construed by proponents of religious toleration as a defensive campaign, which could go some way in explaining why, when the invasion of Scotland was ordered, it became *esprit de corps* and letters abounded from English officers expressing an unusual exuberance within their ranks and 'a spirit of prayer and piety not usual in camps'.[16]

There can be little doubt that, for the invading English army, the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was just as much an enemy as Scottish support for the Crown. Several contemporary sources indicate the anti-Presbyterian intentions of Cromwell's invasion were widely known. The Welsh-born Presbyterian Christopher Love declared shortly before his execution for treason against the Commonwealth in 1651 that anti-Presbyterian sentiment played an integral role in the invasion of Scotland. According to Love, it was the Scots' passion for 'a scriptural presbytery…[and] sound doctrine' constituted in a national church and zealous opposition to any compromise in this respect which drew the ire of the Commonwealth government.[17] Parliament feared the Kirk's uncompromising Presbyterianism and devotion to the covenants would inevitably lead to further Scottish interventions in English affairs. Importantly, however, Presbyterians were not alone in branding opposition to the Kirk as a primary motivation for the English invasion of Scotland. In 1654 an anonymous veteran of Dunbar wrote to the Protector in defence of Baptists and cited their anti-Presbyterian motives as evidence of their piety. Yet more importantly, he also implied this was a common thread shared among all the English combatants who took part in the campaign.[18] 'I confess they [the Baptists] have been enemies

---

[15] A.I. Macinnes, *The British Revolution, 1629-1660* (Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 194.
[16] Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:268; Whitelocke, 459.
[17] Christopher Love, *A Cleare and Necessary Vindication of the Principles and Practices of me Christopher Love* (London, 1651), 49; Doris A. Nix, 'Christopher Love 1618-1651: A Defender of the Covenant,' *Journal of the Presbyterian History Society of England* 13 (1967):138-146, 145.
[18] J.S. Wheeler failed to recognize the religious motivations which drove the English Army's invasion, instead attributing their campaign solely to English nationalism (J.S. Wheeler, 'Sense of Identity in

to the Presbyterian church, and so were you when at Dunbar,' writes the author, 'or at least you seemed to be so by your words and actions...and made this an argument why we should fight stoutly, because we had the prayers of the Independent and baptized churches'.[19] This is the reason religion was used in the tracts produced by the two nations. Religion was fundamentally at the root of the conflict.

Polemic as Self Definition

This chapter is interested in the polemical dialogue that passed between the Church of Scotland and the English Parliamentary Army; the polemical reports that followed the Battle of Dunbar; and the efforts of both sides to explain the conquest of Scotland in relation to God's Providence and the Covenant. An appraisal of these aspects of the conflict is possible because an important collection of printed sources survive, which provide a record of the ongoing dialogue between the ideological exponents of each army.[20] Study of this polemic allows for the identification of ideologies employed by each army to define their own identities in relation to the conflict and in distinguishing themselves from their enemies. By and large the concepts and language used to do this were religious. Through the use of terms such as covenant, providence, and election, both sides set out, in both internally and externally directed polemics, to paint a partisan picture of God's divine will and to defend the religious validity of their positions in a manner closely related to the disputes within the Westminster Assembly. For example, Cromwell's press spun the conflict as a battle between those who advocated religious freedom, toleration, and the preservation of Protestant diversity, against the Scottish Kirk and Establishment who had repeatedly tried to impose a largely 'unwanted' religious conformity on England in the form of a national Presbyterian model of ecclesiastical government. The Church of Scotland, in contrast, painted itself as the champions of Reformed religion defending Protestantism against the 'sectaries' and 'heretics' who had overthrown the English Church, killed the King and assailed

---

the Army of the English Republic, 1645-51' *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century* (ed.) A.I. Macinnes and J. Ohlmeyer (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2002), 151-68).

[19] Evans, *The Early English Baptists*, ii:200-1.

[20] See Appendix I.

Reformed Orthodoxy in the Assembly of Divines. In this light, the struggle between Scotland and England in 1650-1 might be seen as a socio-political manifestation of the heady theological debates of the Westminster Assembly. With this in mind this chapter will seek to demonstrate how the propaganda used to influence domestic religion in England during the 1640s, especially in the struggle between Presbyterianism and Independency during the Westminster Assembly, continued to be used in the international political conflict of the 1650s between England and Scotland.

Two aspects in particular are crucial for understanding the polemical dialogue that developed between the Kirk and Cromwell's troops. First, both sides believed that their propaganda would actually have an effect on popular opinion and swing public support. The Kirk certainly believed by lambasting their opponents as heretical they would secure the opposition of the Scottish people against those they were calling 'blasphemous sectaries', heartening them to defend their nation and religion.[21] They also believed lower-ranking English soldiers could be convinced of their grievous error in invading a 'rightly reformed' and independent kingdom. Likewise, the English supposed their cause would awaken dormant desires for drastic social and religious change among the Scottish populace. Given the chance, the Scottish masses would jump at the opportunity to be liberated from systems which oppressed them, politically and religiously. Frances Dow rightly identified the prevalence of this belief within the English regime in 1651.[22] The English identified their role as providential, believing they were sent to Scotland to 'deliver them from slavery' rather than 'bring them to misery'.[23] Motivated by this self-perception as providential liberators as opposed to conquerors, the English addressed the common people of Scotland in the language of Christian fraternity in an attempt to befriend them.

---

[21] Balfour, iv:88-9, 96-7.

[22] 'Indeed the English believed, in the face of much evidence to the contrary, that many Scots desired deliverance from the dominance of the clergy and that in secular affairs the common people wanted to be freed from the power of the nobility and gentry'(Dow, 26).

[23] *Mercurius Scoticus*, (Sept. 23-30, 1651), 69.

The second important aspect of the propaganda which works itself out in the texts and which is fundamental to the conflict between the Scots and the English (and also to their differing interpretations of the events of 1650-1) are the different ways in which they understood the operation of God's divine will in the world. In fact, some scholars have noted that both the Kirk party in Scotland and the English Parliament verged on theocracies, because of the role of providential interpretation in their political and military decision making.[24] Scotland depended heavily on their covenanted status with God, while England depended on the guidance of God's providential blessings.[25] Basic to every event and action taken by the Kirk and Government of Scotland (especially after the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant in 1643) was adherence to the covenants. Their relation to the covenants served to create a largely consistent and static framework for them to work from. As Margo Todd explains, Scotland was 'a nation bonded together by a religious conviction, ready to take up arms'.[26] The covenants created a largely united vision and way of interpreting God's will, and represented the penultimate expression of God's providence by placing Scotland in the same sort of relationship with God that Israel had experienced in the Old Testament. For this reason, according to Peter Donald, men like Archibald Johnston of Wariston believed: 'the making of the National Covenant was the wedding day of Christ the bridegroom with Scotland his bride' and, as a result, 'the Israel parallel came more and more to the fore' in the months following its signing in 1638.[27] Within this covenanted relationship clear guidelines existed: obedience ensured blessing and protection

---

[24] Thomas Carlyle, (ed.), *The Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell.* (London: Methuen & Co., 1904), ii:63; Walter Makey, *The Church of the Covenant, 1637-1651.* (Edinburgh : John Donald Publishers, 1979), 85ff; Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England.* (Oxford: OUP, 1999), 19. While D. Stevenson claims that 'Scotland under the covenanters was not a theocracy', he goes on to explain the rule of the Kirk party as a 'theocratic experiment failed.' (Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 188-90). J. Cunningham wrote of Scotland in the 1640s: 'the government...at this period approximated very closely to a theocracy'. (*The History of the Church of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1882), ii:45). According to Blair Worden, providence was 'the language of everyday Puritan belief, a language which influenced private lives before public events, and which reinforced conventional authority more often than it subverted it.' (B. Worden, 'Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England.' *Past and Present* 109, (1985), 57).

[25] For a fuller discussion of providence and the Covenants in the thinking of Scottish and English in the aftermath of Dunbar see, pp. 56-63. below.

[26] Margo Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland.* (London: Yale University Press, 2002), 402.

[27] Peter Donald, 'Archibald Johnston of Wariston and the Politics of Religion', *RSCHS* 24(1991), 131.

for God's people, while, disobedience and sin brought divine punishment in order to restore the relationship. Consequently the Kirk interpreted everything that occurred in terms of their covenanted status with God, either as affirmation or as correction. As part of their covenant the Kirk had sworn to maintain Presbyterianism, promote it whenever possible, and to uphold the monarchy. These obligations of covenant narrowed the Kirk's view of providence, because of the need to preserve both the monarchy and what they perceived to be the most perfect form of church gonernment, the Presbytery.[28] What could not be reconciled with the Covenant and the preservation of Presbyterianism was outside the Kirk's field of vision in interpreting God's providence.[29]

In contrast, the Commonwealth's primary interest in God's unrestrictable providence meant a much more dynamic conception of God's workings in the world than could be confined to a static framework of interpretation like that of the Kirk.[30] According to Alexandra Walsham, the interpretation of providence influenced every aspect of life in Puritan England.[31] And while the Commonwealth believed providence was consistent and led in a linear direction it did not necessarily follow along the course of fallen human wisdom, nor could it be defined by a penultimate expression or definition such as a National Covenant. Therefore it took fervent prayer and devotion from the elect to understand God's perpetually revealing providence, since it had to be continually reinterpreted. In the case of the Scottish Kirk, it was not that they held the covenants so high that they disregarded providence as something less than a continual

---

[28] According to Alexander Jaffray, signatory of the Solemn League and Covenant and a member of the Commissioners of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1650, maintaining the Presbytery was a primary if not the 'one and chief end' of the Covenant. Jaffray, 61.

[29] The Scots 'were so inviolably attached to their covenant that they would depart from nothing that was inconsistent with it.' Daniel Neal, *The History of the Puritans.* 3 Vols (London: Printed for Thomas Tegg and Son, 1837), ii:568-9.

[30] In the Puritan mind God's divine will was consistent and unchangeable, and therefore to avoid apparent contradictions it was defined as being expressed in two 'strands'. There was God's 'revealed' or 'signified' will expressed in the Scriptures, but there was also God's 'secret' or 'effectual' will expressed through providences. Humanity's fallen state meant interpretation of God's secret will was a continual process and interpretations were changeable while God's will was not. 'Occurrences which ostensibly controverted biblical edicts undoubtedly agreed wholly with His hidden and steadfast intentions.' Thus God's will had to be continually reinterpreted in light of new providential revelations. (Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, 13).

[31] Ibid, 19.

revealing of God's will, but in their estimation providence had to be consistent with, and interpreted in relation to, the Covenant. The English also held the Covenant as being important, but it was a product of God's Providence for a particular point in time. Although a product of providence, the Covenant could not limit the scope of providential interpretation in England like it could in Scotland. Owing to these different understandings of God's workings, the two nations had different understandings of the events of 1650, and differing interpretations of their obligations and roles in the unfolding of God's divine will.

In both the Committee of Estates in Scotland and the Parliament in England religion served as the guiding force for political and military decision making. Fasting, repentance and days of humiliation were used to correct errors and sinfulness, and ensure God's blessing.[32] Because both nations believed they had a special relationship with God it became important to convince the general public of the divine right and blessing upon their religious preferences, political establishments and military campaigns. The pre-invasion propaganda produced by both sides expresses the dynamic and symbiotic relationship between religion and politics within mid-seventeenth century Britain and the political importance of religious propaganda. As much as the conflict of 1650 was a struggle between nation-states, it equally represented a conflict over political and religious ideologies. For C.H. Firth, the Parliamentarian cause in the Civil Wars and the invasion of Scotland was fuelled by radical ecclesiology that carried over into politics. He states:

> Church democracy, as Baxter called Independency, brought in its train State democracy. Applied to politics, the ecclesiastical theories of the Independents developed into the fundamental principles of democratic government. Those that held a Church was a voluntary association of believers bound together by a mutual covenant, naturally adopted the corollary that a State was an association of freemen based on a mutual contract.[33]

---

[32] C. Durston, '"For the Better Humiliation of the People": Public Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving during the English Revolution' *The Seventeenth Century* 7(1992):134, 138-9. In the previous decades these occasions were used to advance the Puritan cause (J.F. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars 1640-1648* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), ch. 2).
[33] Firth, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans*, 141. For the fundamental importance of religion in the English Civil Wars see: John Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution*, ch. 3;

This stood in stark contrast to the more conservative Presbyterians in Scotland who in religion desired an ecclesiastical government at the national level, as opposed to congregational alone, and in politics upheld the Scottish monarchy. For Firth, both politically and religiously the Scots yielded to 'historical precedents', while the English regime were influenced by their developing belief in 'natural rights'.[34] In other words, for Scotland the religion and form of government set forth in the covenants served as the yardstick by which to measure God's will, while in England a growing sense that a radical break with the past was at hand and God's providence would lead beyond historical precedents. So it should not be surprising that the Church of Scotland, in their polemical works appealed to the authority of the covenants, while the Parliamentary Army harkened back to the success of their previous campaigns as authoritative and evident of God's blessing upon their new way.

Polemical Models for the Kirk

In her studies of seventeenth-century England Ann Hughes has focused on the practice of using polemics as a tool for gaining popular support for denominations within a 'fluid market place' for religion. In particular she asserts that English Presbyterians of the 1640s and 1650s, although not anything like a majority party in England, were 'far from writing off the mass of the people as prone to profanity or to radical heresy' and well aware of the importance of popular support for their cause. Some English Presbyterians spent 'their careers competing for public support and influence in the pulpit and in the press.'[35] Among them were Thomas Edwards and Thomas Hall who used polemic publications 'to compete in a lively fashion for popular support in a public arena'.[36] By exaggerating the excesses of their sectarian opponents they sought to make their own Presbyterian position seem much more moderate and appropriate. Scots Presbyterians, like Robert Baillie, warmly received their works, praising the

---

Jonathon Scott, 'What were Commonwealth Principles?' *The Historical Journal* 47,3 (2004):591-613, 594.

[34] Ibid, 141.

[35] Ann Hughes, '"Popular" Presbyterianism in the 1640 and 1650s: the Cases of Thomas Edwards and Thomas Hall.' *England's Long Reformation: 1500-1800*, The Neale Colloquium in British History, (ed.) Nicholas Tyacke (London: UCL Press, 1998; UCL Press Limited, 2000), 255.

manner in which Edwards' treatises painted the dangerous factions 'in clearer colours than yet they [had] appeared'.[37] Baillie's enthusiastic support for this sort of publication is evidenced by multiple references in his letters between 1644-6 to his excited anticipation for the works of Edwards and others to be published.[38]

Prompted by the impending invasion of Scotland by an army comprised largely of sectarians, fuelling fears that the sort of religious 'fluid market place' existing in England loomed dangerously on the horizon for Scotland, the polemics published by the Kirk in the 1650s were both the continuation and combination of two different propaganda traditions, as well as an altogether new endeavour. Combining an established tradition of publishing against Prelacy with the tradition established in England by Edwards and Hall, exposing the darker side of sectarian religion, the Kirk began to wage war before the English Army reached the Border. Although not new to the use of propaganda, this was the first time the Kirk faced the potential struggle for Scottish public opinion against other 'reformed' (non-Prelatic) religion. David Stevenson has shown how the Kirk first began to use mass printing as a tool for influencing public opinion during the 1638 General Assembly in Glasgow when the Covenanters produced both a *Protestation* against the King's dissolution of the Assembly and the acts of that Assembly.[39] In 1639 the Kirk was again active in a propaganda war against Charles I in an effort to secure the support of the English people. It was such an effective propaganda campaign the King had to respond with his own publications.[40] Again in 1640 the Kirk published *The Intentions of the Army of the Kingdome of Scotland* and *The Lawfulnesse of our Expedition into England Manifested* to persuade the English public that the entry of Scottish forces into England was not an invasion

---

[36] Ibid, 238.
[37] Baillie, *L & J*, ii:190; Ann Hughes, *Gaengraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution* (Oxford: OUP), see ch. 5.
[38] Ibid. ii:193, 201-2, 215, 251, 279, 352, 416.
[39] D. Stevenson, 'A Revolutionary Regime and the Press: The Scottish Covenanters and their Printers, 1638-1651', *The Library, 6th Series*, 7. (London, 1985), republished in D. Stevenson, *Union, Revolution and Religion in 17th-Century Scotland.*, Collected Studies Series (Aldershot: Variorum, 1997), XV:321.
[40] Ibid, XV:323.

against them but an attack on Charles I.[41] However, by 1650 the threat to Scotland's national church was not from Rome or from bishops, but rather from forms of Protestantism lacking the degree of discipline desired by the Presbyterian Kirk. Drawing upon the example established by Edwards and Hall a decade earlier in England, and faced with an unprecedented threat to the recently re-established Presbyterian Kirk, the Church of Scotland produced tracts directed at the general public using popular imagery intended to sway public support. Although some Scots also wrote against English sectarians in the 1640s, such as Samuel Rutherford[42] and Robert Baillie[43], their works were intended for other intellectuals and not to woo popular opinion in the way that Thomas Edwards and Thomas Hall had in England. The polemics produced by the Kirk through the summer of 1650 show the Kirk, in the manner exhibited in the works of Edwards and Hall, making a concerted effort to sustain popular (public) support by putting the excesses of their opponents into print.

Besides borrowing the style of the English Presbyterians, the Kirk also drew upon the images of a 'Sectarian army' used by Edwards in *Gangraena*, in which he wrote 'I do not thinke there are 50 pure Independents in the whole English Army'.[44] In his estimation the religious composition of the English Army was an amalgam of every sect and heresy present in England, with the soldiers perpetually cross-fertilising one another with new varieties of error. 'In one word,' wrote an army chaplain who provided him with information, 'the great Religion of that sort of men in the Army, is liberty of conscience, and liberty of preaching'.[45] Drawing on these examples, the Kirk set out to portray the dark heretical and covenant-breaking nature of the approaching army in the same clear and colourful way in which Edwards had done in England. For the Church of Scotland, the approaching English were not just a temporal foe, but 'sectaries' who held

---

[41] Ibid, XV:325.
[42] Samuel Rutherford, *A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience* (London: R.I., 1649); *The Due Right of Presbytery* (London, 1644); *A Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist.* (London,1648).
[43] Robert Baillie, *Anabaptism, the fountain of all Errours...* (London, 1640); *A Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time.* (London, 1646); *Anabaptism, the true fountaine of Independency, Brownisme, Antinomy, Familisme, and the most of the other errour....* (London, 1647).
[44] Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena* (London, 1646), 16-17.

'monstrous blasphemies and strange opinions in Religion',[46] suffered from 'a spirit of Delusion and Rashness'[47] and had shown 'themselves playne enemies' of true religion by maintaining 'that impious monster of Toleration'.[48] Unlike Hall and Edwards, who in England represented a minority trying to gain popular support, the Kirk worked from a majority position aiming to maintain popular support rather than muster it. While Edwards' and Hall's works might have been read aloud to gatherings or congregations, they were largely dependent upon the literacy of their intended audience. The Kirk, on the other hand, benefited from the ability to have all their tracts read out in every parish church across Scotland by order of the General Assembly. This represented an important advantage in Scotland, where as late as the 1630s only 50 percent of the population was literate, while in the countryside the figures dropped to between 10-20 percent for men and less than 10 percent for women.[49] Accordingly the Kirk worked from a privileged position for two reasons. First, they read their own tracts to the populace of Scotland in the parish, while English tracts were left to be pondered only by those who could read or had them read aloud. Second, they were attempting to maintain popular support rather than create it.

Polemical Warfare

As the inevitability of conflict became apparent by late June 1650, the first publications were produced. On June 25, 1650 the Commissioners of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland published *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning Concerning Present Dangers and Duties.* The work followed just days after the commissioners proclaimed a Day of Humiliation and Fasting

---

[45] Ibid, 16-17.
[46] Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning Concerning present Dangers and Duties, From the Commissioners of the Generall Assembly unto all the Members of this Kirk.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650), 4.
[47] Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *A short reply unto a declaration, entituled, The declaration of the Army of England, upon their march into Scotland.* (London, August 16, 1650), 1.
[48] Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *A short exhortation and warning, to the ministers, and professours of this Kirk.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651), 3.
[49] Todd, *Culture of Protestantism*, 25.

to be observed by every congregation on the last day of June.[50] This corporate action was intended to cleanse the nation and ensure that Scotland was just and pure in the sight of God in light of the three great dangers facing the Nation: first, the 'sudden and unexpected approachings of the Sectarian forces in our Neighbour Kingdom of England'; second, the oppression of the godly in England and Ireland 'now groaning under the tiranny' of England's Parliament, which 'if providence doe not otherwise dispose, ere we our selves may be brought to the like or worse extremity' and; third, Scotland's own Malignant party.

The Commissioners of the General Assembly produced *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning* in order to explicate the present danger facing the country and ordered it to be read in every parish church.[51] Scotland was in 'a time of so great strait', they explained, making it necessary for the Kirk to 'give warning to the Lords people both of their danger, and of their dutie'.[52] In addition to the 'snares' of the Scottish Malignants who reared their ugly head under Montrose earlier in the year a new threat lurked south of the border in the form of an army of 'Sectaries'.[53] They threatened not only the sovereignty of Scotland, but also its properly reformed religion. The Kirk argued the fundamental cause of the invasion rested in the devious intentions of the English Army to bring the same social disorder to Scotland that their distorted religious views had produced in England:

> all that concerns Religion, lye in the dust altogether forgotten and despised by those men, and instead of the beauty and order that should be in the house of God, a vast toleration of many grosse errors is allowed, whereby so many and so monstrous blasphemies and strange opinions in Religion have been broached and are vented in England, as the like hath not been heard of almost in any generation.[54]

Although written against both internal and external threats, the primary thrust of the work framed the English Army as a dark and blasphemous entity. The Kirk's overwhelming concern for the subversive threat of sectarian religion was further supported by their re-publication of

---

[50] Commissioners of the General Assembly, *Causes of a Publick and Solemn Humiliation* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650); *The Impartial Scout*, July 5-12, 1650 [E777(23)].
[51] *RCGA*, ii:421.
[52] Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning*, 3.
[53] Ibid, 12.
[54] Ibid, 4.

earlier declarations, one of which forbade allowing 'idler(s) who hath no particular calling, or vagrant person(s) under pretence of a calling' to perform 'Worship in Families...Seeing persons tainted with errours or aiming at divisions, may...creep into houses and lead captive silly and unstable souls'.[55] According to the commissioners, the survival of the church and kingdom of Scotland depended upon the unity of the nation through adherence to the Kirk and the covenants. *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning* represented the first in a series of publications produced by the Kirk and the approaching English which gradually developed into a polemical dialogue leading up to the Battle of Dunbar.

On June 26, 1650, the day after the Kirk published *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning*, England's Parliament produced their declaration of war. Although the *Declaration of the Parliament of England, upon the marching of the armie into Scotland* listed several political reasons for their invasion of Scotland, such as lack of reparations for the damages caused by Scotland's invasion of England, their rejection of a treaty with the English, and the proclamation of Charles II as King of England and Ireland,[56] Parliament immediately followed them with the pertinent religious issues. Parliament cited slanderous allegations by the Scots, who in the wake of hostilities within the Westminster Assembly 'declar'd against Us as Sectaries', as one of the grounds for their invasion of Scotland and accused the Kirk of fostering division among Christians by subordinating the importance of Christian unity to their own strict and narrow interpretation of the Covenant.[57] In contrast to this policy of division, the English framed their venture into Scotland as an attempt at unifying the godly 'to meet together in the power of true Religion and Holiness'.[58] Accordingly, Parliament claimed promotion of right religion and the gathering of the godly as political motives for their invasion of Scotland.

---

[55] Church of Scotland, *Directions of the Generall Assembly concerning secret and private worship.* (Edinburgh: Re-Printed by Evan Tyler, 1650), 4.
[56] England and Wales, Parliament, *Declaration of the Parliament of England*, 6-7.
[57] Ibid, 7-8.
[58] Ibid, 9.

Two religious themes in particular ran throughout the propaganda. First, the nature of the Solemn League and Covenant, what it required for civil government, and who had been the initial breaker of their shared Solemn League and Covenant thus freeing the other side to legitimately act out in force. Second the issue of church polity, which also remained closely linked to the issue of covenant, in that one of the primary issues in the Covenant was the promotion of a uniform standard of worship and doctrine throughout Britain. The Scots had assumed Presbyterianism would be the model of uniformity. As a result, they viewed the toleration of great variations in both doctrine and worship amongst the English Independents as a violation of the Covenant. This prompted allegations from the Kirk that the English tolerated a milieu of heresy and the English counter-charging the Scots Presbytery of being tyrannical. Although the *political* entity of the English Parliament had published its declaration of why their army marched on Scotland, and the Scottish Committee of Estates produced a response, the dialogue was taken up and continued by the Commissioners of the Kirk and the English Army.

It is worth noting why the Commissioners of the Kirk and the invading English forces produced the bulk of the propaganda, rather than the official political institutions of the Committee of Estates and the English Parliament. For a nation that overwhelmingly believed itself to be in a covenanted relationship with God, it appeared natural for the religious branch, the Kirk, to defend the nation's covenanted position. A further motivation for the Kirk's involvement was the loss of influence and power if Parliament's Army were victorious. Should the English impose their authority upon Scotland, the clergy faced losing the religious monopoly for which they had struggled so hard in the 1630s and 40s. Hence the Kirk viewed ideological opposition to the English Army as imperative. For the English Army, the production of propaganda arose out of necessity. According to M.J. Seymour, the Parliamentarian regime had no official propaganda facility or office.[59] The closest thing to officially published propaganda was the mutually beneficial relationship between the Interregnum regimes and the independent

---

[59] M.J. Seymour, 'Pro-Government Propaganda in Interregnum England, 1649-1660.' (University of Cambridge, PhD Thesis, 1987), 20.

publishers producing 'newsbooks' for economic gain.[60] With no program in place, propaganda by the Parliamentarian regime had to be produced in an *ad hoc* way. However, Cromwell's forces were not unprepared for the publication of polemics. When they marched towards Scotland in 1650 Cromwell had his own printer and printing press in tow.[61] 'Each army carried its own printer with it,' wrote print historian George Chalmers, 'expecting either to convince by its reasoning, or to delude by its falsehood'.[62] With a printing press and skilled men such as Oliver Cromwell, John Owen and the professional propagandist John Hall the army had the potentially devastating weapon of propaganda at their disposal.[63]

The English Army published three tracts during their initial invasion of Scotland, all of which were fundamentally religious in nature, and directed 'to the People of Scotland'[64] or 'To all that are Saints, and Partakers of the Faith of God's Elect, in Scotland'.[65] The papers argued for a distinction between being members of the Kirk and being God's elect, contending election made them brethren in Christ with the English and that this took priority over membership in the Kirk or even citizenship in a temporal kingdom.[66] The Commissioners responded with tracts directed at the lower ranks of the English army, under the pretext of being appeals from the Scottish people, urging the soldiers to understand they risked their salvation by breaking England's covenant with Scotland. Despite the three primary political reasons for the English invasion of Scotland, clearly enumerated in the England's declaration of war,[67] religious themes dominated the literature.

---

[60] Ibid, 11-12.
[61] Ogilvie, 'Papers from and Army Press, 1650', 420.
[62] George Chalmers, *The Life of Thomas Ruddiman* (London, 1794), 117.
[63] Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 199. John Hall was paid a stipend by the Commonwealth government to accompany Cromwell into Scotland and put his polemical tools to use. See ch. 3.
[64] England and Wales, Army, *A Declaration of the English Army Now in Scotland, Touching the Justness & Necessity of Their Present Proceeding in That Nation.* (London, August 12, 1650).
[65] England and Wales, Army, *A Declaration of the Army of England upon Their March Into Scotland To All That are Saints, and Partakers of the Faith of God's Elect, in Scotland.* (London, July 19, 1650).
[66] Abbott, *Cromwell*, iii:283.
[67] 1) The coronation of Charles II as king not only of Scotland but also of England and Ireland; 2) the threat that the Scots would march south on the king's behalf; and 3), the Scots' rejection of a treaty

The publications of the Kirk and the Army in July and August created an exchange of propaganda directed not only at their political opponents but to the whole population of both nations, which Cromwell called 'these great transactions'.[68] The first tract published by the English Army was entitled *A Declaration of the Army of England upon their March into Scotland.*[69] Composed while the army camped at Newcastle-upon-Tyne during their march north, Cromwell had at least eight hundred copies of the declaration printed. Five hundred copies were sent into Scotland with his trumpeter (Bret) while the other three hundred went to Carlisle.[70] According to one of the soldiers present in Newcastle, two days were spent composing a draft document of which one thousand copies were printed. Four days later every copy was burned and production started all over again, suggesting great care was taken in its composition. This also indicates the importance Cromwell ascribed to propaganda. [71] During this time of preparation in Newcastle the soldiers held a fast and heard sermons preached by five of the ministers who accompanied them.[72]

Although it is certain the paper was printed in Newcastle about July 15, there has been some conjecture over what press was used. Ogilvie has asserted the *Declaration* must have been produced on the field press since Newcastle's only printing press belonged to Stephen Bulkley, an 'unbending King's man'.[73] However, the existence of a few original copies of the *Declaration* with the imprint: 'Newcastle, printed by S.B., 1650' raises a series of questions.[74] Was Bulkley the original printer of the tract in Newcastle? Did the army actually have a printing press in tow

---

with the English (England and Wales, Parliament, *Declaration of the Parliament of England, upon the Marching of the Armie into Scotland.* (London, 1650), 6-7).

[68] Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:302; *Perfect Diurnal*, August 12, 1650; *RCGA*, iii:13-15.

[69] England and Wales. Army. *Declaration of the Army of England, Upon their March into Scotland.* (Newcastle: S[tephen] B[ulkley], 1650). [EEB 1641-1700, 1439:33]. The work was signed in the name of Cromwell by his secretary John Rushworth.

[70] Abbott *Cromwell*, ii:288; *Several Proceedings*, July 24, 1650; *Perfect Diurnal*, July 22, 1650.

[71] J.Y. Akerman, (ed.), *Letters from Roundhead Officers Written from Scotland and Chiefly Addressed to Captain Adam Baynes. July MDCL-June MDCLX.* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1856), no. 1 & 2; Grainger, 18.

[72] *Perfect Diurnall*, July 26, 1650; *Several Proceedings*, July 15, 1650.

[73] Ogilvie, 'Papers from an Army Press', 421.

[74] EEB, 1641-1700, 1439:33. Copies seem to survive in Queen's Univeristy (Belfast), the British Library, Worcester College (Oxford), Newcastle Central Library and Society of Antiquaries of

with them? Almost certainly S.B. is Stephen Bulkley, as it was his practice during the Interregnum to use his initials.[75] So what was an ardent Royalist doing printing a tract for the regicide Cromwell? His services were likely either hired or his press commandeered for this work by the army.[76] A permanent press would have been faster and more efficient than a portable version. However, Cromwell also took a press with him, as subsequent declarations published by the army were produced in Berwick and Musselburgh where permanent presses were not available. In this initial publication Cromwell simply took advantage of the fact that there was a well-established and efficient print house that could be commandeered in Newcastle.

Besides questions over the source of the paper's production there are also questions over who penned the declaration. While *A Declaration of the Army of England upon their March into Scotland* is signed in Cromwell's name by his secretary John Rushworth, its authorship, as well as that of the other religiously worded tracts produced by the army on its march north, probably rests with the army's chaplains as much as with any of the officers. Cromwell acknowledged as much in a letter to the General Assembly in August, where he attributed the authorship of a later tract to the soldiers 'and some godly ministers with us'.[77] Among the ministers accompanying Cromwell into Scotland was the great John Owen. While Peter Toon rightly suggests Owen's ideas significantly shaped the work,[78] Owen's influence may have been far greater than simply providing the ideology that lay behind it. In the opinion of the early nineteenth-century biographer William Orme a number of the works bearing the signature of Cromwell likely

---

Newcastle-upon-Tyne (see ESTC). An additional copy is housed in Harvard University Library (Houghton EC65 G798A 650d2).

[75] W.K. Sessions, *Stephen Bulkley, Newcastle's first 'long-stay' printer* (York: Ebor, 1997), 19.

[76] According to W.K. Sessions, the historian of northern English printing, 'by 1650 [Bulkley] our ardent Royalist printer was at last forced to "bow the knee to Cromwell" (Ibid, 21). The following year John Fenwicke's *England's Deliverer*, which praised the English victory at Dunbar, was also printed in Newcastle with the same imprint. This, however, does not clarify whether Bulkley's compliance was voluntary or imposed since the garrison at Newcastle could have intervened on this second occasion as well.

[77] Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii: 302. He was referring to *Vindication of the Declaration of the Army*, see below.

[78] P. Toon, *God's Statesman: the Life and Work of John Owen.* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1971), 43.

originated from the pen of John Owen.[79] Yet in the case of this declaration, there has been some discrepancy between historians as to when Owen joined with the northward marching army. According to Orme, Owen did not reach the army until they were in Berwick.[80] On the other hand, both Anne Laurence and Peter Toon believe Owen made the entire march north from London and preached while the army was in Newcastle.[81] If Owen was in Newcastle when the declaration was written, which appears to be the case, then the man that Toon has called the 'Architect of Independency' would have been present to aid in the important and careful composition of the army's declaration.

As the editions later printed in London and Edinburgh suggest, the army directed their declaration to the general populace of Scotland and not to the General Assembly or any other institution of the Scottish Kirk or State.[82] Written to 'satisfie them (the Scottish Brethren) of the grounds of our present Ingagement'[83] it represents an endeavour reminiscent of the Covenanter work produced upon the Scottish invasion of England in 1640, mentioned above. For this reason the authors addressed it to 'whom we look upon as our brethren,' and expressed their 'desire to make a distinction and separation of you from the rest'.[84] Although they accepted Parliament's reasons for invading Scotland as 'agreeable to the principles of religion, nature and nations' and therefore sufficient, and although did not wish to be perceived as 'improper' or 'superfluous', the soldiers in the English army desired to write to their 'brethren' in Scotland to explain 'the great and wonderful transactions wrought' amongst them 'by the mere finger of...God'.[85] This introduction made two theological claims about the English campaign. First, the tract's repeated references to the brethren, elect and saints in Scotland and

---

[79] William Orme, *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Religious Connexions of John Owen, D.D.* (London, 1820), 126n.
[80] Ibid, 125.
[81] Laurence, 159; Toon, *God's Statesman*, 43.
[82] England and Wales. Army., *A Declaration of the Army of England upon Their March Into Scotland To All That are Saints, and Partakers of the Faith of God's Elect, in Scotland.* (London, 1650). It was later 'reprinted' in Edinburgh by Evan Tyler with the larger corpus of English polemics produced by the army: see below.
[83] *Perfect Diurnall*, July 15-22 (1650), 369. [E777(30)].
[84] Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:283.

its humble references to the fraternal links they had with the pious English army made Cromwell's intentions in producing the work clear. He was bypassing the central religious hub of Scotland and making his case directly to the godly people in Scotland who were God's 'Elect'. This is why he had 800 copies printed for distribution within Scotland. He sought to establish unity between God's elect transcends political or even ecclesiastical allegiances. Second, 'the great and wonderful transactions wrought by the mere finger of...God' were invoked as evidence of God's providential blessings upon the English army. Not only were the English the Christian brethren of the elect in Scotland, they were also God's chosen instrument of imposing the divine will of God.

The paper's claims of affinity between the army and the elect in Scotland and their role as God's instruments were made even clearer in the tract by its differentiation between the elect and the rest of Scotland. Far from wanting to bring any harm to God's elect, the letter warned it would be sinful and foolish for any godly individual in Scotland to stand in opposition to the divinely chosen mechanism for imposing the will of God. 'Nothing is so predominant in us,' it stated, 'as the love we have towards those that fear God there, who may possibly suffer through their own mistakes, or our disability to distinguish in a common calamity.'[86] The message was clear. It was as though Cromwell was warning them not take up arms with the reprobates in Scotland against the English army who, as the instrument of God's work, would inevitably triumph. In militarily resisting the English Army the godly in Scotland would force them to shed the blood of fellow members of the elect body of Christ. Not only would resistance to God's Providence be suicidal, it would also be sinful. In this way, Cromwell attempted to create bonds of fraternal compassion with his audience in Scotland.

As part of this appeal to the people of Scotland, *A Declaration of the Army* gave three primary reasons why an invasion of Scotland was justified. The first was political. The guilt of breaking the Covenant lay with the Scots for imposing Charles II upon England and Ireland, and upon

---

[85] Ibid, ii:283.

the Scots' earlier invasion of England.[87] The second was religious. The tract argued that accusations made by the Scots (such as those in *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning*) that the English were complacent towards heresy were slanderous and uninformed.[88] In contrast, Cromwell labelled the Kirk's domination of religion overzealous, its singular devotion to the Presbytery unchristian and its intended imposition of Presbyterianism on England against the spirit of the Covenant:

> As for the Presbyterian, or any other form of church-government, they are not by the Covenant to be imposed by force.... Doth that name, or thing, give the difference between those that are the members of Christ and those that are not? We think not so. We say, faith working by love is the true character of a Christian; and, God is our witness, in whomsoever we see any thing of Christ to be, their we reckon our duty to love.[89]

According to Cromwell, the English were not opposed to Presbyterianism since 'we are desirous that those who are for the Presbyterian government, should have all freedom to enjoy it', but it is not to be imposed on any.[90] The third reason was moral. According to the tract, Charles II was an unscrupulous man set against all right religion, a man who would associate with the darkest sorts of people in order to regain his throne. The King's associations with Malignants and Papists in Ireland were used as evidence for these claims. While the underhand and oppressive intentions of the Kirk and the King threatened their religious freedom, the English yearned to provide tolerant religion and freedom of conscience for all the elect. This, it was hoped, would serve to explain to the people of Scotland the political (although religiously charged) and pious reasons underpinning the invasion. However, the 'saints' of Scotland were not the only target of this work of propaganda. Establishing the providential nature of their war and the fundamental causes of it was also intended to reassure Cromwell's own troops that their cause was just, that it had been prompted by the sordid actions of the politicians of Scotland and tyranny of the Kirk, and above all that it was the will of God to free the elect in Scotland

---

[86] Ibid, ii:288.
[87] Ibid, ii:284-5.
[88] Ibid, ii:286.
[89] Ibid, ii:285.
[90] Ibid, ii:286.

from the forces that threatened to suffocate their religious freedom.[91] Additionally, there was also a need to affirm the just nature of the invasion to English civilians of either moderate or Presbyterian leanings, for which reason the paper was republished in London.

The Commissioners of the General Assembly did not miss any of the implications of the English propaganda. Uninterested in the position of the national church, the English Army sought solidarity with the common pious people of Scotland. Addressing the tract to the 'Saints' or 'Elect' rather than the Kirk implied that the Kirk was not synonymous with the people of God in Scotland, and that God's elect were a minority not limited to or even indicated by the Kirk.[92] The Commissioners were quick to pick up on the subversive nature of the tract and responded with *A short Reply unto a Declaration.* While the English appealed to the people of Scotland to view toleration towards the English army as a sign of election, the Kirk made the counter claim. According to the *Reply*, 'all the Saints that are in Scotland' would naturally abhor everything taught by the sectarians, their ways being so 'grievous' the elect would 'cry…to Heaven against their present oppression' preferring to 'indure any affliction, then to involve themselves in the guilt' of the unjust English invasion.[93] Thus both sides alleged solidarity with their position to be indicative of election and appealed to pious people that their own position represented the proper Christian allegiance. The Kirk's *Reply*, which was distributed throughout the presbyteries of Scotland, closed by speaking not to the English, but to Scots: warning them to recognise the English as 'high-handed' covenant breakers, subverters of ancient forms of government, and more concerned with liberty than with religion as they 'let people do what ever they want in Religion if they help them'.[94]

The Commissioners contrasted the criticisms of the Kirk's Presbyterian form with the lack of a functioning church government in England. They denied that the Kirk equated Presbyterianism

---

[91] Laurence, 71.
[92] Andrew Kerr, *A Short Reply to the Army's Declaration.* (Edinburgh, July 22, 1650), 1-2.
[93] Ibid, 2.
[94] Ibid, 16-17.

with the totality of Christ's church or that 'Presbyterian' was synonymous with 'elect'.[95] Instead they turned back to the familiar accusations that the English were far too tolerant towards heresy and suggested their supposed toleration prevented the existence of a proper Presbytery in England or any other form of church government that maintained purity and opposed error. While they labeled claims by Cromwell 'that those who are for Presbyterial Government, should have all freedom to enjoy it' as ridiculous in light of the Parliament's refusal to instigate ecclesiastical courts or the imposition of censures.[96] By neglecting to prescribe a church government with the ability to confront and remove heresy, the Commissioners asserted the English Parliament and Army threatened to make impotent all churches over which they had influence. By linking the English to heresy and representing them as opponents to proper church discipline the Commissioners hoped to drive a wedge between the invading enemy and anyone in Scotland who might harbor sympathy for their religious pleadings.

As Cromwell's forces approached the Tweed they composed a second paper entitled *A Declaration of the Army of the Commonwealth of England To the People of Scotland*, while camped near Berwick-upon-Tweed.[97] The declaration, wrote Ogilvie, was 'wholly intended to be a lure to win over the common people to the side of Cromwell,' an endeavor 'not without some success.'[98] Yet its necessity owed to the Kirk's own successful propaganda campaign. According to Whitelocke when the English crossed the border they found the people had been told horrific stories by Scots ministers: 'that the English Army intends to put all the men to the sword, and to thrust hot irons through the women's breasts'.[99] Other reports claimed 'the English would cut the throats of all men, cut off the right hands of boys between six and sixteen, burn women's breasts, and destroy everything'.[100] These reports put great fear into the

---

[95] Ibid, 11-12.
[96] Ibid, 12.
[97] Ogilvie, 'Papers from an Army Press', 422. No original copies survive, only several copies in journals and a reprinted edition from London: England and Wales. Army. *A declaration of the army of the Commonwealth of England, to the people of Scotland*. (London, 1650).
[98] Ogilvie, 'Papers from an Army Press', 423.
[99] Whitelocke, iii:450.
[100] Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:296; *Perfect Diurnall*, (August 5-12, 1650), 410 [E778:18].

occupants of the Borders, until, according to Whitelocke, they were abated by Cromwell's own publications.[101]

In this second declaration by the army, Cromwell complained of the 'groundles and unjust Reproaches, and most false Slanders, [spread by the Kirk] to make the Army odious, and to render us unto the people [of Scotland], as such that are to be abhorred of all pious, peaceable, and sober Spirits, and to be rather Monsters then Men'.[102] He proposed the unjustness of the Kirk's accusations should be evident to the people of Scotland who could remember the well-behaved and pious conduct of the English soldiers who were in the country in 1648. Moreover, the English Army did not enter Scotland for personal profit, but only to secure a 'firm peace between two nations', to prevent 'the destruction of the godly and well-affected' and to preserve the 'power of Godliness and holiness in both nations'.[103] In light of the army's clear purpose he urged the people of the Borders to remain in their homes, since: 'the Gentry and Commonalty of...Scotland...are not the Persons, who...laid the certain foundations of a second unrighteous and unjust Invasion of England'.[104] In addition Cromwell exhorted the godly not to be fooled by the 'craft and subtlety of any', namely the Kirk.[105] However, this is not what happened.

Despite English assurances that those living peaceably would not be molested, the Borders were largely empty when the Parliamentary army crossed the Tweed.[106] According to English reports, the army did not see more than ten Scotsmen on their march between Berwick and Edinburgh

---

[101] Whitelocke, iii:450. *Cromwelliana* provides an interesting story of how Cromwell attempted to ingratiate himself with Scots living in the Borders. It tells of three Scotsmen who were detained by English soldiers. Under Cromwell's personal instruction their horses and money, which had been taken from them, were restored and they were given copies of the newly printed declaration to be taken home. In return for this kindness the Scots pledged to spread the news among their compatriots of the good intentions of the English army (*Cromwelliana*, 83).

[102] *Declaration of the Army of the Commonwealth of England to the People of* Scotland, 3; Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:290; *Perfect Diurnall*, July 22, 1650; *Several Proceedings*, July 24, 1650.

[103] England and Wales. Army. *A declaration of the army of the Commonwealth of England, to the people of Scotland*, 6; Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:291.

[104] Ibid, 5.

[105] Ibid, 7; Abbott, Cromwell, ii:291.

[106] Abbot, Cromwell, ii:290.

leading them to believe those few able men left behind were spies.[107] Orders from the Committee of Estates accounted for the lack of Scotsmen in the Borders. They had commanded every male aged between sixteen and sixty to collect all available provisions and gather in Edinburgh to make preparations for a unified defense of the nation.[108] Of 'the wives [that] stay behind' wrote Whitelocke, '...some of them do bake and brew, to provide bread and drink for the English Army'.[109] This mild cooperation can be accounted for by the desolation of the border country after all food and supplies had been taken away by the retreating male population. Compliance in baking and brewing allowed these women (and their families) to avoid starvation. The barrenness and depopulation of the Borders gave witness to the successful propaganda campaign by the Kirk.

An official response to Cromwell's second appeal to the people of Scotland came from the Committee of Estates. Although produced by a political body (the civil governing body of Scotland) it continued in the language of religion:

> We do therefore desire the Officers and Souldiers of the Army under Lieuetenant Generall Cromwell, to lay to heart the great guiltinesse and misery that followes upon an unjust Invasive War, especially, of Gods Covenanted people.... The cry of the Church and Kingdom of Scotland, the Virgin forced in the fields crying against her ravisher, is loud and shrill in the ears of God.... [110]

For Scotland purely political language was wholly inadequate for the situation at hand. For both the Committee of Estates (who were almost totally under the influence of the 'Kirk Party'[111]) and the Commissioners of the Kirk the only language sufficient to define the situation was that of the covenants, because the problems facing Scotland were believed to stem from England's betrayal of the Solemn League and Covenant.

---

[107] *A Large Relation of the Fight at Leith Neere Edenburgh.* (London, 1650), 1-4; A Perfect Diurnall, Sept. 16-24, 1650, 505.
[108] Nicoll, 19.
[109] Whitelocke, iii:450.
[110] Committee of Estates, *An Answere from the Committee of Estates, To a Printed Paper directed to the people of Scotland, and signed in name of L.G. Cromwel, and his Officers.* (Edinburgh, July 22, 1650), 4.
[111] Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 131, 147, 150-3, 158-9, 165-7; Grainger, 8, 11, 13-15, 33, 36.

The Commissioners of the Kirk did not remain silent either. Besides defending the Kirk's position to the people of Scotland they also directed propaganda at the English soldiers. *For the under-officers and souldiers of the English army, from the people of Scotland* represented an attempt to subvert the English attack from within the army. For this reason the Commissioners once again framed the tract as an appeal out of concern for the salvation of the English troops, who were being misled by the more sinister officers. The various political reasons enumerated in the English Parliament's declaration of war were again systematically refuted and a final warning was given to the English soldiers stressing their personal accountability for participating in an invasion of Scotland: 'Those among you shall be wise, who shall take Warning to proceed no farther in an evil way, lest God, who is the Judge of all things, look upon such Injustice, and Ingratitude, and Breach of Covenant, and require it'.[112] Some solid evidence exists to support the legitimacy of this polemical angle. Before the army began its march north there were some incidents of Parliamentary soldiers having reservations about participating in an invasion of Scotland. Lord Fairfax represents the most notable example. He stepped down as commander-in-chief of the English forces when Parliament made the decision to invade Scotland. His conscience prevented him from initiating a war against a nation with whom England was engaged in the Solemn League and Covenant.[113] In order to avoid controversy or further qualms of conscience within the army, the official reason for Fairfax's resignation was attributed to health rather than conscience.[114]

Yet withdrawals from the army for reasons of conscience were not limited to the time before the army started marching north. Although the troops declared they would live and die with Cromwell while camped at Newcastle, Abbott has identified several reasons to question the

---

[112] Church of Scotland, *For the Under-Officers and Souldiers of the English Army, from the People of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650) [printed July 31] ; English Army, *A declaration of the English army now in Scotland*, 7-8.
[113] Abbott, *Cromwell*, 267-71; Ian Gentles, *The New Model Army in England, Ireland and Scotland, 1645-1653.* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992), 386; Whitelocke, iii:460-2; Grainger, 10.
[114] Gentles, *The New Model Army in England*, 386; *C & P*, i:259-60; Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:286.

actual degree of unanimity within the army.[115] Shortly before the army crossed the Tweed several lower ranking officers were removed and others resigned including Colonel Bright, whose resignation brought about the creation of the Coldstream Guards.[116] Bright had requested two weeks leave which would have allowed his absence when the army entered Scotland. The refusal of this request prompted his resignation. According to Grainger, 'qualms of conscience' regarding the justness of invading England's jointly covenanted neighbour were probably behind Bright's actions.[117] It was to individuals who shared such reservations that the Kirk directed *For the Under-Officers and Soldiers*: individuals whose consciences were on the brink. However, by the time this tract was published (July 30) the English had already crossed the Tweed and so it was probably too late. Morally and psychologically the Scottish Border had been the final obstacle to the conscience of the English soldier. Once across the border invasion had irrevocably been acted out. Those remaining in the English ranks after the final conscience-driven withdrawals at Berwick were predominantly the more extreme Independents, Baptists and anti-Royalists; or more moderate individuals who had wrestled with the issues involved and cast their lot with Cromwell's forces.

After they crossed the Tweed, the English forces seemed largely unhindered by the Kirk's publications and their officers apparently made no attempts to prevent soldiers from reading Scottish propaganda. Cromwell wrote to the Commissioners of the General Assembly shortly after receiving *For the Under-Officers and Souldiers of the English Army*, exclaiming 'send as many of your papers as you please amongst ours, they have free passage, I feare them not; what is of God in them would it might be embraced and received'.[118] Yet, Cromwell did not feel the Scots

---

[115] Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:282.
[116] Edmund Ludlow, *The memoirs of Edmund Ludlow: the lieutenant-general of the horse in the army of the commonwealth of England, 1625-1672.* (ed.) C.H. Firth. 2 vols (Oxford : Clarendon press, 1894), i:252; Daniel MacKinnon, *Origin and services of the Coldstream Guards*. 2 vols (London : R. Bentley, 1833), i:4.
[117] Grainger, 20. C.H. Firth interpreted Bright's resignation as 'disapproval of the King's execution'. However, Charles I had been executed more than a year earlier, so this seems to be an unlikely explanation (*RHCA*, ii:526).
[118] Oliver Cromwell, *A Letter Sent to the Generall Assembly of the Kirke of Scotland.* (London: Printed for Hanna Allen., 1650), 3.

treated the products of English presses so freely. In the same letter promising free distribution of Scottish tracts among his troops he accused the Kirk of censoring English declarations and preventing them from reaching the Scottish people,[119] a charge which the Kirk vehemently denied.[120] Cromwell accused the Kirk of poisoning the minds of the Scottish people: 'And by your hard and subtle words,' he wrote to the General Assembly, 'you have begotten prejudice in those who do too much (in matters of conscience, wherin every soul is to answer for itself to God) depend upon you'.[121] Cromwell desired free distribution of the propaganda by both sides, the Kirk did not. For the Kirk a successful defense to the ideological attacks of the English depended on three endeavours: firstly, prevention of sectarian ideologies spreading amongst the Scottish people (by censorship if necessary); secondly, vilification of Independency as 'sectarian' and 'blasphemous'; and thirdly, undermining the English attack by playing upon fears of Covenant-breaking or displacing a 'rightly' Reformed church. All three of these they did with a good deal of success. The English, however, had other plans.

By early August the English Army was well aware of the factions forming within the Scottish forces and they used this chink in the Scottish armour as a basis for further propaganda. Within Scotland accusations of Malignancy swarmed around those showing loyalty to the King. On August 13, the Kirk composed a declaration known as the 'West Kirk' declaration intended to embrace the new King, while at the same time distancing the nation from the guilt of his personal sins.[122] This, the Kirk hoped, would free those fighting for the Kingdom of Scotland from any accusations of Malignancy and in turn undercut the English claim that their invasion was a stand against Malignancy rather than the Covenant. Published on August 14, 1650, the Commissioners of the General Assembly sent the 'West Kirk' declaration to Cromwell along

---

[119] Ibid, 3-4; Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:302.
[120] *RCGA*, iii:21; NLS, Wod.Fol.XXIX.(45).
[121] Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:302. Cromwell, *A Letter Sent to the Generall Assembly*, 3.
[122] General Assembly, *West-Kirk the 13. Day of August, 1650.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650); *RCGA*, iii:26; NLS, Wod.Fol.XXIX.(47); Wariston, ii:xi-xii.

with a letter from General Leslie (the commander of the Scottish forces) requesting the paper be given the free distribution promised.[123]

Complying with the Scots' request, Cromwell 'caused [the West Kirk declaration] to be read in the presence of so many officers as could well be gotten together on a sudden' and immediately penned responses to both the declaration and Leslie's letter.[124] The Kirk believed the West Kirk declaration put to rest the matter of Malignancy versus covenanted protection of the monarchy, taking away some of the impetus of the English campaign by separating the sovereignty of the Scottish crown from the person of Charles II. They identified the Scottish cause as the promotion of God's chosen form of government for Scotland as defined in the Covenant rather than political support for the person of Charles Stuart. Although Archibald Johnston of Wariston decreed the declaration 'vexed many of [the English] and hindred...[their] intended merch,'[125] the official English response showed no sign of abeyance. Rather than justifying the Scottish cause, Cromwell argued the West Kirk declaration affirmed the English accusations of Malignancy. By placing a king on the throne who had ties with Catholics both in Ireland and on the Continent 'under pretence of the Covenant', Cromwell maintained Scotland could not possibly be acting in covenant. Hence they were political Malignants rather than religious Covenanters.[126]

Cromwell's accusations seem to have deeply affected the Scottish Kirk and Government. Although Wariston slighted Cromwell's reply as 'a rapsodik aunsuer to our paper, shewing that he could not separat our conjunction with the King from Malignancy...'[127] he went on to report several ministers 'pressed on our consciences the guilt of not purging and setling the King's

---

[123] *The Lord Gen. Cromwel's Letter: with a Narrative of The Proceedings of the English Army in Scotland, and a Declaration of the General Assembly, Touching the Dis-owning their King and his Interest.* (London: Edward Husband and John Field, 1650), 7.
[124] Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:306; NLS, Wod.Fol.XXIX.(46).
[125] Wariston, ii:19.
[126] Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:306; *The Lord Gen. Cromwel's Letter*, 11.
[127] Wariston, ii:18.

family'.[128] Shortly thereafter, the first of three important events provoked by Cromwell's criticism of the West Kirk declaration occurred. First, some officers within the Scottish army composed a remonstrance affirming the West Kirk declaration and effectively giving their assent for the implementation of drastic measures that had previously been discussed.[129] Second, on August 16 the King finally signed a declaration proclaiming his personal guilt, rejecting the errors of his parents and declaring himself to 'have no enemies but the enemies of the Covenant, and...no friends but the friends of the Covenant'.[130] For several months the King persistently refused to sign such a declaration, which included an explicit denial both of his mother and father. However, Cromwell's accusations of malignancy and the presence of his army on Scottish soil forced the King's hand. In signing the declaration Charles II set aside everything but the Covenant, including his claim to the throne outwith the Covenant's sworn upholding of the Scottish monarchy, and gave tacit approval for the removal of all malignant individuals from both his personal court and the army. As a result, all Scotland's interests, including the King's, were publicly and ostensibly consigned to the Covenant and it was for the Covenant alone that the army would take up arms. On the same day that Charles signed the declaration the Scots also set about heavy purging within the army.[131] This was the third important event prompted by Cromwell's letter and was a culmination of the West Kirk declaration, the army's remonstrance and Charles II's declaration. Cromwell's accusations alone were not responsible for initiating the purges, as some significant purges had taken place earlier in the month. However, his charge that separation of the Covenant cause from Malignancy was indiscernible as long as Malignants were among their ranks hastened the process and goaded the Scots to purge their forces to the most extreme ends.

---

[128] Ibid, ii:18.

[129] *To the Right Honourable the Lords and Others of the Committee of Estates, The Humble Remonstrance and Supplication of the Officers of the Army.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650); Edward Walker, *Historical Discourses, upon Several Occasions: Viz. I. The Happy Progress and Success of the Arms of K. Charles I.* (London: W.B. for Sam. Keble, 1705), 167-8; David Laing, (ed.), *Correspondence of Sir Robert Kerr, First Earl of Ancram and His Son, William, Third Earl of Lothian.* 2 vols (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1875), ii:285.

[130] *RCGA*, ii:461.

[131] Wariston, ii:19-20.

Preparations for purging began at the beginning of August.[132] On August 1 the Commissioners of the General Assembly ordered the ministers assigned to the various regiments of the Scottish army to begin compiling lists of 'officers or volunteers' who had been Engagers in the unlawful invasion of England, as well as those persons the ministers deemed scandalous in order that they might be removed.[133] Between August 2-5, purges took place throughout the army[134], but the Commissioners complained on August 6 that purging was being 'slowed and obstructed' further fomenting God's anger against Scotland.[135] However, once the commanders in the army and the King had given their consent in the forms of the army's remonstrance and the King's declaration the purges could be taken to the extreme. On August 16, just two days after Cromwell's letter, the most stringent purging occurred.[136] By the end of the month thousands of officers and soldiers had been removed from the Scots Army, significantly weakening their forces. Some estimates suggest that the army was reduced by as much as one-third. One report put the number of soldiers removed at 5,000, while another declared over eighty officers were expelled.[137] Thus the events of August 13-16 provide a significant example of successful English propaganda, in that Cromwell's response to the West Kirk declaration altered (or at least hastened and intensified) the policy and actions of Scotland.

The pre-Dunbar propaganda battle came to a head with a declaration produced by the English Army while camped at Musselburgh on August 1, 1650, in direct response to the Kirk's *For the*

---

[132] Holfelder argues the radical Kirk Party advocated the purging of the army because their continued control of Scottish affairs rested on controlling the army (Holfelder, 47-8).
[133] *RCGA*, iii:9.
[134] Balfour, iv:89; *RCGA*, iii:16. According to Edward Walker, between 3,000 and 4,000 of the 'best Men' had been purged between August 2 & 5 (Walker, *Historical Discourses*, 165). See also Grainger, 28-9.
[135] *RCGA*, iii:16
[136] Wariston, ii:19. According to David Stevenson, the removal of soldiers on August 16 was 'by far the most thorough purge of the army yet undertaken' (Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 145).
[137] *Mercurius Scoticus giving the world ground upon this evident truth, videlicet, that the Scottish rebels, the Presbyter, or Kirckfaction never intended that Charles the second should be their King.* (Rotterdam: P.C., 1650), 10; Balfour, iv:89.

under-officers and souldiers of the English army.[138] *A declaration of the English army now in Scotland* set out the purely religious and pious desires lying at the heart of their invasion of Scotland:

> we value the Churches of Jesus Christ, who are the lot of Gods inheritance Ten thousand times above our own lives; yea, we do bless the Lord we are not onely a Rod of Iron to dash the common enemies in pieces, but also a hedge (though very unworthy) about Christs Vineyard; and if we know our own hearts, where ever the lot of Gods inheritance shall appear to be found in Scotland, we shall think it our duty, to the utmost hazzard of our lives to preserve the same.... We desire it may be known to you our Brethren in Scotland, That we are not Soldiers of Fortune, we are not meerly the servants of men, we have not onely proclaimed Jesus Christ, the King of Saints, to be our King by profession, but desire to submit to him upon his own terms, ...and it is our prayer daily, That those that fear the Lord in England and Scotland may become one in the hand of the Lord, and joyn together in the advancement of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, and throwing down, and tramping upon the Seat of the Beast. And thus we have in the naked plainness of our souls opened our hearts unto you our dear Brethren that fear the Lord in Scotland, where-ever you be found, whether in the highest Councils or the poorest Cottages, who though you now lie scattered, the Lord will in his due time bring you together, and binde you up as his Jewels, and make you one with those that fear the Lord amongst us, which the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.[139]

From the outset of the English Army's march north the government and clergy of Scotland recognised the potential danger posed by several thousand English soldiers maintaining varying degrees of sectarian doctrine entering Scotland. In the previous decade Robert Baillie had expressed concerns that young Scottish soldiers fighting in England ran the risk of being infected by English doctrines simply by serving alongside Parliamentary soldiers, but those concerns paled significantly in comparison to the new situation.[140] At the time they crossed the Tweed the English Army numbered approximately 16,000. Their presence threatened to expose the whole populace of Scotland to 'sectarian' doctrines. The declaration of the English on August 1 exacerbated the worst fears of individuals like Baillie. Not only were these 'blasphemers' and 'heretics' already present in Scotland, but they openly boasted of their

---

[138] England and Wales. Army., *A Declaration of the English Army Now in Scotland, Especially Those among Them That Know and Fear the Lord* (London: [s.n.], 1659). The work is in the British Library, but this bibliographical information is incorrect. The last page is dated: Musselburgh, August 1. 1650. The incorrect dating is most likely due to its being bound with a later work. A second edition was printed: England and Wales. Army, *A declaration of the English army now in Scotland, touching the justness & necessity of their present proceeding in that nation.* (London: Printed for Edward Husband and John Field, August 12, 1650), [Thomason Tract, 93:E.609(10)]

[139] *A declaration of the English army now in Scotland*, 13-14, 16.

[140] Letter to Robert Blair dated May 19, 1644. Baillie, *L & J*, ii:185-6.

intentions to promote their own theological positions to the residents of Scotland, to gather them together, and to oppose the Kirk both physically and ideologically.

According to the declaration, the Scots had brought war upon themselves, because the Covenant had become an idol for Scotland and because Scotland had, in the person of Charles II, chosen a supporter of the Throne of the Beast.[141] Now, Scotland faced the potential loss of its political freedom through military conquest as well as subversion of its recently re-acquired Presbytery through the active intervention of the English Independents and Nonconformists, and all because those in power in Scotland had tried to impose these things on both its English neighbours and on the innocent people of Scotland. 'When Scotland chose new gods, and would have a King out of a Family that God had rejected, then was war in the Gates'.[142] The language of this tract gives a good indication of the radical nature of the English army. As Tai Liu points out, it smacks of millenarianism and provides as justification for their actions the 'destruction of antichrist, the advancement of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, the Deliverance and Reformation of his church'.[143] Once again this third declaration represented the English as a liberating force for the religiously oppressed in Scotland. However, unlike their earlier declarations, by the beginning of August the Parliamentary army proclaimed liberation from religious oppression as the primary motivation for the invasion, rather than meerly a by-product. The army declared its intentions to gather and protect all God's people in Scotland. Yet, who was it that the godly needed protection from in Scotland? In the past the Parliamentary army had used the language of slaying the Beast of the Antichrist when referring to Papacy or Episcopacy, but now there was no Episcopal threat in Scotland. The English army had taken the language formerly used to attack Prelacy and levelled it against the Presbyterian Kirk: this was the institution that welcomed the new king, 'one of the ten horns of the beast'.[144] The tracts launched a smear campaign against the Kirk, and a plea to the Scottish people to 'joyn

---

[141] Ibid, 13, 15.
[142] Ibid, 13.
[143] Tai Liu, *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660*, International Archives of the History of Ideas: 61 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), 74-5.

together in the advancement of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, and throwing down…the Seat of the Beast'.[145] To justify their publication the army declared it to be a sincere response to a Scottish request for the grounds of their invasion, however, there is no Scottish record of such a request.[146] Although both religion and politics had been the original language of the propaganda produced by the Scots and the English, as the penultimate showdown at Dunbar approached, religion became the primary language of the dispute.

Covenant versus Providence

Besides vilifying their opponents with slanderous labels, both sides found it necessary to justify their positions in relation to the Solemn League and Covenant shared between the two countries. Increasingly, however, it became crucial for the Kirk to reaffirm the integrity of the Presbytery and their impeccable adherence to the covenants in order to secure the continued support of its members. The English, on the other hand, had largely freed themselves from the Covenant by claiming the Scots had been the initial breakers of the Covenant and labelling the Covenant as the idol of the Kirk.[147] For the Kirk victory over the invaders rested on their covenanted status with God. The purging that took place throughout August, promoted by the radical wing of the Kirk, likewise drew upon an Israelite model of purity over numerical strength demonstrated in the imagery of Gideon: Gideon's army, although outnumbered, were none-the-less blessed by God for their purity and empowered to defeat their heathen adversaries.[148] A precedent for this belief had been established in 1649 when Gilbert Ker's small Covenanter force of 360 soldiers defeated a royalist force of 1,100 at the Battle of Balvenie.[149] The elements in the Kirk who pushed for purging told the people of Scotland that the sectarian army would

---

[144] English Army, *A declaration of the English army now in Scotland*, 12.
[145] Ibid, 15.
[146] *Cromwelliana*, 83; *The Fifth Monarchy, or Kingdom of Christ, in Opposition to the Beasts, Asserted.* (London: printed for Livewel Chapman, 1659), 20.
[147]English Army, *A declaration of the English army now in Scotland*, 11, 15.
[148] Judges 6-8.
[149] Edward M. Furgol, *A Regimental History of the Covenanting Armies 1639-1651*. (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1990), 326-7.

be destroyed without the Scots army having to strike a single blow.[150] However, with the crushing defeat of the Scots at Dunbar, the Kirk's claims of covenanted preferment received a severe blow. The various factions within the Kirk were forced to respond rapidly to growing concerns among the Scottish people that the Kirk and covenants might be unlawful and/or corrupt, and that God was punishing the nation for disobedience.

The nature of Scotland's devotion to the covenants was a prominent theme throughout the papers produced before Dunbar. In a letter to the General Assembly on August 3, 1650, Cromwell famously requested the Kirk to re-evaluate its position, urging the Commissioners of the Kirk to reflect upon Isaiah 28:5-15: 'The priest and the prophet reel with strong drink...they err in vision, they stumble in giving judgement...(28:7)' and in regards to covenant, 'because you have said, "We have made a covenant with death, and with Sheol we have an agreement; when the overwhelming scourge passes through it will not come to us; for we have made lies our refuge, and in falsehood we have taken shelter (28:15)."'[151] In their reply, composed by James Guthrie, the Commissioners of the General Assembly played what has been called their trump card in defending their adherence to the Solemn League and Covenant.[152] Guthrie reminded his English audience that the Kirk was not alone in signing it.[153] This charge served as the impetus for the re-publication of John Vicars' broadsheet *A Caveat for Covenant-contemners and Covenant-breakers.*[154] The paper had originally been published in London in 1648, in opposition to those who had signed the Solemn League and Covenant, and catalysed the Scots' march south against the King. The Kirk had *A Caveat* re-published in 1650 with a list of 222 members of the House of Commons who had signed the Solemn League, including Scotland's most prominent enemy: Oliver Cromwell. The broadsheet also provided lists of Scripture supporting the making and

---

[150] According to John Owen: 'Their Ministers told the people before our Army came, That they should not need to strike one stroke, but stand still, and they should see the Sectaries destroyed.' Owen's report was published in: Henry Scobell, *A True Relation of the Proceedings of the English Army now in Scotland.* (London: Edward Husband and John Field, 1650), 14.
[151] Cromwell, *A Letter Sent to the Generall Assembly*, 4.
[152] C.J. Guthrie's introduction to *RCGA*, iii:xxx.
[153] *RCGA*, iii:22.

upholding of covenants[155], scriptural warnings against covenant breaking[156] and two examples of what happens to covenant breakers. According to Vicars, covenants made in God's name are binding whether divinely inspired or not, as Vladislaus, the Christian king of Hungary discovered when he betrayed his covenant with the Turkish emperor Amuath (Murad II). Although bound to peace by this treaty, Vladislaus secretly prepared a massive invasion of Turkey. When the fighting began, the Hungarian army ripped through the forces of the Turks, until Amuath appealed to the Christ, in whose name the Hungarians had signed the 'covenant'. The Turkish army proceeded to slaughter the Hungarian's Christian army, killing King Vladislaus in the battle and putting his head on a pike. This is the punishment that awaits even a chosen people, claims Vicars, if they betray a covenant made in the name of God. The re-publication of this work against Covenant-breakers served not only to attack those, like Cromwell, who had already broken the Covenant by invading Scotland, but also warned those Scots who had thus far been loyal to their sworn obligations that any betrayal on their part would ensure their demise.

This leads to the question: if Cromwell and other Englishmen had signed the Covenant, then who were they to demonise it? Did they not also have a responsibility to uphold a covenant that they had sworn to? It became evident through their publications and their interpretation of events that the English were far less interested in the Covenant than they were in providence. While the Scots equated adherence to the Covenant with receiving God's blessing, the English viewed their continuing military successes as clear evidence that they were following God's providential plans. Even before the Battle of Dunbar many in the English force were confident of their providential favour. According to one soldier's account, even in the barren and stripped Scottish Borders he found unequalled peace and contentment:

---

[154] John Vicars, *A Caveat for Covenant-contemners and Covenant-breakers*. (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).
[155] Exod. 19:5; Numb. 30:21; Deut. 23:21; 2 Chron. 15:12-15, 29:10, 34:31-2; Psalms 25:10, 50:14, 103:17-8; Isaiah 56:4-7; Jer. 50:4-5.
[156] Lev. 26:25; 2 Chron. 26:25; Neh. 6:29; Isaiah 24:5, 33:8; Psalms 78:37; Jer. 11:10-1, 34:18, 19:20; Ezek. 16:59, 17:15-19; Hosea 1:9; Amos 1:9; Malachi 2:10; Math. 5:33; Rom. 1:31.

> although I have been without many things of delight and superfluity which your southerne parts and most parts of England afford: yet I cannot say that I ever was in want of anything that was necessary to preserve life, for a good conscience is a continuall feast, and I have found as much content in a peice of rye bread, or a hard bisket, and a cup of water, as ever I did in the most dainty cakes or delitious wines. I have laid down to rest with as much content upon a board, or on the ground with a bundle of straw, as ever I did into the best fetherbed in England. God hath indeed prepared a table in the wilderness, such a table as is full of rich and good things, ful of marrow, wine on the lees refined. The comforts of his spirit, and a sweet communion with him, which surpasses all other injoyments whatsoever, and farre better than all kindes of services of sacrifices which can be performed by us, while we are here in this earthly tabernacle.[157]

Such a claim of providential contentment is quite astonishing in light of other contemporary reports that claim food rations were often in a bad state or in short supply.[158]

For the English, their victory over the Scots at Dunbar when they were outnumbered by at least 4,000 soldiers and held the weaker ground[159] reaffirmed their belief that God's providential blessings were upon them. On the day before the battle Cromwell lamented how illness had depleted his army and remarked that merely an escape past the Scots army would entail a 'miracle'.[160] Victory, however, was absolute. While three thousand Scots were killed and another ten thousand taken prisoner, only twenty English soldiers died on the day.[161] The English soldiers interpreted this as an indisputable evidence of providential deliverance. Alexandra Walsham describes the centrality which providentialism had in seventeenth-century English 'political argument, tactics and action'.[162] Blair Worden's article 'Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England' also illustrates how fundamental providential thinking was, not only to Cromwell, but to the seventeenth-century puritan mind in general.[163] God's hand was seen in every occurrence, from menial things like changes in the weather to more miraculous events,

---

[157] *A Perfect Diurnall*, Sept. 16-24, 1650, (E.780, II), 505; S.R. Gardiner (ed.), *Letters and Papers Illustrating the Relations Between Charles the Second and Scotland in 1650.* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1894), 135.
[158] *Perfect Diurnall*, July 22-9, 1650, 391; *Journal of the House of Commons* (London, 1803-13), vi:483.
[159] Grainger, 38-40. Grainger estimates the forces at Dunbar to have been 12,000 English and 16,000 Scots. Estimates of the forces at Dunbar vary greatly. According to Stevenson, the Scots had almost twice the number of troops as Cromwell, listing Cromwell's forces at 11,000 and the Scots at 20,000 (Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 178).
[160] Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:314.
[161] Gentles, *The New Model Army in England*, 398.
[162] Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, 19.

such as the victory at Dunbar, 'where triumph was snatched from defeat'.[164] According to Worden, Dunbar 'was viewed as an especially significant declaration of God's favor' upon the English enterprise.[165] For this reason Cromwell wrote to Parliament requesting that instead of feeling pride they should thank God for His providence through acts of charity.[166]

Whether providential or not, Cromwell certainly viewed his successes as having divine origin.[167] Despite the fact his superior military tactics and disciplined forces were sufficient in themselves to deliver victory, Gardiner maintains Cromwell utterly attributed the victory at Dunbar 'to the direct intervention of Providence against a hypocritical nation'.[168] The account of the battle he prepared for Parliament drips with the language of providential deliverance.[169] He declares they overcame 'meerly with the courage the Lord was pleased to give' and that despite being outnumbered the enemy was 'made by the Lord of Hosts as stubble to [our] swords'.[170] Later in September, when reporting the movements of his army to parliament, he wrote 'Whereas it hath pleased God by his gracious Providence and Goodnesse, to put the City of Edenburgh, and the Town of Leith under my power'.[171] For Cromwell, as long as his army continued winning he felt sure the hand of God was directing him. As one critic wrote, Cromwell wrongly equated his army's military supremacy with 'a providential power'.[172]

Covenant or no Covenant, the 'providential' victories of the English over their opponents were leading them on towards their goals and were evidence of divine direction. Throughout the accounts of their victories over the Scots at Dunbar, Inverkeithing and Worcester the English contrasted the Scots' battle cry of 'the Covenant' or 'for the faith of the Covenant' with their

---

[163] Worden, 'Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England.' *Past and Present* 109 (1985): 55-99.
[164] Ibid, 69.
[165] Ibid, 81-2.
[166] Oliver Cromwell, *A Letter from the Lord General Cromwel from Dunbar.* (London: Edward Husband and John Field, 1650), 10.
[167] Worden, 'Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England', 57.
[168] Gardiner, *C & P*, i:297.
[169] Cromwell, *A Letter from the Lord General Cromwel from Dunbar*, 6-7.
[170] Ibid, 8.
[171] Oliver Cromwell, *The Lord General Cromwell His march to Sterling. Being A Diary of all proceedings in the Army from their march out of Edenburgh, to the 25 of September 1650.* (London: E.G. in the Old-baily, 1650), 6.

own 'Lord of Hosts',[173] or 'Scotland' versus 'Providence'.[174] The implication drawn from their differing battle cries and the multiple defeats of the Scots was that the English were affirmed in their constant availability to the leading of God's providence, while the Scots' deifying of the Covenant served to bring God's punishment upon them. John Owen confirmed this belief in his report of three Scots ministers who received 'the lot of war' at a skirmish near Musselburgh on August 30, 1650. The ministers were led out in front of the Scottish Army like a righteous shield or a righteous guarantee of victory, similar to the Israelites' use of the Ark of the Covenant. If they were on God's side, Owen declared, they should have been unscathed.[175]

Other reports of English victories were also sent to London in which the providence of God was credited with the English successes over and against the cause of the Covenant. In a work entitled *Emanuel, or, God with us*, the English Independent minister John Canne proclaimed the victory at Dunbar as evidence 'That the Lord of Hosts was against the Covenant, the Scots Cause...for if we will take the Presbyterian sence of it, the Covenant enjoynes men to destroy the Church of God, and to suppresse the gifts of God, and the Spirit of Christ in his Saints, and Servants'.[176] Likewise, when news of the victory at Dunbar reached Massachusetts John Cotton preached a sermon of thanksgiving for the providential advancement of God's cause and later wrote to Cromwell congratulating him on the victory.[177] Cromwell replied thanking the clergyman for the support and prayer of the godly in New England, only lamenting that the victory entailed the suffering of some godly Scots who foolishly opposed them, and branded the

---

[172] *RCGA*, ii:xi.
[173] John Rushworth, *A True Relation of the Routing the Scottish Army near Dunbar, Sept. 3. instant.* (London, Sept. 9, 1650), 5; Cromwell, *A Letter from the Lord General Cromwel from Dunbar*, 8; 'at Dunbar...the word then was the Lord of Hosts and so it was now [at Worcester], and indeed the Lord of hosts was wonderfully with us' (*A Letter To the Right Honorable William Lenthall Esq. Speaker of the Parliament of England.* (London, 1651), 5).
[174] *A Great Victory God Hath Vouchsafed by the Lord Generall Cromwels Forces against the Scots.* (London, 1651), 4.
[175] Henry Scobell, *A True Relation of the Proceedings of the English Army now in Scotland, From the Two and twentieth day of July, to the First of August.* (London, 1650), 14.
[176] John Canne, *Emanuel, or, God with us. Werein Is Set Forth Englands Late Great Victory Over the Scots Armie, in a Battle at Dunbar, Septemb. 3. 1650.* (London, 1650), 22.
[177] Thomas Hutchinson, *A collection of original papers relative to the History of the colony of Massachusets-bay.* (Boston, New-England: Printed by Thomas and John Fleet, 1769), 269.

victory as a fulfilment of prophecy.[178] By framing the outcome of Dunbar in such terms Independents in both old and New England heralded Cromwell's victory as unequivocally the dispensation of God's judgement in their favour and a condemnation of tyrannical state churches.

As a result, the Battle of Dunbar served as a twofold triumph for the English. Militarily they scattered the bulk of Scotland's forces and took nearly 10,000 prisoners. But of even greater importance, psychologically (in terms of their propaganda war) the routing of the Scots by a numerically inferior English force fighting on foreign soil served as a huge providential boost for a Parliamentary army that faced military opposition in Scotland and some political opposition at home. Reports of English victories therefore helped to galvanise support for the army back in England, to abate fears that may still have been festering in the backs of the soldiers' minds and, most importantly of all, to challenge the claims of the Kirk. For Gardiner the great victory at Dunbar was as much over the Solemn League and Covenant as it was over the Scots. The trouncing of the Scottish Army and the subsequent conquest of the country over the following months ensured that the Kirk could no longer impose political or ecclesiastical governments upon England.[179] Cromwell himself perceived the religious ramifications of his victory over the Scots, declaring 'Surely it's probable the Kirk had done their do'.[180] Yet the religious importance of the campaign became increasingly apparent in the occupation of Scotland.

Presbyterian Interpretations in the Wake of Dunbar

Once the Scots army had been defeated at Dunbar the English easily overran the rest of Scotland south of the Clyde-Forth line. While their control was not uncontested, they were able to move through the Lothians and as far as Glasgow with little opposition. The Scots were left

---

[178] Thomas Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*. 3rd edn (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1888), vii:309-10. According to Thomas Carlyle, Cromwell was probably referring to Psalm 110.
[179] Gardiner, *C & P*, i:297.
[180] Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii:327; Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 149.

with the task of trying to keep their supporters loyal and eager to sustain opposition against the invaders. To do this they had to explain the crushing defeat at Dunbar in a manner that ensured God remained with them, which they did in two ways. On the whole the Presbyterian interpretation both north and south of the Tweed was that, like Israel before them, God's chosen people were suffering for their hidden sins, but they had not lost their favoured status which was ensured by the Covenant.[181] Cromwell challenged the Scots ministers who sought refuge in Edinburgh Castle when the English entered the city to see God's providence in what had occurred at Dunbar: 'And shal we after all these our Prayers, Fastings, Tears Expectations, and solemn Appeals, call these bare Events?'[182] The Kirk rejected Cromwell's interpretation in favour of an Old Testament allusion to the relationship between God and Israel. If God could use the Babylonians and Assyrians to correct the Israelites, then could the English not be used to correct the Scots? In response to this interpretation of events fasts and public repentance were ordered to be held throughout Scotland on September 12, 1650 in order to purge the nation of its sin, while the Kirk published confessions of the sins of the ministry.[183] Bound together with the order for fasting was *A Shorte Declaration and Warning to all the Congregations of the Kirke of Scotland*, also composed by the Commissioners of the General Assembly. Both documents were ordered to be read in every congregation at the earliest opportunity.[184] The tract urged Scots to ignore rumours which interpreted the demise of the Scots army as a judgement against the Covenant.[185] Instead they instructed the soldiers in the army to look deeply at their own lives and repent of carnal activities and secular hopes.[186] Finally, they

---

[181] Robert Douglas, *Short Information. A Short Information and brotherly Exhortation to our Brethren of England: From the Commissioners of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland convened at Forfarr. August 12, 1651.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651), 1.
[182] Oliver Cromwell, *Several Letters and Passages Between His Excellency, the Lord General Cromwel and the Governor of Edinburgh Castle, and the Ministers there, since His Excellencies Entrance into Edinburgh.* (London: John Field for Francis Tyton, September 25, 1650), 11-12.
[183] Commission of the General Assembly, *The Causes of a Publick Fast and Humiliation, To be Kept with All Convenient Diligence: By All the Members of This Kirk & Kingdom of Scosland.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1650); Balfour, iv:102; NLS, Wod.Fol.XXIX.(48).
[184] Commission of the General Assembly, *The Causes of a Publick Fast and Humiliation*, 9.
[185] Ibid, iv:99-100.
[186] Ibid, iv:100.

conveyed that the error is not in their Covenant with God, but in their adherence to it.[187] Joined with this declaration was a list of the causes for having a national day of public humiliation and fasting. The primary causes cited were the 'manifest provocations of the King's house', neglect to purge the King's household, laxness and ignorance among the people, divisions in the army, and the seeking of personal preferment rather than defence of the Covenant.[188] The urgency of dealing with hidden sins, particularly failures in adhering to the covenants, featured as the theme of Patrick Gillespie's fast-day sermon on December 26, 1650 in Glasgow.[189] The Protester minister preached on 2 Kings 23, explaining Scotland suffered specifically for the sins of their King. For Gillespie, the sins of the King laid equally with the Kingdom, because 'the King's sin becomes the Kingdom's sin, in so far as it is not mourned for, and repented of.' Incorporation of kingship in a covenant between God and a nation makes the nation culpable for the personal sins of the monarch. In other words, Scotland had made the same mistake as Israel in pursuing a king.[190]

A second explanation for Scotland's plight laid complete blame for the scourge that had befallen them upon the English. This was the explanation favoured by those who would eventually become Resolutioners. Rather than a sign that God had turned against them, or was correcting them, they labelled the defeat at Dunbar a betrayal by the English, with whom they were supposed to be in covenant. The Commissioners of the General Assembly declared that the great guilt of the English in breaking the Covenant provided ample proof that they were not 'in subordination to Religion.'[191] As a result, the Scottish defeats at Dunbar and Worcester could not be blamed on a failure by the Scots, but rather they were the victims of an English betrayal of the Solemn League and Covenant.

---

[187] Ibid, iv:101-2.
[188] Ibid, iv:102-7; NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX.(3).
[189] Patrick Gillespie, *Rulers Sins the Causes of National Judgments: or, a Sermon Preached at the Fast, upon the 26th Day of December, 1650.* (Glasgow: James and William Duncans, 1718).
[190] 1 Samuel 8.
[191] Andrew Kerr, *A Solemn Warning to all the Members of this Kirk, from the Commission of the Generall Assemblie with an Act for the censuring such as act, or comply with the Sectarian Armies.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651), 5.

The Kirk made several proclamations to prevent compliance with the English now comfortably entrenched on Scottish soil declaring any Scot who assisted, joined or even spoke positively of the conquering army ran the risk of extreme censure or even excommunication.[192] The Commissioners of the General Assembly passed their first act against compliance on November 1, 1650, and distributed it in manuscript form before eventually being published on James Brown's press in Aberdeen. The act required presbyteries to note any persons either complying or corresponding with the 'sectaries' or the 'army of the sectaries' and to report them to the Commissioners.[193] In March 1651 another declaration entitled *A Short Declaration and Warning to the Ministers and Professors of this Kirk* proclaimed:

> The Adversaries roaring making a strange noise in the midst of some Congregations, the Inevitable hazard of our dear brethren, to bee seduced into pernicious Heresies and Errours, by the deceatfull practises and speaches of Sectaries, that are cunning to deceave, & speak lies in hypocrisie; The Innocent blood of our brethren murthered by the Sword of a mercilesse enemie; the sighing of the Prisoners, Inhumanelie and cruelly used by these who keep them captive; The care of preserving our posterity from being sunk in the dark dungeons of Errours...Doe cry so lowd in the ears of all who have ears to hear, and a heart to understand to bee awake and quickened unto the necessarie Duetie of the tyme.[194]

This paper, also produced by the Commissioners, warned the people not to be 'carried about with the wynde of Strange Doctrine' and to recognise the clear opposition to true religion represented by the English upholding that 'impious monster of Toleration'.[195] Moreover it urged continued adherence to the cause of the Covenant, declared that those who did not unite with them scattered God's people, and 'risked themselves under the hazard of the displeasure of GOD and the censures of the Kirk' as well as civil punishment from the state.[196]

However, not everyone in Scotland found the Kirk's explanations convincing. The town clerk of Glasgow, hearing of Scotland's defeat at Dunbar, declared 'our way in that business [the Covenant and Engagement against England] was not what it ought to have been; and after some

---

[192] Ibid, 19.
[193] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXIX.(54).
[194] Commission of the General Assembly, *A short exhortation and warning, to the ministers, and professours of this Kirk.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651), 1.
[195] Ibid, 2, 3.
[196] Ibid, 4, 5.

getting it laid to heart, I was challenged for my implicit engaging therein' and resolved to never again adhere to a course of action based upon the judgment of others.[197] Similarly, Alexander Jaffray began to look at the dispensation of events and Scotland's multiple defeats as signs of a more specific fault than just failure to adhere to the covenants.[198] For him, it was a short step from viewing the defeat at Dunbar as a punishment from God to labelling Scotland's adherence to the Covenant as the cause of this punishment. He extracted the fundamental error of the Solemn League and Covenant as the Kirk's unwarrantable devotion to Presbytery:

> And finding that the maintaining of Presbytery was one, if not the main and chief end proposed, by those that were most honest and single-hearted, in contriving and carrying on the Covenant--(others, as statesmen and politicians, had other ends; but I speak of the godly,)--thus having found that we were so engaged to Presbytery, as the only way of Christ, I was necessarily led on to inquire about the thing itself--if indeed it was truly so. This was the true occasion and rise of my inquiry in these matters; and not, as some have conceived, that I was thereto engaged and insnared by men's persuasions, or other base and corrupt ends.[199]

However, such questioning of the Presbyterian Kirk was not widespread immediately after the defeat at Dunbar. On the whole, support for the Kirk and Covenant remained high even after Worcester, although cracks began to show and the splintering that would occur in 1652 began to become apparent. The Kirk had largely withstood the initial storm of English propaganda and had delayed the potentially disastrous religious ramifications of their defeat at Dunbar.

The religious vigour which underpinned the English soldier's invasion of Scotland was corroborated during their occupation of the country. The English soldiers' attitude towards the Kirk, as Frances Dow explains, was tempered by a 'belief that the church had been largely responsible for promoting the late war against England'.[200] Symbols of both the monarchy and the intolerant Presbytery were legitimate targets for the frustration of the soldiers.[201] During the closing months of 1650 several churches in Edinburgh were damaged or destroyed. Holyrood Palace was set alight and the University of Edinburgh ransacked. In other parts of the country,

---

[197] Maidment (ed.). *Historical Fragments*, 4:10.
[198] Jaffray, 62.
[199] Ibid, 61.
[200] Dow, 102.
[201] Nicoll, 35.

Kirk services were interrupted and stools of repentance, which became a symbol of what the soldiers despised in Presbyterianism, were derided or destroyed.[202] Subsequently the policy of the English towards Scotland reflected their distrust of an overtly powerful Scottish clergy.

What became a greater concern for Scotland's rigid Presbyterians was the settlement of English troops in garrisons throughout Scotland. With a largely non-literate population in rural areas, the parishioners of the Kirk were much more susceptible to verbal persuasion than they had been to the printed tracts produced in 1650. Once English garrisons, many with resident chaplains, had been established in remote areas of the country, two new forms of polemic were put into practice: public preaching and public disputing. For the first time ever, the mass populace of Scotland was exposed to new forms of Protestantism that had never before reached the heart of the countryside. Sectarian teaching was far flung with Baptist churches in Leith, Edinburgh, Ayr, Perth, Cupar, Aberdeen[203] and Inverness,[204] not to mention the high proportion of Independents within the forces. Regiments were migratory and manned garrisons throughout the country. As a result, Englishmen preached in the most remote corners of Scotland. By 1655 even the remote garrison at Inverlochy, established by the arrival of 1000 troops from Ireland in June 1654, had its own chaplain.[205] Isolated parish ministers were forced to minimise the impact of sectarian public preaching in any way possible. At times this meant they had little choice but acquiesce to challenges for public disputes. Thus a new chapter began in the struggle between the Kirk and the English Sectarians for the heart and souls of the Scottish people. So while this chapter has focused on the printed polemic produced by both sides in the earliest stages of the English invasion and occupation, the next chapter will explore how the religious tensions expressed in the printed polemic manifested in other ways as English soldiers settled into garrisons throughout Scotland.

---

[202] Lamont, 53-4.

[203] R.B. Hannen, 'Cupar, Fife, 1652-1659,' *Baptist Quarterly*, 10 (1940-1), 45; J. Scott, 'Baptists in Scotland During the Commonwealth,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 3 (1929), 178; J. Scott, 'Baptist Witness During the Commonwealth', *History of the Baptists in Scotland.* (ed.) G. Yullie (Glasgow: Baptist Union Publications,1926), 28-9.

[204] Hoy, 205.
[205] Laurence, *Parliamentary Army Chaplains*, 71; *S & P*, xx, 380.

Chapter II:

'Go not to Gilgal nor Bethaven!': Presbyterian Resistance to the Polemics of Sectarian Occupation.[1]

It was after that through a Boundless Tolleration, a deludge of Errors had broken in upon England, and the Sectarian Army having Subdued Scotland, and dispersed themselves in all the Parts of it, Corrupt Men and Seducers among Them, did endeavour to pervert the People from the Truth.[2]

–George Meldrum, 1692

Anne Laurence has argued the English made little religious impact on Scotland during the Interregnum for two reasons: first, because Presbyterians were too interested in their own internal divisions to pay much attention to the English sects; second, 'there was no serious missionary activity by the English'.[3] This chapter will argue that in light of contemporary evidence both these assertions are unequivocally false. Instead, it will be contended that Interregnum Scotland was a hotbed of religious discourse in which all parties involved were forced to participate in some degree of missionary activity, if for no other reason than to stave off the attempts of rivals. Moreover, in direct contrast to Laurence's claim, it was the English chaplains and soldiers who most ardently pursued proselytizing activities.

After the Battle of Dunbar the English were no longer just an invading army, they were an occupying force able to pursue their desired objectives. That their objectives had religious implications should not be surprising in view of their initial propaganda. As the first chapter has demonstrated, both Scots' clergy and English sectarians defined the conflict between the nations as both a temporal military clash as well as a struggle for the souls of Scotland's populace. In England during the 1640s and on into the 1650s religious radicals, in opposition to the

---

[1] Robert Wodrow, *Analecta: or Materials for a History of Remarkable Providences; Mostly Relating to Scotch Ministers and Christians.* 4 vols (Glasgow: Maitland Club, 1842-3), iii:93.
[2] Preface to: James Fergusson, *A Brief Refutation of the Errors of Tolleration, Erastianism, Independency and Separation* (Edinburgh: George Mosman, 1692). The text of the work comes from sermons written by Fergusson in 1652 in response to the sectarian presence in Scotland. Meldrum's preface records the state of the country and the need for such sermons.
[3] Laurence, 74.

established clergy, invaded pulpits, preached in the open-air, and baited their opponents into public disputes.[4] With their conquest of Scotland the English radicals who comprised Cromwell's army introduced these practices into Scotland and used them against the Kirk. The sectarian presence in Scotland reaffirmed old fears in the Kirk 'that the gangrene of thair errouris may tak hold upone sum ignorant and unstable myndis' among their parishioners.[5] Although ministers of the Kirk initially rejected the prospect of disputing points of religion publicly, they were eventually compelled to enter into public disputes with English sectarians and to compete for the adherence of their parishioners in what they perceived to be an increasingly open religious contest.

Ann Hughes has done much to explain the importance and role of public disputations in England during the Civil War period. Her work is also of great significance for understanding public religious disputes in Cromwellian Scotland as it provides a clear model for both the motivations behind these events and general profiles of the participants. According to Hughes the importance of public religious disputes did not rest wholly in the rhetorical exchanges over dogmatic positions, but equally in the motives of the participants.[6] She has also established that there were significant differences in the ways in which these disputes were carried out. Hughes divides the participants of oral disputations into two categories: those who were 'orthodox', 'moderate' or 'conservative', and those of a more 'radical' persuasion.[7] Radical disputants tended to be more disruptive and frequently appealed to the audience for support, while their orthodox counterparts methodically adhered to set rules of academic debating. Important to this distinction is Hughes' definition of 'orthodox', especially when discussing a period in which no concrete orthodoxy predominated. 'Orthodox' ministers were defined by Hughes as university educated, well supported in a preaching ministry, traditionally Calvinistic in their

---

[4] Ann Hughes, 'Public Disputations, Pamphlets and Polemic, 1649-60.' *History Today.* 41(February 1991), 27-33; Ann Hughes, 'The Pulpit Guarded: Confrontations between Orthodox and Radicals in Revolutionary England.' *John Bunyan and His England, 1628-88.* (eds) Anne Laurence, W.R. Owens and Stuart Sim (London: Hambledon Press, 1990), 31-50.
[5] Nicoll, 17.
[6] Hughes, 'The Pulpit Guarded', 36.

theology and supporters of a Reformed state church of some kind.[8] Through their university education these orthodox ministers were well trained in the manner and procedure of academic debates, as it was a fundamental part of the English university system. Prospective graduates of Oxford or Cambridge demonstrated their competence by debating predetermined topics, 'the answer to the debate would be agreed upon, because the questions were that of inconfutable points of religion'.[9] Students were challenged to create the best argument for a predetermined truth. Because of the organisation, careful orchestration and strict rules of these debates, they were completely different phenomena to what these ministerial candidates would face in open public disputes with radical opponents.

The radical religious ideas that surfaced in the freedom of the Civil War and Interregnum no longer subscribed to what had previously been held as indisputable dogmatic facts. The 'radical' representatives in England's public disputes of the 1640s and 1650s were described by Thomas Edwards in *Gangraena* precisely for their opposition to 'Orthodox' parish ministers. While the accuracy of his descriptions of radicals and their activities may be dubious, it is interesting to note that many of those Edwards described as taking over pulpits, arguing in the streets and participating in slightly more organised public disputes were soldiers of the Parliamentary army. According to Hughes these soldiers were 'rigid separatists and often also Baptists'.[10] These radical elements within the Parliament's Army were the same individuals who would become missionaries for sectarian religion in Scotland where they introduced both radical new doctrines and revolutionary methods of evangelism. As disputants they not only threw out the accepted framework of dogmatics, but also refused the staunch rules of debate that were central to academicians.[11] This posed a significant problem for parish ministers who felt bound by these rules, because the power of public persuasion was not limited to well-reasoned theological

---

[7] Ibid, 37.
[8] Hughes. 'Public Disputations', 29.
[9] Hughes, 'The Pulpit Guarded', 35.
[10] Hughes, 'Public Disputations', 28-9.
[11] Hughes, 'The Pulpit Guarded', 35.

arguments, especially when the dispute was intended to influence the opinion of the general public, rather than to dialectically determine the truth.

In such a religiously volatile age public religious disputes did not necessarily constitute conflicts between organised ideological groups. Many of the 'radical' disputants were on personal crusades advancing their own ideas. While they may have shared their ideology with a larger circle, their support may not have reached beyond their own Independent gathering. Therefore, while the individuals involved may have unofficially represented greater ideological groups, for example, Independents or Baptists against the established Church of England or Church of Scotland, these encounters often boiled down to a contest between particular disputants. An orthodox participant might want to defend orthodox doctrines solely for the benefit of his own congregation, while the radical might be out to win converts away from the established church in that parish to his or her own particular way of thinking. Religion early in the Interregnum was characterised by small sects which may or may not have had connections to a wider circle of similarly minded gatherings. These groups lacked any concrete organization or hierarchy and were prone to fluidly shift doctrinal positions in the tidal ebb and flow of English Protestantism.

This fluidity in opposition to established orthodoxy fuelled disputation, in which the opponents of orthodoxy often initiated debates. These active seekers of disputes employed anarchic strategies to dominate these sometimes raucous encounters. One tactic that greatly threatened the orthodox disputants was the intervention of 'radicals' planted in the audience, a ruse employed in England by the Baptist minister Thomas Collier. He would appeal to his adherents, who pretended to be unbiased auditors in the crowd, and they would become riled and shout down his opponent.[12] This was a very effective tactic, as it gave the impression the radical disputant was swaying a large portion of the audience. A second aspect of radical disputing was unwillingness to concede to proofs contrary to their position. Since they were free to refuse systematic arguments, they were also free from conceding their positions, even

---

[12] Ibid, 38.

when their opponents clearly laid out logical proofs against them. In England, there is evidence that even well educated 'radicals' would evade difficulties through uncouthly violating the proper etiquette of academic disputation. Hughes relates the shock of Richard Baxter at John Tombes' (a Baptist) inability to adhere to the rules of Logic: 'when he was stuck he "breaks over the hedge, and turns all the dispute into a discourse and goes up and down at pleasure".'[13] Such behaviour eventually led the Presbyterian John Ley to warn his fellow orthodox ministers to avoid these situations by ensuring, first, that rules for the dispute were agreed upon before hand; second, that the opponent was credible and worthy; and third, that the occasion would be edifying to all that attended.[14] However, when radicals provoked disputations, orthodox ministers had a difficult time rejecting them without losing face by appearing afraid or unconfident in the certainty of their position. It was, in fact, orthodox ministers that had most at stake in these public encounters. They faced the prospect of defending orthodox faith in front of their own parishioners, against antagonists of unknown repute who were free from the bounds of order and reason that they themselves were obliged to follow. With so much at risk, why did the orthodox ministers of England enter into these debates in the 1640s and 1650s? According to Hughes, their willingness to engage their sectarian opponents is indicative 'of the fluid marketplace that religion in England had become and of the willingness of orthodox Puritans to compete in it'.[15]

The work of Ann Hughes lays a fascinating foundation of scholarship regarding public disputes in England between 'radicals', who were often soldiers in the Parliamentary Army, held unorthodox religious views and desired independent churches; and 'orthodox' ministers, who were proponents of a state church, an organised system of church government and enforcing strict discipline. While her definitions of 'orthodox' and 'radicals' are broad, they fit perfectly with the situation in Scotland during the 1650s. The Presbyterian clergy of the Kirk (whether

---

[13] Hughes, 'Public Disputations', 30.
[14] John Ley, *A Discourse of Disputations Chiefly concerning matters of religion* (1656), 33-4; Hughes, 'The Pulpit Guarded', 39.
[15] Hughes, 'The Pulpit Guarded', 49.

Protesters or Resolutioners) were strong Calvinists, well-educated and demanded the right of a state church: fitting all the criteria to be labelled with Hughes' definition of 'orthodox'. The English chaplains and soldiers also fit well into the model created by Hughes. Chaplaincy in the army that invaded Scotland was voluntary: chaplains were not conscripted. Therefore, as Anne Laurence has asserted, the men attracted to serve in the chaplaincy for the invasion of Scotland were generally of quite radical leanings.[16] Of thirty-six chaplains she identifies as serving the English regime in Scotland, twenty-three seem to be Independents or Baptists. Of the remaining thirteen, ten are too enigmatic to label, while only one can be concretely labelled as both a Presbyterian and supportive of a state church.[17] The low number of Presbyterians can be explained by the difficulty many moderates and Presbyterians had with invading a Reformed Protestant nation bound to England by the Solemn League and Covenant. For this reason the men drawn to serve in an army invading Scotland were predominantly not Presbyterians, but rather Baptists, Arminians, or Independents.

Hughes' work significantly aids an understanding of what was happening in Scotland during the Cromwellian occupation. It provides insight into the reasons why ministers of the Kirk might have entered into public disputes with their sectarian conquerors, as well as the motives of the English chaplains in pursuing them. According to Hughes, orthodox clergy became involved in disputes with their radical opponents when they felt it necessary to vie for the hearts of their parishioners.[18] That Scottish clergy became involved in public disputes with English Sectarians suggests they were in the same position as their Presbyterian brethren in England. They were being forced to compete for the adherence and devotion of the public. The catalyst for this fear within the Scottish clergy was primarily the drawing power of English preachers and their widespread presence.

---

[16] Laurence, 70-2.
[17] Ibid, 74-5. The Presbyterian, William Goode, preached at Newcastle on the armies march north and served in Scotland at least until May 1651 (Ibid, 129-30).
[18] Hughes. 'The Pulpit Guarded', 49.

A Widespread Sectarian Presence

With Charles II's defeat at Worcester (September 3, 1651) and the subsequent fall of the major population centres of Scotland, Cromwell's forces rapidly gained a stranglehold on most of the country. What they could not conquer, they simply contained. By December 1651 the far north of the country was controlled by the garrison at Inverness, all of the north-east including Aberdeen had been secured, and everything south of the River Tay was firmly under English domination.[19] In order to maintain control over the portions of Scotland they had conquered, as well as to keep the restless Highlanders at bay, the English established garrisons and citadels throughout the country. In September 1650 English soldiers were garrisoned in and around Edinburgh, including Holyrood palace, Canongate and Leith, where in total nearly 5,000 English soldiers resided through the winter.[20] As early as April 1651 'the English had garrisons at Douglas, Evandale Castle (Avondale) in Strathaven, Linlithgow, Kilmarnock and Hamilton.'[21] By the spring of 1652 the construction of citadels had begun at Ayr, Inverness and Perth (St. Johnston).[22] The following year garrisons were posted in Edinburgh, Dundee, Aberdeen, Inchgarvie, Linlithgow, Dumbarton, Stirling, Burntisland, Tantallon Castle, Bass Island, Inchkeith, Ruthven Castle (Badenoch), Braemar, Blair Atholl, Dunkeld, Brodick Castle, Dunstaffnage, Dunnolly, Dunnottar Castle, Duart Castle, Orkney,[23] Peebles,[24] Cupar and Falkland.[25] Construction also began in 1654 of a citadel at remote Inverlochy[26] and garrisons were reported at Inverary[27] and Drummond Castle near Crieff.[28] As the decade progressed, it

---

[19] Dow, 14.
[20] James Maidment (ed.), *Historical Fragments, relative to Scottish Affairs, from 1635 to 1664.* (Edinburgh: Thomas Stevenson, 1833), 30. Taken from a manuscript entitled 'Collections by a private hand being kingly of matters from 1650-1662' in the NLS (Wod.Qu.XXXVII, ff 21-39).
[21] 'Memoirs of James Burn, Baillie of the City of Glasgow', Ibid, 18-19.
[22] *S & P*, xxxiv-liii; Dow, 64, 293n; *S & C*, 110; Thurloe, vi:472.
[23] *S & C*, 116-8.
[24] There were provisions for quartering troops in Peebles from Oct. 1651-Sept. 1659. R. Renwick (ed.), *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Peebles, 1652-1714* (Glasgow: Scottish Burgh Records Society, 1910), 4, 6, 7, 12, 19, 20-1, 33, 37, 45.
[25] Row, *The Life of Mr Robert Blair*, 310. Many of these are also listed in Baillie in July 1654 (Baillie, *L & J*, iii:249-50).
[26] Construction of the citadel at Leith did not begin until 1656.
[27] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:249-50.
[28] James Turner, *Memoirs of His Own Life and Times, 1632-1670.* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1829), 109, 112.

seems more garrisons were established with fewer troops in each location. After the suppression of Glencairn's Rising Monck deemed it valuable to have a wider distribution to observe possible discontent as well as to preserve law and order. Although the historian Malcolm Laing suggested the number of garrisons in Scotland diminished to twenty-eight by 1656, a list of regiments in the Clarke Manuscripts confirms English soldiers were garrisoned or quartered in over sixty different locations throughout the country.[29] The list, reproduced by Davies, is the earliest surviving compilation of regiments and quarters, although additional lists for 1658 and 1659 are also extant.[30] None of these lists, however, should be viewed as being complete since a list of 'minor garrisons' in June 1658 records a dozen additional locations not contained in the main list.[31] For a map of these garrisons see page 5 above, for a list see appendix III.

Due to the nature of the army's composition and its wide distribution, it is likely even the most remote corners of Scotland were exposed to 'sectarian' doctrines and the English message of toleration. Moreover, it is plausible that each of the garrisons and citadels stretching from the southern border north to Shetland, and from Brodick Castle, Inverlochy and Stornoway in the west to Aberdeen and Dunbar in the east could have had gathered meetings. There are, however, insufficient records to compile a complete religious profile for each of the various garrisons. Yet one English report dated January 8, 1651 relays, 'there is a very precious people who seeke the face of God in Sutherland and divers other parts beyond Invernesse, ...the people in those parts will rather leave their owne Ministers and come to private houses where our officers and souldiers meete together'.[32] Another report from Tarbet (Argyll) in the summer further supports the dissemination of English religion to the edges of Scotland: 'Some of the Highlanders have heard our preaching with great attention and groanings, and seeming affection

---

[29] M. Laing, *The History of Scotland from the Union of the Crowns*. (London: Mawman, 1819), iii:490; G. Davies, 'The Quarters of the English Army in Scotland in 1656.' *The Scottish Historical Review* 21(1924), 62-7.
[30] See Appendix III
[31] Clarke MSS 3/11: June 24, 1658; 3/3: f. 55-7.
[32] *S & C*, 31.

to it'.[33] Yet, sectarian interference was not limited to the vicinity of garrisons. In 1653 the synod of Argyll found it necessary to send a minister to investigate reports of lay English sailors performing marriages and baptising children on the island of Jura.[34] The presence of the English was widespread. English ships plied the coastal waters of Scotland and made landfall in remote parts of the country. While Scots living near an English garrison were perhaps more likely to come into direct contact with English ideas, even people living in more remote parts might experience English sectarianism first hand. In some ways Scots in remote areas may have been more susceptible to English notions of sectarian religion, especially in places like Jura where the local parish charge had lain vacant since 1649.[35] Unfortunately, for many of the remote parts of Scotland few records from the Interregnum period have survived.

With the English presence so widely spread throughout Scotland they were in an excellent position to maintain their control over the country, promulgate their ideologies and impose their will. This represented a dangerous time for the Kirk, especially because the English were often successful in befriending, or at least achieving a high level of interaction, with the native populace.[36] For example, in March 1653 the inhabitants of Lewis took up arms with the soldiers garrisoned at Stornoway against the Earl of Seaforth.[37] The full degree of interaction between the English and the locals is not certain, but the regiment was noted to be of a strongly Baptist persuasion. At Inverlochy, Lochiel and Clan Cameron entered into a 'strict league and friendship' with the English that lasted to the Restoration despite the clan's initial slaughter of seventy English troops.[38] Similarly, an account from the minister of Kirkhill dated 1655 reveals a high level of interaction between the garrison and the population of Inverness. According to

---

[33] Ibid, 364; Whitelocke, iii:442.
[34] D.C. MacTavish (ed.), *Minutes of the Synod of Argyll, 1652-1661* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1944), ii:28, 39.
[35] *FES*, iv:70.
[36] Reports abound of Presbyteries and Kirk Sessions moving to discourage their parishioners from drinking with English soldiers, expecially women. There are also numerous cases of fornication between Scotswomen and English soldiers. Other reports are less descriptive: '6th June (1652)—Agnes Innes and four other women to be banisched for offences with English troopers, &c.' (Cramond, *Extracts from the Kirk-Session of Elgin*, 278).
[37] Whitelocke, iv:91.

his report the garrison, which first began constructing its citadel on May 16, 1652, provided a wide range of English luxuries including 'a great long tavern with all manner of wines, viands, beer, ale and cider'. It also meant a large financial boost for Inverness. The fir logs needed for construction of the citadel were purchased from a local laird named Hugh Fraser of 'Struey's woods': the parson witnessed 'that gentleman receive 30,000 merks at once for timber'. A great number of Scots laboured in the building work, lured by the exceptional pay: 'At the digging of the trenches every man got a shilling sterling wages a day, so that all the country people flocked to that work, and hardly could you get one to serve you...Commissary Coup, who advanced the money to masons, carpenters and others, told me that the whole expense amounted to about eighty thousand pounds sterling'. However, the benefits were not merely pecuniary:

> They brought such store of all wares and conveniences to Inverness that English cloth was sold near as cheap here as in England: the pint of claret went for a shilling. They set up an apothecary's shop with a druggist's: Mr. Miller was their chirurgeon, and Dr. Andrew Moore their physician. They not only civilised but enriched the place. It were vain to relate what advantage the country had by this regiment.[39]

This interaction built relationships and provided the ministers and soldiers of the English forces with opportunities to advocate their own beliefs, doctrines, and forms of Christianity. Among the forces garrisoned at Inverness during the decade there is evidence of numerous 'Sectarian' groups, including 'Anabaptists', Independents and Quakers.[40]

A more astonishing link between the English Army and the Scottish populace is alluded to in the Kirk Session records of Ayr. Early in 1653 several unfortunate Scotswomen were called before the session having 'fallen' pregnant to soldiers from the Cromwellian garrison. Among those cited for fathering children were three Scots: William Cockburne 'Scotchman…in Captain Ponson's regiment…borne in Edinburgh', Andrew Woddhill 'a soldier with the Englishmen' possibly from Paisley, and Charles Stewart 'Scotisman…in Capt. Pontson's regiment'.[41] There is

---

[38] *S & C*, xlii-xliii, 149-50, 279.
[39] Carruthers, *Highland Note-book*. (Edinburgh, 1843), 97; *S & P*, xlv-xlvi.
[40] James Fraser, *Chronicles of the Frasers*, (ed.) William MacKay (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1905), 397, 421; *S & P*, 350, 352, 362; Thurloe, vi:136, 167
[41] Ayrshire Archives, CH2/751/3/2, March 7, 1653.

also some evidence to suggest a Scot by the name of 'Glengarrie' served Cromwell's forces in Canisbay (near John O'Groats) sometime between 1652 and 1655.[42] When these soldiers enlisted in the English ranks is uncertain, but their participation would have presumably required some degree of acceptance of the ideological rationale for the invasion. As a result, Scots serving in the Commonwealth Army might be the upshot of early English attempts to foster Commonwealth principles among the people of Scotland. Through propaganda, governance, use of Scottish labour in construction and supply of provisions, and even by enlisting Scots soldiers, significant strides were taken by the English regime to establish friendly relations with the general populace of Scotland. The Kirk certainly recognised the threat posed by the presence of English troops. When the English garrison at Elgin temporarily withdrew from the burgh, Elgin's Kirk Session ordered the ministers to carry out a systematic examination of all the burgh's residents.[43] They started by producing a list containing the name of every resident to ensure no one would be overlooked. Unfortunately for the session, the sluggish production of the list delayed examinations and their plans were eventually scuppered when the soldiers returned a month later.[44]

An Evangelical Occupation

The threat posed by a significant presence of English sectarians spread throughout the country was compounded by a willingness and recognition within the English regime that preaching served both as a weapon for undermining the Kirk and a tool for developing solidarity with the people of Scotland. In the closing months of 1651 an English journal purported it would be beneficial if some Kirk ministers were removed and replaced by some 'able Preachers from England' in order to 'draw the people off the leaven of their Pharisaical and rigid Presbyterian Teachers'.[45] This comment came from William Clarke, the secretary to the English Army in

---

[42] M. Pottinger, 'Cromwellian Soldiers in Cannesbey, 1652 to 1655' *Caithness Field Club Bulletin* 11 (1993), 5-8.
[43] Cramond, *Elgin*, 282.
[44] Ibid, 283.
[45] *S & C*, 339-40; *Mercurius Scoticus*, (Nov. 14, 1651).

Scotland, and reflected the prevalent perception within the English regime that the Kirk fundamentally opposed the basic republican and religiously tolerant principles underpinning the Commonwealth. Clarke later suggested that an honest preaching soldier should replace every parish minister in Scotland.[46] One week after this report four ministers were appointed by the English Council of State to accompany the Parliament's Commissioners for Scotland as chaplains.[47] In March 1652 the Commissioners for Ordering and Managing the affairs of Scotland debated sending 'twelve or more' ministers into Scotland to garrisons and 'other convenient places' and approved the funds later in the month.[48] Accordingly, ten ministers were employed with the funds appointed by the Commissioners for Ordering and Managing the Affairs of Scotland, some of whom ministered to civilian congregations.[49] The propagation of toleration and religious Independency became integral aspects of establishing a lasting settlement in Scotland. These concepts were advocated through the preaching of the English chaplains and ministers serving in Scotland who preached publicly on a regular basis, sometimes to large gatherings where the Scots in attendance 'were much taken with the doctrine'.[50]

Fortunately, two sermons preached in Scotland by English chaplains early in the decade survive in print, one by Nicholas Lockyer and one by John Owen.[51] Both sermons share a common theme thus giving significant insight into the agenda of the English regime. The fact that these sermons were preached in Scotland and subsequently printed in Leith by the English controlled press single them out as exemplary models of what the Commonwealth desired from preachers. Owen's sermon was not particularly shaped by the campaign against Scotland. It is typical of his sermons in England and was, in his own words, intended to 'pour out a savour of the gospel on

---

[46] Dow, 27.
[47] *APS*, vi, ii:746.
[48] *APS*, vi, ii:747; C.S. Terry (ed.), *The Cromwellian Union.* (Edinburgh: SHS, 1902), 99; Nicoll, 91.
[49] Laurence, 72. See Appendix V for a fuller discussion of English ministers sent to Scotland.
[50] Thomas Carlyle (ed.), *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches.* 5 vols (London: Chapman & Hall, 1888), iii:96; Lomas (ed.), i:360, ii:159.
[51] John Owen, *The Branch of the Lord, the Beauty of Sion.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650); Nicholas Lockyer, *A Litle Stone Out of the Mountain. Church-Order Briefly Opened.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).

the sons of peace in Scotland.'[52] The sermon is based on Isaiah 56:7, 'For mine House shall be called an House of Prayer for all People'. He uses this passage as a metaphor for how Christ builds his church, which is the house of God. In particular Owen makes four claims about the Church: first, he speaks not only of the universal church but of individual congregations, e.g. 'every particular Church of his Saints, inasmuch as they partake the nature of the whole';[53] second, as the sole designer and builder of his church 'Christ doth all alone';[54] third, only the elect can be the 'living stones' required for its construction;[55] and fourth, Christ alone is the watchman capable of maintaining his church.[56] These four claims about the church make up part of his intricate and subtle attack against national churches, and therefore Scotland's Presbytery.

His definition of what the church is creates an equally clear picture of what the church is not. It cannot be a national institution that includes the masses, because only the elect can be part of the true church. It cannot be controlled or watched over by humans on a national level, because national rulers are detached from the congregations and so are unable to know who should be admitted and who should not. Equally, according to Owen, those who have historically proclaimed themselves as watchmen over Christ's church 'have watched onely for their own advantage' and have been 'the very worst of dogs'.[57] The sermon clearly sets forth Owen's theology of Independency which supports individual congregations, made up of the elect and gathered by Christ, 'which are usefull Partitions in the great mysticall House' the universal body and church of Christ.[58] Owen's espousal of Independent thinking was consistent with his preaching in England, which is why Cromwell summoned him to Scotland.[59] In other words,

---

[52] Owen, *The Branch of the* Lord, preface dedication to Cromwell; William Orme, *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Religious Connexions of John Owen, D.D.* (London, 1820), 125-6.
[53] Owen, *The Branch of the Lord*, 4.
[54] Ibid, 28.
[55] Ibid, 27.
[56] Ibid, 30.
[57] Ibid, 30.
[58] Ibid, 27.
[59] It appears that Owen was with the army while it marched north, but did not actually enter Scotland until September. According to Wariston, Owen had been unenthusiastic about accompanying

Cromwell felt Owen's ideologies and message had a fundamental place in the English plan for Scotland. The centrality of Independency in the campaign against Scotland may also explain why so many New Englanders (both chaplains and soldiers) who had returned to Britain during the Civil Wars took part in the war against Scotland; moreover it may be why the Council of State sent Samuel Mather, eldest son of Richard Mather and brother of Increase, to Leith where he resided from 1652 until 1654.[60] Although Owen left Scotland in October 1651, his sermons continued to be fundamental to the Commonwealth's agenda. Just a few months after his departure, Robert Lilburne wrote to Cromwell appealing for more able ministers to preach publicly and some of Owen's printed sermons for distribution.[61] Lilburne's request may have been the motivation for Owen's sermon *The advantage of the Kingdom of Christ* being printed by the English run Evan Tyler print house in Leith the following year.[62]

Nicholas Lockyer's *A Litle Stone out of the Mountain* is the only other surviving English sermon. Although equally tailored to the purpose of the occupying sectarians, Lockyer's approach was far less subtle than Owen's. While Owen's sermon is pro-Independent, Lockyer's sermon is openly anti-Kirk. Preached sometime in 1651, he elaborated and published it in Leith in 1652 at the behest of his superiors. The epistle dedicatory, signed by Joseph Caryl, John Oxenbridge[63] and Cuthbert Sydenham,[64] the chaplains to the Commissioners for the Affairs of Scotland, serves to further affirm the message of the sermon fit well into the regime's policy. *A Litle Stone out of the Mountain* attacks what Lockyer claims to be the inherently corrupt nature of national

---

Cromwell into Scotland, but did accompany the army to Berwick. (Wariston, ii:16). Perhaps when the army crossed into Scotland on July 22 he stayed in Berwick or returned to Newcastle where he had connections, or perhaps, as Toon suggests, Owen returned to London to continue his duties as preacher to the Council of State (P. Toon, *God's Statesman*, 45). In any case, in September Cromwell summoned him to Scotland (Whitelock, iii:471).

[60] *ODNB* 'Mather, Samuel'; *CSPD*, 1651-2: 610.

[61] John Milton, *The Original Letters and Papers of State, Addressed to Oliver* Cromwell (ed.) J. Nickolls, (1743), 48; Laurence, 71-2.

[62] John Owen, *The Advantage of the Kingdome of Christ, in the Shaking of the Kingdoms of the World.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).

[63] John Oxenbrige served as a Lecturer in Berwick-upon-Tweed from 1648 (Nuttall, *Visible Saints*, 31), so it is likely his previous exposure to Scots made him a desirable candidate for this position.

[64] Sydenham had been lecturer at St. Nicholas's, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Several individuals from St. Nicholas's made forays into Scotland during the Interregnum including Samuel Hammond and William Durant. Durant preached in St. Giles' on September 29, 1650 (*S & C*, 43).

churches, which include the sinful masses, and declares that the Presbyterian Kirk was beyond hope of regeneration. Although some Presbyterians suggested stringent purging of congregations, similar to the purges that which took place within the army before Dunbar, would restore the Kirk, Lockyer flatly rejects any possibility that a national church can be purged: 'how impossible it is, that the far lesser number (retaining their present constitution) should regularly cast out the greater part there from'.[65] He also asserts that external authority over a congregation, such as bishops or presbytery, is an invention of mankind.[66] For Lockyer the only authority over a congregation is Christ and the elders of that particular congregation. In reference to the condition of the Kirk, he writes: 'All that I have heavy upon my heart, respecting both the one and the other, is, that as to Church order, they are in an ill vessell, which cannot possibly live, in such stormes as now beat upon it, from Heaven and from the Saints, and therefore I could wish that all the godly were out on't'.[67] In Lockyer's estimation, the only way forward for the church in Scotland would be through gathering individual congregations of devout Christians out of the ailing national church: like the gathering of the first churches out of synagogues (Gal. 1:22).[68] Once again, this represented the promotion of Independency and the toleration of gathered churches, which is what the Commonwealth believed was necessary before a union between the two nations could be facilitated.

While both these works intended to undermine the Kirk by arguing national churches are abhorrent or unscriptural, the only specific doctrine propounded was a Congregationalist ecclesiology. While they were anti-Presbyterian by opposing external power over congregations, their content was not Baptist, Arminian or Libertarian in nature. They stopped short of supporting any particular sects other than Independency in its broadest context. Instead they limited their scope to the 'corrupt nature' of state churches and the purity of independently gathered congregations of the elect. The publication of these sermons coupled with the

---

[65] Lockyer, *A Litle Stone out of the Mountain*, epistle dedicatory 5-6.
[66] Ibid, 62-3.
[67] Ibid, t.r. 3-4.
[68] Ibid, 46-47.

government's appointment of men like John Owen, Nicholas Lockyer, Cuthbert Sydenham, John Oxenbridge and Joseph Caryl as chaplains to the Council, and Samuel Mather's appointment to Leith, suggest the regime supported the promulgation of Independency and toleration but not necessarily particular doctrines beyond these of an ecclesiological nature.[69]

While it caused the Commissioners of the Kirk great distress that anti-Presbyterian sermons were being preached by English divines like Owen and Lockyer, it caused even greater anxiety that Cromwell allowed men who were not ordained to preach publicly. It was the soldiers within the regiments that harboured the more radical doctrines. From the time Cromwell arrived in Edinburgh in early September 1650 he made it clear that his soldiers would be not only permitted, but encouraged to preach. This became apparent in a collection of famous letters exchanged from September 9 to 12 between Cromwell and Walter Dundas, governor of Edinburgh Castle, representing the ministers of the Kirk who took refuge in Edinburgh Castle after the defeat at Dunbar.[70] When the English Army arrived in the capital Cromwell invited the ministers of the city to withdraw from the castle and to return to their pulpits. Although he offered them free liberty to preach they refused citing lack of assurance for their safety. According to the clergymen, they had heard reports of Cromwell's troops persecuting, and evening martyring, ministers in England, Ireland and also in the Borders of Scotland.[71] Cromwell adamantly denied any ministers had ever suffered at the hands of his soldiers, and counter-charged the Scots ministers of being more concerned with their own wellbeing than with the service of their 'Master'.[72]

---

[69] Caryl, for instance, was a moderate Independent, advocating 'liberal treatment of tender consciences'. He supported the Solemn League and Covenant in 1643 and later supported the Scotsman John Dury's promotion of accommodation between Presbyterians and Independents in 1647. (*ODNB*, 'Caryl, Joseph').

[70] Oliver Cromwell, *Several Letters and Passages Between His Excellency, the Lord General Cromwel and the Governor of Edinburgh Castle, and the Ministers There, Since His Excellencies Entrance Into Edinburgh.* (London: Printed by John Field, 1650).

[71] Ibid, 4.

[72] Ibid, 4.

The letters then turned to the role of the minister and the right to preach. In response to Scots' accusations that the Commonwealth silenced ministers in England, Cromwell declared English ministers 'have liberty to preach the Gospel, though not to Rail, nor under pretence thereof to over top the Civil Power, or debase it as they please'.[73] In this way he made a distinction between the spiritual preaching of the Gospel and the use of the pulpit as a political soapbox. However, as the sermons of Owen and Lockyer show, religious preaching could serve a political purpose. He continued 'No man [ordained or layman] hath been troubled in England or Ireland for preaching the Gospel.'[74] This was the thing that truly worried the General Assembly and the rigid Presbyterians of Scotland, for they disagreed with their English counterparts with regards to what constituted 'Gospel' preaching. The Scots would have preferred to err on the side of stringency in matters of preaching discipline rather than to open the pulpits to anyone who felt they had something to say. The ministers accused Cromwell, because of his allowance of laymen to preach in Edinburgh's pulpits, with opening their pulpits 'that men of meer Civil place and employment, should usurp the calling and employment of the Ministry, to the scandal of the Reformed Kirks'.[75] In response Cromwell's struck against the notion of an elevated clergy, branding ministers as 'helpers' rather than 'Lords over the faith of Gods people':[76] Retorting to the ministers' criticism of soldiers preaching in their vacated pulpits, Cromwell famously replied:

> Are you troubled that Christ is preached? Is preaching so inclusive in your function? Doth it scandalize the Reformed Kirks, and Scotland in particular? Is it against the Covenant? Away with the Covenant, if this be so, I thought the Covenant and these could have been willing that any should speak good of the name of Christ; if not, it is no Covenant of God's approving, nor the Kirks you mention, in so much the Spouse of Christ. Where do you finde in the Scripture a ground to warrant such an assertion, That preaching is included in your function though an approbation from men hath order in it, and may do well, yet he that hath not a better warrant then that, hath none at all. I hope he that ascended up on high, may give his gifts to whom he please.... indeed you erre through the mistake of the Scriptures: approbation is an act of conveniency in respect of order, not of necessity to give faculty to preach the Gospel, Your pretended fear lest error should step in, is like the man that would keep all the wine out of the country, lest men

---

[73] Ibid, 4-5.
[74] Ibid, 4-5.
[75] Ibid., 7.
[76] Ibid, 8.

> should be drunk. It will be found an unjust and unwise jealousie, to deny a man the liberty he hath by nature, upon a supposition he may abuse it, when he doth abuse it, judge.[77]

The position of Cromwell terrified the Commissioners of the Kirk. While it was undesirable to have English ministers and chaplains preach, at least they were ordained and finite in number. Allowing the soldiers to preach, however, meant not only were men who possessed 'heretical' beliefs over running the country, but they were allowed to preach their heresy at leisure.

The widespread distribution of the English and their close proximity to the people made the penchant of the English soldiers to preach a primary threat to the established religion of Scotland. That the English troopers would preach publicly was unavoidable. Many of the soldiers were keen preachers and preached whenever the opportunity arose.[78] James Nayler, for instance, began to preach to a crowd so soon after the Battle of Dunbar that the smoke was probably still heavy in the air.[79] Nayler is a particularly important example of the English soldiers' propensity for preaching. While some scholars have incorrectly identified him as a chaplain to Cromwell's forces,[80] he was actually not even a minister. When Nayler preached along the roadside after the Battle of Dunbar he was a quartermaster in Lambert's regiment of horse,[81] a layman with Independent leanings and not yet convinced as a Quaker. Other examples of English laymen preaching publicly are easily found. According to eighteenth-century ecclesiastical historian Matthew Craufurd, many of Cromwell's officers and soldiers did regularly 'preach and distill their errors to the people'.[82] There are accounts they preached regularly in Aberdeen and Edinburgh, and also in various parts of Fife and Stirling, where Scots

---

[77] Ibid, 10-11.
[78] G.L.S. Thompson singled out the Independents John Owen and Joseph Caryl as having a particular penchant for preaching to both English soldiers and Scots. G.L.S. Thompson, 'The Origins of Congregationalism in Scotland.' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1932), 62.
[79] James Gough, *Memoirs of the Life, Religious Experience, and Labours in the Gospel of James Gough.*, 3 vols. (Lindfield, 1832), iii:51-2; Hoy, 180; M.R. Brailsford, *A Quaker from Cromwell's Army: James Nayler.* (London: Swarthmore Press, 1927), 32-3; Burnet, *Quakerism*, 16.
[80] Hoy, 180.
[81] *RHCA*, 258n; Brailsford, *A Quaker from Cromwell's Army*, 34.
[82] Matthew Craufurd, *M. S. History of the Church of Scotland from the Earliest Dawning of the light of the Gospell after the Apostles Time to the Year 1688*, MSS CRA 1, New College, ii:422.

contemporaries described them as being 'gifted men' who 'preached as they were moved'.[83] James Burns, the bailieof Glasgow, recorded both English ministers and officers 'preached daily' in the city in 1651.[84] In Edinburgh, General Lambert preached frequently at both the 'East Kirk'[85] and the West Kirk (St. Cuthbert's),[86] while Cromwell preached in both St. Giles' and the Tron Kirk.[87] According to Bulstrode Whitelocke while the Kirk's ministers remained in hiding in Edinburgh Castle in October, preaching continued in St. Giles': 'the general and his officers met at the great church in Edinburgh on the Lord's-day, where many Scots were, and expressed much affection to the doctrine preached.'[88] And even more boldly, 'divers of the Scots come to hear the ministers of the army, and seem to be much converted by them, and offer to be employed by the general'.[89] According to Nicoll, General Lambert 'urged' Edinburgh's city council to appropriate to him the East Kirk of the city 'for his exercise at sermound'.[90] The church, which Nicoll described as both 'speciall... the best in the toun'[91] and as 'the new kirk'[92], was the eastern portion of St. Giles' which had been separated from the Old Kirk sometime between 1639 and 1642.[93] By December 1651 the city council gave Lambert control of the church and it became a place where English ministers and soldiers, both officers and troops,

---

[83] Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, 38-9; Nicoll, 68-9; Robert Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii:94; R.B. Hannen, 'Cupar, Fife, 1652-1659,' *Baptist Quarterly*, 10 (1940-1), 45.
[84] Maidment (ed.), *Historical Fragments*, 19.
[85] Nicoll, 69.
[86] W. Stephen, *History of the Scottish Church.* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1896), 317-8n.
[87] Butler, 18-20.
[88] Whitelocke, iii:248.
[89] Ibid, iii:249.
[90] Nicoll, 68. The reason that Lambert was able to gain access to the East Kirk through the city council was because in 1566 Mary Queen of Scots gave control of all of the burgh's churches over to the Magistrates of the city in order for them to encourage the populace in their morality. National Register of Archives (Scotland), 'City Churches, Edinburgh' (Edinburgh: National Archives of Scotland, 1999), 1.
[91] Nicoll, 68.
[92] Ibid, 170.
[93] The 'New Kirk', 'Little Kirk', 'East Kirk' or 'Robert Bruce's Kirk' was first partitioned off from the rest of St. Giles' in 1578. In 1600, after a request from Robert Bruce that the chapel was too small, it was enlarged. In 1634 the wall was taken down, reunifying the St. Giles', before the wall was re-erected in between 1639 and 1642. At this point the two churches inside St Giles' were called the 'East' or 'New Kirk' and the 'Great' or 'Old Kirk'. See: J.C. Lees, *St Giles', Edinburgh: Church, College, and Cathedral* (Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers, 1889), 199-206, 228; A. I. Dunlop, *The Kirks of Edinburgh 1560-1984*, Vols 15 & 16 (Edinburgh: Scottish Record Society, 1988), 44.

preached regularly.[94] This prompted the Protesters to complain to Cromwell in a letter written the following month 'it is not usual for officers and souldiers to stepp into pulpits and to speake there what they list'.[95] The Commissioners of the General Assembly responded to this widespread broaching of sectarian doctrine in January 1651 by urging the people of Edinburgh (who had been under the control of the English since early September 1650) to avoid sectarians: 'we earnestly exhort yow... above all, that yow beware to joyne with them (the sectaries) in any publict worship or any private exercise of religion. Who ever will venture to toutch pitch may be defyled before they be awaire.'[96] This penchant for preaching should not be limited to early enthusiastic days of the occupation. Nicoll reported several English soldiers taught openly in the public places of Edinburgh in May 1652.[97] Neither should the phenomenon be viewed simply as an activity occurring in Scotland's burghs. The Kirk Session records of Alyth recorded an English trooper commandeered the pulpit of their kirk in March 1652.[98] In Elgin the English did not prevent the local minister from preaching, but following the minister's sermon on December 16, 1651, Colonel Thomas Fitch entered the pulpit and offered his own sermon.[99] It was a shrewd move by Fitch; by waiting for the minister to complete his sermon Fitch probably ensured a good attendance for his own sermon.

The threat of sectarian preaching was further magnified early in 1652 by the imposition of religious toleration in February.[100] *A Declaration of the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England, concerning the Settlement of Scotland* laid out the terms under which a Tender of Union would be established. Although approved by Parliament on October 28, 1651, they kept plans of how they intended to settle affairs in Scotland a closely guarded secret until January 31, 1652 when details were released by the Commissioners for Scotland. In matters of religion, Parliament vaguely declared:

---

[94] Nicoll, 68-69.
[95] *RCME*, i:3.
[96] *RCGA*, iii:241.
[97] Nicoll, 94.
[98] James Meikle, *The History of Alyth Parish Church* (Edinburgh, 1933), 91; Henderson, 'Early', 269.
[99] Cramond, *Elgin*, 280.

> As to what concerns the advancement of the glory of God, that their [Parliament and their Commissioners in Scotland] constant endeavours shall be, to promote the Preaching of the Gospel there, and to advance the power of true Religion and Holinesse, and that God may be served and worshipped according to his mind revealed in his Word, with protection, and all due countenance and encouragement therein to the people of that Nation, from those in authority under the Parliament.[101]

This represented, what Parliament perceived to be, a fundamental step in the process of uniting Scotland into a single Commonwealth with England. How this vague declaration would be put into practice depended on the Parliament's Commissioners in Scotland. The Commissioners, unbeknownst to the people of Scotland, had been sent with instructions to promote the preaching of the Gospel in Scotland, but to provide financial support only for ministers known to be pious and well affected to the Commonwealth.[102] On February 11, 1652 the Commissioners for the managing of affairs of Scotland produced an 'Explanation' intended to clarify, among other things, the regime's position on religious toleration.[103] It explained that:

> care shall be taken for removing of scandalous persons, who have intruded into the work of the Ministry, and placing of others fitly qualified with gifts, for the instructing of the people in their stead. And that such Ministers whose consciences oblige them to wait upon God in the administration of spiritual Ordinances, according to the order of the Scottish Churches, with any that shall voluntarily joyn in the practice therof, shal receive protection and encouragement from all in Authority, in their peaceable and in-offensive exercise of the same'.[104]

This in itself would have been undesirable to the Presbyterians of Scotland since they rejected temporal governments have any rights to remove or to plant ministers, but the explanation continued extending the same protection to those 'who not being satisfied in conscience to use that Form [Presbyterianism], shal serve and worship God in other Gospel way, and behave themselves peaceably and in-offensively therein'.[105] Toleration was imposed and the Kirk's domination of Scottish religion broken by the Commissioners' interpretation of the act.

---

[100] *APS*, VI,ii:809-10; NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX.(20); Nicoll, 81.
[101] Ibid, VI,ii:809-10.
[102] 'Instructions to the Commissioners sent to Scotland' dated December 4, 1651 (*S & P*, 394).
[103] While a Scottish copy of these documents does not exist in printed form, the two documents were republished in London on April 12, 1652. England and Wales. Parliament. *Two declarations of the Parliament of the commonwealth of England concerning Scotland*. (London: John Field, 1652).
[104] *APS*, VI,II:809; NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX.(21); Nicoll, 83-4; Whitelocke, iii:393.
[105] Ibid, VI,ii:809.

The commissioners extended civil protection to anyone, explains Frances Dow, 'who could prove himself to be worshipping God in a "Gospel Way"—a vague term which implied a serious threat to the monopoly of the Church of Scotland'.[106] The Kirk already knew what wide-ranging forms of religion were encapsulated in a mid-seventeenth century English definition of 'Gospel Way' through the debates of the Westminster Assembly, where the Kirk's representatives had stringently opposed Independency, nonconformity and toleration. Parliament's declaration introduced a degree of religious liberty previously unknown in Scotland.[107] Alexander Brodie of Brodie amply summarised the trepidation felt by Scottish Presbyterians when he wrote in his diary: 'I conceive the word Gospel-way may include all, and be extended to all, if the magistrate so please, for he makes himself judge'.[108] Within months of the completed conquest of Scotland, the Presbyterian Kirk faced what they perceived to be the grave consequences of an imposed religious toleration in Scotland. The ministry adamantly preached against the declaration, decreeing it to be opposed to the covenants and warning of judgement against those who supported it.[109] It was, as the biographer of Samuel Rutherford put it, 'as unwelcome to a portion of the Presbyterians, and as much an object of reprobation and censure, as persecution itself would have been'.[110]

Despite the imposition of toleration the Kirk attempted to enforce censures upon those who fraternised too closely with sectarians. However, even before the official introduction of toleration the English Army had pursued a policy of inhibiting the censures of the Kirk, as is demonstrated in the case of Sir Alexander Irving of Drum. In December 1651 the Presbytery of Aberdeen summoned Irving to appear for asserting 'no Sectary is so much to be abhorred as a Presbyterian'; publicly declaring after the fall of the Monarchy 'let the Devil take Presbytery, and

---

[106] Dow, 38.
[107] R.B. Knox, 'A Scottish Chapter in the History of Toleration.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 41 (1988), 49-74.
[108] Brodie, 19.
[109] Nicoll , 85; *Mercurius Politicus*, (February 26-March 4, 1652), 1452 [E655(23)].
[110] Thomas Murray, *The Life of Samuel Rutherford.* (Edinburgh: William Oliphant, 1828), 290.

the Covenant, it came from hell, let it go back to it again'; and tending towards Popery.[111] Irving's response resounded as a shattering blow to the authority of the Kirk. Notwithstanding a complete denial of any leanings towards popery, he refused to appear before a Presbyterian inquisition. Irving appealed to two English proclamations produced in previous months. The first was a proclamation against the imposition of oaths produced by General Monck in October 1651,[112] which Irving claimed was directed specifically to all 'Ministers and other Kirk Officers'. The second (no longer extant) 'Warrant' dated December 2 prohibited civil magistrates to 'seize upon, meddle with, or any ways molest the persons or estates of any excommunicated person, or any ways to discharge any other persons whatsoever; to desist from dealing or trading with the said excommunicated persons, without order from the commonwealth of England or their commissioners'.[113] These declarations essentially removed all temporal sting from the Kirk's censures and provided anyone in Scotland who opposed Presbyterianism a reason to cleave to the new conquering government. Irving subsequently petitioned Colonel Overton, the commander of the English forces in Aberdeen, to mediate the situation and challenged John Row (the moderator) and rest of the Presbytery of Aberdeen to appear before Overton at his lodgings in Aberdeen on the day they had appointed to try him. His brazen riposte to the Presbytery included a warning that if they proceeded any further against him they would, by the previous proclamations of General Monck, be presumed to be enemies of the Commonwealth.

Irving praised General Monck for his 'pious enclination towards those that are the highly oppressed in their consciences'. He implored Monck to intervene against the 'animocity of our church judicature' asserting, rather obsequiously, he could not in good conscience submit to the Presbytery of Aberdeen, because it was not sanctioned by the Commonwealth of England, and

---

[111] *S & C*, 348; *Several Proceedings in Parliament*, January 22-29, 1652. There is also a brief account of the proceedings of these events in *Whitelocke*, iii:385, 398-403.
[112] The proclamation stated if anyone forced another to take an oath without prior command from the Commonwealth, both the tenderer and the subscriber would be viewed by the Commonwealth as enemies (*S & C*, 328; *Several Proceedings in Parliament*, Oct. 16-23, 1651).
[113] Whitelocke, iii:385; *S & C*, 350.

it was the Commonwealth that he now looked to for protection 'from the fury of a superstitious clergy'.[114] In response to Row, Irving taunted the Presbytery by branding them a court in opposition to the interest of the Commonwealth 'which by the Providence of God is now our Soveraign Lords and Masters'.[115] He jeered them by asking he be pardoned from 'any such businesse of a Presbyterian Judicatory' until such time as the Commonwealth order him to do so.[116] Turning from mocking jibes to a more aggressive critique, he battered the 'Hierarchical hedge' of the Presbytery for doing more to stifle God's Vineyard than to keep out the wild boars of the Antichrist, suggesting their time would be better spent preaching the Word of God to all nations rather than oppressing the people through their ambitious desires of 'unwarrantable obedience'.[117] The sentence of excommunication was carried out on January 26, 1652,[118] but Irving protested that it carried no weight with either God or man since it came from men rather than the God's 'church'.[119] According to Irving, the Presbytery of Aberdeen was:

> mor full of fyery zeall, to advance thair awn ambitious and wordlie interests than the gospell of Jesus Christ...urging me this twelve moneth bygone with threatening of excommunication, and of temporall losses, to swear and subscryue thair solemn league and covenant, as gif it had been a matter of saluatione for me to sweare to establische by armes Presbiteriane governament in England.[120]

Interestingly, the moderator of the Presbytery of Aberdeen who pushed so hard for Irving to come back into the fold was one of the men who just four months later would vent similar concerns over the motives of Scotland's Covenant and Presbyterianism and declare their own separation from the Kirk. Alexander Irving's audacious refusal to comply with the wishes of the

---

[114] Ibid, 352-3. Another letter was written by Drum on January 20, 1652, claiming that his appeal to Overton was in imitation of St. Paul and further complaining that the Kirk of Scotland attempted to wield power unknown even to the Presbyterians of England (Whitelocke, iii:398-403).
[115] *S & C.*, 353.
[116] Ibid, 353.
[117] Ibid, 353.
[118] According to the Kirk Session records, Drum's excommunication was professed from both pulpits in the Burgh of Aberdeen on January 26, 1652 (Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 117). Whitelocke notes his excommunication on January 24, 1652 (Whitelocke, iii:386).
[119] 'Protestation by Sir Alexander Irving of Drum Against the Presbytery of Aberdeen. 1652,' *The Miscellany of the Spalding Club III* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1846), 205-7. No date is given for this work, but it must have been written later in the summer of 1652 after the censure of Row and others in Aberdeen for sectarian sympathies, because Irving makes mention that the members of the Aberdeen Presbytery who excommunicated him were themselves now separated from the Kirk (Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 219-220; Row, *Life of Blair*, 297). See chapter 4 below.
[120] Ibid, 205-6.

Presbytery of Aberdeen and his appeal to the English regime for protection set a precedent essentially establishing tolerance, or at least preventing persecution, before any official legislation from the English Parliament did so. *Mercurius Politicus* praised Irving's refusal to bow to the Presbyterians and claimed his protection by the English caused the Kirk to look upon Monck and Overton as 'great Antagonists'.[121] These events in Aberdeenshire foreshadowed the Commonwealth's changing method of dealing with the Kirk and provided an indication of how the English intended to settle affairs in Scotland. The imposition of toleration in February 1652 reiterated this policy of supporting individuals willing to stand against the Kirk.

In addition to diminishing the effect of Kirk censures under the umbrella of toleration, the regime also established means for dealing with Scots ministers unwilling to comply with the new order of ecclesiastical affairs. On June 4 the Commissioners for Visiting and Regulating Universities declared they would remove and replace ministers who were found to be scandalous in their lives or conversation.[122] This legislation forced Kirk ministers to adhere to the rules set forth by the new English regime or risk losing their stipends. Protesters labelled this an incursion upon the 'liberties and privileges of the Church of Christ' and heralded any intervention by secular authorities into the planting or deposing of ministers to be 'contrarie to the discipline and government of this church and the civile lawes of the land', which until Scots Law be overturned was still the law of the land.[123]

Public Disputes

A dilemma began to unfold for Scots ministers whose parishioners attended the English sermons on a regular basis. With religious toleration imposed they could do little to oppose the sectarians other than attempt to discredit their theology, especially since church censures would only drive the parishioners in question into the open arms of the English. When the English arrived they had attempted to dispute with the Scots publicly. However, this was rejected.

---

[121] *Mercurius Politicus*, January 22-29, 1652; *S & C*, 355.
[122] Dow, 58; Whitelocke, iii:429, 430.

Public disputing over religious truths was a foreign and undesired practice in Scotland. Yet with little other opportunity to confute their opponents and with the momentum of sectarian preaching swelling, individual ministers, and perhaps presbyteries, were eventually forced into the realisation that the choice to debate had to be seized in order to protect their congregations. There is some evidence to support that presbyteries or synods may have sanctioned the participation of Scots ministers in these occasions. At a dispute between James Wood and the English chaplain James Brown, in which the Englishman exasperated his opponent by his evasion of arguments, Brown asked if there were any other individuals present who would continue the dispute. Andrew Hinniman (Honyman),[124] a minister from St. Andrews, stood up and replied that there were many in Scotland who as God's servants would be willing to defend the truth, but they would not do so without a public calling from the Kirk.[125] While this seems to suggest that in some cases participants defending the Presbyterian position acted under the direction of presbyteries or synods, this was not entirely the case as other ministers took part wholly of their own volition.[126] Just as Hughes suggests that in England the reason for orthodox clergy participating in public religious disputes was the developing religious 'open market', in Scotland the weakening of church censures through toleration and the persistent preaching of English sectarians forced some Scottish ministers, likewise, to engage in disputation for the preservation of their parishioners.

Like their 'orthodox' counterparts in England, the Scots clergy were well rehearsed in academic public debate. According to G. D. Henderson, disputing formed an important part of the educational process in Scottish Universities 'for it tended to develop orderly thinking, logical accuracy, quick judgement, clear expression, fluent utterance, clever criticism, ingenious

---

[123] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX(28), f. 107; Whitelocke, iii:431-2.
[124] *FES*, i:200, 233, 238, 474.
[125] Lamont, 58-9.
[126] James Guthrie gave no indication that he was instructed to dispute with Brown. He appears to have made his own decision to dispute with his antagonist. NLS, Wod.Qu.XVII, ff 194-249; EUL, MSS La.III.368.

argument,' however it also 'tended seriously to pedantry and to the merely academic.'[127] At the University of St. Andrews disputations were held regularly throughout courses in the 1640s to ensure students were commanding the information being taught.[128] In Glasgow, education at the University continued to be conducted in a strongly medieval tradition in which 'the old system of examinations prevailed', but 'the instruction was carried on largely by disputes'.[129] A. Bower explains in his *History of the University of Edinburgh* that it was 'customary' from the establishment of the university in 1583 to hold public disputes between students on the day before the graduation ceremonies.[130] Thus graduates of Scottish Universities were equally familiar with the procedure and experience of academic debating as their English counterparts.

While the Scots clergy were capable disputants, it was not the usual practice in Scotland to hold public disputes between two individuals to decide important issues of religion, and especially not in front of the general public. Since the Reformation important issues of religion were worked out through being openly debated within the hierarchical structure of Presbyterianism: in the presbyteries, synods and General Assemblies.[131] Even under Episcopacy during the first third of the seventeenth-century when controversial questions were discussed by those in prominent places, it occurred behind closed doors rather than as a public dispute in front of the general public.[132] While public disputes were common in England, in Scotland a drastically different social situation made them an unusual and somewhat impractical notion. In England during the 1640s and 1650s an atmosphere of political tension and a widespread desire for radical change

---

[127] G.D. Henderson, *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland.* (Cambridge: University Press, 1937), 121.
[128] R.G. Cant, *The University of St Andrews: A Short History.* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1946), 69.
[129] J.D. Mackie, *The University of Glasgow, 1451-1951.* (Glasgow: Jackson, Son & Co., 1954), 102.
[130] A. Bower, *The History of the University of Edinburgh.* (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Waugh and Innes, 1817), i:247.
[131] Robert Leighton 'blamed the disputations for the sects and factions in the Church [Protesters and Resolutioners]. Education, he felt, had been arranged "as if disputing was the end of learning, as fighting is the design of going to war; hence the youth, when they enter the school, begin disputing, which never ends but with their life".' Henderson, *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland*, 122; Robert Leighton, *Works*, ii:635.
[132] See 'Samuel Rutherford and Thomas Sydserff, bishop of Galloway, "Ane discussing of some arguments against cannons and ceremonies in God's worship",' in David G. Mullan's *Religious*

in both the structures of religion and government existed, which had been wrought through civil war and religious upheaval. So public disputes represented a good way to kindle popular support in bustling urban England. Scotland, however, was not an urban nation like England and people were far less interested in drastic political or religious change. In the words of H.R. Trevor-Roper, 'England and Scotland were poles apart'.[133] England was wealthy, Scotland was poor, England was under going great changes, Scotland had already had its great 'religious revolution'.[134] This is not to say there were no Scots moved by the Commonwealth's pleas for political and religious change; however such desires were not widespread and remained unpronounced before the arrival of the English army. Yet there existed among the English a widespread belief that many Scots wanted to see change in political and religious structures.[135] Although a misinterpretation of the situation, this provided soldiers desiring public disputes with Scottish clergy the excuse they needed to pursue possible opponents.

As a result, public disputes became part of the fabric of Scotland's life during the Interregnum. Several reports of disputations have survived. The clergy of Glasgow, along with James Guthrie and Hugh Binning, held a private dispute with Cromwell and his chaplains in April 1651.[136] Wariston, the leading lay member of the Protester party, had two disputes with English ministers, the first with Thomas Smallwood and William Good over the legality of the invasion of Scotland in May 1651 and the second with Good over the Covenant in June.[137] There were numerous public disputes between the Scottish clergy and the Quakers, including George Fox.[138] While some names can be given other disputants cannot be identified, yet contemporary

---

Controversy in Scotland 1625-1639. SHS, Fifth Series, Vol. 11. (Edinburgh: SHS, 1998), 14-15, 82-99.

[133] H.R. Trevor-Roper, 'Scotland and the Puritan Revolution,' *Religion, the Reformation and Social Change* (London,1967), 395.

[134] Ibid, 396.

[135] Dow, 26.

[136] Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii:98; Matthew Craufurd, *M. S. History of the Church of Scotland...*, MSS CRA 1, New College, ii:420; John Howie, *The Scots Worthies: Their Lives and Testimonies*, 367; Balfour, iv:298; Baillie, *L & J*, iii:165-6, 168; General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, *Lives of Alexander Henderson and James Guthrie*, 153-4; Maidment (ed.), *Historical Fragments*, 5:34.

[137] Wariston, ii:49, 71.

[138] Nickalls, *Fox*, 316.

sources attest disputes occurred frequently. One English newspaper reported rather optimistically: 'the great and vehement disputes, causeth many of the presbyterian party to tremble, and many hundreds fall off from the old tyrannical way, and with great alacrity embrace the new light of freedom.'[139] While another stated: 'There hath been of late some disputations between some Ministers of Regiments and some of the Scotch Ministers, which may end to the discoverie of truth.'[140] And also:

> There are many vehement and great disputes in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and several other places of eminency, touching Church-government, and the Doctrine and Discipline of these times. Our Ministers have entertained their challenges several times; and their pains have wrought so well, that hundreds forsake the old tyrannical Presbytery, and cleave to our party.[141]

John Nicoll claimed, 'men war not aschamed to tak upone thame the functioun of the ministrie... and [offer] publict disputes'.[142] The Fife diarist, John Lamont, reported troops from Colonel Fairfax's regiment interrupted the church service at Pittenweem on Sunday May 24, 1653 and demanded the minister dispute with them publicly. George Hamilton, the minister, cut his sermon short due to the ruckus caused by the English, but the soldiers swore they would continue to pester him until 'he made good his promise…to dispute with' them. [143]

One man in particular repeatedly sought public disputes wherever he went in Scotland, with the intention of winning popular support for his Baptist beliefs. James Brown is known to have publicly disputed with Samuel Rutherford, James Wood (professor of theology at the University of St. Andrews) and James Guthrie. Unfortunately little trace remains of his dispute with Rutherford, other than Brown's own testimony, so it is difficult to ascertain when precisely it took place.[144] However, since it is mentioned in Brown's book published in 1653 (before his dispute with Guthrie in October) it must have occurred before Brown's book went to the

---

[139] *The Faithful Scout* (Oct. 29-Nov. 5, 1652), 740.
[140] *Several Proceedings in Parliament and other Intelligence and Affaires.* (London: October 21-28, 1652.), 2520.
[141] *Mercurius Brittanicus.* (Octob. 26-Nov. 2, 1652), 238.
[142] Nicoll, 94.
[143] Lamont, 53-4.
[144] James Brown, *Scripture-redemption freed from men's restrictions: being an answer to a book lately published by Mr. William Troughton.* (London: J.C., 1653), title page, 12, 14, 15.

presses earlier in that year. In contrast, Brown's disputes with Wood and Guthrie are the best attested of any disputes between English chaplains and Scots clergymen during the period. Published accounts in English journals and personal eyewitness accounts recorded in diaries survive for the debate with Wood, while James Guthrie preserved the letters leading up to their dispute as well as a transcription of the dispute itself in a manuscript comprising nearly 60,000 words.[145]

Brown graduated from Oriel College, Oxford, in 1638 and soon thereafter took the charge of the parish church in Tenbury, Worcestershire. At an unspecified date he was convinced of the errors of Episcopacy through a public dispute with a Baptist minister. Rejecting Episcopacy he became 'through mercy a Preacher of the faith which once he destroyed'.[146] It was probably due to his own conversion experience that he became such an eager disputant. Eventually he joined the Parliamentary Army as a chaplain and in 1652 was assigned to Colonel Fairfax's regiment of foot soldiers. This regiment gained a notorious reputation for disrupting ministers of the Kirk.[147] His missionary endeavours in Scotland began almost immediately after his arrival. According to the Baptist historian R.B. Hannen, Brown began to preach publicly in Cupar as soon as the regiment arrived.[148] During the regiment's stay in Fife a number of baptisms by submersion were reported. In September and October 1652 'the said Mr Browne did rebaptize severall of Coll. Fairfax foot regim[ent] in the water of Eden, near to Erdries lodging, by dipping them in the water over head and eares, many of the inhabitants looking on.'[149] Yet, the baptisms were not limited to soldiers. Brown's first year in Fife saw some Scots in and around Cupar join their fellowship as well. Three sisters named Elspet, Isobel and Christin Millar were all baptised

---

[145] Lamont, 58-9; *S & C*, 53; *A Perfect Diurnall of some Passages and Proceedings.* (London: October 18-25, 1652.), 2253; *A Perfect Account.* (No. 95. Oct. 20-27, 1652), 754 [E678(25)]; and *Perfect Passages.* (No. 71. Oct. 20-27, 1652), 552 [E799(23)]; NLS. Wodrow.Qu.XVII, ff.194-249.

[146] Brown, *Scripture-redemption freed from men's restrictions*, preface. According to Hoy the 1653 edition of this text is not extant: Hoy, 192n. However, copies exist in the British Library, the Bodleian Library and Worcester College, Oxford as well as on UMI microfilm (Early English Books, 1641-1700; 2399:3).

[147] It was soldiers of this regiment that interrupted George Hamilton at Pittenweem, see above. June 22, 1652: 'The Last Lord's day a soldier of Col. Fairfax his regiment that interrupted [a minister of the Kirk] in the Pulpit, was Committed' (*Mercurius Politicus*, June 24-July 1, 1652, p. 1703. [E669:3]).

in the River Eden.[150] In addition, when an English soldier named William Thomson married Isobel Webster, a Scotswoman, James Brown officiated as minister.[151] So it would appear Brown was highly active from his arrival in Scotland and significantly influential in the early Baptist successes in Fife. Yet, Brown's efforts were not limited to ministering to the people; he also sought to dispute with the indigenous clergy.

His disputation with James Wood took place on October 12 and 14, 1652, and centred on paedo-baptism, the severity of the Fall, and the nature of atonement. Two separate accounts have survived. The English version, which appeared in several journals, reported no clear winner but relayed hopes 'a good seed had been planted' through the advocacy of English doctrines.[152] The Scottish account, on the other hand, spoke disparagingly of Brown's debating skills. His arguments were allegedly so poor an English soldier stood up and declared that Brown seemed a little confused.[153] 'Mr. Wood had the far best of both dayes, bot Browne wold not be convinced' according to the eyewitness John Lamont.[154] In the summer of 1653, Colonel Fairfax's regiment moved from Fife to Stirling, which meant new ministers with whom Brown could dispute. He spoke with both ministers in Stirling, David Bennett and James Guthrie, but must have decided that Guthrie was a more desirable opponent and began to pester him for a public dispute. Besides simply being the local minister it is likely Brown desired to dispute with Guthrie because he had become one of the foremost members of the Protester party. Brown's choice of opponents in Scotland shows he preferred high profile opponents, perhaps because they might ensure a larger audience. Despite claims in the introduction to *Scripture-Redemption*

---

[148] R.B. Hannen, 'Cupar, Fife, 1652-1659,' *Baptist Quarterly*, 10(1940-1), 45.
[149] Lamont, 60.
[150] The records of the Presbytery of Cupar reports the three sisters were summoned to appear before the presbytery in 1656, but Hannen asserts that their baptisms took place in 1652. Hannen, 46; Kinloch, *St. Andrews & Cupar*, 177.
[151] Ibid, 47.
[152] *A Perfect Diurnall of some Passages and Proceedings.* (London: October 18-25, 1652.), 2253; *A Perfect Account.* (No. 95. Oct. 20-27, 1652), 754 [E678(25)]; and *Perfect Passages.* (No. 71. Oct. 20-27, 1652), 552 [E799(23)].
[153] Lamont, 58-9. The protesting English soldier mentioned by name in Lamont's account was Major Butler. This was not the only occasion when Brown and Butler seem to have been at odds. Brown recorded some of the arguments which Major Butler had put forward in *Scripture-Redemption Freed* (1653), 12.

Freed that he never instigated public disputations, the evidence contradicts this assertion. Brown wrote in his introduction:

> I never challenged any Minister of Christ to dispute, but once as I remember, and that was when I was a Parish-Priest and Minister of Antichrist (as many now are) and the Lord in mercy made that man an instrument to reveal to me the principles of the doctrine of Christ; and the beginnings of that blessed Gospel-light, which I now through grace walk in. I could wish that all the Parish-Ministers would seek to dispute with those they count Hereticks. (I mean such as walk in obedience to the commands of Christ) till they sped no worse then I did.[155]

In contrast to the first part of this statement, Brown enthusiastically endeavoured to procure public disputes. His own testimony expresses how life-changing such an encounter had been for him. It should not be surprising if he desired to provide the same revelatory experience for some other poor minister lost in an anti-Christian church. It was Brown, according to Guthrie, that requested their public dispute.[156] Likewise, after his dispute with James Wood it was Brown who essentially challenged all comers.[157] Although Hannen claims the Presbytery of Cupar instigated the debate between Wood and Guthrie in 1652, there is no corroborating evidence to support his claim.[158] Overwhelmingly the evidence indicates Brown actively provoked the public disputes in which he participated during his stay in Scotland, a point supported by Guthrie's assertion to Brown 'I have heard it to be your way in England, and have known it to be your way in Scotland to go about from place to place, provoking to publick disputs'.[159]

As the best documented dispute from beginning to end of any during this period, the contest between James Guthrie and James Brown offers deep insight into the events provoking local ministers to engage their sectarian antagonists. It therefore serves as an excellent case study of the causes, topics discussed and the aftermath of such an encounter. Although Guthrie gives no express reasons for why he succumbed to Brown's challenges, the Scottish church historian Robert Wodrow reports episodes illustrating why Guthrie, as well as other ministers, might have

---

[154] Lamont, 58-9
[155] James Brown, *Scripture-redemption freed from men's restrictions* (1653), intro 9.
[156] NLS. Wodrow.Qu.XVII, f. 194.
[157] Lamont, 58-9.
[158] Hannen, 46.

acquiesced to requests for disputation: first, the regular interruption of Kirk services by English soldiers; second, the drawing power of English preachers. English intrusions upon Kirk services were an issue across Scotland.[160] Besides the disruption at Pittenweem mentioned above, the Presbytery of Peebles and Biggar complained on May 26, 1651 of being interrupted during worship and generally harassed:

> They [Sectaries] have in many partes disturbed divyne worshippe, impeding our coming together, scattering us when we were mett, contradicting us in performing of the worshippe of God; and some of us have been assaulted by them with charged pistolls and uther weapons when we were in pulpit and at our houses, and others of us have been caryed away in our persons and detained for a time. Neither hes their rage stinted here, nor are we so much troubled with their oppression against us, but that which breaks our hearts and exceeds all the rest (becaus done more immediatly against God) is their cruell mocking of his worshippe, constant profaneing his Sabboths, and ther horrid blasphemies of his holie name.[161]

According to Robert Wodrow, Guthrie faced similar obstruction to his ministry. One Sabbath, (Wodrow does not specify the date) while on his way to the Kirk, a mob of 'Sectarians' and 'Malignants' confronted Guthrie and physically prevented his passing. This interference kept him from reaching the Kirk and forced him to preach in his home.[162] While the labels used might indicate Resolutioner interference, one of Guthrie's stipulations for agreeing to a dispute with Brown was that English soldiers cease harassing Stirling's ministers. He demanded 'no disturbance in word or deed ...by the souldeery; and that from henceforth you nor they shall not speak publickly at the times of publick worship in the congregation'.[163]

A second reason Guthrie became involved in disputing with Brown was the risk sectarian preaching posed to his congregation. Guthrie and several other Protesters had written to Cromwell in March 1653 about 'the English actings amongst us', seven months before his debate with Brown, complaining of the 'errours daylie vented in this land...by some in the Army'. Additionally they complained of the English soldiers intruding into Scottish pulpits

---

[159] NLS. Wodrow.Qu.XVII, f. 221.
[160] Dow, 61.
[161] *RCGA*, iii:469.
[162] Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii:98.
[163] NLS, Wod.Qu.XVII, f. 194.

whether they were ordained or not.[164] Yet in Guthrie's case the threat posed by this preaching struck exceptionally close to home in an incident involving Guthrie's friend and servant James Couie.[165] In all accounts James Couie was a faithful friend and servant who transcribed some of the last letters dictated by Guthrie from his prison cell in Edinburgh before Guthrie's execution in 1660. Despite his loyal friendship, the following story provides an intriguing insight into the attraction of the English preachers and the struggle faced by the Scottish clergy to impede their success:

> James Couie went one evening and heard one of the Sectarie's Ministers preach in Stirling. Mr Guthrie missed James out of the house, and he very narrowly enquired where he had been? James did a while conceal where he was, but at length Mr Guthrie importuning him to tell, he at length told that he was hearing one of the English Ministers preach; at which Mr Guthrie seemed to be very displeased, and said, 'James, go not to Gilgal nor to Bethaven! Whatever these men be, they have nothing to do here!'[166]

Couie's sneaking out to hear English ministers preach must have shocked Guthrie into the realisation that the Presbyterian influence in Scotland was not unassailable. He probably decided that by acquiescing to the persistent requests of James Brown for a debate, his ministry would stop being pestered and he could once and for all quell the preacher attempting to steal away converts from his congregation and from his own household!

The details of the dialogue between Brown and Guthrie survive because Guthrie meticulously recorded both the dispute and the correspondence exchanged between them. No doubt this represents his attempt to fulfil his own wish for the debate to be carried out in writing, in order that it might be made available to a wider audience. Two copies of his collection survive; one seems to be in Guthrie's own hand,[167] while the second is a copy made from the original by

---

[164] *RCME*, i:24-5

[165] W.I. Hoy also believes this incident was significant in Guthrie's decision to dispute with Brown (Hoy, 190).

[166] Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii:94.

[167] Special Collections of EUL, Laing MSS III.368. Two pages of the public dispute and three letters are missing from both manuscripts, but these portions do not diminish the overall consistency of the dialogue. Hoy asserts that the penmanship is that of Guthrie (Hoy, 190n).

Robert Wodrow.[168] The question naturally arises: if all the records of the dialogue between Brown and Guthrie are the product of Guthrie, how reliable or non-partisan can they be, especially since Hughes points out that even the manner in which disputants publish their own version of events could be a polemical form in itself.[169] There are two basic points supporting the legitimacy of Guthrie's account. First of all, what survives is a long, consistent and chronological collection of all but three of the letters between the two men as well as a transcription of the debate (missing just two pages) comprising almost 60,000 words. It seems very unlikely Guthrie altered the letters, as they provide an almost audible dialogue in which the authors respond to questions arrising in previous letters. The only questionable material then is to be found in the transcript of the debate itself. It is impossible to know whether Guthrie wrote it down from memory, or if he acquired it from someone who had taken it down at the time of the debate. In either case it brings us to the second point in support of the accuracy of Guthrie's account: the behaviour and theology of Brown recorded in his debate with Guthrie are consistent with the records of the earlier disputations with Samuel Rutherford and James Wood.[170] Brown chose the same subjects for the debates and used very similar arguments.

The first surviving letter is Guthrie's response to an initial request for a public dispute by Brown. Guthrie states that although his first choice is to carry on their discussions by correspondence in order that they might be available to a larger audience, he will acquiesce to Brown's desire for a public dispute on one condition. 'Therefore if you so please and if the Lord so will you shall upon friday nixt...after my causing to ring a bell to give advertisement to ye people of our meeting find me in ye church', providing Brown first subscribe in writing to the orderly practices of proper academic disputing, including the use of syllogisms, argument based only on the strength of Scripture and reason, and a promise to 'forbear passions and

---

[168] Hoy's citation of the work being located in New College Library (University of Edinburgh) sent the author on a wildgoose chase (185n). Wodrow's copy is located in the NLS, Wodrow.Qu.XVII. folios 194-249.
[169] Hughes, 'The Pulpit Guarded', 45.
[170] Brown. *Scripture Redemption Freed*, 5-8, 12, 14-15; Lamont, 58-9.

reproachfull reviling expressions'.[171] Probably already aware of sectarian disputing in general through English writers like Thomas Edwards, Guthrie also seems to have already known about Brown in particular: 'I did desire you to forbear reproaches and revilings, because…I have heard of your manner'.[172] Additionally, he added the stipulation that neither Brown nor the troops under his care interrupt worship in any of Stirling's kirks. Although Brown agreed to the terms he did so with sarcasm:

> I shall endeavour to keep to the form of sound words in all our reasonings, not digressing from the point in hand: I shall by Gods grace wit meekness, love and holy zeal for God carry on our discourse none shall speak (by my consent) in relation to our reasoning but you and I… But that I should undertake that none shall ever do it is to require an impossibility; for I have but a short space to stay here 2dly: my time is not to be forever in this world: 3dly I cannot command mens consciences....[173]

Clearly Guthrie never intended Brown to ensure that no one would ever interrupt his ministry, so Brown's response was somewhat acerbic. Yet, it serves as an indication of the divergences that separated the two men's approaches to public disputing. Guthrie sought concise answers and definitions. Brown, on the other hand, tended to go to extremes. Guthrie disregarded the sarcastic response and reasserted his expectations for an orderly disputation, asking: 'will [you] debate syllogistically, and without long rhetoricall discourses, yea or not?'[174] His repeated pressing for the proper use of syllogisms and arguments reaffirms Guthrie had knowledge of Brown's past refusals to employ them. Besides being aware of his practice, Guthrie was also well prepared for Brown's theology. At Guthrie's request Brown provided a copy of his recently published *Scripture-Redemption Freed from Men's Restrictions* for the Scotsman.[175]

When the two men finally met at 10 o'clock on Friday morning, October 21, 1653, it immediately became apparent that Guthrie had been correct in his efforts to ensure the debate would have rules to prevent it from becoming a spectacle. From the outset issues of procedure arose. Although the topics, order and structure of the day were arranged in advance, they began

---

[171] Wodrow.Qu.XVII, f. 194.
[172] Wod.Qu.XVII, ff. 195-6.
[173] Ibid, f. 194
[174] Wodrow.Qu.XVII, f. 194.

by disagreeing over which topic would be addressed first. Guthrie expressed his intention to refute Brown's doctrine that Christ died for everyone. However, Brown disagreed with this order of debate. The differences continued to multiply. When finally allowed to begin against Universal Atonement, Guthrie opened by stating 'whosoever is not given of the Father to Jesus Christ, these Jesus Christ did not dy for, But all men are not given of the Father to Jesus Christ: therefore Jesus Christ did not dy for all and every man'.[176] He made the traditional predestinarian claim; not everyone is elect, and Christ died only for the elect. Brown rejected this statement claiming it to be unscriptural. The Scot made several attempts to explain the Scriptural foundation of his position, but Brown continued to oppose his rival's line of argument:

Brown: I know no truth in Scripture by argument Sir I shall shou you Scripture for what I say, if you have no Scripture for it than nothing can be said.

Guthrie: Is this truth or falshood which I have said.

Brown: I desire Scriptur = truth and no syllogisms.

Guthrie: The Lord Jesus Christ did use syllogisms himself; and if you speak against it you [sheu] yourself a[n] irrational man; according to the Scripture this is either truth or falshood I have said, your answers Sir I desire in the affirmative or in the negative.

Brown: Friends mark a[n] irrational man he takes me to be.

Guthrie: What else can I take you to be if you will not grant the argument to be either truth or falsehood.

Brown: Bring Scripture for what you say.

Guthrie: Sir I say Scripture sayed this, whom soever Christ dyed for are given to him of the Father:

Brown: Scripture does not say so many words.

Guthrie: Does it say the thing it self?[177]

Guthrie maintained the traditional Calvinistic view that Atonement is limited to the elect. Yet Brown refused to accept anything other than verbatim Scripture as proof. This led Guthrie to

---

[175] Ibid, f. 195.
[176] Ibid, f. 199.

ask if his opponent would only accept truth if found in Scripture in 'so many letters, syllables and words'.[178] Although both men agreed before the dispute to use syllogisms as a way of proving their arguments, Brown flatly denied them on the day. Eventually Guthrie challenged him as to whether he accepted 'Scripture consequences'. Brown responded 'not in that nature', at which point Guthrie raised the question, if there is no Scripture in the New Testament giving a warrant for a Christian to be a magistrate or a soldier, then 'by Mr Browns divinity' there is no warrant under the New Testament for a Christian to be a soldier or a magistrate. 'I pray you where you and your powers are...' asked Guthrie, 'I put you to it before all whom you serve Mr Brown to answer'.[179] Brown replied by accusing Guthrie of changing the subject, but increasingly it became clear who was being evasive.

Repeatedly Brown turned from his opponent to the crowd, at one point proclaiming in response to Guthrie's syllogism: 'ye that understand consider this falsity and deceit, it is nothing but Sophistry'.[180] On at least seven different occasions Brown turned to the crowd rather than answer his opponent's challenges. Often this resulted from Brown being dumbfounded by Guthrie. At times Brown seemed unable to see the full implications of his own theology. Guthrie, who proved to have a very sharp wit and a deeper understanding of Brown's theology than Brown did, on several occasions had to answer the questions he had posed to his opponent when Brown proved unable to do so. When discussing Atonement Guthrie asked, based on Romans 8:32, if God gives the saints 'all things' because of their belief, because they are members of the church or if it is because Christ died for them? Essentially Guthrie asked who gets the inheritance bought through Christ's death and why? Brown could not satisfy Guthrie with an answer, because he could not delineate between those various aspects of atonement within his theological construct. He believed in a sort of Universal Atonement, in which Christ died to pay for the sins of the 'first covenant', or for Adam's sin, but not for the rest of

---

[177] Ibid, f. 199.
[178] Ibid, f. 199.
[179] Ibid, f. 199.
[180] Ibid, f. 199.

humanity's sins. However, Brown could not verbalise his position adequately enough to engage Guthrie in a discussion of it. After asking the question eight times Guthrie answered for Brown, explaining the saints get all things because Christ died for them and he did this because they are elect.[181] Later, when discussing the implications of Universal Atonement, Guthrie again silenced the Englishman. Brown argued that since Christ's death had freed humanity from any responsibility for Original Sin, people need only to repent of their own personal sins and cast them away. This did not sit well with the strongly Calvinist Guthrie and led him to ask to whom the 'word of reconciliation' should be preached. When pressed as to the ramifications of his doctrine and being unable to satisfy the Scotsman, Guthrie again spoke for Brown: 'since you labour to argue instead of answering my argument I give you a clear answer thus, God is reconciled by the death of Christ in regard of purchase or price there being now a ransom laid down by which the justice of God is satisfied for the sins of the elect...I pray all the hearers to consider the argument: If Christ died for all sins then the Gospel need not be preached to any'.[182] While Brown disagreed with this assertion, because he believed the gospel teaches repentance is necessary in order to 'cast away' sin and be redeemed, he was unable to clarify his position.

The debate continued to pursue the nature of Atonement. Guthrie pushed the point that only those who are given by the Father (the elect) are saved by the blood of the Son. It was evident from early in the debate that a fundamental chasm separated the two men's theology. When faced with the predestinarian concept of God's giving the elect to Christ, Brown tried to skirt the issue by suggesting a twofold giving, the first is the giving of all of creation to Christ, and the second is conditional upon an individual's faith in Christ.[183] In Guthrie's mind this did not hamper his argument. He believed faith is given by the Father to the elect, therefore it does not

---

[181] 'I will give the answer for you, seing you cannot; I say the apostle speaks to the Romans as a people in covenant with God, in a church=state as beleivers and professours; but that he doth not lay the weight of giving them all things on that, but on Christ's delivering himself up to death for them', ibid, f, 202.
[182] Ibid, f. 204.
[183] Ibid, f. 200.

matter if there is a twofold giving, because the second giving is still dependent on the Father and therefore in his estimation his proof was sound. Eventually Brown had to define his understanding of the nature and scope of Christ's death and in so doing shocked his Scottish opponent. According to Brown, Christ did not die to save anyone from spiritual death, but rather His death saved all of humanity from the temporal death caused by Adam's sin. One day, explained Brown, all the dead will rise from the grave to be judged, not for the sin of Adam but for their own sins, which they will be personably responsible for, because according to Brown, 'all have so much means of grace as leaves them without excuse'.[184] He believed those who repent of their sins will be saved and those who do not will be damned. Guthrie described this not only to be 'strange divinity' but declared it contrary to both Independents and Congregationalists such as Thomas Goodwin and John Cotton, as well as contrary to the doctrines of the Anabaptists.[185] He called Brown's doctrine the 'grossest part and the very dregs of pelagianism' which had been 'condemned and exploded by all the Christian churches and contrary to the confessions of faith of all the protestant churches in the world'.[186] The implication of Brown's theology was clear to Guthrie, if Christ's death freed all humanity only from a mere temporal death brought about by Adam's Sin, then Brown rejected the Reformed doctrines (e.g., Lutheran or Calvinist) of Original Sin, Predestination and maybe most importantly to the Scottish mentality, Covenant. It also diminished Christ's role in redemption and removed him completely from the salvation of the individual, since according to Brown salvation is dependent wholly on the repentance and casting off of one's own sins.

In an attempt to regain control of the debate, Brown returned to his original proposition that Christ died for all. The brunt of his argument laid on five Scriptures Isaiah 53:6, 1 John 1:23, 1 Thes. 2:6, 2 Cor. 5:14-15 and Heb. 2:9, all of which he believed clearly state that Christ died for all.[187] Brown must have momentarily felt confident, having presented what he felt were five

---

[184] Ibid, f. 203.
[185] Ibid, f. 203.
[186] Ibid, f. 203.
[187] Ibid, f. 208.

solid verbatim portions of Scripture explicitly declaring Christ died for 'all' or 'every man' or 'the world'. Guthrie coolly replied the use of the term 'all' did not refer to every individual and that even the use of globalised terms such as 'the world' as it is used in John 6:33 refer only to the saints: 'For the bread of God is he who cometh down from heaven and gives life to the world'.[188] Brown protested and claimed 2 Thes. 2:10 supported his belief that those who perish do so because they choose to refuse to love the truth and so be saved.[189] Guthrie discounted this use of the Scripture, explaining that those spoken of were damned not because they did not choose to love the truth but because they could not choose to love the truth.[190] Brown simply could not grasp double predestination; it was contrary to everything he held to be true. 'Sir... I do not judge it blasphemy,' states Brown, 'to say that through Christ all men may have power or are inabled to believe'.[191] And again later he asserted that 'I conceive if so be there is a spirit of wisdom in the hearers this day, they will need no proof of this, I beleive you cannot but see and know it is the duty of the creatures to do only so much as God enables them to do'.[192]

In a last effort to confute predestinarian election, Brown cited Heb. 10:29: 'How much more severely do you think a man deserves to be punished who has trampled the Son of God under foot, who has treated as an unholy thing the blood of the Covenant that sanctified him, and who has insulted the Spirit of Grace?'[193] Essentially, the question he posed was how could Guthrie explain that only the elect are sanctified through the blood of Christ, if Paul states that some of those who are sanctified reject Christ? This was probably, as W.I. Hoy suggests,[194] Brown's strongest argument of the day, however, Guthrie quickly countered the danger. He explained that those referred to in the verse were only sanctified externally, that is to say, they had not been fully sanctified. While they had made a public profession they were not in fact actually elect. He used the example of Simon Magus who professed outwardly to love Christ but

---

[188] Ibid, f. 209.
[189] Ibid, f. 210.
[190] Ibid, f. 210-11.
[191] Ibid, f. 212.
[192] Ibid, f. 212.
[193] Ibid, f. 213.

inwardly remained a reprobate. This left Brown with little else to say but that Guthrie's gloss was 'exceeding[ly] dark...a dark gloss on a clear text'.[195]

Unable to establish his own views of universal atonement in the face of Guthrie's well defended theology of predestination, Brown turned to the second issue of the day, the practice of Infant Baptism. In the tradition of Covenant Theology that shaped the thinking of the Church of Scotland and in the tradition of the continental Reformers Guthrie maintained that because circumcision had been the seal of God's covenant with the Jews, and because it had been extended to both those in covenant with God as well as their children baptism, the sign of the new covenant, is available to all who are in covenant with God. Brown agreed with Guthrie that God is in covenant with children, and even infants. However in the case of infants he argued that, since they are unable verbally to accept the Covenant for themselves, God is in covenant with them but they are incapable of being in covenant with God. Bemused by this logic, Guthrie retorted: 'an unheard of distinction...all these with whom God is in covenant...they are in covenant with Him' and he cited Deut. 29:10-12 and Ezek. 37:21 as proof that not only is God in covenant with the children of the Jews but also their children's children.[196] The debate ended with neither side giving any ground in their discussion of paedo-baptism and with Guthrie charging 'I get nothing from you but words and strange divinity'.[197] Through the dispute it became increasingly apparent that the two men were fundamentally separated by their understandings of original sin, atonement, predestination, election and covenant.

Although Robert Wodrow's *Analecta* praises Guthrie's immense patience in disputing,[198] James Brown clearly agitated the Scots minister. What seems to have aggravated him most was Brown's inability to follow the rules of academic debate, declaring near the end of their dispute

---

[194] Hoy, 193-4.
[195] Wodrow.Qu.XVII, f. 214.
[196] Ibid, f. 219.
[197] Ibid, f. 219.
[198] 'In debating with any person, (Guthrie) was most calm, and not in the least passionat; and if he observed any heat or passion break forth, he would have said, "We must now give it over; for if we

'Mr Brown you have printed you[r]self a fellow in Oxford; but surely you do not keep the laws of dispute'![199] This accusation that Brown knew the rules of academic disputing but refused to use them validates Hughes' thesis that many educated 'radicals' rejected the use of an academic or 'orthodox' framework of disputing, rather than being unfamiliar with them. Guthrie closed the dispute by making it known to Brown and all in attendance that he felt his time had been wasted. In terms reminiscent of Baxter's complaint about Tombes, Guthrie told Brown, 'I perceive when [in] many thing[s] you are straited and knows not how to answer, you make diversions and turns you to your friends; Therefore the day being spent, and it now growing dark I leave you with your friends since I can get no clear satisfying answer from you to any thing that I propound'.[200] Despite Brown's best efforts at evasion and his attempts to engage the crowd, Guthrie maintained both his composure and control of the debate, and refused to give into his opponent's 'radical' approach.

Less than a week after their public dispute, Brown started hounding the Scots minister for a second dispute in letters alleging: 'I find that publick disputts are very profitable for the hearers...I desire that another day may be sett apart for the finishing of what was then begun' as well as the justification of national churches.[201] When the letter arrived at Guthrie's home, he was away in Edinburgh. Being informed of Guthrie's whereabouts by the messenger, Brown sent a second letter to him in the capital. Upon returning from Edinburgh, just two days after the initial letter was sent, the minister of the Kirk replied that despite receiving two letters in less than twenty-four hours he held 'little or no inclination to publick disputes with' the Englishman, but inquired whether Brown continued in his 'former importunity concerning a new disput'.[202] He expressed his utter bewilderment at both the intentions of Brown and the roots of his theology:

---

turn any way passionat, the true end of this present exercise is entirely lost".' Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii:94-5.

[199] Wodrow.Qu.XVII, f. 218.

[200] Ibid, f. 219.

[201] Ibid, f. 220.

[202] Ibid, f. 221.

> I confess that to me it is unknown what you mean or intend by such importunat and frequent provocations for venting such strang and uncouth opinions which are contrary to the whole tenor and current of the Scriptures, and to the judgment of all sound divines in all ages, yea, many of them to the judgment not only to the congregationall divines in old and new England but also to the confession of the faith of many of the Anabaptists churches....[203]

According to Brown his desire for a second 'fuller conference' stemmed wholly from a desire to 'advance the glory of the Lord in the manifestation of truth either by you or me no humble sober heart was ever a loser by free and fair reasoning out of the Scriptures'.[204] To this request Guthrie offered five reasons why a second public dispute was unwarranted: first, Brown held 'many uncouth and strange opinions contrary to the tenor of the Scriptures'; second, 'indifferent men' may be led astray by Brown's heretical teachings; third, the English chaplain had deferred to the crowd in the previous dispute rather than answering his inquiries; fourth, he failed to allow the scripture consequences that he had promised to; fifth and finally, Brown's reputation preceded him as one who goes 'from place to place, provoking to publick disputs'.[205] Yet in spite of these good reasons not to have a second debate, Guthrie left the possibility open by offering his opponent four conditions that might clear the way for a further dispute. Guthrie demanded that Brown provide in writing: first, a scriptural defence of his position on original sin and magistrates restraining heretics; second, evidence that the officers and soldiers of the English garrison actually desired a second dispute in order to prove that it was not only Brown who wanted it; third, an agreement for allowing argument by scripture consequences and acknowledgement that divine truth can be proven by clear deductions and inferences from Scripture; and fourth, an assurance that he would not evade questions or engage in long discourses which tend to 'darken a disput'.[206] Only on completion of all four of these requirements would the Scots minister even consider a second conference.

Continuing in his usual manner, Brown's response did little to appease his would-be opponent. Replying the same day (October 31) he received Guthrie's conditions, he showed no signs of

---

[203] Ibid, f. 221
[204] Ibid, f. 221.
[205] Ibid, f. 221-2.

acquiescing from his former ways. 'Surely if I maintain any corrupt doctrine', wrote Brown, 'if you were a minister of the Lord Jesus you should take every opportunity to oppose me in my publick exercises knowing that I give liberty to all men to ask a reason of any thing that I deliver, I should willingly so deal with you if you were free to it, but knowing you are unfree to such debates I have endeavoured to prevail with you for a fixed conference'.[207] He arrogantly ended the letter, 'in your next I desire your positive answer whether you disput or not? and what day it shall be' after only paying lip service to Guthrie's required conditions.[208] Hardly a humble response from the man requesting a second debate.

Yet again Guthrie, reputed for his patience, was pushed beyond his ability to restrain himself. 'My soul is weary of your importunity', wrote Guthrie, 'it is not from any fear either of you[r] strength, or jealousie that...I have not hitherto condescended to allow you any more publick dispute; indifferent men who were wittnesses to our last debate, and I suspect your own conscience also, doth bear record that I have no cause to decline it upon that accompt'.[209] He explained that being a minister of Jesus Christ does not necessarily entail debating the corrupt doctrine of another in public. In response to the doctrine that Brown put forward, Guthrie made it clear that he saw nothing new in it.

> Mr. Brown I again desire to tell you that your opinions are the very dregs and grossest part of Pelagianisme, Popery and Armenianisme[210] and that Pellagius, [Robert] Bellar[mine][211] and Armenius did plead these causes much more strongly than you do, and that the arguments of your book are but little of their stuff borrowed from them and published in a worse frame, and therefore they be errors I do see little advantage in debating with you for refutations of them because you bring nothing for strengthening thereof but what hath been abundantly refused already.

---

[206] Ibid, f. 222.
[207] Ibid, f. 213. Due to an error in the numbering of the folios in the Wodrow manuscript, after folio 222 the numbering begins again with 213.
[208] Ibid, f. 213.
[209] Ibid, f. 213.
[210] Brown had apparently been accused of Arminianism before, because in his work *Scripture Redemption freed* he states 'for my part I never read his (Arminius') works as the searcher of hearts doth know'. Brown, *Scripture-redemption freed from men's*, 76.
[211] Since the conflict over Episcopacy came to a head in Scotland in the 1630s Robert Bellarmine was considered by Presbyterians as the Catholic theologian most intent on undermining reformed religion (D.G. Mullan (ed.), *Religious Controversy in Scotland 1625-1639*. (Edinburgh: SHS, 1998), 28, 109-20, 165, 167, 173, 175-7, 211). He was therefore the epitome of Rome's heretical theologians, and was here listed among the other arch-heretics Pelagius and Jacob Arminius.

Despite all these reasons not to give Brown his much desired second debate, he offered his would-be opponent one final chance. In a letter dated November 2, Guthrie stated he would entertain a second encounter over the issue of paedo-baptism (or 'baby sprinkling' as Brown called it) on two conditions: first, Brown submit in writing to follow the 'ordinary known received rules of disputation'; and second, that referees be appointed to officiate the dispute and keep it on track.[212] Guthrie even went so far as to suggest two Englishmen to serve as the referees, Major John Cloberry, the commander of the garrison at Stirling, and Samuel Bryan, also a chaplain to the garrison in Stirling. It is up to the judges, he writes, to 'prescrib to us both that method and ways of arguing which we shall be oblidged to follow'.[213] After making these immense concessions for a dispute that he claimed to have little desire to take part in Guthrie, understandably adds the ultimatum 'which if you do refuse I beseech you to be silent and trouble me no more'.[214]

Up to this point the lines of communication were open, but from here they took a turn for the worse and were irreconcilably damaged. Rather than accepting this beneficial set of conditions, Brown answered back by rejecting the need for referees: since he had always agreed to follow the rules of proper academic debating, Major Cloberry and Mr. Bryan were not required. He then made the ill advised mistake of claiming that Cloberry and Bryan judged being named as referees without their prior consent 'a kind of an affront'.[215] Guthrie immediately sent letters to both men inquiring if they had been offended by his nomination and also to find out whether the troops of the garrison were even interested in a second dispute. Major Cloberry professed he had been accused of a 'gross disingenuity' by Brown's accusation. Far from being insulted, he praised Guthrie for his compromise. He had never met 'with greater ingenuity and candor' than the Scots minister had shown by putting his trust in them.[216] Samuel Bryan, likewise, denied any insult in being nominated and further attested that he and the Major were impressed

---

[212] Wodrow.Qu.XVII, f. 215.
[213] Ibid, f. 215.
[214] Ibid, f. 216.
[215] Ibid, f. 216.

with the self denial of Guthrie in asking Englishmen to be judges when 'the antagonist' was 'our friend, acquaintance, countreyman and member of the army'.[217] It also came to light that besides falsely putting words in the mouth of the garrison commander, Brown had also exaggerated the interest within his regiment for further disputes. Major Cloberry informed Guthrie he had heard little discussion among his troops about a further dispute.

Contrary to Brown's assertion that he followed the rules of academic disputing, both Major Cloberry and Samuel Bryan disputed the value of the first encounter. Unless a subsequent dispute was 'orderly and methodicall', wrote Bryan, it would once again be time 'vainly spent'.[218] With regards to prescribing a rule for a second dispute Major Cloberry explained both he and Bryan were wary of the task, being ignorant of how a legitimate disputation could take place without the allowance of logical arguments.[219] Bryan also assured Guthrie if a second dispute did come about that he and Major Cloberry would perform faithfully in the trust Guthrie placed in them and act as just referees 'if Mr Brown will not wave or decline the way of arguing by consequences methodically digested unto syllogisms according to the known and common law of disputation'.[220]

Armed with letters from the commander and the chaplain, Guthrie wasted no time in letting Brown know he had been caught out as a liar on two counts. It was Brown's false accusations that insulted the two men rather than Guthrie's gracious suggestion they would be suitable judges.[221] In addition, he informed Brown there was no truth in his claims that many English soldiers desired to attend a second dispute. In the light of these two fabrications, Guthrie resolutely refused to take part in any further public disputes with Brown. This left the English chaplain with only one option. If he wished to continue the dialogue it would have to be in

---

[216] Ibid, f. 218.
[217] Ibid, f. 218.
[218] Ibid, f. 218.
[219] Ibid, f. 218
[220] Ibid, f. 218.
[221] Ibid, f. 219.

writing in order for it to be published for the 'view and judgement of others'.[222] Rather than being apologetic after having been caught out, Brown responded in his typically barbed manner: 'I am sure that some others with my self were more than confident that you never intended another publick disput'.[223] Unwilling to believe that the opportunity had slipped past him he even offered to submit a list comprising the names of officers who wished to observe further disputes, but Brown had missed his chance. No further public disputes between the two men were forthcoming. In response to his opponent's arrogant letter, Guthrie lost his patience for the third time:

> you may have confidence more then enough that you do great things in disput and I have heard of your boasting.... If you can be entreated to do yourself so much favour as to enquire and hearken to the judgment of discerning and unbyassed men you'll happly hear that in publick disput you have often been put to silence and shame and brought to such straits that you could neither grant nor deny nor distinguish and have been forced to run upon contradictions not only to the truth but even to your self and have shewn such weekness *as even your own friends have been ashamed of you*.... It is not from any thing I have found or do fear of your strength or the strength of your cause that I shun more publick disput with you and therfore be not puffed up in mind...*many able and gracious men, ministers and Professors of the Gospell in several parts of the land, do not judge you worthy to be disputed with in such away as you call for*; which I speak not for preferring of my self nor vilifying of your person, but to give you an ingenuous account of the things that makes me so little inclinable to hearken to your desire and to convince you (if possibly) of the error of your way.[224]

Despite the disappointment of being denied a second public dispute, Brown agreed to carry on in correspondence if Guthrie would prepare a written defence of paedo-baptism. Guthrie wrote a treatise of almost 10,000 words. Although Brown had been transferred to Burntisland Guthrie still expected a response since the two had agreed to continue their discourse via letters, but he never received one. Instead the dialogue sputtered out. Brown's failure to provide an adequate response suggests that he had little interest in discourse, but only in gathering an audience.

Guthrie's successful dispute with Brown and his management of Brown's subsequent requests for a further dispute may be attributed to three factors. First and foremost, Brown was unable to employ the 'radical' tactics, described by Edwards and mentioned by Hughes, that were

---

[222] Ibid, f. 219.
[223] Ibid, f. 222.
[224] Ibid, f. 222-3. Italics for emphasis are my own.

available to his counterparts in England. It would have been impossible for Brown's supporters from the regiment to infiltrate the meeting posing as Scots and shout down Guthrie, as Collier's followers had done to his opponents in England, or to act out a mass conversion, because they would have easily been identified as English troops. In relation to the bustling streets of London, Stirling was a small place and strangers were quickly recognised. Had Brown's followers attempted any disruptive antics they would only have served to undermine his efforts by depicting the English, at least in the eyes of reserved Presbyterians, as brash hooligans rather than pious Christians interested in conferring over the truths of the Christian faith. This meant Brown had no support from the crowd to distract or shout down his opponent. When Brown turned to the crowd he found no relief from Guthrie's probing questions. The second factor that aided in Guthrie's success was the unsuitability of public disputation as a means of winning over the populace of rural Scotland. Scotland lacked England's intense atmosphere of revolution and radical religious change. The vast majority of Scotland's populace had no resentment for the religious form of their national church. Certainly tensions between Protesters and Resolutioners ran high, but the value of Presbyterianism as a viable form of ecclesiastical government was not the issue.[225] Most Scots did not perceive the Kirk as being overly intellectualised nor did they view the predestinarian Calvinism as oppressive. Those who attended the dispute between Guthrie and Brown did so out of curiosity rather than out of a yearning for religious liberation or change. In essence the lack of a revolutionary atmosphere at these disputes neutered the tactics of the English 'radicals'. For this reason the strategies developed by the radical groups which formed in England in the 1640s were ill-suited to woo the Scottish people. Both of these first two factors significantly aided the third, which was Guthrie's ability to manage the direction of the dispute. He initiated the topics and unrelentingly kept his opponent to the questions at hand. Guthrie never allowed Brown to stray, while his questions put Brown to the test. Being in a position to keep a tight reign on the

---

[225] For the tensions between factions within the Kirk in Stirling see: R. Renwick (ed.), *Extracts from the Records of the Royal Burgh of Stirling, A.D. 1519-1666* (Glasgow: Glasgow Stirlingshire and Sons of the Rock Society, 1887), 220-7; *RCME*, ii:24n, 25-9, 31-3; *FES*, iv:319, 324.

dispute, combined with Brown's radical ploys being neutralised, the Scots clergyman easily refuted his opponent's theology.

What this case study seems to suggest, which may have been the pattern across Scotland, is that the ability of English preachers attracted curious Scots to hear them lecture. Initially the Scots clergy would have had little need or desire to enter into public disputes with the English, despite the continual prompting of the English chaplains and soldiers. However, as the Scots clergy saw the threat of sectarian preaching increase, particularly after the imposition of toleration in February 1652, they weighed up the threat and decided that taking part in disputes was necessary to curb the threat to the Kirk. Guthrie's experience of his close friend and servant James Couie attending the sermons of an English preacher must have been a startling revelation. Warnings alone did not seem to impede attendance at English sermons. Coupled with the need to put an end to the English disruption of Kirk services, the risks were weighed up and participation in public disputes was deemed necessary. Fortunately for the Scots when they entered into disputes with 'sectaries' in Scotland they were on home soil. Their English opponents, unable to employ radical and distracting tactics, faced the prospect of being locked in an unavoidably academic dispute. In this situation, with an audience largely curious rather than revolutionary, they failed to sway the masses. While English preaching may have been magnetic, attempts to proselytise through disputes were thwarted by tenacious and well-educated Scots clergy. Perhaps the efforts of men like James Brown would have been more effective if they had stuck to public preaching, rather than picking oratorical fights with opponents who outmatched them in the intellectual arenas in which these disputes took place.

While individuals within the English forces were motivated to be missionaries for their own religious groups, the incident between Guthrie and Brown suggests that the Commonwealth regime did not support the promotion of particular doctrines, but only the promotion of toleration and the right of autonomously gathered congregations to form and govern themselves. Evidence for a policy of maintaining moderacy in religion is supported by the

sermons chosen for publication in Scotland by the English regime and also by Whitelocke's report dating from July 1652: 'the independents endeavour to settle a freedom there from the tyranny of the presbyterian classes and prelatical high commissioners, not excluding moderate dissenters from church government from a share in the advantages of government'.[226] The English regime sought to facilitate an alternative to a national church which enforced conformity or 'formality', just as they had in the previous decade in England.[227]

Some Englishmen, however, like Brown, used the opportunity of a public dispute to promote their own views rather than promoting the Congregationalism advocated in the sermons of Owen and Lockyer. This may explain why Brown's superior, Major Cloberry, when given the opportunity to support a second dispute between the two ministers, chose not to encourage it. Perhaps he recognised slight profit had come from the first dispute in contrast to the positive response towards English preaching. The promotion of toleration and the gathering of congregations remained the regime's primary interest, not the spreading of particular doctrines. This perspective seems to have been dominant within Cloberry's regiment, which C.H. Firth praised for their non-partisan stance and ability to avoid becoming embroiled in the doctrines of radical sects like the Quakers or Levellers.[228] Instead they supported the position of Cromwell and other moderate Independents in the government, that toleration was necessary for a successful and stable union.[229] A public dispute over paedo-baptism, atonement or even predestination did little to establish the toleration necessary for an adequate union of Christian nations. The only dispute of which there is record of a key member of the English regime participating was the debate between Cromwell, his chaplains and the Scots clergy of Glasgow. On this occasion they did not debate doctrine or practice, but whether the invasion of Scotland

---

[226] Whitelocke, iii:442

[227] J. C. Davis 'Against formality: one aspect of the English Revolution', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, 3 (1993), 265-88.

[228] *RHCA*, 565.

[229] B. Worden, 'Toleration and the Cromwellian Protectorate,' *Persecution and Toleration: Papers Read at the Twenty-Second Summer Meeting and the Twenty-Third Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*. (ed.) W.J. Sheils (London, Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society by Basil Blackwood, 1984), 210-11.

had been a violation of the Solemn League and Covenant.[230] Cromwell advocated the Solemn League and Covenant had not been broken in their invasion of Scotland, because it had already been nullified by Scotland's invasion of England in 1648. Furthermore, he argued that the Covenant which had bound both nations did not exclude all Protestant forms other than Presbyterianism. For Cromwell and his fellow members of the Commonwealth government the religious questions to be discussed with Scotland's clergy were not those regarding baptism or atonement, but rather the unity of Protestant Christians through the toleration of differing doctrines.

In Scotland, however, unity had been forged through covenants based on the core doctrines of Calvinist Presbyterianism. Scotland had made a pact in its covenants not to tolerate any substitute to 'Paul's Presbytery'. 'The great hazard of our Church this day,' wrote Robert Baillie in 1646, 'comes from the evill of Errour. This, if the Apostle Paul may be trusted, doth eat up the soul no lesse then a Gangrene the body'.[231] In England, however, the implication of signing the Solemn League and Covenant had not been universally identified as the elevation of Presbytery over all other forms of church government as it had in Scotland. Rather than the imposition of uniformity, the Commonwealth had chosen to overlook doctrinal differences in order to create a new political and social structure. While in Scotland such toleration was viewed as an allowance of heresy, and thus utterly incompatible with the central premise of their nation's covenanted status with God, in England it had become a fundamental component of the Commonwealth. Denial of toleration would inevitably lead to an implosion of the Commonwealth, as it was fundamental to the Christian republicanism at the heart and foundation of their government. This meant that it had to be an integral element in England's union in Scotland. Union between two countries could not be attained if the core principles and ideologies in the two countries were diametrically opposed. While the preaching of Baptist or

---

[230] Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii:98; NCL, MSS CRA 1, ii:420; John Howie, *The Scots Worthies: Their Lives and Testimonies.*, 367; Balfour, iv:298; Baillie, *L & J*, iii:165-6, 168; General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, *Lives of Alexander Henderson and James Guthrie*, 153-4.
[231] Robert Baillie, *A Dissuasive from the Errours of the time.* (London: 1646), 4.

Arminian doctrine could be beneficial for the cause of promoting toleration, in that some Scots might hear it, become proselytes and join gathered congregations, the Commonwealth was not interested in the success of any particular 'denomination' except for those which shared their core interest in the toleration of gathered churches.

Contrary to claims the English occupation intended to make little religious impact on Scotland, this chapter has demonstrated the evangelical intentions of the soldiers and chaplains to advocate their personal religious ideologies. Moreover, the regime maintained a policy of supporting their endeavours as long as they served to advance the core ideologies of independently gathered congregations and toleration. While this chapter has dealt primarily with the endeavours of individuals to promote their own doctrines among the Scots, and the regime's support of these activities, the following chapter will focus on an aspect of Commonwealth/Protectorate policy which provides a clear indication of the regime's changing strategy regarding religion: the use of the printing press in Interregnum Scotland.

Chapter III:

'*The Dead-Man's Testament*' and '*A Litle Stone*': The Commonwealth's Campaign against the Scottish Presbytery.[1]

What the wise observing King uttered long agoe, that of making of Books there is no end, was never more verified in any then it is in the present age wherein, *scribunt docti indoctique*, every smatterer and every fancie-full head must have the Presse travel to bring forth their froathy conceptions: And Presses by many are made use of as engines to discharge revylings, reproaches, and blasphemies against the God of Heaven, his blessed Truths, wayes and Ordinances.[2]

–James Wood, 1654.

The desire of religiously radical members of the English army to promote their own beliefs in Scotland, discussed in the previous chapter, is only part of the story with regards to the conflict between the English and the Scottish Kirk during the Interregnum. This chapter will focus on the continued efforts of the English regime to undermine the Presbyterianism of the Kirk after their initial occupation of Scotland, and inquire to what depth an anti-Presbyterian feeling existed within the English regimes appointed to rule in Scotland.

One of the most indicative forms of evidence to support the Commonwealth's true intentions regarding the Kirk is their use of the printing press in Scotland. It has been argued that England's government during the Interregnum was rather impotent in its control of English printing presses. Despite the passage of strict laws to regulate printing by the Commonwealth, printers were largely left alone as long as they did not rant against the government or print blatant heresy.[3] While complaints of leniency in controlling the press in England may have rung

---

[1] Thomas Wood, *The Dead-Man's Testament: or, A Letter Written to All the Saints of God in Scotland, Fellow-Heirs of the Blessing with Those in England.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1651); Nicholas Lockyer, *A Litle Stone Out of the Mountain. Church-Order Briefly Opened.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).
[2] From Wood's dedication to the Earl of Cassils in: James Wood, *A Little Stone Pretended to be Out of the Mountain, Tried and Found to be Counterfeit.* (Edinburgh: Printed by Andro Anderson, 1654), ded. 2.
[3] W.M. Clyde, *The Struggle for the Freedom of the Press from Caxton to Cromwell* (London: Humphrey Milford, 1934), 228-30.

true, especially to London's Presbyterian printers,[4] in Scotland the English mastery of the presses created a very different situation. There can be no doubt who controlled what was printed during the Interregnum in Scotland, particularly in the early years. After the English entered Edinburgh on September 7, 1650, they quickly seized control of the capital's presses and only one of the city's three major printing houses continued to operate.[5] Although the regime did not impose strict laws regulating the presses of Scotland as they had in England, the martial nature of their rule enabled them to maintain strict control over Scotland's small number of presses with little difficulty. During the Interregnum authority to print rested entirely with the English army. As A.J. Mann describes it, 'put most simply "*cum privilegio*" replaced "*cum privilegio regali*".'[6]

Throughout the Interregnum the English controlled presses of Scotland produced declarations and newsbooks for the benefit of the regime. In addition they also produced various forms of polemics aimed against their opposition. While a handful of tracts were produced against monarchical government and the person of the King, the vast majority of polemical works continued to be aimed at the Scottish Presbytery. According to Frances Dow, the Kirk with their strict interpretations of the Covenant, although internally divided, represented the greatest sustained opposition to the plans of the 'sectarian' presence in Scotland.[7] But even more importantly, the Kirk represented the greatest sustained opposition to the religious toleration and pattern of government foundational to the Commonwealth. This ideological opposition to a Republican state that promulgated the practice of sectarian religion was magnified by the Kirk's unquenchable desire to interfere in English affairs. In this respect, H.R. Trevor-Roper

---

[4] Ibid, 228; Luke Fawne, *A Beacon set on fire or the Humble Information of certain booksellers stationers of London, to the Parliament and Commonwealth of England* (London: 1652); *The Beacons Quenched* (London: Henry Hill, 1652); *A Second Beacon Fired* (London, 1654); John Goodwin, *A Fresh Discovery of the high-Presbyterian Spirit, or Quenching the Second Beacon Fired* (London: H. Cripps, 1655). See also: E.H. Pearce, *Sion College and Library* (Cambridge: CUP), 111-18.

[5] Nothing was printed by Gideon Lithgow or the heirs of George Anderson until 1652. In 1653 Andrew Anderson, the son of George, replaced the imprint of 'the heirs of George Anderson'. All of these printers were based in Edinburgh, until Andrew Anderson moved to Glasgow in 1657. Tyler's last imprint in Scotland before the restoration appears in 1653.

was largely correct when he explained the occupation of Scotland by the English as a reactionary endeavour by which the 'new English Revolution' imposed itself upon Scotland as a counteraction to the continued pressing of the 'old Scottish revolution' (Presbyterianism) upon England.[8] Dow similarly interprets the long-term aim of England's policy as safeguarding 'the revolution in England by exporting some elements of it into Scotland'.[9] Since many Englishmen believed the stability of their regime was forged in religious ideology,[10] the intolerant Presbytery continued to be the Commonwealth's primary opponent. For this reason the English regime used Scotland's own printing presses to produce propaganda for undermining Presbyterianism and for promoting gathered churches in its place. The initial works of propaganda were fairly subtle: they did not attack the Kirk overtly, but rather the degree of reformation that had taken place in Scotland. By the second year of the occupation some papers were so officiously anti-Presbyterian the Protester party complained to Cromwell: 'By many, severall pamphlets are printed and vented full of scorne and reproaches, not only against the whole Ministrie, but against sundrie of the ordinances of God.'[11] And again in 1653: 'Wee read and hear many things that are industriously printed and spread for loosing the bond of the Covenant or placing the performance of the articles thereof in things that to our best understanding are contrarie unto and destructive of the dueties contained therein'.[12]

Before Cromwell entered Scotland in July 1650 he had already established the printing press would be an important tool in his campaign, and its importance did not diminish during the occupation.[13] From the outset printed material produced in Scotland served as a primary channel through which the English regime communicated with the populace. Immediately

---

[6] A.J. Mann, *The Scottish Book Trade 1500-1720: Print Commerce and Print Control in Early Modern Scotland.* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000), 146.
[7] Dow, 35.
[8] H.R. Trevor-Roper, 'Scotland and the Puritan Revolution', *Religion, the Reformation and Social Change* (London: Macmillan, 1972), 411.
[9] Dow, 32.
[10] For an excellent description of the religious foundation of Cromwell's political aims see: Worden, 'Toleration and the Cromwellian Protectorate', 199-233.
[11] *RCME*, i:3.
[12] Ibid, i:32.

upon his arrival in Edinburgh (September 7, 1650), in an endeavour to ingratiate himself with the residents, Cromwell produced a printed declaration granting protection for anyone who wished to bring goods to market.[14] Permission for markets to take place was welcome news to the residents of Edinburgh who complained early in August that food, drink and other provisions were so scarce they could hardly be purchased, and when they could be found prices had risen to twice their normal rates.[15] Cromwell almost certainly printed his declaration on the Edinburgh press of Evan Tyler, the King's printer in Scotland. Although Cromwell had a portable press in his military train, he had already shown that when available he preferred to use a permanent press: it was faster, more efficient, and produced better quality text. But how could Cromwell have had access to the King's printing press in Edinburgh on the very day that he arrived in the city? While the English forces were in Newcastle, they had persuaded the 'unbending Royalist' Stephen Bulkley to print the *Declaration of the Army of England, Upon their March into Scotland.* In Scotland, however, the use of Evan Tyler's press was not the one-off production of a single document, but the beginning of a decade long English ascendancy over Scotland's presses.

In 1647 the London Stationers Company purchased both Evan Tyler's Edinburgh printing house and his patent as the King's printer in Scotland granted him in 1641. They made the purchase to stop cheap off-prints inundating the English market, which Tyler had been able to produce under his charter. By 1650 an Englishman named John Twyn resided in Edinburgh and ran the print house along with seven English servants, but the Stationers kept the imprint of Evan Tyler.[16] David Stevenson identified the value of a London based printing cooperative maintaining the imprint of 'Evan Tyler' from 1647 into the Interregnum:

> At a time when relations between the kingdoms were frequently strained and sometimes led to war, for the (London Stationers') Company to have advertised

---

[13] See Ch. 1.
[14] Oliver Cromwell, *By His Excellency. Whereas it Hath Pleased God by His Gracious Providence and Goodnesse, to Put the City of Edinburgh and Towne of Leith Under My Power,* ([Edinburgh], 1650).
[15] Nicoll, 23.
[16] For a brief history of Tyler's print house see Appendix IV.1.

> through its imprint its ownership of the Scottish state printer could have led in Scotland to demands for a Scottish take-over, and in England demands that the Company stop its Scottish branch printing anti-English propaganda. The problems of the multi-national company in times of international tension are nothing new![17]

It is because the printers working under the name of Evan Tyler were English and employed by the London Stationers Company that such a seamless transition occurred in September 1650 between the printing of Scottish propaganda and English propaganda. Stevenson notes that this must have been a relief to the English printers working there.[18] An entry in the Calendar of State Papers records the English control of the press and notes a lack of desire for using it to produce anything for the English market.[19] Instead the continued use of the press was purely for producing texts for distribution in Scotland. The centrality of the press in English plans was evidenced by the relocation of the press to the heavily garrisoned town of Leith sometime before mid-March 1651. Effectively this moved the press into the heart of the Commonwealth's regime: Leith would become the largest of England's citadels in Scotland and an important hub from which Interregnum government in Scotland operated. Within months the press started printing Scotland's first multi-issue newspaper entitled *Mercurius Scoticus*,[20] (produced from July 22, 1651 to January 13, 1652) to satiate the desires of 'many Forreigne expectants eyes' and the English soldiers in Scotland who desired to be kept abreast of news from England and Ireland.[21] The English regime's intention to use the printing press as a chief means of communication, coupled with the willing compliance of Scotland's greatest printing press, enabled the new English regime to print at their leisure.

During the first month of the English occupation of Edinburgh Evan Tyler's press produced three works, all of which favoured the cause of the Commonwealth and set the tone for the Commonwealth's early use of propaganda: first, befriend Scotland's poor; second, vilify the King; and most importantly, third, undermine the Kirk. The first work published in Edinburgh

---

[17] David Stevenson, 'A Revolutionary Regime and the Press', XV:333.
[18] Ibid. XV:334.
[19] *CSPD*, 1651:65.
[20] J.C. Irons, *Leith and its Antiquities* (Edinburgh: Morrison & Gibb Ltd., 1897), ii:122. David Stevenson has pointed out that the first newspaper printed in Scotland was on August 16, 1648, but only one issue was produced (Stevenson, 'A Revolutionary Regime and the Press', XV:332).

has already been mentioned: Cromwell's declaration allowing much needed markets to take place in the capital.[22] Second, the regime reprinted *The King of Scotlands Negociations at Rome for Assistance Against the Common-Wealth of England* intended to alienate the 'papist' Charles II from the fervent Presbyterians who supported the covenants' position on monarchy.[23] This edition included the text from the earlier version printed in London as well as some additional letters between the Lord Chancellor of Scotland and the King taken at Dunbar. Even in these polemics against monarchy, religion prevailed as a fundamental reason for opposing Charles II.[24] The third of these early publications was *Several Letters and Passages*, comprising correspondence between Cromwell and Walter Dundas, the governor of Edinburgh Castle. Already discussed in chapter two, these letters focus on the differences between Presbyterian and Independent thinking over the interpretation of Providence, the liberty of Christians, the right of laymen to preach, and the continuing process of Reformation. The letters served as a forerunner to the bulk of the Commonwealth's propaganda that would follow.

External Calls for Reform

In the closing months of 1650 Tyler's press produced general reports of news pertaining to the Commonwealth, proclamations by the government, and polemics aimed at the established Presbyterian status quo: questioning the degree of Reformation in Scotland and the prevailing form of church government. The re-publication of William Dell's sermon preached before the Parliament in 1646 entitled *Right Reformation* fits into this last category. The work pleads for the internal nature of 'Gospel Reformation' which is contrasted against simple 'Civil-Ecclesiastical Reformation'.[25] Although written four years earlier for an English audience, its reproduction in

---

[21] *S & C*, 316; *Mercurius Scoticus*, July 22 to 30, 1651.
[22] Oliver Cromwell, *By His Excellency. Whereas it Hath Pleased God by His Gracious Providence and Goodnesse, to Put the City of Edinburgh and Towne of Leith Under My Power,* ([Edinburgh]: s.n., 1650).
[23] *The King of Scotlands Negociations at Rome for Assistance Against the Common-Wealth of England, As Also Severall Letters of the Chancellour of Scotland to the King Since His Coming Into Scotland, Taken in His Cabinet at the Late Fight Neer Dunbar.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).
[24] For discussion of an additional polemic against monarchy see Appendix II.3.
[25] William Dell, *Right reformation: or, the reformation of the church of the New Testament represented in gospel-light.* (Printed at London, and reprinted at Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650), 5-6.

a Scottish setting implied Scotland's Reformation merely occurred in the structure, hierarchy and liturgy of the Kirk rather than in the hearts of the people.[26] In contrast to a superficial reformation forcefully imposed by men, true inward Gospel Reformation, explains Dell, is brought about by Christ (the only true Reformer) and must be peaceful, because the Gospel is peaceful.[27] This represented a great complaint Independents had against the Presbytery. For English Independents, civil magistrates have no place in imposing reformation or religious conformity upon individuals, because reformation does not come from human will but rather from the will of God.[28] Proper reformation begins in the Word and produces changes in the heart, unlike Civil-Ecclesiastical reformation, which is an imposed reformation, and 'reforms by breathing out threatnings, punishments, prisons, fire, and death'.[29] While Civil-Ecclesiastical reformation initially makes a 'great noise and tumult', it eventually cools 'and after lies as still as a stone'.[30] The differentiation between 'Right reformation' and 'Civil-Ecclesiastical reformation', presented in the contemporary context of Scotland's occupation by a sectarian army, could not be viewed by the Kirk as encouraging to their position. Without ever mentioning the Kirk directly, the message of the work in its present publication was clear. The English regime was promoting further religious change that they hoped would carry those receptive in Scotland beyond both Presbyterianism and an intolerant state church. From the Kirk's perspective the publication of the work on a Scottish press did not bode well for the future use of Scotland's printing presses.

---

[26] Ibid, 5.
[27] Ibid, 22.
[28] In New England it was a different story, where Independents adhered to a strict discipline enforced by civil magistrates which rivalled Scotland's Presbytery for vigilence in stamping out heresy. See: D.F Chatfield, 'The Congregationalists of New England and its Repercussions on England and Scotland.' (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1964), 262, 265-9.
[29] Dell, *Right Reformation*, 21.
[30] Ibid, 9.

In late November or early December 1650 another work with similar intentions emerged from Tyler's press.[31] John Owen's *The Branch of the Lord* (already discussed in Chapter 2) comprised a compilation of two sermons preached by the English chaplain at Berwick-upon-Tweed and Edinburgh. He dedicated the published work to Cromwell, whose solitary intention in these 'great under-takings' was, according to Owen, the gathering together and unifying of God's elect. Now indistinguishable from each other, the sermons profess Jesus Christ as the sole owner, builder, inhabitant, watchman and avenger of the Church.[32] Christ alone can perform these functions and only the elect are chosen to be the building material of the church: 'dead stones' turned into the 'children of Abraham'.[33] Intended 'to poure out a savour of the Gospel upon the Sons of Peace' in Scotland, the sermons actually call for the elect in the country to abandon their Assemblies 'resting on outward Church privileges' and made up of 'dead rubbish' and gather into a 'spiritual Estate where men are living stones'.[34] Once again the Kirk is not attacked overtly, but Owen challenges the composition of a church that includes the profane masses and proposes further reform beyond the outward forms which inhibit the proper gathering of Christ's church in Scotland.

By early 1651 the English began to take a more subversive approach to the Church of Scotland. Part of this process was to help facilitate the Protester-Resolutioner division within the Kirk. When the English took Edinburgh the Resolutioner controlled Commissioners of the General Assembly withdrew to Aberdeen, where they printed their works on the press of James Brown. This gave one party of the Kirk a voice in print, but not the other. The English took the stance that allowing the factions within the Kirk to 'vent their spleen on one another', as Frances Dow explains, served to weaken the Kirk as a whole.[35] As a result, the English regime printed Protester works in order to foster the divisions within the Kirk. These works made up the bulk

---

[31] John Owen, *The branch of the Lord, the beauty of Sion: or, The glory of the Church, in its relation unto Christ.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650). The epistle dedicatory written by John Owen was addressed to Cromwell and dated: Edinburgh. November 26. 1650.
[32] Ibid, 12.
[33] Ibid, 30.
[34] Ibid, 42.

of the corpus relating to the Kirk produced by Tyler's press during 1651 (for a fuller discussion of the English use of the press in the Protester-Resolutioner debate see Appendix II.2). However, after the Battle of Worcester on September 3, 1651, the threat posed by Charles II diminished significantly, leaving the Kirk unrivalled as the single greatest enemy of the Commonwealth in Scotland. The regime stopped their tacit support of the Protesters and levelled their attacks at all strands of the Kirk.

Mysterious Voices from Within

After Charles II's flight to the continent the Kirk remained uncontested as the prime obstacle to the regime's plans. The Presbyterian stranglehold on Scottish religion and the Kirk's railing against compliance with the English, prompted some Englishmen to call for the complete removal of the Presbyterian hierarchy:

> The truth is, *if you give them an Inch, they will take an Ell*, and be like Thorns in your sides, when you think to have more quiet and security. Therefore, you must demolish the whole structure of that Hierarchy if you will bee at rest: For, the Assembly leads the Classes; the Classes the Parochial Priests, and these all (more or less) lead the Common people by the nose upon any expedition; so that if the State shall have need to levy men, little will be done, upon any occasion, without the consent of the Soveraign Kirk Authority.[36]

As a means of combating this threat, and with absolute control of all of Scotland's presses, the English printed a series of works either written by Scots, or penned in a manner to give the impression that they were written by Scots, contesting the covenanted status of both the Kirk and the Kingdom of Scotland. These works are extremely important for two reasons. First, they indicate a growing discontent within Scotland towards the aims and means of a national Covenant so bound up with maintaining a Presbyterian church. Second, they demonstrate an English desire to foster these feelings by using the mechanism of propaganda in order to diminish the threat of Scotland's intrusive national Kirk.

---

[35] Dow, 27.
[36] *Mercurius Politicus*, (Oct. 23-30, 1651), 1161 [E644:5].

A Word of Advertisement & Advice to the Godly in Scotland was among the first of these papers. The original Edinburgh edition simply identifies the author as 'A Scotch man...a cordiall wel-wisher to the interest of the godly in Scotland, both in civils and spirituals', but the preface to the later London edition provides additional information about the author and the purpose of reprinting it in England.[37] The preface explains Cromwell sent the paper to the printers in London along with a letter instructing them to reproduce the work so those 'that truly fear God' and who continue to be unsatisfied with the war in Scotland might be persuaded of its just nature. The paper's power for swaying public opinion rested in Cromwell's claims that the author, who pleads for a union between the godly in both countries, 'was lately one of the Committee of Estates in Scotland, and at the first entrance of our Army a Lieutenant Colonel against us'.[38] Who exactly wrote the work is uncertain. If Cromwell's description of the author as being both a Lieutenant-Colonel and a member of the Committee of Estates is correct it could have been anyone of seventeen different men who held both positions.[39]

The work represents a significant shift in English polemical tactics. Unlike previous works of propaganda written by Englishmen, or Scots advocating a particular strain of Presbyterianism; this document represents an appeal from a Scotsman to his fellow Scots urging them to cast off their misconceptions of the covenants, to recognise the malignant intentions of those in positions of influence, and to seek Christian unity with the godly in England. For the author, Scotland falsely believed overturning Episcopacy and reinstating the Presbytery to be the

---

[37] J. Chalmers, *An Historical Account of Printing in Scotland*, i:f. 282.
[38] Ibid, i:f. 282.
[39] I have cross-referenced those men recorded in Furgol's *A Regimental History of the Covenanting Armies* as holding the rank of Lt-Col with the lists of men appointed to the Committee of Estates (*APS*, vi,ii:536ff, 631ff) and compiled a list of 17 names: Walter Scott, William Scott, James Arnot, Sir John Brown of Fordell, Thomas Bruce, John Cockburn of Ormiston, William Dick, James Fraser of Brea, James Hackett, Hew Montgomerie, Sir Charles Erskine, Arthur Forbes, Alexander Ingliston of Ingliston, William Ker of Newtowne, Viscount Newburgh, Sir Andrew Ker and David Weymes. The most likely of these men to have composed this work are those who served on the Committee in 1649, but were not re-admitted in December 1650, for by this time he would most likely have begun to side with the English. Men who served in 1649, but were not readmitted in Dec. 1650 were: Walter Scott, William Scott, James Arnot, Sir John Brown, Thomas Bruce, John Cockburn, James Fraser, James Hackett, Arthur Forbes, Alexander Ingliston, William Ker and Andrew Ker. However, most of these men went on to serve the English regime in some form or another, therefore it is extremely difficult to pinpoint one individual as being the likely author.

penultimate fulfilment of God's will. However the greatest threat to God's people is never open enemies who are easily identifiable, but rather internal enemies: profane men who detest the godly and godliness.[40] As an example he cites the actions of the Kirk Party in 1648 who preached against the 'Sectarians' in England, but then welcomed their assistance when the opportunity arose for a *coup d'état* against the established 'malignant' government of Scotland.[41] Once their own aims were achieved and the English withdrew from Scotland 'there was nothing almost to be heard in Pulpits but the Army of Sectaries, the persideous Murtherers, filthy Dreamers, Contemners of Authority, Razers of the foundations of Government, Alterers thereof contrary to the Covenant, and therefore perfidious Covenant-breakers'.[42] As a result, the author claims their actions were carried out 'under the pretence of good Patriots' making it evident 'their interest is worldly, and not Spirituall, and hath the Mark of the Beast upon it'.[43] Yet, far from intending to justify the actions of the English, the author endeavours to show how those in power in Scotland had created division between the godly in both countries in order to satiate their own personal greed.[44] It was this hypocritical manipulation of the covenants to advance a hidden agenda that brought heightened tensions and mistrust between the two countries, and ultimately war.[45]

In addition, the author entreats the people of Scotland to take notice of two things: first, the source of their contempt for England's 'sects'; and second, the actions taken by Scotland's church and government that made Cromwell's invasion unavoidable. Rather than denounce the godly in England based merely upon the slander of the Kirk, he pleads for the Scottish people to take notice of the deception and liberate themselves from ignorance:

> [The Kirk's] naming all the English Army Sectaries and Blaspemous, without exceptions, Enemies to the People of God and to godliness, Their bitter way of expressing of this, without...refuting their Error, or shewing what they held, their

---

[40] Scotch man, *A word of Advertisement*, 6.
[41] This collusion refers to the Whiggamore Raid in which the radical party in the Kirk came into power.
[42] Ibid, 10-11.
[43] Ibid, 16, 17-18.
[44] Ibid, 14-15.
[45] Ibid, 15.

> laboring to wrest every thing to the worst sence...yet I appeal to one and all of you, if their hath not been, and is such a spirit even amongst you, that you could not, nor cannot bear any thing differeing from your own opinion (or rather the opinion of the Kirk) whether in Doctrine, Discipline, or the business of the time, notwithstanding the most of you... could not give a reason for what you held or practised, especially in these things relating to the times, but were implicitly led by other men's judgements, which is your reproach, your sin and your snare this day....[46]

While not excusing the English invasion, the author points out the Scots had several opportunities to prevent it. Scotland's refusal to sign a treaty with the Commonwealth, their continual treating with the King (and proclamation of Charles II as King of Great Britain and Ireland) and their own invasion of England in 1648 for the advancement of Presbyterianism all played their part in bringing about the invasion.[47] All three actions were taken in the interest of Covenant and promulgated by the Kirk.

Finally, there is an appeal for his fellow Scots to look beyond their present suffering and recognise the great work God had begun in bringing the godly in both nations together. Although it might seem the godliest in Scotland suffered the most during the invasion, God's providence works in inexplicable ways. 'Perhaps', he explains, 'the Lords designe is to make each of you usefull in convincing one another in the extreams that either of you (it may be) hath been inclining to.... Sure I am it is the Designe of God, to have his People one, & to cause them follow him together with one heart'.[48] Rather than a trial or a punishment for some failure in keeping the Covenant, *A Word of Advertisement* urges fellow Scots to consider the possibility that the present situation might instead be God's way of bringing together His people in the two nations for them to correct each other's excesses and errors, thereby promoting the Kingdom of God over and above the kingdoms of the world.

In late November 1651 Evan Tyler's Leith-based press printed the most dubious of the English polemics against the Kirk and the second by a Scottish author. As its title suggests, *The Dead-*

---

[46] Ibid, 16-17.
[47] It should be noted that these are the three primary reasons give in: England and Wales, Parliament, *Declaration of the Parliament of England* (1650), 6-7.
[48] Ibid, 21-2.

Man's Testament was the posthumous publication of a letter written by a poor, blind, 'sometimes inhabitant of Leith' named Thomas Wood.[49] Prefixed to the work is a letter from the Lieutenant-Governor of Leith verifying the Commonwealth's approval of its publication:

> Having perused this Book, Intituled, *The Dead-Mans Testament*; I do finde it to be Orthodox and sound, and likewise usefull for the Lords People, namely, those to whom it is directed, I do therefore allow it forthwith to be Printed and Published. Given under my hand at Leith, Novemb. 25. 1651. Timo[thy] Wilkes

If by 'Orthodox and sound' Wilkes, an Independent, meant derisive against the Kirk and the Covenant then this is an entirely orthodox work.[50] It is intriguing that the first work to appear by authority is nowhere near being the first publication produced by the regime in Scotland. Neither is it the first publication from Tyler's press after the move to Leith.[51] Perhaps the inclusion of a letter sanctioning the publication of the work signifies the changing role of the English army. By November 1651 the conquest of Scotland was largely complete and the army set about the task of maintaining order in Scotland by martial law. More importantly perhaps, Cromwell had returned to England in pursuit of Charles II's army when it marched south at the end of July and was never to return to Scotland. In the absence of the Commander-in-Chief of the Parliament's forces the letter provided a record of why and by whom the publication was authorised. Wilkes' certification demonstrates that this production was part of the Commonwealth's continuing struggle to separate the people of Scotland from the Kirk and for this reason 'usefull for the Lords People'.

Whether the author of *A Dead-Man's Testament* really was Thomas Wood, or whether it was even a Scot, is open to debate. Thomas Wood can only be described as an enigmatic figure at best. According to William Dundas, Wood held a position in the 'Custom-house' in Leith. On

---

[49] Thomas Wood, *The Dead-Man's Testament: or, A Letter Written to All the Saints of God in Scotland, Fellow-Heirs of the Blessing with Those in England.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1651).

[50] *RHCA*, 389.

[51] Cromwell, Oliver. *By His Excellency. Forasmuch as divers of this nation, notwithstanding their peaceable living and abiding at their severall habitations, within the quarters of the army, under my command,...* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1651) [March 15, 1651]; *The protestation of diverse ministers, against the proceedings of the late commission of the Church of Scotland: as also against the lawfulnesse of the present pretended assembly.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1651) [July 20, 1651]; England and Wales. Parliament. *At a court-martiall at Leith, October, 16. 1651. Ordered, that no souldier of*

several occasions he found himself at odds with the Presbyterian authorities for advocating 'that Christ was the Word, and that the Letter was not the Word' and 'that the Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us'.[52] As early as 1646 the Commissioners of the General Assembly ordered a trial and censure of Wood by the Presbytery of Edinburgh.[53] This was not the only conflict between Wood and the Kirk, but by 1649 Wood bowed 'to the Assembly against his Light' in order to avoid excommunication, which would have meant losing his job.[54] These events may have been what led the Edinburgh antiquarian Robert Mylne (1643?-1747) to include the work in a collection of Quaker pamphlets. That Mylne believed Wood to be a Quaker is clearly evidenced in the table of contents: 'Wood that quaker Indweller in Leith his dead mans testament 1651'.[55] While the aspersion 'indweller' may suggest that Wood is not Scots, it more likely stems from his opposition to the Kirk which led to him being marginalised. Of even greater interest is the claim that Wood was a Quaker, since the earliest Scottish Quakers are believed to have appeared in 1653.[56] If Wood was Scottish and Mylnes' claim is accurate, it would show missionary success by the Friends in convincing native Scots at least two years earlier than has been traditionally believed. No matter what his actual religious affiliation, Wood certainly was an opponent of the covenanted Presbyterians of the Kirk.

Evidently a number of questions linger about the authorship of the work. However, concrete answers about Wood are largely irrelevant, because even if he was the source of *A Dead-Man's Testament* others were involved. A postscript informs the reader that Wood was blind, which means someone else transcribed the work, and additionally that the tract was finished by a mystery Scot who delivered it into the hands of the English.[57] Perhaps this person served as the

---

the regiment, of Col. Geo Fenwick, Governour of Edinburgh, Leith, and Barwick; shall presume to be married to any woman of, or in Scotland, without consent.... ([Leith: s.n., 1651]).

[52] Dundas, *A Few Words of Truth*, 8.
[53] *RCGA*, i:47.
[54] Dundas, *A Few Words of Truth*, 8. This must have occurred in about 1649, since Dundas claims he died two years later.
[55] NLS, 1.337.
[56] Burnet, *Quakerism*, 13.
[57] Wood's blindness must have set in during the final two years of his life, since Dundas makes no mention of the infirmity.

scribe who took down the blind man's words, or perhaps he was the author and put his own words into the dead man's mouth. According to the postscript, only the first eleven pages of the paper were finished at the time of Wood's death. The final four pages pertaining to the Assemblies of the Kirk and the postscript itself were completed by the unnamed Scot 'at the desire of a Religious Officer of the English Army'.[58] Why he gave this work to the English and why he added to it are both questions which cannot now be answered. What is clear is why the English printed the work. *A Dead-Man's Testament* is a direct attack on the National Kirk by a deceased Scotsman, and as such served as a perfect critique of the Kirk for two reasons. First, coming from a Scotsman its accusations had the immediacy of someone familiar with the Kirk. Second, since the author was dead he could not be drawn into a dialogue over his position or shamed into recanting his views, nor could he be confuted or cross examined. Its voice from beyond the grave gave it a mystical appeal and sense of authority far beyond what Owen or Lockyer could produce. The work stood as the final testament of a Scotsman discontented with the National Kirk. Although the persuasion of the author is uncertain, his intentions become secondary to those who printed it.

Wood addressed his letter to 'all the Saints of Scotland, Fellow-Heirs of the Blessing with those in England'. First, his mellifluous words implored his compatriots to recognise the true causes of their present distress; second, he struck out at what he claimed to be the five errors that plague the Kirk: its constitution, doctrine, worship, errant covenants, and National Assemblies. For too long the Kirk had been put upon a pedestal to be overly glorified 'as did the Jewes in the Temple', all the while being overrun and polluted by 'all the prophane multitude of ignorant Atheists, Witches, Blasphemers, Drunkards, Scolders, and Mockers of Godlines in the Land, under the name of a true Reformed Church of Christ, and a communion of the Faithful'.[59] This mixing of the multitudes took place, according to Wood, because of the greed of the rulers of the Kirk. In their desire for power they sought to join Civil and Ecclesiastical powers, and in so

---

[58] Wood. *The Dead-Man's Testament*, 16.
[59] Ibid, 4, 5.

doing compelled sinners to appear before Kirk Sessions and Synods, 'although not to God (who approveth no compelled service)'.[60] Simply put, the Kirk made the same error as the Roman Church. By forcing all within their sphere of influence to conform to the Kirk they created a mass-pollution in both local congregations and in the national membership of the state church. For Wood the Kirk could never be a properly reformed church until its constitution is purified to include only those who choose to be members and who submit themselves to ecclesiastical judicatories. This is a theme repeated throughout the polemics printed by the English. The belief that the national church of Scotland 'hath been a Church most gloriously reformed, and worthy to be a Pattern to all others' only served to promulgate error in Wood's estimation.[61] Communion with the unrepentant multitudes, instead of bringing blessings to the Saints, brought punishment for blasphemy and the curse of the Law. The Kirk fostered an atmosphere in which outward trappings of holiness, such as attending the sermon, partaking of communion and singing the psalms merely covered up the wickedness of people's hearts allowing them access to the Kirk without requiring any true reformation taking place within their lives.[62] Therefore the Worship of the Kirk becomes corrupt. Finally, for Wood, the creation of the National Covenant gave final evidence of the Kirk's depravation.[63] When the degenerate masses of Scotland foolishly engaged in a Covenant with God they obligated themselves 'under such horrible pains, to defend that which they never knew, they bound themselves over to the curse of the Law'.[64]

The final section of *The Dead-Man's Testament* is the product of the anonymous Scot who polished up the paper and delivered it to the English. In this addendum he critiques the Kirk's synods, presbyteries and General Assemblies claiming there is no scriptural warrant for these meetings. He refutes the traditional scriptural defences of Presbytery by arguing the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15) met only once, while the meeting of the Elders at Ephesus (Acts 20:17)

---

[60] Ibid, 6.
[61] Ibid, 8.
[62] Ibid, 10.
[63] Ibid, 11.

cannot be said to have convened regularly. Moreover, the Scottish practice of these meetings is to emit declarations, catechisms and restrictions on private worship which interfere in the freedom of Christians to gather and worship God when they please. Establishing limitations on how frequently Christians can gather and in what composition they may meet is unbiblical. It is wrong, claims the author, to force Christians to wait a week 'to hear those Preach, of whom they expected most for Edification, although their Parish-Priest had been an idiot, void of the Saving knowledge of God'.[65] In conclusion, the work accuses the Presbyterian assemblies to be 'Popish-like' if they believe themselves to be 'the Inheritance and Church of God, by way of eminency and speciall propriety'.[66] These criticisms closely mirror the arguments put forward against Presbyterianism in England and New England during the 1640s. Independents in England accepted that Acts 15 and 20 provide examples of multiple congregations meeting together to discuss extraordinarily difficult issues, but refused to accept them as warranting a hierarchal structure. As a result, such occasional meetings were voluntary and only consultative in matters of doctrine, but not juridical. In New England such synods, although only occasional, were considered more binding upon those attending and were employed to deal with difficult issues like the Antinomian controversy in Massachusetts Bay colony.[67] However, due to the censorship implemented by the General Assembly in the late 1640s these debates were new for Scots.

All the errors listed by Wood stem from a common source, the misinterpretation of correct church composition. *A Dead-Man's Testament* follows *The Branch of the Lord* in appealing for purer church membership, and echoes *A Word of Advertisement* in criticising the corruption of the Covenant and Presbyterian hierarchy. Consequently it should be seen as consistent with and an addition to the Commonwealth's continuing propaganda campaign against the Kirk. However, the work's use of a Scottish voice, like *A Word of Advertisement*, set it apart from previous

---

[64] Ibid, 11.
[65] Ibid, 15.
[66] Ibid, 15.

critiques of the Kirk written by Englishmen and gave it greater polemical influence. Coupled with its voice from beyond the grave approach it is by far the most contentious item printed by the English propaganda machine during the Interregnum. The lasting impact of this work throughout the decade is demonstrated by the allusion to it in the title of James Durham's posthumously published book *The Dying Man's Testament to the Church of Scotland* published in 1659.[68]

Shortly thereafter, early in January 1652, the third 'Scottish' work came off the Leith based press and was entitled *To the very honorable the representative of the Common-vvealth.*[69] The broadsheet is a petition and extremely rare. Only one surviving copy of the work is known.[70] Like *A Dead-Man's Testament*, the document was published by the authority of Timothy Wilkes, Lieutenant-Governor of Leith, granted on January 2, 1652. Addressed to Cromwell, it is an appeal from Scots willing to embrace the Commonwealth's actions as 'the designe of the advancement of CHRIST'S KINGDOM, and the just Freedom and Liberty of the People'. Although no names are given, the authors were almost certainly responsible for a previous paper to the English entitled 'Overtures to the Right Honorable Commonwealth' (no longer extant) which consisted of fifteen overtures, as well as papers submitted to various Resolutioner and Protestor meetings

---

[67] D.F. Chatfield, 'The Congregationalists of New England and its Repercussions on England and Scotland, 1641-2.' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1964), 46.

[68] James Durham, *A dying man's testament to the Church of Scotland, or, A treatise concerning scandal divided into four parts* (Edinburgh: Christopher Higgins, 1659). The work summarized Durham's efforts throughout the decade: the unification of the Kirk. He addresses how to deal with scandal without schism, however he also includes a section on 'errors'. John Carstairs, author of one of the prefaces wrote: 'In the *third part* concerning *Scandalous Errours,* wonderfully suited to this time of so great infection, sicknesse and mortality, by the raging plague and botch of errour, exceedingly gathered to a head, ripened and made to break and run out, to the infecting, in a manner, of the very air wherein the Churches of these Nations breath, by the heat and warmnesse afforded to it from a lamentable liberty and vast Toleration: In this *third part,* I say, there is, as it were, a Physicians Shop, full of choice preservatives against, and soveraign remedies of, poysonable errours and heresies'. Durham argues throughout the third section that toleration has historically proven to destroy the Church and contends that magistrates have an obligation to oppose error (154-5, 190-2, 194-201, 240-8).

[69] *To the very honorable the representative of the Common-vvealth. the humble petition and remonstrance of such in Scotland.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).

[70] The only known surviving copy is held in the NLS: Ry.1.1.73. It appears to be the printer's proof.

across the central belt.[71] The authors claim to have favoured toleration for a long time, but had been suppressed by Scotland's Malignant and Presbyterian parties. As a result they praise the present endeavours of the English in advancing religious toleration as 'the Lord's doing, and it is marvailous in our eyes' and make four supplications to Cromwell. First, that the people of Scotland should enjoy the same freedoms and liberties as their English neighbours and that this should be facilitated by a union of the two nations. Second, that godly men be appointed to govern, rather than individuals who would tyrannise over them, because they would delight to follow individuals who live implicitly by faith. Third, that God's people be given 'all due Christian freedom' to worship as their consciences dictate without fear of tyrannical suppression. Fourth, that worldly greatness not be the deciding factor in the selection of governors. These four requests established that there was a portion of Scotland's society, no matter how small, not only willing to comply with English rule, but who actually saw this as a sort of Exodus out of Scotland's Presbyterian Egypt. The English were anxious to capitalise on this request by making it known publicly and using it as propaganda.[72]

The publication of this work, like that of *A Word of Advertisement* and *A Dead-Man's Testament*, intended to advertise to the people of Scotland that religious opinion in the country was not uniform, even among their compatriots, and that significant religious change was on the way. That these works were published by the English army shows they were in line with the Commonwealth's agenda for Scotland. The polemical war against the Kirk continued to intensify and the regime gladly used Scottish works in their arsenal. Although Nicoll complained in November 1651 that 'religion' (the Kirk) was 'slighted and condemned' under the new regime, poisoned by errors and heresies, things were to get much worse for the Kirk in the following months.[73]

---

[71] For a discussion of authorship see chapter 4, below. Nicoll, 63; Row, *Life of Blair*, 289; Dow, 29; Holfelder, 144.
[72] For more on the authorship of this work, see ch. 4.
[73] Nicoll, 65.

Settled Government and Overt Attacks on the Kirk

On January 15th the Parliament's Commissioners for Settling and Managing the Affairs of Scotland arrived in Dalkeith, taking up residence in Dalkeith Palace.[74] Five days later they 'discharged the printing of diurnalls at Leith, or else where'.[75] The order, according to the editor of the news journal, was directed at *Mercurius Scoticus*.[76] This official act censuring what was essentially their own printing press shows that a marked change in governing style was taking place, a centralisation of government. Rather than a wholesale stoppage of printing journals in Leith, *Mercurius Scoticus* would be replaced by London based newsbooks that shared more implicitly in a symbiotic relationship with the Interregnum government. Two months after the silencing of *Mercurius Scoticus* the London based *A Diurnal of some Passages and Occurrences* began to be re-printed at Leith on March 15, 1652.[77] In June 1653 *Mercurius Politicus* also began to be re-printed in Leith.[78] These papers maintained a pro-government slant in return for inside information, which allowed them to be the first to provide breaking news. As a result both the newsbook and the government profited from this mutually beneficial arrangement.[79] Because of the rapid transfer from the printing of one journal to another the censure of *Mercurius Scoticus* had little impact on the printer, probably Christopher Higgins by this time, for he continued to print journals; however now they were simply reprints of the government approved London editions. Under the commissioners new laws and structured government replaced the impromptu martial law of the Parliament's army. On February 12th the Commissioners

---

[74] Nicoll, 79.
[75] Lamont, 37.
[76] *S & C*, 315.
[77] C. Nelson and M. Seccombe, *British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1641-1700* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1987), 56. The journal was re-printed in Leith from March 15, 1652 until January 4, 1653.
[78] Printing of *Mercurius Politicus* moved to Edinburgh in 1654 and continued to be printed until April 11, 1660, when its name was changed to *Mercurius Publicus*. (Nelson, *British Newspapers and Periodicals*, 242. George Chalmers, and others, have incorrectly recorded the starting date to be October 1653. George Chalmers, *The Life of Thomas Ruddiman*. (London: John Stockdale, Piccadilly and William Laing, Edinburgh, 1794), 117).
[79] For an explanation of the symbiotic relationship between the Interregnum government and the news journals see: Seymour, 'Pro-Government Propaganda in Interregnum England, 1649-1660', 60, 408.

announced the Parliament's plan for establishing their rule in Scotland.[80] Two day later they gave their own more detailed description as to how they planned on settling matters.[81] As discussed in chapter two, this entailed the imposition of toleration for anyone worshipping in 'A Gospel Way'.[82] Whether independently gathered congregations formed or not, the English regime had accomplished what it desired: the Presbyterian tyranny had been broken, and the Presbyterians' ability to impose their church government on England or interfere in English politics was unequivocally diminished.

Two triumphalist sermons formerly preached before Parliament in the Autumn of 1651 made their way to the press of Evan Tyler in the early part of 1652 as part of a celebration of the Commonwealth's victory not just over Scotland, but more specifically over the Presbytery. These sermons stand out as unusual, for while it was common for sermons preached before Parliament to be printed in England,[83] they were rarely reprinted in Scotland.[84] In fact, these appear to be the only two reprinted in Scotland during the Interregnum. John Owen preached his sermon to Parliament on October 24, 1651, a day set aside for solemn thanksgiving for the defeat of the Scots Army at Worcester.[85] He heralded the victory at Worcester as one over 'those who would have been our Oppressors in Scotland', who had prepared a new antichrist to replace Prelacy, 'a heavie yoke, a beast that had it grown to perfection, would have had horns and hoofs,' and whose maintenance thereof was the great interest of the Scots.[86] In Owen's estimation, Scotland had been the instigator of the troubles between the two countries, because

---

[80] England and Wales. Parliament. Commissioners for ordering and managing affairs in Scotland. *By the Commissioners of the Parliament of the Common-VVealth of England, for ordering and managing affairs in Scotland. The Parliament of the Common-VVealth of England, having taken the settlement of Scotland into their serious consideration....* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1651) [February, 1652].

[81] England and Wales. Parliament. Commissioners for ordering and managing affairs in Scotland. *By the Commissioners of the Parliament of the Common-VVealth of England, for ordering and managing affairs in Scotland. Although the Parliament of the Common-Wealth of England, in their declaration, concerning the settlement of Scotland....* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1651) [February, 1652].

[82] See p. 79-81, above.

[83] Seymour, 'Pro-Government Propaganda in Interregnum England, 1649-1660', 79.

[84] J.F. Wilson notes that actually very few sermons preached to the Long Parliament between 1649 and 1653 were actually printed (Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament*, 274n).

[85] Owen, John. *The advantage of the kingdome of Christ, in the shaking of the kingdoms of the world: or, Providential alterations, in their subserviencie to Christ's exaltation. Opened in a sermon preached to the Parliament, Octob. 24. 1651.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).

they attempted to impose their tyrannical anti-Christian form of church government upon England. Hence he urged people of England to celebrate their victory at Worcester, as it is their duty 'to rejoyce when Babylon is destroyed with violence and fury'.[87] If the Scots had had their way a national church would be set up over all of Britain and none would live peaceably unless they were subjects of that Kirk. Victory at Worcester showed God's 'Providential alterations' to the Kirk's unholy plans. It was for their lusting and deceitful intentions in matters pertaining to religion the Scots were crushed by God like 'the Cockatrice in the shell'.[88]

A second sermon of thanksgiving preached before Parliament, by Peter Sterry, also found its way to the printing press at Leith. Equally uninhibited in its criticism of the Kirk, Sterry preached *England's Deliverance from the Northern Presbytery* to Parliament on November 5, 1651 (the anniversary of the 'Gun Powder' plot).[89] He made a corollary between England's salvation from the popish 'Gun-powder-Treason' and their victory over the Scots at Worcester explaining that both were divine acts of deliverance from Antichrist.[90] His epistle of dedication for the printed sermon professes his intention for the work to be a warning to his Christian brethren about the hidden dangers of the Presbytery: 'For this I have desired in my Preaching, in my Prayers, to work with GOD, even for the opening of the eyes of men to see, that the same spirit which lay in the polluted Bed of Papacy, may meet them in the perfumed Bed of Presbytery'.[91] Based on Jeremiah 16:14-15, the sermon focused on God's promises to deliver His people 'out of Egypt "out of the NORTH".'[92] Sterry's selective restructuring of Jeremiah 16:15 in order to emphasize the 'North' as representative of Scotland continues throughout the piece.[93]

---

[86] Ibid, 9-10.
[87] Ibid, 12.
[88] Owen, *The advantage of the kingdome of Christ*, 10.
[89] Peter Sterry, *England's Deliverance from the Northern Presbytery, Compared with Its Deliverance from the Roman Papacy: by Peter Sterry, Once Fellow of Emmanuel Colledge in Cambridge, Now Preacher to the Right Honorable the Councell of State, Sitting at White-Hall.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).
[90] Ibid, 13.
[91] Ibid, 8.
[92] Ibid, 10.
[93] Jeremiah 16:14-15: '(14) Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that it shall no more be said, The LORD liveth, that brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; (15) But, The

According to Sterry, the godly in England face two 'capital enemies' in the forms of Papacy and Presbyterianism, both of which share similar anti-Christian traits. Both maintain an unhealthy devotion to forms, which 'assumes a Spiritual and Civil power to it self; [and] ...makes it self drunk with the wine of Fornications, with Earthly powers and interests, such as takes to it self the Iron Mace of fleshly force and fury, to break in pieces at pleasure Common-wealths, Crowns, Consciences, Estates, and Hearts of men'.[94] Devotion to forms causes Scripture to become the letter of the law, robbing it of its spiritually nurturing power and leaving it 'but a breathlesse Carkass, or a Dead Letter.'[95] The diminishing of Scripture's power and value is evident in both churches. While the Roman Church prohibits the use of the Scriptures in the vernacular the Kirk is little better, since it prohibits the interpretation of Scripture 'which the Holy Spirit brings forth to every man in his own spirit'.[96] Furthermore, both Rome and Scotland's Kirk are greatly guilty of Pharisaic suppression of those who exhibit spiritual enthusiasm or who seem to act contrary to their interpretation of the Gospel. 'Both the Papists and the Scots Presbyterians,' he posits, 'are like fishermen in the River Thames who set up their baskets to catch "Lampries" who swim against the current.'[97] In addition, they interject in the politics of the temporal world, crossing over from the spiritual to the civil. Sterry compares the Papal bull against Queen Elizabeth, which gave England to the King of Spain for Elizabeth's apostasy, with Scotland's attempt to return England to the Stuart monarchy.[98]

Not satisfied with merely painting the Presbytery with the same brush as Rome, Sterry intensified his argument, alleging that the Kirk's actions are more destructive and more dangerous to true faith than those of Rome, because the Kirk dresses itself in the Reformation. Something that is partially reformed, or pretends to be, but underneath remains corrupted, is far

---

LORD liveth, that brought up the children of Israel from the land of the north, and from all the lands whither he had driven them: and I will bring them again into their land that I gave unto their fathers' (*KJV*).

[94] Ibid, 15.
[95] Ibid, 16.
[96] Ibid, 17.
[97] Ibid, 18.
[98] Ibid, 19.

more insidious than something that is wholly and visibly corrupt: an argument the Presbyterians had used against Episcopalians a decade earlier. Evidence of the corrupt intentions of Presbyterians was clear in their open scheming against England. While the gunpowder plot (fomented by Catholics) intended to remove England's government, the Scots were intent on the subversion of England's government, religion and people, and all, by an 'Army made up of Highlanders, who never knew Christianity or Civility'.[99] The vile nature of the Scots' conniving was made abundantly clear, in that while the Gunpowder plot was planned and implemented secretly, the Scottish 'plot' was formulated and hatched very publicly in the forum of the national church. Hence the entire Church of Scotland was complicit in this treachery. Although God had delivered England from Popery and Prelacy, Sterry heralded the victory at Worcester 'saved us from the Black plots, and Bloudy powers of the NORTHERN PRESBYTERY,' a deliverance which 'hath excelled them all'.[100]

The re-publication of these English sermons preached before Parliament serve as evidence for two important suppositions. First, many in England viewed the 'defeat' of the Scottish Presbytery as the vanquishing of an old enemy. This gives support to the view that Scotland's Presbytery was perceived to be a direct threat to the Commonwealth, and its overthrow a principal objective of the war. Second, these sermons were deemed to carry a valuable message for the people of Scotland, namely, that the undermining of their Kirk had been ordained by God and they should be thankful that for a third time they too had been freed from the yoke of the beast (Roman Catholicism, Episcopacy and now Presbytery). Yet, despite the proud declarations of victory over the Kirk in the sermons of Owen and Sterry, the Presbyterian Kirk continued to be perceived as the greatest threat to the Commonwealth's stability. In April 1652 *Mercurius Politicus* reported:

> It is the onely Thorn that is left in the Paw of the English Lyon; take it out or else it will fester and gangrene. I fear it is a Thorn in the side too, for they say, they have friends still in England. Beleeve it, all your other Enemies are tame beasts to the high Presbyter, and yet with the winding and turning of a Religious pretence, and

---

[99] Ibid, 23.
[100] Ibid, 14.

> an artificial zeal against Heresie, he will, like a tame Snake (if not warily avoided) get into your bosome.[101]

For this reason propaganda against the Kirk continued to be produced, because unless an alternative to the Presbyterian Kirk could be established the Church of Scotland would continue to oppose the Commonwealth. That same spring the *Weekly Intelligencer* heralded the success of the regime's campaign against the Kirk:

> the Parliament of England, and their Commissioners in Scotland are doing what they can for the advancement of the Gospel with authoritie to carry on that great work, which will adde much unto their glory, and stop the mouthes of all their Adversaries. And it is worth your observation, that many of the godly partie in Scotland that had heretofore hard thoughts of our Church Government, begin now to be more satisfied and to comply with us.[102]

The establishment of toleration and the increasing stability of the regime in Scotland gave the English the foundation to produce their most audacious and open attack against Presbyterianism. Rather than works by Englishmen advocating Independency, or tracts of nameless Scottish origin simply criticising the Kirk, the regime now prepared an all out attack on the Presbytery to be produced in an easily distributed package. Shortly after the arrival of the Commissioners for settling the affairs of Scotland (and their chaplains) and their subsequent imposition of toleration Evan Tyler's shop printed an expanded edition of Nicholas Lockyer's sermon entitled *A Litle Stone out of the Mountain.*[103]

Lockyer, an Independent chaplain with the English forces, took full advantage of his time in Scotland for promoting his beloved Independency. While he is best remembered for his brazen

---

[101] *Mercurius Politicus*. (April 15-22, 1652), 1551 [E660(5)].
[102] *The Weekly Intelligencer of the Commonwealth*. (March 23-30, 1652), 400 [E658(8)].
[103] Nicholas Lockyer, *A Litle Stone Out of the Mountain. Church-Order Briefly Opened.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652). The sermon takes its title from Daniel 2:34, in which a small bit of stone is cut from a mountain 'without hands' and this grows into a mountain in its own right. Lockyer interprets this as the formation of Independent congregations out of degenerate churches. Due to the limitations of this thesis it would be impossible to include a complete study of how Daniel 2:34 was used in 17th century scholarship, however Calvin addressed the verse in the ninth lecture of his *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel*. Here he identifies the stone as being Christ himself, rather than the church. The earliest use I have found in which the 'stone' is identified as the Church is in Roger Williams *The Bloudy Tenant, of Persecution* (London, 1644). For Williams the stone is the 'Christian Church, or Kingdome of Saints' and the mountain the civil state or 'Roman Empire' (p. 89). While this is the earliest precedent I have found for this use of the verse by Independents, the phrase was subsequently used several times in works produced in Scotland: *Mercurius Politicus*, (August 12-19, 1652), p. 1806

printed attack on Presbyterianism, a report from April 1652 places Lockyer in 'the north', probably in the vicinity of Aberdeen, helping to establish Independent congregations at the request of some Scots.[104] The significance of his impact in Scotland is testified by lingering Presbyterian disdain for him. Five years after he left the country his memory still evoked an emotional response from Robert Baillie who in 1658 referred to him as 'that asse Lockier'.[105]

According to the print historian James Chalmers the plan of the Parliament's Commissioners was to first establish toleration, then to turn their efforts to openly attacking the Kirk in print.[106] That the publication of *A Litle Stone* was the product of the regime and not just the author Nicholas Lockyer is verified by the work's epistle of dedication, signed by Joseph Caryl, John Oxenbridge and Cuthbert Sydenham, the three chaplains to the Parliament's newly arrived Commissioners. Their dedication sets the tone of the regime's continued attack on Presbyterianism: calling for recognition of God's judgement against Scotland, their covenants and the Kirk as evidenced in Scotland's defeats at Preston, Dunbar, Hamilton, Inverkeithing and Worcester.[107] They identify the mixed constitution of the Kirk as the primary cause of this punishment and argue the urgent need to restore the church in Scotland to a proper composition. Since the truly godly are inevitably 'lost and drowned' among the degenerate masses in a state church, they argue the only way forward is separation from the Kirk and gathering Independent congregations.[108]

Lockyer's own preface explains it to be an appeal for the well-being of the elect in Scotland, who 'are in an ill vessell, which cannot possible live, in such stormes as now beat upon it, from Heaven and from the Saints, and therefore I could wish that all the godly were out'.[109] His intention is twofold. First he defends the validity of independently gathered congregations

---

[E674:6]; *To the very Honorable the Representative of the Commonwealth* (Leith, 1652); Francis Howgill, *To all You Commanders and Officers of the Army in Scotland* (Leith, 1657), 4.

[104] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:178.

[105] Ibid., iii:401.

[106] J. Chalmers, *An Historical Account of Printing in Scotland*, i:f285.

[107] Lockyer, *A Litle Stone out of the Mountain*, e.d. 2.

[108] Ibid, e.d. 5-6.

against the aspersions of Presbyterian detractors and second, he asserts the fundamental flaws of the Kirk. Lockyer dismisses Presbyterian accusations that Congregational churches are breeding grounds of 'many monsters' and 'heresies' as slanderous libels. He singles out Thomas Edwards' *Gangraena* and Samuel Rutherford's *A Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist* as particularly defamatory and untenable attacks on Independency. Rutherford wrote in 1648 he knew of none in England who were purely Independent, claiming all those gathered under that banner of Independency held some other 'unsound and corrupt tenets' in addition.[110] Lockyer retorted:

> It makes me tremble to read this expression...surely there be many Independents in England, that this good man is a stranger to, and how he should then dare to speak so of them all as he does, is fearfull, If Christians can allow themselves this kinde of latitude, to gloss upon their Brethrens words and persons, I know not how any man shall so speak, write, or live as not to be printed and staged to all the World for an Heretick.[111]

According to Lockyer, such unfair judgements were partially to blame for the present plight of Scotland. In contrast to the picture of a polluted Kirk painted by the commissioner's chaplains in their dedication, Lockyer expresses the approval that would shower down upon Scotland if the ministers of the Kirk would recognise their error in damning the Independents and take back their sharp words 'of which their pens, pulpits, and papers are full.'[112] Hence, according to Lockyer, Scotland's guilt in the eyes of God did not rest wholly upon attempts to make England Presbyterian or the impurity of the Kirk, but also for their defamation of nonconformist Christians in England. From a defence of Independency in the face of Presbyterian criticism, Lockyer proceeded to his own attack on the Presbytery.

For Lockyer, the Kirk has three primary flaws: first, an improper constitution; second, a tyrannical rule by elders; and third, an idolatrous devotion to presbytery. He chose Acts 15:3 as the Scripture on which to base his sermon: 'They were sent on their way by the church and travelled through Phoenicia and Samaria, telling the full story of the conversion of the Gentiles,

---

[109] Ibid, t.r. 3-4.
[110] Samuel Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist.* (London, 1648), 250-1.
[111] Lockyer, *A Litle Stone out of the Mountain*, 47-51.
[112] Ibid, pre. 6.

and causing great rejoicing amongst all the Christians'.[113] From this very brief Scripture he asserts the proper constitution and operation of the church can be deduced: 'The complexion of the visible Church under the Gospel, is said here to be conversion, the constituting matter, converted ones.'[114] Since the church is expressed as being comprised only of converts, he questions how Presbyterians can criticise Independents for loosing themselves from corrupt mixed churches and gathering together people who show the signs of being truly converted. He cites Galatians 1:22 as giving full warrant for gathering properly constituted congregations out of corrupt ones, just as the first Christian churches were gathered out of 'that...Church of the Jewes'.[115] To explain the proper constitution of the church, he uses the story of Simon Magus, just as James Brown did in his dispute with James Guthrie.[116] Although Simon convinced the Apostles that he was truly a member of the body through a public confession and an apparent outward conversion, when it became evident he was 'one not in Christ' the church shunned him as a hypocrite.[117] From this the church must recognise their commission to admit only those who show the signs of election and if anyone admitted to fellowship should prove to be a reprobate they must be removed from the church. Likewise, if the church becomes corrupted by unrepentant multitudes, then the elect should separate themselves and reconstitute into a new congregation just as early Christians broke away from synagogues. For Lockyer the Scottish Kirk urgently required that latter step since 'the bad wil cast out the good, sooner then they wil condescend to cast out themselves'.[118] In fact, Lockyer perceived the Kirk's depravity as so complete, he brands it 'not a man but a carcasse'.[119] Unless the Kirk give birth to something new, it was beyond resuscitation.

---

[113] Ibid, 1.
[114] Ibid, 2.
[115] *Ibid*, 46-7. Gal. 1:22: 'I was still unknown by sight to the Christian congregations in Judaea' (*RSV*).
[116] NLS. Wod.Qu.XVII, f. 214.
[117] Lockyer, *A Litle Stone out of the Mountain*, 58-60.
[118] Ibid, 131.
[119] Ibid, 131.

Lockyer's second complaint regarding the Presbytery is the diminished role of the Christian in the functioning of a congregation. For Lockyer all believers should be participants in the church, by which he means actively taking part in the governing of the church. Just as Catholicism and Episcopacy are 'usurpers and Lords over the flock of Christ' because they make Christians spectators and remove from them the power given to them as believers, the Presbyterian Kirk also deprives 'the people of God of their best Liberties'.[120] Before the 'Council' of Laodicea in the mid-fourth century, Lockyer alleges, the church was democratic.[121] After this, however, representatives began to be selected to rule over the church and the role of elders became that of rulers. He argues elders should not have absolute power over the congregation since 'the spirit of discerning...is not confined as a peculiar to the Presbytery, or Eldership of the Church'[122] and especially since the power of the keys 'to bind are given to the whole church, which is constituted of converted believers'.[123] For this reason, the elders of a church have no greater claim to the power of the keys than any other believers within the church, since he argues the keys were not given to Peter as an Apostle or an elder, but as a believer.[124] Since all believers are given a share of that power and because all share in the spirit of discernment, the Church must operate in an 'Organicall' way.[125] Lockyer uses the example of the body to explain this. Some members are eyes, while others are hands or feet, but all must work in unity if the body is to function effectively. He would disagree with anyone who argued this model implies elders alone serve as the part of the body which dictates the function of the congregational-body.

The Biblical model of eldership, explains Lockyer, means elders should be elected by the congregation and aid in the governing of the church. 'So long as they go right,' they are 'to be

---

[120] Ibid, 75.
[121] Ibid, 82-3. A specific date for the Canon of Laodicea cannot be ascertained, but it is known to have occurred between the Councils of Antioch (341) and Constantinople (381).
[122] Ibid, 68.
[123] Ibid, 72-3.
[124] Ibid, 64.
[125] Ibid, 88.

honoured and followed; but if otherwise, to be admonished, and if impenitent, to be rejected'.[126] While they may have a special designation they are not to be raised up or set over a congregation.[127] Since no elder has complete power over a congregation and since they must operate as a part of the body, Lockyer contends that there can be no eldership in which elders are appointed over congregations of which they are not themselves members. This carries over into an argument against presbyteries quite conventional in relation to the Presbyterian-Independent dispute of the 1640s and similar to the arguments in *A Dead-Man's Testament* against the use of Acts 15 and 20 to establish the legitimacy of Presbyterian hierarchy.[128] Citing Acts 20:28 Lockyer establishes the limitations of Eldership, excluding any warrant for rule external of the congregational elders charge to: 'keep guard over yourselves and over all the flock [not flocks] of which the Holy Spirit has given you charge, as shepherds of the church of the Lord'.[129] As in Cotton, Norton and others, foreign elderships, or visiting elders, may provide counsel, but they do not have any authoritative jurisdiction.[130] An elder's jurisdiction reaches only as far as his pastoral power.[131] To support this assertion he cites 1 Peter 5:2 'look after the flock of God whose shepherds you are; do it, not under compulsion, but willingly'.[132] Every congregation is fully self-sufficient, because they are complete and 'hath sufficiencie within it self, to exercise all the ordinances of Christ; to ordain, to excommunicate' without the intervention of 'foreign' Elders.[133] Preaching, he claims, is held in higher regard by the Apostle than binding and loosing, therefore if Christ trusts churches to preach (a greater thing) then surely he trusts them to do a lesser thing (bind or loose).

---

[126] Ibid, 65.
[127] Lockyer's position advances to a degree of 'democracy' that New England Independents had shied away from. For an explanation of the divergence between England and New England Independents on this point, see: Chatfield, 'The Congregationalists of New England and its Repercussions on England and Scotland, 1641-2', 32-42, 263-72, 274-5.
[128] See p. 135, above.
[129] Lockyer, *A Litle Stone*, 99.
[130] Chatfield, 42.
[131] Lockyer, *Litle Stone*, 109.
[132] Ibid, 111.
[133] Ibid, 119.

The third and final criticism put forward is the manner in which the Presbytery is held up as an idol in Scotland. This is not an allegation found only in Lockyer. An English journal in December 1651 equates the Scots' admiration for Presbyterianism with the devotion of Ephesus for the goddess Diana, likening the production of the covenants and the promotion of Presbytery with the making of 'silver schrynes for Diana'.[134] For Lockyer and others of his persuasion, the Kirk had stepped out of one kind of idolatry at the Reformation, to tread in another. He urges the godly in Scotland to heed the words of 2 Cor. 6:17 and 'Come away and leave them, separate yourselves, says the Lord; touch nothing unclean. Then I will accept you'. This final accusation hit at the signing of the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant which placed the preservation of the Presbytery at the forefront of their endeavours. Throughout this work Lockyer slyly moved his attack from the mixed multitude of the Kirk, to the tyrannical nature of its organisation. Finally, he struck at the people's deep devotion to the Kirk suggesting that extreme devotion to the Presbytery polluted that form of church government by making it an obstructive idol, hindering the worship of God, impeding any other Christian forms and fomenting intolerance towards nonconformists.

While these arguments were not radically new in relation to the Presbyterian-Independent debate in England during the 1640s, it must be remembered they had never before been breached to the Scottish public. The General Assembly had banned all books tending towards Independency or separation in 1647, the year before Norton's *Responsio*, Cotton's *The Way of the Congregational churches cleared*, Allin and Shepard's *Defence*, and Hooker's *Survey of the summe of church discipline* were published in England.[135] Hence this was all radically new to most Scots. Although the Church of Scotland was integrally involved in the debate over ecclesiastical government in

---

[134] Nicoll, 71-2.

[135] John Norton, *Responsio ad totam quaestionum syllogen à clarissimo viro domino Guilielmo Apollonio ... propositam ad componendas controversias quasdam circa politiam ecclesiasticam in Anglia nunc temporis agitatas spectantem,* (Londini: R.B. impensis Andreae Crook, 1648); John Cotton, *The way of Congregational churches cleared in two treatises.* (London, 1648); John Allin and Thomas Shepard, *A defence of the answer made unto the nine questions or positions sent from New-England, against the reply thereto by that reverend servant of Christ, Mr. John Ball, entituled, A tryall*

England, as far as the population of Scotland were concerned, it was an external debate taking place abroad. With regards to the intricacies of the debate, they were completely unaware. As a result Lockyer's work brought the debate to the Scottish populace for the first time.

Although Lockyer attacked the composition, structure and even the nation's devotion to the Kirk, probably the most important aspect of this work is its brevity. The work comprised 138 pages bound into a small pocket-sized volume.[136] It is an excellent piece of propaganda because its economy makes the work easily digestible. Following in the example of the regime's earlier pieces of propaganda against the Kirk the work adheres to the tradition of religious polemical pamphlets in England, which were directed to the general public and for that reason kept concise. By keeping the work short and to the point the chance of the general public taking the time to read it was greatly enhanced.

Softening Regulation and Presbyterian Response

The Commonwealth's continuous attacks upon the Kirk began to take their toll in 1652. In the latter part of the year, the English newsbook *Mercurius Britannicus* reported the clergy preaching vehemently against the intervention of the English into Scottish affairs, complaining they had removed first the bonds between the King and his people, then between 'the Magistrate and the people' and now finally between 'the Minister and the people'.[137] Yet the imposition of toleration and the attack of Lockyer did not mark an end for the Kirk, only an end to its silence. Significantly, the replacement of the Commonwealth's initial martial rule in Scotland by political Commissioners also marked the end of stringent control of Scotland's presses. Despite their initial show of power in censuring *Mercurius Scoticus*, civilian government was more lax towards the presses than the army had been. Gradually, the apathy towards the control of printing that was a trademark of Interregnum England began to creep into Scotland. The Kirk began to

---

of the new church-way in New-England and in old wherin. (London: R. Cotes, 1648); Thomas Hooker, *A survey of the summe of church-discipline. (London, 1648).*

[136] The volume measures approx. 3" x 1.5".

[137] *Mercurius Britannicus*, No. 19. (Nov. 23-30, 1652), 290 [E801(4)].

create printed works of their own, beyond those of the bickering Protester-Resolutioner conflict, intended to defend Presbyterianism and thwart the threat of Sectarianism.

In 1652 two of Edinburgh's great printing presses sprang back into action.[138] Within this atmosphere of lightened censorship James Guthrie produced a treatise on the role of elders in the church.[139] Although not explicitly billed as a response to Lockyer, the subject and its publication so soon after *A Litle Stone* suggests that it was a motivating factor for the Protester. He stated that vitally important among his reasons for the production of the work was 'vindicating the Doctrine of our Church concerning these Church-Officers, that the mouths of such who speak evil may be stopped, and others who stumble may be satisfied'.[140] Echoing Lockyer's criticism of elders as rulers and his claim they are an invention of man, Guthrie set out to establish the divine origins of the office of ruling elders.[141] He explained the specific warrant for 'ruling' elders as distinctive from ministers, doctors and preaching or teaching elders.[142] Guthrie asserted that the earliest foundations for the office of ruling elders was in the Jewish church[143] and then turned to evidence in the Fathers citing Ambrose, Tertullian, Basil and Augustine to support the early origins of this office in the Christian church.[144] The work described the proper calling of elders, their election and their authority to rule over the church. He supported the rule of elders in individual congregations, but in direct opposition to Lockyer,

---

[138] Gideon Lithgow and The Heirs of George Anderson: *The psalms of David in meeter* (Edinburgh: Gideon Lithgow, 1652); *A representation of the sad condition and humble desires of the people of Glasgow* (Edinburgh: by the heirs of G. Anderson, 1652); Westminster Assembly, *The Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms First Agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and Now Appointed by the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, to be a Part of Uniformity in Religion Between the Kirks of Christ in the Three Kingdomes* (Edinburgh: printed by the heirs of George Anderson, 1652); C. Irvino, *Bellum Grammaticale, ad exemplar Mri. Alexandri Humii, in gratiam eorum, qui Amoniores Musas venerantur*, (Edinburgi: haredes Georgii Andersoni, 1652).

[139] James Guthrie, *A Treatise of Ruling Elders and Deacons.* (Edinburgh: n.a., 1652). While censorship began to lessen, it was not excessively loose. Guthrie's work was published without an imprint by the printer, perhaps a sign that times were tense.

[140] Ibid, 13.

[141] Ibid, 25.

[142] Ibid, 23.

[143] Ibid, 26. 2 Chron. 19:8; Jer. 29:1; Matt. 16:21-3; Acts 4:5.

[144] Ibid, 26. Presbyterians were not affraid to use Patristic sources to support their claims. They did so excessively in the struggle against Episcopacy in the 1620s and 1630s. See: David G. Mullan (ed.), *Religious Controversy in Scotland, 1625-1639.* (Edinburgh: SHS, 1998).

also in presbyteries, synods, General Assemblies and taking it a step beyond to all 'diverse Nations professing the Faith of Jesus Christ'.[145] 'In all Assemblies of the Church, Ruling Elders being therto rightly called, have power to sit, write, debate, vote, and conclude in all matters that are handled therein, Acts 15:2 and 6:22-3', wrote Guthrie.[146]

The importance of this work was not its defence of eldership, but what it reveals about elements within the Kirk rapidly responding to overt English polemics against their Presbyterian Church structure. According to Wariston, the tract provided an important reply to those who criticised the ability of the pure minority in the Kirk to purge out the degenerate masses, a criticism found in Lockyer's *Litle Stone*. Guthrie maintained that even in a congregation where none can be found who are godly enough to serve as elders, the book of discipline provides that out of two or three congregations the Presbytery may choose elders to rule over the whole 'and so debar from the table the ignorant and scandalous', but 'not to cast the whole multitude out of church fellowship'.[147] What is more, his ability to get this work printed in Scotland in 1652 illustrates the loosening of England's initially very tight control of Scotland's presses. Its speed in publication may have been greatly aided by it being a defence and definition of the proper role of elders rather than an overtly anti-English or anti-Independent rant.

None the less, Lockyer's work continued to be a thorn in the side of the Kirk. James Wood was apparently appointed to produce a Resolutioner response to the work but was extremely slow in doing so. Baillie wrote to him on February 14, 1653 and accused him of lethargy: 'Will yow let Lockier triumph whole yeares? O laziness, laziness!'[148] It was not until 1654, two years after the publication of *A Litle Stone*, that Wood's response to Lockyer's attack made its way into print.

---

[145] Ibid, 56.
[146] Ibid, 57.
[147] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX.(26), f.96.
[148] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:214. There is some indication James Wood was the semi-official (or at least chosen) author of polemics for the Resolutioners during the Interregnum. In the same letter encouraging him to speed up his reply to Lockyer, Baillie also called on him to reply to James Guthrie's *The Nullity of the Pretended Assembly at St. Andrews* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652), a Protester declaration against the Resolutioners and the General Assembly of 1651 (Baillie, *L & J*, iii:213-14; Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 206).

Judging by the magnitude of the work it seems unlikely laziness is what slowed the author down. *A Litle Stone pretended to be Out of the Mountain* is a bulky response to Lockyer's little book, in which every point made by the English chaplain is exhaustively refuted.[149] Including the two appendices added against the Independents in Aberdeen, who 'it seemeth they have been in a manner his proselytes', the book comprises 386 pages.[150] The sheer volume of the work meant that while Wariston took the time to read it most ordinary Scots probably did not.[151]

Wood claims he does not charge Independents with perverse intentions, since he highly respects Hooker, Cotton and others.[152] Nevertheless, their desire for establishing a pure visible church has 'dazled' their eyes to such a degree they are in danger of destroying the foundations of all Reformed Churches.[153] For this reason he set upon the task of refuting every point made by Lockyer *ad nauseam.* To begin he criticises the Englishman's attempt to found an ecclesiology upon such a short piece of scripture Acts 15:3, especially if Lockyer interprets the text to mean only the converted were drawn to the Apostles: 'upon this Passage of Scripture...I am ready to think few else would have dreamed much appearance of weight could been laid on for that purpose'.[154] 'The preaching of the Gospel,' argues Wood, 'being a draw net...catches good fishes and bad together, and the outward Kingdom of God, as a field wherein are tares and wheat growing together'.[155] How can a church be filled with only those truly converted? Lockyer says that very spiritual men can discern. Who are these very spiritual men? Are they

---

[149] James Wood, *A Little Stone Pretended to be Out of the Mountain, Tried and Found to be Counterfeit.* (Edinburgh: Printed by Andro Anderson, 1654).
[150] Ibid, ded. 9. The Aberdeen Independents will be studied in chapter 4.
[151] Wariston, ii:232-3.
[152] Doctrinally, the Kirk and New England Independents differed little other than in their interpretations of proper church polity. The theology of both was highly Calvinist, Predestinarian, and Federal, and unlike the English Independents present in Scotland during the Interregnum, both abhorred toleration not only of those of different 'denominations' but also of slight variances in Doctrine. Furthermore, both Scottish Presbyterians and N.E. Independents agreed that the magistrate had an obligation to intervene in matters of heresy and corrupt doctrine. See Chatfield, 'The Congregationalists of New England and its Repercussions on England and Scotland, 1641-2.' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1964); Willam Bartlet, *IXNOΓPAΦIA. Or a Model of the Primitive Congregational Way* (1647), 102-4.
[153] Wood, *A Little Stone Pretended to be Out of the*, ded. 5-7.
[154] Ibid, 1.
[155] Ibid, 5.

the leaders? Would that not be against the way of Congregationalists to have leaders deciding who can come in and who cannot?

For Wood the Independents teeter precariously on the brink of heresy. If they claim that they are able to discern who is truly elect and some of their members prove to be regenerate then they profess Arminianism, because they claim that humans 'may have the practice and power of godlinesse, and afterward let it go'.[156] If they reject this then they must set standards of morality for whom they will admit, which tends towards Donatism.[157] The other option is the one practised by the Presbyterians which is to admit the impossibility of knowing whether someone is actually elect, but to allow entrance into the church upon an outward profession. Wood found a further error in Lockyer's teaching that elders may not rule without consent of the congregation, claiming it to be nothing more than the doctrine of the Levellers.[158] However, for Wood the true tragedy of Lockyer's attack was not the spreading of error, but rather like Lockyer's own expression, malicious reproaches aimed at fellow Christians.

> Ah Mr. Lockier! my soul is sorrowfull and heavy to think, a man, professing Christianity, a Minister of the Gospel, standing to speak in the Lords sight, and in his Name, should have uttered such a horrid accusation and bitter invective against many whom Jesus Christ hath interest in, and will owne at the last day.[159]

Unfortunately Wood's work proved too robust to be a practical response that the average member of the Kirk would have time or energy to read. Yet, by the time of its publication the common people of Scotland were not the only Scots who needed persuading. By 1652-3 a number of Scots ministers were being drawn like 'little stones out of the mountain' into Independency, which will be discussed in the following chapter.

The Protectorate and the Abatement of Anti-Presbyterian Works

The inception of the Protectorate marked a significant change in the religious policy of the English, especially towards the Kirk. As Protector, Cromwell espoused his own vision of the

---

[156] Ibid, 39.
[157] Ibid, 37.
[158] Ibid, 217, 221.

Christian Republic dependent not merely on mutual toleration amongst Christians, but unity between them.[160] This had been his desire for years, declaring in 1648: 'I profess to thee I desire it in my heart, I have prayed for it, I have waited for the day to see union and right understanding between the godly people (Scots, English, Jews, Gentiles, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, and all)'.[161] According to Blair Worden, when Cromwell entered Scotland in July 1650 he did not wish to dash the Presbyterian Kirk into pieces, which he could have done in 1648 but chose not to, because he desired to 'make all Christians of one heart' and institute a Christian Commonwealth in which all of God's people could worship as the Spirit led them.[162] This does not mean his purpose in invading Scotland was not anti-Kirk, but once the Kirk's intolerant stranglehold on Scottish religion had been broken he desired to rebuild a Christian unity comprising all Christian groups.[163] Cromwell reiterated this desire in a speech made in September 1656, plainly declaring his desire 'that there might be union in all transactions relating to our affaires at home as well as abroad, and a tenderness that those either of Presbyterian, Independent, or Anabaptist forme, might not tread upon the heeles or prejudice one another'.[164] This freedom for Christians to practice in their own way also empowered them to have their say in matters of religion. His regard for the freedom of the Christian is best summarised in a statement often attributed to him: 'I had rather that Mahometanism were permitted amongst us, than that one of God's children should be persecuted'.[165] In fact it was only after the establishment of the Protectorate that the press in Scotland became truly open to religious dialogue. More importantly, the inception of the Protectorate marked the end of anti-Presbyterian papers being produced by the regime in Scotland. Even the number of Protester-

---

[159] Ibid, 104.
[160] B. Worden, 'Toleration and the Cromwellian Protectorate', 210.
[161] Ibid, 210-11; Abbott, *Cromwell*, i:677.
[162] Ibid, 210-11. He is quoting *A Declaration of the Army of England upon their March into Scotland*; Abbott, *Cromwell*, i:283-9.
[163] W.G. Berry, *Scotland's Struggles for Religious Liberty*, Eras of Nonconformity, VIII, (ed.) C. Silvester Horne (London: National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, 1904), 38.
[164] *Clarke Papers*, iii:73.
[165] Firth, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England*, 300-1. Whether this statement can actually be attributed to Cromwell is a matter of conjecture. Certainly posterity has continued to accept the link, but many scholars remain unconvinced. Geoffrey Nuttall identifies the original source

Resolutioner works dwindled from Cromwell's inception as Protector until after his death, for he sought to resolve the division in the Kirk.

In March 1654, Cromwell sent for John Livingston, Patrick Gillespie and John Menzies to come to London and in May for Robert Blair, Robert Douglas and James Guthrie, as well, in order that a solution to the problems in the Kirk could be agreed upon. However, a balanced agreement could not be reached, because Blair, Douglas and Guthrie made excuses and failed to comply with his summons.[166] Instead Patrick Gillespie and John Menzies pushed through 'Gillespie's Charter' giving the power to plant new ministers to the Protesters and Aberdeen Independents, compounding Resolutioner anxieties.[167] Further significant attempts were made by Lord Broghill, President of the Scottish Council between September 1655 and August 1656, to resolve the issues which continued to divide the Protesters and Resolutioners. Although Julia Buckroyd argues his attempts represent a significant break from Cromwell's policies, they do not break from Cromwell's intentions.[168] Among Broghill's endeavours, he requested Cromwell to order a conference to be attended by equal numbers of Protesters and Resolutioners in order that they might come to a compromise in the manner of filling empty charges.[169] While this and all other attempts ultimately failed to resolve the divisions within the Kirk,[170] Broghill's strategy did entice both the Protesters and Resolutioners to plead their cases before Cromwell.[171] Broghill's efforts stemmed from the vision of Cromwell, shared by others of a moderate disposition within the regime, that unity among Christians must provide the foundation for the secure future of Britain. They were also indicative of a paradigmatic shift during the Protectorate away from 'sectarian organisation' and theology towards voluntary unity in religious co-existence. Cromwell desired unity within the Presbyterian party in Scotland just as he wished

---

of the statement as Roger Williams ('Presbyterians and Independents Some Movements for Unity 300 years ago', *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England* 10 (1952), 5).

[166] Mylne, *Collections on Ecclesiastical Affairs*, f. 757; Dow, 196.

[167] This resolution will be addressed in chapter 4.

[168] J. Buckroyd, 'Lord Broghill and the Scottish Church, 1655-1656,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (1976) 27:359-68.

[169] EUL, La.I.321(5).

[170] Dow, 195-210; Holfelder, 212-245.

for Christian unity among the churches in England. His wish for Presbyterians and Independents to come together began to bear fruit in England in the growth of voluntary associations of moderates from both parties,[172] a pattern reflected in some degree in Scotland as well.[173]

The opening of channels for religious dialogue, however, also had its drawbacks for the Protector as seditious elements began to vent their displeasure. Tension between Baptists sympathetic to the Fifth Monarchists and Cromwell's government continued to grow in 1653 over the question of whether Cromwell should take on the role of Protector.[174] Cromwell's acceptance of the Protectorate on December 16, 1653 sent shock waves through the army. Many of those who had fought in the Civil Wars did so in opposition to monarchical government. They viewed Cromwell's acceptance of the Protectorate as the re-imposition of what they had spilt blood to overturn. Just a month after Cromwell's inauguration as Lord Protector Wariston refers to Cromwell as being 'at great straits by the opposition of the Anabaptists'.[175] With this backlash from radical Republicans and Millenarians, the Kirk was no longer perceived to be the greatest threat to the stability of Interregnum regime. The government's propaganda turned from the Kirk to producing adequate defences for the newly established form of government. According to a contemporary English journal, the regime re-printed John Goodwin's *Synkretismos* in Leith in 1654 as an appeal to accept the change in government.[176] Goodwin wrote, 'whatsoever power be, they are ordained by Him [God]'.[177] A month later the press also reprinted Marchamont Nedham's defence of the Protectorate was

---

[171] Buckroyd, 368.
[172] Gardiner, *C & P*, iv:24.
[173] See ch. 4, below.
[174] Firth, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England*, 326-7.
[175] Wariston, ii:199.
[176] 'Diurnal of Occurences in Scotland,' *The Spottiswoode Micellany*, (ed.) James Maidment (Edinburgh: Spottiswoode Society, 1845), ii:174.
[177] John Goodwin, *Synkretismos: or Dis-satisfaction Satisfied. In seventeen sober and serious queries....* (London: J. Macock, 1653), 4-5.

also printed in Leith.[178] The target of the English propaganda changed from the Presbytery, who opposed their tolerant stance on religion, to the religiously radical who had been so instrumental in bringing about the establishment of the Commonwealth.

While the diversity of the papers printed continued to increase, at no point could printing in Scotland be described as a free-for-all. At the end of March 1655, Cromwell gave 'his Highness Councell in Scotland' the power: 'to erect and make use of and comand any Presse or Presses there for printing and publishing any Proclamacons, Declaracons, Orders, Bookes or other matters wch they shall think fitt for the publique Service and to prohibit the use thereof by any other persons, or in any Cases where they shall see cause'.[179] It was about this time that James Brown began to print again in Aberdeen, with the bulk of his work being the re-publication of government proclamations.[180] Further evidence that the Presbyterians were no longer perceived as the primary threat is evidenced by the Council in Scotland permitting Rutherford's *The Covenant of Life Opened* to be printed in Edinburgh in 1655.[181]

Scotland's presses continued to print Protester and Resolutioner works, which were few in number until after Cromwell's death. However sectarians produced tracts aimed at other religious groups recently introduced into Scotland. Between 1655 and 1657 a series of anti-Quaker tracts composed by English authors were printed on Edinburgh's presses.[182] These works along with the regime's treatment of members of the sect elicited Quaker responses and

---

[178] 'Diurnal of Occurences in Scotland,' *Spottiswoode Miscellany*, ii:194; Marchamont Nedham, *A true state of the case of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging; In reference to the late established government by a Protector and a Parliament.* (London: Thomas Newcomb, 1653).

[179] Maclehose, *The Glasgow University Press 1638-1931*, 40; *Scots Acts, 1648-1660*, vol. vi. part ii, 827.

[180] For the role of Brown's press during 1650-1 see Appendix II.2.

[181] Samuel Rutherford, *The Covenant of Life Opened: or, A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace.* (Edinburgh: A. Anderson, 1655).

[182] John Gilpin, *The Quakers Shaken, or, A Discovery of the Errours of That Sect.* (Printed at London, and re-printed at Edinburgh,1655); John Stalham, *Contradictions of the Quakers (so Called) to the Scriptures of God.* (Edinburgh,1655); James Brown, *Antichrist (in Spirit) Unmasked.* (Edinburgh: printed by Christopher Higgins, in Harts Close, over against the Trone-Church., 1657).

apologetics.[183] The relaxation of the press after Cromwell became Protector even saw the publication of a tract in Leith that some historians have billed as a Catholic apologetic.[184] *Love the Precious ointment, that flowes down from the head Christ Jesus* with all of its references to the 'Catholick' church is not, however, a Roman Catholic apologetic. It is a Quaker work pleading for love, patience and toleration between Christians, in terms similar to Cromwell's own ideas.[185] Cromwell was in fact very supportive of this aspect of Quaker doctrine, as evidenced by the great respect he had for George Fox.[186] Although religious tolerance may have been expanding, Roman Catholicism did not benefit. In fact, in 1657 Parliament produced a new act for rooting out Catholicism printed in Scotland on James Brown's printing press.[187] Despite the Presbytery of Jedburgh's complaint of 'sinfull Literyes', Scotland's presses were largely free of contentious religious texts between 1655 and the Protector's death in September 1658,[188] except for those few published against Catholics, who according to several reports were increasing in number in Northern Scotland.[189] In fact the Council in Scotland became so concerned over the presence of Jesuit priests in 1656 they declared the death penalty be imposed on any Catholic priest found

---

[183] Jonas Dell, *Forms the Pillars of Antichrist.* (London: printed for the author, and are to be sold at the Black-moor neer Fleet-Bridge, 1656); Francis Howgill, *To All You Commanders and Officers of the Army.* (Leith: s.n., 1657).

[184] *Love the Precious Ointment, That Flowes Down from the Head Christ Jesus, to All His Members; and Makes Them Dwell Together in Unity.* (Printed at London, and then re-printed at Leith, 1654).

[185] In the catalogues of most libraries which possess a copy of this work it is listed as a Catholic apologetic. Robert Mylne, however, in one of the National Library of Scotland's copies made the proper recognition of the text as a Quaker publication (NLS 1.337).

[186] D.M. Butler, *George Fox in Scotland* (Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1913), 21.

[187] England and Wales. Parliament. *An Act for Discovering, Convicting, and Redressing of Popish Recusssants....* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1657).

[188] *APS*, vi, ii: 767.

[189] William Guild, *Anti-Christ Pointed and Painted Out in His True Colours.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1655); William Guild, *An ansvver to a popish pamphlet.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1656); William Guild, *The noveltie of poperied discovered and chieflie proven by Romanists out of themselves.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1656). For the increase of Roman Catholicism see: Baillie. *L & J*, iii:291, 304; Jaffray, 38-41; M.V. Hay, *The Blair Papers* (1929), 187-8; C. Baxter, *Synod of Fife*, 175; Row, *Life of Blair*, 327-8; Firth, *Last Years of the Protectorate*, ii:105-6; Clarke MSS, 1/12: f. 93; Brodie, 147; Whitelocke, iv:229; Stuart, *Strathbogie*; Nicoll, 178; *RCME*, i:84; Cramond, *Extracts from the Records of the Synod of Moray* (Elgin, 1906). In 1653 a Jesuit priest was tried in Edinburgh, Whitelocke, iii:3. In Oct. 1657 the Synod of Aberdeen appointed Alexander Scrogie to go to Edinburgh to inform the Council of Estate of the rapid growth of 'poperie' in the North East of Scotland. Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 238.

in the country.[190] The presses picked up steam again when the Protester-Resolutioner controversy re-erupted in 1658.[191] After Cromwell's death, the uncertainty of what would follow saw several works published in which particular views were defended and held up in the hopes they would be tolerated in the event of governmental changes.

As has been shown, the greatest control over the publication of religious works occurred between the initial arrival of the English in Edinburgh and the imposition of the Protectorate. Clear evidence supporting an English agenda against the Kirk survives in the polemics published in this period. The texts produced serve to show the English did not attack Presbyterianism simply because the Kirk opposed their occupation and incorporation of Scotland into one Commonwealth with England. Instead the regime perceived covenanted Presbyterianism to be intolerant and therefore by its very nature fundamentally opposed to certain basic beliefs integral in the intellectual underpinning of England's Commonwealth. The Kirk had been viewed over the previous decade as, next to the monarchy, the single greatest threat to England's burgeoning desire for religious freedom and toleration. However, the degree to which different members of England's Republican government viewed the danger posed by Scotland's Presbytery significantly shaped their opinions of what lengths were needed to neutralise the threat. The gradually increasing crescendo of ferocity in the polemics, before their sudden quelling under the Protectorate, gives an indication of the spectrum of opposition to Presbyterianism which existed in the regime. In an interesting contrast, in predominantly Presbyterian English communities, works by Independent authors were prohibited during the Interregnum.[192]

---

[190] Thurloe, iv:700; *S & P*, 329-30; Dow, 205.
[191] See Holfelder, Ch. 5.
[192] R. B. Carter, 'The Presbyterian-Independent Controversy with Special Reference to Dr. Thomas Goodwin and the Years 1640-1660.' 2 vols (Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1961), ii:10: 'I spoke with some chiefe of Bolton, whose desire to have no erroneous Authors Or that have any tincture thereof, though mixed with never so much other good matter for feare of infection; Particularly by all meanes they would Not have One Indepenent writer in all the number, by any meanes how excellent soever for feare of any of there falling in love with teh way for the man's sake. This means I have purposely omitted many excellent authors e.g. Tho. Goodwine, Mr. Burroughs, Greenhill, Carul [Caryl], Bridge...Shepheard. As alsoe upon the other accompt Dr. Jerem. Taylor, Hammond, Chillingworth, Baxter' (Richard Copley Christie, *The Old Church and School Libraries of Lancashire*. (Chetham Society, 1885), p.23, dated April 5th, 1655).

Therefore the struggle between religious and ideological groups transcended the Scots-English conflict.

The Commonwealth's polemical efforts against the Kirk began as passive questioning of Presbyterianism and prompts for further Reformation, before swelling into more subversive texts of apparently Scottish origin. The propaganda reached its height under the Commissioners for Settling the affairs of Scotland in 1652 with the production of openly anti-Presbyterian tracts, before withering away under the Protectorate. The forms of polemic Cromwell encouraged during his time in Scotland from 1650-1651 were not intended to topple Presbyterianism to the degree the Episcopal Church had been pulled down in England. His desire, which expressed itself during the Protectorate, was a softening of the Kirk into what Monck hoped for after the Restoration, a 'Presbyterianism government not rigid'.[193] Cromwell did not wish the Kirk to be torn down but for it to be allowed to continue unhindered, in a tolerant manner, alongside other forms of Christian practice. Essentially, opposition to the Kirk stemmed from a long struggle in England against enforced 'formality'.[194]

However, Cromwell possessed a more moderate religious mindset than many of his fellow Republicans who sat in Parliament or served in the army. The arrival of the Commissioners for Settling the affairs of Scotland in 1652 initiated a more caustic approach to addressing the problem the Kirk posed for the Commonwealth's plans. That the Kirk was a threat to the Commonwealth was universally accepted by those who desired religious toleration to be an integral aspect of government. Fervently Independent chaplains were sent to accompany Parliament's Commissioners. These men were as equally intolerant of the Presbytery as the Kirk was of them. Their venomous attacks against the Kirk led the Inverness-shire minister James Fraser to complain of the 'factious Independents...direct opposition' to and persecution of Presbyterians.[195] The fervent attack against the Kirk produced by Lockyer, and anxiously

---

[193] J.K. Hewison, *The Covenanters*, 2 vols (Glasgow: John Smith and Son, 1913), ii:58.
[194] Davis, 'Against formality', 265-88.
[195] Fraser, *Chronicles of the Frasers*, 393.

encouraged by the commissioners' chaplains, did little to soften the opinions of the vast majority of Scottish Presbyterians towards toleration. For this reason, the polemics against the Kirk stopped when Cromwell became Protector. Cromwell desired Christian unity and harmony, not division. Although initially he fostered the dissention within the Kirk as a means to divide and conquer his enemy, after toleration had been successfully imposed and Independent congregations had room to develop, he set to the task of trying to heal the Protester-Resolutioner split. Cromwell's attempts at undermining the Kirk were for the purpose of diminishing their intolerance, thus enabling him to build a more stable foundation on which to construct his longed-for Christian Republic.

Chapter IV:

'Neirer the patterne of the Word': A Season of Indigenous Scottish Independency.[1]

Thes. 207. As there seldom ariseth any turbulent Opinion or party in the Church, but by the occasion of some neglect of Truth or Duty, which by their extremities God calleth to reform....

It is a special part of our wisdom to know what is our Health by our Diseases, and to learn Truth from the erroneous, and Duty from them that swerve into extreams. ...I could say the like of other Parties that have lately risen up. One sort runneth to them, and another part raileth at them; but he is the wise man that knoweth how to receive from them so much as is good, and leave the rest; could we duly improve them, we might have cause to thank God (though not them) that ever he permitted such occasions of our Reformation.[2]

–Richard Baxter, 1659

Now that the religious motives of the occupying English Army, their attempts to undermine rigid Presbyterianism in Scotland and to establish independently gathered congregations in its wake have been established, the final two chapters will focus on the success of their endeavours. This will be done not simply in terms of the imposition of fully formed English congregations or the occasional attendance of a few Scots at predominantly English led and constituted congregations; rather, this study will attempt to assess the success of engrafting a new religious ideology into Scottish society. Quakers and Baptists will be dealt with in Chapter Five. Here the focus is the Scottish adoption of Independent ecclesiology. It was mentioned in the introduction to this thesis, but is worth repeating: the triumphalist Presbyterian histories of the nineteenth-century have done much to obscure modern perceptions of the religious struggle in Scotland during the seventeenth-century and especially during the 1650s. Too much emphasis has been placed on the Protester-Resolutioner conflict and this has in turn diminished recognition to what degree Presbyterianism and its covenanted status came under scrutiny. This is particularly true among Protesters who experienced sharp internal divisions over interpretations of how Commonwealth policy reflected their own desires for a purer Kirk and to

---

[1] Declaration in favour of the 'Congregational Way' composed in Aberdeen on May 24, 1652. NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX.(24), f. 83-4 and printed in Alexander Jaffray, *The Diary of Alexander Jaffray* (ed.) John Barclay (Aberdeen: George and Robert King, 1856), 167-71.

what degree the two were compatible. Some Protesters actually took an interest in promoting sectarianism.[3] The present chapter will focus on groups in Scotland who during the Interregnum either separated themselves from the Kirk, or were separated from the Kirk by ecclesiastical censure but continued to function as independent gatherings. In general there are four different circumstances addressed in this chapter: first, ministers who were deposed by the Kirk but continued in their ministries with the support of their congregations; second, individuals who voiced support for the Commonwealth and advocated the gathering of Independent congregations; third, Scots who actually formed their own Independent congregations; fourth and finally, Gillespie's faction of Protesters for whom the distinction between rigid Presbyterianism and Independency blurred. The chapter will also seek to establish that the Commonwealth's religious aims in Scotland were not in vain, as an underlying distrust of Presbyterianism had already been established through the Kirk's actions in the previous decade.

Some of the earliest evidence of separation from the Kirk during the Interregnum was a small and predominantly enigmatic group of ministers in Orkney. Few Orcadian records survive from the early years of the Interregnum and this is due to the lack of a Presbytery in Orkney from July 1650 until mid-1654. On June 10, 1650 the General Assembly deposed all but two of Orkney's ministers for subscribing a declaration in support of the invasion of Scotland by the Marquis of Montrose.[4] In total between nine and twelve ministers were deposed in Orkney and another seven in Caithness.[5] In an attempt to alleviate the clerical vacuum created in Orkney the Commissioners of the General Assembly sent John Harper, David Kennedy and James Wallet (all expectants) north in January 1651.[6] However, even with these individuals helping to serve in

---

[2] Richard Baxter, *Baxter: A Holy Commonwealth* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994), 1659.
[3] Dow, 101.
[4] Lamont, 41.
[5] Nicoll, 26; *APS*, vi:569, 573. Due to the incomplete records it is difficult to ascertain the exact number of depositions in Orkney. Stevenson believes two were deposed in 1649 and then nine were deposed in 1650 for signing the declaration (David Stevenson, 'Deposition of Ministers in the Church of Scotland, 1638-1651.' *Church History* 44 (1975): 321-335, 335).
[6] *RCGA*, iii:271.

the 'vacant' Orkney parishes there was still a significant problem. While they could preach, they were not ordained, and so were unable to participate as constituent members in the reconstitution of the Presbytery. This lack of a presbytery in Orkney meant four years of relaxed discipline in the islands and gave the individuals who had been sent to fill vacant charges little disciplinary leverage.

After labouring in Orkney for three years without ordination, Kennedy along with John Gibson travelled to Edinburgh to be inducted into vacant charges. The Presbytery of Edinburgh ordained and admitted them to the charges of Birsay-Harray and Holm (respectively) on May 10, 1654, citing the lack of a constituted presbytery in Orkney and the recent shortage of meetings in Caithness due to the presence of Cromwellian troops (who garrisoned Helmsdale, Dunbeath, Dochmaluag Castle, Girnigoe/Sinclair Castle, Anderwick Tower, Canisbay and Thurso at various times) as the warrant for their intervention.[7] Yet more interesting for the present study is the primary reason cited by the presbytery for ordaining the two men, because 'deposed and excommunicat ministers have begunne to excercise the ministry there, [and] like so to continue unless some actuall ministers be admitted and sent hither'. Although the parish charges had supposedly been 'vacant' for four years, at least some of the ministers deposed in 1649-50 continued their ministries despite the censures against them. One of these ministers was Gordon Graham who 'intruded' in his parish of Sandwick and Stromness until he was reinstated on July 28, 1658, meaning he potentially served in his old charge for eight years after his deposition.[8] Crucially, this situation could only have occurred with the support of his congregation, which denotes the parish operating in a proto-Congregational model in direct opposition to the General Assembly. More importantly, Graham was not alone in ignoring the judgement passed by the Kirk. Other ministers seem to have continued to work in their old charges as well. William Watson (Hoy and Graemesay), George Johnston (Orphir), John Balvaird (Rousay and Egilshay) and David Watson (Westray) were all deposed in 1650, but

---

[7] Craven, *History of the Church in Orkney, 1558-1662* (Kirkwall: William Peace and Son, 1897), 218.
[8] J. Smith, *The Church in Orkney* (Kirkwall: W.R. Mackintosh, 1907), 148.

apparently remained active in their parishes until being restored in either 1658 or 1659. Perhaps the reason ecclesiastical records have not recorded them as intruders as they did Graham is due to the greater remoteness of their parishes; all except Johnston held charges off the Orcadian mainland.[9]

The difficulty of deciphering the situation in Orkney during the Interregnum is further compounded by the 1660 pre-Restoration deposing of the minister of Stronsay for being a fully-fledged Independent of the English variety. Patrick Waterstone, one of the two Orkney ministers who had avoided being deposed in 1650 by not signing the declaration in support of Montrose, reportedly separated himself 'from the whole Church of Scotland, and judicatorie thereof, by ane uncontrollable Libertie to erect himself into ane Congregational Church'.[10] When Waterstone actually separated from the Kirk to form his congregational church is uncertain, because he may have had an Independent church for some time protected from Presbyterian interference by the February 1652 English imposition of religious toleration. That he favoured Independency before the end of the Interregnum is indicated by his subscription to the 'request for Gospel Priviledges' submitted to the Commonwealth Parliament in the summer of 1659.[11] Although Stronsay is an island some miles east of Kirkwall and the Orkney mainland, the English troops were active throughout Orkney and garrisoned both Kirkwall and Noltland Castle on Westray. One English report declared the Commonwealth's influence exerted from Orkney 'extend[s] to above 150 miles', possibly referring to control of the Shetlands as well.[12] Stronsay's geographical isolation probably served as a greater buffer from the presbytery (after it was re-established in 1654) than from the influence of the English. The fact that Waterstone was deposed in March 1660, only four months after the English army had withdrawn from Orkney, might suggest that the presbytery could only move against the minister after the

---

[9] Smith, 200, 212, 282, 300-1.
[10] Craven, *Orkney*, 221.
[11] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX.(27), f 106.
[12] *Mercurius Politicus*, (March 11-18, 1652), 1470. [E656:20]

English had withdrawn, thus leaving open the possibility that he had maintained a Congregational church for some time.

It would be overstating the case to claim that all those ministers who carried on their work after being deposed in 1650 were acting as Independents in the English sense of the term, as Waterstone clearly was. However they were proceeding in direct opposition to an act of the General Assembly. Perhaps they were encouraged to reinstate themselves in their parish ministries by the English soldiers who began to garrison Orkney early in 1652. The language of the Presbytery of Edinburgh's declaration suggests the ministers did not continue in their charges immediately after being deposed, but rather that there was a gap between their deposition and resumption of work. English encouragement probably played an important role in Waterstone's separation as it certainly did elsewhere in Scotland. Needless to say, whether the deposed ministers were acting under English influence or not, they represent a larger change in Scotland. The degree of unity under a national Presbytery expressed in the National Covenant of 1638 was beginning to show cracks by 1648. The Synod of Moray noted William Watson, minister of Duthil, replied to a 1646 order from the General Assembly to preach against the sects in England by declaring: 'How can we speak against Sects seing we are the most abominable sect in all the world because of our government'.[13]

Importantly, remote Orkney is not the only place in Scotland where ministers continued to tend to their congregations despite being deposed or even excommunicated. In January 1650 George Muschet, minister of Dunning, and John Graham, minister of Auchterarder, were similarly deposed for 'malignancy'.[14] Yet despite the censures against them, both men continued in their ministries and 're-invested themselves' to their churches and stipends. On June 8, 1652, representatives from the Synod of Perth served notices for the ministers to appear before the Synod to convene in the Kirk of Dunning on the following morning. The events that transpired have been immortalised in *A Fight at Dunin in Scotland, Between the Scots Women and the Presbyterian*

---

[13] Cramond, *Moray*, 100.

Kirkmen, which, although sometimes described as a satirical work, reports true events albeit in the interest of English propaganda.[15] Fortunately the general details of what took place can be confirmed thanks to the existence of an equally biased Presbyterian account.[16]

The story goes that John Graham not being at home when the messenger from the Synod arrived the summons was delivered to his wife. That night she and approximately 120 other women, and some men dressed in women's clothes according to the Kirk's account, met in the woods near Aberuthven and armed themselves with wooden clubs and bagpipes. Before dawn they marched to Dunning and took possession of the kirkyard. When one of the ministers of the synod, infuriated by the interference of the women, attempted to enter the Kirk 'those Amazons' beat him 'for his paines'.[17] A full scale riot ensued and the representatives of the Synod were chased from the village losing a dozen of their horses and several of their hats. The English version of the story singles out Alexander Rollock, minister in Perth, claiming he fled from the village losing his hat, cloak and horse in the process. After running a mile from the village he threw himself down before an English soldier and on bended knee begged him for protection from the fearsome women.[18] The Synod re-gathered under the protection of Lord Freeland near Forgandenny and, according to the English account, condemned the entire lot of the fairer sex to be 'wicked'.[19] English journals spun this event in relation to the revolt against Episcopacy in 1638, supposedly started by Jenny Geddes' reaction to the prayer book: 'the Kirkmen look upon [this] as a very ominous disaster, that the women, who began with the Bishops in the years 1638. 1639. should now likewise begin with them'.[20] In October the synod planted Andrew Rollo into the 'vacant' charge of Dunning despite Muschet's continuing

---

[14] *FES*, iv:258, 268.
[15] A. B., *A Fight at Dunin in Scotland, Between the Scots Women and the Presbyterian Kirkmen.* (Edinburgh, 1652). Also brief accounts exist in : Whitelocke, iii:432-3 and *Mercurius Politicus*, (June 17-24, 1652), 1682, 1686-7 [E668:13].
[16] J. Wilson, *Dunning: Its Parochial History, with Notes, Antiquarian, Ecclesiastical, Baronial, and Miscellaneous.* 2nd edn (Crieff: D. Philips, 1906), 40ff.
[17] *A Fight at Dunin in Scotland*, 3; *Mercurius Politicus*, p. 1687.
[18] Ibid, 3.
[19] Ibid, 5.
[20] Mercurius Politicus, 1687.

ministry, which persisted until he was reinstated in April 1660. Thus even in southern Perthshire there are examples of ministers continuing in their duties with the support of their congregations in opposition to church judicatories, even by means of armed violence.

The deposition of ministers for being in opposition to the prevailing party within the Kirk represents an important aspect of the events both in Orkney and in Perthshire. In his study of depositions under the covenanters between 1638 and 1651, David Stevenson explains that of the 236 depositions during the period of study only 10% were due wholly to scandalous behaviour.[21] The other 90% 'were depositions of those who opposed, or failed to support enthusiastically enough, the predominant faction in the Kirk.'[22] Unsurprisingly the peak years for depositions were 1639—the year after the signing of the National Covenant—and the years following Scotland's failed engagement with the King (1648). In the three years between the Engagement and the defeat of the Scots at Worcester 105 ministers were deposed, most for holding the wrong political views. Just being neutral towards the Engagement was enough, according to Stevenson, to be labelled an enemy of the Kirk by the radical covenanting party (Kirk Party) who seized control of Scotland's government with the aid of Cromwell's army in the Whiggamore Raid of 1648.[23] The policy verged on hypocrisy and members of the Kirk Party recognised it just as clearly as their opponents. At the same time the Kirk was defending the Covenant, supporting the King, and advocating a national presbytery in England, they were purging out Presbyterian ministers at home. In describing the divergent experiences of representing the Kirk in the Westminster Assembly and the Kirk Party within the General Assembly, George Gillespie relayed to John Livingstone, 'he was hardly a moneth [in London] before he was in danger to turn malignant, and hardly again a month in Scotland, but he was in danger to turn a sectary'.[24]

---

[21] D. Stevenson, 'Deposition of Ministers in the Church of Scotland, 1638-1651,' 321-335.
[22] Ibid, 324.
[23] Ibid, 329; Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution*, 115-16.
[24] Livingstone, 'Memorable Characteristics', in W.K. Tweedie (ed.), *Select Biographies* (Edinburgh, 1845), i:331; Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions*, 219.

The inquisitorial proceedings fuelled by the radical party of the Kirk were not limited to individual ministers. Presbyteries that neglected to produce condemnations against the Engagement came under scrutiny and were visited by special commissions of visitation made up of the 'most zealous brethren of Edinburgh, Lothian and Merse'. The Presbyteries of Dun, Chirnside, Ross, Sutherland, Shetland and of course Orkney and Caithness were all visited by such commissions. Such party politics did little to quell concerns over Scotland's adherence to the covenants, especially after the defeats of their covenanted army at Dunbar and Worcester. In this way the harsh politics, infighting and unjust purging of godly ministers within the Kirk fostered dissatisfaction and resentment towards centralized ecclesiastical government, thus paving the way for Independency to be introduced into Scotland.

The Fertile Soil of Discontent

With the arrival of the English army late in the summer of 1650 a massive influx of alternative religious ideas was introduced into Scotland for the first time. For many Scots this must have been quite a confusing set of circumstances, being exposed to ideas and sects that they had not heard of, and more varieties of Protestantism than they ever knew existed. For others it was probably an exciting revelation. Looking back on the closing months of 1650 Nicoll commented:

> the names of Protestant and Papist wer not now in use, ...in place theairof rais up the name of Covenanteris, Anti-Covenanteris, Croce-Covernanteris, Puritanes, Babarteres, Roun-heidis, Auld-hornes, New-hornes, Croce-Pet[it]ioneris, Brownistes, Separatistes, Malignantis, Sectareis, Royalists, Quakeris, Anabaptistes'.[25]

Partly due to the influx of these new ideas, partly as a reaction to the devastating defeat of Scotland's 'Covenanted' army at Dunbar, and, more significantly, as a reaction to the factionalism experienced within the Kirk over the previous decade, a more overt anti-Presbyterian sentiment and scepticism towards the covenants began to swell among Scotland's populace. As a result, newly introduced alternatives to the Presbytery were not falling on infertile or untilled soil. Division within the Kirk and harsh party persecutions created fissures

in the Presbyterian disposition of Scotland, like small crevices in a monolithic granite crag, where sectarian seeds found just enough soil to grow. As these new religious ideas took root they forced the fractures ever wider, further eroding the uniformity of the Kirk and securing themselves more space to mature. Nicoll commented on January 1, 1651 of growing fears that some ministers of the Kirk were beginning to favour the 'Cromwellites'.[26] In April the Kirk generally acknowledged the gravity of the situation in a declaration for nationwide fasting and humiliation when they instructed prayer 'for those who have fallen into the wayes or errors of the enemie'.[27] Ferment and fear grew throughout the summer of 1651, but with Cromwell's army still south of the Firth of Forth some hope of mounting successful military resistance to their army and heresies persisted. However, the defeat of Scotland's forces at Worcester on September 3, 1651 dealt the Kirk a significant blow. The Presbyterian factions that had already begun to develop in Scotland became increasingly polarized with the result of further ostracising those in the middle.

The Resolutioners interpreted the defeat as the result of over stringent purging of their forces at the Battle of Dunbar, which meant both Dunbar and Worcester had been fought with remnant armies rather than with the full strength of Scotland. Protesters interpreted the defeat as judgement against taking up the malignant cause of the King and thus a betrayal of religious commitments made within the covenants. These are the two contemporary interpretations of events put forward in most accounts of Scottish history. However, some voiced a third interpretation and reaction to the defeat of Scotland's covenanted cause. This third explanation argued the Kirk unjustifiably interfered in politics under the guise of the covenants, especially in their prompting Scotland's involvement in the English Civil Wars, leading the nation astray and resulting in their present circumstances.

---

[25] Nicoll, 38-9.
[26] Ibid, 48.
[27] *RCGA*, iii:343.

A paper termed the 'Declaration and vindication of the poor opprest Commons of Scotland' denounced involvement in English affairs, but singled out the greatest atrocity as the manner in which the poor people of Scotland had been oppressed by their own gentry and clergy. 'We humblie declare that we can find no records in Scripture, Ecclesiastick Historie, nor the historie of no nation under heaven can shoe that ever yr hes beene a people so opprest, bornen downe, and trampled over as we these many years past by our fellow subjects'.[28] The paper identifies the oppressors as the opportunists and fanatics who took the aims of the Covenant to an extreme under the rule of the Radical Kirk Party which came into power under the aid of the English Army in 1648. The poor suffered greatly, argued the author/s, between the Kirk Party's declaration in favour of Charles II and the Scots final defeat at Worcester. Large tariffs were placed on foodstuffs in order to provide for an army to fight against England's Parliament. Yet when the English invaded Scotland in 1650 these same radical elements in the positions of authority carried out 'ridiculous' purging of that very army; labelling the purging before Dunbar as a 'Divilish dark plot' and betrayal of the Kingdom of Scotland that led to the 'most disgraceful' defeat in the history of Christendom. And despite the travesty that unfolded, those responsible for the demise of Scotland continued in their narrow way.

The work singles out the Protesters for 'lying in their bastard hatching uncleaness' by continuing to believe they were the only godly party in Scotland and planting as many of their own into vacant charges as possible. The paper's disgust at the mistreatment of the poor and devout people of Scotland by fellow Scots led them to declare the poor class of the nation would gladly live peaceably under English rule on two conditions: first, nothing be put upon Scotland that would 'molest consciences' or 'imply perjury'; and second, no Scots, or at least none of those involved in the government of the Kirk Party, be given positions of trust in the new government. This sentiment illustrates the utter despondency felt by some Scots towards the fruits of Scotland's labours carried out in the name of the covenants. The author/s of this work verbalised what James Paterson explained in his history of Ayr and Wigton, namely that some

---

[28] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXXI.(37).

Scots were 'happy' to be controlled by a power other than the radical factions under whom Scotland had suffered so greatly in the 1640s.[29] When the paper began its circulation is uncertain, but by January 28, 1652 it had been printed.[30] More importantly, however, this was not the only paper produced regarding this point. Nor was this the only dissent expressed towards the Kirk.

At a Protester meeting held in Edinburgh in early October 1651, the full breadth of the religious milieu beginning to form in Scotland came into view for the first time.[31] Never had a religious conference in Scotland had such a radically disjointed range of religious perspectives. Numerous sectarian doctrines were put forward in the congress, which lasted between sixteen and eighteen days.[32] Most of the dissenting ideas came from elders who advocated an end to the national presbytery, the lawfulness of lay preaching by any 'haiffing the Spirite to preach', a denunciation of sabbatarianism, and the rejection of paedo-baptism in favour of believer's baptism.[33] Others brought the covenants into question in varying degrees.[34] John Livingston, minister of Ancrum, declared from the pulpit of St. Giles' that covenants are not equal to Scripture and Scotland 'too much' idolised them.[35] John Menzies, professor of divinity at Marischal College and minister of Greyfriars (Aberdeen), and Alexander Jaffray, former provost of Aberdeen, went a step further. They questioned whether the covenants were even legal.

Alexander Jaffray, one of the emissaries who travelled to Breda in 1650 to negotiate the return of Charles II, was taken prisoner at the Battle of Dunbar and remained in the custody of the English for 'five or six' months.[36] During this internment he spent a great deal of time in frequent conversations with John Owen, Lt.-General Fleetwood, and Oliver Cromwell

---

[29] J. Paterson, *History of the Counties of Ayr and Wigton*, 2 vols (Edinburgh: James Stillie, 1864), i:clxxxv.
[30] Whitelocke, iii:387.
[31] A list of some of the ministers and ruling elders present is given in: *Mercurius Politicus*, Oct. 6, 1651, 1134 [E643:16].
[32] Lamont, 35.
[33] Nicoll, 61-2, 63.
[34] Ibid, 63.
[35] *Mercurius Politicus*, Oct. 7, 1651, 1138.

himself.[37] These dialogues set Jaffray's mind into motion, prompting him to mull over the present circumstances, 'the clear evidences of the Lord's controversy with the family and person of our king', and the apparent providential dispensation of God's judgement against Scotland. Upon his release early in 1651 Jaffray returned home to Aberdeen 'in the end of February or March' still pondering these questions.[38] Although he initially tried to suppress his doubts fearing openly expressing them would lead to suffering, especially if the 'King's' party should prevail (Scotland continued to hold out against Cromwell's forces), Jaffray could not curb his doubts.[39] Instead he entered into discourse with John Menzies (professor of divinity at Marischal College and minister of Greyfriars Church, Aberdeen)[40], John Row (minister of Aberdeen's third charge and instructor of Hebrew at Marischal College)[41], William Muir (Elder in the Kirk, professor of mathematics and principal of Marischal College)[42] and the layman Andrew Birnie (regent in Marischal College)[43] over his uncertainties. So sincere was his desire to candidly discuss his thoughts with those pious men, he even allowed them to peruse his personal journal so they could see the progression of his thoughts.[44] To Jaffray's relief he found these men were burdened with the same questions and they found in each other kindred spirits.

During the summer of 1651 Jaffray composed a summary of his thoughts and sent them to 'some good men in the south', but failing to receive a satisfactory answer he travelled, along with John Menzies, William Muir and Alexander Skene, to the previously mentioned Protester conference.[45] On the evening of October 6 Jaffray and Menzies met privately with Lord

---

[36] According to Balfour, the release of Jaffray and John Carstairs was arranged on Nov. 22, 1650, which would have made his incarceration less than three months (Balfour, iv:168).
[37] John Barclay, the editor of Jaffray's journal, also thinks there is reason to believe from his developing advocacy of toleration that Jaffray came directly under the influence of William Dell, Fairfax's chaplain and major proponent of religious toleration (Jaffray, 172-3).
[38] Jaffray, 58.
[39] Ibid, 59.
[40] P.J. Anderson (ed.), *Fasti Academiae Mariscallanae Aberdonensis: Selections from the Records of the Marischal College and University, 1593-1860.* (Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1898), 34-5, 51, 211.
[41] Lamont, 47; Spottiswoode, *The History of the Church and State of Scotland*, app. 25.
[42] Anderson, *Fasti Academiae Mariscallanae Aberdonensis*, 28, 53.
[43] Ibid, 36.
[44] Jaffray, 59
[45] Dow, 26-7

Archibald Johnston of Wariston, James Guthrie and Patrick Livingstone, leading members of the Protester party. Despite meeting for several hours the conference did little to appease the concerns of either Menzies or Jaffray, so the following day Jaffray submitted a paper 'containing my thoughts of the causes of the Lord's controversy with the land' to the Protester assembly.[46]

Jaffray's paper no longer survives, but entries in his diary provide a good account of how he perceived the present state of affairs. First, he considered the crushing defeat of Scotland's forces at Dunbar, when they had advantages in both number of troops and position on the field of battle, warranted inquiry into whether their defeat had been a dispensation of God's judgement against some fault.[47] Many Protesters already accepted this supposition, however Jaffray continued. Second, he suggested that 'the dreadful appearance of God against us at Dunbar', after so many public appeals to Him, represented not a judgement against the propriety of Scotland's adherence to the covenants, as the Protesters had argued in opposition to their Resolutioner counterparts, but rather a judgement against the covenants themselves.[48] Jaffray came to the conclusion Scotland had fallen in love with Presbyterianism as 'the only way of Jesus Christ'. Consequently the maintenance and expansion of the Presbytery became the primary intention of the covenants.[49] The most fundamental drive in the dispute over church governments, in Jaffray's words, is not about religion, but rather 'who shall have most hand in ruling the rest'.[50] Hence Scotland's great guilt laid in pridefully attempting to impose their chosen form of church government upon others and holding it up as the sole form of Christian church government. 'Without doing Presbyterians any wrong,' he states, 'it is not the only way of Christ, as they would have it, and as in the Covenant all sworn to it. [The Presbytery] is in my apprehension...but a human invention, composed with much prudence and policy of man's wit,

---

[46] Wariston, ii:147; Jaffray, 60.
[47] Jaffray, 62.
[48] Ibid, 62.
[49] Ibid, 61.
[50] Ibid, 63.

fitted for those times, when it had its rise in Geneva, from that precious and worthy man, Calvin'.[51]

Jaffray's paper caused a great stir in the Protester meeting and prompted a second private conference on October 9. This time Menzies and Jaffray met with all the leading figures of the Protester party. They spent all morning debating in Wariston's chamber with John Carstairs, Samuel Rutherford, Patrick Livingstone and James Guthrie, but neither side conceded any ground.[52] The men from Aberdeen, however, did agree to take no further action before additional meetings could be arranged. Significantly, the influential role of Jaffray's paper in the unfolding of events within the Protester party has been overlooked. It was only after Jaffray submitted his paper to the conference and met for a second time with Protester leaders that Wariston turned his attention to the production of the famous Protester work the *Causes of the Lords Wrath Against Scotland*, eventually published in 1653 after a great deal of circulation in manuscript form.[53] Wariston's attempt to enumerate the sins responsible for Scotland's culpability actually represents his effort to shift the blame away from Jaffray's arguments against the covenants and Presbyterianism.

The debate sparked by Jaffray's paper at the Protester meeting in October 1651 begs the question of why so much dissent appeared so quickly in the Kirk. Even more importantly, why did it surface in the Protester party? The answer lies in the nature of that party. While the Resolutioners interpreted the covenants as treading a balance between the preservation of Presbyterianism and the maintenance of Scotland's traditional political structures and monarchy, the Protesters were much more religiously radical, willing to flirt with abandoning political structures and even support for the monarchy if it would provide a purer Kirk.[54] They had pinned all their hopes upon their covenanted status and been the primary instigators for purging

---

[51] Ibid, 62-3.
[52] Ibid, 60.
[53] Wariston, ii:148-9; Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston, *Causes of the Lords Wrath Against Scotland: Manifested in His Sad Late Dispensations; Whereunto Is Added a Paper, Particularly Holding Forth the Sins of the Ministery* (Edinburgh: by the heirs of Geo. Anderson, 1653).

the army before the Battle of Dunbar. They had advocated 'For the Covenant' as the battle cry at Dunbar. Consequently the annihilation of Scotland's army, patterned after the army of 'Gideon', left many devastated and questioning how to interpret God's providence. While some Protesters chose to interpret their defeat as an indication of additional hidden sins requiring repentance, others, like Menzies, Jaffray and their fellows in Aberdeen, turned their queries deeper. The Protesters by nature were simply the more religiously radical group in the Kirk. It was easier for religious radicals to shift from one extreme to another than it was for moderates to become radical.

Moreover, the Protesters represented the portion of the Kirk who generally desired a more experiential form of Christianity, demonstrated in their exuberant multi-day communion celebrations.[55] They were overwhelmingly the individuals described by Louise Yeoman who adhered to Presbyterianism in the previous decades because it protected 'the inner world from being smoored by exposure to a lifeless time-serving episcopal ministry, and ceremonies'.[56] They shared the New England Independents high-esteem for conversion experiences, which explains the popularity of Thomas Shepard's writings in Scotland throughout the 1640s despite the crackdown on 'Independent' works.[57] For this reason, individuals devoted to Presbyterianism because of its high-value on the personal religious experience were perhaps more susceptible to interpreting the defeats at Dunbar and Worcester as divine judgements for particular faults, than the generally more pragmatic Resolutioners. The Protester emphasis on personal conversion and vibrant personal religious experience gave them a natural affinity for the Independent concept of congregations including only those likely to be elect. Perhaps some came to view gathered congregations as the next logical step from the conventicles which

---

[54] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:175-6.
[55] Burnet, *Burnet's History of his own time*, 41; W. Stephen, *History of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1896), i:325-6; L.E. Schmidt, *Holy Fairs.* 2nd edn (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.), 32-41.
[56] L.A. Yeoman, 'Heart-Work: Emotion, Empowerment and Authority in Covenanting Times.' (Ph.D. diss., University of St Andrews, 1991), ix.
[57] Ibid, 35. Editions of Shepard's works were printed in Edinburgh in 1645, 1647, 1650 (see H.G. Aldis, *List of Books Printed in Scotland Before 1700* (Edinburgh: NLS, 1970)).

formed under Episcopacy in the 1620s and 30s.[58] Certainly even those Protesters who rejected separation from the Kirk, like Andrew Cant, envied how Independency maintained the purity of the sacraments.[59] If 'conversion' and a 'new birth' represented an integral aspect of the desired experience of the Covenanters, which Yeoman suggests,[60] then the arrival of Independency which advocated the inclusion of only those converted through an intense spiritual experience, may have been perceived by the more radical and experiential Covenanters (which the Protesters certainly were) as the arrival of a purer manifestation of a covenanted religious experience. Another indication of the desire for intense personal religious experiences the Protesters shared with Independents was exhibited in the Protesters' experimentation with personal covenants during the Interregnum.[61]

Scottish Sectarians

Disputes over the Kirk and the covenants did not reach their apex in the October Protester meeting. Jaffray's submission initiated a series of papers handed in to various meetings across the country. The first was a 'twelve-headed' paper given to the Protester meeting at Edinburgh in mid-November 1651 and also probably to the Commissioners of the General Assembly in the same month.[62] Although the paper itself no longer survives, James Balfour has preserved an

---

[58] D. Stevenson, 'Conventicles in the Kirk, 1619-37.' *RSCHS* 18 (1974), 99-114.
[59] See p. 241-3, below.
[60] Yeoman, 'Heart-Work', 25.
[61] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:276.
[62] Holfelder suggests this paper was given in to a meeting in Kilmarnock, but gives no citation supporting grounds for making this claim (Holfelder, 144; he cites: Balfour, iv:330-3; Peterkin, 645-6). The only evidence I can find is that a supplication advancing similar ideas was composed by a **group of sectaries** who also produced *Overtures to the Right Honorable* (the 'fifteen overtures') and *To the Very Honorable the Representative of the Common-Wealth* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652) sent to the 'West' (Hoy, 182n). While this does not prevent the author of the 'twelve-headed' from being numbered among the group who composed the other tracts, the 'twelve-headed' paper referred to by Holfelder has a single author according to Balfour, Peterkin and Nicoll (67). According to Balfour, from whom Peterkin drew his information, the paper was submitted to several gatherings, but does not indicate any in particular except the Protestor meeting at Edinburgh. Nicoll additionally claims the paper by 'ane godly Scott' (certainly the 'twelve headed' paper) was also submitted to the Commissioners of the General Assembly (Resolutioners) in Edinburgh. So it seems Holfelder confused the 'twelve headed' paper written by a single anonymous author with another paper written by a group of 'Scottish Sectaries'. A discussion of possible adherents to this group is found in the following pages.

outline.[63] The paper challenges [1] Scotland's adherence to both the covenants and [2] monarchy; [3] coercing the most ignorant in the land to adhere to the covenants; [4] the passionate and bitter invectives against the Godly in England; [5] the espousing of the malignant cause; [6] pollution of the Kirk's ordinances by inclusion of the 'vilest' men; [7] the idolising of men; [8] refusing the treaty offered by the English; [9] promotion of the Presbytery as the 'vtermost attainable perfectione of reformatione'; [10] 'the smothering of light and withdrawing from duties; [11] the neglect and oppression of Scotland's poor; and finally [12] attempting to carry on the Reformation with scandalous and unsuitable people in places of trust. Little is recorded of the response the paper elicited from fellow Scots, but approving English journals referred to it as 'By ane Godly Scott' or 'by a godly brother'.[64]

When the Protesters reconvened in Edinburgh in late December they received another paper of 'fifteen overtures' entitled 'Overtures to the Right Honorable Commonwealth of England' submitted by a group of Scots.[65] By now the Protesters termed them 'malignants', describing them as 'some few who formerly were accounted pious and gracious men, that were of this mind, their judgments being now corrupted by sectarian principles'.[66] Accusations of malignancy, however, were utterly unfounded. Instead, the authors of these overtures were converts to the English concepts of religious freedom and toleration, and thus increasingly sceptical of the covenants and Presbyterianism. Or perhaps it might be more correct to say: due to an increasing scepticism towards the covenants and Presbyterianism these 'Scottish Sectarians' embraced English notions of religious freedom and toleration. Unfortunately, the only known copy of the overtures is now lost, but before the document disappeared W.I. Hoy

---

[63] Balfour, iv:330-3; Peterkin, 645-6.
[64] Ibid, 67; Peterkin, 645-6; Balfour, iv:330-3.
[65] Hoy, 182n.
[66] Nicoll, 63; Row, *Life of Blair*, 289. Their judgements were followed by Dow and Holfelder (Dow, 28; Holfelder, 144).

preserved their substance.[67] His account can in turn be partially verified by William Row's fragmentary preservation.[68] According to Hoy, the fifteen overtures request:

> that only the 'certain' Godly in Scotland[69] are to be entrusted with power although the uncertain are to be considered as brethren, that malignants and noblemen are to be cast out of power and the former brought to trial, and also have their land sequestered, that minor posts not be used as merchandise but given to the English or faithful Scots, that Scots law be replaced by English law, that actions against the present government be punished, that liberty of conscience be granted in religion, blasphemies and heresies be curbed, the mouths of ministers be stopped who preach seditious doctrine, gathered churches conform to the primitive apostolic pattern, and that the Power of the Presbytery be abolished that 'the name of a national church may perish under heaven in Brittaine'.[70]

Nothing about these requests is 'malignant'; a common slander used to discredit opponents and usually referring to interest in temporal issues over and above right religion. On the contrary, the overtures themselves denounce malignants while perfectly reflecting the religiously motivated aims of the Commonwealth expressed in the *Declaration of the Army, now in Scotland* written at Musselburgh on August 1, 1650 and the Terms of Union which would be produced a few months later by Parliament. The 'Scottish Sectaries'[71] who produced this paper embody the success the Commonwealth hoped to attain in their conquest of Scotland. Needless to say, these overtures found little favour among the majority in the Protester meeting. Although the authors who submitted the paper attended the meeting, the overriding opposition to their position caused them to withdraw after only one day of discussions.

---

[67] Hoy, 182n. Hoy claims that the text of these fifteen overtures has been preserved in Wodrow's manuscript collection now housed in the NLS. His citation form (Wod. Col., Mil. Col, LS I 6,10) is archaic and predates their transfer from the collections of the Church of Scotland into the Scottish Records Office. The collections have now been moved to the NLS and all records of Hoy's cataloguing are extinct. To the best of my ability I have been unable to find this source, despite the kind help of the staff at both NLS and the NAS. I have established the relationship between the two cataloguing systems, LS I 6,7 = Wod.Fol.XXIX; LS I 6,8 = Wod.Fol.XXX; and so on up to LS I 6,9 = Wod.Fol.XXXI. This, however, is where the correlation between the two systems ceases and there is no LS I 6,10. For this reason we are left reliant on Hoy's citation of the source.

[68] Row, *Life of Blair*, 289.

[69] 'The "certain" godly' refers to those bearing outward signs indicative of election.

[70] Hoy, 182n.

[71] Both Protesters and Resolutioners referred to the authors of this work as 'sectaries' for adopting the principles of the 'sectarian army'. Hoy uses the phrase 'Sectarian Scots'. My use of 'Scottish Sectaries' is an attempt to maintain the label used by their contemporaries, while at the same time identifying them as Scots who have accepted English ideologies.

It is unfortunate that while we can glean from the overtures what the authors stood for we lack any certainty as to who they were. W.I. Hoy in his exploratory study of the period suggests the Aberdeen Independents and the Scottish Sectarians were a homogenous group by claiming the Aberdeen ministers suspended by the 1652 Resolutioner General Assembly were the 'Scottish Sectarians'.[72] However, what was happening in Scotland in 1651 and 1652 cannot be identified as a cohesive movement. Instead, different groups in different parts of the country were working through their own queries. What they had in common was a general distrust of the Kirk's actions during the 1640s, and a sensitivity and receptiveness to the religious and political messages of the English. For instance, Jaffray and Menzies were working in the context of a localised Aberdeen movement focused on the proper composition of individual Christian congregations and the legality of the covenant. The Scottish Sectarians who composed these (and subsequent) overtures were probably located in the south of the country. While they shared some ideas, in late 1651 the Scottish Sectarians were quick to promote political union with England, the gathering of Independent congregations, and the dissolution of the national Presbytery at a time when the Aberdeen Independents had not yet even settled on separation for themselves. Additionally, when the Aberdeen Independents finally did write in May 1652 suggesting they might separate, they made no mention of any of the previous Scottish Sectarian declarations. More importantly, neither did Wariston in either of his two replies to Aberdeen. Wariston, being in the inner circle of the Protester movement, would have had intimate knowledge of both the Aberdeen Independents and the 'Scottish Sectarians' who attended the Protester meeting in December. Had any of those who signed the Aberdeen letter of 24 May, 1652 been involved with the composition of the Scottish Sectarian overtures he would have known. Wariston's silence in this regard suggests none of the would-be Aberdeen Independents were involved in the production of the 'Overtures'.[73]

---

[72] Hoy, 186-7.

[73] The portion of Wariston's diary from the end of October 1651 until April 1652 has not been preserved. However, Wariston's failure to mention the papers of the Scottish Sectarians in his large response to the Aberdeen Independents is fairly conclusive that they had no common links.

In general the Aberdeen Independents and the Scottish Sectarians can be distinguished in two ways. The Aberdeen Independents were primarily focused on the shortcomings of the national church in terms of its impact on the purity of local congregations and the sinful effect of propagating Presbyterianism under the guise of the covenants. While they may have become involved in politics, as Jaffray later did, it was not until after they had settled their religious queries: their primary focus was the health of the church, particularly at the local level. Many Scottish Sectarians also embraced Independency, but were initially concerned with replacing the oppressive political structures in Scotland and securing their own participation in the functioning of Commonwealth government. Though Scotland's ventures in the name of the covenants were the issue that prompted both groups to look for change (and they moved increasingly towards the same goals) they started in different places. These two different positions correspond to two distinctive reasons why Scots may have embraced Independency. First either as a rejection of the coercive power of the national church which dominated the consciences of its members, or second, for more ecclesiologically based reasons, such as desiring purer congregations and ordinances. While the two are not mutually exclusive, neither are they inherently linked.

While the ringleaders of the Aberdeen Independents can be identified through historical accounts and their subscription to declarations, the Scottish Sectarians are significantly more enigmatic. The anonymous author of *A Word of Advertisement* and the author of the 'twelve-headed' paper can probably be numbered among the Scottish Sectarians, beyond that it is difficult to identify particular individuals without making sweeping assumptions. So it may prove to be of greater use to identify individuals who were sympathetic to their 'sectarian' sentiment. Some likely candidates are John Swinton (younger) of that Ilk, Sir James MacDowall of Garthland, Colonel William Lockhart of Lee, Sir Walter Dundas (Laird of Dundas and Governor of Edinburgh Castle), William Dundas (younger brother of the Laird of

Duddingston),[74] John Ho[o]me ('servitor' to Dundas of Dundas), Major Andrew Abernethie, Lieutenant Robert Andrew, Captain Holburne, Lieutenant William Govan, Major William Johnston, Colonel Gilbert Ker, Colonel Archibald Strachan, and the three brothers Sir James Hope of Hopeton, Sir John Hope of Craighall and Sir Alexander Hope.[75] Swinton, John Hope and Lockhart served as judges and members of Commonwealth parliaments under the English and might in some degree owe their allegiance to personal religious changes. Swinton voted against levying troops to oppose Cromwell's invasion in 1650 and eventually became a Quaker; Lockhart formed a gathered congregation in his home in May 1652; Hope is reported to have encouraged John Owen to return to Scotland and preach in 1653.[76] When Hope died in 1654 Nicoll noted his opinions were viewed as erroneous by many contemporaries, as he thought poorly of the ministers of the Kirk and perceived God was doing a great work through the English.[77] MacDowall of Garthland, who also served in Commonwealth Parliaments, signed a petition in 1659 requesting a permanent religious toleration be imposed in Scotland and all previous Scottish legislation opposing toleration or preventing religious diversity be abolished.[78] Johnston, Home and Ker were all dealt with either by the Committee of Estates or the Commissioners of the General Assembly for favouring the Independents or surrendering their posts in order to join with the English in 1650 as Swinton, William Dundas, Abernethie, Govan and Strachan purportedly did.[79] On March 24, 1651, William Dundas, Walter Dundas, Col. Archibald Strachan, Swinton, John Home, Major Johnston, Major Abernethie, 'with divers others' were all summoned to appear before the Committee of Estates for complying with the 'sectaries'.[80] In April 1651 the Commissioners of the General Assembly reissued summons for

---

[74] Nicoll, 52; *RCGA*, iii:377.
[75] Row, *Life of Blair*, 250-4, 269; RCGA, iii:169-70, 243; Abbott, ii:366-74; Jaffray, 58-9; Balfour, iv:238-40, 246; Laing (ed.) *Correspondence of Sir Robert Kerr*, ii:325-6; 'Collections by a private hand', 31-2;Holfelder, 95; J. Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions*, 221; Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 195-6.
[76] Balfour, iv:79-80; Wariston, ii:169; *APS*, vi, ii:751.
[77] Nicoll, 124.
[78] Row, *Life of Blair*, 338.
[79] Maidment, *Historical Fragments*, 5:30; Row, *Life of Blair*, 250, 270; Whitelocke, iii:255-8; Lamont, 26-7.
[80] Balfour, iv:271.

Swinton, William Dundas, Lieutenant Andrew, and Lieutenant Govan for their compliance with the 'Sectarian Army now infesting' Scotland.[81] Swinton, William Dundas and Major Abernethie were all ordered to be excommunicated by the Commissioners on May 24, 1651 for their compliance with the 'sectaries', while Walter Dundas only received a further summons.[82] According to William Row, Major Abernethie had 'always spoke favourably of Independency and against Presbyterian government' and the Commissioners claimed he was partially responsible for the surrender of Edinburgh Castle.[83] Major William Johnston supposedly had 'gone into that blasphemous armie of Sectaries' and remained among them in Edinburgh, where he spoke 'familiarlie' with their officers and generally complied with them.[84] Strachan commanded a regiment in the Army of the Western Association, but following personal correspondence with Cromwell became disenchanted with the malignancy of Scotland's cause and joined the English in December 1650.[85] The Kirk suspected he also played some part in convincing Dundas to surrender Edinburgh Castle.[86] Accordingly, on January 12, 1651 the Kirk excommunicated Strachan and 'deliuered [him] to the deivuell' for being too sympathetic towards the 'sectarians'.[87] Gilbert Ker also served as an officer in the Western Association before surrendering to the English in December 1650. Captain Holburne was called before the King and Parliament in December 1650 for suspected 'underhande dealling' with Cromwell's informants.[88] By William Dundas' own account, he was disenchanted with Presbyterianism before the Interregnum and may have even been under threat of excommunication before then.[89] Certainly he attempted to obtain some banned books, labelled 'Sectary Books' by the Kirk, from a London merchant sometime between the General Assembly's ban in 1647 and the

---

[81] *RCGA*, iii:377.
[82] *RCGA*, iii:437-8. According the Kirk Session records of Elgin, Govan and Strachan were excommunicated as well by August 24, 1651 (Cramon, *Elgin*, 279).
[83] Row, *Life of Blair*, 253; *RCGA*, iii:378
[84] *RCGA*, iii:378.
[85] Ibid, iv:267; *ODNB*, 'Strachan, Archibald'. A jotting on the back of a manuscript in the Wodrow Collection suggests it may be part of the discourse between Strachan, Gilbert Ker and Cromwell (Wod.Fol.XXXI.(39)).
[86] *ODNB*, 'Strachan'.
[87] Balfour, iv:240; *Some Sober Animadversions, Humbly, and In All Meekness Offered to the Consideration of All Who Truly Fear the Lord.* (London, 1659), 15.
[88] Balfour, iv:250.

arrival of the English Army.[90] Another possible candidate to fit the Scottish Sectarian mould is John Mein, who was accused of treason for giving information to the English in 1650 and subsequently sentenced to death.[91] Mein is of particular interest, and should be included in this list of individuals, because in the 1620s his father faced the wrath of both civil and ecclesiastical authorities for promoting and holding religious conventicles, which he and his contemporaries called 'congregations'.[92] The elder Mein also served on the Kirk Party's commissions for purging between 1648 and 1650.[93] So there is some reason to believe the younger Mein's sympathy for the English may have been motivated by religious dissent towards the Kirk, making him another strong candidate.

While none of these men can be proven to have had any association with the previously mentioned documents, they all displayed sympathy with the English religious agenda, a characteristic of the Scottish Sectarians. Wariston accused Swinton in August 1651 of 'comending the Sectaries to the skyes'.[94] Others like Sir John Chiesly admitted later in the decade to be tired of Presbyterianism, but he probably was not strong enough in this opinion in 1651 to be considered a potential author.[95] These few examples of only prominent individuals show there are a significant number of potential candidates for the authorship of the supplications for union and toleration. Thus the lack of names attached to the overtures does not diminish their value as a testament to the changing political and religious climate in Scotland.

The Protester meeting responded to the 'Overtures to the Right Honourable Commonwealth' by drafting their own letter to Cromwell. Disagreements over the appropriate tenor delayed its

---

[89] Dundas, *A Few Words of Truth*, 6-8.
[90] Ibid, 9.
[91] Balfour, iv:297. Only a late pardon from Charles II prevented his execution (Ibid, iv:299).
[92] Hoy, 179; D. Stevenson, 'Conventicles in the Kirk, 1619-37. The Emergence of a Radical Party', *RSCHS*, 18 (1974), 101-5.
[93] James Bulloch, 'Conformist and Nonconformists' *Transactions of the East Lothian Antiquaries and Field Naturalists' Society* 8 (1960): 70-84.
[94] Wariston, ii:119.
[95] Brodie, 189.

completion until January 2, 1652. The letter denounced the great variety of errors the English presence introduced; their intervention in Kirk matters; silencing ministers who preached about political matters; public preaching by soldiers; disruption of Kirk services; printing of anti-Presbyterian tracts; gathering of Independent congregations; subordination of the church to the state 'in the things of Christ'; as well as the duplicitous nature of the conquest of Scotland by their fellow covenant takers.[96] Additionally it urged for the preservation of the Presbytery. The Protesters submitted a copy of the letter to General Lambert, the acting Commander-in-Chief of the army in Scotland, but he refused to grant a pass to the young messenger instructed to deliver it to Cromwell and reportedly answered the letter with the foreboding comment, 'Soon may your fears fall upon you'.[97] Copies of the letter reached English journals which ridiculed calls for the preservation of the Presbytery and mocked the 'suffering' of those who 'goe aboute to be persecutters'.[98]

The same day the Protesters finished their letter the English regime printed 'a declaration with some overtures' by the Scottish Sectarians as a broadsheet entitled *To the Very Honorable the Representative of the Common-Vvealth.*[99] This is an extremely rare tract, the sole surviving copy is held in the National Library of Scotland.[100] The paper constitutes a rare testament to the aims and objectives of the Scottish Sectarians. Having recognised their discussions with the Protesters made little progress they had retired and set about producing a second supplication to the Commonwealth, including a declaration of their purpose in doing so. Once the English received the paper it was printed under the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor of Leith, Timothy Wilkes. He called the authors 'diverse Good People of Scotland' and deemed it 'very essentiall to the welfare of the Godly and honest Party in Scotland, and of great advantage to the

---

[96] *RCME*, i:1-12; Whitelocke, iii:389; NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX.(19).
[97] Row, *Life of Blair*, 291.
[98] Balfour, iv:348.
[99] See p. 149, above. Row, *Life of Blair*, 291; Hoy, 183n; *To the Very Honorable the Representative of the Common-Vvealth. the Humble Petition and Remonstrance of Such in Scotland* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).
[100] Shelfmark: Ry.1.1.73, which has been reproduced on microfilm: Mf.SP.141(19).

carrying on the great Work of God in the world'. The authors' intentions in making their requests to the English government were, they claimed, to save the godly in Scotland who risked being crushed 'by the Ocean-like inundations of Malignant [secular] and Presbyterian Confluences'. Four requests are made and they differ little from those in the previous supplication. First, they request that Scotland and England be made into one equal commonwealth in which citizens of both nations may share the same liberties and privileges. Second, that godly governors be chosen who show great integrity, live implicitly by faith and who will not tyrannise over those they are appointed to govern. Third, that God's people be given 'all due Christian freedom' to practise their faith without threat of cruelty or coercion. Finally, those who are selected to rule should be chosen not for their worldly status but for their piety and integrity.

While there is no doubt that the authors were Scottish there is some evidence that they were under particular English influence. The authors suggest 'the poor, foolish, and contemned things of this World, are suitablest to our Lords designe: By the mouth and strength of such, he perfecteth his praise: It is *the little stone out of the mountain without hands*'. The phrase 'little stone out of the mountain', taken from Daniel 2:34, was the title of a sermon preached in Edinburgh by Nicholas Lockyer in 1651 (and printed in 1652).[101] Lockyer worked feverishly in Scotland to promote the gathering of congregations. The message of this English advocate of Independency fits well with the desires of those Scots who were growing increasingly weary of the covenants and the Presbyterian Kirk they underpinned. Within weeks of this paper's publication Whitelocke noted the printing of the 'vindication of the poor oppressed commons of Scotland' on January 28.[102] Increasingly those who were dissatisfied with Kirk and Covenant found a voice.

---

[101] See ch. 3, above.
[102] Whitelocke, iii:387.

Separation

By the close of 1651 dissent began to move from the pages of written and printed papers into the sphere of physical action. Nicoll lamented the bleak state of ecclesiastical affairs at the close of 1651:

> Divisiounes, distractiounes, and hart birninges among all soirtis of pepill, both Kirk and Stait; Many of the ministrie fomentaris of divisioun, dealing too rigidlie with sum, and too favorablie with utheris, seiking out rather the pepillis schame than thair syn; quhairon followit manifold errouris and hereseis, sum ministeris refuisand to baptize infantes, utheris taking upon thame to marry men privilie haiffing twa wyfes on lyff....[103]

Reports of gathered churches began to increase at the end of 1651. On December 16, 1651 *Mercurius Scoticus* conveyed the situation in the vicinity of Linlithgow where a Mr. Baugh (or Waugh)[104] gathered a 'Proselized Congregation' of 'people suitable to his owne minde'.[105] In this account he cleverly foiled a parish minister's attempt to end his ministry: when the minister of the Kirk cut the rope to the church bell in an attempt to prevent him from gathering his congregation he simply tied the two pieces of rope back together and summoned his flock. In early January news from the Highlands described 'a very precious people who seeke the face of God in Sutherland and divers other parts beyond Invernesse...[who] will rather leave their owne Ministers and come to private houses where our officers and souldiers meete together'.[106] Three months later Lilburne reported 'the Lord is pleas'd to open the eyes of many to draw them out of their old formes [Presbyterianism] into a neerer communion with those that truly feare God amongst us, and divers are become Members of [gathered] Churches, and many more would if meanes were not wanting amongst them'.[107] And again a few days later, 'there is an increase of good people who daily some way or other are sweetned towardes us, and become more united in their affections and judgements, only there wants some meanes to lead many into a clearer

---

[103] Nicoll, 77-8.
[104] John Waugh was minster of Bo'ness from 1648-1670. Arrested for praying for the King in 1654 (*FES*, i:195). If this account is correct he abandoned his parish charge at least for a period of time.
[105] *S & C*, 345.
[106] Ibid, 31; Dow, 27.

light that are waiting for it; and I could with this were nott soe much neglected by the State as it is'.[108]

In March 1652, Nicoll noted the first significant break from the Kirk. He reports 'sum malignant and independant party in the North' separated from the Kirk because they found that 'bloody' and 'barbarous' events had always accompanied Scotland's Presbyterian government.[109] While Nicoll includes the entire text of their declaration of separation, he neglects to include the names of those who signed it, and hence has forced later readers to speculate about its authorship. It has long been assumed this declaration refers to the Aberdeen Independents; an assumption based primarily on three pieces of evidence. First, Aberdeen's Independents suggested the potentiality of their own separation in the spring of 1652. Second, there is a mention in the journal *Mercurius Politicus* dated March 1652 that 'severall Kirks about Aberdeen are faln off, and have deserted that Presbytery which gives an Alarm to their Brethren in Fife and Edenburgh'.[110] Third, Robert Baillie reported on April 1, 1652 that Lockyer had been summoned to the north to aid some Scots in gathering Independent congregations and that at the time of writing the letter Lockyer was in Aberdeen.

While the evidence does give some credence to this view, there are several points that suggest the 'separation' Nicoll refers to did not occur in Aberdeen. First, Jaffray, Menzies, Row and the others did not send their letter proposing separation until May 24, more importantly they did not officially separate from the Kirk until October. Furthermore, the two documents claiming separation bear no similarities other than the use of the phrase 'gospell way', which actually refers to the protection promised by the English in their declaration of toleration on February 11, 1652, that pledged support for anyone wishing to worship in a 'gospell way' other than

---

[107] *S & C*, 123.
[108] Ibid, 127.
[109] Nicoll, 91; Hoy, 185.
[110] Mercurius *Politicus*. (March 25-April 1, 1652), 1493 [E658:13].

Presbyterianism.[111] Second, that Lockyer ended up in Aberdeen should be of little surprise. Even if he had been invited north by another group it is likely he would have passed through Aberdeen, either sailing there from Leith, or simply taking a detour to visit those who had openly questioned Presbyterianism in previous months. Third, it is a certain fact that the group in Aberdeen consisting of Jaffray, Menzies, Row and the others was not the sole group in the northeast of Scotland to have separated in 1652. Sometime earlier in the year (probably after January 26) Andrew Ballenden, at the prompting of the English, entered the vacant parish charge of Drumoak.[112] Ballenden worked 'upon the independent and congregationall course' for several months before appearing before the Presbytery of Aberdeen to recant his actions in October.[113] A report from the end of the decade also cites four other ministers in or around Aberdeen separated from the Kirk, but without mentioning the dates of their separation.[114] Therefore other separations from the Kirk occurred besides the famous group in Aberdeen and could account for the reports of *Mercurius Politicus* in March declaring many Kirks 'faln off' near Aberdeen. Fourth and finally, Nicoll remarks those who declared separation in March were 'occasioned by sum censures put upone thame for thair publict synnes'.[115] This would not have applied to any of the ministers in Aberdeen, who were at this point still functioning within Presbytery. It *would*, however, have applied to any of the ministers who were deposed in Orkney and Caithness in 1650, but there is no surviving evidence for making such a bold assumption. The clue to answering who these separatists were lies in the Presbytery book of Strathbogie.[116]

---

[111] *RCME*, i:24, 26; Nicoll, 84; *APS*, vi,ii:809; Wod.Fol.XXX.(21), f. 60; Dow, 41. Dow describes 'gospel way' as being simply 'a vague term which implied a serious threat to the monopoly of the Church of Scotland' (Dow, 38).

[112] Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 222.

[113] Ibid, 223.

[114] R. Pittiloh, *The Hammer of Persecution* (London: L. Chapman, 1659), 10-12. Pittiloh (a contemporary and a Scot) names Row, Menzies and Seaton, all of whom are part of Jaffray's group in Aberdeen, but he also mentions John Forbes (Kincardine O'neill), Row's son-in-law John Mercer (Kinkellar), William Youngstone (Durris) and John Young (Birse) as having separated or become 'Baptists', yet fails to provide any dates.

[115] Nicoll, 91.

[116] J. Stuart (ed.), *Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie. 1631-1654.* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1843).

In June 1652 William Gordon of Dumbennan stood before the Presbytery of Strathbogie under threat of censure for 'false, lying, scandalous reproaches against the Kirk of Scotland'.[117] Rather than succumbing to threats of an ecclesiastical reprimand, Gordon responded by submitting a declaration of separation to the Presbytery that matches Nicoll's almost *verbatim*.[118] The similarity between the declarations is so close it suggests they come from a common source. That is to say Gordon either had direct contact with the authors of the first declaration or shared contact with the same source. The Aberdeen Independents seem an unlikely source for this declaration, because they did not officially separate from the Kirk until October and the letter they prepared in May only declared their increasing favour for the 'Congregationall way' not that they were yet prepared to take it up. However, the Presbytery of Strathbogie did receive a letter and some 'public papers' from John Row on April 28, probably including a paper questioning Presbyterianism he had submitted to the Synod of Aberdeen five days earlier.[119] So it is not beyond the realm of possibility that a dialogue relating to separation took place between the group in Aberdeen moving towards Independency and some in Strathbogie who were more eager to separate from the Kirk.[120] Evidence in their records suggests the Presbytery of Strathbogie perceived Independency as a local threat by March 1652. George Meldrum (possibly the 1651 graduate of Marischal College who became a prominent minister after the Restoration) spoke to the presbytery about the danger it posed and offered a defence of Presbyterian ecclesiastical government.[121] Pleased with his work the presbytery gave him an additional sum of money to continue his studies.

The threat of Independency noted by the presbytery corresponded with the arrival of a significant English presence in area. English soldiers were garrisoned in Rothiemay Castle at the northern end of Strathbogie and in Kildrummy Castle just to the south, as well as in a number of other locations in the North East. In April 1652 the Presbytery complained of the disruption

---

[117] Ibid, 222.
[118] See Appendix IV.
[119] See page 191, below.
[120] Stuart, *Strathbogie*, 220.

caused to their proceedings by 'great numbers' of English soldiers 'remaining in their boundes'.[122] Perhaps one of these garrisons served as the source for the declaration of separation, or perhaps, as Hoy suggests, it may have come from Nicholas Lockyer, who travelled widely throughout the country promoting division. Lockyer definitely visited the North East of Scotland in the spring of 1652 at the invitation of some Scots who wished him to oversee the gathering of Independent churches.[123] Perhaps the subscribers of Nicoll's declaration, who separated in March, are the same individuals who requested Lockyer's help. If this were the case, they may have composed the declaration with Lockyer's help. Or possibly, Lockyer provided the document for them. A prepared statement for use by rural Scots was a legitimate enterprise since research into the literacy of rural parishes in the 1630s has deduced that less than twenty-percent of the population could read.[124] Whatever the precise circumstances, Gordon had some association with the authors of the declaration in Nicoll's journal and here is a case of separation in north-eastern Scotland completely outside the Presbytery of Aberdeen and separate from the famous Aberdeen Independents. Approximately a year after William Gordon's declaration, Sir Robert Gordon of Gordonstoun and his family, 'the most considerable part of the parish', 'defected' from the kirk at Ogston in April 1653.[125] Two months later his son-in-law, David Barclay of Ury (father of the famous Quaker Robert Barclay of Ury who later served as governor to the Scots-Quaker colony in East New Jersey), publicly rejected the doctrine and discipline of the Kirk declaring it to be a false church.[126] By October Gordonstoun began building a new church at Kinnedar.[127] What became of the gathering there is uncertain, but Gordon died in 1656. It is interesting to note that the North-

---

[121] Ibid, 219.
[122] Cramond, *Moray*, 114.
[123] Hoy, 185.
[124] Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland*, 25.
[125] Cramond, *Moray*, 117.
[126] Ibid, 117. This demonstrates a strand of religious dissent long before the family's adoption of Quakerism c.1666. For a brief discussion of the 'conversions' of Robert Barclay see 'Barclay, Robert, of Ury' in *ODNB*.
[127] Ibid, 118.

East of Scotland, and Strathbogie in particular, was again a hotspot for separation when Congregationalism rekindled in the nineteenth century.[128]

Aberdeenshire and Strathbogie were not the sole bastions of success for the English message of separation. Nicoll reported in May 1652, without any geographical specification, that laymen took upon themselves the role of the ministry without a 'lauchfull calling' and preached, performed weddings and baptisms, and publicly debated their new doctrines.[129] The Kirk excommunicated Alexander Cornwell, minister of Muiravonside near Linlithgow, in 1652 for privately performing marriages, some of which were reportedly polygamous, and for baptising 'old people'.[130] In Edinburgh, the Scotsman Colonel William Lockhart of Lee, who served the Commonwealth as a judge and later as a diplomat to France after marrying Cromwell's niece, opened his home on May 29, 1652 for a gathered congregation to meet.[131] Sir James Turner branded him a 'great Independent'.[132] Lockhart had served during the Engagement in 1648 and been taken prisoner by the English. During his internment he spent time in Hull where he conversed regularly with the governor, the politically and religiously radical Robert Overton, and in Newcastle where his fellow Scots accused him of being too friendly with the Particular Baptist Paul Hobson.[133] 'Lockhart might have been released for money, but,' wrote Sir James Turner, 'whether it was to save that, or to enjoy the too acceptable company of Paul Hobson that he remained in Newcastle, he knows best'.[134] So it may be his leanings towards English religious practices were established before Cromwell's invasion.

Other Independent congregations also reportedly formed in 1652. In a letter dated July 8, 1652, Baillie explains a group separated from the Kirk in Fenwick despite tearful sermons against

---

[128] H. Escott, *Beacons of Independency: religion and life in Strathbogie and Upper Garioch in the nineteenth century* (Huntly: Express, 1940).
[129] Nicoll, 94.
[130] Ibid, 94; *FES* i:222.
[131] Wariston, ii:169
[132] James Turner, *Memoirs of His Own Life and Times, 1632-1670.* (ed.) T. Thomson. (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1829), 78.
[133] 'Sir William Lockhart of Lee' *North British Review* 36 (February-May 1862), 90-1.
[134] Turner, *Memoirs*, 79; 'Sir William Lockhart of Lee', 91.

schism preached by the parish minister William Guthrie.[135] Evidence of general support for 'sectarian' or Independent religion within the burgh of Glasgow is evidenced in reports that, in the days following the great fire which razed large portions of the city on June 15, 1652, ministers of the Kirk preached throughout the municipality that the fire was God's judgement 'for compliance with the sectaries'.[136] Most famously the General Assembly of 1652 censured Thomas Charteris the minister of Stenhouse for refusing to baptise infants.[137] These events, along with others doubtlessly lost forever, prompted English journals to report in November 1652 that many Scots were coming out of the divided Kirk into 'the Congregational way'.[138] Such was the pressure in the west of Scotland the minister of Kilwinning, James Fergusson, preached several sermons in 1652 and after against toleration, error, separation and Independency.[139] Frances Dow heralds the events of 1652 as indicative of 'the way in which the presence of the English army and the work of the parliamentary Commissioners had struck a blow at established practices in Scotland', although argues the overall impact of separatists was small.[140]

Yet the momentum of Independency carried into 1653. That year a 'Congregational' church gathered in Kirkintilloch/Lenzie, with the Englishman John Beverley settled into the charge at the calling of twenty-seven people. This forced the Presbyterian minister to preach 'in the fields, or in a barne' without a stipend.[141] When Sir Arthur Forbes' troops raided the area in November 1653, during Glencairn's Rising, they singled out the members of the gathered congregation and they received the brunt of the incursion.[142] Beverley's arrival may have been

---

[135] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:193; Donaldson, 'Schism', 217.
[136] *Mercurius Politicus*, (June 24-July 1, 1652), 1703 [E669:3]; Whitelocke, iii:433.
[137] Nicoll, 94; Row, *Life of Blair*, 297; *RCGA*, ii:530.
[138] *Perfect Passages* (Nov. 5-12, 1652), 571. [E799:33]; *A Perfect Diurnal* (Nov. 8-15, 1652), 2290. [E799:35]
[139] James Fergusson, *A Brief Refutation of the Errors of Tolleration, Erastianism, Independency and Separation* (Edinburgh: George Mosman, 1692).
[140] Dow, 27.
[141] Some records report a church in Lenzie while others mention Kirkintilloch. They are only a mile apart so it seems likely that they are the same congregation. *S & C*, 265; *Mercurius Politicus*, (Nov. 17-24), p. 2875; Baillie, *L & J*, iii:202, 217, 244; 'Diurnall of Occurences in Scotland' *Spottiswoode Miscellany II*, 140; Holfelder, 182; Baillie, *L & J*, iii:244.
[142] *S & C*, 265;

in reply to a plea from Scotland the previous year 'that there wants English (probably meaning Independent) Ministers in Scotland'. In 1655 he left the parish, but remained in Scotland as fiscal records show Beverley received payment for working in Scotland through 1657. By 1658 he had returned to England.[143] In September 1653 the Commissioners for Visiting Universities in Scotland planted Francis Craw, a Scots Protester with Independent leanings, into the charge of Chirnside.[144] The following August Wariston relayed a report from James Guthrie indicating a congregation of Scots and English soldiers met together in Stirling.[145] Also in 1654, two English Independents, John Collins and John Stalham, were sent to minister in Scotland.[146] Stalham served in Edinburgh for a year before returning to England probably sometime after March 1655.[147] John Collins, educated at Harvard,[148] had a longer stay in Scotland than either Beverley or Stalham. He remained in the country until 1659, being called to a new Independent church in Leith in 1658 which although Congregational, rejected paedo-baptism.[149] His ordination to the charge came at the hands of six ministers from Newcastle, among them Samuel Hammond. The church continued to grow in the closing months of the year.[150] Yet careful reading of the slim surviving sources indicates Stalham, Collins and Beverley were not the first English ministers sent to serve as ministers to civilian congregations rather than as chaplains.

In July 1652 three English Independents were sent to Scotland in response to a request from the Commissioners of Scotland for some ministers to be placed in English garrisons and other

---

[143] Whitelocke, iii:438; Laurence, 99. Baillie claims he was only in Lenzie for two years (Baillie, *L & J*, iii:313.
[144] Dow, 147, 308. In 1658, having fled Scotland after being deposed for immorality, Francis Craw settled into the vicarage in Hundon, Suffolk. He was removed by the Act of Uniformity (*FES*, ii:33; *Calamy Revised*, 431).
[145] Wariston, ii:314.
[146] *CSPD*, 1654:195, 450.
[147] He was certainly back in Essex by 1657 when he wrote *The Reviler rebuked* (London: Henry Hills and John Field, 1657) against Richard Farnsworth's 'attempted answer' *Vindication of the Scriptures against the Scotish Contradictators*. This work by Farnsworth was written in response to Stalham's anti-Quaker tract written in Edinburgh in 1655: John Stalham, *Contradictions of the Quakers* (Edinburgh, 1655).
[148] W.L. Sachse, 'The Migration of New Englanders to England' *American Historical Review* 53 (1948), 267.
[149] The congregation was not a baptist congregation. Thurloe, vii:527.

convenient places.[151] Besides the two ministers sent as chaplains (James Brown and Thomas Twisse)[152] Samuel Mather, Thomas Brag and Sidrach Simpson were given £500 to travel to Scotland in July 1652.[153] Whether Simpson travelled or not is uncertain; if he did his stay in Scotland was very short. Mather and Brag definitely did make the journey. Brag stayed in Scotland until September 1653, being latterly at Stirling where he was described as serving as a 'minister' rather than a chaplain. It is intriguing to speculate over the possibility that Brag may have been ministering to the congregation of English soldiers and Scottish civilians mentioned by Guthrie. When Brag left Scotland another Englishman, Samuel Bryen, replaced him as 'minister at Stirling'.[154] Samuel Mather, educated at Harvard (MA 1643) resided in Leith where he reputedly ministered to a church until November 1654 when he left for Ireland.[155] In 1655 Robert Dalliel, minister of Swanton Morley, Norfolk, received £200 pounds to serve in Scotland as a minister of the gospel.[156] Yet despite these several glimpses of ministers and congregational gatherings in Scotland during the middle years of Interregnum, the Scot Thomas Charteris remains the only minister whose career as an Independent in Scotland can be properly charted.

After a brief stint at Stenhouse (near Hamilton), where Baillie claims he abandoned 'his poor charge', Charteris was called as minister to an Independent congregation gathered under English encouragement at Kilbride (East Kilbride).[157] There the gathered congregation, for which Charteris received 'the best stipend in the west' of £1200 a year, consisted of only twenty to thirty members of a parish comprising over two thousand people. Charteris took the manse, glebe and church for his own use, leaving the bulk of the parish to build a new manse for a replacement Presbyterian minister and provide a stipend out of their own pockets. Reasons for

---

[150] Ibid, vii:527.
[151] C.S. Terry, (ed.) *The Cromwellian Union*, (Edinburgh, 1902), 99; Laurence, *Parliementary Army Chaplains*, 72; *APS*, vi,ii:747; *CSPD*, 1651-2:191; Nicoll, 91.
[152] Laurence, 72, 103, 191.
[153] *CSPD*, 1651-2: 610.
[154] *APS*, vi,ii:750-1. Samuel Bruen is likely the Samuel Bryan who James Guthrie asked to be a referee in he were to take part in another dispute with James Brown (NLS, Wod.Qu.XVII, f. 215-18).
[155] Laurence, 152; *ODNB*, 'Mather, Samuel'; Sachse, 'The Migration of New Englanders to England', 267.

further grievances against the minister come from reports that Charteris subsidised his massive stipend through horse breeding and trading. Not surprisingly, Baillie and subsequent Kirk historians, as well as Quaker historians, construed the demise of Charteris as divine judgement.[158] One Saturday evening in June 1656, while stroking a horse as it grazed in the Kirk-yard, Charteris received a powerful kick in the chest and died from the injury early the next morning. While Craufurd, as a later Kirk historian, inherited contempt for Interregnum separatists, Baillie's dislike for Charteris was altogether more personal. Baillie had been awarded the stipend of Kilbride in January 1651 for his work at the University of Glasgow.[159] No doubt he was perturbed when the stipend ended up in the pocket of Charteris, a separatist, rather than in his own.

The growth of Independency did not go unnoticed by the Kirk, but, Baillie noted the difficulty of dealing with 'schismatics' in mid-1652. Besides the support Independents enjoyed from the English regime, internal divisions within the Kirk prevented the General Assembly from effectively moving against them. In a letter outlining the problem, Baillie cited Thomas Charteris as a prime example of how a lone schismatic, who could have been easily censured in earlier years, managed to continue.[160] Later in the chapter it will be shown that even some Protesters encouraged the development of Independency. So Scottish Presbyterians did not hold the English solely responsible for the growth of sectarian religion in the country. But still, the Resolutioners did the best they could to prevent Independent ministers from being placed in Kirk buildings or in vacant charges. A month after Beverley's induction into the charge at Lenzie the Commissioners of the General Assembly considered the 'inorderly way of intrusion of young men to the ministry in congregations without consent of Presbyteries'.[161] Two days

---

[156] *APS*, vi,ii:897. Collins also received £200 pounds in 1655, while Beverley only received £80, probably because he received an additional stipend from the gathered congregation.
[157] Matthew Craufurd, 'History of the Church of Scotland,' MSS CRA 1, New College Library, ii:421.
[158] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:322-3; Wariston, iii:34-5; Craufurd, ii:422; Naismith, *Stonehouse*, 116. For the Quaker account of the providential nature of Charteris' death see Ch. 5.
[159] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:lxiv.
[160] Ibid, iii:187.
[161] *RCGA*, iii:548.

later they passed an act prohibiting 'disorderly and violent intruders' into vacant charges and ordered presbyteries to deal in an ecclesiastical way with all 'disorders, usurpations, and incroachments upon the liberties of the Kirk and the consciences of the people'.[162] Ostensibly powerless after the imposition of toleration in the previous year this declaration had much more bark than bite, however, it probably served to confirm the English decision to disperse the General Assembly when in met in July and to prevent it from convening again during the Interregnum.

It is regrettable that while the existence of Independently gathered congregations can be confirmed in Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Kirkintilloch/Lenzie, Fenwick, Stonehouse, East Kilbride, Perth, Linlithgow and possibly Birse, Durris, Kinkellar, Strathbogie and elsewhere, few details of these groups other than their presence can be scraped together. Although a scarcity of records for Independent congregations in Britain is not uncommon—few records for Independent churches in England survive either—in Scotland the lack of source material is largely due to two factors. First, Independent gatherings formed completely separate from local Kirk congregations and beyond the corrective reach of their Kirk Sessions so they are not mentioned in their records. When, as happened at Kilbride, gathered churches displaced Kirk congregations, the Presbyterians were forced into 'the field'. They were no longer a bastion imposing social conformity and congregations were forced to become introverted in some aspects of their discipline. In at least one case, the records of the Kirk Session appear to have completely ignored the separation. The parish records of Fenwick apparently make no mention of a gathered congregation forming, despite Baillie's adamant claim some separated from William Guthrie's congregation.[163] Second, because they flourished under the protection of the widely dispersed English garrisons, Independents had alternative communities to turn to for support.[164] For this reason an in-depth study of the group in Aberdeen, for whom the most

---

[162] Ibid, iii:550.
[163] A.C. Jonas, 'Extracts from the Parish Records, 1644-1699.' *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*. 46 (1911-12), 27-52; Baillie, *L & J*, iii:193; Donaldson, 'Schism', 217.
[164] See Appendix III for a map of English garrisons.

information survives, is essential. They have been mentioned in previous studies of the Interregnum,[165] but important primary sources have been neglected. A re-evaluation of the Independents of Aberdeen is necessary and beneficial to understanding of the development of Independency in its wider Scottish context.

The Aberdeen Independents

After Jaffray and Menzies' meeting with their Protester counterparts in Edinburgh in October 1651, stirrings of separation in Aberdeen were relatively quiet until late in the following spring. On April 23 John Row submitted a paper to the Synod of Aberdeen requesting each presbytery and every minister in those presbyteries carefully review the Acts of the General Assembly and 'other thingis ordered by our reformerris' in consideration of five points. First, what qualifications and way of living are required for ministers of the gospel? Second, what is required for elders and deacons? Third, what are the requirements for public penitence in order to reinstate and absolve sinful members? Fourth, what is to be required before participation in the sacraments of baptism and communion is granted? Fifth and finally, what are the qualifications required for an individual to be considered a constituent member of a visible church?[166] This paper reinitiated the momentum towards schism among the group in Aberdeen.

Row's submission of this paper begs the question of what prompted action in Aberdeen after their party had been dormant for the better part of six months. The impetus probably stemmed from several sources, but one factor in particular seems to have been of paramount importance. The Commissioners of the English Parliament granted toleration and protection in February 1652 for groups wishing to gather in a 'gospel way' outwith the Church of Scotland.[167] In and around Aberdeen in January the Kirk had moved against individuals verbally criticising

---

[165] Hoy, 178-211; G.D. Henderson, 'Some Early Scottish Independents,' *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society* 12 (1933-6), 100-16 and re-printed in G.D. Henderson, *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland* (Cambridge: University Press, 1937), 205-19.
[166] Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 217
[167] Nicoll, 81; *APS*, vi:ii,809; *Two Declarations of the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England. Together with Several Proceedings of the Commissioners Appointed by the Parliament for Ordering and Managing Affairs in Scotland.* (London: John Field, 1652).

Presbytery and the covenants including Sir Alexander Irving of Drum, and the husband and wife Paul Colinson and Marjorie Inglis, for 'defection from the trew protestant reformed religion, according to the Covenant'.[168] Fear of censures may have kept many on the cusp of division quiet, but the imposition of toleration and the steps taken to enforce it took the sting out of the Kirk's bite. Toleration encouraged anyone who harboured Independent sympathies, or even displeasure towards the Kirk, to take action. In March the *Weekly Intelligencer* reported 'the Parliament of England, and their Commissioners in Scotland are doing what they can for the advancement of the Gospel with authoritie to carry on that great work, ...many of the godly partie in Scotland that had heretofore hard thoughts of our Church Government, begin now to be more satisfied and to comply with us'.[169] The separation of others near Aberdeen who were themselves in all probability encouraged by the promise of toleration, as reported in *Mercurius Politicus* in early April, perhaps hastened the actions of Row and his counterparts.[170] While, contemporary reports that 'two eminent' ministers had joined gathered churches may have peaked Row's interest in surveying his peers to see if any others were tempted to separate.[171] In any case, none of those involved with Jaffray, Menzies and Row were yet prepared for actual separation in the spring of 1652.

After 'eight or nine' weeks of conferences between Jaffray's faction and the 'most learned ministers in Aberdeen', they composed a famous letter voicing support for the 'Congregational way' on May 24, 1652 and sent it to the Protesters in Edinburgh. They corresponded with the Protesters because the would-be separatists were members of that party before extricating themselves from the Kirk.[172] In his journal Jaffray asserted the purity of their intention:

> some Christians in Aberdeen, men and women, having for a long time been convinced of these things, (long before ever a thought of them was with me,) found themselves obliged to endeavour to have the ordinances administered in a more pure way, than there was any hope ever to attain to have them in the national way. But before we would conclude to do any thing of this, it was thought

---

[168] Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 117.
[169] *The Weekly Intelligencer of the Commonwealth*, (March 23-30, 1652), 400 [E658(8)].
[170] Mercurius *Politicus*, (March 25-April 1, 1652), 1493 [E658(13)].
[171] *S & C*, xl; *Several Proceedings in Parliament*, (29th April-6th May 1652).
[172] Row, *History of the Kirk*, 533.

> necessary, first to impart our purpose to some Christian friends, and to be willing to hear what they could object against our resolution.[173]

In the past some historians have mistakenly attributed the letter to the English Commissioners. Both William Orme and G.L.S. Thompson (following suit) took a report in Whitelocke to infer this paper was one of English policy, rather than a declaration of Scots moving towards the English position of Independency.[174] However, written as a sincere letter to beloved fellow Christians, it is both a declaration of their judgement and a plea for correction if their opinions are mistaken. It raised questions in regards to two fundamental characteristics of the Kirk: its constitution or inclusion of members; and its form of government. Much along the lines of the paper submitted by Jaffray in October 1651, the authors declared their questions arose from 'the Lord's dispensations toward the land' and begged for providential interpretation of Scotland's demise at Dunbar and Worcester.[175]

For the Aberdeen Independents the blame for Scotland's present state lay with a fundamental error in the ecclesiology of the national church. From the Reformation the Kirk had started with a fundamentally wrong assumption. Rather than include the masses and then pare out the clearly degenerate, the Church of Christ should start by gathering together true believers:

> To us it seems, for aught we can search in the word, that none should be admitted as constituent members of a visible church, but such as with a profession of the Truth join such a blameless and gospel-like behaviour, as they may be esteemed, in a rational judgment of charity, believers, and their children. Such were the churches founded by the apostles, which ought to be patterns for us, as appears by the titles given to them, 'saints, sanctified, justified, purchased by the blood of Christ,' &c.[176]

New Testament labels used to describe the Church such as 'saints', 'sanctified' and 'justified' were interpreted by the Kirk, like most other Reformed churches, to mean the invisible elect among the visible church. Jaffray and his fellows opposed this interpretation stating 'We cannot acquiesce to that common answer, that these expressions are to be understood of the better

---

[173] Jaffray, 65.
[174] Orme, 488; Thompson, 62; Whitelocke, iii:441-2.
[175] Jaffray, 167. A short summary of the document is contained in Whitelocke, iii:441-2.
[176] Ibid, 168; Wod.Fol.XXX.(24), NLS, f. 83.

part'.[177] Instead the Church should be comprised only of those who show signs of true sanctification, by means of a sincere profession of faith accompanied with outwards signs of grace. This concept was fundamental to what the English were advocating in their earlier propaganda, and advocated by English radicals like the Baptist James Brown and the Independent Nicholas Lockyer. 'It is certain, our churches were not constituted according to this rule,' they wrote, '...yea, alas! few of our precious men will acknowledge it to be a rule'.[178]

For Jaffray, Menzies, Row, Muir and Birnie, the signatories of the letter, this mixed multitude in the church resulted in the corruption of the sacraments, 'which we know not how to partake of, without sin, in our multitude'.[179] Citing 2 Cor. 6:14-17, they argued that by partaking of the Eucharist with profane individuals they sinfully affirmed them as members of Christ's body. The problem was clear: the church was overrun with 'heathenish idolators' and something needed to be done. The difficult question they faced was how could they remove the degenerate masses and restore the Church of Scotland to its right relationship with God. After struggling with the issue for months they resolved only separation from the Kirk, although far from their original intentions, could rectify the situation. Too much corruption had been allowed in the Kirk for far too long and now no alternatives remained by which the sinful mixture in the church could be resolved. Following closely the rationale and language of Lockyer, they argued that it is impossible for the minority to purge out the more numerous 'sour leaven'.[180]

Through their evaluation of the problem facing the Kirk and the best means of responding to it, they came to view the Presbyterian system of church government as being fundamentally to blame for creating the pollution. So the devotion to Presbyterianism expressed in the covenants was culpable for ensuring that the problem would continue. The Aberdeen Independents were quick to explain they had initially been wary of casting aspersions upon the Kirk: 'we did a long

---

[177] Jaffray, 168.
[178] Ibid, 168-9.
[179] Ibid, 169.

time suppress them as temptations; because we had solemnly, though too implicitly, engaged to the maintenance thereof'.[181] However, which is the greater sin, having too hastily agreed to the covenants and then realising the fault and correcting it, or continuing to support a perverted church under the guise of impious covenanted obligation? They concluded the way forward was not in the Presbyterianism of the Church of Scotland, but in separate Independent congregations. After first carefully explaining the sincerity and process through which they had progressed, the authors asserted 'so far as we can see the congregational way comes nearer to the pattern of the word than our classical form'.[182] Yet rather than this being the apex of their argument, this statement served as their starting point.

Besides inherently fostering corruption, Jaffray and his fellows explained that Presbyterianism also stripped Christians of the powers of jurisdiction and censure given to them by Christ, and subjected them to presbyteries, synods and assemblies. Reiterating arguments used by Independents in the 1640s and recycled by Lockyer they argued 'the people had no small influence in matters of discipline' in the early church, but Presbyterianism swallowed up these rights.[183] For the authors, congregations are not only the base component bodies of the church, but whole and complete 'churches' endowed with all necessary powers of jurisdiction and censure. So besides taking away ecclesiastical powers from individual congregations, the Presbytery also removes their right of democratic self-rule, or makes it only superficial, with the real power being reserved for Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies.

All in all, the authors seem to have been greatly influenced by English propaganda published in Scotland in the previous year. Following quite closely the arguments put forward in Lockyer's *A Litle Stone*, the declaration from Aberdeen works through the same progression of thoughts. First, Scotland's repeated defeats at the hands of the English are all signs of God's judgement

---

[180] Ibid, 169; Lockyer, *A Litle Stone out of the Mountain*, e.d. 5-6,
[181] Ibid, 169.
[182] Ibid, 169.
[183] Ibid, 170; Lockyer, *A Litle Stone out of the Mountain*, 82-3.

against the sins of the nation.[184] Second, the source of Scotland's sin is the ill state of its church and the idolatrous nature of Presbyterianism.[185] Third, the problem cannot be solved by purging.[186] Fourth, new pure congregations need to be gathered out of the old corrupt churches.[187] Fifth and finally, properly gathered congregations being whole and complete must govern themselves. External rule over congregations is both 'an invention of man' and a corruption of the original democratic nature of the early church.[188] Further evidence from a later letter by Row indicates the authors, who were certainly influenced in their interpretation of current events by contemporary English propaganda, may have relied more heavily on Lockyer and his fellow propagandists for their understanding of Independency than might initially be thought.

Despite claims by Wariston that Aberdeen had Thomas Hooker's *Survey of the Summe of Church Discipline* (1648) and Cotton's *The Way of Congregational Churches cleared* (1647) as foundational works for their espousal of Independency,[189] Row stated three days after signing the letter of May 24 that he had not read either of the works, nor had he ever seen them.[190] Perhaps the works were in the libraries of one of Aberdeen's universities, however not necessarily. As mentioned earlier, the 1647 General Assembly of the Kirk passed an act prohibiting works promoting Independency or Separation.[191] The crackdown was so complete, according to William Dundas, ministers intercepted the mail of suspect persons and confiscated parcels. As a result, 'a Box with about Three Pound Sterling worth of Books' sent to Dundas by a London merchant aboard a ship destined for Prestonpans never made it to its intended recipient. John Oswald, minister of Prestonpans,[192] confiscated the shipment of books as soon as it arrived,

---

[184] Lockyer, 'epistle dedicatory,' 2.
[185] Ibid, preface, 6; 'to the reader,' 3-4; 126-8.
[186] Ibid, 'epistle dedicatory', 5-6.
[187] Ibid, 46-7.
[188] Ibid, 82-3, 92-119.
[189] Wod.Fol.XXX.(24), f. 85.
[190] Row, *History of the Kirk*, 533.
[191] See introduction.
[192] *FES*, i:389.

because he knew they were coming.[193] With such a strict censorship in place Aberdeen's colleges may have been prevented from acquiring the works, in which case, Lockyer and the other Englishmen in Scotland with Cromwell's army were likely the primary source for their burgeoning Independent thinking. Therefore it should not be surprising that many of the responses elicited by the declaration accuse the authors of falling under the spell of Nicholas Lockyer.

An excellent insight into the thinking behind one individual's adherence to the declaration has been preserved in the personal letter of John Row, mentioned above, written to his 'deare brother'.[194] It conveys his personal thoughts and serves to underline the sincerity of all the signatories. In the letter Row pleaded with his brother, 'I cannot think bot you are affected with our sinfull mixtures'.[195] He expressed his perception of the overwhelming corruption in the Kirk: claiming less than one in one hundred Scots were fit for communion. While conceding some congregations might have twenty people free from ignorance and scandal, many had none.[196] From this Row deduced a bare profession must not be enough to warrant membership in the visible church; if it is, many hypocrites abound in the Kirk. Referring to the Kirk's *Directory for Church Government*, he argued that since members of the visible church are called visible saints, the Kirk has an obligation to separate 'the precious from the vile'.[197] Purging would be 'sweit', but it is impossible because the majority of the General Assembly, Synods and Presbyteries are 'corrupt'.[198] As a result, Row and his fellows found it necessary to seek a middle way between the 'Papists...in on extreame' and the Brownists and Separatists on the

---

[193] Dundas, *A Few Words of Truth*, 9.
[194] In addition to the printed edition of the letter in Row's *History of the Kirk* (533-5) a copy is preserved in manuscript form in EUL, La.I.314a. There has been some conjecture over to whom this letter was addressed. David Laing, the editor of Row's *History of the Kirk*, claims it was directed to one of Row's siblings (p. 534), while the Historical Manuscripts Commission *Report on the Laing Manuscripts preserved in Edinburgh Library* (London, 1914), ii:270 identifies the recipient as Wariston.
[195] Row, *History of the Kirk*, 533.
[196] Ibid, 534.
[197] Church of Scotland, *A Directory for Church-Government* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1647), 2, 7, 16, 17.
[198] Row, *History of the Kirk*, 534.

other.[199] Although the 'old rules' of the Kirk empower congregations to use the power of the Keys granted to them by Christ to censure and excommunicate they are prevented from using them. Elderships, synods, presbyteries and assemblies usurp the power of congregations to act.[200] 'Strange', he explains:

> ane adulterie fals out in Aberdene, and yet we may not excommunicat him, bot ane extrinsicall and a superior judicatorie must doe it, yea, doe it all; Christ hath given excommunicatione to the Church quhere the offence is done, yet not one of those how able soever darre excommunicat, yet that eldershipe and breithren can know the cace better nor an Ecumenick Synod.[201]

It would be wiser, in Row's estimation, to remit all censure to congregations since they have a better knowledge of their own business and possess all necessary power to carry out the action. As for the covenants, they were intended to further reformation, but if they prove to inhibit it in anyway then they must be subject to re-evaluation; especially since so much of what had been done since the original signing of the National Covenant in 1638 opposed true Reformation. He further urged his brother not to interpret his thoughts as meaning there is no 'Church in Scotland', but rather that faults within the Kirk desperately needed to be attended to. Finally, he asserted his position to be the way 'the Lord's word hath swayed my mind'. Though Row fully expected persecution, excommunication and loss of livelihood he hoped his 'brother' would comfort Row's mother, assuring her not to believe false reports.[202] In addition, he asked for a genuine reply to his thoughts. Row's personal account demonstrates the sincerity of the authors in writing the 24 May letter. Row and his colleagues did not wish to destroy the Kirk, but help it attain the degree of Reformation intended by their predecessors.

The letter from Aberdeen of 24 May 1652 initiated a massive flurry of correspondence. According to Jaffray they received 'large letters from many good men, both south and west' and

---

[199] Ibid, 536.
[200] Ibid, 536.
[201] Ibid, 537.
[202] Ibid, 538-9. Reports circulated in 1652 that Row and Menzies had become Anabaptists and that Row's wife and been 'dipped' or re-baptised (Lamont, 47; Pittiloh, *The Hammer of Persecution*, 12-3) In this letter Row explains he is aware of the rumours, but declares (as of May 1652) they are categorically untrue.

Wariston affirms several individuals wrote to dissuade them.[203] Wariston wrote to Aberdeen twice. David Dickson and Alexander Brodie of Brodie both sent letters, neither of which survive.[204] Samuel Rutherford definitely wrote: as John Coffey has pointed out, his letter survives, undated, at the end of the printed edition of his letters.[205] Rutherford urged the would-be Independents to take account of the great danger others would be subjected to through their separation. Their change to 'another Gospel-way' would exclude all non-believers, preventing those who most need the Gospel from hearing it preached and leaving them 'to the Lions and wild beasts of the Forest, even to Jesuits, Seminary Priests, and other seducers'. These would be great dangers at any time, but they were compounded under the Commonwealth by legislation stripping the magistrates of any power to force people to attend the Kirk and hear the Gospel preached.[206] Rutherford made two requests: first, that all involved observe a day of Humiliation in order to seek the God's judgement; second, that a conference be held at the earliest convenience 'before you fix Judgment and Practice on any untroden Path'.[207]

A letter from John Nevay, minister at Newmilns and nephew of Andrew Cant, and some other Protesting ministers in the Presbyteries of Ayr and Irvine 'against the hazard of Independency' was also probably directed to Aberdeen and may be one of those from the 'west', although the surviving copy does not include the names of its intended recipients.[208] Nevay and his fellows pleaded against separation from the Kirk in a voice that fits well with the events in Aberdeen and the issues raised in the declaration:

> We have heard to ye afflicting of our spirits that some of you...are inclining to that which is called the congregationall way, and that some others are lyk to goe a greater lenth. We know not what truly may be in the report, and from o[u]r souls...wish there were none at all. Yet have conceave it our duty to acquaint yow with what we heare of yow...That yea in ye zeal and pane of God, may carefull watch and guard against the snares of the tyme, the wyles of the devill and may keep your garments undefiled. ...A

---

[203] Jaffray, 65; Wariston, ii:179.
[204] NLS MSS. Wod.Fol.XXX.(26); Wariston, ii:179; Brodie, 22.
[205] J. Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions*, 222; Rutherford, *Letters*, 704-7.
[206] Rutherford, *Letters*, 706.
[207] Ibid, 707.
[208] Jaffray, 65; NLS, Wod.Qu.XXIX(63), f. 178-9. Nevay was the cousin of Jaffray's wife.

> dividing way evin from the precious and godly in the land, both ministry and professors; as we judg is not to be allowed of God: so wee are persuaded it will both weaken...if not utterly impossibilitate the so much desyred and longed for reformation.[209]

However, Wariston wrote to Aberdeen first, on June 9, 1652 and composed a second letter early in September. These two letters, totalling about 40,000 words, survive in Wodrow's collection in the National Library of Scotland and are an invaluable addition to what is known about the situation in Aberdeen.[210] Wariston began writing to Aberdeen before he ever saw their 24 May letter. After Lockhart gathered a congregation in his home in Edinburgh, Wariston began to 'look over thes things which was now most lyk to trouble the Churche of Scotland', namely separation and the growing threat of Independency.[211] At the behest of Andrew Cant, minister of Aberdeen and Jaffray's father-in-law, Wariston began to draft a letter to Jaffray, Menzies and those who had questioned the Kirk in the Protester conferences in October 1651. After completing about half the letter he received the letter of 24 May from the Aberdonians, accompanied by a personal letter from Jaffray, which has not been preserved.[212]

Wariston's primary intention in writing was to plead with the would-be separatist to take no further action before meeting to discuss the validity of separation with others in the Kirk. He asserted even the most rigid grounds for separation held by the Brownists would not allow for separation without first seeking counsel with those from whom they were separating. Thus any separation without prior consultation with their Protester brethren would be a 'new practice' against those established by Independents in England and New England, and even the Brownists.[213] He also warned them of the dangers of moving too quickly, alleging Thomas

---

[209] NLS, Wod.Qu.XXIX(63), f. 178.

[210] These letters have only briefly been referred to in the work of Hoy (186-7), but not mentioned at all in Donaldson or Henderson (G. Donaldson, 'The Emergence of Schism in Seventeenth-Century Scotland,' *Scottish Church History*, (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1985), 205-19; G.D. Henderson, 'Some Early Scottish Independents' *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland.* (Cambridge: University Press, 1937), 100-16).

[211] Wariston, ii:169.

[212] Ibid, ii:173.

[213] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX(24), f. 85. Protesters firmly believed they had not separated from the Kirk. Instead they held the Resolutioners had stepped out of the Kirk in pursuing the malignant aims of the King. So Rutherford is clearly imploring Aberdeen's would-be separatists to meet with fellow Protesters again, just as they had in the previous October.

Charteris regretted separating from the Kirk without first seeking proper counsel.[214] This appeal to be methodical led Wariston to inquire by whose doctrine separation would take place. Would it be the Independents of England or New England, or would it be under the tenets of the Amsterdam separatists or those of the Brownists?[215] Wariston showed a broad knowledge of writers for and against separation, citing John Cotton,[216] Thomas Hooker,[217] John Norton,[218] Giles Firmin,[219] Thomas Brightman,[220] Francis Johnston,[221] John Ball,[222] Daniel Cawdrey,[223] and others, including 'several old books betuix the Brounests and aunsuerers to them' that had 'providentially' come to his hands out of David Calderwood's library.[224] Although Wariston claimed to have 'borrowed' the bulk of the literature, he likely possessed a wide variety of sectarian books. According to William Dundas, when the minister of Prestonpans confiscated his shipment of books they ended up in Wariston's possession.[225] In fact, Wariston probably received a large number of banned books, as the General Assembly appointed him in 1638 to judge what books were acceptable and which were not.[226] Hence, Wariston dictated the General Assembly's 'Index' of Independent texts. In addition to having access to many Independent works, he also showed familiarity with recently published books. His citation of Firmin's work, published only a few months earlier, indicates both a massive influx of English works by 1652 as well as Wariston's up-to-date knowledge of the relevant sources. Although he claimed to be unfamiliar with the hypotheses and concepts that underpinned the tenets of Independency in

---

[214] Ibid, f. 86.
[215] Ibid, f. 86; Hoy, 186.
[216] John Cotton, *The way of Congregational churches cleared in two treatises*. (London, 1648); John Cotton, *Of the holinesse of church-members*. (London, 1648).
[217] Thomas Hooker, *A survey of the summe of church-discipline*. (London, 1648)
[218] John Norton, *Responsio ad totam quaestionum syllogen à clarissimo viro domino Guilielmo Apollonio*. (Londini, 1648).
[219] Giles Firmin, *Separation examined: or, a treatise vvherein the grounds for separation from the ministry and churches of England are weighed, and found too light*. (London, 1652).
[220] Thomas Brightman, *A reuelation of the reuelation that is, the reuelation of St. Iohn opened clearely With a logicall resolution and exposition*. (Amsterdam, 1615).
[221] Francis Johnson, *A treatise of the ministery of the Church of England Wherein is handled this question, whether it be to be separated from, or joyned vnto*. (1595).
[222] John Ball, T*ryall of the nevv-church vvay in New-England and in old*. (London, 1644).
[223] Daniel Cawdrey, *The inconsistencie of the independent way, with Scripture and it self*. (London, 1651).
[224] Wod.Fol.XXX(24), f. 85; Wariston, ii:169.
[225] Dundas, *A Few Words of Truth*, 10.

England and New England (which is unlikely considering he represented Scotland in the Westminster Assembly), he certainly demonstrated an excellent awareness of the sources and identified persecution under Episcopacy as their primary motivation and justification.[227] In this light, he inquired, what case did those in Aberdeen have for separation? Had they suffered persecution as the Independents of England or those who fled to New England under the oppression of Episcopacy?

In addition to questions over their grounds of separation, Wariston also inquired by what means they intended to constitute new congregations. Would they require everyone in their new congregations to be truly elect? If this were the case, he believed this implied all members shared an equal state of grace.[228] He questioned the validity of such a premise for gathering congregations, pointing out rather facetiously that even Saul as a persecutor did not distinguish between those who made an outward profession and those who showed 'positive evidences of holynes'.[229] Besides the impossibility of determining who is actually elect, attempting to include only those who are deemed 'visibly' elect was a new step in Scotland.[230] God's election cannot be known; therefore this new model of the church would be based on guesswork. Even Cotton, Wariston points out, agreed it is better to error on the side of charity. Historically a confession of faith had always been sufficient for admission into the church and enough, at least initially, to be called 'holy'. As a result, there would always be some hypocrites in the church, which is clearly made evident throughout the New Testament.[231] Since positive evidences had never been the foundation for inclusion in the visible church separation from a church based on a lack of external evidence of election, such as exemplary holy living, would be hypocritical.[232] If anything, such a separation would only serve to weaken Christ's church further. Separation,

---

[226] *Acts of the General Assembly*, 30.
[227] Ibid, f. 86-7.
[228] Ibid, f. 89.
[229] Ibid, f. 87.
[230] Ibid, f. 88.
[231] Ibid, f. 90.

Wariston explains, is like divorce which 'causes a wife to cease being a wife'.[233] Similarly, the withdrawal of the elect from the Kirk would cease to make the Church of Scotland a church. Hence, those who separate ran the great risk of committing a sin that damages both those separating and the church they separate from, since diminishing the church 'diminishes Christ's kingdom'.[234] Withdrawal of the most godly from a church makes any further purging out of the scandalous virtually impossible.[235] Instead of rashly rushing to separate, which divides the Kirk, Wariston urged them to fulfil their covenanted responsibility and purge out the scandalous as the Kirk teaches, thus healing the church of her ailments and making her stronger.[236] Finally, Wariston warned of the ramifications of their actions beyond Scotland. Since the Kirk was esteemed throughout Europe, a rejection of the Church of Scotland would be a rejection of all Reformed Churches and would weaken the Protestant cause across the Continent. Do not bury the Kirk that 'begot and buire us' without further conference, he pleaded, as she 'deserves at leist a more honorable buriall from hir avne tho these should compt hir but a name that she leaveth and is deid'.[237] This request for further counsel represented the fundamental intention of this letter. In the mean time he urged the Aberdonians to ponder the queries put forward to would-be separatists by Giles Firmin in his recently published *Separation Examined.*[238]

Wariston went on to question the sincerity of Jaffray and his fellows. He accused the ministers John Row and John Menzies, in particular, of being untruthful and dishonest with their Presbyterian counterparts by ignoring opportunities to discuss the issues with other ministers outside Aberdeen. Despite offers to accept counsel, had they really sought it? Their premises, in Wariston's estimation, were based heavily on John Cotton's response to Rutherford's *The Due Right of Presbytery.* Despite claiming they were 'glad to receave light in these poynts' both Row

---

[232] By 'positive evidences' Wariston does not mean a personal narrative of conversion as was required in New England. In fact, the vague nature of the phrase is intentional. Wariston is emphasising the difficulty in defining exact standards for identifying the elect.
[233] Wod.Fol.XXX(24), f. 87.
[234] Ibid, f. 88.
[235] Ibid, f. 90.
[236] Ibid, f. 86, 88.
[237] Ibid, f. 91.

and Menzies had recently met with Rutherford, but neither of the Aberdeen ministers broached the subject of separation.[239] Wariston viewed this as duplicitous, especially in light of contemporary reports Row and Menzies had progressed far enough towards separation that they had authored a book against Presbyterianism awaiting publication at the press. To Wariston it seemed evident Row and Menzies carried out a secret agenda while continuing to ostensibly function within the Kirk. This fraudulence prevented the necessary discourse required for reconciliation. That Wariston believed reconciliation was possible is evidenced in his plea that 'there is no differenc betwixt Presbyteriall and Congregationall men for ought evir I could read albeit therbe anent the admission of members in ye constituting of a church but we are in ye cais of repairing an old hous and not of building a new one from the foundation'.[240] It may be to Giles Firmin that Wariston owed, if not this argument, at least this terminology.[241] Having wasted an opportunity to discuss their position with Rutherford, Wariston included in his letter a recent tract by Rutherford 'anent the visible church'.[242]

Wariston shared this letter to Aberdeen with David Dickson and other ministers of Edinburgh, who gave their approval, before sending it.[243] Reports from Aberdeen suggested tensions were high. Andrew Cant preached against Menzies and Row, and vice-a-versa, to the detriment of their congregations.[244] On June 30, the Synod of Aberdeen met and discussed the earlier letter submitted by Row in April. According to the records of the meeting, the ministers present unanimously approved the constitution and government of the Church of Scotland 'by sessiones, presbyteries, provinciall and generall Assemblies, beeing in subordinatione to one

---

[238] Ibid, f. 86; Giles Firmin, *Separation Examined*, 97-99.
[239] Wod.Fol.XXX(24), f. 90. Cotton dedicated a portion of *The way of Congregational churches cleared in two treatises* to refuting Rutherford (pt. II:20-44).
[240] Ibid, f. 91.
[241] 'You must put a difference between Churches new erecting, and these in England, which have been Churches for so long; when I raise a house from new from the ground, I may then doe as I please, but if I be mending an old house, I must doe as well as I can, repaire by degrees' (Firmin, *Separation Examined*, 82). S. Hardman Moore, 'Arguing for Peace: Giles Firmin on New England and Godly Union.' *Unity and Diversity in the Church*. (ed.) R.N. Swanson. Studies in Church History 32. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1996), 257.
[242] Ibid, f. 86. This tract will be discussed below.
[243] Wariston, ii:174.
[244] Ibid, ii:175.

another', except for John Row, John Menzies and John Seaton.[245] The three dissenting ministers submitted their own paper, explaining they had 'for a considerable space of time' been searching the mind of God in relation to the government of the church and had come to the following conclusion:

> wee humblie conceave, with reverence to preciouse, holy, and learned men of another judgment, that ther are not to [be] found convinceing scripturall grounds for our classicall subordination, with power or jurisdiction in poynt of censur. As to thie constitution, wee judge that o[u]r sinfull mixtures, and promiscuouse administration of ordinances, without due distinction betuixt the precious and thie vile, is not thie least sinne of thie land for which the Lord is contending with us; butt, when it shall bie more distinctly told us what our rule of constitution is, wee shall more distinctly ansuir to this last branch.[246]

The synod declared the paper to be 'contrary to the Word of God, to the covenants and to the judgement of the General Assembly' and then moved to suspend the ministers. Row, Menzies and Seaton were referred to the Resolutioner Commission of the General Assembly, prohibited from meeting either publicly or privately, and forbidden from taking part in any activities tending towards separation or subversive to Presbyterian government.[247]

Despite increasing strain in Aberdeen, the letters of Rutherford, Wariston and others had their desired effect. No further steps toward separation would occur until further discussions could take place. 'After seeking God in this,' wrote Jaffray, 'we could not see how we could refuse this their offer of conference, as a means by which the Lord might further make known his mind to us'.[248] Jaffray and Menzies were designated to travel to Edinburgh once again, where they conversed with Alexander Cant, Rutherford, James Guthrie, Patrick Gillespie and John Carstairs

---

[245] Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 219-20. This is an interesting account, because among those participating in the Synod of Aberdeen meeting were several individuals who within a short space of time themselves reportedly separated from the Kirk: William Muir, John Mercer (Kineller), John Forbes (Kincardine O'Neil) and John Young (Birse). This means one of three things: 1) they were as of yet undecided and cannot be listed among those who separated from around Aberdeen before Jaffray's group, 2) they kept quiet and did not show support for Row's motion, or 3) although designated members of the Synod of Aberdeen for April 23, 1652, by June they were no longer attending and thus their dissent was not recorded. See list of Synod members: Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 213-16.

[246] Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 219-20. Four other ministers (Duncan Forbes, Robert Keith, William Ramsay and George Tailifer) submitted an additional paper outlining concerns over the mixture of the 'precious' and the 'vile' at the Lord's Table, but affirmed the form of the Kirk (Ibid, 220).

[247] Ibid, 219-20.

[248] Jaffray, 65.

in Wariston's chambers. They met in two half-day conferences on the mornings of July 19 and 22, 1652 to consider the constitution of the church, pollution of ordinances, and how communion might be administered in a more pure manner than the 'national way', but came no closer to resolving their issues.[249] According to Jaffray, both the Protesters and the Aberdeen contingent conversed very calmly, except for Andrew Cant who stormed out of the meeting. The series of conferences ended with Jaffray and Menzies being more confirmed in their thoughts and the Protesters 'having exonerated themselves very freely and lovingly to us'.[250] Still conscious of the gravity of their actions, the Aberdeen contingent agreed to host further discussions, this time in Aberdeen, with Rutherford, Guthrie, Gillespie and John Carstairs. Wariston and his colleagues were limited in their time, as the Resolutioner General Assembly was taking place in Edinburgh and they were preparing 'Remonstrances' against the meeting. However, Wariston's concern for the situation in Aberdeen was so great, once he completed his remonstrance to the General Assembly, he produced a 'postscript to my letter upon that poynt that the ordinances ar not polluted to us who useth al means to prevent known wicked men's winning to them'.[251]

Meanwhile, the Resolutioner-controlled General Assembly convened on July 20, 1652.[252] On 21 July they suspended four ministers, two from Aberdeen, one from Old Aberdeen, as well as Thomas Charteris who had already officially separated from the Kirk. There has been some conjecture as to who the unnamed ministers in new and Old Aberdeen were. William Row in his *Life of Blair* identified the three ministers as John Row, John Menzies and William Muir.[253] Muir, however, was not ordained; he was an elder and the principal of Marischal College in 1650. The actual ministers suspended were Row, Menzies and John Seaton, second minister at St. Machar's, who had been referred to the General Assembly by the Synod of Aberdeen on

---

[249] Wariston, ii:180-1; Jaffray, 65.
[250] Jaffray, 65.
[251] Wariston, ii:181. An incomplete copy of this paper has been preserved in the Wodrow Collection: 'A Postscript anent the third point', NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX.(23).
[252] Maidment, *Historical Fragments*, 24.
[253] Row, *Life of Blair*, 297. Dow and Holfelder followed Row in this claim (Dow, 60; Holfelder, 176).

June 30 for their declaration against the Presbyterian government. For Row, Menzies and Seaton the censure had little sting as it came from the Resolutioner party, with whom those favouring Independency in Aberdeen held little or no hope of reconciliation.[254] However for the Resolutioners, this separation by ministers who had once been Protesters fuelled their already deep-rooted distrust of that camp.

On September 6, 1652 Wariston sent a second letter to Aberdeen. His letters, especially this second one, are important. Doctrinal sources from the Aberdeen Independents are slim. Wariston's second letter came after extended discourses with Jaffray and Menzies and therefore his response provides enhanced insight into the progression of their thinking, beyond the initial inclinations expressed in their letter of 24 May. Wariston's second letter is nearly twice the length of his first and was prompted 'by a good providence I got sight of a letter of yours to a near friend'. His primary focus in this letter is the necessary requirement to be called a visible saint, and the relating expectation of church constitution. This focus signifies the importance these issues continued to have: they must have been at the core of the discussions held in July. For Wariston, the desire to name only those with apparent discernable evidence of real inward sanctification as visible saints was far too narrow, and resulted in two primary errors being advocated in Aberdeen. First, they were incorrect in assuming real inner sanctification is required for membership in the visible church. On the contrary, he argues, there are seven means by which an individual can be called a visible saint and hence accepted as members of the visible church, either by [1] inward grace evident through holiness, [2] an outward calling, [3] by covenants or covenanted profession, [4] being born to professing parents, [5] through baptism, [6] professed subjection to the Gospel, or [7] by confirmation by the better part of the congregation.[255] Second, their misunderstanding of membership requirements made interpretation of the proper composition of churches too narrow. The principal cause of this

---

[254] Protesters took little heed of Resolutioner censures either. James Guthrie, Patrick Gillespie and James Simpson were all deposed by the General Assembly in 1651, but continued in their ministries (Nicoll, 158).
[255] NLS. Wod.Fol.XXX.(26), f. 95, 101.

misunderstanding stemmed from an improper interpretation of universal terms. Scripture, according to Wariston and Guthrie in his dispute with Brown, speaks of things in collective so that 'all' does not mean 'every' and 'none' does not mean absolutely no-one.[256] Neither does 'all' include every member since often, Wariston argues, it does not include women or children, nor should it be interpreted to mean that all the tens of thousands of believers in the early church in Jerusalem were all truly saints. This new interpretation he attributed to the officious influence of Ranters and Arminians. Instead, the church is obliged to accept all who sincerely profess faith and possesses no warrant to judge the validity of professions, unless there is blatant scandal or sinful behaviour in the individual's life. Drawing on Richard Baxter, Wariston contends: first, a serious confession of faith is a 'probable sign of trew faith'; second, the church is bound to judge such professors as likely to be true believers; third, the church is thus obliged to accept them into membership; fourth, this profession is 'an infallible evidence of sincere faith'; and fifth, the church has no warrant to judge if the individual's faith is sincere or not, except in the case of gross scandal.[257] Although this might leave the church open to charlatans, the church's obligation is to error on the side of inclusion.

As in his first letter, Wariston continued to maintain that the presence of hypocrites has been a natural part of the church from its earliest days, even going as far as to state that all the churches described in both the Old and New Testaments were comprised predominantly of reprobates. All visible churches, he explains, are 'heterogeneous mixes' and even in the best-constituted churches mentioned in Scripture, of the many that are called only a few are chosen.[258] This mixture had to be tolerated because the standard requirement for membership in the church, as demonstrated in Acts 11:26, was merely a 'dogmatic faith' or a sincere profession of orthodox

---

[256] Ibid, f. 97. He lists the verses as examples of 'all' and 'every' not being used as universal absolutes: Acts 2:41-5, 50; Acts 21:5; Ezek. 10:15, 18, 22, 24-5; Deut. 29:11-15, 32:11-12; Joel 1:14, 2:1, 13-17; Jer. 43:4-7.
[257] Ibid, f. 96; Richard Baxter, *Plain Scripture Proof of Infants Church-membership and Baptism.* (London, 1651). It appears Wariston was not quoting from Baxter directly, but summing up the arguments he found in Baxter.
[258] Ibid, f. 96.

faith.[259] A truth, he argued, accepted even in the churches of New England where they admit congregations will be mixed.[260] Requiring evidence of sanctification before membership was a fallacy. The great difference between the Independents and the Kirk, in his estimation, rested on whether a serious profession of faith was enough for church membership.[261] He identified the great error being purported in Aberdeen as the requirement of positive evidences, in addition to a confession of faith, in order for real sainthood to be attributed.[262] This strict interpretation of membership lacked charity and therefore risked excluding sincere believers, something even Cotton and Hooker would deny. It was better, safer and more Christian to error on the side of charity: 'We should do in Gods ordinances all *ex fide*, as well as *cum charitate*'.[263] Where was charity in separating from the Kirk? Especially if separation entailed casting out of confessing believers, which had never been the way of Christ's church.[264]

At this point, unlike later generations, Wariston could accurately claim schism was not the way of the Church of Scotland.[265] Separation had long been rejected in the Kirk as a viable means for dealing with corruption, even when the question of mixed communions had been a burning issue under Episcopacy.[266] 'And so 20 yeirs agoe non of the godly in Scotland scrupled to goe to pure communions, though persons knowinlie prophane come to the same'.[267] He argued the New England divines Cotton, Cobbet and Norton all supported this point.[268] In Scotland the temptation to separate from impure members within congregations had been historically rejected, according to Wariston, for three reasons. First, separation runs a great risk of being sinful because it judges others when Christians are called to esteem others as 'better than

---

[259] Ibid, f. 99.
[260] Ibid, f. 100; D. Korbin, 'The Expansion of the Visible Church in New England: 1629-1650', *Church History* 36 (1967), 189-209.
[261] Ibid, f. 98.
[262] Ibid, f. 101.
[263] Ibid, f. 95.
[264] Ibid, f. 95.
[265] G.W. Sprott, *The Doctrine of Schism in the Church of Scotland*. MacLeod Memorial Lecture, 1902 (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1902), 1-22.
[266] G. Donaldson, 'The Emergence of Schism in Seventeenth-Century Scotland', 205-19.
[267] Wod.Fol.XXX.(26), f. 95.
[268] For a study on a similar debate in the New England context, see: E.F. Hirsch, 'John Cotton and Roger Williams: Their Controversy concerning Religious Liberty', *Church History* 10 (1941), 38-51.

ourselves' and so is to the detriment of weaker Christians.[269] Second, separation is not progressive in terms of Reformation, but actually prevents the reform of error by removing the necessary tools: it is the 'unchurching [of] the whole', and as he stated in his first letter, it weakens the chance of purging within the body that remains.[270] Third, the Kirk is endowed in the *Book of Discipline* with the tools to remove corruption through purging rather than separation. Hence purging should always be the first reaction. Responding directly to the challenge put forward in Lockyer's *A Litle Stone*, that purging out the degenerate masses by the pure minority is impossible, Wariston referred to James Guthrie's *Treatise on Ruling Elders* published in February, declaring the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was prepared for such a situation.[271] In the event that suitable elders cannot be found in a congregation, the Presbytery may choose elders from two or three congregations to rule over them all. In this way righteous elders may be empowered to purge congregations of hypocritical members and cultivate the church until it is able to appoint elders from within.[272] Therefore the problem of mixture in the Kirk is not a flaw in the Presbyterian system of church government, but the failure or neglect of many within the church to fulfil their obligations of maintaining purity of membership.[273] Wariston challenged the would-be separatists to try purging in the manner of the Kirk first, which is their covenanted duty, before abandoning the Church of Scotland.[274]

The overall value of Wariston's letter is its expression of Protester fears that some of their former brethren in Aberdeen were on the brink of creating a new separatist tradition outwith any previously established pattern or grounds. This fear seems to have been widespread and is testified by numerous letters and repeated requests for further discourse. Wariston's letter concludes with an appeal for the Aberdonians to be patient for a bit longer, urging them to ponder his arguments, to carefully read the tract of Rutherford that he had sent to them, and

---

[269] Wod.Fol.XXX.(26), f. 95.
[270] Ibid, f. 96.
[271] Ibid, f. 101.
[272] Ibid, f. 96; Guthrie, *A Treatise of Ruling Elders and Deacons*, 31.
[273] Ibid, f. 96.
[274] Ibid, f. 95-6.

most importantly, to try to deal with the 'leaven' in their congregations by purging and not by 'deserting the camp'.[275] Soon, he explained, four ministers would arrive for the further conferences promised on Jaffray and Menzies' last visit to Edinburgh.[276] Among the emissaries set to visit was Samuel Rutherford who had already written to them and whose latest tract had been forwarded to Aberdeen by Wariston.

Almost completely forgotten, there is a manuscript housed in New College library identified in the catalogue simply as an 'Unidentified Scottish MS on Congregationalism and Church Government...165?'.[277] I believe this document is the tract 'anent the visible church' written by Samuel Rutherford and sent by Wariston to Aberdeen. Previously the importance of this document's link to Aberdeen has been misunderstood, just as Rutherford's letter to Aberdeen was before John Coffey rightly identified it as addressed to the Aberdeen Independents.[278] Notes written on the folder containing the document attest to the enigmatic provenance of the work. As a result the manuscript has quietly collected dust on the shelf—its importance unrecognised—since arriving at New College in 1909.[279]

Though the history of the document is mysterious, it is now possible to put the work into its original context, identify an approximate date for its production, and importantly, identify its author. Key to understanding its context is recognising the tract's link to Aberdeen is much greater than the reference to the 'Brethren in Aberdeen' in its closing lines. The framework of the document actually builds around excerpts from the letter of 24 May. The author systematically quotes directly from the letter of 24 May and then refutes the Aberdonians' assertions. The overall premise of the tract is the same as Wariston's, arguing separation from a

---

[275] Ibid, f. 102-103.
[276] Wod.Fol.XXX.(26), f. 101, 103.
[277] NCL, MSS Box 28.5. The first four pages of the manuscript are missing and the brief description attached to it simply reads: 'This manuscript...contains a discussion of the Presbyterial as compared with the Congregational system: It seems to have been written when the Westminster Assembly was sitting, or soon after, and with reference to objections made by the "Brethren in Aberdeen" as is mentioned at the close'.
[278] Rutheford, *Letters*, 706; Coffey, 222.

rightly Reformed Kirk is wrong and lamenting a new pattern of separation is being constructed in Aberdeen: 'we are sorry in your first stepps yow are involved in a deeper pitt of separatione then all the single Independants in old and new England'.[280] The author justifies his claims through copious citations of Hooker, Cotton and other New England Independents.[281]

With regards to the authorship, there is no doubt in my mind that Samuel Rutherford composed the tract. Two points lead me to this conclusion. First, Wariston's letters state Rutherford produced a paper in response to contemporary questions over the constitution of the visible church. This gives chronological evidence indicating Rutherford produced a tract around this time that has not previously been accounted for. The challenge to this theory is the short period between the arrival of the Aberdeen letter sent on May 24 and Wariston sending his letter on June 9. If Rutherford composed the tract he did so in little more than a week. Yet the speed of the tract's production may be suggested in the lack of wide-ranging citation. In the following year Rutherford wrote a similar tract on the obligation of magistrates to oppose heresy, which bears striking similarities to the New College document both in penmanship and format, utilising a wide range of Continental and Latin authors.[282] While time may have limited the author's ability to employ a wide-variety of sources to refute the Aberdeen Independents, Rutherford's mastery of Cotton and Hooker would have enabled him to quickly produce an adequate response within the allotted time.[283] Moreover, since Rutherford was actually in Edinburgh when the Aberdeen letter arrived he could have immediately begun working on a response. Second, the work uses several turns of phrase nearly identical to Rutherford's letter to Aberdeen. In his letter to Aberdeen, Rutherford argues excluding good people from churches

---

[279] A jotting, possibly written in the hand of the college librarian Rev. James Kennedy, explains he had no idea how the benefactor (Mr. MacLean) who donated the tract to New College came to possess the document or to what exactly it pertains.

[280] Ibid, f. 17.

[281] The author cites a number of sources from New England, but particulary Cotton's *The Way Cleared* and Hooker's *Survey.*

[282] EUL, La.I.69(5): 'Portion of an unfinished treatise on the Power of the Civil Magistrate in Matters of Religion.' In this work Rutherford cited a host of Continental and Latin authors

[283] By this time Rutherford had written *The divine right of church-government and excommunication* (London, 1646) and portions of *A survey of the Survey of that summe of church-discipline penned by*

leaves them vulnerable to 'lions and wild beasts of the forest, even Jesuits, seminary-priests, and other seducers...For the magistrate hath no power to compel them to hear the Gospel, nor have ye any church-power over them, as ye teach'.[284] The New College manuscript asserts: 'The magistrate cannot compel them to hear the gospell, nor ar they under any pastorall care of yours, nor have yow any calling of Christ as lawfull pastors, doctors, or elders, to feed them, must they not then be left to seminary preists, Jesuits, Arminians, Socinians, Antinomians, antiscripturists, [libertines] ever to prey upon'.[285] There are additional similarities, such as repeated references to 'golden candlesticks' taken from Revelations 1-2 that feature in both of the documents, as well as in Rutherford's later *The Covenant of Life Opened* and *The Survey of the Survey*.[286] The manuscripts repeated references to Cotton and Hooker may further justify Rutherford's authorship, or at least that the author had been involved in the debate against Independency from the 1640s and more specifically within the Westminster Assembly.

Scotland's representatives at the Westminster Assembly witnessed the flurry of New England texts produced by English Independents in 1648 to justify English Independency. As a result, Rutherford and his fellow representatives from Scotland identified New England as the ideological bastion for the practice of English Independency. Wariston's continuing interest in censorship probably encouraged him to read the latest sources such as Firmin and Baxter. The author of the manuscript, on the other hand, rebutted the Aberdeen Independents almost solely from the texts issued four years earlier as the classic defenses of Independency.[287] Rutherford was less interested in more recent voices in the discourse, because his experience in the Westminster Assembly reached back to the days when the leading voices were all in New

---

Mr. Thomas Hooker (London, 1658). Wariston claimed in his letter he had read multiple portions of Rutherford's *Survey of the Survey* (NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX(24), f. 86).

[284] Rutherford, *Letters*, 706.

[285] MSS Box 28.5, f. 18. A similar reference to leaving one's charge to 'Lion and beasts' can also be found in Rutherford, *A survey of the Survey*, 36-7.

[286] Samuel Rutherford, *The Covenant of Life Opened*. (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1655), 79, 390-1; Rutherford, *A survey of the Survey*, 19, 31, 55, 103-4, 178-83, 261, 385, 412-3, 452-5.

[287] In 1648 English Independents published a series of works by New England divines to defend their own practices in England, some of which they had possessed for several years. The publication of these works in quick succession was an organized barrage of polemics. See: Chatfield, 77.

England. Rutherford had the New England sources at his fingertips, but more importantly they were well versed in his mind since he had already written against them. For him, New England's arguments were the intellectual foundation of all British Independency. These factors all lead me to ascribe this work to Samuel Rutherford and to place the work in the series of discourse instigated by the Aberdeen letter advocating separation.[288] The importance of this work is not in any original arguments against Independency, but in Rutherford's perception that the unfolding events in Aberdeen merited an immediate written condemnation. This tract, along with the letters written by Rutherford, Wariston, David Dickson, Alexander Brodie of Brodie, and Nevay and his Protesting ministers of Ayr and Irvine, demonstrate the gravity of the situation as far as the Protesters were concerned. Separation from the Kirk could not go unchallenged.

By mid-August English commentators were already reporting a complete separation in Aberdeen, but they were premature.[289] Shortly after Wariston's second letter, Rutherford, James Guthrie, Patrick Gillespie and John Carstairs arrived in Aberdeen for what would be their penultimate discussions.[290] To their great disappointment they found upon arriving that John Menzies, Aberdeen's 'ringleader', was sick, as was the elder and Principal of Marischal College, William Muir.[291] The emissaries stayed in Aberdeen for 'seven or eight days'[292] and met frequently with two ministers (probably Row and Seaton), some of the colleges' regents (surely

---

[288] By no means can these few paragraphs incorporate an entire ideological argument for Rutherford's authorship of the manuscript. For this reason the argument must be kept brief. It is my intention to produce a fuller analysis of the evidence in a later scholarly work, but at present the goal is simply to identify the manuscript as integrally intertwined in the Aberdeen controversy and to sketch out some preliminary reasons why I am convinced the work is Rutherford's.

[289] *Mercurius Politicus*, August 12-19, 1652, p. 1806. [E674:6]: 'In the mean time of all these doings, there is a blessed work going on at Aberdeen, Mr. John Menis, the Professor of Divinity, Mr Samuel Row, and Mr. Jeffereyes the Provost, and many precious Christians, are joyning themselves into a Congregationall communion: They have been here waiting on the Protestators, and have had many conferences with them at my Lord Warristons about all the points of government, and have soberly and modestly put them all to it, and ar now parted to follow on their own work...like a little stone cut out of the mountains.'

[290] *Mercurius Politicus*, Oct. 7-14, 1652, p. 1942-3 [E678:10].

[291] Row, *Life of Blair*, 300-1; Jaffray, 66.

[292] An English journal reported Rutherford, Carstairs, Robert Blair and another unnamed minister travelled to Aberdeen and disputed for three or four days with the ministers and people of the town

Birnie was among this number) and Jaffray. The absence of Menzies led William Row to conclude little could be resolved without his presence, but in truth the Aberdeen group had already made up their minds, as is evidenced in Jaffray's diary.[293] When the Protesters left Aberdeen the impossibility of reconciliation between the groups was clear. Jaffray's account portrays these meetings as the last hurdle before they could separate in good conscience. The Protesters, on the other hand, left feeling the impending separation would only open the door for further heretical doctrines, lamenting 'there were some also there that were against infant baptism, and were in danger to be tainted with other errors'.[294]

Within a matter of weeks, the Synod of Aberdeen reported the official separation of Row, Menzies and Seaton from the Kirk 'to independencie'.[295] This report on October 21, 1652, puts the secession from the Church of Scotland a full year after Jaffray's paper to the Protester assembly in Edinburgh and five months after the letter declaring their judgement in favour of Independency over the Presbyterianism of the Kirk. Although their opponents still probably perceived their separation as rash, the Aberdonians had been patient and given their Protester counterparts every opportunity to dissuade them. Even after their official separation, they seemed to move slowly. The synod appointed four ministers to meet with them. Whether or not the Aberdeen Independents met with David Lindsey, William Douglas, William Strachan and Robert Keith is uncertain, but the seceders did wait several more weeks before consummating their new gathering.

In November 1652 the Aberdeen Independents gathered in Greyfriars' Kirk (the chapel of Marischal College and Menzies' church) for their first 'public' partaking of the 'ordinance of the Lords Supper'.[296] Their contemporary Robert Pittilloch was probably referring to this event when he wrote: 'a very considerable number of Ministers, Magistrates, and the vulgar sort of

---

who were intent on withdrawing from the Church of Scotland ('Diurnal of Occurences in Scotland,' *The Spottiswoode Micellany*, (ed.) J. Maidment (Edinburgh: Spottiswoode Society, 1845), 87).

[293] Jaffray, 66.

[294] Row, *Life of Blair*, 301.

[295] Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 222.

people, separated from the promiscuous constitution of a National Church, associated themselves together, and in the presence of the mixt multitude did break bread together, as a seal of their resolution never to return to the errour of the multitude any more'.[297] Despite the attentiveness of his work, Hoy ends the story in Aberdeen without noting this gathered communion. For him the height of indigenous Independency in Aberdeen was marked by Row's appointment as principal of King's College the following year. G.D. Henderson reports further events in Aberdeen in regards to Menzies, Row, Jaffray and Seaton, but he too stops short of expressing the overall importance of the movement. According to Henderson, 'the Independents held a Communion service together in the Greyfriars' Kirk at Marischal College, but thereafter abandoned the idea of forming a separate Church'. He suggests that although they did not die out immediately, as there were reports from the following year that 'Separatists, Anabaptists, Independents and others of that manner, the growth of which goes on apace within the bounds', it was not long before they gave up their cause.[298] This claim probably rests on two statements. First, Row's *Life of Blair* contends 'they strove to erect separate gathered and independent congregations, but could not effectuate it.'[299] Second, Pittilloch states 'in a short space hereafter, the zeal of their Patrons became cold, and they not onely found want of freedom and protection from those of whom they expected it'.[300] But these claims may rest on the understated nature of the gatherings more than on any evidence of failure. The truth is, despite evidence being in short supply, the Independent movement in Aberdeen did not fade away following the gathered communion. If anything the Independency movement swelled,

---

[296] Jaffray, 66.
[297] R. Pittiloh, *The Hammer of Persecution* (London: L. Chapman, 1659), 10. Pittiloch's name is spelled variously in his different publications. For the purpose of this work the spelling given by General Monck on a certificate granted to Pittiloch will be used (*Clarke Papers*, iv:271). F.J. Grant adopted the same spelling in *The Faculty of Advocates in Scotland, 1532-1943* (Edinburgh: Scottish Record Society, 1944).
[298] Henderson, *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland*, 108; John Davidson, *Inverurie and the Earldom of the Garioch* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1878), 310.
[299] Row, *Life of Blair*, 297.
[300] Pittilloh, *The Hammer of Persecution*, 10-11.

particularly in Aberdeen's universities where Baillie claimed in 1654 'almost all in both colledges, from Remonstrators, had avowedlie gone over to Independencie and Separation'.[301]

In England Independent gatherings formed in two ways. Either in the gathering of an entirely new Independent congregation operating separately from the local parish, or as a gathering of individuals from within the parish in order to administer the sacraments to only those most likely to be elect. The minister of the St Stephen's Coleman Street parish church in London, John Goodwin, stopped administering sacraments within his church in 1644.[302] Instead, he administered the sacraments to godly individuals gathered from within the parish and beyond who met regularly in either the church or his home. While Goodwin continued to preach to the parish church, the gathered community to whom he provided the sacraments formed into 'an artificial, extended kin group, both secular and spiritual in nature' that transformed from a purely religious grouping to 'a nexus of social, political and spiritual bonds'.[303] This is maybe what happened in Old Aberdeen. The Kirk Session of Old Machar's in Old Aberdeen complained their minister, John Seaton, refused to administer the sacraments in February 1654.[304] Their frustration drove them to hand over the church's cloths, communion cups and Kirk Session book to William Douglas, professor of Divinity at King's College, in April.[305]

If this was the pattern in Old Aberdeen, an alternative pattern may have been employed in new Aberdeen, where the chapel of the college was not a parish church. An example of using a college chapel to form an extra-parochial congregation in England can be drawn from one of the key proponents of Independency who inspired them. While John Owen served as Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, he purportedly formed a Congregational church in the chapel of Christ

---

[301] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:242.
[302] M. Tolmie, *The Triumph of the Saints* (Cambridge: CUP, 1977), 111-16.
[303] Ellen S. More, 'Congregationalism and the Social Order: John Goodwin's Gathered Church, 1640-60', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 38 (1987), 213.
[304] Munro, *Old Aberdeen*, 49.
[305] Ibid, 50.

Church, which was not a parish church.[306] This scenario is strikingly similar to the Aberdeen Independents who had close ties to the university and whose only recorded meeting took place in the chapel of Marischal College. The group in Aberdeen could have continued to meet in Greyfriars as long as they had the support of the university, since it was the chapel of Marischal College and did not become a parish church until 1828.[307] With the principal, the professor of divinity/chaplain, and at least one regent involved in the congregation this seems probable and sheds new light on Baillie's comment that nearly everyone in Aberdeen's colleges embraced Independency.[308] In fact, it seems logical that if the bulk of Marischal faculty supported a gathered congregation the college's chapel would be a reasonable place to meet. Yet even if Greyfriars had not been available, it would not have prevented them from gathering. Another English example exhibits a collegiate based congregation gathering without the use of a college chapel. At Magdalen College, Oxford, Thomas Goodwin, the president of the college, ministered to a Congregational church meeting in his home.[309] Such gatherings rooted in academic communities outwith parishes offered havens where, as Jaffray described the yearnings among his fellows in Aberdeen, the ordinances could be administered 'in a more pure way…than the nationall church'.[310] As with the community at Magdalen College, no records of membership survive for the Aberdeen gathering.[311] However, it may be inferred from entries in Jaffray's diary that two women named Jane Ramsay and Elsinet Smith were involved at least for a time.[312]

In contrast to reports by William Row and Robert Pittilloch of Independency failing, numerous English reports in the closing months of 1652 indicate 'gathered churches' were building steam

---

[306] George Vernon, *A letter to a friend concerning some of Dr. Owens principles and practices.* (London, 1670), 15. Richard L. Greaves, however, suggests there is no evidence to support this claim (*ODNB*, 'John Owen), however Peter Toon's seminal work on Owen (*God's Statesman*, 58) does not rule out the possibility despite the lack of solid evidence.
[307] *FES*, vi:8.
[308] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:242.
[309] Nuttall, *Visible Saints*, 13; *ONDB* 'Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680)'.
[310] Jaffray, 65.
[311] Toon, *God's Statesman*, 58.
[312] Ibid, 118.

in Scotland.[313] One journal stated: 'The Gathered Churches in Scotland go on so successfully, that many who derided them, begin to admire them, and love them'.[314] And another claimed 'hundreds forsake the old tyrannical Presbytery, and cleave to our party'.[315] In February 1653 several English journals carried happy news from Aberdeen: 'the honest party at Aberdeen are now withdrawing from under the rigourous yoak of their Kirk sway, and are, some of them, very cordial and clear to the interest of England'.[316] Yet the swelling success of Independency did not mean the Kirk ceased to oppose separation where they were able. The departure of Andrew Ballenden of Drumoak from the Kirk, at the prompting of the English soldiers in local garrisons, caused the Synod of Aberdeen to summons him to appear before them in October 1652. Ballenden appeared and duly repented of his error. Despite his willing recantation the synod decided to make an example of him. The synod required him to sign a declaration professing his error and vowing he would leave Scotland and never to return under pain of excommunication.[317] Whether the synod actually intended for this sentence to be carried out is uncertain. Whether it even could be carried out is equally uncertain. Ballenden may not have been able to leave the country even if he wanted to as the presence of the English Army restricted travel. In any case, the message of the synod was clear. They were taking a strong stance against separatists wherever they could.

The following April a quite different series of events transpired. After missing several meetings of presbytery, the Synod of Aberdeen ordered a trial of the life, doctrine and conversation of John Forbes, minister of Kincardine O'Neil, in response to reports he was dissatisfied with Presbyterianism or at least its present form in the Kirk.[318] No further mention of Forbes occurs in the synod records. Pitilloch, however, asserts he separated from the Kirk and held a gathered

---

[313] Mercurius *Brittanicus*. (Nov. 30-Dec. 7, 1652), 277 [E801(10)].
[314] *S & C*, 370; *Several Proceedings in Parliament*, Nov. 25-Dec. 2, 1652.
[315] *Mercurius Brittanicus*, (Octob. 26-Nov. 2, 1652), 238.
[316] *Mercurius Politicus*, (February 17-24, 1653), 2249 [E688:10]; 'Diurnall of Occurences in Scotland' *The Spottiswoode Miscellany II* (ed.) James Maidment (Edinburgh: Spottiswoode Society, 1845), 103.
[317] Stuart, *Aberdeen*. 223.
[318] Ibid, 225.

congregation in Kincardine.[319] Despite the Presbytery's attempt to censure Forbes, he quietly withdrew from the Kirk. Although he remained under threat of excommunication until his death in late 1657 or early 1658, Forbes never conformed.[320] These two examples indicate the Kirk's ability to censure separatists had limitations. They could only effectively move against those who recanted and submitted themselves to the authority of presbyteries or synods. Essentially submission to censure had to be voluntary. Had Andrew Ballenden not given way to a guilty conscience, or if he had simply dismissed the synod's threat of excommunication, he could have continued his gathered ministry just as Forbes purportedly did. These events in the vicinity of Aberdeen demonstrate how toleration functioned in Scotland.

Although Presbyterians might attempt to levy ecclesiastical pressure against dissenters, adherents to Independency found support in various quarters, especially in Aberdeen. The English Army represented the first source of support. Their presence prevented violent opposition called 'Club Law' by the Quakers. Anyone favouring Independency had the support of the local English troops, who came to the aid of Alexander Irving of Drum in his stand against the Presbytery of Aberdeen and likewise probably offered protection to Forbes.[321] Besides the support of the English regime the Independency movement in Aberdeen had created their own safe haven. Even in the early days of Jaffray's questioning of the Covenant and Presbytery, he had approached individuals in places of influence within his *alma mater*, Marischal College. Significantly, the first individuals gathered together all had ties to the college. William Muir was principal, John Menzies was professor of divinity and minister to the college's chapel, John Row was an instructor of Hebrew and Andrew Birnie was regent. This gave them significant influence within Marischal College, but by 1653 their influence would be extended over both of Aberdeen's colleges.

---

[319] Pittiloh, *The Hammer of Persecution*, 10-12.
[320] Ibid, 12.
[321] See Ch. 3.

Early in 1653, under the newly formed Commissioners for Visiting Universities the principals of Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities were replaced. Robert Leighton was appointed principal of Edinburgh in February, while Patrick Gillespie, who had already showed signs of compliance with the English, was made principal of Glasgow—much to the chagrin of Robert Baillie and several other ministers of Glasgow who opposed the appointment.[322] The reason for Leighton's appointment is uncertain, but probably stemmed from his moderate disposition. His contemporaries considered him a sincere individual who actively sought peace and the unification of the two parties in the Kirk. As principal he urged Edinburgh's students to avoid 'that itch for polemical and controversial theology which is so prevalent and infectious'.[323] Gillespie, on the other hand, received his appointment because he had proven himself to be loyal to the English regime as had the college's rector, George Lockhart of Lee—William's brother—who had joined 'heartily enough' with the English.[324] According to his critic, Robert Baillie, Gillespie and his appointments to the college faculty were all 'for their common masters sake the English'.[325] From the English perspective, the appointments of both Leighton and Gillespie served to advance Commonwealth policies. Leighton represented a moderate voice in Edinburgh, where Protesters and Resolutioners so frequently bickered, while Patrick Gillespie represented the faction of the Kirk which dominated the west of Scotland and proved to be more loyal to the English than either Wariston or Guthrie would ever be.

In Aberdeen, where both colleges actually functioned as a single university during the Interregnum,[326] the English appointed John Row principal and Gilbert Rule, who also favoured

---

[322] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:237-43; Nicoll, 108.
[323] 'Robert Leighton' in *ODNB*; Brodie, 41.
[324] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:238.
[325] Ibid, iii:241.
[326] The two colleges were united in 1641 on paper into 'King Charles' University' (J.M. Bulloch, *A History of the University of Aberdeen, 1495-1895*. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895), 120). Under the Commonwealth, the two colleges were treated as one university, with the principalship of King's College equating the position over both colleges (R. S. Rait, *The Universities of Aberdeen: A History* (Aberdeen: James Gordon Bisset, 1895), 152).

Independency, as sub-principal.[327] Their appointments solidified what had already become apparent in Aberdeen. Independency now officially dominated both of the burgh's colleges. Coupled with the induction of Gillespie in Glasgow, it meant parties not only amenable, but actually compliant, with Commonwealth religious policies dominated two of Scotland's four universities. Moreover, from as early as the appointment of Row as principal in March 1653 the Aberdeen Independents worked closely with Gillespie's party of Protesters.[328] While Rutherford, Wariston, Guthrie and other leading Protesters distanced themselves from the Aberdeen Independents, Gillespie's faction, worked hand in hand with them. When Gillespie sought to appoint a new regent to Glasgow University he called for a young man from Aberdeen, Andrew Burnet, for whom Gillespie received testimonies from 'all the apostates in the Colledge of Aberdeen'. This incensed Baillie, but he found Gillespie's refusal to oblige Burnet to subscribe to the Covenant even more irksome.[329]

At a time when a significant fissure began forming within the Protester party over how to respond to English rule, links between the English regime and those showing support for the Commonwealth were solidified. Wariston, Guthrie, Rutherford and the majority of Protesters in the East strongly opposed any supplication to the English or acceptance of their interference in matters of Scottish religion. Gillespie on the other hand, along with a growing body of Protesters in the West, showed themselves more than willing to bow to English authority.[330] While preaching in an Edinburgh pulpit in October 1654 Gillespie even publicly prayed for the health and preservation of the Protector, and for God 'to bless all his proceidings'![331] By the

---

[327] Rule, a graduate of St. Andrews, retired to England in 1656 to minister at an Independent church in Alnwick, Northumberland. He was ejected under the act of uniformity and returned to Scotland. After several turbulent years, including imprisonment on the Bass Rock, he was appointed principal of the University of Edinburgh in 1690 (Bulloch, 122; A.G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), 420; *ODNB*).

[328] In a manuscript letter dated March 4, 1653, Patrick Gillespie mentions having recently returned from Aberdeen, which may suggest he was in Aberdeen to witness Row's appointment (NLS, Wod.Qu.XXIX.(61)). Hoy drew this same conclusion drawing on Baillie (*L & J*, iii:177; Hoy, 184n).

[329] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:242.

[330] Holfelder, 182-4.

[331] Nicoll, 162; Lee, *St. Giles', Edinburgh*, 227-8. In December 1656 a day of thanksgiving was appointed to celebrate the discovery of a plot to kill Cromwell. Gillespie kept the day in his church (Nicoll, 190).

latter part of 1656 both Patrick Gillespie and John Livingstone were openly fraternising with the English regime: preaching in 'the English church to their Councell and Judges', going home in the private coach of Lord Broghill (President to the Council in Scotland), preaching to the judges in Glasgow, and entertaining them at home.[332]

Gillespie's Protesters and Disciplinary Minded Independents

In 1653 the English regime began to shower favour upon those showing an inclination towards their religious policies. It was during this year the English Congregationalist John Beverley entered the charge at Lenzie, a parish within the Presbytery of Glasgow.[333] Holfelder has suggested that the passive acceptance of the appointment by Gillespie's party demonstrates their tacit acceptance of the regime's involvement in religious matters as well as the founding of a mutual agreement to support the appointment of Independents in some vacant charges if the English would enter Protesters (of Gillespie's party) in others.[334] But this interpretation of events interpolates too much Presbyterian sentiment and underestimates the proactive role of Gillespie's faction in entering Independents into vacant charges. Rather than a passive acceptance of English dominance, Gillespie's faction actually exhibited a significant change of tack.[335] In fact the Protesters had just as much to do with Beverley's placement as the English did, since they reportedly ordained him to the charge of Lenzie.[336] Two years later they planted another Englishman named William Muircroft in Cathcart.[337] Baillie complained of their collusion in July 1654:

> When a very few of the Remonstrants and Independent party will call a man, he gets the Kirk and the stipend; but whom the Presbytery, and well near the whole congregation, calls and admits, he must preach in the fields, or in a barn, without

---

[332] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:322.
[333] *A Perfect Diurnal*, Nov. 14-21; Baillie, *L & J*, iii:202, 217.
[334] Holfelder, 182.
[335] Gillespie came to front a faction of the Protester party found predominantly in the West. What separated them from the Guthrie-Rutherford-Wariston Protesters was their willingness to make concessions with the English. As early as April 1653, the English identified this third party within the Kirk. 'Diurnall of Occurences in Scotland' *Spottiswoode Miscellany II*, 113.
[336] *FES*, ii:482; Baillie, *L & J*, 314.
[337] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:314; *FES*, iii:381.

> stipend. So a sectary is planted in Kilbride, another in Lenzie [or Kirkintilloch], and this guyse will grow rise to the wrack of many a soul.[338]

However, Beverley was different to many of the other English ministers who had been in Scotland during the first two years of the Cromwellian occupation. In 1659 he published *Unio Reformantium* which called for unity between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, based upon their shared heritage as Reformed Churches, and strengthened by the strict concepts of discipline shared by the New England Congregationalists and Protesters in contrast to the 'unlimitted' toleration permitted in England.[339] In the same work he praised James Guthrie and declared the greatest number of godly ministers in Scotland were Protesters rather than 'loose' Resolutioners.[340] It was an interesting laud, considering Guthrie cared little for Beverley or any of the Independent ministers serving in Scotland. Gillespie, however, shared Beverley's desire for strict discipline within congregations. He believed this could never become the norm in Scotland if the Resolutioners were predominant, so Gillespie cast his lot with English Independents who advocated strict discipline rather than toleration. In many ways it mirrored attempts by Independents and Presbyterians in England to establish unity between 1652 and 1655.[341] To borrow a quote from the English context, it seems as though Gillespie's party and strict disciplinarian Independents, like Beverley and John Stalham,[342] recognised 'Presbytery, and Independency [are] not two religions: but one religion to a godly, honest heart; it is only a little ruffling of the fringe'.[343] Holfelder approached the state of the situation when he wrote: 'While the majority of Protesters still clung to the theory of a comprehensive national church

---

[338] Ibid, iii:244.

[339] 'I pray John, or rather Brother Timpson, are we for such an unlimitted Toleration? ...yea, doth not New-England Practice confirme the contrary, where even Antinomianism and all other Sects and Errours are rooted out? ...and we lately by Letters from New England, that the Quakers, who so madly range as wild beasts here, yet they could not get admittance there, but such as went over with such Books about them, the Books were burnt, and the persons imprisoned, till the same Ship returned to take these back again, Are we then for such a Toleration?' (John Beverley, *Unio Reformantium. Or, The Presbyterian and Independent Vindicated, from the Contradictious Way of Free-Admission.* (London, 1659), 164).

[340] Ibid, 24.

[341] For a summary of this process in England see: Geoffrey Nuttall, 'Presbyterians and Independents Some Movements for Unity 300 years ago.' *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England* 10 (1952), 4-15.

[342] Stalham's similarity to Beverley is attested in the preface he composed for Beverley's *Union Reformantium*. His ministry is discussed below. Also see Appendix V.

comprised of both the elect and reprobate, in practice they had moved towards a much more exclusive position - one which was not at all dissimilar to the Independency of the separatists'.[344] In fact Gillespie's party had accepted many aspects of the English message of Independency without actually separating from the Kirk. The mutual respect between Gillespie's Protesters and these disciplinarily rigid Independents illustrate the forming of a new loosely knit religious party in Scotland.

There remained two stringently Presbyterian parties in Scotland, Guthrie-Rutherford-Wariston's party of Protesters and the Resolutioners. Both advocated maintenance of the national Kirk on a strict Presbyterian model, but could not agree which of them represented this Kirk. Gillespie's faction acted independently of Guthrie-Rutherford-Wariston party of Protesters and made a move towards consolidation and cooperation with disciplinarily strict Independents like Beverley and John Stalham (sent to Scotland by the Council of State)[345], as well as with the Aberdeen Independents. For Gillespie's party the distinction between Independents and Presbyterians began to blur, precisely what Cromwell desired. This cooperation indicates Gillespie's party had probably given up national Presbyterianism as a viable model through which the purity of particular congregations could be maintained; giving a measure of credence to David Stevenson's claim that some Protesters were willing, 'at least temporarily' to abandon 'the claim that Scotland was bound by the Solemn League and Covenant to impose her religion on England'.[346] Certainly a number of Gillespie's contemporaries accused him of deserting Presbyterianism and observed partitions among the Protesters. James Burn, bailie of Glasgow, alleged Gillespie 'did disclaim' the Covenant, while Baillie accurately identified the difference

---

[343] William Cradock quoted in Nuttall 'Presbyterians and Independents', 15.
[344] Holfelder, 178.
[345] *CSPD*, 1654:195, 450. In fact the similarity between the ideological and theological positions of the two men is testified to by Stalham's epistle dedicatory to *Unio Reformantium.*
[346] Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 157.

between the Guthrie-Rutherford-Wariston's party of Protesters and those Protesters complying with, or falling into, the errors of the English.[347]

Although Baillie accused Gillespie of defending toleration his accusations are probably unfounded. When Thomas Charteris took charge of an Independent church in 1652 and came under accusations of Anabaptism, Gillespie, John Carstairs and Francis Aird prevented the Synod of Glasgow from censuring him. Gillespie's Protesters defended him as a 'godly man' in the face of Baillie's protest to the contrary.[348] Rather than implying Gillespie tolerated Baptists, it more likely suggests that Charteris, like the Aberdeen Independents, had qualms about the necessary standards for parents when admitting an infant for baptism.[349] Certainly Stalham, who had proven himself to be no friend to Baptists,[350] regarded Charteris as highly as Gillespie did. Stalham called Charteris 'a precious' minister of the Gospel.[351] Disciplinarily rigid Independents like Beverley and Stalham, who came together with Gillespie's group, were not interested in extensive toleration. They adhered to strict Calvinist doctrine including limited election and strongly opposed what they perceived to be heresy, as is demonstrated in Stalham's work against the Quakers written while ministering to a gathered congregation in Edinburgh.[352]

In contrast, the Protesting party of Guthrie, Rutherford and Wariston consistently opposed both separation from the Kirk and compliance with the English. On March 17, 1653, they wrote a letter entitled 'Declaration of Exhortation to the Separatists in Aberdeen'.[353] Despite being addressed to the straying brethren in Aberdeen, it was equally addressed to 'all others within the land who being members of this Kirk have already declined or do anie way incline to

---

[347] In Burns estimation, this meant 'they had served their turn with the Covenant, and now it was at an end, and no more obligatory' (Maidment, *Historical Fragments*, 30). Baillie, *L & J*, iii:245, 283.
[348] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:322.
[349] Nicoll, 94.
[350] Stalham defended his congregation in England against Baptists, including the soapboiler Thomas Lambe, in a debate at Terling, Essex in January 1643 (John Stalham, *The Summe of A Conference* (London, 1644) and wrote against the the Baptist Samuel Oates in 1647 (*Vindiciae Redemptionis* (London, 1647). See 'Stalham, John' in *ODNB*.
[351] John Stalham, *Contradictions of the Quakers...by John Stalham, Preacher of the Gospel (for the Present) at Edinburgh in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1655), preface.
[352] Ibid.
[353] *RCME*, i:37-43.

the wayes of Separation'.[354] Once again the main body of Protesters cite the primary motivation for wanting to separate from the Kirk as being the mixed nature of communion. They warn it is easier to see flaws in Presbyterianism when one has had a long acquaintance with it than it is to see the errors of Congregationalism 'while it is but new to them and doe but see litle or no thing at first of the evill'.[355] Despite deep affection for those who have separated in Aberdeen and their great lengths to find a compromise, the majority of Protesters (led by Wariston, Guthrie and Rutherford) would not accept or tolerate separation from the Kirk, especially since the Resolutioners accused them of acting out their own separation.[356]

The Resolutioners were equally concerned with the events unfolding in Aberdeen. Gillespie's collusion with English Independents, his appointment as principal of the University of Glasgow by the English regime, and his ties with the Aberdeen Independents were all reasons for the Resolutioners to grow increasingly sceptical of the Protester faction and fearful of the growing threat of Independency, especially its ascendancy in Aberdeen's colleges. In 1653 the Commissioners of the General Assembly instructed the Resolutioner William Douglas, professor of Divinity at King's College, to keep tabs on Independent and Baptist activities in Aberdeen, record how it was being dealt with and to report his findings back to them.[357] In 1654 the Resolutioners' own rebuttal of the Aberdeen Independents appeared in print in the form of two appendices in Wood's *A Litle Stone Pretended to be out of the Mountain.*[358] Begun as reply to Lockyer's *Little Stone*, the events of 1652 in Aberdeen caused Wood to refocus his work and broaden its scope. Wood's appendices, like his response to Lockyer, were long and drawn

---

[354] Ibid, i:37.
[355] Ibid, i:41.
[356] Ibid, i:43.
[357] Davidson, *Inverurie and the Earldom of the Garioch*, 310; *RCGA*, iii:549-50; G.L.S. Thompson, 'The Origins of Congregationalism in Scotland.' (PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1932), 82.
[358] For a discussion of Wood's work as a response to Lockyer, see ch. 2, above.

out. Although, in responding to Aberdeen Wood did not refute every point they had raised, acknowledging that several 'godly men' had already done so.[359]

Wood's first appendix makes two primary points. First, he warned the Aberdeen Independents they were bound to arrive at loggerheads with one another as they began to deliberate doctrines amongst themselves. He mentions their growing debate over the requirements for paedobaptism and predicts the escalation of the discussion from the requirements made of parents in order for children to be baptised into the gathered church to whether baptism makes children complete members of the church.[360] Although there are no records detailing the intricacies of the question in Aberdeen, it was a debate not restricted to that burgh. A decade later Congregational churches in New England struggled to come to terms with the implications of their gathered-ecclesiological identities and membership policies. The question in New England centred on second and third generation members of gathered churches. They debated whether the child of a baptised adult who professed faith and lived piously, but who had no conversion experience, could be baptised, and if so, whether they could partake of communion and have a voice in congregational decision making. The Massachusetts Synod of 1662 decided infants of a confessing, but conversionless, parent could be baptised, however they were barred access to communion or a voice in governing the church until they could demonstrate a conversion experience their own. This became known as the 'Half-Way Covenant' and established a two-tiered status of church membership.[361] Although the debate in Aberdeen probably had not reached this complex definition of baptism and membership by the mid-1650s, that they were even debating the implications of paedobaptism within a gathered church indicates the difficulty in reaching a consensus when defining the boundaries of a new community (or an old one for that matter). These difficult questions relating to baptism and

---

[359] Wood may have been referring to replies by Wariston, Dickson and Rutherford, but this would be a generous label to use in referring to Protesters, so it may mean earlier Resolutioner responses had been produced as well.
[360] Wood, *A Little Stone Pretended*, 170.
[361] R.G. Pope, *The half-way covenant: church membership in Puritan New England.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

membership probably account for many of the accusations of 'Anabaptism' against Scots Independents. They probably were not 're-baptising' individuals, but rather refusing baptism to children the Kirk would have deemed as coming from fit parents. Second, Wood argues by separating from a properly reformed church the Aberdeen Independents were repeating the errors of the Donatists and Novatians. Both Augustine and Cyprian had clearly spelled out the heretical nature of separation from a true church on the grounds of corruption and Wood argued only through wilful ignorance to the warnings of the Church Fathers could the replication of such basic errors be explained.[362]

In his second appendix Wood inquires why none of their leanings towards Congregationalism were vented before the Scots' defeats at Dunbar and Worcester, and states, along the lines of Wariston's complaint, that their silence represented deceit. Even more disturbing, while they had held conferences with the Protesters, who shared their strict views in relation to dealing with the King, they made no attempt to discuss their imminent defection with the Resolutioners who were the more numerous party in the Kirk and who controlled the General Assembly. This, he explains, indicates the spirit leading them to separate was not of God but rather one of dissension.[363] The rest of the appendix focuses on the fallacies held by the newly gathered Congregationalists that there is no ecclesiastical authority over that of the individual congregation and that members of the congregation have equal authority with elders. Wood argues Presbyteries, or an equivalent, had always been a part of the church responsible for overseeing congregations.[364]

Institutional Support for Independency

Despite the opposition of the Resolutioners and the majority of Protesters, the Aberdeen Independents continued to flourish. Perhaps the greatest boon for them came in March 1654 when in the interest of religious unity Cromwell summoned Patrick Gillespie, John Livingston

---

[362] Ibid, 189-91.
[363] Ibid, 361-2.
[364] Ibid, 378-86.

and John Menzies to London.[365] His invitation to these individuals owed much to a belief within the English regime that the Protesters were the most likely party in the Kirk to cooperate: a reputation based almost completely on Gillespie's willingness to comply with the English, which had won over Colonel Robert Lilburne (Commander-in-Chief of the forces in Scotland from December 1652 until April 1654)[366] and possibly the successful cooperation between the Aberdeen Independents and Gillespie's party.[367] Livingstone attempted to decline the invitation on the grounds of ill-health; however when Lilburne informed him he would either go voluntarily or as a prisoner he willingly travelled to London.[368] Gillespie and Menzies, in contrast, jumped at the chance, but due to ill health Menzies went some time later than Gillespie. After meeting with the Protester and Independent representatives, Cromwell summoned Robert Blair, Robert Douglas and James Guthrie in May.[369] None of the three who received this summons went to London. Blair and Guthrie, here demonstrating his opposition to compliance with the English, made their excuses and sent them along with letters crying down the imposed toleration.[370] Douglas excused himself a bit more gracefully sending a letter to Lord Broghill begging him to relay his apologies to the Lord Protector for his inability to travel to London.[371] However, the refusal of Blair and Douglas to attend to Cromwell's invitation was to have disastrous consequences for the Resolutioners.

---

[365] Row, 313. Lamont and Nicoll give the date of their summons to be April 1654 (Lamont, 68; Nicoll, 127).
[366] Dow, 99, 102.
[367] Dow, 196.
[368] Row, *Life of Blair*, 313.
[369] Douglas was a Resolutioner, Guthrie a Protester, and Blair had avoided joining with either faction attempting to bring about reconciliation within the Kirk. A copy of the summons has been preserved in the manuscript collections of the historian Robert Mylne (NCL, MSS MYL, f. 757).
[370] Row, *Life of Blair*, 315. According to Nicoll, only Gillespie and Livingstone were invited in the first round, which he states happened in April, Menzies was not invited till the second round of invitations sent in May (Nicoll, 127).
[371] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXVI.(2). What the relationship between Douglas and Broghill was at this time is unclear, however the latter was serving as MP for Cork and already held some sway with the Protector. The connection between Blair and Broghill coupled with Cromwell's desire for a settlement between the factions within the Kirk may have had something to do with Broghill's later appointment as President of the Council for Scotland.

While in London, Gillespie and Menzies assisted with the production of an ordinance that came to be known as 'Gillespie's Charter'.[372] The ordinance, passed on August 8, 1654, represented the Scottish version of the scheme instituted in England the same year to try new ministers before giving them charges or stipends. For the Resolutioner Robert Baillie the ordinance fulfilled his worst fears: Baillie had written in July of his dread the Kirk 'shall be cast under such a Committee as now guides all ecclesiasticall affaires in England...the most whereof are Anabaptists and Independents'.[373] The ordinance divided Scotland into five regions and gave the power of authorising and planting ministers to designated individuals.[374] According to the charter the Commissioners for Visiting Universities were restricted to filling vacant charges only with individuals certified by a quorum of any four or more (at least two being ministers) designated triers. According to Frances Dow, Gillespie's participation is evidenced in the fifty-seven Scots chosen to be triers, the vast majority of whom were either Protesters or full-blown Independents.[375] Additionally, the settlement provides further credence for a link between Gillespie's Protesters and Menzies' Independents. In the vast region defined as north of Angus, which included present-day Aberdeenshire, Banffshire, Morayshire, Inverness-shire, Ross and Cromarty, Sutherland, Caithness, Orkney and Shetland, a quorum for planting ministers could be substantiated by Row, Menzies, Jaffray and Muir.[376] This was a fact not lost on the more rigid Protesters of Guthrie-Rutherford-Wariston's variety, who complained in a letter to Cromwell and again in a subsequent letter to General Monck that such a vast area of

---

[372] APS, vi,ii:755; Dow, 196-8; Row, *Life of Blair*, 318; Nicoll, 135.
[373] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:253.
[374] *APS*, vi,ii:832. 1) Lothian, Merse and Teviotdale; 2) Dumfries and Galloway; 3) Glasgow and Ayr; 4) Perth, Fife and Angus; and 5) 'be-north Angus'.
[375] Dow, 197. Some of the individuals of interest assigned to be triers were: **For Lothian, Merse and Teviotdale**: Sir Archibald Wariston, Sir Andrew Kerr, *Colonel Gilbert Ker*, *William Dundas* (see ch. 5, below; Nicoll, 52); **For Glasgow and Ayr**: John Carstairs, John Nevay, Francis Aird, Patrick Gillespie, John Graham, John Spreul (wrote 'I am under some temptation to join with the English' in his journal, Maidment, *Historical Fragments*, 4:9); **For Perth, Fife and Angus**: James Guthrie, Robert Blair, Samuel Rutherford, James Simpson (who had asked for a conference with Lockyer, Baillie, *L & J*, iii:177); **'be-north Angus'**: Brodie of Brodie (see ch. 5, below), *John Row*, *John Menzies*, *Alexander Jaffray*, *William Muir*, Robert Keith, Duncan Forbes (both Keith and Forbes subscribed the moderate declaration against the mixing of the 'precious' and the 'vile' in response to Row's April 23, 1652, paper to the Synod of Aberdeen, *Stuart*, 219-20), Andrew Cant. Individuals known to have embraced Independency or another English sect are listed in *italics*.
[376] *APS*, vi,ii:832

Scotland could be controlled by four avowed Independents.[377] Contemporaries complained that 'Independents, enemies of the Church of Scotland, are admitted on it' and 'deposed men' were given power to 'govern the admission of other ministers'.[378]

Gillespie's Charter also established the duty of Parliament's commissioners to provide out of the public funds 'a competent maintenance, for such ministers who have Gathered Congregations in Scotland' and likewise to ensure that stipends be available for 'godly ministers...free to labour...in the way of the church of Scotland'.[379] Neither the Resolutioners, nor the Guthrie-Rutherford-Wariston Protesters were happy with the English government's involvement in deciding stipends. The combination of giving Independents so much influence in such a vast region of Scotland, coupled with Gillespie's hand in the work drove an even greater wedge between the factions within the Protester party and further convinced the Resolutioners that none of them could be trusted. Several declarations against the ordinance were produced by different synods across the country.[380] Despite the great power the ordinance appeared to give for settling charges, several 'Congregationall Ministers who have been instruments of much good in Scotland' felt it necessary to inquire of Cromwell, via Monck, how the ordinance would affect them and how it should 'incurrage them to goe on in that good worke which they have begun'.[381] There are no names attached to the letter, but Thomas Charteris (East Kilbride), John Beverley (Lenzie), John Collins (Edinburgh) and John Stalham (Edinburgh) were all in Scotland serving as ministers to gathered congregations, rather than as military chaplains. Samuel Mather (Leith) and Samuel Bryan (Stirling) were also in Scotland and may very well have been in the same situation. In short, they feared the ordinance undermined their roles by giving control back to factions within the Kirk. Barely a week later, Cromwell reassured them that competent stipends would continue for ministers of gathered churches no matter what the triers

---

[377] *RCME*, i:63, 79. According to William Row, only William Guthrie and John Nevay supported the ordinance, while Robert Blair, Samuel Rutherford and Alexander Moncreiffe railed against it as some 'kind of Prelacy' (Row, *Life of Blair*, 318).
[378] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXXI.(44), f. 122.
[379] *APS*, vi,ii:832
[380] Row, *Life of Blair*, 318-19.

had to say.[382] As a result, previously established gathered congregations were exempt from the ordinance.

Neither the Resolutioners, who were largely excluded from positions of trying candidates, nor the rigid Protesters were willing to concede to such an invasive English encroachment into Scottish religion. According to Nicoll, many of those nominated simply refused to fulfil their role as triers, essentially nullifying the act.[383] For this reason, the charter, although reaffirmed by Broghill in September 1655 as the official policy of the English regime and remaining so until July 1656, has been hailed by historians as a dead letter.[384] Sometime in 1655 a declaration was submitted to the Council in Scotland by several of the 'triers' appointed in the charter, pronouncing why they refused to engage in the employment.[385] They listed, among other reasons for rejecting the ordinance, the inclusion of Independents 'unchurch…all the constitute congregations in Scotland' and argued this to be an integral aspect of the ordinance: 'absolutlie ordained to be sett on foot and established'.[386]

Despite the Charter being an overall failure, there is some evidence in the region 'be north Angus' Independents were able to put the ordinance to good use. Sometime between 1653 and 1656, John Seaton became minister of the first charge of Old St. Machar's. Seaton had been the minister of the second charge since 1650, but when he declared for Independency in 1652 the congregation refused to hear him preach.[387] He managed to remain in the second charge, but when William Strachan, minister of the first charge, died in 1653 the congregation and the synod refused Seaton to assume the vacant charge.[388] However, by January 1656 Seaton had been

---

[381] *S & P*, 185.
[382] *Ibid*, 193; Nicoll, 267.
[383] Nicoll, 158.
[384] Dow, 196, 205-6. For Broghill's support of the Charter: Lamont, 91; J. Buckroyd, 'Lord Broghill and the Scottish Church, 1655-1656,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27 (1976), 359-68.
[385] EUL, La.I.321(3). The work is entitled 'The humble representation of sundry ministers and [others] name in the ordinance for the better support of universities and incouradgment of publict preachers', but unfortunately no subscribers' names are included in the manuscript.
[386] EUL, La.I.321(4).
[387] Munro, *Old Aberdeen*, 48.
[388] D. Stevenson, *St Machar's Cathedral and the Reformation* (Aberdeen: Friends of St Machar's Cathedral, 1981), 13.

planted in the first charge.[389] How and when this occurred is uncertain, but it is likely the appointment took place sometime between 1654 and 1656 when Gillespie's charter remained in effect, facilitated by a Jaffray-Menzies-Row-Muir quorum.[390]

The power to plant and remove ministers was not the only incentive given by Cromwell to compliant ministers. When Menzies and Gillespie returned from London in August 1654, they had not only secured the legislative support of the English regime, but also financial support for their universities.[391] 'An Ordinance for the better Support of the Universities in Scotland and the Encouragement of Publick Preachers', the official name of 'Gillespie's Charter', granted lands and rents to the Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen, while making no mention of Edinburgh or St. Andrews.[392] The act transferred all lands formerly belonging to the Bishop of Galloway to the University of Glasgow and those having belonged to the Bishop of Aberdeen to the University of Aberdeen, with two-thirds going to King's College and one-third to Marischal. The Aberdeen colleges were also given fishing rights on both the rivers Dee and Don as well as the North Sea. In addition, two hundred merks were to be given annually to both the universities.[393] This generosity showed Cromwell's willingness to heap benefits upon sympathetic and loyal individuals and institutions. Over time, Gillespie's critics took notice of the great many gifts the Protector bestowed on the principal of Glasgow University.[394]

In later years additional favours were bestowed on the universities. In 1657 the government granted the University of Glasgow permission to print Bibles in any language and to produce

---

[389] Munro, *Old Aberdeen*, 51.
[390] Ascertaining the impact of Triers in Scotland is extremely difficult as there are no Scottish equivalent to the English records held in Lambeth Palace (MSS L. 996-999, 1662).
[391] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:282.
[392] It was only after further financial gifts to both Aberdeen and Glasgow that Robert Leighton, the principal of Edinburgh University, petitioned the Lord Protector and in 1658 received a £200 annual endowment (Firth, *Last Years of the Protectorate*, ii:100; *CSPD*, 1657-8, 77; *APS*, vi,ii:877).
[393] *APS*, vi,ii:831; Nicoll, 165-6; Baillie, *L & J*, iii:282. In Aberdeen's case, the money would come directly out of the city's excise, and was again divided with two-thirds going to King's College (APS, vi,ii:832).
[394] Nicoll, 267.

any academic books that they needed, a privilege not given to any other university in Scotland.[395] With the money given to the university in Gillespie's Charter and subsequent money given by the municipal government, Gillespie funded substantial building work at the university which even Baillie could not refrain from praising.[396] However, it was the University of Aberdeen that continued to receive favours most consistently. In 1658 Cromwell granted a charter to the University of Aberdeen reaffirming the provisions promised under Gillespie's charter, further accentuating the privileged status of Aberdeen.[397] That same year Row set about extending King's College by adding a square tower on the northwest corner of the quadrangle that housed amenities such as a fully fitted billiards room. Among those contributing to the building project were a host of Englishmen. In total, donations from English soldiers equalled about £500, £120 of which came personally from General Monck. Several more Englishmen including William Clarke (Monck's secretary), Colonel Thomas Fitch, Major John Hill and others were listed among those giving at least twenty pounds.[398] The generosity of the English soldiers, no doubt coupled with the desire to further endear themselves to the Protector, led to the college naming the new building 'Cromwell's Tower'. The successful fundraising for an addition to King's College encouraged a similar project to begin at Marischal the following year, where plans were made for building a 'Public School' in the grounds of college. Oxford, Cambridge and Eton were among the institutions that contributed to the project. Cambridge gave approximately 40 merks and Oxford just over £53, while the most generous donor was found in the Aberdeen Independents' old friend and mentor Nicholas Lockyer. Having recently been appointed Provost of Eton in January of that year, he and John Oxenbridge, a fellow at Eton and another former Independent chaplain with the army in Scotland, gave £185 for the building

---

[395] *APS*, vi, ii:762; W. J. Couper. *The Origins of Glasgow Printing* (Edinburgh: Geo. Stewart and Co., 1911), 14

[396] McCoy, *Robert Baillie and the Second Scots Reformation*, 174-8. An example of the building work is still extant in the Pearce Lodge.

[397] Anderson, *Fasti Academiae Mariscallanae Aberdonensis*, i:287-90.

[398] Rait, *Universities of Aberdeen*, 241.

project at Marischal, which had essentially become the seedbed of Independency in Scotland.[399] Thus relations between Lockyer and the Aberdeen Independents maintained long after Lockyer left Scotland and he seems to have remained loyal to their cause and ideologies. Obviously such generosity did little to scupper accusations that Menzies, Row and crew were proselytes of Lockyer. Baillie did not fail to recognise the reason for Aberdeen's preferential treatment. They were under the dominance of Independents who used Scotland's universities 'for the corrupting of our youth'.[400] It is also interesting to note that among the students of divinity at Marischal College during this time was James Fraser of Brea (MA 1658), and it may have been his studies under the tutelage of Menzies and Row that laid the foundations for his later unique theological position.[401]

The Twilight of 17th Scottish Independency

Despite the fact Hoy and Henderson seem to indicate the high point in the Independency movement in Scotland as the gathered communion in Aberdeen in November 1652, or the months that immediately followed, and Wariston claimed the death of Charteris in June 1656 marked the demise of the only two 'gathered congregations in Scotland' the overall evidence suggests the movement continued for much of the 1650s.[402] In December 1656, Baillie again protested the Aberdeen Independents not only continued to thrive, but continued to collude with Gillespie's party of Protesters. He called them 'our northern separatists...with whom we must joyne in silence'.[403] At that time controversy swirled over the parish charge of Eccles, where a Protester minister had been planted, but was unable to settle due to opposition. Baillie feared with the support of the English regime and the Commissioners for Visiting Universities a Protester would be placed in the charge, or even worse, John Livingstone might bring 'a

---

[399] Ibid, 151, 286. Another link between Scotland and Eton was through the fellow and chaplain of Eton, Paul Hobson, who was on friendly terms with Lockhart.
[400] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:327.
[401] Anderson, *Fasti Academiae Mariscallanae Aberdonensis*, ii:222; *ODNB* 'James Fraser of Brea'.
[402] Wariston, iii:35.
[403] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:308.

professed Independent' from 'Aberdeen's nest'.[404] A month later, Baillie continued to rail against the Independent congregations formed earlier in the decade at Lenzie and East Kilbride, and even worse their usurpation of Scotland's universities 'as they have done in Aberdeen'.[405] Baillie's comments imply that Gillespie still favoured some of the Independents and possessed the power to plant them. With regards to the balance of power in Glasgow in October 1657, Nicoll wrote: 'matteris in Kirk Session were totalie gydit by him (Gillespie), and none elected elders or deacons but by his approbation and accordance...he gydit and governit in that town'.[406] Additional support for the ongoing success of the movement is reported in that year when Jaffray, then a resident in Edinburgh, explained that only geographical separation prevented him from having those 'with whom formerly [he] walked in fellowship at Aberdeen' baptise his newborn son.[407] As late as 1658 a new Independent congregation formed in Leith under the English minister John Collins.[408] Nonetheless, the movement was in overall decline by 1658. A significant blow for the Aberdeen Independents came in November 1657 when John Seaton, minister at Old St. Machar's, left Scotland to take charge of a gathered church at Felton-bridge, Northumberland.[409] Why he left is uncertain, but by the end of 1658 the Aberdeen Independents seem to have completely disappeared.

What happened to bring about the end of the Aberdeen Independents and what became of other gathered churches? Several factors probably contributed to the demise of the movement in Aberdeen. First of all, from about midsummer 1652 Alexander Jaffray was no longer consistently involved with the group. Soon after the submission of the May 24 letter, Cromwell appointed him Director of the Scottish Chancery. He accepted the post in June and apart from the eight months he spent in London serving as a member the Commonwealth Parliament from July 1653-February 1654, Jaffray spent the six months during 'the Session' in Edinburgh and the

---

[404] Ibid, iii:327
[405] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:335.
[406] Nicoll, 205.
[407] Jaffray, 98-9.
[408] Thurloe, vii:527.

other six months of the year in Aberdeen.[410] Being gone for half the year would have made his involvement increasingly marginal. In November 1656 Jaffray moved his family to Edinburgh, initially settling in Newbattle before relocating to Abbey Hill.[411] This series of events marked the removal of a major stabilising influence from the Aberdeen Independents which must have been greatly missed with the remaining strong personalities of Menzies and Row. More than that, Jaffray's absence marked the removal of the *primum mobile* as his father-in-law, Andrew Cant, termed him.[412] In Cant's estimation, Jaffray remained the major 'stumbling block' in Aberdeen in January 1656, so his complete absence from November doubtless had a significant impact on the Aberdeen Independents.[413]

However, Jaffray underwent a metamorphosis of his own which is highlighted in a short entry in his journal. Thomas Jaffray, his son, was born in Edinburgh in 1657. Several children were born into the family during the Interregnum, but previously Alexander had either been in Edinburgh, when the family continued to live in Aberdeen, or in London when his children were born.[414] Now, however, the family resided in Edinburgh where he was neither a member of a gathered church, nor any better inclined towards Presbyterianism. Being geographically separated from those with whom he 'formerly walked in fellowship at Aberdeen' he resolved to find a Kirk minister who would perform the sacrament in a private manner and allow him to declare publicly that the baptism was only an induction into the 'universal or catholic church' rather than a particular national church as well as voice his objection to national churches. After meeting with Jaffray and discussing his objections and stipulations John Sinclair, minister of Ormiston, agreed to perform the sacrament on these terms. However, when Sinclair arrived at Jaffray's Newbattle home on May 12, 1657 he was no longer willing to allow Jaffray to voice

---

[409] John Row, 'Diary', *Scottish Notes and Queries* (Aberdeen:1894), 52. According to Row's diary, Seaton was ousted by the Act of Uniformity and returned to Aberdeen with his family in March 1662.
[410] Jaffray, 68-9; Nicoll, 95.
[411] Ibid, 69-70.
[412] Historical Manuscripts Commission. *Report on the Laing Manuscripts Preserved in the University of Edinburgh* (ed.) Rev. H. Paton (London, 1914), i:298; EUL, La.I.320.
[413] EUL, La.I.320.
[414] Jaffray, 99.

publicly his objections to national churches on the grounds that if the Presbytery of Edinburgh found out they would be none too pleased with his baptising the child of a sworn-schismatic, especially after acquiescing to such terms. Instead Sinclair suggested, for both their sakes, that someone else present the child for baptism. Not wanting to cause problems for the minister who had already gone out on a limb for him, Jaffray allowed Robert Porteous, a bailie of Newbattle, to present the child for baptism.

If Jaffray was still so averse to the national church, why did he have his child baptised by a Kirk minister? Jaffray desired to 'give an evidence to the godly men of the Presbyterian way, of my willingness to live peaceably and in love with them, partaking with them in all duties, so far as I may do it without sin; though in the matter of their constitution and form of government I differ from them.'[415] Essentially the position Jaffray held, which Cromwell had advocated, was not that Presbyterianism was essentially bad, but rather overbearing on people's consciences and in its national structure incompatible with the existence of congregations in their purest possible form. He did not hold the belief that the Presbytery could not be allowed to continue, just that it could not continue to dominate the consciences of others. Having bought into the Cromwellian concept of Christian unity, Jaffray desired 'all such as fear him [God], may "walk in love", as becomes the children of one Father'[416] and thus sought to do as much as possible to engage with fellow Christians without sinning against his conscience. The following year (1658) he allowed his wife to present their newborn twins for baptism within a Kirk 'under certain limitations' and contemplated taking communion with those who 'most purely' administered it.[417] Explaining his position, he wrote:

> I ever thought it, and still think it my duty, so far as I may without sin, to go along with any of the Lord's people:—while [or until] the Lord clear up our darkness, we must bear one another, or [we shall be likely to] devour each other. And I am confident, it is our duty, not only to bear with one another, wherein we may without sin, but to walk together. Only special care should be had in this case, that, (in that peremptory and peevish disposition of *the most part of the godly in this land*, who can be satisfied with no less, than to have all men conform to *them* and be of

---

[415] Jaffray, 99
[416] Ibid, 119.
[417] Ibid, 114, 116.

> *their* judgement,)—I say, especial care should be had, that, by our *conforming* to such, we do not *confirm* them in their sinful mistakes; and therefore, upon all occasions that are convenient, would testimony be given against their errors.[418]

Although Jaffray and the Aberdeen Independents originally fell under the influence of Lockyer who advocated strict separation, even isolation, from ungodly 'leven', some of them gradually drifted towards a position similar to Beverley's and evidenced by Gillespie in his dealings with the English. Ideologically they remained Independents, and believed they must continue to witness against the Presbyterian error of demanding conformity (what Davis calls 'formality')[419] on their unbending terms, but in pursuit of unity they attempted to engage with the 'purer' sort both within the national church and without. Gillespie's' own faction were, in some ways, closer to Independency than they were to even their fellow Guthrie-Rutherford-Wariston Protesters because they likewise gave up on the national model of the Presbytery espoused in the covenants and the requirement to impose it on others. Essentially, they took a step towards the model of congregational government exhibited in New England.

Jaffray was not alone in coming to a sort of *via media* between isolationist separation and embracing the absolutist position of the national Kirk. An ambiguity in distinctions between the position of the Independents and some of the Protesters began to form. Besides the compliance shown to Independents by Gillespie's Protesters, in 1655 Menzies demonstrated compliance with the more rigid Guthrie-Rutherford-Wariston Protesters. The separation by his former Protesting brethren for the sake of purer administration of ordinances greatly disturbed Andrew Cant. He desired purer ordinances as well, but could not bring himself to separate from the Kirk. In 1653 he came up with a scheme for restricting communion to individuals willing to submit themselves for public trial.[420] This sparked a major controversy in Aberdeen, wherein the Resolutioners perceived Cant dangerously flirted with an ecclesiology all too similar to the Aberdeen Independents. The Resolutioner majority in the synod accused any who might

---

[418] Ibid, 112.
[419] Davis, 'Against Formality', 265-88.
[420] Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 118-20.

adopt this policy as acting out a 'practical separation' from the congregation and the Kirk.[421] Moreover, they called the proponents of the scheme 'innovators, practicall separatists, schesmaticks, mackers of divisioune...backsliders from the guid old way' and 'pharisaical'.[422] Yet acting on a suggestion made by Guthrie that John Menzies might be convinced from proceeding any further in that 'neu way' of Independency, Cant sought Menzies' backing for his controversial plan. Guthrie warned Cant not to get drawn into the errours of the Aberdeen Independents, but suggested 'in vhat else he may condescend to gaining of him (Menzies) I vish he suld doe'.[423] So Cant pitched his proposal to the Independent. By January 1656 he convinced Menzies to 'go along with' the plan, which drifted dangerously close to the practice of the London Independent John Goodwin—who preached to his parish but only administered the sacraments to the gathered.[424] However, by January 1656 communion limited to those publicly tried had already been carried out twice, so Menzies' support was not to effectuate limited communions, but merely for support against the swelling pressure in both the Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen.

From Cant's perspective this scheme must have seemed like a compromise between Menzies' actual separation and their shared desire for purer ordinances. Moreover, the whole scheme may have been an attempt to bring the Aberdeen Independents back into the Protester fold. Yet Cant worried Menzies' support was precarious and feared that he might simply opt for that 'new congregation' which had been 'sealed' by the communion of November 1652.[425] Cant urged Wariston to write to Menzies and encouraged him to continue his support for the new communion format. During the summer of 1655 Brodie noted Menzies sat in the Presbytery meetings to consult, but could take no part in decision-making, which may have been due to his

---

[421] Ibid, 128.
[422] Ibid, 132.
[423] *Report on the Laing Manuscripts*, 296; EUL, La.I.319.
[424] There may be some dispute about this date. The editor for the *Report on the Laing Manuscripts* assigns the date as January 9, 1655. However, since the date is taken from the original letter, it almost certainly means January 9, 1655/6. For Goodwin's pattern of Independency see p. 216, above.
[425] *Report on the Laing Manuscripts*, 297; EUL, La.I.320.

professorship in the university.[426] So how did Menzies help Cant? Perhaps Menzies' influence can be seen in May 1656, when the Resolutioner majority in the Synod of Aberdeen attempted to quash Cant's scheme. Just after Cant arrived at a meeting of the synod, to which he had been summoned, English soldiers intervened. An officer representing the garrison commander (probably Michael Richardson at the time)[427] entered the meeting and ordered the synod to cease from interfering in Cant's business.[428] Menzies' sway with the English, exhibited in his role in the production of Gillespie's charter, could easily account for the English intervention. The collusion between Cant and Menzies should not, however, be interpreted as an end of Independency in Aberdeen. While the controversy played out both Row and Jaffray were identified by Cant as remaining separated from the Kirk. Cant actually requested Wariston write 'scharplie' to Row 'reproving him for what he hath done, and desiring him, yea, conjuring him to do no more' and to Jaffray, as the separatists' primary instigator, urging him to stop encouraging the congregation.[429] So the Aberdeen Independents continued. Moreover, the assistance Menzies provided for Cant does not mean he stopped being an Independent. Menzies' support for Cant represents his willingness to support a venture advancing a degree of reform he and his fellows had sought, but had been unable to effectuate earlier in the decade without schism. Menzies remained an Independent until about June 1658 when he returned to the Protester fold.[430] Yet this incident served to further muddle the distinction between Independents and Protesters.

As far as the Resolutioners were concerned such collusion only reaffirmed their belief that none of the Protesters were Presbyterian, since they refused to recognise the authority of the Resolutioner majority within the Kirk. As Holfelder put it, the Protesters had separated into 'some form of erastian, neo-Independency'.[431] G.D. Donaldson, David Stevenson and John

---

[426] Brodie, 163.
[427] *RHCA*, 554.
[428] Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 232-3.
[429] *Report on the Laing Manuscripts*, 298; EUL, La.I.320.
[430] Baillie, iii:364.
[431] Holfelder, 250.

Coffey have all recognised the contradictory position of the Protesters.[432] According to Coffey, although Rutherford never separated from the church he could no longer tolerate the degeneration of the Kirk brought about through its mixed multitude membership. As a result, 'one of the greatest seventeenth-century defenders of divine-right Presbyterianism finished his days as a rebel against the church polity he had sought so hard to establish'.[433] For the Protesters, as the decade progressed the focus increasingly shifted from national presbytery to discipline within congregations. Donaldson, drawing on Baillie, suggests this shift was evidenced in the Protesters' rigid restrictions to communion evidenced in Glasgow and Aberdeen which tended 'towards something like a "gathered congregation".'[434] However, the best indication of the extent to which the distinctions between Independency and the Protesters' Presbyterianism had blurred is evidenced by a report from the Quaker Francis Howgill. According to Howgill, when he arrived in Scotland in 1657 he found large numbers of English soldiers attending Kirk services presided over by Scottish Ministers, despite those ministers being the 'false Prophets…and incendaries' who had embroiled 'all the poor people of this Nation in blood to fight for their imagined calfe Presbitery'.[435] After the dissolution of the 1653 General Assembly, the Kirk's national assembly did not meet again for the remainder of the Interregnum, while synod and presbyteries were intermittently barred from meeting.[436] Writing in 1659, James Guthrie declared these measures had in a 'great measure overthrown' the government and discipline of the Kirk.[437] This vacuum of Presbyterian power reduced the practice of discipline in the Kirk to something not all that different to Independency. Discipline predominantly had to be congregationally based and was dependent on the offender subjecting

---

[432] G.D. Donaldson, 'The emergence of schism in seventeenth-century Scotland', 215-18; Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 228; Coffey, 219-24; Holfelder, 250.
[433] Coffey, 224.
[434] Donaldson, 'Schism', 217; Baillie, *L & J*, iii:220: 'they are moving to celebrate a Communion here…They will exclude such multitudes for one cause or for another that the end will be the setting up of a new refined congregation of their own adherents'.
[435] Francis Howgill, *To All you Commanders and officers of the Army of Scotland.* (Leith,1657), 2-3.
[436] Dow, 102-4.
[437] James Guthrie, *Some Considerations Contributing Unto the Discoverie of the Dangers That Threaten Religion and the Work of the Reformation in the Church of Scotland.* (Edinburgh,1660), 72.

him or herself to the authority of the congregation.[438] As one Scottish critic put it: 'the general and lawfull assemblies of this church ar wholly taken away the provinciall synods and even presbyteries and kirk sessions seim to be whooly taken away because as non of thes are expressly acknowledged: so it wold appear that all the lawes concerning ye same ar annulled an made voyd'.[439] For moderate Independents within the army a disempowered Presbyterian Kirk free of General Assemblies was less officious than the radicalism of Quakers, Baptists and Fifth Monarchists. The compliance between Gillespie's Protesters, Aberdeen Independents and the disciplinarily strict English Independents blurred the clear patterns of Independency provided by Lockyer and Owen. As a result many English soldiers happily found the Calvinist doctrine they craved consistently voiced from Scottish pulpits without the Presbyterian baggage they had risked so much to usurp. So at least for some English soldiers the distinction between their Independent congregations back home and a Presbyterian Kirk devoid of 'tyrannical' General Assemblies, presbyteries and synods—as the editor of Wood's *A Dead-Man's Testament* termed them[44()]— began to diminish.

By 1658 the vast majority of Scots who had stepped out of the Kirk to embrace Independency ended up following one of two paths. First, some, like Jaffray, who as late as the spring of 1657 differed little from the Kirk theologically except in his interpretation of the role and function of external ecclesiastical government over a congregation, took a more tempered view of the Kirk and tried to coexist with it but could not in good conscience restore their membership. This would have been the same for some of his counterparts in Aberdeen. After the dust from their separation had settled the overwhelming majority of Aberdeen Independents were still very Calvinist and Reformed in their theology. Though initially unified in their agreement that gathered congregations were a better alternative to Presbyterian mass-inclusion, the Cromwellian ideal of toleration tempered their position. They attempted to maintain fraternal

---

[438] *Mercurius Politicus* noted in April 1652, two months after toleration was imposed, the Kirk's 'Tyrranik discipline' was limited to those who would submit to it, since the English would protect those who refused to do so (*Mercurius Politicus*. April 15-22, 1652, p. 1551 [E660:5]).
[439] EUL, La.I.321.(2), f. 1.

links and foster unity with various Christian groups, but chose not to ally themselves with any particular gathering. Jaffray remained, as one slightly biased late eighteenth-century source put it, 'in private for some years, a solitary mourner not joining with any profession in religion' until after the Restoration.[441] Barclay, a Quaker, explained that although he may have been 'considered' an Independent, from his move away from Aberdeen 'he belonged to no distinct society of Christian professors' until four years after the Restoration he joined the Quakers.[442] But in truth, Jaffray remained an 'Independent' without a congregation until well after the Restoration, as did William Dundas, whose chronologically deficient account of his own experience explains he too eventually joined the Quakers, but probably not until after 1666.[443] Some, however, did not remain as neutral as Jaffray and Dundas did during the latter years of the Interregnum. For some the introduction of Independency into Scotland set them onto a new trajectory of rapid religious progression over a relatively short period of time. According to Baillie's reports several members of Thomas Charteris' Independent congregation in East Kilbride, including the Hamilton family, 'turned quakers' before the minister's unfortunate demise in 1656.[444] There is also evidence to believe this affected the gathered church at Lenzie, where at least one dispute with local Quakers occurred.[445] Some other members of Charteris' congregation reportedly became Baptists.[446] In less than four years a number of Scots became convinced of Independency, joined Charteris' congregation and then subsequently turned Quaker or Baptist. For these individuals, their progression might best be interpreted in light of Jonathon Scott's suggestion that sectarianism within the England of the 1650s represented not 'a series of *movements* but...a succession of *moments*'.[447] Hence, for some Scots Independency

---

[440] Wood, *Dead Man's Testament*, 15.
[441] Kendall (ed.), *Piety Promoted* 8 vols, 2nd edn (London: James Phillips, 1789), i:79.
[442] Jaffray, 197.
[443] Dundas, *A Few Words of Truth*, 18.
[444] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:323; Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers*, 2 vols (London: Luke Hinde, 1753), ii:494-5; Henderson, 'Early', 105. Wariston puts the number at eleven (Wariston, iii:35).
[445] NLS, Wod.Qu.XCVIII.(6), f. 105-7.
[446] Pittiloh, 10-13. For a fuller discussion see Ch. 5 of this thesis.
[447] John Morrill (ed.) *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s* (London: Collins & Brown, 1992), 10.

served as an initial starting point in a progression towards other more radical positions. Margaret Anderson represents an example of this progression in Aberdeen. The wife of an Aberdeen bailie, Anderson was a member of the Aberdeen Independents before being baptised by a Baptist soldier during the Interregnum. Yet sometime before her death in 1663 Anderson joined the Quakers.[448]

The rest of the Aberdeen Independents who, like John Menzies and probably Andrew Birnie, maintained orthodox Reformed theology throughout, found themselves gradually drifting back into the Presbyterian Kirk since they only differed on principles of ecclesiology.[449] This was a step closer to Gillespie's position than Jaffray was willing to go, but for Menzies and others it represented a middle ground. They eventually came to view their position on ecclesiastical government as differing from the Kirk's more in degree than in kind.[450] For this reason, it is likely many of the Aberdeen Independents swallowed their pride and returned to the Kirk, a process which may have been hastened by the re-eruption of the Protester-Resolutioner debate following the death of Cromwell. However, according to Jaffray's testimony those formerly belonging to the Aberdeen Independents continued to be viewed by the Guthrie-Rutherford Protesters as, along with Gillespie's faction of Protesters, proto-Independents after their return to the Kirk. As a result hostile exchanges between Cant and Menzies continued after the latter rejoined the Kirk.[451] The reunion also seems to have left some of the former Independents, 'that handful who fear him in Aberdeen' as Jaffray referred to them, excluded from the ordinances served in Aberdeen's churches. Jaffray had hoped the appointment of James Durham, who along with Robert Blair had avoided joining either faction in the Protester-Resolutioner dispute,[452] to one of Aberdeen's vacant charges would facilitate reconciliation in Aberdeen and allow the former Independents access to the sacraments. Durham was

---

[448] John Row, 'Diary,' *Scottish Notes and Queries* (Aberdeen) 7(1894), 70.
[449] Menzies later conformed to Episcopacy at the Restoration.
[450] D.F. Chatfield's thesis suggests the differences between New England Congregationalism and the Presbyterian Kirk of the early 1640s were more of degree than of kind (Chatfield, 'The Congregationalists of New England and its Repercussions on England and Scotland, 1641-2,' 172ff).
[451] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:356; Jaffray, 105.

unanimously called in December 1657, but he died in Glasgow on 25 June, 1658 before he could make the move to Aberdeen.[453] Jaffray lamented his death and prayed God would 'point out some other way, whereby the work of the gospel and the ordinances, in purity may be administered there'.[454] The implication is that Row was no longer ministering to a gathered congregation. What course Row took is uncertain as the ecclesiastical records of Aberdeen make no further mention of him, but at the Restoration he attempted to ingratiate himself to the King by writing a poem against Cromwell.[455] It did little to help him, as he refused to conform and was removed from his principalship.

Thus it would seem that the disappearance of Scottish Independent congregations by the end of the Interregnum owed much to renewed pressure to rejoin the Kirk, the development of a party within the Kirk sympathetic to the aims of the Independents, and a trajectory towards more radical positions. Just as Baillie, Rutherford and the English Presbyterian Thomas Edwards had warned before the English army arrived in Scotland, Independency proved to be a springboard into other 'errors' rather than a static ending point for those questioning the Presbyterian Kirk. By 1654 a plethora of options were available to Scots malcontented with the Presbyterian Kirk. Moreover, a fluid religious marketplace had developed in which denominational drifting was both permitted and protected. For any individuals who actually remained inclined to Independency until the Restoration their freedom to keep gathered congregations disappeared. The incoming tide of Prelacy and uniformity swept away toleration just as the 'ocean-like...confluences' of Presbyterianism and Malignancy described by the Scottish Sectarians in their appeal to the English government in January 1652.[456] The Restoration served to drive Independents only mildly displeased with the Presbytery towards the Covenanters, because even those with qualms about a national Presbyterian Kirk viewed it as the better alternative than

---

[452] Christie, G. 'James Durham as Courtier and Preacher.' *RSCHS* 4 (1932), 75.
[453] Stuart, *Aberdeen*, 145.
[454] Jaffray, 118.
[455] Henderson, 'Early', 111.
[456] *To the Very Honorable the Representative of the Common-Vvealth. the Humble Petition and Remonstrance of Such in Scotland.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).

Episcopacy. Others like Jaffray and Dundas who could not reconcile themselves to the Kirk were driven into more radical patterns of dissent. In 1662, repulsed by both the Covenanters and Episcopacy, Jaffray and several others in Aberdeen embraced Quakerism and established a long lasting tradition in Aberdeen that would in subsequent decades extend to New Jersey.[457] This preservation of Quaker ideologies and their Scottish exportation to the New World two decades after the Restoration, serve as a testament to the long-lasting impact of the religious policies introduced by the English during the Interregnum.

As we have seen, the English advocacy of toleration and Congregationalism did not find success in Scotland purely of its own accord. The Kirk's increasingly extreme interpretation of the covenants and their harsh dealing with ministers who did not follow the party line during the 1640s had already begun to erode away the unity of the Kirk before a shot was fired at Dunbar. Defeat there, after lofty promises by radical Presbyterians that their covenanted army would prevail, simply served to reinforce doubts. Disappointment, disillusionment and infighting within the Kirk tilled the soil of discontent and frustration which provided fertile grounds for the religious seeds that the English sowed during the Interregnum. For this reason, the preaching of Independency and toleration of Protestant variations struck a chord with many Scots who had either suffered under the persecution of the Kirk or had become disenchanted with the apparently empty promises of divine blessing in return for a covenanted nation willing to expand the influence of Presbyterianism by military means. While the Kirk did not experience excessively widespread separation, there is evidence that a wide range of Scots viewed, at least for a time, the English concepts of Congregationalism and toleration 'as nearer the patterne of the Gospel' and chose them over their own rigid and sometimes harsh

---

[457] Ned C. Landsman, *Scotland and its First American Colony 1683-1760* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 103; D. Dobson, *Scottish Quakers and Early America: 1650-1700.* (Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Pub. Co., 1998).

covenanted Presbytery. All of which was supported by an intriguing trilateral relationship between the English regime, Gillespie's party of Protesters and Scottish Independents.

Chapter V:

The 'Lamb's War' in Scotland: The Rise of the Quakers and the Fall of the Baptists.[1]

Oliver Cromwell's initial foray into Scotland in the summer of 1650 relied heavily upon England's various radical Protestant groups. They had served loyally in the fight against what they perceived as a religiously intolerant and politically tyrannical king in two separate civil wars, and so had few qualms with taking part in a military campaign against a neighbouring religiously intolerant state that supported their old enemy Charles Stuart. However, the relationship between Cromwell and these sectarian religious groups changed after his ascendancy to power. This strain became increasingly apparent as the military regime of the Commonwealth gradually changed into a civilian government established under a Protector, leaving many who had risked life and limb to believe the monarchy they had fought to bring down had been re-imposed under a different name. This chapter will focus on how the changing relationship between Baptists, Quakers and the government thwarted early successes in introducing sectarian religious forms into Scotland, and show how their remarkable change of circumstances during the course of the Interregnum in Scotland eventually encouraged them to act together, if only for a very brief time.

Various historical accounts of both the Baptists and the Quakers in Scotland during the Interregnum have already been produced.[2] For this reason, the present chapter is not interested in giving a comprehensive history of either group. Instead the focus will be a comparison of the different ways they engaged with each other and with the Scottish populace in an attempt to

---

[1] The quotation refers to the dynamic relationship between Baptists and Quakers in their attempts to bring about Christ's second advent (the 'Lamb's War') as explored in: T.L. Underwood, *Primitivism, Radicalism and the Lamb's War*. Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. (Oxford: OUP, 1997).

[2] J. Scott, 'Baptists in Scotland During the Commonwealth,' *RSCHS*, 3 (1929), 174-85; J. Scott, 'Baptist witness during the Commonwealth,' *History of the Baptists in Scotland*. (ed.) G. Yullie (Glasgow: Baptist Union Publications, 1926), 24-39; R.B. Hannen, 'Cupar, Fife, 1652-1659.' *Baptist Quarterly*, 10(1940-1), 45-9; G.B. Burnet, *The Story of Quakerism in Scotland 1650-1850* (London: J. Clarke, 1952); J. Torrance, 'The Quaker Movement in Scotland,' *RSCHS*, 3 (1929) , 31-42; J.

explain why, despite some significant similarities, they experienced distinctly different results in their attempts to proselytise Scots. The chapter will attempt to assess the fortunes of both groups in Scotland and to gauge the changing tide of military support towards both groups, thus showing that the radicalism Cromwell initially depended so heavily upon to quell the Presbyterian threat in Scotland eventually became too much of a liability to the increasingly civilian government of the Interregnum.[3] Finally this chapter will endeavour to demonstrate that their different approaches to proselytising the Scottish people significantly impacted their fortunes. It will be argued that this explains why, despite both groups facing strong opposition soon after the Restoration in 1660, one group was able to survive while the other disappeared from Scotland for over fifty years.

During the 1650s the Baptists and Quakers had a complex and entangled relationship with one another. T.L. Underwood's work *Primitivism, Radicalism and the Lamb's War*, wonderfully lays out their similarities and differences, and most importantly the things that linked them together. In relation to the Presbyterians of the Kirk and the moderate Independents promoting religious toleration within the Commonwealth/Protectorate, Baptists and Quakers sought to experience a distinctly different dispensation of God's Kingdom, although both wished to realise a 'primitive' church much more fully than either the moderate Independents or the Presbyterians.[4] The Baptists through strict membership requirements, initiation via believer's baptism, and strict discipline sought to imitate the early church as it is described in the New Testament; while the Quakers through the direct guidance of the Inner Light believed they actually experienced the Apostolic Church directly. For the Quakers neither the early church nor Christ's death and resurrection were temporally distant. They believed both were a perpetual part of their immediate religious experience. 'Thus the Christ whom Baptists thought of as preaching, crucified, buried, resurrected, and ascended into heaven some sixteen hundred years before,'

Torrance, 'The Early Quakers in North-East Scotland,' *Transactions of the Banffshire Field Club* (Aberdeen, 1936), 67-87.

[3] Macinnes, *The British Revolution*, 208-9.

explains Underwood, 'became for Quakers the Christ within them, who spoke and was crucified, buried, resurrected, and ascended--all within'.[5]

This similar desire for a more immediate experience of the primitive church brought them together while at the same time it drove a wedge between them. For Quakers, the Baptists' imitation of the New Testament church failed to fully claim the power of Christ, the Church or the Holy Spirit because they believed 'to have the immediate experience that the earliest Christians had...required the internalization and spiritualization they practiced.'[6] In other words, proper forms do not equate with real experience. Equally, the Baptists were wary of Quaker claims that seemed to minimise the historical death and resurrection of Christ, while overestimating the religious freedom manifested through the Holy Spirit. This led to conflict between them, because both groups recognised the basic desire driving the other but could not condone the other's conclusions. Quakers believed Baptists stopped short of fully realising the nature of the Church, while Baptists perceived Quakers took things way too far.

Yet despite the apparently perpetual conflict between them, they were perceived by both mainstream Puritan and Presbyterian circles as being at the same radical end of the Christian Church, because of their shared desire to experience more fully the primitive church. This common desire was most fully expressed in their soteriological and sacramental doctrines, which although different from each other linked them quite closely on one end of the spectrum with the Independents and Presbyterians similarly linked at the other.[7] Thus when the two groups arrived in Scotland en masse during the Interregnum the Kirk perceived them as two heads of

---

[4] T. L. Underwood, *Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb's War the Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: OUP, 1997), 6.
[5] Underwood, 34.
[6] Ibid, 35.
[7] Ibid, 120.

the same heretical hydra.[8] The differences between them were merely of degree; Baptists were slightly more radical than the Brownists, and Seekers were the most radical of them all.[9]

The result of these two groups being lumped together as radicals by mainstream Puritans and Presbyterians was that they became increasingly entangled in each other's business, as well as with other radical groups like the Fifth Monarchists. When any aspersion or negative public opinion was vented against any one of these groups by more moderate churches it had the knock-on effect of casting a shadow on all the groups perceived as being part of the extreme or radical end of the religious spectrum. So as the government of the Commonwealth became increasingly civilian, (especially after the inception of the Protectorate), and the pattern of religious and political settlement became evident, the discontent publicly vented by the Fifth Monarchists served to draw increased attention to the politically dissident nature of other religious groups holding radical ecclesiologies. Hence increased pressure was put upon Quakers who challenged social hierarchies and refused to remove their hats to social superiors, in spite of the desire of George Fox and other leading Quakers that the Friends avoid any involvement in political intrigue.

A second dimension that brought the Quakers and Baptists together was that they often vied for the same proselytes. In fact a dynamic struggle existed within the army in Scotland between various sectarian groups vying to win over soldiers to a particular sect. The Baptist Miles Sindercombe had, according to C.H. Firth, joined the army solely for the purpose of promulgating his doctrines within the army in Scotland.[10] These endeavours were not limited to either the Baptists or to gaining the adherence of those yet uncommitted to a particular sect. Indeed the Quakers often targeted Baptist meetings as good places to find proselytes.[11] As is

---

[8] Robert Baillie, *Anabaptism, the True Fountaine of Independency, Brownisme, Antinomy, Familisme, and the Most of the Other Errours, Which for the Time Doe Trouble the Church of England, Unsealed.* (London: printed by M.F. for Samuel Gellibrand, 1647).
[9] Robert Baillie, *A Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time.* (London: printed for Samuel Gellibrand, 1646), 6.
[10] *RHCA*, 134.
[11] Underwood, 16.

often the case with groups who have more in common than they would like to admit, a strong antipathy existed between them, which Underwood has charted through the polemic publications the two groups produced against each other in England. In Scotland, the Quakers and Baptists shared very much the same relationship as they did in England. Both groups contended for the same potential new members and bitterly opposed each other's errors, as George Fox found out when angry Baptists confronted him during visits to Leith and Perth in 1657.[12] It was those Baptists, declared Fox, who were 'the ground and cause of our banishment out of this place'.[13]

But despite the ways in which they were linked, the two factions had different introductions into Scotland and became integrated into Scottish culture in different ways. The Baptists entered into Scottish society closely bound to the English regime in power after victory at Dunbar. The close relationship between the newly forming Baptist congregations and the governmental regime was both the source of Baptist success in the early years of the Interregnum and the eventual cause of their downfall. Quakers, on the other hand, entered Scotland predominantly as a civilian movement. While this presented its own challenges as far as gaining a foothold in Scotland it served to provide them with a distinctly different base of support and ensured from the beginning that they were not reliant upon governmental protection or support.

Baptists and the Army

Baptist ideas did not enter Scotland for the first time during the Interregnum. In 1642 there were reports that the Laird of Tulliefruskie (possibly a Gordon) came under the influence of Baptist doctrines before being quickly censured by the Kirk.[14] In 1647, another Scotswoman named Christian Blyth was excommunicated and forced to flea to England to escape continued persecution.[15] In previous manifestations the Kirk moved quickly to suppress what it perceived

---

[12] Fox, 243, 248.
[13] Ibid, 248.
[14] Scott (1926), 25; Henderson, *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland*, 101-2; Spalding, *Memorialls of the Trubles*, ii:203; *Some Sober Animadversions*, 12.
[15] *Some Sober Animadversions*, 11.

as a grotesque error and the source of all other heresies. However, the Kirk's situation under Cromwell's regime differed greatly from the decade before. The English victory at Dunbar ushered in a decade of religious toleration in which thousands of religiously radical Englishmen occupied the country and ventured into virtually every corner of Scotland. It did not take long before the evangelical efforts of the Baptists began to visibly bear fruit.

By 1652 there were Baptist gatherings beginning to form across Scotland. The most famous of these met alternately in Edinburgh and Leith before permanently settling in the port town. Local tradition holds that the building in which they met can still be seen above the old citadel's gate on Dock Street, but in fact, that structure is a later addition.[16] In 1652 Baptist gatherings met in Perth (St. Johnston), Cupar and possibly at or near Dundee. There were also probably meetings in Ayr, Aberdeen and Inverness, locations that definitely had Baptist churches later in the decade.[17] If there was no Baptist congregation in Stirling in 1652, there certainly was in 1653 when the aggressive and confrontational Baptist chaplain of Col. Fairfax's regiment, James Brown, arrived in the town. The gathering seems to have continued to meet in Stirling for the rest of the decade and in 1659 Monck reported some individuals in the town were promoting the Anabaptist cause while seeking to put down the local ministry.[18] Brown may also have had links with Baptists in the regiments garrisoned at Falkland and Perth who he visited in January 1654, as part 'of that dutie which is incumbent on me in reference to them'.[19] The Baptist historian David Douglas, and subsequently James Scott, have alleged Baptists were so prevalent in the army and so widely dispersed throughout the forces that Baptist groups gathered and met in most of the garrisons and citadels throughout the country.[20] As the contemporary historian James Heath (1629-1664) put it, the Army that invaded and occupied Scotland 'swarmed' with

---

[16] John Russell, *The Story of Leith* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1922), 347.
[17] E.B. Underhill (ed.), *Records of the Churches of Christ Gathered in Fenstanton, Warboys and Hexham, 1644-1720.* (London: Hanserd Knollys Society, 1854), 165n, 333; R.B. Hannen, 'Cupar, Fife, 1652-1659,' 45-9; Scott (1929), 178; D. Douglas, *History of the Baptist Churches in the North of England from 1648 to 1845.* (London: Houlston and Stoneham, 1846), 37-8; Fraser, *Chronicles*, 415; *Clarke Papers*, iv: 160-1, 258; Burnet, *Quakerism*, 27.
[18] *Clarke Papers*, iv: 92.
[19] NLS, Wod.Qu.XVII, f. 240.

Baptists.[21] Certainly there were Baptists in remote places. Evidence suggests that during the Interregnum Baptists groups were spread from the Borders to Caithness, and possibly beyond.[22]

A significant amount of information about Baptists in Scotland has been fortuitously preserved in the records of the Baptist churches in Hexham, Northumberland and Fenstanton, Cambridgeshire.[23] Among theses documents is a letter from an English Baptist named Edward Limburgh who found himself in Jedburgh in October 1652.[24] Despite complaints of the country's spiritual deadness and his lamentations over the lack of fellowship, it is unlikely Limburgh was as spiritually isolated as his letter seems to suggest. Why Limburgh was in Scotland is somewhat uncertain. Frances Dow suggests he was a missionary, which is a legitimate claim as Baptists in Scotland actively evangelised, but it is equally likely that he was simply an enlisted soldier in a regiment quartered at Jedburgh.[25] In either case, Limburgh perceived his sojourn into Scotland as providential.[26] His complaints of the spiritual destitution of his new surroundings came fresh upon his arrival to Jedburgh and seem to stem largely from being geographically removed from the Baptist church at Hexham that had baptised him into their fellowship only one month earlier.[27] It is therefore probable he missed the spiritual euphoria he had experienced as a newly baptised member of a gathered congregation rather than there being a complete lack of fellowship. Since this is Limburgh's only surviving letter we do

---

[20] Douglas, *History of the Baptist Churches in the North of England*, 37; Yullie, 26; Scott (1929), 175.
[21] James Heath, *A Brief Chronicle of the Late Intestine Vvar in the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland* (London: printed by J.P., 1676), 273.
[22] Throughout the decade the garrisons on Mull, Lewis, Orkney and Shetland were occupied by rotating regiments. The garrison in Orkney may have been at certain times particularly radical as it opposed Monck in 1659 while under the command of Capt. Henry Watson (*RHCA*, 516). Major Edward Lunne who commanded a company occupying Scalloway Castle in Shetland in 1653 was also discharged from the army in 1659 when Monck was clearing out all disaffected troops (*RHCA*, 478, 480). Major Peter Crisp commanded the garrison near Stornaway in 1652 but was removed from his commission in 1659. Both Lunne and Crispe were described as being 'of that church' referring to the Baptists (*S & C*, 221; *Clarke Papers*, iv: 160-1, 258; *RHCA*, 480).
[23] E.B. Underhill (ed.), *Records of the Churches of Christ Gathered in Fenstanton, Warboys and Hexham, 1644-1720.* (London: Hanserd Knollys Society, 1854).
[24] Ibid, 301-2.
[25] Dow, 61; Yullie, 30.
[26] Underhill, *Records*, 301.
[27] Underhill, *Records*, 302n.

not know what became of him but he may have come to find as he settled into his quarters that there were other English soldiers in the same situation.

Another source supporting the existence of Baptist communities in remote or rural parts of Scotland indicates the existence of a gathering in Helmsdale (Sutherland), where Colonel William Packer's regiment garrisoned the castle in 1656. Although Packer, himself a fervent Baptist, was in the south of England in 1656 he sent a letter to the regiment referred to by the Quaker Jonas Dell as a 'Scandalous Paper'.[28] The work does not survive, but according to Dell, Packer encouraged his regiment in the principles of the General Baptists advocating baptism by immersion, promoting free will, and the possibility of falling from grace, while warning them not to fall into the errors of the Quakers.[29] This account tantalisingly brings to memory reports from January 1652 that 'a very precious people' in Sutherland and 'diverse parts beyond Inverness' left their Kirks in order to attend meetings of officers and soldiers gathered in private homes.[30]

Scots began to take serious notice of the Baptist presence among them as early as October 1651 when compatriots in a Protester meeting held in Edinburgh famously put forward some Baptist ideologies.[31] The following May, Nicoll reported that Alexander Cornwell and Thomas Charteris were carrying on some strange practices and maintaining 'Anabaptist' principles.[32] In September 1652, not being fully aware of the situation in Aberdeen, Lamont falsely reported that John Row and John Menzies had become Anabaptists and utterly refused to baptise

---

[28] Dell only refers to the author as W.P., but J. Scott rightly attributed the work to Packer in Yullie, 30. Major William Packer was dismissed with three other officers in February 1658 all of whom were described as being 'Anabaptists' (*Clarke Papers*, iii: 140-1).

[29] Jonas Dell, *Forms the Pillars of Antichrist; but Christ in Spirit the True Teacher of His People; and Not Tradition.* (London: printed for the author, and are to be sold at the Black-moor neer Fleet-Bridge, 1656). According to *ODNB* ('Packer, William')Packer was a Particular Baptist, but Dell's account suggests General Baptist views.

[30] *S & C*, 31

[31] Nicoll, 62; Douglas, 37; Scott (1929), 177.

[32] Nicoll, 94.

infants.[33] Other rumours about Row's family were in circulation about this time. In his 27 May, 1652 letter Row felt it necessary to deny his wife had been baptised by Baptists near Dundee.[34] Baptist principles came closer to home for the Fife based diarist John Lamont in October 1652 when the General Baptist James Brown arrived in Cupar as chaplain to Colonel Fairfax's regiment. Brown's ministry in Cupar was anything but quiet. Well know for his penchant to seek public debates, as chapter two demonstrated, it was while in Cupar he made 'national news' for disputing with James Wood, minister in St. Andrews, for two days in the Kirk at Cupar.[35] Yet even more shocking, or possibly intriguing, for the many inhabitants of Cupar who witnessed the event was the rebaptism of several soldiers who were dipped 'over heads and ears' in the River Eden by Brown earlier in the month.[36]

Despite the relatively few recorded accounts of baptisms, these were not isolated events. According to Lamont throughout March 1653 a significant number of people were re-baptised in the Water of Leith.[37] In April public baptisms by immersion took place three times a week in the tributary. On Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays people were baptised at Bonnington Mill, with as many as fifteen people receiving the ordinance in a single day, sometimes with several hundred onlookers. According to Nicoll, the individuals being baptised represented diverse social ranks and, unlike Lamont's report of English soldiers being baptised, in Leith it appears many were Scots of both sexes and various social ranks.[38] The only individual immersed in the Water of Leith known by name is Lady Craigie-Wallace, described by Lamont as a Scotswoman from the west of Scotland.[39] She probably came from Ayr as Craigie-Wallace Castle is described

---

[33] Lamont, 48. Row and Menzies may have stopped baptising infants for a short period of time but this was based on Independent principles and the fitness of the child's parents rather than Baptist principles. See Ch. 4.
[34] Row, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, 539.
[35] *S & C*, 53; Lamont, 58-9; *A Perfect Diurnall of some Passages and Proceedings* (October 18-25, 1652), 2253; *A Perfect Account* 95 (Oct. 20-27, 1652), 754. [E678(25)]; *Perfect Passages* 71 (Oct. 20-27, 1652), 552. [E799(23)].
[36] Lamont, 49.
[37] Ibid, 54.
[38] Nicoll, 106.
[39] Lamont, 54.

in Blau's 1654 atlas as lying between Newton-on-Ayr and the bridge into the town.[40] Although reports of baptisms from other parts of the country are lacking it is not improbable that around the many garrisons spread throughout the country similar incidents could have taken place, especially around the large citadels of Perth, Ayr and Inverness. At least one baptism occurred in Aberdeen, where a significant Baptist presence was firmly rooted.[41] Others may have occurred in Dundee where Row's rebuttal to rumours of his wife's baptism 'above Dundie' might suggest baptisms took place in Dighty Water.[42] It is far from beyond the realm of possibility that individuals were submerged in the Tay, the Dee or the Don, the River Ness or maybe, in Lady Craigie's Well in Ayr. In the case of Ayr there is supplemental evidence to support Baptist activity in the area in 1653. An incident in the Kirk Session records one parishioner libelling another as one infected with the 'errours of antitrinitarianism and...rebaptising' and further claiming 'he had left the towne to be rebaptised and diped in the Ladie Craigies Well'. In this instance the accused was vindicated through the Kirk Session's inquiry and it was the libeller who was 'processed'.[43] Yet the account might suggest that the well may have been recognised as a centre of Baptist activity. Certainly by 1653 the growth of the Baptists in Scotland was a source of concern and rumours and accusations were rife. Looking back on 1653 Nicoll declared: 'this yeir Anabaptistes daylie increst in this natioun, quhair nevir nane wes befoir, at leist durst not avow themeselffis: bot now many maid oppin professioun thairof, and avowit the same'.[44] According to another credible source, the growth of the sect in

---

[40] Joan Blaeu, *Atlas novus* (Amsterdam, 1654), v:54. It is not the present Craigie House as this was built in the eighteenth-century, but the estate is on the correct side of the river.

[41] John Row, 'Diary' *Scottish Notes and Queries* 7 (1894), 70. For evidence of the Baptist presence in Aberdeen, see: Burnet, *History of his own time*, 38; *RHCA*, 309-10. According to Robert Pitilloch the Kirk minister at Durris, William Youngstone, became a Baptist and was replaced by a new minister of the local laird's choosing (R. Pittiloh, *The Hammer of Persecution* (London: L. Chapman, 1659), 10).

[42] Row, *History of the Kirk*, 539.

[43] Ayrshire Archives, CH2/751/3/2, f. 290.

[44] Nicoll, 106.

Scotland so heightened fears among the Protesters that they produced a paper in March 1653 denouncing the 'new Scots Dippers'.[45]

The hastening success of the Baptist in the country during 1653 was by no means coincidental. From December 1652 until April 1654 Col. Robert Lilburne, brother of the politically volatile John Lilburne, served as Commander-in-Chief of the forces in Scotland. He was an ardent Baptist and did all he could to promote their cause in Scotland.[46] While officially he followed the Commonwealth's policy of promoting religious toleration and the gathering of independent congregations, for which reason he favoured the Protesters over the Resolutioners (believing they were likely to become Independents) and desired to distribute the sermons of John Owen, he also actively sought to bolster the Baptist presence in Scotland.[47] In the spring of 1653 a Baptist minister recently ordained in Hexham arrived in Dalkeith. His name was Edmund Hickeringill (or Hickhorngill) and he had been sent by the Baptist congregation in Hexham to take up a chaplaincy in Scotland. Soon after his arrival a former Baptist chaplain turned officer convinced Hickeringill of the limitations put upon one's ministry through chaplaincy and persuaded Hickeringill that taking up a secular military commission would provide him with greater freedom for evangelistic outreach.[48] The suggestion that taking a military commission as opposed to a chaplaincy because it might provide greater opportunity for missionary work is a telling claim that demonstrates the wide-ranging freedom English soldiers had to promote their own religious views within the bounds of their military duties.

Hickeringill was swayed by the argument, but Lilburne, who hosted the English Baptist in his own quarters (Dalkeith Palace) appointed him as a chaplain to his personal regiment before he could make his feelings known.[49] The appointment lasted only a short time, but while serving as

---

[45] Whitelocke, iii:481. No such tract has survived.
[46] F.P.G. Guizot, *Memoirs of George Monk* (trans.) J.S. Wortley (London,1838), 76; Douglas, *History of the Baptist Churches*, 39; Scott (1926), 26; Scott (1929), 175.
[47] For Lilburne's favour towards the Protesters see: Dow, 101. For request for Owen's sermons see Ch. 2.
[48] Underhill, *Records*, 307-8, 311-13, 317-18.
[49] Ibid, 311.

chaplain to his regiment Lilburne gave him freedom to be involved in the Baptist church that met alternately in Edinburgh and Leith. The members of that congregation, including Major Abraham Holmes (later implicated in Overton's plot) and more significantly the Fifth Monarchist Major-General Thomas Harrison, were eager for the newly arrived English Baptist to join their congregation.[50] However, Hickeringill's work as a chaplain was short lived. Fulfilling a promise made to Hickeringill to give him the first open commission that might come available, Lilburne made him a lieutenant in Colonel Daniel's regiment in Perth. Clearly Lilburne felt keeping a Baptist in his army as a soldier, although not as desirous as filling the vacancy of a chaplain in his regiment, was better than letting him return to England.[51]

Links between Hexham and the Baptists in Scotland, particularly Lilburne, were very good. The few letters that survive in the Hexham records from between March and September 1653 record at least two members of the Hexham congregation joining the Edinburgh/Leith church.[52] Besides lay connections, the church in Hexham also strove to provide ministers to serve amongst their brethren in Scotland whose congregations they termed 'sister churches'. Although the first emissary sent to be a chaplain proved to be a failure, Lilburne continued to enlist the help of the Hexham congregation in providing Baptists for service in Scotland. Shortly before his commission in Colonel Daniel's regiment, Hickeringill wrote to relay a message from Lilburne to the church in Hexham:

> I am desired by Col. Lilburne,' he explains, 'to propose to you, that bro. Tillam, Bro. Anderton, Bro. Stackhouse, or any other fitly qualified brother amongst you, will bestow his talents in the condition of a chaplain to a regiment, about which

---

[50] Ibid, 313 and n.

[51] Hickeringill had chequered career and later gave up on the Baptists altogether. After a brief stint as a Quaker the Baptist church at Leith excommunicated him. He later became a Deist. In 1654 he served as governor of 'Macklove Castle' and in the years following left Britain and in the course of his life visited Jamaica, Surinam, Barbados and other places in the West Indies (A. B., *Reflections on a Late Libel, Intitled Observations On a Late Famous Sermon, Intitled Curse ye Meroz: With a full and true Narrative of Mr. Hickeringill's Life.* (London: Printed for John Williams, 1680), 12). I have been unable to ascertain the precise location of Macklove Castle, but by his own description it was situated 'on the skirt of the Highlands' (*RHCA*, 492). Perhaps this refers to Meikleour, four miles SW of Blairgowrie.

[52] Charles Bond is mentioned in a letter dated June 22 and Hugh Hesloppe in August (Underhill, *Records*, 328, 332).

> place there are divers honest Scotch people that long to be gathered into the same gospel order with us, but they want a faithful pastor.[53]

The letter is important for two reasons. Firstly, it demonstrates Lilburne's personal desire for the promotion of the Baptist movement in Scotland; secondly, it expresses his conviction that there were Scots beyond Edinburgh and Leith wanting to join Baptist churches.

Hexham responded by sending Thomas Stackhouse. His initial visit was as a messenger, but he soon accepted an invitation from Lilburne to serve as minister to the Edinburgh/Leith congregation and returned to Scotland. It is an impressive feat that the church at Hexham, only established in mid-1652, sent two men as Baptist ministers within a year of their formation.[54] Hickeringill and Stackhouse are both examples of the missionary fervour of the English Baptists. They were baptised together on August 25, 1652 and in less than a year both had travelled to Scotland to spread Baptist doctrines.[55] This may not have been the only congregation with whom Lilburne had correspondence as it is only through the fortuitous preservation of these letters by the church at Hexham that we know of this important relationship. His personal interest in the promotion of the Baptist movement explains why no similar letters exist in his official letter book preserved in the Clarke manuscripts.[56] There may also be some reason to believe that the churches in Scotland were involved with Baptist Association meetings which took place in England, as a member of the church at Leith travelled to Fenstanton in Oxfordshire very near to the time of a meeting of the Abingdon Association in 1656.[57]

Another English Baptist who made inroads with the Scots was Captain John Gardiner. Gardiner had himself served as a chaplain for at least two years in Scotland before giving up the post in preference to a commission as a captain. He convinced Hickeringill not to accept a

---

[53] Underhill, *Records*, 319.
[54] Ibid, 389.
[55] Ibid, *Records*, 290.
[56] Clarke MSS, 3/1.
[57] Underhill, *Records*, 180-1; B.R. White, 'Organisation of the Particular Baptists, 1644-1660,' *JEH* 17 (1966), 218.

chaplaincy. Like the Independent Lockyer, Gardiner actively promoted his own particular sect, serving as an avid missionary of Baptist doctrines throughout his stay in Scotland. According to Baillie, Gardiner was actively 're-baptising' in the spring of 1652. From the tenor of the letter it may have been in Fife, although soon thereafter Gardiner garrisoned Dunottar Castle which the English captured in May.[58] Gardiner also baptised Margaret Anderson, wife of the Aberdeen bailie John Scot, presumably in Aberdeen.[59]

A fourth prominent Baptist working in Scotland was James Brown whose career as a chaplain has already been discussed, but it is important to keep in mind his active ministry from late in the summer of 1652 through 1654.[60] During this time he served at Cupar, Stirling and Burntisland, where he baptised soldiers (and certainly anyone else he could proselytise) and disputed with the local clergy, declaring against double predestination and the magistrate's right to interfere in religious matters. The Baptist church with which he was involved in Cupar in 1652-3 continued to meet in the years after he left. According to a report from the Fife minister William Row dated July 30, 1656, some Scots had 'laitlie' been re-baptised in Cupar.[61] Four Scotswomen who joined the Baptists in Fife can be listed by name: Elspet, Isobel and Christian Miller, and Isobel Webster.[62] All four women faced the censures of the Kirk, but only Christian's excommunication is recorded in the Presbytery records in July 1658.[63] As late as February 1659 the Synod of Fife still endeavoured to reprimand Isobel Webster and her husband William Thomson, an Englishman, who had been wed by Brown in 1653. Both Webster and Thomson were eventually persuaded under increasing pressure from the local

---

[58] *L & J*, iii:177; Laurence, 128. Hoy suggests that the letter seems to imply that Gardiner was in or near St Andrews, (Hoy, 185n).
[59] John Row, 'Diary,' *Scottish Notes and Queries* (Aberdeen) 7(1894), 70. For Lockyer, see Ch. 4 above.
[60] See Ch. 2 above.
[61] Kinloch, *St Andrews & Cupar*, 71.
[62] Hannen, 45-9; Baxter, *Synod of Fife*, 176, 180; Kinloch, *St Andrews & Cupar*,, 71, 178-82.
[63] Kinloch, *St Andrews & Cupar*, 182.

community to repent of their 'errore and defection to Anabaptisme' and forced to bring their four-year-old child to be baptised in the parish Kirk.[64]

Other prominent Baptists in Scotland included the Particular Baptist Major Abraham Holmes and, much more importantly, Major-General Thomas Harrison who were both involved with the congregation in Leith. What is important to note about these central characters is that they were all part of the military structure. There certainly were Scots who joined the Baptists, like Lady Craigie-Wallace, Margaret Anderson, Isobel Webster and the Miller sisters. However, during the Interregnum the infrastructure of Baptist churches in Scotland consisted of English soldiers; the leading members were English officers and troops, and the ministers were predominantly military chaplains. As in Ireland, the relationship between the Baptists and the Army must be viewed as a significant reason for early success.[65] In contrast to the Scottish Independency that developed in Aberdeen, Baptist churches in Scotland were at best English-dominated congregations containing some Scots converts. Besides reports that Charteris and Cornwell may have adopted some 'Anabaptist' practises there is no evidence to suggest that any Baptist churches were gathered under Scots ministers. In fact, the dominance of the English in leadership of Baptist churches is suggested in the re-publication of William Kiffin's confession by the Edinburgh/Leith congregation.[66] A short letter describing the congregation's intentions in reproducing the Confession of Faith prefaced the work, printed in March 1653. Most telling in the brief introduction, which explains that the church met alternately between Edinburgh and Leith, is that at least two of the four signatories were English soldiers.[67] The reliance of this sect on the English military establishment for support ensured that in the early years of the Interregnum the Kirk could do little to oppose them and so they made early gains. However, in

---

[64] Ibid, 183.
[65] Crawford Gribben, 'Defining the Puritans? The Baptism Debate in Cromwellian Ireland, 1654-56,' *Church History* 73 (March 2004), 88.
[66] *A Confession of Faith, of Severall Congregations or Churches of Christ in London, Which are Commonly (Though Unjustly) Called Anabaptists.* fourth impression, corrected (Leith,1653).
[67] Thomas Spencer, Abraham Holmes, Thomas Powell and John Brady. Spencer was a captain and Holmes was a Major.

time this English infrastructure left them vulnerable as the Protector's attitude towards the Baptists began to change.

Oliver Cromwell became Protector of the Commonwealth on December 16, 1653. Many Baptists, Fifth Monarchist and others were outraged by his assumption of the title of Lord Protector. One Edinburgh diarist singled out the 'Anabaptists' as the most outspoken in their dissent.[68] Yet this criticism did not come out of the blue. In the months leading up to the inauguration of the Protectorate various sources recorded the growing dissension, particularly among Baptists, which increased dramatically with the dissolution of the radically laden Nominated Assembly on December 12.[69] Thurloe reported at the beginning of the month: 'it is beleived, wee shall have very much troble from the Anabaptists'.[70] Baptists began to be viewed as inherently linked with Fifth Monarchists and as a result many within Cromwell's government believed the Baptists would never be satisfied with a civilian government. And indeed it was Baptists with radical ecclesiological and eschatological leanings that brought governmental and military pressure on the sect. Despite James Fraser's lament over the variety of sects 'tollerated or winked at' by the English government tensions began to build between those who desired further radical changes and the moderate Independents in power within Cromwell's regime.[71]

Apprehensions began to surface in the latter part of 1652, a full year before Cromwell became Protector. In October 1652, John Owen preached against the radical sects in front of Parliament. He distanced the Independents from any sects that tended towards agitation or civil unrest, denouncing such views as intolerable.[72] 'There is nothing more opposite to the spirit of the Gospell,' spoke Owen, 'then to suppose that Jesus Christ will take to himselfe a kingdome

---

[68] NLS. Wod.Qu.XXXVII, f. 35-6.
[69] Thurloe, i:396, 621, 632, 639.
[70] Ibid, i:621.
[71] Fraser, *Chronicles*, 405.
[72] Tai Liu, *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), 73-4, 119.

by the carnall sword and bow of the sonnes of men.'[73] In the months following the inception of the Protectorate discontent towards the government among religiously radical groups continued to swell, rumours of plots against the Protector increased and the regime kept a watchful eye on those groups with a high proportion of dissenters.[74] All of which continued to alienate the more radical sects from the moderate Independents who dominated the government. Some Baptists perceived the growing distrust the Protector held for their sect and attempted to sweeten his disposition towards them, while others continued to smoulder with discontent.[75] In Scotland, where things were already volatile in the wake of Glencairn's Rising, dissidents were watched especially closely. Radical opposition to the Protectorate could not be tolerated within the army since military unrest threatened the stability of English rule in Scotland, and as a result, the safety of England itself.

Throughout 1653 the security of Scotland escalated as an issue for concern. Lilburne did his best to contain the Royalist rising led by the Earl of Glencairn, but proved progressively less successful.[76] He attributed the mounting air of rebellion to the clergy of the Kirk, a lack of law and order in the Highlands, and a persistent fear of Charles II invading Scotland with an army of foreign mercenaries.[77] The proportionately high ratio of the Baptist sect among the soldiers in Scotland, a group in which some members openly opposed the Protectorate and whose growth had been actively facilitated by the efforts of the Commander-in-Chief of the forces there, served to heighten fears in London that a discontented army in Scotland might represent a serious threat to the Commonwealth. Hence a change of leadership was imminent. For several months the Commonwealth's intention had been to send General Monck to Scotland to take over as Commander-in-Chief of the forces. However, the war with the Dutch lingered on

---

[73] John Owen, *A Sermon Preached to the Parliament...October 13, 1652.* (London, 1652), 19; Liu, *Discord in Zion*, 74.
[74] Row, *Life of Blair*, 313.
[75] Evans, *The Early English Baptists*, ii:200-2; Thurloe, ii:150-1.
[76] Dow, 79-98.
[77] Ibid, 105, 114.

and prevented Monck from reaching Dalkeith until April 22, 1654.[78] Not only did the arrival of Monck signal the end of preferential treatment for the Baptists within the army in Scotland, but weary of all radicalism he watched the Baptists with great care. In fact, it has been suggested Monck's original appointment as Commander-in-Chief of the forces in Scotland when Cromwell marched south after the Scots in 1651 owed to his conservatism.[79] Certainly, when he returned in 1654 many of his contemporaries believed he 'went to Scotland to keep the Anabaptist party quiet'.[80]

During 1654 distrust of Baptists steadily increased throughout the three nations. Early in the year Thurloe received reports of Baptist discontent in Wales.[81] Several reports also came from Ireland in March and April illustrating a general sense of unrest and identifying the Baptists as the root of the problem.[82] By October it was widely believed the Baptists were on the brink of an armed revolt.[83] In April unfolding events in Scotland gave Cromwell and Monck reason to fear a similar threat existed in Scotland. In April 1654, Colonel Matthew Alured, who had been garrisoned in the citadel at Ayr (a Baptist hotbed) and served the previous year as commander of all the forces of the west of Scotland, was sent to Ireland to recruit troops to garrison the citadel at Inverlochy. Within weeks of his arrival in Ireland Alured became implicated in subversive activities.[84] Cromwell wrote to General Fleetwood on May 16, explaining 'I am sufficiently satisfied of the evill intentions of colonel Alured...tendinge to the makeinge up a just suspicion...I doe thinke fit to revoake colonel Alured from that ymployment.'[85] Relieved of command, Alured was ordered to report to the Protector and Fleetwood sent two trusted

---

[78] Ibid, 115.
[79] Douglas, *History of the Baptist Churches in the North*, 39.
[80] Thurloe, ii:414.
[81] Ibid, ii:64, 93.
[82] Ibid, ii:149, 163, 213, 216.
[83] Ibid, ii:641.
[84] *RHCA*, 285, 464, 550.
[85] Thurloe, ii:285.

officers, Lieutenant-Colonel Finch and Major Reade, to accompany Alured's recruits to Scotland in order to keep an eye on them and also 'to discover what is working in Scotland'.[86]

When Alured arrived in London he met with some disaffected Baptists and Levellers in and around the capital, which did little to put Cromwell's mind at ease.[87] In September he signed a petition along with Colonel John Okey and Colonel Thomas Saunders, both of whom had served with him in Scotland, against Cromwell's usurpation of power, rule without an elected Parliament, and control of a standing army; declaring all these things to be against 'those Fundamental Rights and Freedomes of the Commonwealth, that were the first Subject of this great Contest'.[88] However, before the petition could be distributed troops raided Alured's residence and confiscated the document. Alured was arrested, cashiered and imprisoned. Okey and Saunders avoided incarceration, but lost their commands, while the Leveller John Wildman, who has been identified as the actual author of the work, published it under the title *The Humble Petition of Several Colonels of the Army.*[89] Distributed with another seditious tract entitled *Some Mementois for the Officers*, several copies of the petition were confiscated on their way to Scotland, while some copies were found in circulation in Scotland.[90] This series of events did more than just cast a shadow over Alured and those individuals associated with him in London, they also heightened suspicions of Baptists in Scotland, particularly soldiers in Ayr where he had been garrisoned since March 1652. The regime believed they posed a real threat to the Protector and the established government of England.

In the meantime Cromwell's regime attempted to satisfy religious radicals venting displeasure towards the Protectorate. Cromwell courted the various religious groups, meeting with them to discuss the settlement of religious toleration. In mid-December it became clear religious

---

[86] Ibid, ii:295.
[87] Ibid, ii:313.
[88] Matthew Alured, *The Case of Colonel Matthew Alured.* (London, 1659), 9-15.
[89] Barbara Taft, 'The Humble Petition of Several Colonels of the Army: Causes, Character, and Results of Military Opposition to Cromwell's Protectorate,' *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 42 (1978-9), 15-41; Gardiner, *C & P*, iii:211; Liu, *Discord in Zion*, 138-9.

toleration would continue for all Protestants who lived peaceably, steered clear of gross heresy and refrained from disrupting the public peace.[91] This reassertion that a broad religious toleration would continue did little to quell Cromwell's detractors, because many of them were millenarians who desired a particular ideal of godly government they believed to be unattainable under the Protector.[92] In December the Scot Robert Blair noted that Anabaptists openly showed contempt towards the Protector and it became a generally acknowledged fact that a strand within the Baptist and the Fifth Monarchy movement viewed Cromwell as the prime obstruction to their goal: the physical implementation of Christ's Kingdom on earth.[93]

About a month after the arrest of Alured and his accomplices in London a new plot slowly came to light in Scotland.[94] The intrigue, which took several months to unravel, was divulged through the discovery of a letter distributed to various regiments throughout Scotland. On December 18, 1654 a group of Baptists with Fifth Monarchy leanings met in a private home in Aberdeen and produced the document. The letter alleged the 'many vowes, declarations and solemne appeals to the most high, and...the price of all that blood, and treasure' expended during the Civil Wars risked being profaned by the establishment of the Protector. Therefore, all those who had shed blood or made promises to God in order to establish a godly Commonwealth were in great danger of divine wrath if they idly stood by and accepted the change of government.[95] According to Daniel Davis, one of the messengers instructed to deliver the letters, copies were intended for Major Henry Dorney (deemed by Baillie to be a 'sectarian preacher' possibly in Glasgow)[96], Captain Thomas Spilman (who may have been in Perth, but in that month was sent to England), Captain Earley in Stirling and Ensign Snow in

---

[90] Nicoll, 145. A manuscript copy of *Some mementois for the officers and and shouldiers of the Army* has been preserved in the Wodrow Collection: NLS, Wod.Qu.XXIX(56).
[91] Clarke MSS, 1/13: f. 120; 1/14: f. 170.
[92] Liu, *Discord in Zion*, 118-43.
[93] Row, *Life of Blair*, 319.
[94] For a summary of 'Overton's Plot' see: Gardiner, *C & P*, 227-32. Hoy incorrectly states that the plot was uncovered in January 1656 (Hoy, 197).
[95] Clarke MSS, 1/15: f. 26; Thurloe, iii:29-30.
[96] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:361.

Glasgow.[97] Davis's letters, however, were never delivered. He heard news that a second messenger (John Greene) similarly instructed to deliver letters had been apprehended and imprisoned for distributing seditious papers. Fearing a similar fate Davis burned the copies entrusted to him.[98]

The letter itself was not overtly seditious, that is to say it did not openly advocate mutiny or incitement to rebellion. Instead it laid out the rationale that supporting the Protectorate without voicing concerns over the justice of such an extreme change of government devoid of the people's consent was immoral. In view of the imminent danger brought about by the abandonment of 'the good old cause' the authors invited representatives from the various regiments in Scotland to meet and discuss the matter at the Green Dragon Pub in the Canongate of Edinburgh on January 1, 1655. Despite the generally moderate tone of the letter, two aspects of it prompted further investigation by Monck and Timothy Wilkes, the deputy governor of Leith. First, the letter questioned the authority of the Protector and advocated meeting secretly to discuss an active response. Second, the distribution of the letter to individuals throughout the country suggested a network of discontent. In less than a week a number of arrests were made and details of a wider plot began to be revealed.[99] Through subsequent investigation it became apparent the primary participants in the production and distribution of the letter held similar Baptist sentiments and also that there were a number of other seditious works in circulation.

Much of the blame was laid on Major-General Robert Overton who, despite having no part in the production of any of the subversive documents, clearly had knowledge of the meeting in Aberdeen and the ensuing distribution of the letter. As a result the event came to be known as 'Overton's Plot'. His failure to report the details of such a questionable and potentially seditious meeting made him a prime accomplice in Monck's eyes. As a result Timothy Wilkes, who

---

[97] *RHCA*, 258, 260, 438, 440.
[98] Thurloe, iii:206.
[99] Ibid, iii:45.

oversaw the early stages of the inquiry, ordered Overton's papers to be searched. In his personal case some lines of anti-Cromwellian verse were discovered written in Overton's own hand[100] Overton was arrested and sent to London to be tried. Cromwell perceived Overton's involvement as particularly seditious because he had personally promised the Protector, before returning from Hull to his commission in Scotland in 1654, to refrain from anything resembling insubordination and vowed to quit his commission if he felt disaffected towards the government for any reason.[101] In 1659, when questioned about Overton's imprisonment for over four years without charges ever being filed against him, Judge Advocate Henry Whalley, who had carried out the ensuing investigation in Dalkeith, testified before Parliament he had found a second letter among Overton's papers. 'I found one letter sealed with silk and silver ribbon,' explained Whalley. 'It had no hand to it. The contents were that there was an intent to murder the Protector and Lord Lambert and six others. I was sorry to find it'.[102] So some officers possessed knowledge of a desire within the army to kill the Protector and yet failed to report it to Monck. While Overton may not have hatched a plot, he at least harboured knowledge of it, for which he paid a great price. Moreover, his high profile as a Major-General, his connection to the plot and the belief among his contemporaries that he was an 'Anabaptist' all placed added pressure on the Baptists in Scotland.[103]

In the course of the investigation several other Baptists were implicated. The inquisitors identified Captain John Hedworth as the author of the letter. Several other officers had signed the work including the Baptist chaplain Samuel Oates.[104] Major John Bramston, a known Baptist, was found to have been integrally involved in the ideological formulation of the plot,

---

[100] The questionable piece of poetry is preserved in Thurloe (iii:75-6). The poem was later attributed to John Cleveland and has been published among his works. Thus, Overton was not the original author of the piece, but simply made a copy for himself (*RHCA*, 393).
[101] Gardiner, *C & P*, 227-8.
[102] W.H. Dawson, *Cromwell's Understudy: The Life and Times of General John Lambert and the Rise and Fall of the Protectorate.* (London: William Hodge and Co., Ltd., 1938), 309.
[103] Thurloe, ii:19.
[104] Signatories: Capt. Henry Hedworth, Lieutenant John Braman, coronet John Toomes, John Loveland, quarter master William Barford, quarter-master John Gregory, quarter-master John Waltridge, Mr. Samuel Oates and Lieutenant Rawson (Thurloe, iii:206; Clarke MSS, 1/15: f. 26, 40).

and seems to have actually had more of a hand in the seditious nature of the meeting in Aberdeen than did Overton. Bramston testified he had no desire to attend the proposed meeting in Edinburgh, but that Overton had urged him to do so. If this was true, it could only have been because Bramston did not deem the Edinburgh meeting sufficiently radical for himself, as he aggressively opposed the Protector. Bramston also confessed to authoring a second letter referred to as 'An Epistle to the Churche atte the Glassehouse' as well as a tract entitled 'Reasons why those who did signe ye late addresse to the Lord Protector are not to bee communicated within the ordinances of God'. Additionally, he admitted to possessing a tract against fellowship with Baptists who accepted the Protectorate, produced by the English Particular Baptist Paul Hobson.[105] Any reference to Bramston's second letter must be conjecture as no copy survives, however the short title given indicates the London Baptist meeting in the Glazier's Hall in Broad Street, known as the 'Glasshouse Church', were the intended recipients of the letter.[106] These may have been among the papers Monck reported being printed in Scotland at the end of 1654.[107] This wide array of Baptists papers in circulation in Scotland, coupled with the discovery of suspect letters intended for Baptists gatherings in England gave authorities further reason to fear a wider Baptist conspiracy. Soon thereafter several English Baptists and Fifth Monarchists were rounded up in England and Ireland, including Major General Thomas Harrison and John Wildman, for suspected involvement in a series of 'Anabaptist plots' aimed at overthrowing the Protector.[108] In Scotland, John Nicoll explained the events as part of a wider plot carried out by 'Anabaptists' who intended to undermine the 'Protestant churches' in Scotland, England and Ireland.[109] As a result, according to both Lamont and Blair, a host of senior officers of Baptist persuasion were arrested and subsequently cashiered from the army in the Scotland.[110] Not all those implicated received punishment. Major Abraham Holmes of Monck's regiment, for instance, retained his

---

[105] Clarke MSS, 1/15: f. 41; *S & P*, 192.
[106] White, 'The Organisation of the Particular Baptists,' 209-10, 213.
[107] Thurloe, iii:45.
[108] Gardiner, *C & P*, iii:267-9; Fraser, *Chronicles*, 409.
[109] Nicoll, 144.

commission probably because he forwarded the copy of the letter he received on to Monck.[111] Yet, the events were generally portrayed as a campaign of persecution against the Baptists. One of the signatories of the original letter, John Braman, declared what occurred to be a persecution of those 'seeking the perfection of Liberty' who were cast out of the army and 'brow beat[en]' in a manner 'inconsistent with Christianity'.[112]

The widely held belief regarding the plot was that three thousand troops, under the command of Overton, intended to seize Monck and remove him from his commission in Scotland. These soldiers would then march into England and rendezvous with several thousand more troops raised by Haselrig who would be waiting for them in Newcastle. From there the army would march south against Cromwell.[113] The investigation in Scotland continued into March under Judge Advocate Whalley who repaired to Dalkeith to take charge of the inquiry. He made no link between the meeting at Aberdeen and any particular larger plot, however Whalley concluded the letter produced in Aberdeen on December 18 tended 'to sedition, muteny, and devisions in the armey'.[114] For the Baptist movement in Scotland, being linked to a seditious plot proved to be a heavy blow which put them at odds with both the English government and the Scots.

The Baptists in Scotland replied in two ways. First, the Baptist congregations in Leith, Edinburgh and Perth (St. Johnston) produced and printed 'The Humble Address of the Baptized Churches, consisting of Officers, Soldiers and others walking together in Gospel Order' directed to the Protector in an attempt 'to cleare our innocency from those...aspersions we are Charged with...Wee [desire to be] noe more under suspition of guilt (in this matter) of

---

[110] Lamont, 88; Row, *Life of Blair*, 319; Yullie, 31.
[111] Thurloe, iii:46.
[112] J[ohn] B[raman], *Calumny condemned: or, a true, exact, and sober account of the Scotch plot* (London, 1659), 4-6.
[113] Nicoll, 145; Thurloe, iii:185.
[114] Thurloe, iii:206

our Society'.[115] In doing this they admitted the bulk of the plotters were Baptists, but argued they were of a different disposition and disowned them: 'though our bretheren...[we]...beare our testimonies against such as great sinners and as Enemies to the publick peace and welfare of the Nation'.[116] In stark contrast, some of the Baptists who opposed the Protectorate took a second and quite a different view of events. Bramston's paper against communion with Baptists who supported the Protectorate stood in stark contrast to humble appeals claiming Baptist solidarity with the government. This paper of eighteen points transparently expressed his Fifth Monarchy tendencies and equated any degree of acceptance of Cromwell as Protector as a denial of the first principle—to have no other King but Jesus—and guilt for all the blood shed in the Civil Wars.[117] A growing chasm opened between moderate Baptists who embraced the Cromwellian ideal of mutual religious toleration and the more millennial Fifth Monarchist variety who were absorbed in what they perceived to be an eschatological struggle to establish God's Kingdom in the British Isles.

It was the latter type of Baptists the regime feared and who Monck cashiered from the army in the early months of 1655. However all Baptists were affected by the negative aspersions and rumours spreading about them. By February 22 all the signatories of the Aberdeen letter had been cashiered from the army.[118] Subsequently the government's policy towards the sect changed. Baptists in Scotland had not been under close observation like the meetings between Alured, Wildman and others in London. Whereas Alured's petition was seized before it had a chance to circulate, the Aberdeen letter circulated for almost a week before any arrests were made. Hereafter, however, Cromwell's spymasters carefully watched Baptists, and regular reports on their activities and disposition were made to the Protector.[119] Their meetings continued to gather, but support for their missionary endeavours in Scotland stopped. Samuel

---

[115] Clarke MSS, 1/15: f. 34; Evans, *The Early English Baptists*, ii:215-18; *A Perfect Diurnall* (February 5-12, 1655), 4143-4 [E479:22]; *Mercurius Politicus*, (February 1-8, 1655), 5101; *Several Proceedings*, (February 1-8, 1655), 4437; Hoy, 197.
[116] Clarke MSS, 1/15: f. 35.
[117] Clarke MSS, 3/2: f. 92
[118] Clarke MSS, 1/15: f. 49.

Oates would prove to be the last Baptist chaplain employed in Scotland.[120] Although the government sent other chaplains to serve both regiments and civilians in Scotland, they were of the Independent variety. No one affiliated with potentially radical or seditious sects gained employment in Scotland. As a result, the relationship between the Baptists and the army became increasingly strained. In Ireland Henry Cromwell's chaplains actively preached against the Baptists in 1655.[121] While Baptist congregations in Scotland continued to meet, they became increasingly insular. They maintained contact with their Baptist brethren in England but the lack of representation among the military hierarchy in Scotland, coupled with the moderate nature of Monck and his officers, meant their days of actively proselytising Scots were over. Scotland's Baptist communities continued to be involved in the wider Baptist network. A second edition of Daniel King's *A Way to Sion Sought* printed in Edinburgh in 1656, showed their awareness of the current issues being disputed in Baptists circles stretching throughout Britain and Ireland. This edition included a postscript dedicated to the raging debate among Baptists as to whether the laying on of hands should be required for admittance of new members. The postscript appears nowhere else other than in this Edinburgh edition. While this shows their continuing involvement in the larger Baptist network and desire take to an active part in the contemporary issues being disputed among their brethren, their expansion and influence within the government of Scotland had greatly diminished. Several of the most influential officers of their persuasion were gone and the officers that remained were overtly suspicious of those Baptists remaining among their ranks. They were forced to do their best to keep a low profile and to avoid drawing any more attention on themselves than necessary.

The implication of Baptist involvement in Overton's Plot also had a detrimental effect on their relationship with the Scottish population. Their Presbyterian opponents took full advantage of the apparently sinister affiliation between Baptists and failed plots against the Protector, spinning out their own versions of what had transpired. Rumours of the nefarious nature of the

---

[119] Thurloe, vii:335-6, 371, 554, 627.
[120] Laurence, 70, 72, 74.

plot grew increasingly extreme. One report from Edinburgh alleged the 'Anabaptist' plan entailed an armed band of the sect meeting at Newhaven and then entering Edinburgh on horseback over the frozen Nor Loch that skirted the northern side of the castle rock. Once inside the city the miscreants intended, in the manner of the Anabaptists at Munster over a century earlier, to massacre all the inhabitants of Edinburgh before burning it to the ground.[122] Despite there being no truth in these rumours, they did little to settle the nerves of the Scottish populace. For those who already had distrustful inclinations towards Baptists, the revelation that the government in England could not trust them only served to exacerbate fears among Scots. Rumours of the 'bloody' nature of the plot even circulated among English soldiers.[123] As a result, the involvement of Scots civilians with the Leith congregation dwindled. A letter sent to some Baptist brethren back in England in November 1655 noted the decline of civilian membership and relayed that the congregation comprised mostly soldiers.[124] By 1657 Blair recorded that Baptist were more feared in Scotland than was Cromwell.[125] Their association with the plot in late 1654 set them on a downward trajectory in Scotland.

Quakers and the Scottish Populace

'Overton's Plot' rekindled awareness of the radical nature of English religion among the Scots in the spring of 1655, which in turn accentuated the significant growth the Quakers had experienced over the previous twelve months. According to Nicoll, the Quakers attracted both English and Scots, men and women, drawing 'many' away from the Kirk. Moreover, they interrupted sermons in several of the capital's churches.[126] Nicoll was not alone in making note of the swelling air of religious radicalism in Scotland in 1655. 'The swarming of errours,' wrote

---

[121] *Clarke Papers*, iii:52.
[122] 'Collections by a private hand being kingly of matters from 1650-1662,' NLS, Wod.Qu.XXXVII, ff 21-39, f. 37.
[123] J.Y. Akerman (ed.), *Letters from Roundhead officers written from Scotland and chiefly addressed to Captain Adam Baynes* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1856), 114.
[124] Underhill, *Records*, 164.
[125] Row, *Life of Blair*, 333.
[126] Nicoll, 147.

Brodie in August, were 'mor then at ani tym'.[127] Although present in Scotland during the early years of the Interregnum, prior to their growth spurt in 1654 the Quakers had been relatively quiet in Scotland. In stark contrast to the military-based Baptists, the Quaker movement was predominantly civilian based. Their meetings had been quiet in nature and less embroiled in politics than either the Independents or the Baptists.

Consensus among historians has been that the first Scottish Quaker meetings formed in the west of Lanarkshire, near Glassford, in 1653 when John Hart of Glassford and Alexander Hamilton of Drumbowy, along with Hamilton's wife and sister, began to meet regularly.[128] Soon other meetings were formed at Garthshore and Bedcow (both very near Kirkintilloch/Lenzie). According to G.B. Burnet, author of the seminal work on Quaker history in Scotland, these meetings met for an entire year before any English Quakers knew of them or had contact with them.[129] However, while Scottish Friends may have developed in relative isolation from groups in England it is extremely unlikely they did so without any contact with English Friends. Although Norman Penney contends some 'serious-minded people in different parts [of Scotland] had arrived at the standpoint of Quakerism before any knowledge of Friends had reached them' he also contradicts Burnet's claims by explaining that at least one Quaker missionary, Christopher Fell, ventured into Scotland in 1653.[130]

Some answers as to how these Scots based meetings of Friends formed can be gleaned from closer analysis of some of the key figures involved in the west of Scotland, which are the best documented. Alexander Hamilton and his family are known to have been members of the gathered Church formed by Charteris at Kilbride. Their formation of a Quaker meeting did not sit well with Charteris, who threatened them with excommunication in 1656. Only two weeks before the deadline he set for the Hamiltons to denounce their error, Charteris met his fateful

---

[127] Brodie, 147.
[128] Burnet, 14; Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers*, 2 vols (London, 1753), ii:494. W.F. Miller puts the date as late as 1656 (W.F. Miller, 'Notes on the Early Records of Friends in the South of Scotland from 1656 to about 1790' *JFHS* 1 (1903), 70).
[129] Burnet, *Quakerism*, 14.

end. Thus Baillie and subsequent Presbyterian historians were not alone in viewing the demise of Charteris as an act of divine providence.[131] As members of a gathered congregation it is likely the Hamiltons had closer contact with the English soldiers stationed in that part of the country than did their fellow compatriots, since they had already embraced a religion that their Presbyterian neighbours would have deemed 'English'. Perhaps this is how they met Quaker soldiers and were convinced. Hamilton and his family certainly were not the only Scots to be drawn into Independency before moving to a more radical position.[132] Whether John Hart was involved with this congregation is uncertain, but Wariston claims a total of eleven members of Charteris' congregations became Quakers before his death in 1656.[133] Another possible means of turning these Scots to Quakerism, once again via the English army, may have been their shared vocation. Both Hart and Hamilton were agricultural workers, as was another early member of their meeting named Hew Wood. It may have been through their provision of supplies to one of the English garrisons situated in close proximity at perhaps, Strathaven (Avondale Castle), Hamilton, Douglas or Kilmarnock that they were exposed to Quakerism.[134] Due to the migrations of regiments and the fact they were divided into quite small groups to serve multiple garrisons at a time, it is impossible to compile a list of soldiers stationed at a particular garrison at any given time. However, the arrival of the army early in the 1650s and their long-standing local presence in that part of Scotland makes them prime suspects for the introduction of Quakerism, as J. Torrance has argued.[135]

Despite the later universal acceptance that those convinced in 1653 were the first Scottish Quakers, the nearly contemporary Scots antiquarian Robert Mylne (c.1643-1747) claimed an earlier proselyte. Mylne, who correctly identified the 1654 tract *Love the Precious Ointment* as a Quaker rather than Roman Catholic document, also claimed that Thomas Wood, author of *A*

---

[130] Penney, *Fox*, 450 (291.4); 451 (292.3).
[131] Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings*, ii:494-5.
[132] See ch. 4.
[133] Wariston, iii:35; see p. 245, above.
[134] Hew Wood was a nursery seedsman in the vicinity of Hamilton and was also a gardener for the Duke of Hamilton (Torrance, 'Quaker Movement,' 34).

Dead-Man's Testament, was in fact a Quaker.[136] There is no other evidence either to support or challenge Mylne's claim Wood, who died in 1651, was a Quaker.[137] Nor is there any evidence of any other Quakers in the east of Scotland until two years later. However, the presence of English soldiers in Leith from September 1650 provided ample opportunity for the convincement of local people. Even if Wood had been dead for two months when his tract was published, that would have meant he lived for a full year in the English-occupied town of Leith. The great difficulty is determining the influence of Quakers in the army when it arrived in Scotland in late July 1650. The infamous James Nayler was in Scotland that year, but he was not actually convinced until the following year. Yet one witness to his preaching after the Battle of Dunbar reminisced of the power of his speech: 'I was struck with more terror by the preaching of James Nayler than I was at the Battle of Dunbar...I could not help staying a little though I was afraid to stay, for I was made a Quaker, being forced to tremble at the sight of myself'.[138] While Nayler was not yet convinced in 1650, he may have been, as Burnet suggests, 'a Quaker in all but name' while in Scotland.[139]

One important question is how early the word 'Quaker' can be used. The 'society of Friends' was initiated in 1647 with the gathering of Seekers by George Fox in north of England. The name 'Quaker' was famously and concretely pinned to the Friends in 1650. Now it might be argued that the movement did not really take root as a national movement until Fox established a base at Swarthmore Hall in the latter half of 1652. But for the purposes of this paper the impact of Quakerism was established in Scotland by the close of 1650, because that is when John Nicoll first took notice of the movement in the country.[140] Consequently, if Nicoll reports

---

[135] Torrance, 'The Quaker Movement in Scotland,' 35.
[136] NLS, 1.337. See p. 127, above.
[137] William Dundas make several references to Quakers that he met in Scotland, as well as biographical information about Wood, but he makes no claim that Wood was a Quaker (Dundas, *A Few Words of Truth* (1673)).
[138] James Gough, *Memoirs of the Life, Religious Experience, and Labours in the Gospel of James Gough.*, 3 vols (Lindfield,1832), III:51-2; Hoy, 180; M.R. Brailsford, *A Quaker from Cromwell's Army: James Nayler.* (London: Swarthmore Press, 1927), 32-3; Burnet, *Quakerism*, 16; Jaffray, 413.
[139] Burnet, *Quakerism*, 16.
[140] Nicoll, 39.

that there were indeed Quakers in Scotland in late 1650, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that Wood could indeed have been influenced by Friends within the army and this may have been his motivation for producing *A Dead-Man's Testament.* A second report, from November 1652, tends to suggest that the Quakers had a foothold in Scotland prior to the gatherings in 1653. The English journal *Faithful Scout* stated that some 'Shakers' were brought before the English judges because 'there actions are such as doth much trouble the godly people, not onely Presbyterians, but such as are for the Congregational way, they do loath and detest such blasphemous and vilde practices'.[141] Nothing could be proven against them in this trial and no other information about their identities is given. Whether these 'Shakers' were actually Quakers, since their title may not have yet been known in rural Scotland, is uncertain, but notice of such enthusiastic activity is important.

Besides the Friends' meetings formed among Scots in the west in 1653, another began the same year in the home of the Col. William Osborne, a Scot in Edinburgh. He was 'one of our first apostates to [the] English' in 1651, according to Robert Baillie. Later, he became an open leader of the Quakers in the streets of the capital.[142] From 1653 until he moved to the west in 1657, a Quaker meeting met in his Edinburgh home.[143] Another Scot named Richard Rae, an Edinburgh shoemaker, also preached Quakerism in his native land, while other Scottish meetings also formed in Lesmahagow, Douglas, Lenzie and Ford, all in the west.[144] Although Lanarkshire, the vicinity of Kirkintilloch and Edinburgh were hotspots these were not the only places where Scots were convinced. Alexander Brodie recorded in his journal that William Gordon, Laird of Lunan (Angus), was embroiled in Quaker doctrines by 1656. This report is intriguing, since Redcastle, a possible Cromwellian garrison in later half of the decade, is less

---

[141] *The Faithful Scout*, (No. 95. Nov. 5-13, 1652), 746 [E799(34)] and (No. 96. Nov. 12-19, 1652), 752 [E799(38)].
[142] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:323.
[143] Penney, *Fox*, i:451 (292-2); Torrance, 'The Quaker Movement in Scotland,' 32; Nickalls, *Fox*, 315n. Miller however, attributes the first meetings to 1656 (W.F. Miller, 'Notes on Edinburgh Meeting Houses,' *JFHS* 6(1909), 27). Burnet is noncommittal on the date (Burnet, *Quakerism*, 18).

than a kilometre from Lunan. Brodie also reports Christian Russell, a woman from Elgin, embraced Quaker doctrines in 1656.[145] Another Scot named Patrick Livingston became convinced while visiting England sometime in the 1650s and settled there for the rest of the Interregnum. When he returned to Scotland in the 1660s he found a Scots weaver near the border named James Halliday, who had 'been a long time convinced'.[146]

From 1654 the sect in Scotland experienced a significant boon with a flood of English Quaker missionaries. At least fifty travelled to Scotland between 1654 and 1657, twenty in 1655 alone.[147] These missionaries visited many places in Scotland including Orkney and Shetland. Two Quakers even reached Lochaber in December 1657.[148] They attempted to visit the garrison at Dunstaffnage Castle, but the bitter winter weather prevented it. Instead they stayed in the town of Lochaber (present day Fort William) for several days, proclaiming the truth to the residents of the town. The reporter of this visit, Captain Timothy Langley, was unsure if they ever entered the English garrison at Inverlochy, but claims in December 1657 new Quaker missionaries were sent into the region weekly.[149] Some finance for their endeavours came from the funds of Swarthmore. In 1654 James Graham in Edinburgh received ten shillings to purchase books. The following year Swarthmore allocated over £25 for various Friends travelling to Scotland, which is a great deal considering a Friend travelling to New England only received £2.[150] While reports of these missionaries have been made in several works, the most interesting and enigmatic is mentioned only in the memoirs of Francis Howgill. He reports

---

[144] J. Robertson (ed.), *Ecclesiastical Records. Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark, 1623-1709.* (Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1839), 101-2; Torrance, 'Quaker Movement,' 35, Weare, *Doctrines*, 48; Baillie, *L & J*, iii:357.
[145] Brodie, 178.
[146] 'The Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting att Urie,' *JFHS* 7(1910), 98. This may be the James Heliday jr. whose death on November 20, 1675 and burial in the Pleasance in Edinburgh is recorded in early Quaker records (A.S. Maxwell, (ed.) *Scottish Quaker records,Society of Friends. Register of Births, Proposal of Marriage, Marriages, and Deaths. 1647-1878* (Aberdeen, 1960),181).
[147] Burnet, *Quakerism*, 15; W.F. Miller, 'Stranger Friends Visiting Scotland, 1650-1797.' *JFHS* 12 (1915), 80; Hoy, 199. J. Torrance puts the number visiting in '55 at a minimum of seventeen (Torrance, 'The Quaker Movement in Scotland,' 32).
[148] Burnet, *Quakerism*, 26.
[149] Thurloe, vi:708.
[150] 'Financial Statements sent to Swarthmore, 1654 and 1655' *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 6 (1909), 50-1, 84-5, 127-8.

encountering a young Scots Quaker in Oxford sometime between 1654 and 1656 preparing for his return to Scotland to preach the truth.[151] The targets of these missionaries were English soldiers, their families and the Scots. They did not distinguish much between military or civilian, or even between Scots and English. Their goal was simply to preach the Gospel of the Inner Light. Monck wrote to John Thurloe in February 1658 of 'what labour and pains those Quakers take to get proselytes'.[152] Thus it became, or in the case of the Scots remained, a civilian movement with some military adherents. The one significant change which occurred through persistent English missions was the increasing radicalism of Quakers in Scotland.

While earlier meetings of Friends in the west, as well as in Col. Osborne's Edinburgh home, had met quietly, the new missionaries interrupted services of both the Kirk and the gathered churches. They preached in or outside parish churches, much to the dismay of the ministers, and took advantage of public gatherings such as markets, horse races and even executions as opportunities to spread the truth. There are very few reports of Scottish Quakers instigating public disturbances, especially before 1656. Even Quakers in the English regiments tended to keep quite a low profile until the arrival of missionaries. In Inverness for instance, it was not until the arrival of the often-troublesome nineteen year-old John Hall in 1657 that any of the Quakers there ventured to interrupt services in the 'steeplehouse', which happened to be a Baptist Church.[153]

This increase in both the number of Quakers and their radicalism did not go unnoticed. Within the year they were under threat of excommunication for their heretical ways. Interestingly, the first threat of excommunication of a Quaker in Scotland did not come from the Presbyterian Kirk, but rather from Thomas Charteris who had himself only recently been settled in the gathered church at East Kilbride—a fact that demonstrates the toleration advocated by the government was not embraced or interpreted uniformly by the various radical groups taking

---

[151] James Backhouse, *Memoirs of Francis Howgill, with Extracts from His Writings* (York: W. Alexander and Son, 1828), 50.
[152] Thurloe, vi:811.

root in Scotland. Quakers represented a very real threat not only to Presbyterian ministers, but also to Independent and Baptist gatherings. All these were fields ripe for the picking as far as Quakers were concerned. It was in fact the gathered churches in Aberdeen, represented by John Row, John Seaton and a student of the university named Alexander Gordon, who complained to the garrison commander that John Hall, an English Quaker missionary, interrupted Seaton's preaching in Old St. Machar's in March 1657. This incident is interesting, because it pitted not only English Quaker against Scots Independents, but also English Quaker against fellow Englishman. After ridiculing Seaton in the pulpit, Hall turned his attention to the university, calling it 'a cage of unclean birds'. When an Englishman named Proctor intervened the English soldier lodging the Quaker missionary, Cornet Ward, threatened Proctor with imprisonment in the guardhouse. [154]

Such disturbances meant many in the English regime found the growth of Quakers as disturbing as the Kirk did. The English Independent John Stalham, preaching in Edinburgh with a stipend from the Council of State, published his *Contradictions of the Quakers* in March 1655.[155] His inspiration had been the disruptive presence of Quakers in Edinburgh. He reported they met privately, but interrupted services of both the Kirk and the English gathered congregations.[156] Fed up with their shenanigans Stalham set out to expose their many errors in print. In preparation he read as many Quaker tracts as he could get his hands on and gathered accounts of their behaviour and doctrines from other ministers, including the 'precious Gospel Minster' of Kilbride, Thomas Charteris.[157] In total three anti-Quaker works were printed in Edinburgh in 1655. Andrew Anderson's press printed *A Serious Review of Some Principles of the Quakers*, possibly by the freelance propagandist Peter English, and John Gilpin's 1653 work *The Quakers*

---

[153] Burnet, *Quakerism*, 27.
[154] Thurloe, iv:145-6, 162; Burnet, *Quakerism*, 26-7. Burnet gives the date incorrectly as 1658.
[155] John Stalham, *Contradictions of the Quakers (so Called) to the Scriptures of God, and to Their Own Scriblings and Vain Janglings. VVitnessed and Published by John Stalham, Preacher of the Gospel (for the Present) at Edinburgh in Scotland.* (Edinburgh,1655).
[156] Ibid, 'To the Christian Reader,' 1.
[157] Ibid, 2.

Shaken was reprinted in the city.[158] Recognition of the Quakers' potentially dangerous opposition to mainstream Protestant religion became increasingly apparent to the establishment, both Scots and English.

By 1656 pressure against Quakers increased throughout the British sphere of influence. In that year the regime in Ireland proclaimed the Quakers to be their greatest enemy, while the government of Massachusetts passed a law forbidding them in the colony.[159] Scotland was no exception to this trend. The first cases of Quaker persecution in Scotland also took place in 1656. In June the Scotsman William Stockdale and the Englishman John Bowron were 'shamefully' driven from the town of Strathaven for proclaiming their message of the truth in the streets.[160] This sort of mob violence is what Quakers referred to as 'Club Law'. Such exhibitions of physical violence tended to occur in places without English garrisons at the prompting of the local Presbyterian clergy.[161] One month later the bailiff of Hamilton at the behest of the town's minister imprisoned two Scots Quakers, Alexander Hamilton and John Hart.[162] In October, Stockdale along with John Gill, an Englishman, and several of the Friends from the Glassford meeting were again violently driven out of Strathaven. On this occasion the Quaker chronicler stressed that blood was shed.[163] No clear reason is given for the sudden appearance of violent persecution against a meeting that had been gathering there for three years. The most likely factors to have brought this change were the removal of the garrison

---

[158] John Gilpin, *The Quakers Shaken, or, A Discovery of the Errours of That Sect.* (Printed at London, and re-printed at Edinburgh,1655); P. E., *A Serious Review of Some Principles of the Quakers: Wherein Error Is Discovered, and Truth Defended.* ([Edinburgh]: [Andrew Anderson], 1655). The English Quaker Richard Farnsworth replied to both works of both Stalham and P.E. (who he suggests might be Peter English) in *The Scriptures vindication against the Scotish contradictors* (London: for Giles Calvert, 1655). According to J.C. Irons, the historian of Leith, Peter English was an ambitious young English lawyer who was residing in Leith (Irons, *Leith and its Antiquities* (Edinburgh: Morrison & Gibb, Ltd, 1897), ii:122-3). In 1653 he had authored another work in Leith entitled *The Survey of Policy, or a free Vindication of the Commonwealth of England against Salmasius and other Royalists.* (Leith, 1654).

[159] Thurloe, iv:508; Ebenezer Hazard, *Historical Collections.* (Philadelphia, 1792-4), i:630-2.

[160] 'Some Early Suffering in Scotland,' *JFHS* 21(1924), 68; NAS, CH10/1/66, 1.

[161] Weare, *Doctrines*, 10-14.

[162] CH10/1/66, 1.

[163] 'Some Early Sufferings in Scotland', 68.

from Avondale Castle in the village of Strathaven and the imposition of new legal acts and judicial positions.

The reduction of the garrison at Avondale (or Evandale) Castle in Strathaven may have occurred in the latter months of 1655 when Monck was being challenged to cut costs. He replied, 'we have already quitted as many guarrisons as possibly wee may with safety'.[164] Avondale Castle may have been one of those recently cut. Certainly by 1656 it was gone as it does not appear in a list of the garrisons in the country that year.[165] Yet its reduction did little to endanger the stability of English control in the region, since garrisons at Lanark, Kilmarnock, Hamilton and Douglas remained. It did however change things for the Quakers that met at nearby Heads. The village was left as an island almost equidistant from those four remaining garrisons. Thus it appears that the removal of the garrison had a significant affect on how Quakers could be treated. For while there were two violent attacks on Friends in Strathaven in the summer and autumn of 1656, in the garrison town of Hamilton two Quakers preaching in the street were arrested, but not physically accosted in any way. A later English Quaker missionary also attested to the intervention of English soldiers, who even if they were not sympathetic to the Quaker movement would prevent gratuitious public violence. When Stephen Crisp visited Dalkeith in 1659, he reported that only the intercession of the soldiers garrisoned there kept the Presbyterians from killing him.[166]

Unlike Baptist gatherings which had very close ties to the English Army, Scottish Quakers formed among locals outwith the vicinity of garrisons, because they were not dependent either upon clergy or on leadership being provided by the English soldiery or government. Since convinced Friends were considered equals they did not need clergy and thus were able to establish themselves in a way that Baptists could not. While Baptists, who required a letter from an adherents' previous church to assure upright life and doctrine, tended to remain tied to the

---

[164] *S & P*, 302-3; Dow, 142.
[165] G. Davies, 'The Quarters of the English Army in Scotland in 1656,' *SHR* 21 (1924), 62-7.
[166] Stephen Crisp, *Description of the Church of Scotland* (London, 1660), 4.

'missionaries' who brought the sect to Scotland, Quakers required no prior experience making them more mobile and allowing meetings to form anywhere comprised entirely of local members. This meant they were not tied to English garrisons, but this also meant they were far more vulnerable to persecution.

A second important factor that permitted the increase of persecution against Quakers was the passing of two new acts of legislation. In September 1656 Parliament passed *An Act Against Vagrants* in an effort to crack down on individuals travelling without passes or valid reasons. 'Itinerant Quakers,' wrote Burnet, 'who for the time being had no fixed abode and no "occupation" except the unpopular and "suspect" one of spreading their doctrines, thus fell very easily within the meaning and scope of the Act'.[167] For Scots uneasy over the arrival of roving Quaker missionaries, this act provided them a guise through which they could legally persecute unwanted visitors. It was most likely under this new act that action was taken against Quakers in the parish of Lanark in October 1656. It was certainly under the anti-vagrancy law that Stockdale, Hamilton, Hart, Andrew Brown and George Wilson were taken into custody at Kilmaurs in February 1657 under the order of William Muir of Rowallan a local Justice of the Peace.[168] In the following year it was also under the anti-vagrancy act that the JP for Rutherglen ordered the English Quaker Richard Pinder to be imprisoned in that town, and subsequently passed from constable to constable until returned to England.[169] Both visiting and local Friends who strayed too far from home were similarly treated in his jurisdiction, but Scottish Quakers did not face this deportation.

The act against vagrants followed on and acted in cooperation with the Protectorate's definition of the parameters of toleration. On December 15, 1654 the government declared no one would be challenged in their liberty of conscience or prosecuted so long as they were not Papists or Prelates, and as long as they did not preach gross heresy or 'doe any overt or publique act to the

---

[167] Burnet, *Quakerism*, 29.
[168] NAS, CH10/1/66, 2. Justice of the Peace will from hence be referred to as 'JP'.

disturbance' of the public peace.[170] Significantly, this definition of toleration negatively affected both the Ranters and Quakers who were prone to public displays and enthusiastic public proselytising. Under these provisos local Quakers could be persecuted in their own hometowns. For if the local ministers or townspeople complained of them interrupting sermons or preaching publicly in an unordinary manner they could be charged with disturbing the peace. This gave those commissioned with maintaining law and order great power under their own discernment as to whether public preaching of Quaker doctrines constituted an act of public disorder. It also gave significant power to the auditors, for if they reacted in a riotous manner the preaching Quaker could be charged with disturbing the peace. However, the real significance of this policy came to the fore with the establishment of Justices of the Peace in Scotland.

When the English system of Justices of the Peace was introduced into Scotland in February 1656, important powers for maintaining order and peace were given to particular individuals.[171] With this power, coupled with the act against vagrancy and the prerogative to discern what constituted disturbing the peace, Justices of the Peace considerably dictated how Quakers would be treated. 'As custodians of the criminal law,' explains Frances Dow:

> they were empowered to proceed against persons committing riot and to put into effect the laws against vagabonds, trespassers and poachers, forestallers and regraters of markets, and profaners of the Sabbath. Their jurisdiction over the morals of the nation extended also to "Mockers or Reproachers of piety", particularly persons found guilty of swearing and/or fornication, on whom they could impose severe fines, thus exercising a power formerly employed by the kirk sessions.[172]

This meant the persuasion of the JP significantly affected how 'religious radicals' could and would be treated in a given area. All of these JPs were of course individuals the English deemed

---

[169] 'Some Early Suffering in Scotland.' *Journal of the Friends Historical Society*, 21(1924), 70; *S & P*, 308-16.
[170] Clarke MSS, 1/14: f. 170.
[171] Dow, 146, 178-81. Justices of the Peace were originally appointed in Scotland in 1610, however most scholars agree the posts rapidly fell into disuse. Julian Goodare alone has challenged this assumption (J. Goodare, *The Government of Scotland 1560-1625* (Oxford: OUP, 2004), 203-7). Whether the English reintroduced the position or not, they certainly shook up the structure and only appointed JPs they believed were loyal to the Commonwealth. For records pertaining to JPs under the Protectorate, see: *S&P*, xxxviii, lix, 98, 106, 308-16, 321 and *n*, 403, 405 and *n*.
[172] Dow, 178-9.

loyal to their government, but they had differing opinions on religion which became evident in their treatment of religious disturbances. William Mitchell of Douglas, for instance, was brought before the JPs in Hamilton at the behest of the local clergy for an 'unlawful' Quaker marriage. The court offered him the choice of paying a fine of twenty shillings or receiving twenty lashes. Refusing both options he instead received twenty-nine days of imprisonment. The Scots clergy, unsatisfied with this punishment, received an order from another JP, Gavin Hamilton of Raploch, for Mitchell to be turned over to a captain enlisting soldiers to fight in France. Mitchell was 'violently' removed from the tolbooth in Hamilton and transferred to the tolbooth in the Canongate of Edinburgh. Only the intervention of George Monck prevented him from becoming an indentured soldier.[173] Hence the JPs had immense power to deal with religious dissidents, but the affection of these individuals towards Quakers varied widely. So while the Earl of Nithsdale and John Swinton of Swinton, between them JPs for Berwickshire, Dumfriesshire and Haddington, and Col. Ashfield in Glasgow were sympathetic to the Friends, others, particularly James Stewart of Castlemilke (acting in Hamilton), William Lawrie of Blackwood and Gavin Hamilton of Raploch (both acting in Lanark) were not.[174] The incident of William Mitchell also demonstrates how the system could be abused by the Quakers' opponents. If the sentence handed out by a Justice was not deemed harsh enough, a more rigid judge might be sought to provide a different verdict.

Friends came under continued pressure in the closing months of 1656, but in the spring of 1657, sensing threats of excommunication did little to deter Quakers, the Synod of Glasgow made concerted efforts to discourage them by intensifying labours to ostracise them socially. They declared anyone found to be a Quaker would face immediate excommunication. At the end of May seven Friends were excommunicated in the Presbytery of Lanark.[175] In addition the

---

[173] NAS, CH10/1/66, 2.
[174] NAS, 'A Remembrance, or Record of the sufferings of some freinds of the trueth in Scotland,' CH10/1/65, 3; CH10/1/66, 1-3; *S & P*, 308-16. Interestingly, the influence of the Independents in Aberdeen was reassured by the appointments of Alexander Jaffray and Stephen Winthrop (son and grandson of governors of Massachussets) as JPs.
[175] Robertson, *Lanark*, 103.

synod declared any member of the local communities trading with, entertaining or lodging any Quaker risked censure as well.[176] Gone were the days when the English army would automatically intervene for those suffering for conscience sake. Monck's warrant of December 2, 1651 prohibiting magistrates to 'seize upon, meddle with, or any ways molest the persons or estates of any excommunicated person, or...*to desist from dealing or trading with the said excommunicated persons*, without order from the commonwealth of England or their commissioners' no longer represented the policy of the English.[177] Subsequent to this order Quakers were stoned or beaten, while those who housed them in Newmilns (Ayrshire), Strathaven, Lesmahagow, Kirkintilloch, East Kilbride and Glassford were arrested under the orders of JPs sympathetic to the Presbyterians.[178] Other JPs however, used their position of influence to protect Quakers. George Fox reported, also in 1657, that the Governor of Glasgow, Colonel Richard Ashfield, 'being a justice of peace' prevented Presbyterian persecution of the Quakers within his jurisdiction.[179] Ashfield's generosity to the Quakers included granting passes for two English Quaker missionaries to travel through Fife and on to Inverness at their leisure, something that greatly displeased the governor of Perth, Colonel Daniels (also a JP).[180]

The influence of sympathetic garrisons and JPs could also be seen on the other side of the country, where the Synod of Fife was still intent on stamping out Baptist ideology within its bounds. On April 7, 1657, the Baptists who had been repeatedly summoned to appear before the Presbytery of Cupar finally made an appearance, but the threat of excommunication did little to deter them.[181] It took two years from the time Christian Miller was identified as a Baptist by the Presbytery of Cupar before they finally excommunicated her. The presbytery had repeatedly

---

[176] Weare, *Doctrines*, 14; Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (London: Temple Smith, 1985), 49; *To You the Parliament Sitting at Westminster* (London, 1659); Stephen Crisp, *A Description of the Church of Scotland*, 14.
[177] Whitelocke, iii:385; *S & C*, 350.
[178] Weare, *Doctrine*, 13-4.
[179] Fox, 246.
[180] *S & P*, 50, 314.
[181] Baxter, *Synod of Fife*, 180.

summoned her to appear, but she ignored them.[182] Although able to threaten with ecclesiastical censures the presbytery could not intervene physically as they would have done a decade earlier. Nor could they employ the 'Club law' against Baptists, because they were not vagrants and they did not disturb the peace. But probably of even greater importance Presbyterians could not persecute converts to English denominations in such close proximity to English garrisons such as Cupar, St. Andrews or Perth (which certainly contained a Baptist church) nor when several of the JPs for Fife, such as William Lockhart, Charles Fairfax and Captain Samuel Poole (who was convinced by Fox in 1657), were partial to radical religion.[183]

Despite the potential protection provided by a tolerant JP the Presbyterian persecution against Friends gathered pace through 1657 because the English Army carried out its own persecution of Quakers within their ranks. Appeals from a handful of officers throughout the country prompted widespread purging. Lieutenant-Colonel Miles Mann in Inverness and Col. Daniels in Perth complained of the 'sottish stupid generation of Quakers' and asked Monck to take actions to 'prevente these blasphemous hereticks from corrupting the soldyery'.[184] Heeding these requests Monck asked Cromwell's permission to take drastic action in the face of a growing Quaker problem.[185] Sedition, like the subversive plotting exhibited by some Baptist in 1654, did not represent the paramount reason for Monck's request. Instead concern over the rapid spread of Quaker doctrines and the refusal of Quakers to recognise social protocol such as removing one's hat or saluting an officer justified their removal. Major Richardson, the governor of Aberdeen, wrote to Monck 'I think it not their principle to fight nor to own authority longer than it may serve their own ends'.[186] Mann reaffirmed this threat: 'theire principalls are

---

[182] Kinloch, *St Andrews & Cupar*, 176-82.
[183] *S & P*, 312. Some of the officers in Fairfax's troop also served as JPs for Fife, among them were individuals noted for favouring religious radicalism. Capt. Thomas Hutton had some Quakers in his troop before the purge in 1657, but Firth also indicates that his regiment had a strong Anabaptist contingent (*RHCA*, 249). Captain John Pym, was also noted for being of radical religious views according to Firth, while Captain John Freeman had been accused of fostering the spread of Quakerism in 1656 (*RHCA*, 503).
[184] Thurloe, ii:167-8.
[185] *S & P*, 350-1; Thurloe, vi:136, 167.
[186] Thurloe, vi:162; *JFHS*, viii:158-9; Torrance, 'The Quaker Movement in Scotland,' 33.

spreading soe they are much prejudiciall to the decipline of the army'.[187] As Barry Reay suggests, these traits were unfavourable to military discipline.[188] However, Monck's decision was no doubt affirmed by incidents in March involving the hot-headed Quaker John Hall in Aberdeen and his ensuing visit to Inverness.[189] Monck wrote to Cromwell noting the rapid growth of the Quakers in the army, their inability to either give or receive orders due to unwillingness to acknowledge authority, and the bona fide threat they might pose for a potential mutiny, stating: 'truly I think they are very dangerous people should they increase in your army'.[190] The first discharges took place before Cromwell even replied to Monck's request. On March 13 Richard Popplewell was cashiered from the army after nearly eight years service.[191]

When Cromwell's reply finally arrived on April 22 the Protector showed no hesitation in endorsing Monck's proposal.[192] His compliance probably resulted from multiple reports during the spring that another Fifth-Monarchist plot was afoot, in which 'its sayd the Anabaptists and Quakers were chiefly active in the conspiracy'.[193] During the months of March, April and May, and then again in October, November and December, Quaker soldiers were cashiered from the Army in Scotland simply for being members of that sect.[194] In total approximately forty soldiers were removed from nine of the seventeen regiments in the country.[195] Importantly though, none of these officers were recent recruits to the army. They had all served at least seven years and quite a few had served since the beginning of the Civil Wars.[196] Despite their long history of faithful service the threat they were perceived to pose outweighed their valuable service. The removal of Quakers from the army meant the loss of the vast majority of soldiers who had sympathy for Scots convinced of the 'truth'.

---

[187] *S & P*, 352.
[188] Reay, 51.
[189] *S & P*, 350-2; 362-3.
[190] Thurloe, 136.
[191] Clarke MSS, 3/11: (unfoliated) March 13, 1657.
[192] Ibid, April 22, 1657.
[193] N. Penney (ed.), *Extracts from State Papers Relating to Friends 1654 to 1672* (London: Friends Historical Society, 1913), 29.

Although some Quaker soldiers gave up their commissions before they were formerly cashiered, their mistreatment did not go on unnoticed by the wider community of Friends. One of the Quaker missionaries in Scotland while all this purging took place was Francis Howgill. In July he wrote an open letter to the commanders of the army in Scotland. He urged Monck and the other officers responsible for the Army in Scotland to look back over the previous years of fighting and remember God's deliverances and victories given to them before asking how they could in turn persecute the people of God who had risked their lives in the common cause. How unjust was it to persecute those who had taken part in the blessings bestowed by God? And why were they removed? According to Howgill, the commanders of the army were 'setting to have your selves worshipped with caps & knees, and in language, such as all the holy men of God never owned nor knew...[you] have forgotten the rock from whence you were hewn' and 'because they [Quakers] cannot submit to your wills, nor give that to man which belongs to God'.[197] But such pleas did little to change the policy of the government.

After December the removal of Quakers from the army in Scotland ceased. This was not due to the complete success of the purging, as some soldiers and their wives were convinced in the closing months. Interestingly Ashfield, known to Monck in March 1657 as one who 'favours' the Quakers, but who was not convinced until at least the very end of December, avoided losing his commission despite hosting a Friends' meeting in his home. Similarly, Captain Samuel Poole, his wife and several officers were convinced in 1657 by Fox during his visit to Burntisland.[198] So there were still some interested in providing protection for Scottish Quakers, as Burnyeat confirmed receiving protection from the soldiers in the southwest of the country in 1658.[199] But the purge of soldiers in 1657 did mean two things. First, a significant warning had

---

[194] *Clarke Papers*, iii:122-3; *S & P*, 350-2, 362-3; Dow, 234, 328n; *Clarke MSS* 2/13: March 2, 13, 27; April 16, 22; May 9, 15, 20, 25, 29; Oct. 16, 26, 27; Nov. 20, 21; Dec. 22 1657.
[195] Dow, 328n; Reay, 50.
[196] *Clarke MSS* 2/13; Reay, 19.
[197] Francis Howgill, *To All you Commanders and officers of the Army of Scotland* (Leith,1657), 3
[198] Fox, 247-8.
[199] John Barclay (ed.), *Journals of the Lives and Gospel Labours of William Caton, and John Burnyeat*, 2nd edn (London: Harvey and Darton, 1839).

been given to the Quakers in the army, and this in turn caused the movement to become even more civilian-based. Second, the removal of the Quakers meant the dominant radical group left in the army (for the next year at least) were the Baptists, who strongly opposed Quaker doctrines. Thus protection for Quakers from the English soldiers from March 1657 was simply hit or miss. Some soldiers like Ashfield assured protection for Quakers, while others, like the Baptists Fox encountered in Perth, drove them out of town. But unbeknownst to the Baptists their days were numbered as well.

At least fifteen English Quakers visited Scotland as missionaries in 1657. The most notable Quaker visitor was George Fox, who entered Scotland on September 10, 1657. Despite the troubles that had befallen Quakers he still had major drawing power. Soon after crossing the border into Scotland the innkeeper where his party lodged passed on a request from the local Earl to visit his home. No specifics are given, but it is generally accepted this was the Earl of Nithsdale whose seat was Caerlaverock castle.[200] The Earl apparently had some affinity towards Quakerism, for he expressed to Fox and his fellow travellers that were it not for a funeral he had to attend he would like to accompany them on their trip.[201] From the Borders Fox and his entourage continued north to visit established Quaker meeting houses in Douglass, Heads (a hamlet of Strathaven), Badcow (Bedcow), Garthshore, Glasgow, Leith, Edinburgh, Linlithgow, Perth and probably Dundee. They also visited the house of William Osborne who guided Fox and his party through Scotland. His house, according to Burnet, was located near the Campsie Fells.[202] There can be no doubt that a meeting of Friends gathered in his home.

It was while Fox was at the home of Osborne that an important and often overlooked event took place. Under the literary supervision of Fox and his English travelling companions the book *The Doctrins and Principles of the Priests of Scotland* was compiled.[203] Astonishingly, historians

---

[200] Burnet, *Quakerism*, 34. Nigel Smith, editor of the new Penguin edition of Fox's Journal, unequivocally assigns the identity of this mystery Earl to the Earl of Nithsdale (Fox, 239).
[201] Fox, 239.
[202] Burnet, *Quakerism*, 35.
[203] Fox, 239.

have overlooked the significance that the authors of the work are Scottish. George Weare, listed as the author on the London printed title page, was in fact George Weir of Lesmahagow who along with his mother (Katherine Hamilton) and two sisters (Katherine and Janet Weir) suffered for their faith at the hands of the Presbytery of Lanark.[204] Some of Weir's altercations with the clergy of Lanarkshire are given in the work,[205] as are some of the experiences of other Scots Quakers such as John Hart (joint founder of the meeting at Glassford), Andrew Brown (Glassford), John Lowcock (Glassford), William Mitchell (Douglas) and possibly Richard Ismay (Hamilton).[206] At least three of the authors attributed to the work are definitely Scottish Quakers, while the other three might very well be, but they are more enigmatic and difficult to pin down.[207] The work has a very 'us' and 'them' voice in which the authors denounce the violence and doctrines preached by the Kirk's clergy, but, rather than being an indication of foreign authorship, it is an indication of the authors' deep-seated sense of being Quakers as opposed to the national Presbyterian church that censured, beat and imprisoned them. Throughout the work these Scots Quakers name and shame the ministers in the local churches of Strathaven, Lesmahagow, Glassford, Glasgow, Dalserf, Bothwell, Lenzie, Edinburgh and East Kilbride who opposed them physically and theologically.[208] They denounce the 'Club Law' advocated by those ministers and declare the antichristian nature of such abuse. 'Ye may see Christ and the Apostles taught another doctrine,' they wrote, '*Love your enemies*, and thou teachest

---

[204] Robertson, *Lanark*, 101. Katherine Hamilton may have been the sister of Alexander Hamilton, which would put her among the first to be convinced in Lanarkshire.
[205] Weare, *Doctrines*, 45-6, 48.
[206] Ibid, 12-15, 45-6, 48; Robertson, *Lanark*, 101-2. Ismay, if he was Scots, already had ties to Friends in England as he was given £2 for two trips into Scotland by the Swarthmore fund, but he seems to have spent a great deal of time in the west of Scotland ('Financial Statements sent to Swarthmore, 1654 and 1655,' *Journal of the Friends Historical Society*, 6(1909), 51). He would not be the sole example of a Scots Quaker travelling back and forth, with the return trip to Scotland viewed as a missionary foray (Backhouse, *Memoirs of Francis Howgill*, 50).
[207] George Weir, William Mitchell and John Hart are definitely Scots. W.F. Miller suggests that Richard Ismay is English, but gives no supporting evidence for this assertion ('Stranger Friends visiting Scotland,' 81). William Grey and William Lowry are too enigmatic to trace, but it appears Grey signed the petition requesting 'gospel privileges' in 1659 and numerous Greys are listed in the Maxwell's *Quaker Records of Scotland* in the latter half of the seventeenth-century. Several listings for Lauries are also given. Possible dates of burials are found in Maxwell: John Hart at Shawtonhill, April 8, 1686 (181); Andrew Brown at Shawtonhill, February 25, 1690 (161); William Mitchell at Shawtonhill, Dec. 2, 1687.
[208] Weare, *Doctrines*, 1-2.

to stone them, contrary to Christ and his Apostles, we doe conclude it [persecution] to be the doctrine of the Devill'.[209] And again, 'Allase for you ye poor silly Priests, and mad Presbyterians! Is this your work to set people to stone, and cry up club Law, and Law to chop off their heads? is this the way to convert them? ye should goe to convert them, instruct them, convince them, love them, heap coals of fire upon'.[210] Thus the difference between the authors and the ministers they malign is not one of national identity but purely of religious identity. For this reason the appeal of Scottish Quakers to their fellow Scots for dialogue rather than persecution is a moving testament to the degree of religious change that took root in Interregnum Scotland.

The Doctrins and Principles of the Priests of Scotland also gives an indication of the particularly intense opposition of the Scottish clergy to the doctrine of the Inner Light, the primacy of continuing revelation beyond the Scriptures, and the Quaker rejections of physical baptism, predestination and the doctrine of limited atonement. In many ways the acceptance of Quaker doctrines by Scots represented a complete rejection of the dogmatic principles of the Kirk. It was a revolt against the harsh Calvinism that dominated the religious conscience of Scotland, as well as the actions of both Kirk and State since the signing of the National Covenant in 1638. This is why the Scottish clergy responded so vehemently against Quakers. While Independents erred in the proper form of church government, Particular Baptists additionally misunderstood the importance of paedobaptism, and General Baptists carried both of those errors, plus completely misunderstood the doctrines of predestination, election and atonement; the Quakers threw most of these concepts out the window. They rejected physical sacraments, the concepts of predestination and limited atonement, and not only any form of national church organisation, but eldership within particular congregations. Any of one of these errors would have been intolerable, but the combination of them all caused the Presbyterian clergy to view Quakers as the antithesis of the church, a sort of anti-church. This accounts for Presbyterian anger towards

---

[209] Ibid, 10.
[210] Ibid, 13.

Scots convinced by Quakerism and the vehemency which provoked the minister of Lenzie to inform one Scottish Quaker 'that if the Lawes were right they would chop of[f] all the Quakers heads'.[211] Yet despite the avid opposition to the movement by the established Church of Scotland and the removal of Quakers from the army, they continued to win converts.

Through the missionary endeavours of Fox, Howgill, Alexander Parker and others several Scots were convinced in 1657. Among them such prominent individuals as Lady Margaret Hamilton (possibly the daughter of the Duke of Hamilton), John Swinton of that Ilk, Sir Gideon Scott of Highchester, Walter Scott of Raeburn, Charles Ormiston (brother of Gideon Scott), Anthony Haig of Bemersyde, and his brother William.[212] Through the closing years of the Interregnum close contacts between the English and Scottish Friends appear to have been very loving and amicable. During the stay of one English Quaker, the brewer Edward Billing, strong ties with Scottish Friends were formed. Billing served as a cornet in the army until discharged in October for being a Quaker.[213] During his time in Scotland Billing, later part proprietor of the East New Jersey colony, established friendships with Scots Quakers. When he and his partners looked to appoint a governor for the East New Jersey colony in 1679 they turned to the Scots Quaker Robert Barclay.[214]

Sectarian Unity in the Closing Years of the Interregnum

Though Quaker growth continued throughout 1657 and Baptists maintained a stable presence things changed considerably by the middle of the following year. Since the failure of Overton's plot in December 1654 Baptists, along with Quakers, had been implicated in several other failed conspiracies against the Protector or the government throughout the three nations.[215] In the space of five years they had changed from being the bedrock of the army and Commonwealth dream to being perceived as the single greatest threat to its continuance. Moreover a significant

---

[211] Ibid, 12.
[212] Penney, *Fox*, i:451 (292.3).
[213] Clarke MSS, 3/11: Oct. 27, 1657.
[214] Nickalls, *Fox*, 320n; Penney, *Fox*, i:452 (297.1); ii:434 (211.2).
[215] Row, *Life of Blair*, 330, 333; Whitelocke, iv:234, 288.

change had taken place within the government. More moderate Independents joined Cromwell in the inner circle of the government and the radical ecclesiology and eschatological vision once so integral to the successful formation of a Christian Commonwealth were pushed to the fringe and viewed with distrust.[216]

Driven by ill health and concern over their continual penchant for plotting, Oliver Cromwell sent orders dated June 10, 1658 to the Commissioners in Scotland instructing them to 'See that no Baptist holds any office of trust, nor practices law, nor keeps a school'.[217] It was a devastating blow to the movement in Scotland. Though an English source reported Baptists to be the 'major party' in Leith, this public denouncement from the Protector put them in a state of shock.[218] 'They neither rejoice with those that rejoice, nor morne with those that morne,' explained Timothy Langley, 'as to the present: but they still looke like a commonweale of there owne'.[219] Henceforth, Cromwell's spymasters kept an exceptionally close watch on both the Baptists and the Quakers in Scotland, providing him, and subsequently Thurloe, frequent updates as to their disposition.[220] Not surprisingly, the impact on the Baptists was greater than the removal of Quakers from the army had been to the largely civilian-based Friends. Some evidence regarding the nature of Quaker meetings is provided in Langley's reports on the sect in Edinburgh and Leith. At the end of 1657 separate meetings of Friends existed in both places. The Leith meeting comprised mostly women who met daily in a hired room. Among their number Langley postulated 'they have got a small parcell of Scotts into their crew', about a dozen, but 'they have great hopes of gaining a lady in Edinburgh'. With regards to the wider Quaker movement in Scotland, he explained they were gaining 'many' proselytes in the west of Scotland.[221]

---

[216] Liu, *Discord in Zion*, 140-60.
[217] *CSPD*, 1658-9:61.
[218] Thurloe, vii:194.
[219] Ibid, vii:197.
[220] Ibid, vii:403, 527, 554.
[221] Ibid, vi:709.

Fears about Baptists persisted, and the discovery in early September 1657 of a pocket-sized Baptist tract in Leith led many to believe they were preparing to hatch a new plot.[222] Soon after Langley reported that they were in a 'mousing posture'.[223] Although reports of Cromwell's death gave them brief optimism, by November they were in deep doldrums of melancholy complaining they had been outwitted. An indication of the depths to which the sect had fallen may be indicated by the formation of an Independent church in Leith in the beginning of November. Although they shared the Baptists' rejection of paedobaptism, they refused to have anything to do with the Baptists meeting in Leith. The group was certainly out of favour. The drastic shift in policy towards Baptists led to nothing short of a kind of persecution, though not to the degree that J. Scott's exaggerated claims suggest.[224] Cromwell's orders did not implement a wholesale removal of Baptists from the army in the manner Quakers had been removed in the previous year. There are no records in Monck's order book for particular officers or troopers being removed from their posts, but this does not diminish the significance of what took place however. To some degree the action taken against Baptists in 1658 represented a more significant persecution than what the Quakers had experienced, because this time around the victims were predominantly civilians, whose proselytism the regime had fostered and encouraged. It represented the fruition of a long and gradual reaction against radicalism. However in the final year of the Interregnum several important events marked the lasting and important impact of the introduction of Protestant diversity to Scotland. The proceedings against the Baptists did not go unnoticed and in the following year a Scots advocate branded the betrayal of the Baptists and the failure of the Protector to assure toleration as a 'hammer of persecution'.

---

[222] Ibid. vii:371.
[223] Ibid. vii:403.
[224] Scott, (1926), 32; Scott, (1929), 183.

Robert Pittilloch was admitted to the public office of advocate in the year 1651.[225] Early in the Interregnum he showed little interest in religious liberties, even publishing a tract in condemnation of a printed Baptist sermon by Salomon Saffrey in 1652.[226] However, over the next few years Pittilloch made a significant swing towards the religious and political views of the Commonwealth. By the spring of 1659 Monck lauded his many years of service to the Commonwealth:

> March 11, 1658/9.--Certificate, that the bearer, Mr. Robert Pittiloch, Advocate, hath for severall yeares past expressed much affection to the interest of the English in Scotland, and was in the beginning of November 1654 appointed Sollicitor for his Highnesse the Lord Protector and Commonwealth: In which office hee continued till the 11th of February 1656, att which time he was appointed by his Highnesse' Councill in Scotland to serve as Advocate to the State, in which hee served till June 1659. And during the said imployments (as well as before) hee behaved himself faithfully, honestlie, and diligentlie, and exercised the same with much ability and advantage to his Highnesse' interest.[227]

From his loyal service to the Protectorate Pittilloch earned a voice of credibility and in 1659 he used his voice to appeal the plight of those who embraced patterns of Christianity introduced during the Interregnum under what he described as a failed toleration. For Pittilloch, proselytes were being betrayed in two ways. First, the English government, particularly under the Protectorate, failed in its duty to maintain the religious toleration promised to the Scottish people. Second, he claimed the existence of a Presbyterian plot to oppress and persecute anyone opposed to a strong Presbyterian national Kirk, which Cromwell's acquiescence helped to facilitate.

To elaborate Pittilloch's first point: three times, he argued, the people of Scotland were promised the freedom to practise Protestant religion as they wished. Initially, this occurred in the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant. The English Parliament had obliged itself 'to

---

[225] Sir F.J. Grant (ed.), *The Faculty of Advocates in Scotland, 1532-1943* (Edinburgh: Scottish Record Society, 1944), 172.

[226] Robert Pittillok, *A short brotherly examination of a sermon: At first preached by Mr Saloman Saffrey, and after published in print.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652). The tract is a response to: Salomon Saffery, *Part of a Discourse, Tending Only to Invite Those That Believe in Christ, to be Conformable to Him in Baptisme* ([s.l.]: [s.n.], 164?). I have been able to trace only one surviving copy of this work. It is stored in the special collections of the University of Aberdeen, King 231/53.

take what is done to another as done to themselves, in the prosecution of the true ends of the Covenant'.[228] While the Kirk viewed this as a pledge to Presbyterian church government, Parliament had interpreted it as preservation of Reformed religion within acceptable parameters. The next promise came in the army's declaration at Musselburgh on August 1, 1650, in which they declared 'where ever the lot of Gods inheritance shall appear to be found in Scotland, we shall think it our duty to the utmost hazard of our lives, to preserve the same' and 'though ye be scattered, the Lord will in his due time bring you together, and bind you up as his jewels, and make you one with those that fear the Lord amongst us'.[229] Though this declaration came from the army rather than the Parliament itself, it was nothing less than a declaration from Englishmen to provide religious liberty. Finally, the Commissioners of the Parliament had promised as one of the fundamental principles of their rule in Scotland in February 1652 to 'protect and incourage such as walk soberly and christianly, albeit serving God in a different way from the Presbyterian and National Church'.[230] Despite these three separate pledges to extend the religious toleration enjoyed in England to the people of Scotland the government had utterly failed to do so. In fact, this failure was so complete the government permitted and even carried out persecution of English and Scots Christians who adhered to English models of Protestant religion.

The primary driving force behind the persecution faced by Quakers and Baptists in Scotland was, according to Pittilloch, the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Despite being stripped of all authority to judge men's consciences early in the rule of the Commonwealth, gradually the Presbyterians' power had been restored. In arguments that echo sixteenth-century Anabaptists' claims that the rise of Constantine initiated the downfall of the Christian Church, Pittilloch pinpointed the change of religious policy towards the Kirk to the 'raising' up of Cromwell to the

---

[227] *Clarke Papers*, iv:271. The dating in this certificate is strange since it ascribes to be written in March '59, but explains Pittilloch continued to work until June '59.
[228] Robert Pittilloh, *The Hammer of Persecution: or, the Mystery of Iniquity In the Persecution of Many Good People in Scotland, Under the Government of Oliver Late Lord Protector, and Continued by Others of the Same Spirit; Disclosed, with the Remedies Thereof.* (London: L. Chapman, 1659), 6.
[229] Pittiloh, *The Hammer of Persecution*, 7.

Protectorate. According to the author, Cromwell's efforts to ingratiate the fractured elements within the Kirk gave them increasing influence in ecclesiastic and judicial matters in Scotland through a series of policy changes. Initially Gillespie's Charter (August 1654) gave a quorum of four Scots certifiers within each of the five regions the power to certify ministerial candidates, thus qualifying them to receive stipends from the state. Although admittedly in the area 'be-north of Angus' several Independents were made triers, overwhelmingly the rest of those chosen were (in Pittilloch's estimation) rigid Presbyterians. Despite the evidence examined in chapter four for the compliance of Gillespie's Protesters with disciplinarily strict Independents, they certainly were not tolerant towards Baptists, Quakers or any other group failing to meet their strict standards of Calvinist doctrine. Although the ordinance actually had little impact, Pittilloch claimed the Presbyterians made use of this 'Episcopal Dignity...for establishing their own Creatures in the Ministry'.[231] But even the power to plant ministers did not satisfy them, for they wished to be able to depose them as well. The establishment of the Commissioners for Visiting Universities in June 1652 prevented the deposition of ministers by any authority other than their own.[232] Yet by August 1656, as far as Pittilloch was concerned, the government had completely relinquished control in religious matters at a grassroots level.

Under a deal brokered by Lord Broghill, the President of the Scottish Council who in his pragmatism greatly favoured the Resolutioner majority, the English agreed to turn the power of certifying candidates for ministry to the Resolutioners in return for an implicit promise the ministers would live peaceably, refrain from subversive activities and stop praying for the King.[233] This gave the Presbyterians complete power for planting and removing ministers. The settlement marked a radical shift of policy in Scotland. Broghill had little concern for the advancement of sects. Rather he pursued a policy which would ensure that the majority in Scotland would leave peaceably and that moderate religion would prevail. He was completely

---

[230] Ibid, 7.
[231] Ibid, 11; Dow, 200-1.
[232] Dow, 58-61.
[233] Dow, 206.

unsympathetic to the rigid Protesters of Wariston, Guthrie and Rutherford's party whom he called 'Fifth-monarchist-presbyterians' because of their unwillingness to recognise any authority other than their own.[234] Additionally, this move and the failure of Gillespie's Charter affirm that Gillespie's party, who were willing to accept English rule and to work alongside disciplinarily strict Independents, were too small to broker a deal settling Scotland's religious divisions on the national rather than regional level. This settlement, which represented a major departure from the policy earlier in the decade of supporting the growth of sects, demonstrated Cromwell's willingness to compromise on his dream settlement of a mutually tolerant Christian Commonwealth in order to guarantee more immediate stability in Scotland.

For Pittilloch the restoration of power to the Kirk left gathered churches vulnerable and undermined all earlier efforts to establish them. No matter what Presbyterian emissaries in London might claim to the Protector and Parliament, the restoration of Presbyterian domination was not universally desired in Scotland. He marked it a great error for anyone in England to believe all Scots were Presbyterians who desired a national church.[235] To justify his claim he gave the names of several ministers of the Kirk who had separated either into Independency or who had become Baptists, including the familiar names of Thomas Charteris, John Seaton, John Row and John Menzies. In addition he also listed several individuals for whom Pittilloch's account is the only explicit record of their separation, noting John Mercer (Row's son-in-law, Kinkellar) and John Young (Birse) 'verbally converted to make progress with such as were separated', and William Youngstone (Durris) and John Forbes (Kincardine O'Neill) sided with the Baptists.[236] While their separation may indicate the success of Commonwealth policies in propagating alternatives to the national Kirk, these ministers' subsequent suffering marked its failure. Pittilloch claimed Seaton's withdrawal to England was one of flight, and alleged both Youngstone and Forbes 'died of grief', as did John Row's wife.[237]

---

[234] Dow, 204.
[235] Pittiloh, *The Hammer of Persecution*, 13.
[236] Ibid, 10.
[237] Ibid, 12-13.

However, these were not the sum of the government's failure in protecting converts. Even more shameful, under the Protector's order of June 10, 1658 several Scots were removed from government posts simply for being Baptists. The government might not be able to protect the consciences of defected clergy, but they certainly could have refrained from firing Scots solely on the basis of religious affiliation, especially when the government had advocated proselytism earlier in the Interregnum. One such casualty was Claud Hamilton who originally worked in Edinburgh as a commissary, but after being transferred to Stirling he eventually lost his employment altogether.[238] Similarly, William Dundas (supervisor to the government's messengers), Archibald Weir (sheriff or keeper of records), Alexander Dick of Haddington (Clerk to the Peace) and James Lindsay (collector) were all removed form their posts.[239] Others reportedly had to leave the country due to the persecution they faced.[240] Only Robert Gordon (clerk to the Exchequer and subsequently Presenter of Signatories)[241] escaped dismissal from his post, who being 'related to a person of Power greater than himself', was merely demoted to position of less importance.[242] After these individuals were removed Parliament needed to replace them and had little knowledge of the capable candidates.[243] The Resolutioners took advantage of the privileged status granted them in 1656 and provided a list of viable candidates void of sectarians and Protesters. Pittilloch identified this as another instance of the English government acquiescing to the Kirk to the detriment of those who had bravely accepted the religious ideals which formed the bedrock of the Commonwealth. For Pittilloch, this represented the ultimate example of England's failure to uphold the promises made to the 'godly' in Scotland.

Importantly, Pittilloch was not the only Scot to publish against the persecution of those promised toleration. In 1659 several Quakers, particularly in the west of Scotland, produced a

---

[238] *S & P*, 317; Pittilloh, *The Hammer of Persecution*, 12-14.
[239] *S & P*, 317, 389.
[240] David Pearsone (a schoolmaster), the son of the Lord of Leyes, and a Mr. Malice all fled to England to avoid persection, according to Pittilloch (14).
[241] Nicoll, 95, 207, 222.
[242] Pittiloh, *The Hammer of Persecution*, 12-13.

declaration of their sufferings, signed by Osborne and others.[244] Although an important document, it is far less unique than Pittilloch's: Quaker meetings throughout Britain and Ireland were producing similar papers.[245] However, the documents demonstrate how integrally connected the Scottish meetings of Friends were with their English brethren. It is indicative of the ascendancy of Quaker identity over and above nationality. Yet more importantly, Scotland's Quakers not only joined with their fellow Quakers, but in the face of persecution they demonstrated closer ties with other sects in Scotland than sects in England did at any time during the Interregnum.

On May 7, 1659 the Rump Parliament re-assembled for the first time since being dissolved by Cromwell in April 1653. This meant that all proceedings of Union during the interlude were null and void, including the Ordinance of Union passed in April 1654.[246] As a result, establishing terms for a permanent Act of Union became a priority for the continued stability of the Commonwealth and the debate over the terms of the settlement was rekindled. In the early days of the newly reformed Parliament, Wariston, the only Scot appointed to the Council of

---

[243] Ibid, 13.
[244] *To You the Parliament Sitting at Westminster, Our Request Is to God That You Rule for His Honour. Here are Several of Our Names, Who Thus Suffers in the Behalf of Many More in the Nation of Scotland.* (London, 1659). Yet again this is an extremely rare document. The only known surviving copy is held in the British Library, 1865.c.15(9). Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution*, 49.
[245] *To the Parliament of England now sitting in VVestminster. Being a breif accompt taken out of the multitude of the cruel grievous and bloody sufferings and persecutions of the people of God, (called Quakers) who have had their goods...* (London, 1659); *To the Parliament of England, who are in place to do justice, and to break the bonds of the oppressed. A narrative of the cruel, and unjust sufferings of the people of God in the nation of Ireland, called Quakers* (London, 1659); Edward Burrough, *A declaration of the present sufferings of above 140. persons of the people of God (who are now in prison,) called Quakers: with a briefe accompt of about 1900. more, being but a part of many more that have suffered.* (London, 1659); George Fox, *For the Parliament of England and their army so called. Your day into darknesse is turned; the sun is gone down over you; ye have had a large day, and power given unto you; to have done the will of God* ([London], 1659); George Fox, *To the Parliament of the commonwealth of England. A declaration of the suffering of several of the people of God (our friends and brethren, who work out their salvation with fear and trembling) in New England, and amongst the Dutch* ([s.l. : s.n., 1659?]); John Hodgson, *Love, kindness, and due respect, by way of warning to the Parliament of the Common-wealth of England, that they may not neglect to the great opportunity now put into their hands, for the redemption and freedom of these oppressed nations...* (London, 1659).
[246] Dow, 241.

State, spoke against including a declaration of religious toleration in any Act of Union.[247] His words caused a great stir and by his own admission his speeches against toleration became a topic of discussion throughout London.[248] The premise of his argument alleged 'few or none' in Scotland supported toleration and its exclusion from an Act of Union would bolster favour among Scotland's Presbyterians.[249] Some other Scots, of a different judgement to Wariston, heard his speeches and implored the supporters of toleration in Scotland to produce a supplication to the Parliament requesting the inclusion of toleration in any legislation for union. Swinton and Garthland, MPs for Scotland, may have been among this number as in May they had advocated a union between the nations on the stipulations set down in 1651 and 1652, which included religious toleration.[250]

In July 1659 some persons 'well affected' to the English Commonwealth 'in the vicinity of Edinburgh' produced a petition. They lobbied for the permanent establishment of the religious toleration introduced into Scotland in February 1652 and requested all previous Scottish legislation opposed to toleration be abolished. Although toleration had been promised in 1652 it clearly had not prevailed as different groups had suffered in the previous two years wholly for their religious persuasions:

> We desire heartily to bless God on your behalf, and to own you in the prosecution of that glorious Work so long contended for against *Usurped Tyrrany* in the middest of us.... It is therefore our humble Desire, for ourselves, and several others in this Nation, That you will take care to provide for our just Liberties; that we may share in those Gospel Priviledges that the truly Godly in England contend for, and expect to be secured in by you: And that any Laws or Acts of Parliament of this Nation contrary hereunto may be abolished; either by some Proviso to that effect to be

---

[247] From the end of 1656 Wariston showed increasing compliance with the English. After being offered a salary of £300 to care for the public records of Scotland he hailed Cromwell as 'the man whom thou hes providentially maid Thy depute on earth' (Wariston, iii:54). After serving in London as an envoy for the Protesters, Guthrie referred to him as 'our Independent' in London. In July 1657 he took the office of Public Register for Scotland; in November became a Commissioner for the Administration of Justice; January 1658 sat in the newly formed upper house of Parliament; January 1659 of Richard Cromwell's Parliament; at the restoration of the Rump Parliament he appointed to the Council of State (*ODNB*, 'Johnston, Archibald; Dow, 214, 221-2, 237, 240-3).

[248] Wariston, iii:112.

[249] Ibid, iii:112; Row, *Life of Blair*, 338.

[250] *Journals of the House of Commons*, vii, 664; Nicoll, 242-3; Holfelder, 284.

> inserted in the Act of Union, or by some other more expedient way, as you shall think fit.[251]

C.H. Firth attributed this supplication to the 'gathered churches', by which he meant the Independents.[252] Certainly it expressed desires articulated by the Scottish Sectarians earlier in the decade. However, Scots contemporaries were quick to point out that its subscription included more than just Independents. Robert Blair explains the authors may have been Independents, but it served as a unifying point for other sectarian groups who had over the decade fallen out with each other, suffered persecution and now were brought back together to plead for rightful toleration.[253] One Edinburgh diarist attributed the work primarily to the Baptists, while Baillie noted that the signatories were largely Quakers.[254] The truth is that this petition served as a rallying point for all the sectarian groups in Scotland.

Despite Robert Blair's assertion that very 'few Scots of any note' signed the petition, the signatures attached provide fascinating insight into a shared endeavour by Scots Quakers, Independents and Baptists in a petition to achieve toleration. Essentially they resolved to overlook their differences, understanding that successfully securing toleration meant all for one, or none for all. Through analysis of the signatures given to the petition an indication of the religious diversity of the signatories can be given for the first time. Among the more than two hundred signatures given to the petition were Archibald Weir, James Lindsey and William Dundas of Dundas all of whom were described in *The Hammer of Persecution* as being removed from their posts in 1658 for their Baptist sympathies, as well as Robert Gordon demoted for Independency.[255] The former Protester Thomas Ireland, James MacDowall of Garthland and 'Peter Inglish' (probably the part time propagandist for the English living in Leith, author of *The*

---

[251] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX.(27), f.105; *Some Sober Animadversions*, 1-2.
[252] *Clarke Papers*, iv:51n; *S & C*, xxxix-xli; Dow, 242.
[253] Row, *Life of Blair*, 338.
[254] Maidment (ed.), *Historical Fragments*, 5:53; Baillie, *L & J*, iii:430.
[255] See p. 301, above. NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX.(27), f. 106; Pittiloh, *The Hammer of Persecution*, 12-3; *S & P*, 389.

Survey of Policy (1653)), all signed.[256] So did William Dundas (brother of the laird of Duddingston), Lieutenant William Govan and Andrew Abernethie, who had been excommunicated for joining with the English in 1650/1 and were apparently in favour of Independency.[257] Other signatories were John Home (servitor to Dundas of that Ilk) accused of joining with the English in 1651 but not excommunicated for it, and Henry Hope, a Scot who served as Treasurer for the High Court of Justice.[258] Patrick Waterstone, the Orkney minister who officially gathered an Independent church on the island of Stronsay sometime before 1660, also appears as a subscriber.[259]

Among the Quakers who signed the petition were a significant number from meetings in the west of Scotland, such as Robert Tod, Andrew Gray, John Lococke, William Mitchell, John Hart, Andrew Hamilton, Andrew Brown, Thomas Jack, Alexander Hamilton, Gabriel Hood [Hud], John Hutcheson, William Gray[260] and John Mitchell, all mentioned in the earliest recorded history of Quakers in the west of Scotland.[261] Additionally, several other individuals from the west of Scotland described in the 1659 London edition of *Doctrines and Principles* as having been excommunicated from the Kirk for being Quakers also subscribed the petition: Robert Smallie, James Finley, James Cooke, William Hamilton, Robert Gray, Thomas Craige, John Robbins, Robert Hamilton, John Hamilton, John Torrance, Alexander Hart and Gavin Hart.[262] That these individuals had been excommunicated by ministers of the Kirk suggests they were at one time members of the Church of Scotland, that is to say Scottish. Prominent Quakers from other parts of the country also signed, including William Osborne, Anthony Haig

---

[256] The plight of Ireland is discussed below. For MacDowall of Garthland see p. 176, above. For English see p. 282 above, and Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 81, 183, 267.

[257] See p. 176, above. Wod.Fol.XXX.(27), f. 106; Row, *Life of Blair*, 253, 270. Abernethie was appointed a JP for 'Edinburgh Shire' in 1656 showing that he continued to be in favour with the regime, (*S & P*, 312).

[258] See p. 176-7, above. Nicoll, 52.

[259] Wod.Fol.XXX.(27), f. 106. See Ch. 4.

[260] Co-author of *The Doctrins & Principles of the Priests of Scotland* (1657).

[261] NAS, CH10/1/66, 1-3; CH10/1/65, 2-4; Robertson, *Lanark*, 101-3.

[262] William Stockdale, *The Doctrines and Principles* (London, 1659), 3-6; Wod.Fol.XXX(27), f. 106.

of Bemersyde, Andrew Robison [Robeson][263] and Richard Rae, the latter two being in Edinburgh.[264] Another Scottish signatory was William Welch the Clerk to the Admiralty, possibly a Quaker (at least his wife Sarah certainly was).[265]

Though the petition claimed to be from Edinburgh and its immediate vicinity, signatures evidently came from a much wider area, as Patrick Waterstone's signature demonstrates. The wide dispersal of these signatures, collected in a short period of time, gives an indication of the range of Scots who were separated from the national Kirk. Although Pittilloch's claim there 'had been thousands in Scotland separated from the National Church' are probably exaggerated, this supplication exhibits a significant number of Scots continuing to pursue the ideals of toleration.[266] But importantly the numbers here only represent the male portion of Scots separated from the Kirk. Lady Gordon is the only female subscriber to the paper. Taking this into account the numbers would swell drastically. The spymaster Timothy Langley reported in late 1658 that in Edinburgh Quakerism was particularly strong among women and the trend among Baptist adherents (at least in Fife) indicated a high proportion of female proselytes.[267] The petition cannot provide an accurate estimate of how many people considered themselves members of a sectarian party. Its significance lies in what it shows about Scots of previously factious inter-relationships unwilling to conform to the national Kirk, speaking in a united voice to request 'Gospel Priviledges' for all Christians save Episcopalians and Roman Catholics.

The petition's submission to the Parliament occurred on July 27, 1659.[268] Its contents and roughly the number of signatures were common knowledge in London at least a week before this however. Wariston reported on the July 19 it saddened him to see the paper 'from above

---

[263] In 1662 Robeson was imprisoned in Duns for being a Quaker, during which time he produced a letter to the people of Scotland. In this letter he declares himself to be a Scot, Scotland being the land of his 'nativitie' (NLS, MS. 2201, f. 99).
[264] Penney, *Fox*, i:451 (292.3), 452 (296.1).
[265] *S & P*, 390.
[266] Pittiloh, *The Hammer of Persecution*, 13.
[267] Thurloe, vi:709
[268] *Journals of the House of Commons*, vii:736; Dow, 242; *Clarke Papers*, iv:51n; *Some Sober Animadversions*, 'to the reader,' 1.

200 hands in Scotland' requesting the abolition of laws inhibiting liberty of conscience.[269] The following week the petition was presented to the Parliament by Col. Ralph Cobbet and two Scots. Unfortunately the journal of the House of Commons only notes Cobbet and provides no details about the Scots who accompanied him.[270] William Row suggests William Dundas and Robert Gordon delivered the petition, noting they were in London at the time serving as 'the devil's agents, for toleration', although Garthland was in London as well.[271] Parliament responded positively to the petition and expressed appreciation, but its submission compounded the debate over union, prolonging it so much the issue remained unresolved when Parliament dissolved on October 13.[272] Presbyterian relief that toleration in Scotland had not been reaffirmed in a completed Act of Union was muted by fears the positive reaction of Parliament might 'provoke' from the sectarians petitioners.[273]

News of the petition sent shock waves through the Kirk. In his diary Andrew Hay noted a widespread sense that the Lord would imminently withdraw from Scotland, and that error threatened to burst forth in greater abundance, 'especially' in light of the petition to the Parliament.[274] It was a matter of great concern for Presbyterians that sectarian groups in the country had the audacity to prepare such a petition to Parliament, particularly because it threatened to put an end to the gradual coup they had managed to foster in the last half of the decade. As a result, opinions differed within Presbyterian circles over an appropriate response. Both the Synods of Fife and Galloway wrote declarations against the petition,[275] while the Presbytery of Kirkcudbright declared the petition:

---

[269] Wariston, iii:126.
[270] *Journals of the House of Commons*, vii:736.
[271] Blair, *Life of Row*, 338. Nicoll affirms Gordon's involvement, but makes no mention of Dundas (Nicoll, 244-5).
[272] Dow, 242.
[273] Wariston, iii:128.
[274] Reid (ed.), *Andrew Hay of Craignethan's Diary*, 99.
[275] NLS, Wod.Fol.XXX.(43) and (44). Concern over toleration in Galloway seems to have predated the petition. Sometime in the previous year, Earlstoun urged the Synod of Galloway to condemn toleration: 'Will yow be exsamples and instruments to foment the division and distraction by your straining at an politick adn only civil question, and will yow not scrouple to swallow so monstrous ane carnall as Tolleration, wherby covenants, o[a]thes, declarations and warnings are so openlie violatt to the ruine of religion and government evin in a moment', (Wod.Fol.XXXI.(62), f. 153).

> tends to the overturning of the wholl work of reformation of religion amongst us both in doctrine worship government and disciplin and to the abolishing of all wholesome laws and acts of parliament made for the securing of these precious interests...[we] Doe declair the said petition to be a dreadfull violation and breach of the oath of god lye upon us both with nationall covenant and the solemne league and covenant...and lykwayes to be a most malicious design...so to open a wyder gap to the plottering of all error and heresie of sin and iniquity and of all manner of confusion upon this poor kirk and nation.[276]

These declarations were rapidly produced and distributed in manuscript form. The declaration from Kirkcudbright is dated August 17, 1659. Other Presbyteries debated whether it was a better course of action to reply against the petition or ignore it. Andrew Hay of Craignethan advocated the importance for Presbyteries to voice their utter opposition to toleration as incompatible with the Presbyterian government of the Kirk. Robert Baillie on the other hand, although a rigid opponent to sectarianism, urged the Presbytery of Glasgow not to reply to the petition. In a letter to fellow Resolutioner Robert Douglas in Edinburgh, he advocated that any response to the petition would be dangerous on two accounts. First, if only the aspect of toleration were written against, it would serve as a tacit acceptance concerning other aspects of uniting the two countries. Second, very careful language was essential, because a fine balance needed to be struck between condemning toleration in light of the covenants and avoiding making enemies among the Independents and Anabaptists among the 'Chief Statesman' in the Parliament. Erring either way could be costly to the Presbyterian cause in the long run.[277]

The Presbytery of Edinburgh, along the lines of Baillie's advice, took their time and produced a declaration against the petition in July and printed it in October.[278] They directed the brunt of their attack against the Quakers, or those acting 'under the pretence of a *new light*',[279] and declared it disingenuous to label the petition as being prescribed by those in the vicinity of Edinburgh when the signatures represented individuals spread across the country. What

---

[276] Wod.Fol.XXX.(48), f. 157.
[277] Baillie, iii:392-5.
[278] Church of Scotland. Presbytery of Edinburgh, *A Testimony and Warning of the Presbyterie of Edinburgh, Against a Late Petition, Tending (in the Scope and Design Thereof) to the Overturning of the Ordinances and Truth of Christ in This Church. Octob. 5. Anno. Dom. 1659.* (Edinburgh,1659); 'Collections by a private hand being kingly of matters from 1650-1662,' NLS, Wod.Qu.XXXVII, f.37.

surprised the presbytery most was the collusion of several sects including ones which previously professed themselves 'opposite to the way of the Quakers'.[280] As far as they were concerned the petition could be presented in no other way than an 'endeavour to pluck up the hedge planted by God about His Vineyard, and to open a door to the atheisticall and profane under pretence of new lights'.[281] But not all Scots agreed to this interpretation.

Before the end of 1659 a Scot, possibly residing in London but a native of Edinburgh, defended the sincerity of the petitioners' pious request in *Some Sober Animadversions*.[282] The author declared that what the petition requested had already been promised in 1652, and argued the necessity of removing Scottish legislation opposing toleration.[283] In contrast to the Presbyterian suggestion that the petitioners' intentions were to 'break down hedges', the author explained they were not requesting anything uncommon in the Commonwealth, only assurance Scots should experience the exact same Gospel privileges 'enjoyed' by the English.[284] In response to accusations the petitioners had separated from the body of Christ (the Kirk), the author inquired whether it is not the responsibility of the godly to distance themselves from 'grossly mixed communions' in light of the biblical imperative, 'Come out of her, my people' (Rev. 18:4).[285] He then turned the question on its head: if toleration tends to 'overturn the Kirk', then is not the Kirk the problem rather than toleration? Independents, Baptists and Quakers all professed in the petition to have no qualms allowing toleration.[286] Presbyterian aversion to toleration and inability to function alongside it might suggest Presbyterianism is incompatible and unwarrantable within the framework of a Christian Commonwealth.

---

[279] Ibid, 3.
[280] Ibid, 5.
[281] Ibid, 7; *Some Sober Animadversions, Humbly, and In All Meekness Offered to the Consideration of All Who Truly Fear the Lord, and Enquire in His Ways, in Scotland upon A Testimony and Warning, Emitted by the Presbytery of Edinburgh, Against a Petition Lately Presented to the Parliament, in Defence of the Said Petition. Published to Vindicate Truth, and Undeceive the Simple.* (London, 1659), 2.
[282] Ibid, 25.
[283] Ibid, 8.
[284] Ibid, 2-3, 8.
[285] Ibid, 6.
[286] Ibid, 3.

Some Sober Animadversions reaffirmed the petitioners' call for the dissolution of Scottish laws prohibiting religious meetings outside of the Kirk and the end of the Kirk's violent opposition to those who choose to do so. 'All who [are] other from you,' explains the author, are labelled 'erroneous hereticks and schismaticks and therefore not to be tollerated'.[287] Presbyterian use of Club Law against heretics and censures against those who entertain them were judged incompatible with the religious ethos long established by the Commonwealth.[288] Several historical examples of their persecution of nonconformists over the previous decade are given including Christian Blyth, Mrs. Adair, Gilbert Gardin, Mr. Tayes and Mr. Flint who were all excommunicated and faced various forms of persecution for being 'Anabaptists' over the previous two decades. Of Mrs. Adair it is said she had no peace until after the English victory at Dunbar.[289] The author denounced the excommunication of Swinton, William Dundas, Major Abernethie, Captain Griffin and Colonel Strachan simply for being too sympathetic to the 'sectarians'.[290] The cruelty of the Kirk towards dissenters itself testified to the errour of their ways, especially since no grounds are given in Scripture for dealing with heretics other than verbal rebukes, casting out, or cutting off from fellowship.[291] Rather than attempt to defend the beliefs of the Quakers or any other group who participated in the promotion of the petition, the author simply stated that 'Gospel-Liberties' are the issue not particular principles.[292] 'People may have the Letter of Scripture, and the Bible in their pockets and houses,' writes the author:

> and be versed in the Learning of Universities, and have good breeding, and natural endowments, and walk civilly in their outward carriages, and yet be ignorant of, and strangers unto the Knowledge of God in Christ Jesus, Gospel, Church, Ordinances, and Ministry; for all these are spiritual, and spiritually discerned: and the World cannot receive the Spirit of Truth, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him.[293]

In this way the petition and those who supported it, like the author of *Some Sober Animadversions*, significantly challenged one of the fundamental assumptions of Presbyterianism: education and

---

[287] Ibid, 22.
[288] Ibid, 3, 16.
[289] Ibid, 11-12.
[290] Ibid, 15.
[291] Church of Scotland. Presbytery of Edinburgh, *A Testimony and Warning of the Presbyterie of Edinburgh, Against a Late Petition,* 16, 23.
[292] Ibid, 7.

training are not the paramount requirements for Christian life and Church leadership. Such a claim seemed utterly reprehensible to the Kirk, but is a sign that a different way of thinking about church had made inroads into the consciousness of some Scots.

While proponents of toleration in Scotland found bold voices in 1659, their desires for mutual toleration were not reflected in the political environment of the Commonwealth. Heightened tensions between the army in England under the command of Lambert and the Parliament led to the dissolution of Parliament on October 13, 1659, before terms to union could be agreed. The request by Scotland's Baptists, Quakers and Independents stood in stark contrast to the events of the closing months of 1659 which threatened the continuation of the Commonwealth and overshadowed any disputes regarding toleration in Scotland.[294] By December 1659 it looked as though England might experience a third Civil War. Monck's forces in Scotland sided with the Rump Parliament and represented the moderate interests of the Commonwealth. The army in England, led by Major General John Lambert who favoured the Baptists and radical sects within the army, carried the support of the religiously radical elements within the nation. Richard Baxter described Monck's stand against Lambert as a struggle against the 'usurpation of the fanaticks (Anabaptists, Seekers, &c.)'.[295] The impending conflict polarised support on religious grounds. According to one account letters were being sent north of the border to encourage insurrection among the remaining radicals in the army. In October 1659 a second purge of Baptists, this time solely within the army, took place. Many officers were either discharged or imprisoned in Edinburgh or Tantallon Castles.[296] In total about one-hundred and

---

[293] Ibid, 24.
[294] For a comprehensive analysis of the closing months of the Interregnum, see: Dow, ch. 12.
[295] Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (London, 1696), 214.
[296] Reid (ed.), *Andrew Hay of Craignethan's Diary*, 169, Row, *Life of Blair*, 339; Heath, *A Brief Chronicle* (1676), 430. This was deemed necessary especially in light of attempts to restructure his forces by the Committee for Nomination of Officers appointed by the Rump in the summer. Although an attempt to subordinate the Army to the Parliament, the seven member committee was dominated by three military officers who held Baptist sentiments (Dow, 251-2).

forty officers were either discharged or had deserted by the beginning of December.[297] In Ayr alone 30 soldiers were discharged, all described as 'Capt. Spencer's people...of that church', i.e. Baptists.[298] On December 31 a series of printed papers of Baptist origin denouncing Monck's position were discovered in Leith which prompted a search for hidden presses in the port town and further action against the sect.[299] This third purge of the sect served as the terminal blow for the Baptists in Scotland. By the beginning of 1660 the removal of all Baptist soldiers marked the complete dismantling of the Baptist infrastructure in Scotland.

Interpreting Divergent Experiences

After the Restoration both Baptists and Quakers were singled out and acted against by Scottish Episcopalians, Presbyterians and secular authorities who all agreed on the necessity of suppressing them, because they represented the ideologies that underpinned the Commonwealth throughout the Interregnum. In 1661 the Scottish Parliament produced an act against all meetings of Baptists or Quakers which quashed the promises of toleration extended to them under the Commonwealth.[300] Despite being the targets of the same legislation and policies of persecution, Baptists and Quakers experienced drastically different fortunes at the end of the Interregnum and into the Restoration in Scotland. This section will attempt to explain why these two groups, whose similarities were discussed at the beginning of this chapter, fared so differently in the face of Presbyterian and Episcopalian opposition.

Baptists disappeared almost immediately after the Interregnum and may have vanished even before then. The Baptists' failure to maintain the success they experienced during the Interregnum rested on their poor strategy of integrating into Scottish society. From the arrival of the movement their infrastructure depended heavily upon the English Army for ministers

---

[297] Dow, 253. Even long-time supporters of Monck, like Abraham Holmes, deserted their posts in Scotland establishing allegiance on grounds of religious persuasion. Holmes left Scotland and secured Carlisle for Lambert as conflict between the two armies began to look inevitable (*RHCA*, 579-80).
[298] Adv.Ms.35.5.11, f. 58; *Clarke Papers*, iv:160-1.
[299] Adv.Ms.35.5.11, f. 62-4, 79, 83.
[300] Parliament of Scotland, *Proclamation Against All Meetings of Quakers, Anabaptists, & c.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1661).

and support. When that relationship, which seemed to be under constant pressure, became strained in 1655 (Overton's Plot), frayed in 1658 with Cromwell's orders to remove Baptists from places of trust, and severed in 1659 with the wholesale cashiering and imprisonment of all Baptists in the army, the sect found itself in a poor position to carry on. Their last gasps in seventeenth-century Scotland are not recorded, but once Monck marched south they could not have lasted long. The army left behind had no sympathies for Baptists. Those Baptists not discharged or imprisoned fled to England, making it unlikely there were any sympathetic English left in Scotland. In such an inhospitable setting, even those Scots Baptists who had nobly held out in Fife earlier in the year could not have continued. With no local garrisons for support and facing censures from the Kirk including bans on trading with 'sectarians' Baptists very quickly would have found themselves isolated socially and financially. In short, the Baptists in Scotland were far too dependent on the support of the English regime and never established their own roots independently of the army. In relation to the Scots, Baptists failed to overcome their affiliation with the infamous 'Anabaptists' of the Continent. Before the movement even arrived in Scotland it had been linked ideologically, by Baillie and others, to what happened at Münster more than a century before.[301] They never adequately dealt with the continued correlation between themselves and the 'Anabaptists', by either embracing the label and making it their own, or sufficiently rejecting it. Instead they meekly accepted it with only mild reservations, as is evidenced in their declaration of faith in 1653, where they referred to themselves as the gathered churches of Christ 'commonly (though unjustly) called Anabaptists'. Moreover, rather than distancing themselves from such negative correlations, they actually reaffirmed those stereotypes by becoming embroiled in multiple failed conspiracies. As a result, Baptists actually confirmed the negative images portrayed by Baillie in 1647 and gave rise to new myths of violence and slaughter.

---

[301] Robert Baillie, *Anabaptism, the True Fountaine of Independency, Brownisme, Antinomy, Familisme, and the Most of the Other Errours.* (London: printed by M.F. for Samuel Gellibrand, 1647).

With regards to the Quakers, claims by James Torrance and G.B. Burnet that the movement in Scotland was a failure are misleading and myopic. Though the Quakers never achieved the numerical success in Scotland that they did in England, nonetheless they attained something remarkable and worthy of note. They were the only religious group introduced into Scotland during the Interregnum to survive uninterrupted to the present day. This is an astounding feat, especially when during the increasing persecution of the 1660s they actually spread over the country and numerically increased. Yet, this growth owes much to seeds planted by other sectarian activity in Scotland during the Interregnum. In Aberdeen for instance, Alexander Jaffray (a former Independent) and Margaret Anderson (a former Baptist) were among the early Quaker converts in that city in the early 1660s. William Dundas, likewise, joined the Quakers after the Interregnum after a stint of Independency.[302]

So why were the Quakers the only sect to survive beyond the Interregnum, especially when Independency was so close doctrinally to the Kirk? The survival of Quakerism in Scotland rests predominantly on three points. First, theologically the Quakers offered a distinct alternative to the Kirk. The close doctrinal similarity between the Independents and the Kirk actually served as a primary reason why Independency failed in Scotland. The only significant difference advocated by the Independents was simply a change in ecclesiastical government from a top down national structure to the basic powers of church government being retained in individual congregations.[303] In short Independency simply was not different enough to warrant holding out, especially when at the Restoration Episcopacy had to be opposed. Baptists offered a different doctrine of Baptism and sometimes Arminian theology, but this was half way to the

---

[302] For a discussion of Independency see chapter four above.

[303] While ministers of the Kirk went to great lengths in writing against Independents they produced nothing against the Quakers, not even in manuscript form. Perhaps this can be explained by the lack of points of contact between Calvinist Theology and Quaker Theology. Whereas the Kirk had to battle hard against Independents because they were asserting ideological supremacy in degrees rather than in significantly different concepts, . In other words, Independents were more of a threat because their position was close to the Presbyterians, so crossover from one side to the other could more easily take place. Presbyterians and Independents did not argue whether elders were an important part of a church, but rather the nature and degree of their power. Quakers on the other hand denied any hierarchy in the church. Hence Presbyterians felt less need to intellectually oppose Quakers (and to

Quakers. Those who took strides towards the Baptists often found it easy to take additional steps towards the Friends. Quakers were, in terms of seventeenth-century Protestantism, the opposite end of the spectrum to the Kirk's hard Calvinist theology. They represented something completely 'other'. In contrast to the Kirk's strict doctrine of double predestination, Fox and the Scottish Friends preached free grace revealed through the Inner Light in All and the death and resurrection of Christ as 'a propitiation for the sins of the whole world'.[304] This did not represent the universal atonement of later Quakers, but an evangelical message for all humanity to cleave to Christ and to a salvation, not dependent on cold election, but of hope that through embracing the Inner Light (Christ) and believing its continuing revelation the faithful will find the salvation God intends for them. For 'the grace that bringeth salvation hath appealed to all men which teaches us to live soberly and godly: and to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts'.[305] Whereas the Kirk preached unconfirmable election shrouded in doubt and manifested in countless testimonies, which Fox simply interpreted as 'the greatest part of men were ordained for hell', the Quakers offered hopeful action. 'Therefore all people believe in the light as Christ commands,' proclaimed Fox, 'and own the grace of God your free teacher: and it will bring you your salvation for it is sufficient'.[306] Set against a Kirk which could bar members from the sacraments, the Quakers internalised them. As a result they provided a more immediate experience of Christ, free from obstruction or censure by temporal ecclesiastical courts, and provided a stronger sense of the priesthood of all believers than was offered through the Kirk's stringent control or the Episcopacy that followed. This no doubt appealed to some. Quakers offered a distinct alternative in a culture dominated by a strict hierarchical church that maintained orthodoxy by censure and reprimand: freedom and empowerment to actively take control of one's personal and spiritual life free from any clerical mediation.

---

some degree the Baptists) because in terms of doctrinal formulae the Quakers were altogether on another playing field.

[304] Fox, 240.

[305] Ibid, 241.

[306] Ibid, 241.

A second key factor contributing to Friends success through the Interregnum and beyond rested in their shared self-identity. As Kate Peters notes, Quakers took ownership of the label 'Quaker'. Although intended to be slanderous, they made it a 'banner of unity'.[307] This provided distinct borders for the movement allowing them to formulate a solidified identity other sectarian groups like the Ranters never attained. Whereas Baptists could not shake the negative associations of their continental ancestors and eventually had to accept an unwanted nomenclature, the Quakers' ability to take an aspersion and through their propaganda embrace it as a positive identity, allowed them to take ownership of their title and assert their distinctiveness.

Third and finally, Quakers were the best prepared sect to survive through the Interregnum and flourish after the Restoration, because in Scotland, as in England, they were born and bred in turmoil. Scottish Quakers were never the chosen sect of the establishment nor had they ever really experienced wide ranging protection from the government. Despite the Protector's great admiration for Fox,[308] in distant Scotland they were viewed by the military regime as a nuisance and liability, while being the victims of Presbyterian 'club law'. Unlike Baptists and Independents who offered new communities of support under the protection of either the government or Baptist soldiers during the Interregnum, the Quakers rarely found any institutional support. As a result, the Quakers were long experienced in being persecuted and persevering. From 1650 until 1687 the decision to join the Quakers included an inherent acceptance of possible persecution and social exclusion in Scotland. Yet for those Scots who became convinced persecution did little to inhibit the joy of pursuing the truth. As the Scottish Quaker Andrew Robeson put it: 'who shall turn it backwards? Tho breirs, & thorns may now spring up, their comes a day of burning'.[309] The open recognition of possible persecution

---

[307] Kate Peters, '"The Quakers quaking": print and the spread of a movement.' *Belief and Practice in Reformation England.* St Andrews Studies in Reformation History, (eds) Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 1998), 250-67.
[308] D.M. Butler, *George Fox in Scotland* (Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1913), 21.
[309] NLS, MS. 2201, f. 100.

provided the Quakers a strength and resilience unmatched among the religious groups taking root in Cromwellian Scotland. Far from being a failure, the Quaker movement in Scotland overcame great odds and opposition to establish a distinct religious movement that has survived uninterrupted for over three-hundred and fifty years. In fact, in the years immediately following the Interregnum, they felt a sense of triumph; interpreting the re-imposition of Episcopacy as God allowing a temporary triumph of the Beast in order to punish the sins of their Presbyterian persecutors. 'Hath he not washt away thy laite oppressors as with a flood? And was it not because they provocked him with anger?'[310] 'Altho the Lord suffers a floode of prophanity (Episcopacy) to wash down a Fabricke of false worship in hiposcrisie that was idolatrously weavd in the land,' wrote Robeson in 1662, eventually God would remove all anti-Christian forms allowing the Quakers and all tolerant Christians to thrive.[311]

Unfortunately for the Baptists, they fell into the caricature given to them by their enemies. Through their involvement in radical dissent manifested in political intrigues they ostracised themselves from the government who relied upon them so heavily during its campaigns against the King and the Kirk. When the favour of English government turned against them they were left with no friends in times of trouble. Lacking the grit the Quakers developed through years of opposition, the Baptists quickly folded under Presbyterian opposition once the army had forsaken them. It would be sixty years before any Baptists would again make headway among the Scots. By that time the Quakers were an established group in Scotland, both in Lanarkshire and Aberdeenshire, and had made forays into the New World.

---

[310] Ibid, 99.
[311] Ibid, 100.

Conclusion

The question may be asked: What impact did the introduction of sectarian religion during the Interregnum have upon Scotland? If any, was it lasting? Although the Quakers were the only religious group introduced during the Interregnum to survive beyond the Restoration period, the relationship between the people of Scotland and alternative forms of Protestantism to the Presbytery is a crucially important subject. The religious controversy within Interregnum Scotland between the Kirk and sects, has largely been overshadowed by the subsequent struggle between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism in the 1660s and 1670s. Successive historians of the Kirk have looked back over the seventeenth-century as a time when it was twice victorious over Episcopacy, and the doctrines of the Kirk dominated those of the Independents in the Westminster Assembly of Divines. However, in practical terms, the price paid for the advancement of the Presbyterian cause weighed heavily upon the people of Scotland. It embroiled them in two English Civil Wars and led to England's invasion of Scotland in 1650. The human cost was enormous. Just in Scotland's defeats at Dunbar (September 3, 1650) and Worcester (September 3, 1651) approximately 20,000 Scotsmen were taken prisoner: many of whom died in captivity or were shipped as indentured servants to the colonies.[1]

Far from being a decade in which the only questions relating to Presbytery and the covenants were regarding how to best propagate them, Scotland's devotion to the Kirk, covenants and King all came under intense scrutiny during the Interregnum. This intense re-evaluation was exacerbated by the polemic dialogue carried on by the English Army and the Kirk before the Battle of Dunbar. Both sides asserted that the righteousness of their actions over the previous decade would be vindicated in the present conflict. This in turn greatly raised the religious stakes for both England and Scotland. When Scotland's Army, which boasted so many advantages, was decimated at Dunbar in such an emphatic manner, men like Alexander Jaffray,

---

[1] Grainger, 42-58; Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 149, 174; Dow, 11; Diane Rapaport, 'Scottish Slavery in 17th-Century New England.' *History Scotland* (5.1) 2005, 44-52.

Thomas Wood and Col. Archibald Strachan began to ask whether Dunbar should be viewed as a divine judgement against the ideologies to which Scotland had pinned their hopes: Kirk, covenants and Presbytery. They began to entertain the possibility that the way forward might be outside a national Presbyterian Kirk.

The fact that this questioning and subsequent disillusionment corresponded with the arrival of the English Army—which had not only predicted God's judgement against the Kirk, but offered a plethora of alternatives to Scotland's state church—provided a platform for English zealots within the army to preach the merits of their own preferred patterns of Protestantism. But while the more radical sects were eager to trample down the Kirk and to proselytise Scotland to their own doctrinal factions, they were out of touch with what Cromwell and his fellow moderate Independents were attempting. Cromwell's desire, which became increasingly clear after he became Lord Protector, was not for everyone to accept a uniform pattern of church government, liturgy and practice, because he was an anti-formalist.[2] He was not even seeking a simple toleration for all Protestants. What he truly longed for, as Blair Worden has identified, was unity among all Christians.[3]

The policy of the Commonwealth, after an initial period of producing anti-Presbyterian works intended to undermine the dominance of the Kirk, sought to build bridges with the godly in Scotland rather than to remove all traces of Presbyterianism from the country. Cromwell was not opposed to Presbytery, only an intolerant Presbytery that lorded over the consciences of others.[4] From the perspective of an English regime pursuing religious unity, a national Presbytery represented rigid 'formality' understood to be incompatible with Christian liberties.[5]

---

[2] J. Coffey, *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford.* (Cambridge: University Press, 1997), 188; J.C. Davis, 'Cromwell's Religion', *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (ed.) J. Morrill, (London, 1990), pp. 198-208.

[3] B. Worden, 'Toleration and the Cromwellian Protectorate,' 210.

[4] This may be another reason that the struggle against Episcopacy in the 1630s and again in the 1660s and 70s has so significantly overshadowed what happened in the 1650s, because those periods it really was about preserving Presbyterianism in the face of total disestablishment.

[5] J. C. Davis 'Against formality: one aspect of the English Revolution', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, 3 (1993), 265-88.

The evidence from the Interregnum suggests an English policy of tolerating the Kirk so long as it did not attempt to oppress the consciences of those who chose 'another gospel way'. That is why the official policy of the English regime was not to promote one particular sect over another. For Cromwell, this was the most difficult aspect of dealing with the radicals in his army, as they tended to persecute each other and persisted to be the greatest obstacle for him to overcome in establishing the Christian Commonwealth he longed for.[6] 'Is it ingenuous to ask for liberty, and not to give it?' 'Where shall we find men of a universal spirit? Everyone desires to have liberty, but none will give it'.[7]

This official policy, that is promoting toleration and the gathering of congregations, shines light on Major John Cloberry's unwillingness to facilitate a second dispute between James Brown and James Guthrie. Their first encounter had not, in Cloberry's view, contributed to Christian unity. It also explains why Robert Lilburne, being an avid Baptist, distributed sermons by John Owen that advocated the gathering of the godly out of a dead church. Under the Protectorate, the differences between Independents and Presbyterians, from the regime's perspective, were minimised. The Protector and Lord Broghill, during his stay in Scotland from September 1655 to August 1656, made great efforts to bring the fractured Kirk together and to bring it into a positive co-existent relationship with the government. Certainly, Gillespie's faction of Protesters demonstrated that with a degree of compromise Presbyterians could not only coexist but thrive under the Commonwealth's religious policy, that is, if they could see past their desires for national conformity. The collusion between Gillespie and the English Independent John Beverley illustrated that a moderate position could be reached in which both sides were content, with the focus shifting from the structure of a single national church government to a shared desire for strict discipline within individual congregations. As was shown in chapter four, seeking unity between Presbyterians and Independents on these grounds was not unique to

---

[6] Ibid, 211.
[7] Abbott, *Cromwell*, iii:459, 547. 586; iv:271; Worden 'Toleration and the Cromwellian Protectorate', 211.

Scotland.[8] In this way a small group of individuals on both sides found common ground in Interregnum Scotland that could not be agreed to in the Westminster Assembly. Of course this compromise was not acceptable to the majority of the more stringent sort on either side, but it was a hopeful start. It was along these lines that Broghill's hopes rested when he wrote to Cromwell in February 1656 of plans to lull both Protesters and Resolutioners into union under the Protectorate and boasted of the benefits the Protector could reap among English Presbyterians if this could be done.[9]

Great efforts were made for recognition and compromise between Presbyterians and the Independents because the Protector desired unity and toleration amongst the godly, and generally numbered both groups among the godly. In appointing committees to certify ministers he 'endeavoured to settle a way for approbation of men of piety and fitness for the work, and the business committed to persons both of the presbyterian and independent judgment, men of as known ability and integrity, as, I suppose, any the nation hath'.[10] Thus with the inception of the Protectorate the government's policy of energetically promoting Independency in Scotland shifted to finding common ground. The aim was to find unity among the godly, with some kind of equilibrium between Independents and Presbyterians. The underlying premise remained the toleration of the rights of the congregation through the softening of the Kirk's rigid hierarchy, minimising the Kirk's ability to work from the top down by the dissolution of the General Assembly and preventing presbyteries and synods from meeting when tensions ran high.[11] And it seems that this policy was accepted by many of the troops as well, since the Quaker Francis Howgill scolded the multitude of English soldiers attending Kirk services in 1657:

---

[8] Nuttall, Geoffrey F. 'Presbyterians and Independents Some Movements for Unity 300 years ago.' *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* 10 (1952), 4-15; Nuttall, Geoffrey F. 'Relations Between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in England.' *Studies in the Puritan Tradition* (Dec. 1964): 1-7.
[9] Thurloe, iv:557
[10] Whitelocke, iv:135.
[11] Dow, 104-5, 146-7.

> countenancing the Priests and Teachers of this Nation, and upholding the same worship, which some of you in years past would have been ashamed of, and are not you going to learn of them, and to be taught by them, who before Dunbar, Prophecyed all your destruction, and your totall overthrow, and delivered you up to Satan as Hereticks: and so were...incendaries to imbroyl all the poor people of this Nation in blood to fight for their imagined calfe Presbitery; and are they now become your Teachers?[12]

That the distinction between Independency and the rigid Presbyterianism of the Kirk seems to have blurred for some English soldiers is a further example of the successful fruition of Cromwell's dream. But this was not a difficult step for English troopers of an Independent leaning since the aspect of Presbyterianism that they so hated, the intolerant ecclesiastical government, had largely been removed through the abolition of the General Assembly and the disenfranchising of synods and presbyteries by English intervention.[13] In the absence of a domineering ecclesiastical government English troops of the Independent variety could in good conscience attend Kirk services to hear the Calvinist preaching that so many of them loved. Although the rift between the Resolutioners and Protesters was not mended under the Protectorate, Menzies' return to the Kirk and Gillespie's compliance with English Independents demonstrate Cromwell's desire for an amicable resolution between Presbyterians and Independents achieving some success in Scotland. A further example of the pursuit of Christian unity was Jaffray asking the minister of Ormiston as the minister of *a kirk* (as opposed to being a minister of *the Kirk*) to baptise his child. This is the sort of Christian co-existence Cromwell sought: free from any struggle for power or preferment. In the example of Jaffray it found a greater success in Scotland than it often did in England where sects struggled so hard for supremacy over their rivals.

Ascertaining a precise number of Scots who accepted sectarian doctrines is not possible. However, it is wrong to accept James Guthrie's 1659 claim that 'scarce' one in a thousand Scots were 'infected' as evidence of a minimal impact—as Hoy did—without noting Guthrie's

---

[12] Francis Howgill, *To All you Commanders and officers of the Army of Scotland.* (Leith,1657), 2, 3

[13] English intervention was demonstrated on several occasions, but of particular interest was the intervention in Aberdeen when the synod moved to stop Cant's restricted communion format: see ch. 4.

admission 'some hundreds' had joined with sects.[14] Guthrie gauged the health of the church by overall national adherence and so the presence of several hundred sectarians 'being openly fallen off to Independency, some to Anabaptism, some to Quakerism' may have seemed 'inconsiderable in comparison to the Body of this Church'.[15] For this reason Guthrie could disparage claims of success by opponents of the Kirk as unjustifiable. Yet in making such claims he failed to recognise the ecclesiological perspective of those 'sects' who by self-definition perceived themselves to be a small amount of 'wheat' collected out of the 'chaff' majority. As a result, measuring success by numerical quotas is unfair in light of the distinctly different ecclesiological definitions. While the national Kirk strove for uniformity and wholesale inclusion of Scotland's populace, the radical groups, which formed during the Interregnum, believed they would always be the righteous minority. Achievement should therefore be measured in terms of an established presence, represented by a strong voice advocating their principles. By such standards even Guthrie would admit sectarian success by the end of 1659 as they already had 'no small footing amongst us' and 'strongly' pleaded for continued toleration for all Protestants save Episcopacy.[16] Hence Guthrie argued 'sectarians' represented a dangerous leaven in Scotland which, although proportionately small in comparison to the national church, ought to be feared for their 'growth and increase...in Scotland'.[17]

The success of the religious revolution in Scotland during these ten years manifested itself in two ways. First, was the survival of the Quakers beyond the Restoration until the present day, which Alan Macinnes calls 'the one British religious legacy of the 1650s...within the indigenous

---

[14] Guthrie, *Some Considerations*, 65, 66; Hoy, 209. Moreover, one in a thousand is not an insignificant number in a country whose population in the mid-seventeenth century was probably approaching one million. Estimates of Scotland's population before 1700 are very hazy. According to R.E. Tyson the population of Scotland grew rapidly from 1500, when the population was close to 700,000, until the 1640s (Michael Lynch (ed.) *The Oxford Companion to Scottish History* (Oxford: OUP, 2001), 'population patters', 488. While Michael W. Flinn's work identifies factors and trends in Scotland's population fluctuations, he fails to offer any estimates for the total population of Scotland during the 17th century (Michael W. Flinn, *Scottish population history from the 17th century to the 1930s* (Cambridge: CUP, 1977).

[15] Ibid, 85, 65.

[16] Ibid, 68, 69.

[17] Ibid, 69.

population of Scotland'.[18] Second, was the petition for 'Gospel Priviledges' in Scotland, presented to Parliament in 1659. Putting aside the habit of measuring the success of the church by numerical membership, we may be able to appreciate the degree of change experienced by those who in the space of a decade went from supporting violent expansion of a particular ecclesiastical structure to embracing Cromwell's desire for Christian unity and toleration. The Scots who signed the petition for 'Gospel Priviledges' in 1659 (whether Baptist, Quaker or Independent) had progressed a step beyond their English counterparts whose sectarianism brought about the downfall of the Commonwealth just a few months later. The stand off between Monck and Lambert in the closing months of 1659 bore witness to the narrow ambitions of two factions which had formed within the English government. The extreme Baptists and Fifth Monarchists who dominated the army in England desired to usher in a new Kingdom of Christ and could see no compromise short of a millenarian facilitation of Christ's Second Advent. Equally, the moderate Independents had abandoned the Christian confraternity fundamental to the Commonwealth ideal when they expelled those difficult to control elements out of the army in Scotland. By excluding the radical elements so fundamental in the establishment of the Commonwealth, the moderate Independents and pragmatic Republicans signalled the imminent failure of that body politic. Religious divisions became a fundamental obstacle for the successful maintenance of the Commonwealth. Even Cromwell, 'the most tolerant man of his age', as L.F. Brown termed him, reached a limit of tolerance towards sects and died at odds with both the Quakers and the Baptists.[19] In Scotland, however, the Commonwealth ideals of religious toleration and confraternity persisted among a loosely knit circle of individuals. In signing the petition requesting the maintenance of gospel privileges for all sects, Scottish proselytes to 'English' religions shone brighter in their principles than the missionaries who had brought the message of toleration and the politicians who had advocated

---

[18] Macinnes, *The British Revolution*, 287*n*44.
[19] L.F. Brown, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and the Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum.* (Oxford: OUP, 1912), 134.

it. This pursuit of mutual toleration was the 'Gospel Pattern' of coexistence between inherently divergent Christian communities that the Protector had advocated until his death.

Appendix I: Pre-Dunbar Propaganda of 1650

1. List of Works produced in the run-up to Dunbar

This table contains the publications leading up to the Battle of Dunbar, discussed in chapter one. The dates of publication are as accurate as possible. Those without specified dates are listed in their relative chronological order.

June 21	Church of Scotland, *Causes of a Publick and Solemn Humiliation [21 June 1650]* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).
June 25	Church of Scotland. General Assembly. Commission (Andrew Ker), *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning Concerning Present Dangers and Duties, from the Commissioners of the Generall Assembly Unto All the Members of This Kirk.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, June 25, 1650).
June 26	England and Wales. Parliament, *Declaration of the Parliament of England, upon the Marching of the Armie Into Scotland, June 26, 1650.* (London: William Dugard, 1650).
?	Church of Scotland. General Assembly. Commission, *Causes of a Publique and Solemn Humiliation appointed by the Commission of the General Assembly.* (Edinburgh: E. Tyler, 1650). To be kept on June 30. [Perfect Diurnall, July 1-8, 1650. E777(21)]
?	Church of Scotland, *A Declaration of Principles on Which the Army Is to Fight.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).
?	Church of Scotland, *Directions of the Generall Assembly Concerning Secret and Private Worship, and Mutuall Edification, for Cherishing Piety, for Maintaining Unity, and Avoiding Schism and Division. With an Act for Observing These Directions, and for Censuring Such as Use to Neglect Family Worship. And an Act Against Such as Withdraw Themselves from the Publike Worship in Their Owne Congregations.* (Edinburgh: Re-Printed by Evan Tyler, 1650).
July 15	England and Wales. Army, *A Declaration of the Army of England upon Their March Into Scotland: To All That are Saints, and Partakers of the Faith of God's Elect, in Scotland.* (Newcastle: S.B., 1650). [This certainly refers to Stephen Bulkley.] Subsequently reprinted in London by Edward Husband and John Field on July 19.
July 19	Church of Scotland, *A Declaration of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, in Answer to a Declaration, intituled, A Declaration of the Parliament of England, upon the Marching of Their Army into Scotland, and Concerning Present Dangers and Duties, in Reference both to Sectaries and Malignants.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).
c. July 20-21	England and Wales. Army, *Declaration of the Army of the Commonwealth of England to the People of Scotland.* No original copies survive, but was reprinted in London by Husband and Field. [Composed at Berwick: Abbott, The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, II:290; also Perfect Diurnal, July 22, 1650; Several Proceedings, July 24, 1650]

July 22 **Cromwell's forces cross the Tweed.**

July 22 Scotland. Committee of Estates, *An Answere from the Committee of Estates, To a Printed Paper Directed to the People of Scotland, and Signed in Name of L.G. Cromwel, and His Officers.* (Edinburgh, July 22, 1650).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly. Commission (Andrew Ker), *A Short Reply to the Army's Declaration.* (Edinburgh, July 22, 1650).

July 25 Friend to the Commonwealth of England, *The English Banner of Truth Displayed: or, The State of This Present Engagement Against Scotland.* (London: printed for Giles Calvert, 1650).

July 27 Scotland. Committee of Estates, *Proclamation, July 27 [Offering a Pardon to Those of the English Army Who Shall Come Over to the Scottish Army].* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

July 31 Church of Scotland, *For the Under-Officers and Souldiers of the English Army, from the People of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: printed by Evan Tyler, 1650).

August 1 England and Wales. Army. *A Declaration of the English Army now in Scotland, especially those among them that know and fear the Lord.* London: [s.n.], 1659. [In the British Library, this bibliographical information is incorrect. The last page is dated: Musselburgh, August 1, 1650]

August 3 England and Wales. Army, *A vindication of the declaration of the Army of England upon their march into Scotland, from the uncharitable constructions, odious imputations, and scandalous asperations of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland,* [dated August 3, 1650 and found in Andrew Ker, *A Short Reply Unto a Declaration, Entituled, The Declaration of the Army of England, upon Their March Into Scotland. Together with a Vindication of the Declaration of the Army of England upon Their March Into Scotland, from the Uncharitable Constructions, Odious Imputations, and Scandalous Asperations of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, in Their Reply Thereunto.* (London: Printed for John Field, August 16, 1650) and English Army, *A Declaration of the Army of England upon Their March Into Scotland as Also a Letter of His Excellency the Lord Generall Cromwell to the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland Together with a Vindication of the Aforesaid Declaration from the Uncharitable Constructions, Odious Imputations, and Scandalous Aspersions of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, in Their Reply Thereto and an Answer of the Under-Officers and Souldiers of the Army, to a Paper Directed to Them from the People of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650)]

Oliver Cromwell, *A Letter Sent to the Generall Assembly of the Kirke of Scotland.* (London: Printed for Hanna Allen., 1650) [dated and sent to the Commissioners of the General Assembly on August 3]

August 7 James Guthrie's reply to Cromwell's Letter: Commission of the General Assembly, 'For the Commander-in-chief of the Armie come from England into Scotland' dated August 7, 1650, in J. Christie, ed., *Records of the Commission of the General* Assembly, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: Scottish Historical Society), iii:19-23

?	John Vicar, *A Caveat for Covenant-Contemners and Covenant-Breakers.* (Printed in the year of the Dukes unlawfull Engagement against England; 1648. and now re-printed, at Edinburgh in the year of the... unlawfull ungagement against Scotland,1650).
August 14	Church of Scotland, *West-Kirk the 13. Day of August, 1650.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650) [Kirk disowned the sins of the King and Malignancy]. Accompanied by letter from Gen. Lesley. Printed on the 14th, delivered to Cromwell, he replied the same day.
	Oliver Cromwell, *The Lord Gen. Cromwel's Letter: With a Narrative of The Proceedings of the English Army in Scotland, and a Declaration of the General Assembly, Touching the Dis-Owning Their King and His Interest.* (London: Printed by Edward Husband and John Field, Printers to the Parliament of England, August 23, 1650). [Letter sent on August 14.]
August 15	Scotland. Army, *To the Right Honourable the Lords and Others of the Committee of Estates, The Humble Remonstrance and Supplication of the Officers of the Army.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).
August 16	Charles II. *A Declaration by the Kings Majesty.* Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650. [A broadsheet, probably the initial publication of the work.] Charles II. *By the King, Charles by the Grace of God....* Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650. [bound copy]
September 3	*Battle of Dunbar*
?	*The King of Scotlands Negociations at Rome for Assistance Against the Common-Wealth of England, As Also Severall Letters of the Chancellour of Scotland to the King Since His Coming Into Scotland, Taken in His Cabinet at the Late Fight Neer Dunbar.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).
?	Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *The Causes of a Publick Fast, and Humiliation to be Kept with all Convenient Diligence.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1650). Including 'A Letter, to the Presbyteries, from the Commission of the General Assembly' signed by Robert Douglas and 'A shorte declaration and Warning to all the Congregations of the Kirk of Scotland' signed by A. Ker, both dated September 12, 1650.

2. Secondary Polemic Pertaining to the Invasion of Scotland

Propaganda in 1650 was not limited the words produced by the two forces in conflict in Scotland. Other polemical texts, both pro-Parliamentarian and pro-Covenant, were published in England. *The King of Scotlands Negociations at Rome* expounds the papist nature of Charles II, and

claims he requested aid from the pope in return for pronouncing Britain Catholic once his throne had been restored.[1] Individual copies of the letters were also published in English newsbooks in early July.[2] Sermons preached against the Scots in Parliament were also published. One such sermon by Thomas Brooks, given on the day of Thanksgiving for the victory at Dunbar (October 8), was based upon Isaiah 10:6: 'I will send him against an hypocriticall nation; and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets'.[3] This theme showed up repeatedly in the propaganda produced in England against the Scots and their Kirk.

Another theme which appeared frequently identified the source of conflict as Scotland's overriding devotion to the Covenant above all else. This theme featured in *The English Banner of Truth displayed.*[4] *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning*, although written and printed in London, responded directly to the Kirk's initial propaganda. It challenged the Kirk's accusations of heresy in England by pointing out they failed to list any of these heresies by name.[5] *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning* is important because it demonstrates that the polemics catered to an eager audience in England as well as Scotland. Other voices entered the fray and many citizens in England were keen to hear the ongoing dialogue.

Yet by no means did all the works of propaganda produced in England support the Parliamentarian invasion of Scotland. Some works were pro-Covenant or at least supportive of fellow Protestants. The Puritan William Prynne, for instance, wrote *Sad and serious political considerations, touching the invasive war against our Presbyterian Protestant brethren in Scotland.* As the title

---

[1] *The King of Scotland Negociations at Rome for Assistance Against the Common-Wealth of England, In Certain Propositions There Made, for, Good on His Behalf; in Which Propositions His Affection and Disposition to Poperie Is Asserted.* (London: William Du-gard, 1650).
[2] *The Impartial Scout*, July 12-19 (1650), 246-7 [E777(29)]; *Several Proceedings in Parliament*, July 11-18 (1650), 215-18 [E777(27)].
[3] Thomas Brooks, *The Hypocrite detected, anatomized, impeached, arraigned, and condemned before the Parliament of England. or, A Word in Season.* (London: Fr: Neile, 1650), 1.
[4] Friend to the Commonwealth of England, *The English Banner of Truth Displayed: or, The State of This Present Engagement Against Scotland.* (London: printed for Giles Calvert, 1650).
[5] Servant of the Common-wealth of England, *An Examination of the Seasonable and Necessarie Warning Concerning Present Dangers and Duties, Emitted from the Commissioners of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, Unto All the Members of That Kirk. June 25 1650: Which Was Printed at Edinburgh.* (London: William Du-gard, 1650), 8.

suggests he believed the invasion was unjust, but more importantly, he believed it threatened the stability of European Protestantism as a whole. For Prynne, the real threat for Protestants did not lie in other Reformed Churches, but in the scheming plans of the Catholics and Episcopalians.[6] He produced a history of the Civil Wars up to 1650 in which he rendered Catholicism as the deceptive force at the root of all divisions between Protestants. The ultimate end of the fighting between the English and the Scots, feared Prynne, would be a weakening of all the Reformed Churches in Britain enabling the Papacy to regain control in both countries.[7] While Prynne was not a 'Presbyterian' in terms of polity he was strongly Calvinist and a sturdy proponent of a national church in England, and he therefore fits into the broader definition of 'Presbyterian' put forward by Ann Hughes.

According to Hughes, there were orthodox Puritan clergy in England who may be 'loosely termed Presbyterian' because, even though they 'were more open-minded on details of church government' than those who overtly called themselves Presbyterian, they still 'supported a national church', were 'Calvinist in doctrine' and were active in a 'rigorous disciplinary structure'.[8] It was into this group of individuals, Presbyterian in every aspect but name and precise form of ecclesiastical polity, into which Prynne fits. A relatively small number in the English army would fit Hughes' broader definition of Presbyterian. On the whole English Presbyterian support for the invasion of Scotland was limited and few took part in the invasion. This can be seen by the proportionately small number of Presbyterian chaplains that served in the invading army in comparison to previous campaigns.[9] Furthermore, Presbyterian opinion in England remained unconvinced about the justice of invading Scotland and highly skeptical of the army. Whitelocke reported in August 1651 that rigid Presbyterian ministers refused to give thanks for recent victories over the Scots.[10] And generally, there was a feeling among

---

[6]William Prynne, *Sad and Serious Political Considersations, Touching the Invasive War Against Our Presbyterian Protestant Brethren in Scotland.* (London: [s.n.], 1650), 2.
[7] Prynne, 12.
[8] Ann Hughes, '"Popular" Presbyterianism in the 1640 and 1650s', 235-6.
[9] Laurence, *Parliamentary Army Chaplains*, 70.
[10] Whitelocke, iii:340.

Presbyterians, even in England, that the Commonwealth's Army was overwhelmingly sectarian. The Presbyterians of Nottingham complained in December 1651 that the soldiers of Col. Whalley's regiment who preached openly in the city constituted the worst plague the city had ever experienced.[11] These accounts support other contemporary reports from the period that the army was sectarian in its composition. Bishop Burnet, a native of Aberdeen, certainly thought so when he recollected in his memoirs that the vast majority of the English soldiers in that city during the 1650s were either 'Anabaptist' or Independent in their religious persuasion.[12]

---

[11]Ibid, iii:372.
[12] Gilbert Burnet, *Burnet's History of his own time.* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1875), 38.

Appendix II: English Use of the Printing Press

1. Evan Tyler's Edinburgh Printing House

Evan Tyler, an Englishman, seems to have had few loyalties. Appointed the King's printer in Scotland in 1641[1] he continued to print for both the King and the Kirk until the beginning of September 1650. However, upon Cromwell's arrival in Edinburgh his imprint began to appear on pro-Commonwealth publications, both secular and religious in nature, while in 1655 he published a new edition of Robert Baillie's *Disswasive from the Errors of the Time* in London.[2] Yet any questions over his personal loyalties are complicated when it is explained that Evan Tyler was not just an individual, but also the 'label' used by the London Stationers' Company for their printing endeavours in Scotland.

Traditionally historians of Scotland's printing presses have held the belief that Evan Tyler's press was sold to the London Stationers' Company sometime after the English conquest of Edinburgh, a belief proposed in James Watson's 1713 preface to *The History of Printing* and propagated by subsequent historians of Scottish printing.[3] W.J. Couper also followed very closely to the chronology of events reported by Watson going as far as to explain that Evan

---

[1] The King's patent in Scotland was jointly given to Tyler and Robert Young in 1641. Young died in 1643, leaving Tyler the sole holder of the grant. D. Stevenson, 'A Revolutionary Regime and the Press: the Scottish Covenanters and Their Printers, 1638-51,' *Union, Revolution and Religion in 17th-Century Scotland.* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1997), XV:326.

[2] Oliver Cromwell, *Several Letters and Passages Between His Excellency, the Lord General Cromwel and the Governor of Edinburgh Castle, and the Ministers There, Since His Excellencies Entrance Into Edinburgh.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650); *Relation of a Great Victory.Against Clanricard Near the Shannon.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650); *The King of Scotlands Negociations at Rome for Assistance Against the Common-Wealth of England, As Also Severall Letters of the Chancellour of Scotland to the King Since His Coming Into Scotland, Taken in His Cabinet at the Late Fight Neer Dunbar.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650); John Owen, *The Branch of the Lord, the Beauty of Sion.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650); Robert Baillie, *The Disswasive from the Errors of the Time, Vindicated from the Exceptions of Mr. Cotton and Mr. Tomes.* (London: Evan Tyler, 1655).

[3] James Watson, *James Watson's Preface to the History of Printing 1713* (Greenock: Thomas Ray, 1963), 8; George Chalmers, *An Historical Account of Printing in Scotland, During Two Centuries... 1507 to 1707.* 2 vols. NLS, Adv.MS.17.1.16, i:f186; George Chalmers, *The Life of Thomas Ruddiman, A.M.* (London: John Stockdale, Piccadilly and William Laing, Edinburgh, 1794), 117; James Chalmers, *An Historical Account of Printing in Scotland from 1507 to 1707 Containing Anecdotes of the Printers with Their Works and the Several Patents to the Kings Printers.* 2 vols. NLS, Adv.Ms.16.2.21, i:f287; H.G. Aldis, *List of Books Printed in Scotland Before 1700.* (Edinburgh: National Library of Scotland, 1970), 114.

Tyler left Scotland in 1650 only to return to printing in the country in 1651 and 1652. However he came the closest of the print historians to solving the convoluted series of events that led to Tyler's imprint ceasing in Scotland when he mentions a report that the London Society of Stationers purchased a Scottish printing shop for 'a great sum' in 1647.[4] Although non-committal as to whether it was the press of Evan Tyler, Couper was on the right track to unravelling a truth which dramatically reshapes the traditional beliefs regarding the use of the printing press in Interregnum Scotland.

It was eventually David Stevenson who put all of the pieces together, although it is actually quite clearly spelled out in a February 1651 citation in the Calendar of State Papers.[5] The London Stationers' Society purchased the rights to the company and equipment of Evan Tyler's shop in Edinburgh for £430 Sterling in 1647.[6] This business transaction was motivated by Tyler's possession of the royal patent in Scotland, which he received in 1641. The patent, explains David Stevenson, gave Tyler 'the rights of the King's Printer to export to England and thus evade monopoly restrictions'.[7] By buying out his name and thus his patent, the London Stationer's Company had purchased a significant share of the Scottish market as well as control over cut-price backdoor access to the English market. Hence, the printing press of 'Evan Tyler' was controlled from London for nearly three years before Cromwell invaded Scotland. Since the motives of the London based owners were purely fiscal the press continued to print for the Kirk and the King through the contentious years both during and after the second English Civil War.

In all likelihood Tyler was not in Edinburgh at the time of Cromwell's arrival in 1650, since contemporary reports suggest an Englishman named John Twyn was running the press along

---

[4] W. J. Couper, *Scottish Rebel Printers.* (Edinburgh: The Darien Press, 1912), 9-15.
[5] D. Stevenson, 'A Revolutionary Regime and the Press', XV:315-337; *CSPD*, 1651:65
[6] *Ibid.*, XV:327.
[7] *Ibid.*., XV:326.

with seven English servants.[8] A list of names in the burgh records of Edinburgh of men given exemption from the Scottish levying of July 1650 includes eight printers described as both English and printers to the King.[9] Tyler's name was not among them. 'Evan Tyler' remained the imprint of the press until it changed to Christopher Higgins in 1655. Although Watson, G. Chalmers, J. Chalmers, Aldis and Couper all believed Higgins to have arrived sometime between 1651 and 1654, he is actually listed among the men already working at Tyler's press in July 1650.[10] It can therefore be said without any doubt that the same printers who served the needs of the King and the Kirk before Cromwell's invasion continued to provide the same services for the new regime throughout the Interregnum. This may also explain why in July and August of 1650 Cromwell's declarations sent to the Scottish people came to be reprinted in Edinburgh.[11] There is further evidence to suggest that the London Stationers' Company was quite busy at the time printing in Edinburgh and Tyler's press could not fulfil the demand. In 1650 William Nisbet's *A Golden Chaine of Time* was published by the heirs of George Anderson 'for the Company of Stationers', an imprint that seems to suggest that the Society was hiring out the services of other presses.[12]

2. English Use of the Press in Relation to the Protesters-Resolutioner Dispute.

At the end of 1650 the English regime was not the only group in Scotland using a press for polemical purposes and Evan Tyler's was not the only active printing press. When Tyler's shop

---

[8] *Ibid.*, XV:333. Further evidence to suggest Evan Tyler was absent when Cromwell arrived in Edinburgh is that at the Restoration he resumed printing for the King. It is difficult to see how this could have happened unless he pleaded to the King that in his absence he had no control over what was produced under his imprint.

[9] M. Wood (ed.), *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh 1642 to 1655.* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1938), 252; Stevenson, 'A Revolutionary Regime and the Press', XV:333.

[10] *Ibid.*, 252.

[11] See Ch. 1. Had Tyler's press been run by patriotic Scots perhaps only the Scottish propaganda would have appeared and the Edinburgh editions of the English works may never have been produced.

[12] It has been suggested that a group of Edinburgh stationers formed a 'Society' for publishing works for their respective shops as early as 1649 (J. Chalmers, *An Historical Account of Printing in Scotland*, i:320), however there is little evidence of this endeavour being called a Society of Stationers until the imprint appears in 1660.

began to print for the English regime the King declared his grant as royal printer forfeited on December 4, 1650:

> [Tyler] not onlie maid his residence in England and joyned himself with that rebellious pairtie thaire who have rejected governement But also have joyned to that pairtie who have invaded this Kingdome and by himslef and his servands printed and published diverse seditious rebellious and scandalous papers destructive to his Majesties Governement and to the Governement of this Kirk and Kingdome.[13]

The King chose as his replacement the Edinburgh-based bookseller Duncan Mun, but unfortunately, Mun lacked an essential piece of equipment, a press, and so never performed any work for the King.[14] With Mun unable to print for the Scots, and with no time to wait for him to try to find a printing press, another option had to be found. Fortunately there was a press in Aberdeen, far beyond the reach of the English who were still south of the Firth of Forth. This press was used to continue advocating the cause of the King and the covenants; however the radical minority within the Kirk challenged the continued support of the King as malignancy.

After the Battle of Dunbar the radical party of the Kirk fell out of favour with the moderate majority.[15] The intense purging of the army at the behest of the more extreme party and then the army's subsequent routing at Dunbar had weakened their position. The balance of power swung back to the more moderate group within the Kirk who stringently supported the King's role in a Covenanted Scotland. This moderate group (which would later make up the Resolutioner party) acted as the Commissioners of the General Assembly (the Commissioners of 1651).[16] In September 1650 they fell back from Edinburgh and began to produce works on

---

[13] James Maclehose, *The Glasgow University Press 1638*-1931 (Glasgow: University Press, 1931), 33; Couper, *Scottish Rebel Printers*, 11-12. The document is printed in its entirety in Maclehose, 32-4, while the original is held in the NAS: *Registrum Secreti Sigilli*, MS., vol. cxvi. f.179.

[14] Maclehose, *The Glasgow University Press 1638-1931*, 33; Stevenson, 'A Revolutionary Regime and the Press,' XV:334.

[15] For a history of the Protester-Resolutioner conflict and the preceding division see: K.D. Holfelder, 'Factionalism in the Kirk During the Cromwellian Invasion and Occupation of Scotland, 1650 to 1660: the Protester-Resolutioner Controversy,' (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1998).

[16] The Protesters also claimed to be the Commissioners of the General Assembly, but the styled themselves as the '1650 Commissioners' referring to the General Assembly before the Public Resolutions which they viewed as a corruption of the Kirk.

the press of the Aberdeen printer James Brown.[17] From the Aberdeen press they continued to produce tracts supporting the Covenant and the King, declarations for fasting, and polemical propaganda in an effort to steer the Kirk between what they identified as the 'two Rocks of the Malignant *Scylla*, and Sectarian *Charybdis*'.[18] The intention of the Commissioners to create propaganda is clear from the product of their presses, but that it was at the forefront of their minds is further supported by Robert Baillie's complaint in May 1651, 'Your press is exceeding slow: I think, Mr. Robert Ramsay's, and Mr. James Fergusone's paper[19] might have been printed; and some invitation to the English to leave Cromwell, whither many of them doe incline'.[20] Baillie was not the first Resolutioner to lament that the press was not working fast enough. In February the Resolutioner controlled Commission of the General Assembly sent John MacGhie, a man who had 'a care of printing the public papers', to Aberdeen to hasten the process, pay the printer, protect it from the influences of the radical party in the Kirk (Andrew Cant was in Aberdeen), and get the works distributed to the various presbyteries. To aid MacGhie in his efforts a letter was also sent to the Provost of Aberdeen requesting him to advance any money needed to get the works completed.[21]

From their press in Aberdeen the moderate Commissioners of the General Assembly continued to attack the English as 'Sectarians'. In *A Solemn Warning to All the Members of This Kirk*, produced at Perth on January 7, 1651, they explained that despite their apparent victory over

---

[17] Holfelder (p. 94-5) makes the claim that the Resolutioners acquired the services of Brown in response to Protester works being printed on Tyler's press, but this is chronologically incorrect since the pro-monarchy moderate party of the Kirk who controlled the Commission of the General Assembly printed several items on Brown's press in the closing months of 1650. Holfelder's assumption is probably based upon the Commissioner's complaint in early January 1651 that 'the wanting of a presse for printing doth exceedingly impeed the speedy dispatch of papers necessarie for information' and that Aberdeen had yet to receive some papers produced by the Commission (Christie, iii:251). However, the existence of Resolutioner works produced in late 1650 by Brown shows unequivocally that the printer was already active in their cause before the end of the year. Thus the comments regarding 'want' in reference to printing probably refer to the isolation and slowness of the Aberdeen press in comparison to Tyler's, rather than an actual inability to find a printing press.

[18] Whitelock, ii:447.

[19] Possibly a prototype of *A Brief Refutation of the Errors Toleration, Erastianism, Independency and Separation* (London: George Mosman, 1692). Although this work was based on a collection of sermons preached by Fergusson in 1652, it may at least provide an insight into the content of an earlier work.

[20] Baillie, *L & J*, iii:168.

Scotland, the English still bore great guilt for invading Scotland, breaking the Covenant and not being 'in subordination to Religion'.[22] They encouraged the godly to persevere, promising that God's justice is not blind and included a threat of excommunication and censure for any Scot that aided the invaders. In March a second warning was produced entitled *A Short Exhortation and Warning to the Ministers and Professours of This Kirk*, which reiterated the message of the first. It proclaimed the continuing responsibility of the Kirk to resist the sectarians who made 'a strange noise in the midst of some Congregations', maintained 'that impious monster of Toleration', and again threatened excommunication and censure to anyone who assisted them.[23]

From early on in their campaign the English had recognised the growing tensions in the Kirk, which they hoped they could foster to their own advantage.[24] When the moderate majority took control of Brown's press and produced this early handful of works in late-1650/early-1651 the English decided to publish the works of their Presbyterian rivals (those who would become known as Protesters), which accused the moderates of malignancy, in an attempt to exacerbate the internal turmoil within the Kirk.[25] In the opening months of 1651 the English regime did not favour one party over the other (although they sympathised with the Protesters apathy towards the monarchy), but realised the value of continuing tension within the Kirk for weakening it as an opponent. For this reason the English gave the radical party of the Kirk a voice in print. The first Remonstrant work to be printed by the English controlled press of Evan Tyler was *The Remonstrance of the Presbytery of Sterling*.[26] Rumours began to circulate after its publication that the paper had been delivered to Cromwell by Archibald Johnston of Wariston,

---

[21] *RCGA*, iii:285-6.

[22] Andrew Kerr, *A Solemn Warning to all the Members of this Kirk, from the Commission of the Generall Assemblie with an Act for the censuring such as act, or comply with the Sectarian Armies.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651), 5.

[23] Commission of the General Assembly, *A short exhortation and warning, to the ministers, and professours of this Kirk.* Perth, 20 March, 1651. (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651), 1-3.

[24] Dow, 25-6, 27.

[25] Stevenson, 'A Revolutionary Regime and the Press', 335; Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 255.

[26] Church of Scotland. Presbytery of Stirling, *The Remonstrance of the Presbyterie of Sterling, Against the Present Conjunction with the Malignant Party to the Commission of the Kirk at St. Johnston* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1651). The paper was given in to the Commissioners of the General Assembly very late in December 1650 and printed by the English in early February 1651.

an avid opponent to the resolutions with the King, who was in Edinburgh and had meetings with the Lord General around the time it was printed. Whether Wariston delivered the paper to Cromwell is highly doubtful, but it is clear that when it came to Cromwell's hand he instructed it to be printed.[27] The rumours over possible collusion with the English fermented the distrust already present in the Kirk, and might be the reason why the Royalist Sir James Balfour referred to Guthrie and his fellow proto-Protesters as 'sectaries'.[28] Fears that some members of the Kirk were secretly treating with Cromwell's regime intensified, which is precisely the discord Cromwell and his regime had hoped for in producing the remonstrance.[29]

The radical party's access to the English controlled printing press in Edinburgh had a significant impact on radical-moderate relations within the Kirk and prompted a marked change in the efforts of the moderate party's polemics. Suddenly they were not the only Presbyterian party in Scotland with a voice in print. Rather than focusing their printed efforts wholly against the English they became locked in an internal dispute within the Kirk. The Commissioners of the General Assembly replied to the remonstration from Stirling with *The Answer of the Commission of the Generall Assemblie.*[30] Tensions continued to build until the General Assembly in July 1651. The outcome of the Assembly was the polarisation of the radicals and the moderates into the Protester and Resolutioner parties, a schism over the Kirk's treating with the King which lasted until the Restoration. Several papers were submitted in protest against the validity of the Assembly because it upheld the King's place in the Covenant and the inclusion of malignants in the Kirk.[31] The fracturing within the Kirk became the primary focus for both parties. So much so, that in August the moderator of the General Assembly, Robert Douglas, produced *A Short*

---

[27] Row, *Life of Blair*, 256; K.D. Holfelder, 93-4.
[28] Balfour, iv:240.
[29] Stevenson, *Counter-Revolution*, 163.
[30] Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *The answer of the Commission of the Generall Assemblie, to the quaeree, propounded to them, from the Parliament. With an answer of the Commission of the Generall Assemblie, to a letter, sent to them, from the ministers of the Presbyterie of Sterline....* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651).
[31] *The protestation of diverse ministers, against the proceedings of the late commission of the Church of Scotland: as also against the lawfulnesse of the present pretended assembly.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1651); Holfelder, 121-9.

Information addressed to the Presbyterians in England imploring them to beware of the Protesters.[32] In the work he expressed the Resolutioner opposition to the Sectarians, but went on to defend the Resolutioners against the Protesters' accusations of Malignancy, making the claim the Protesters' divisiveness was equally as dangerous as the sectarian Army among them for 'the weakening of the hands that were at the work'. They 'have opposed these just and necessary Resolutions, and actively obstructed the use of the lawfull and only likely means left of opposition to the prevailling Enemy,' Douglas explained, 'setting on foote a State-separation which necessarly tendeth to a Kirk-separation'.[33] Douglas' *Short Information* was the last paper produced on a free Scottish press. Less than a month after its publication Aberdeen surrendered to General Monck and the English silenced Brown's press, giving them complete control of Scotland's printing industry. However, the English regularly allowed the papers produced by both the Protesters and Resolutioners to be published: infighting within the Kirk only served to foster their policy of weakening the Kirk and diminished Presbyterian interference in their pursuit of a Republican utopia. In October 1651 the English published a Protester work entitled *A discovery after some search of the Sins of the Ministers...by the Brethren of the Presbytery of Kilmarnock*. The English particularly enjoyed this paper; because it was an admission by some in the Kirk they had been too concerned 'with their own credit and applause'.[34] Cromwell's decision to give the party without a press a voice proved an advantage by deferring aspersions away from the English and adding fuel to the fire within the Kirk. However, with absolute control over all of Scotland's presses, the regime changed the tact of their propaganda and attacked the Kirk more overtly. With Charles Stuart no longer in the country (having fled after defeat at Worcester on September 3, 1651) and control over all the populous regions of the

---

[32] Robert Douglas, *Short Information. A Short Information and Brotherly Exhortation to Our Brethren of England: From the Commissioners of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland Convened at Forfarr. August 12, 1651.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651).
[33] Douglas, *Short Information*, 3.
[34] *Mercurius Politicus* (Oct. 21-28, 1651), 103; Presbytery of Kilmarnock, *A discovery after some search of the Sins of the Ministers...by the Brethren of the Presbytery of Kilmarnock.* (Leith: n.a., 1651).

country, by November 1651 the regime perceived the opposition of the Kirk as the last major obstacle.

3. Polemic against Charles II in 1650-1

It is interesting to note that the English only printed one polemical work against the King in 1651 before the Battle of Worcester. The paper, probably printed in Edinburgh in 1650 and again in 1651,[35] proved to be the regimes last veiled attack on monarchy.[36] Craftily given a title suggesting a pro-monarchy stance, *The Grounds and Reasons of Monarchy, Considered and Exemplified out of the Scottish History* represented another work of Cromwellian propaganda. The title page of the work lists the author only as 'J.H.', which has led to conjecture in later years and resulted in the paper being incorrectly attributed to James Harrington, the author of *Oceana*.[37] The actual author was the Cambridge graduate John Hall who accompanied Cromwell into Scotland in 1650 by order of the Council of State. Hall received a pension from the Council and therefore it may be assumed the regime employed him as a polemicist. In this tract he challenged the divine ordination of monarchy and the purity of monarchical succession in Scotland. Initially Hall expressed the complexity of claiming monarchy as a form of government by divine right based simply upon Scripture. Israel had demanded a king in order to be ruled as their neighbouring nations, and therefore God provided them one, but monarchy was not God's perfect intention.[38] Hall argued the Sanhedrin is the divinely ordained pattern of human government and the Republicanism of the Commonwealth must be closer to that form than monarchy. However, even if the establishment of kingship could be affirmed as 'sacred' and 'inviolable'

---

[35] J. Chalmers, *An Historical Account of Printing in Scotland*, i:f284. An edition of the work was printed in London in 1650 with the imprint that it was taken from an Edinburgh copy, but the first copy printed in Edinburgh has not survived.

[36] In 1653 a work was published in Leith defending the Commonwealth [Peter English, *The Survey of Policy: or, A Free Vindication of the Commonwealth of England, Against Salmasius, and Other Royallists*. (Leith, 165)], in which arguments were made against Royalist opponents. According to records in Worcester College, English was commissioned for this work by Robert Lilburne and John Lambert, and received £20 (Clarke MS 3/6: f. 1; Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 81, 183, 267). This work was likely in response to Glencairn's Rising which began in January of that year.

[37] The paper is included in the complete works of Harrington: John Toland (ed.), *The Oceana of James Harrington and his other works*. (London: Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1700), xxxviii; NAS: J. Chalmers, *An Historical Account of Printing in Scotland*, i:f 284.

questions regarding proper succession remained. Surely, if succession is broken and usurpers are found to have infiltrated the monarchy, then it can no longer be held as continuing in the same lineage appointed by divine right and therefore its warrant is lost. 'Matters of Government ought to be governed by prudence,' he claims, but to support corrupt monarchical dynasties, 'is to put them into the hands of Fortune'.[39] For this reason a Republic is much better than a monarchy, because when men conspire and interject themselves 'all this is clear; and in case any particular man aspire they know whom to joyn against and punish as a Common Enemy'.[40] Having established usurpation as grounds for removal of a monarchical dynasty, Hall provided an historical overview of the Scottish monarchy. In his narrative he illustrated the intrigue and betrayal which had accompanied Scotland's monarchy, demonstrating the Stuart line had no connection to Scotland first king, whom he identified as King Fergus, and thus no proper claim to the Scottish throne.[41] Moreover, Charles I's dealings with Popery and his marriage to a Catholic proved him to be a usurper and for his usurpation and blasphemy God had judged him. Scotland's blindness to these truths permitted the nation to deal with his son, which in turn brought their present punishment upon them:

> how dangerous it is to espouse such an interest, which God with so visible and severe a hand fights against, carryed on by, and for the support of a Tyrannizing Nobility and Clergy, and wherein the poor People are blindly led on by those affrighting (but false and ungrounded) pretensions of perfidy and perjury, and made instrumentall with their own estates and blood, for the enslaving and ruining themselves.[42].

Even in this attack upon Charles II the author continued to place equal blame on the 'tyrannizing' clergy. He asserted the Kirk's dealings with Charles II, along with their misguided pressing of both monarchy and Presbyterianism upon England under the guise of the covenants, were the causes resulting in England's invasion of Scotland. The King had no divine right to rule and the Kirk's continued support for him in their covenants showed they had little

---

[38] 1 Samuel 8.
[39] Hall, *The grounds and reasons of monarchy*, 19.
[40] Ibid, 21.
[41] For a brief summary of the origin myth of the Scottish monarchy see: MacInnes, *The British Revolution*, 13-17.
[42] Ibid, 50.

understanding of how to interpret God's providence. Hence blame for Scotland's suffering lay with the 'perfidy and perjury' of the nobility and clergy.[43]

[43] Ibid, 50.

Appendix III: English Garrisons in Scotland

The earliest complete list of garrisons in Scotland does not appear until 1656; however it is important to note that they coincide with reports that the number of garrisons was being reduced about this time. Therefore between 1651 and 1655 the number of garrisons exceeded the sixty-seven listed in the first list given here from the Clarke Manuscripts. These lists are **not** exhaustive. For a map of the geographical distribution of these garrisons see the map on page 5.

English Garrison in 1656[1]

Aberdeen
Aberdeen, New
Aberdeen, Old
Anstruther
Ayr Citadel
Ayr Town
Balloch and Weymes
Balloch
Bass Rock
Blair
Bog o'Gight (Gordon Castle, Fochabers)
Braemar
Brechin
Burntisland
Cardross
Castle Sinclair/Giringoe Castle
Cromarty Castle
Cupar
Dalkeith
Douglas Castle
Downe (Doune?)
Drummond Castle
Dumfries
Dunbar
Dundee
Dunfermline
Dunottar Castle
Duns
Dunstaffnage Castle
Edinburgh
Edinburgh, Castle
Elgin
Falkirk
Finlarig (Killin)
Fraserburgh
Glasgow
Haddington
Hamilton
Inverlochy
Inverness Castle
Inverness Citadel
Inverwick (Innerwick?)
Irvine
Jedburgh
Kelso
Kilmarnock
Kirkcaldy
Kirkwall
Lanark
Leith
Linlithgow
Loch Ness (Frigate 'Reformation')
Maybole
Montrose
Newbattle (Abbey)
Paisley
Peebles
Peterhead
Queen's Ferry (South Queensferry)
Ruthven Castle (Badenoch)
Selkirk
Shetland
St. Andrews
St. Johnston (Perth)
Sterling Downe
Stirling
Tantallon Castle

[1] G. Davies, 'The Quarters of the English Army in Scotland in 1656,' *Scottish Historical Review* 21(1924), 62-7.

Garrisons, November 1657[2]

Aberborthwick (Abbey of Arbroath)
Aberdeen
Anstruther
Balloch
Banff
Bass Rock
Blair Castle
Bog o'Gight
Braemar
Brechin
Buchanan Castle
Burntisland

[2] Clarke MSS 1/3: ff 18-19.

Cardross
Castle Sinclair/Giringoe Castle
Crail
Cromarty Castle
Cupar
Dalkeith
Douglas Castle
Doune Castle
Drummond Castle
Dumbarton
Dumfries
Dunbar
Dundee
Dunfermline
Dunnottar Castle
Duns
Dunstaffnage Castle
Dysert
Edinburgh
Edinburgh Castle
Elgin
Falkland
Finlarig (Killin)
Forfar
Fraserburgh
Glasgow
Haddington
Hamilton
Inverlochy
Inverness
Irvine
Jedburgh
Kelso
Kilmarnock
Kinghorn (?)
Kirkcaldy
Kirkwall
Lanark
Leith
Linlithgow
Loch Ness (Frigate 'Reformation')
Maybole
Montrose
Musselburgh
Newbattle
Paisley
Peebles
Pittenweem
Queensferry
Ruthven Castle (Badenoch)
Scalloway Castle (Shetland)
Selkirk
St Andrews
St Johnston (Perth)
Stirling
Tantallon Castle
Wemyss

Garrisons, November 1658[3]

Aberdeen
Anstruther
Arbroath
Ayr
Banff
Bass Rock
Blair Castle
Bog o'Gight (Fochabers)
Braemar
Brechin
Burntisland
Cardross
Castle Sinclair/Giringoe Castle
Crail
Cromarty Castle
Cupar
Dalkeith
Douglas Castle
Doune Castle
Drummond Castle
Dumbarton
Dumfries
Dunbar
Dundee
Dunfermline
Dunnottar Castle
Duns Castle
Dunstaffnage
Dysert
Edinburgh
Edinburgh Castle
Falkland
Finlarig
Forfar
Fraserburgh
Glasgow
Haddington
Hamilton
Inverlochy
Inverness
Irvine
Jedburgh

[3] Clarke MSS, 1/3: ff 55-7.

Kelso
Kilmarnock
Kinghorn
Kirkcaldy
Kirkwall
Lanark
Leith
Linlithgow
Maybole
Montrose
Newbattle
Paisley
Peebles
Pittenweem
Queensferry
Ruthven Castle
Scalloway Castle (Shetland)
Selkirk
St Andrews
St Johnston (Perth)
Stirling
Strathbogie
Tantallon Castle
Wemyss

'Petty Garrisons': June 24, 1658[4]

This list of 'petty garrisons' shows that smaller fortifications across Scotland were garrisoned by English forces, which were not listed as permanent garrisons.

Ballindalloch Castle (Moray)
Balloch Castle
Brahan Castle (near Dingwall)
Burgie Castle
Carnwath (?)
Craighouse (South Edinburgh)
Cromarty Castle
Helmsdale Castle
Lovat Castle (near Beauly)
Redcastle (Beauly Firth or Lunan Bay)
Skibo Castle
Spittal (?) Castle
Spynie Castle
Stornoway

Other Garrisons not listed in the official lists given in the Clarke Manuscripts.

Boghall Castle (Biggar) (1650)

Canisbay, Caithness (1652?-55?)

Castle Menzies

Castle Tioram (1651)

Dochmaluag Castle

Drumlanrig Castle

Duart Castle, Mull

Earl's Palace (Kirkwall)

Edzell Castle

Fyvie Castle

Kinneil House

Lochranza Castle, Arran

Noltland Castle, Westray (Orkney)

Rothiemay Castle

St. Magnus' Cathedral (Kirkwall)

Struthers Castle (1653)

[4] Clarke MSS, 3/11: June 24, 1658.

Appendix IV: Declarations of Separation submitted in 1652

William Gordon, Presbytery of Strathbogie, June 1652

'William Gordon, pariochiner of Dumbennan, compeiring, gave in a declinatour, with many false, lying, scandalous reproaches against the Kirk of Scotland, and government theroff, the tenour quherof followes:

"I vnderscryber, of the pariochin of Dumbennan, and Presbyterie of Strathbogye, havin, by manie and sundrie sad experiences, found the manie bloodie and barbarous inconveniences quhich hav alvayes accompanied the Presbyterian government by their usurpatioune, and mixed auctorite with the civill power, and tyrannous persecuting of mens consciences who, out of tender scruples, did differe from their opinions in matters indifferent and circumstantiall; as also, finding that the greatest part of their prayer and preaching doth more tender the advancment of their private interest and factioune then the propagatioune of the gospell; and seeing their frequent railing against the auctoritie and civill power which God hath set over us, quherby the peoples mynds are keeped unsetled and averse from the cordiall compliance and union of both nations, quhich, by God's great mercie, we ar now lyk to enjoy. For thes reasons, I doe therfor declare that I neither will nor can continue a member of the Presbyterie of Strathbogye, and that I shall no mor esteeme of their excommunicatioune than thei did formerly of the Pope, but intend, God willing, to live in such a gospell way as the Lord hath dispensed in his sacred word, and not occasion any disturbance to this present government of the commonwealth of Great Britain. And to testifie this solem separatioune, I have subscribit thir presentis with my hand. William Gordon."

The presbyterie, haveing read and considered the paper, how malitious and invective it was against the servants and government of Christs church, did ordaine Mr. Villiam Jamison to excommunicate the said Villiam *quam primum*; quhilk sentence beeing intimate to him, he lookit verie forwardly, and uttered himself most proudly and malitiously.'[1]

Nicoll, March 1652: 'Declaratioun emitted by sum malignant and independant pairtie in the North'

'Quhairas we, under subscryveris of the paroches of, &c., having by many sad experiencis, fund the bloodie and barbarous inconvenientis quhich hath alwayis accompaneyed the Presbiteriall governament, by thair mixed autoritie with the civill power, and tyranous persequuting of mens consciencis, quho, out of tender scruples, did discent from their opiniones in materis indifferent and circumstanciall, or did refuis to sweir such doubtfull oathes as they understood not. As also, finding that the greatest pairt of thair publict prayer and preaching did and doeth moir tend to the advancing of privat interest and factioun than to the propagating of the gospell, and thair frequent rayling aganes authoritie and civill power, quhich God hath set over us, quhairby the pepillis myndis ar keiped unsetled and avers from the cordiall compliance and Unioun of both natiounes, quhich, by the Almichtie Godis great mercy we ar lyke to enjoy. For these reasones, we do heirby thairfoir declair, that we nather can nor will continue memberis of Presbyteriall governament, and that we sall no moir esteme of thair censures than formerlie, all guid Cristianes did esteme of Popes excommunicatiounes; bot intendis to leave in such a gospell way as the Lord hath dispensed in his sacred word, and not occasioun any the leist disturbance of this present governament of the Commonwealth of Great Britane. To testify this solempne separatione, we haif heir unanimously subscryvit our names, &c.'[2]

---

[1] Stuart, *Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie*, 222.
[2] Nicoll, 91.

Appendix V: English Ministers Serving in Scotland

Between 1652 and 1659 there is evidence of several English ministers being sent to Scotland, not solely as chaplains but to serve civilian gatherings as well. After the Commissioners for Scotland arrived in January 1652 and took account of the situation, they identified a need for qualified English ministers and requested twelve ministers be sent from England to reside in garrisons and other convenient places in Scotland.[3] The request was forwarded by the Council of State to the Commissioners for Irish and Scottish affairs in March, who decided some ministers should be sent.[4] In response James Brown was sent as a chaplain to Thomas Fairfax's regiment and Thomas Twisse became chaplain to Colonel Alured's regiment.[5] Additionally Samuel Mather, Thomas Brag and Sidrach Simpson were given £500 for travel to Scotland in July.[6] Whether Simpson travelled or not is uncertain, if he did his stay in Scotland was very short. Mather and Brag definitely did travel to Scotland. Brag stayed in Scotland until September 1653, being lastly at Stirling where he served as a 'minister'. He was replaced by Samuel Bruen.[7] Mather, educated at Harvard (MA 1643), resided in Leith where he ministered to a church until November 1654.[8] In 1654 two further English Independents, John Collins and John Stalham, were sent to minister in Scotland.[9] Stalham served in Edinburgh for nearly a year before returning to England probably sometime after March 1655.[10] John Collins, educated at Harvard, had a longer stay in Scotland than either John Beverley[11] or Stalham. He remained in the country until 1659, being called to a new Independent church in Leith in 1658 which was

---

[3] C.S. Terry, (ed.) *The Cromwellian Union*, (Edinburgh, 1902), 99; Laurence, *Parliementary Army Chaplains*, 72.
[4] *APS*, vi,ii:747; *CSPD*, 1651-2:191; Nicoll, 91.
[5] Laurence, 72, 103, 191.
[6] *CSPD*, 1651-2: 610.
[7] *APS*, vi,ii:750-1. Almost certainly the Samuel Bryan requested by James Guthrie to be a referee in the event Guthrie publicly disputed again with James Brown (NLS, Wod.Qu.XVII, f. 215-18).
[8] Laurence, 152; *ODNB*, 'Mather, Samuel'. In November 1654 Philip Nye nominated Mather to go to Ireland.
[9] *CSPD*, 1654:195, 450.
[10] He was certainly back in Essex by 1657 when he wrote *The Reviler rebuked* (London: Henry Hills and John Field, 1657) against Richard Farnsworth's 'attempted answer' *Vindication of the Scriptures against the Scotish Contradictators*. This work by Farnsworth was written in response to Stalham's anti-Quaker tract written in Edinburgh in 1655: John Stalham, *Contradictions of the Quakers* (Edinburgh, 1655).
[11] See chapter 4.

Congregational but rejected paedo-baptism. His ordination to this charge was carried out by six ministers from Newcastle, including Samuel Hammond.[12] The church continued to grow in the closing months of the year.[13] In 1655 Robert Dalliel, minister of Swanton Morley, Norfolk, received £200 pounds for ministering to a congregation in Scotland.[14] Collins also received £200 pounds in 1655, while Beverley only received £80, probably because he received an additional stipend from the gathered congregation. It should be noted, Stalham, Collins and Dalliel were all paid with civil funds rather than military funds. They were sent to minister to civilian congregations, not to serve as chaplains. Later that year Thomas Gumble travelled to Edinburgh as preacher to the Council in Scotland.[15] Further funding was earmarked for the advancement of the gospel in the years that followed. In January 1656 the Council of State ordered that just over £640 be set aside out of the governmental budget in Scotland 'for the maintenance of such godly ministers as shall be invited into Scotland'.[16] Cromwell wrote to the Council in Scotland in April 1658 instructing them to set aside a futher £600 for 'planting the gospel in the Highlands' after receiving reports from Gaelic speakers who had visited the region that Highlanders longed to hear the Word preached.[17] By May he had raised the sum to £1200 in light of the great danger posed by Catholicism in the remote northern regions of Scotland. The money was to be spent on ministers, school teachers and schools and in June Cromwell

---

[12] Hammond, Cuthbert Sydenham (chaplain to the Commissioners of Scotland) and William Durant all had ties through St. Nicholas's, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where they all served as lecturers (Nuttall, *Visible Saints*, 24).
[13] Thurloe, vii:527.
[14] *APS*, vi,ii:897.
[15] Laurence, 72; *ODNB*, 'Gumble, Thomas'.
[16] *CSPD*, 1655-6:107.
[17] *CSPD*, 1657-8, 367.

instructed that the money be sequestered from lands formerly belonging to bishops, deans and the crown.[18] Also in that year John Price returned to Scotland.[19]

[18] *CSPD*, 1658-9:4, 60.
[19] Laurence, 72.

Listed below are English ministers known to have served in Scotland during the Interregnum for **at least three months**. Dates are approximate. The core information for this table was taken from Anne Laurence *Parliamentary Army Chaplains*, 1642-51 (London: The Boydell Press, 1990). Names marked with an asterisk (*) are ordained ministers who took military or civil postings.

Name		D	Arr.	Dep.	Reg./charge	Location	
Ashwell	Nicholas	-	1657	1658	Talbot	-	
Bell	Willism	B?	1650	1/51	Grosvenor	-	
Beverley	John	I	1653	1657	GC	Lenzie	
Bragg	Thomas	-	1652	mid-54	GC?	Stirling	
Briscoe	Michael	I	7/50	10/51	Cromwell	-	
Brown	James	GB	1652	1655	Fairfax	Cupar, Stirling, Burntisland	
Bryan/Bruen	Samuel	-	9/54	-	GC?	Stirling (see ch. 2)	
Burdett	George	I?	1650	-	Lilburne	-	
Caryl	Joseph	I	7/50	1/51	Cromwell	-	
Caryl	Joseph	I	1/52	6/52	Commission	Dalkeith, Edinburgh	
Clark	Matthew	I?	1651	c.1655	Hacker	-	
Collins	John	I	1654	1659	GC	Edinburgh	NE
Coventry	John	-	7/50	10/51	Thomlinson	-	
Dalliel	Robert	I?	c.5/55	-	Council?	paid 200/ in 1655 from civil funds.	
Downing*[1]	George	I	1655	1659	Clerk to the Scottish Council.	Edinburgh	NE
Eaton	Samuel	I	7/50	10/51	Cromwell	-	NE
Freer	George	-	1650	1651	Lambert	-	
Gardiner*	John	B	1650	1654	Monck	Dalkeith, Dunnottar, baptised a woman in Aberdeen.	
Gibbs	John	B?	1650	1651	Okey	-	
Goode	William	P	1650	1651	Cromwell	-	
Goodgroom	Richard	B/I	1653	12/54	Harrison Monck	-	
Gumble	Thomas	I	1655	1659	Council	-	
Hickeringill*	Edmund	PB Q D	1653	1655	Lilburne	Chaplain in Leith, lieut. in Perth, governor of Macklove(?) Castle.	
Hoadley	John	-	1659	-	Monck	Edinburgh Castle	NE
Ives	Jeremiah	GB	1650	1651	Whalley	-	

[1] Although Downing never served as a chaplain in Scotland, he was ordained and had served as a chaplain to Okey's regiment and to the garrison at Newcastle (W.L. Sachse, 'The Migration of New Englanders to England.' *American Historical Review* 53 (1948), 267; *ODNB*, 'Downing, Sir George (1623-84)').

Jackson	Daniel	-	1659	-	Sawrey	Ayr	
Junis*	James	-	1654	-	Harrison	served as Major.	
Lockyer	Nicholas	I	1651	1653	Cromwell	Edinburgh, but travelled widely.	
Mather	Samuel	I	c.7/52	11/54	GC	Leith	NE
Moore	-	-	1653	1654	Okey	'53-Southwest, '54-Highlands	
Oates	Samuel	GB	1650	1/55	Pride	Aberdeen	
Owen	John	I	1650	1651	Cromwell	Edinburgh	
Oxenbridge	John	I	1/52	by 10/52	Commission	Dalkeith, Edinburgh	
Price	John	-	1654	-	Read	Stirling	
Price	John	-	1658	1660	Monck	-	
Ramsbottom	Abraham	-	1650	1651	Hacker	-	
Root	Henry	I	1650	1652	Cromwell	-	
Saunders	John	-	1650	1653	Twisleton	-	
Smallwood	Thomas	I	1650	1652	Lambert	-	
Stable	Samuel	-	1658	-	Cobbett	Dundee	
Stackhouse	Thomas	PB	1653	-	Lilburne	-	
Stalham	John	I	1654	6?/56	GC	Edinburgh	
Stapylton	Robert	I	1650	9/51	Cromwell	-	
Sydenham	Cuthbert	I	1/52	6/52	Commissioners	Dalkeith, Edinburgh	
Taylor	Thomas	I?	1650	-	Ripon	-	
Twisse	Thomas	P?	1652	1653	Alured	-	

Key:
Denominations:
D- Deist I- Independent B- Baptist (uncertain affiliation) GB- General Baptist
PB- Particular Baptist P- Presbyterian Q- Quaker
NE- indicates they had migrated from New England.
GC- indicates minister of a gathered congregation.
* - denotes an ordained minister who served as a commissioned officer in the English Army or in some civilian capacity for the Commonwealth/Protectorate Government.
?- denotes the most likely affiliation/role indicated by the evidence available.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Ayrshire Archives

CH2/751/3	Ayr Kirk Session Records

National Archives of Scotland (NAS)

CH10/1/65	'A Remembrance, or Record of the sufferings of some friends of the trueth in Scotland'.
CH10/1/66	'All Sufferings and imprisonments preceiding the yeare 1670' of Quakers in Scotland.
CH10/3/35	'A breiff historicall Account, and Record of the first Rise, and progress of the Blessed Truth, Called in derision Quakerism in and about Aberdeen.'
GD1/389/6	Proceedings against Thomas Ireland.

National Library of Scotland (NLS)

Mf.114(1-17)	Microfilm copy of the William Clarke Manuscripts held in Worcester College, Oxford and NLS. G.E. Aylmer (ed.) Brighton Harvester Microfilm 1977-9.
MS. 2201, f. 98-100.	'A testimony in uprightnes to all people of a pairt of the travel of my Soul within thy borders, o Scotland, these many days by A Robeson, a Quaker, Duns, 1662'.

NLS, Advocates' Library Manuscripts Collection

Adv.Ms.16.2.21	James Chalmers, 'An Historical Account of Printing in Scotland, 1507-1707', 2 vols.
Adv.MS.17.1.16	George Chalmers, 'An Historical Account of Printing in Scotland, 1507-1707'.
Adv.MS.33.4.1	Diary of John Nicoll.
Adv.Ms.35.5.11	William Clarke Papers, principally for the years 1648-9 and 1659.

NLS, Wodrow Collection

Wod.Fol.XXX.(19)	Copy of a letter from Andrew Ker and many professors and ministers of the Gospel met at Edinburgh (to Cromwell), January 2, 1652.
Wod.Fol.XXX.(20)	Declaration of the Commonwealth Parliament. Dalkeith, January 31, 1652.
Wod.Fol.XXX.(21) 1652.	Commissioners' explanation of the Declaration, February 11,
Wod.Fol.XXX.(23)	'A Postscript Anent the Third Point'.

Wod.Fol.XXX.(24)	Letter dated May 24, 1652 advocating the 'congregationall way' and signed by Alexander Jaffray, John Row, Andrew Birnie, William Muir and John Menzies. Followed by a reply by Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston.
Wod.Fol.XXX.(25)	Andrew Cant, 'A Brotherlie & Christian Exhortation & warning from many Ministers, Elders & Professors of the Gospell in Scotland unto those of the English Nation who have bene antagons of or had accession unto the late & present actings and transactions that concerns this land'. March 17, 1653.
Wod.Fol.XXX.(26)	Wariston's second letter to Aberdeen directed to John Menzies and others.
Wod.Fol.XXX.(27)	Petition for Gospel Priviledges, 1659.
Wod.Fol.XXX.(43)	'Warning of the Synod of Galloway against the Tolleration'.
Wod.Fol.XXX.(44)	'Testimony of the Synod of Fife against the Tolleration'.
Wod.Fol.XXX.(48)	Presbytery of Kirkcudbright's declaration against petition, August 17, 1659.
Wod.Fol.XXXI.(37)	'Declaration and vindicaiton of the poor opprest Commons of Scotland to God, Angells and men of all nations'.
Wod.Fol.XXXI.(39)	Some queries, possibly those sent by Archibald Strachan to Oliver Cromwell.
Wod.Fol.XXXI.(40)	Letter from George Lockhart of Lee to (Robert Douglas?), November 9, 1653.
Wod.Fol.XXXI.(42)	'A letter containing some reflections on a Sectarian paper', 1653, possibly in the hand of James Sharpe.
Wod.Fol.XXXI.(43)	Ordinance to support Universities and Public Preachers in Scotland, 1653.
Wod.Fol.XXXI.(44)	Observations on the English Ordinance regarding universities and public preachers.
Wod.Fol.XXXI.(45)	Draught of a petition to the English Council by Ministers for their stipends, 1654.
Wod.Fol.XXXI.(62)	Earlstoun's paper against Toleration to the Synod of Galloway, 1658(?).
Wod.Fol.XXXI.(63)	Petition from Edinburgh against toleration, 1659.
Wod.Fol.LXVI	Original correspondence on ecclesiastical affairs. 1606-53.
Wod.Fol.LXVII	Original correspondence on ecclesiastical affairs. 1606-53.
Wod.Qu.XXIX.(56)	'Some mementois for the officers and shouldiers of the Army kom -- soom sober Christians'.
Wod.Qu.XXIX.(61)	Letter of Patrick Gillespie, March 4, 1652.
Wod.Qu.XXIX.(63)	Letter from ministers in the southwest against Independency probably directed to Aberdeen circa 1652.
Wod.Qu.XVII	Letters and debate between James Brown and James Guthrie, bound with a copy of Guthrie's 'Waters of Sihor'.

Wod.Qu.XXXVII, f. 21-39	'Collections by a private hand being kingly of matters from 1650-1662'.
Wod.Qu.XCVIII.(6), f.105-7.	'Conference with Quakers, at Wester Leinzie without date. In Mr. McWard's hand. Perhaps before the Restoration'.
Wod.Qu.XCIX.(5)	'Reasons for a testimony against Tolleration with Objections Answered'.

New College Library, University of Edinburgh (NCL)

MSS Box 28.5	Anonymous Scottish manuscript on Congregationalism and church government.
MSS CRA 1	Matthew Craufurd, 'History of the Church of Scotland from the Earliest Dawning of the light of the Gospell after the Apostles Time to the Year 1688', 2 vols.
MSS MYL	Robert Mylne's collections on Ecclesiastical Affairs, 1645-1708.
MSS PIT	MS volume of Archibald Pitcairne, containing copies of various political and religious documents (1639-1715).

University of Edinburgh Library, Special Collections (EUL)

La.I.314	Letter from John Row to John Menzies dated 27 May, 1652, 'dealing with the subject of character, qualifications and duties of Church-members'.
La.I.319	Correspondence of Wariston and James Guthrie, 1654.
La.I.320	Andrew Cant to Wariston, January 9, 165[6], reporting the state of things in Aberdeen.
La.I.321	'Papers illustrative of the relations between the Government of the Commonwealth and the Church of Scotland'.
La.III.368	Letters and Debate between James Brown and James Guthrie in Guthrie's own hand.

Primary

An Act for Discovering, Convicting, and Repressing of Popish Recusants. At the Parliament Begun at Westminster, the 17th Day of September, An. Dom. 1656. (Edinburgh: Christopher Higgins, 1657).

Animadversions upon a Certain Scottish Answer, with an Additional Reply to M'Donnel's Answer. (London: T. Newcomb [and Samuel Brown] for Richard Lowns, 1651).

Akerman, J.Y. (ed.) *Letters from Roundhead Officers Written from Scotland and Chiefly Addressed to Captain Adam Baynes. July MDCL-JuneMDCLX.* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1856).

Alured, Matthew. *The Case of Colonel Matthew Alured.* (London: Printed for L. Chapman, 1659).

B., A. *A Fight at Dunin in Scotland, Between the Scots Women and the Presbyterian Kirkmen.* (Edinburgh, 1652).

B[raman], J[ohn]. *Calumny Condemned: or, a True, Exact, and Sober Account of the Scotch Plot: for Which Many Worthy Officers Were Dismissed Their Commands, and Cashiered the Army.* (London: J.C., 1659).

Baillie, Robert. *Anabaptism, the True Fountaine of Independency, Brownisme, Antinomy, Familisme, and the Most of the Other Errours, Which for the Time Doe Trouble the Church of England, Unsealed. Also the Questions of Pædobaptisme and Dipping Handled from Scripture. In a Second Part of the Disswasive from the Errors of the Time. By Robert Baillie Minister at Glasgow.* (London: M.F. for Samuel Gellibrand, 1647).

Baillie, Robert. *A Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time.* (London: printed for Samuel Gellibrand, 1646).

Baillie, Robert. *The Disswasive from the Errors of the Time, Vindicated from the Exceptions of Mr. Cotton and Mr. Tomes.* (London: Evan Tyler, 1655).

Baillie, Robert. *Letters and Journals.* (ed.) D. Laing, 3 vols (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1841-2).

Baillie, Robert. *A Scotch Antidote Against the English Infection of Arminianism.* (London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1652).

Balfour, Sir James. *The Historical Works of James Balfour of Denmylne and Kinnaird, Knight and Baronet; Lord Lyon King at Arms to Charles the First, and Charles the Second.* 4 vols (Edinburgh, 1824).

Barclay, John (ed.) *Journals of the Lives and Gospel Labours of William Caton, and John Burnyeat.* 2nd edn (London: Harvey and Darton, 1839).

Baxter, C. (ed.) *Ecclesiastical Records. Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife, 1611-1687.* (Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1837).

Baxter, Richard. *Baxter: A Holy Commonwealth.* (ed.) William Lamont. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought (Cambridge: CUP, 1994).

Baxter, Richard. *Reliquae Baxterianae: or, Mr. Richard Baxter's narrative of the most memorable passages of his life and times.* (London, 1696).

Beverley, John. *Unio Reformantium. Or, The Presbyterian and Independent Vindicated, from the Contradictious Way of Free-Admission: Especially, in Answer to John Timpson, and W. Morioe, Much Tending to the Desired Union of Reformers in the Churches Truth and Peace: in Seven Chapters* (London: Ja. C., 1659).

Binning, H. *The Common Principles of Christian Religion Clearly Proved, and Singularly Improven: or, A Practicall Catechism, Wherein Some of the Most Concerning Foundations of Our Faith are Solidly Laid Down, and That Doctrine, Which Is According to Godliness, Sweetly, Yet Pungently Pressed Home, and Most Satisfyingly Handled By That Worthy and Faithfull Servant of Jesus Christ Mr. Hew Binning.* (Glasgow: A. Anderson, 1659).

Binning, H. *An Usefull Case of Conscience, Learnedly and Accuratly Discussed and Resolved. Concerning Associations and Confederacies with Idolaters, Infidels, Hereticks, Malignants, or Any Other Knoun [Sic] Enemies of Truth and Godlinesse.* (Edinburgh, 1693).

Birch, T. (ed.) *A Collection of State Papers of John Thurloe.* 7 vols (London, 1742).

A Brief Narrative of The Great Victorie, Which it Hath Pleased God to Give to the Armie of This Common-Wealth Against the Scots Army, Near Dunbar, in Scotland, on Tuesdaie Morning, the Third of This Instant September, Related to the Council of State by an Express Messenger of the Lord General, Sent from the Armie, Which Messenger Was Present at the Action. (London: William Du-gard, 1650).

Brodie, Alexander. *Diary of Alexander Brodie of Brodie (1652-80).* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1863).

B[rooks], T[homas]. *The Engagement Vindicated: From the Objections, Cavils, Scruples, That Wilfull Opposers, or Doubtfull, Unresolved Judgements May Cast upon it. Wherein, All Such Objections are*

Answered; the Government Proved; the Engagement it Self Both Lawful, and Necessary, from Clearest Principles of Conscience and Reason. To the Satisfaction of All Such as are Doubting. (London: T. Mab and A. Coles for T.B., 1650).

Brooks, Thomas. *The Hypocrite Detected, Anatomized, Impeached, Arraigned, and Condemned Before the Parliament of England. or, A Word in Season.* (London: Fr: Neile, 1650).

B[rooks], T[homas]. *A Message from the Lord General Crumwel to the Communalty of the Kingdom of Scotland.* (London: printed for J.J., 1650).

Brown, James. *Antichrist (in Spirit) Unmasked: or, The Leaven of the Sadduces (Lately Lying Hid Amongst the Ranters and Quakers) Laid Open to Publick View.* (Edinburgh: Christopher Higgins, in Harts Close, over against the Trone-Church., 1657).

Brown, James. *Scripture-Redemption Freed from Men's Restrictions: Being an Answer to a Book Lately Published by Mr. William Troughton.* (London: J.C., 1653).

Brown, James. *Scripture Redemption Freed from Mans Restriction Being an Answer to a Book Published by Mr. William Troughton.* (London: Francis Smith, 1673).

Burnet, Gilbert (Bishop). *Burnet's History of His Own Time.* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1875).

Burns, J. 'Memoirs by James Burns, Bailie of the City of Glasgow, 1644-1661' *Historical Fragments* (ed.) J. Maidment (Edinburgh 1833).

Canne, John. *Emanuel, or, God with us. Werein Is Set Forth Englands Late Great Victory Over the Scots Armie, in a Battle at Dunbar, Septemb. 3. 1650. And by Many Particulars of Gods Acting and Appearing Then for us, it Is Certaine (and so Much Is Clearly Proved) That Our Armies Marching Into Scotland, and the Wars Undertaken and Prosecuted Against That Nation, to be upon Grounds of Justice and Necessity, as the Parliament of England Hath Declared. Also Here Is Shewed, How Grosly the Covenant Is Abus'd, and What an Idoll it Is Now Made. With the Fraud and Falsehood of the Scots, and Their Kings Hypocrisie and Dissimulation. Moreover Such Objections are Answered, as Seeme to Have Any Thing in Them, Against the Point Here Asserted.* (London: Matthew Simmons, 1650).

Charles II. *By the King, Charles by the Grace of God.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Charles II. *A Declaration by the Kings Majesty.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Church of Scotland. *Causes of a Publick and Solemn Humiliation. [21 June 1650].* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Church of Scotland. *The Confession of Faith of the Kirk of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Church of Scotland. *Confession of Faith of the Kirk of Scotland.* (Tot Rotterdam: Weduwe van Matthijs Wagens, 1655).

Church of Scotland. *A Declaration of Principles on Which the Army Is to Fight.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Church of Scotland. *Directions of the Generall Assembly Concerning Secret and Private Worship, and Mutuall Edification, for Cherishing Piety, for Maintaining Unity, and Avoiding Schism and Division. With an Act for Observing These Directions, and for Censuring Such as Use to Neglect Family Worship. And an Act Against Such as Withdraw Themselves from the Publike Worship in Their Owne Congregations.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly. *An Act and Overture of the Generall Assembly, for the Peace and Union of the Kirk, With a Letter to the Nobility, Gentry, and All Other Wise and Pious Persons in Every Presbyterie, to Promove the Same (August 2).* (Leith, 1652).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly. *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638-1842.* (ed.) T. Pitcairn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Printing & Publishing Co., 1843).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly. *A Declaration of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, in Answer to a Declaration, Intituled, A Declaration of the Parliament of England, upon the Marching of Their Army Into Scotland, and Concerning Present Dangers and Duties, in Reference Both to Sectaries and Malignants.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly. *Three Acts of the Generall Assembly, for Promoving [Sic] the Knowvledg of the Grounds of Salvation, and Observing the Rules of Discipline.* (Leith, 1652).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly. *Warning and Declaration from the Generall Assembly.30 of Iuly.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *The Answer of the Commission of the Generall Assemblie to the Quaeree Propounded to Them from the Parliament with an Answer of the Commission of the Generall Assemblie to a Letter, Sent to Them from the Ministers of the Presbyterie of Sterline.* (London: James Brown, 1651).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *The Causes of a Publick Fast and Humiliation, To be Kept with All Convenient Diligence: By All the Members of This Kirk & Kingdom of Scosland.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1650).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *Causes of an Humiliation Appointed by the Commission of the Generall Assembly, to be Observed through This Whole Kirk, on the Last Sabbath of March, and the First Sabbath of Aprile, 1653.* ([Edinburgh?], 1653).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *The Confession of Faith, And the Larger and Shorter Catechism.* (London: First Printed at Edenburgh, and now reprinted at London for the Company of Stationers, 1653).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *For the Under-Officers and Souldiers of the English Army, from the People of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *The Great Sin and Chief Guiltiness of Scotland in the Contempt of the Gospel.* ([Edinburgh?], 1654).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *The Great Sin, and Chief Guiltines of Scotland, in the Contempt of the Gospel. As it Was Branched Out in Particulars, by the Commission of the General Assembly, in the Year, 1650. Now re-Printed at the Desire of the Synod of Lothian, for the Fast Appointed by Them in the Year, 1654.* (Edinburgh: A. Anderson, 1655).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *The Humble Remonstrances of the Commission of the Generall Assemblie, To the Kings Majestie, and Honorable Committee of Estates, of the Third, and Twenty Fyfth of January, 1651. With The Answer from the Kings Majesty & Honorable Committee of Estates, Thereunto; of the Sixth of Februarie, 1651.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *Perth Decemb. 14. 1650. The Commission of the Generall Assembly Considering How Greivous a Sin Against God and Scandall to Religion it Were for Any of This Kirke and Kingdome to Joine or Comply with Any of the Sectarian Enemy.* (1650).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *Reasons of a Fast.December 22. 1650.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1650).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning Concerning Present Dangers and Duties, from the Commissioners of the Generall Assembly Unto All the Members of This Kirk.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *A Short Exhortation and Warning, to the Ministers, and Professours of This Kirk.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *A Short Exhortation and Warning to the Ministers and Professours of This Kirk; from the Commission of the Generall Assembly. Perth, 20 March, 1651.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *A Short Reply to the Army's Declaration.* (Edinburgh, 1650).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *A Short Reply Unto a Declaration, Entituled, The Declaration of the Army of England, upon Their March Into Scotland. Together with a Vindication of the Declaration of the Army of England upon Their March Into Scotland, from the Uncharitable Constructions, Odious Imputations, and Scandalous Asperations of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, in Their Reply Thereunto.* (London: Printed for John Field, August 16, 1650).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *A Solemn Testimony Against Toleration and the Present Proceedings of Sectaries and Their Abettors in England, in Reference to Religion and Government, with an Admonition and Exhortation to Their Brethren There, from the Commissioners of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1649).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *A Solemn Warning to All the Members of This Kirk, from the Commission of the Generall Assemblie with an Act for the Censuring Such as Act, or Comply with the Sectarian Armies.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651).

Church of Scotland. General Assembly, Commission. *West-Kirk the 13. Day of August, 1650.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Church of Scotland. Presbytery of Edinburgh. *A Testimony and Warning of the Presbyterie of Edinburgh, Against a Late Petition, Tending (in the Scope and Design Thereof) to the Overturning of the Ordinances and Truth of Christ in This Church. Octob. 5. Anno. Dom. 1659.* (Edinburgh, 1659).

Church of Scotland. Presbytery of Stirling. *The Remonstrance of the Presbyterie of Sterling, Against the Present Conjunction with the Malignant Party to the Commission of the Kirk at St. Johnston.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1651).

Clarke, William. *The Clarke Papers.* (ed.) C.H. Firth, Camden Society new Ser. 49, 54, 60, 62. (London: Camden Society, 1890-1, 1894-5, 1899).

Committee of Estates (Scotland). *An Answere from the Committee of Estates, To a Printed Paper Directed to the People of Scotland, and Signed in Name of L.G. Cromwel, and His Officers.* (Edinburgh,July 22, 1650).

Convention of Estates (Scotland). *Articles and Ordinances of War.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Committee of Estates (Scotland). *Declaration of the Committee of Estates.in Answer to.The Declaration of the Parliament of England.(June 18).* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Convention of Estates (Scotland). *Edinburgh, 4 Iune 1650. The Estates of Parliament Now Presently Conveened, Taking Into Consideration the Necessary Duty Lying upon Them to Use Their Best Endeavors for Securing of Religion and the Peace of the Kingdom.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Convention of Estates (Scotland). *Edinburgh, the Twentie Day of June, 1650. The Estates of Parliament Now Presently Conveened in This Fift Session of This Second Triennal Parliament, Taking to Their Consideration the Dangers Which Threatens Religion & This Kingdome.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Cramond, William (ed.) *Extracts from the Records of the Kirk-Session of Elgin* (Elgin, 1897).

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

Cramond, William (ed.) *The Records of Elgin, 1234-1800.* (Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1898).

Cromwell, Oliver. *By His Excellency. Whereas it Hath Pleased God by His Gracious Providence and Goodnesse, to Put the City of Edinburgh and Towne of Leith Under My Power.* ([Edinburgh]: [Evan Tyler], 1650).

Cromwell, Oliver. *A Declaration of Oliver Cromwell, Captain General of All the Forces of This Common-Wealth.* (London: William Du-gard, 1653).

Cromwell, Oliver. *A Letter from the Lord General Cromwel from Dunbar; Containing a True Relation of the Proceedings of the Parliament Army Under His Command in Scotland; And the Success God Was Pleased to Give Them Against the Scots Army, in a Battle at Dunbar the 3 of September. 1650.* (London: Edward Husband and John Field, 1650).

Cromwell, Oliver. *A Letter Sent to the Generall Assembly of the Kirke of Scotland.* (London: Printed for Hanna Allen, 1650).

Cromwell, Oliver. *The Lord General Cromwell His March to Sterling. Being A Diary of All Proceedings in the Army from Their March Out of Edenburgh, to the 25 of September 1650. Also, The Lord Generals Proclamation in Relation to Edenburgh and Leith.* (London: E.G., 1650).

Cromwell, Oliver. *Several Letters and Passages Between His Excellency, the Lord General Cromwel and the Governor of Edinburgh Castle, and the Ministers There, Since His Excellencies Entrance Into Edinburgh.* (London: John Field, 1650).

Dell, Jonas. *Forms the Pillars of Antichrist; but Christ in Spirit the True Teacher of His People; and Not Tradition: for the Spirit of God Is Not Bound to Any Place, nor Time, nor Form; we May Not Limit the Holy One of Israel. The Spirits Teaching Doth Unmask and Unvail the False Prophet, or the Carnal Worshipper, and Discovers Them to be the Agents and Agitators of Antichrist. And the Kingdome of Antichrist Is Subdued to us, and Destroyed in us, by the Spirits Teaching. And to Him That Is Led by the Spirits Teaching Do I Commend These to be Received, and Not to the Naturall Mans Wisdom;. Written in Scotland in Opposition to Some People Who Do Imitate John the Baptist, by Dipping Themselves in Water, Holding Out Free-Will, and Falling from Grace, and Pretend That They are the Only Disciples of Christ, and Reject the Spirits Teaching, by One Who Waits to See the Downfal of the Kingdom of Antichrist, and the Prosperity of Sion, Jonas Dell Something in Answer to a Scandalous Paper Given Forth by W.P. to the Souldiers in the Garrison of Holmdell in Southerland.* (London, 1656).

Dell, William. *Right Reformation: or, the Reformation of the Church of the New Testament Represented in Gospel-Light. In a Sermon Preached to the Honourable House of Commons, on Wednesday, November 25, 1646. Together with a Reply to the Chief Contradictions of Master Love's Sermon, Preached on the Same Day. Published According to Order, for the Good and the Faithfull, at Their Desire, by William Dell, Minister of the Gospel, Attending on His Excellecy Sir Thomas Fairfax.* (Printed at London, and reprinted at Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Douglas, Robert. *Short Information. A Short Information and Brotherly Exhortation to Our Brethren of England: From the Commissioners of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland Convened at Forfarr. August 12, 1651.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1651).

Douglas, William. *The Stable Trueths of the Kirk Require a Sutable Behaviour. Holden Forth by Way of a Sermon. Delivered by Mr. William Dowglas Professor of Divinity in Kings Colledge, in the University of Aberden [Sic]. April 18. 1659.* (Aberdeen: J. B., 1660).

Dundas, William. *A Few Words of Truth from the Spirit of Truth.* (1673).

Durham, James. *The Dying Man's Testament to the Church of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: Christopher Higgins, 1659).

E., P. *A Serious Review of Some Principles of the Quakers: Wherein Error Is Discovered, and Truth Defended.* ([Edinburgh]: [Andrew Anderson], 1655).

Edwards, Thomas. *Gangraena.* (London: printed for Ralph Smith, 1646).

England and Wales. Army. *A Declaration of the Army Concerning the Apprehending of Major Gen. Overton, and the Rest of the Officers of Scotland, Who Had a Design to Divide the Forces, and Stand in Opposition Against the Lord Protector, and the Present Government in England. Likewise, a Remonstrance to the People, to be Published in All Cities and Market Townes Throughout England and Wales; and Their Resolution Touching the Lawes of the Land, and the Priviledge of the People.* (London: printed for C. Norton, 1655).

England and Wales. Army. *Declaration of the Army of England, upon Their March Into Scotland.* (Newcastle: S[tephen] B[ulkley], 1650).

England and Wales. Army. *A Declaration of the Army of England upon Their March Into Scotland as Also a Letter of His Excellency the Lord Generall Cromwell to the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland Together with a Vindication of the Aforesaid Declaration from the Uncharitable Constructions, Odious Imputations, and Scandalous Aspersions of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, in Their Reply Thereto and an Answer of the Under-Officers and Souldiers of the Army, to a Paper Directed to Them from the People of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

England and Wales. Army. *A Declaration of the Army of England upon Their March Into Scotland To All That are Saints, and Partakers of the Faith of God's Elect, in Scotland.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

England and Wales. Army. *A declaration of the army of the Commonwealth of England, to the people of Scotland.* (London: Edward Husband and John Field, 1650).

England and Wales. Army. *A Declaration of the English Army Now in Scotland. [Sic] To the People of Scotland, Especially Those among Them, That Know and Fear the Lord; we the Officers and Souldiers of the English Army Do Send Greeting.* (London, 1650).

England and Wales. Army. *A Declaration of the English Army Now in Scotland, Touching the Justness & Necessity of Their Present Proceeding in That Nation.* (London: Printed for Edward Husband and John Field, August 12, 1650).

England and Wales. Army. *A Declaration of the Officers of the Army in Scotland to the Churches of Christ in the Three Nations.* (Edinburgh: C. Higgins, 1659).

England and Wales. Army. *Letters from the head-quarters of our army in Scotland: being a diary of all proceedings in the army to Octob. 30. 1650. An Accompt of Col. Kerr and Straughans overture to the Lord Generall Cromwell, about accomodation.* (London: E.G., 1650).

England and Wales. Parliament. *An Act Against Vagrants, and Wandring, Idle, Dissolute Persons. At the Parliament Begun at Westminster the 17th Day of September, an. Dom. 1656.* (Edinburgh: Christopher Higgins, 1657).

England and Wales. Parliament. *Declaration of the Parliament of England, upon the Marching of the Armie Into Scotland.* (London: William Du-gard, 1650).

England and Wales. Parliament. *Proclamation, 27 September Against All Ministers Who Pray for the King.* (Edinburgh: C. Higgins, 1655).

England and Wales. Parliament. *Proclamation Against All Meetings of Quakers, Anabaptists, & c.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1661).

English, Peter. *The Survey of Policy: or, A Free Vindication of the Commonwealth of England, Against Salmasius, and Other Royallists.* (Leith, 1654).

Farneworth, Richard. *The Scriptures Vindication Against the Scotish Contradictors. By One John Stalham, and as he Saith, Preacher of the Gospel at Edenborough in Scotland. And the Other Tiled [Sic], A Serious Review of Some Principles of the Quakers; Wherein Error Is Discovered, and Truth Defended; by P.E. and Written with a Pen at Edenborough, Printed in the Year 1655, and a Written Name, as if it Were the Printer Called Peter English, but no Printed Name; and Thus They Shuffle, but Laid Open to Their Shame, and Truth in This Short Answer Is Defended and Cleared, and Their*

Errour Is Discovered, and They Ensnared. Who Both Have Manifested Their Contradictions Both to the Scriptures, and Their Own Writings, and so Have Not the People Which They Call Quakers. Published by a Servant of the Lord Jesus, in Yorkeshire in England, Known to the World by the Name of Richard Farneworth. (London: printed for Giles Calvert, 1655).

Fergusson, James. *A Brief Refutation of the Errors Tolleration, Erastianism, Independency and Separation Delivered in Some Sermons from I Job. 4. I, Preach'd in the Year 1652 to Which are Added Four Sermons Preach'd on Several Occasions.* (Edinburgh: George Mosman, 1692).

The Fifth Monarchy, or Kingdom of Christ, in Opposition to the Beasts, Asserted, by the Solemn League and Covenant, Several Learned Divines, the Late General and Army (Viz.) in Their Declaration at Muslebrough, August 1650. Wherein the Old Cause Is Stated, Appeals Made, the Scottish Blood Spilt, and the Banners Yet in Westminster-Hall Witnessing the Great Decision Then Given on Christs Side. Also, by a Letter from the Officers of the Army in England, to Their Brethren in Ireland, the 11 of May, 1653. Justifying on Christs Accompt, the Dissolution of the Parliament; and Consonant Thereunto, the Generals Speech to Those That Succeeded in the Government, the Fourth of July Following. With a Short Application, and Some Brief Proposals Grounded on Scripture, in Order to a Lasting Settlement in This Hour of Distraction, the Foundations Being Out of Course. (London: printed for Livewel Chapman, 1659).

Firth, C.H. (ed.) *The Clarke Papers.* 4 vols (London: Camden Society, 1891-1901).

Firth, C.H. (ed.) *Scotland and the Commonwealth.* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1895).

Firth, C.H. (ed.) *Scotland and the Protectorate.* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1899).

Fox, George. *The Great Mistery of the Great Whore Unfolded.* (London: Printed for Tho. Simmons, 1659).

Fox, George. *The Journal.* (ed.) Nigel Smith (London: Penguin Books, 1998).

Fox, George. *The Journal of George Fox.* (ed.) J.L. Nickalls (Cambridge: CUP, 1952).

Fox, George. *The Journal of George Fox.* (ed.) N. Penney (Cambridge: CUP, 1911).

Fraser, James. *Chronicles of the Frasers.* (ed.) William MacKay (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1905).

Friend to the Commonwealth. *A Declaration of the Commissioners for Visitation of Universities, and for Placing and Displacing of Ministers in Scotland; Against Praying, or Preaching for the Pretended King of Scotland: With Some Reasons Given by Some of the Ministers of Edinburgh, Why They Cannot in Conscience Omit to Pray for Him: Together with an Ansvver to the Said Reasons, Wherein the Unwarrantablenesse of That Practice Is Proved from the Word of God. And the Equity and Necessity of the Present Proceedings of the Commissioners in Order to the Publick Peace, Is Cleared and Justified to the Consciences of Rationall and Peaceable Men.* (Leith,1653).

Friend to the Commonwealth of England. *The English Banner of Truth Displayed: or, The State of This Present Engagement Against Scotland.* (London: printed for Giles Calvert, 1650).

Gardiner, S.R. (ed.) *Letters and Papers Illustrating the Relations Between Charles the Second and Scotland in 1650.* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1894).

Gillespie, Patrick. *Rulers Sins the Causes of National Judgments: or, a Sermon Preached at the Fast, upon the 26th Day of December, 1650.* Glasgow: James and William Duncans, 1718.

Gilpin, John. *The Quakers Shaken, or, A Discovery of the Errours of That Sect by John Gilpin, of the Town of Kendale in Westmoreland, Who Was Once One of the Said Sect, and Afterwards by Gods Grace Left the Same; Attested by the Major and Pastour of Kendale, and Diverse Others.* (Edinburgh: Printed at London, and re-printed at Edinburgh, 1655).

Gough, James. *Memoirs of the Life, Religious Experience, and Labours in the Gospel of James Gough.* 3 vols (Lindfield, 1832).

A Great Victory God Hath Vouchsafed by the Lord Generall Cromwels Forces Against the Scots. (London: Printed for Robert Ibbitson, 1651).

Green, M.A.E. (ed.) *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series 1651-1660.* 13 vols (London, 1877-86).

Guild, William. *Anti-Christ Pointed and Painted Out in His True Colours, or, The Popes of Rome Proven to Bee That Man of Sinne and Sonne of Perdition Fore-Prophesied in Scripture by the Clear Witnessing of Roman Catholicks Themselves, Who Lived and Died in the Communion of That Church.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1655).

Guthrie, James. *A Humble Acknowledgement of the Sins of the Ministery of Scotland.* ([Edinburgh?], 1653).

Guthrie, James. *Protesters no Subverters, and Presbyterie no Papacie; or, A Vindication of the Protesting Brethren, and of the Government of the Kirk of Scotland, from the Aspersions Unjustly Cast upon Them, in a Late Pamphlet of Some of the Resolution-Party, Entituled, A Declaration, &c. With a Discovery of the Insufficiency, Inequality and Iniquity of the Things Propounded in That Pamphlet, as Overtures of Union and Peace. Especially, of the Iniquity of That Absolute and Unlimited Submission to the Sentences of Church-Judicatories That Is Holden Forth Therein, and Most Unjustly Pleaded to Belong to the Being and Essence of Presbyterial Government.* (Edinburgh, 1658).

Guthrie, James. *Some Considerations Contributing Unto the Discoverie of the Dangers That Threaten Religion and the Work of the Reformation in the Church of Scotland.* (Edinburgh, 1660).

Guthrie, James. *A Treatise of Ruling Elders and Deacons.* (Edinburgh, 1652).

Guthrie, William. *The Christians Great Interest.* (Glasgow: C. Higgins, 1659).

Guthrie, William. *A Clear, Attractive, Warming Beam of Light from Christ the Sun of Life, Leading to Himself; Wherein Is Held Forth a Clear, Sound and Easy Way of a Soul's Particular Closing with God in the Covenant of Free Grace, to the Full Ending and Clearing All Debates Thereanent.* (Aberdeen: James Brown, 1657).

Guthry, Henry. *The Memoirs of Henry Guthry.* (Glasgow: printed for A. Stalker, 1748).

Hall, John. *The Grounds and Reasons of Monarchy, Considered and Exemplified Out of the Scottish History by J.H.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1651).

Hazard, Ebenezer. *Historical Collections: consisting of state papers and other authentic documents, intended as materials for an history of the United States of America.* (Philadelphia, 1792-4).

Heath, James. *A Brief Chronicle of the Late Intestine Vvar in the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland.* (London: J.P., 1676).

Henderson, E. (ed.) *Extracts from the Kirk-Session Records of Dunfermline, from A.D. 1640 to 1689 Inclusive.* (Edinburgh: Fullarton & McNab, 1865).

Howgill, Francis. *To All You Commanders and Officers of the Army of Scotland.* (Leith, 1657).

The Humble Representation of Some Officers of the Army, to the Right Honourable Lieutenant General Fleetwood. Delivered, November 1. 1659. (Edinburgh: Printed at London, and reprinted by Christopher Higgins, 1659).

Hutcheson, George. *A Review and Examination of a Pamphlet Lately Published, Bearing the Title of Protesters no Subverters, and Presbyterie no Papacy, &c. By Some Lovers of the Interest of Christ in the Church of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: C. Higgins, 1659).

Hutchinson, Thomas. A collection of original papers relative to the History of the colony of Massachusets-bay. (Boston, New-England: Printed by Thomas and John Fleet, 1769).

Innes, C. and T. Thomson (eds). *The Acts of the Parliament of Scotland.* 11 vols (Edinburgh, 1814-44).

Irving, Alexander. 'Protestation by Sir Alexander Irving of Drum Against the Presbytery of Aberdeen. 1652.' *The Miscellany of the Spalding Club III.* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1846), 205-7.

Jaffray, Alexander. *Diary of Alexander Jaffray: Provost of Aberdeen, One of the Scottish Commissioners to King Charles II, and a Member of Cromwell's Parliament: to Which are Added Particulars of His Subsequent Life, Given in Connexion with Memoirs of the Rise, Progress, and Persecution of the People Called Quakers in the North of Scotland among Whom he Became One of the Earliest Members.* (ed.) John Barclay, 3rd edn (Aberdeen: George & Robert King, 1856).

Johnston, Archibald, Lord Wariston. *Causes of the Lords Wrath Against Scotland: Manifested in His Sad Late Dispensations; Whereunto Is Added a Paper, Particularly Holding Forth the Sins of the Ministery.* (Edinburgh: by the heirs of Geo. Anderson, 1653.)

Johnston, Archibald, Lord Wariston. *Diary of Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston.* (eds) D.H. Flemming and J.D. Ogilvie. 3 vols (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1919-1940).

Jonas, A.C. 'Extracts from the Parish Records, 1644-1699.' *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.* 46 (1911-12), 27-52

Keith, George. *Help in Time of Need, from the God of Help. To the People of the (so Called) Church of Scotland, Especially the Once More Zealous and Professing, Who Have so Shamefully Degenerated and Declined from That Which Their Fathers the Primitive Protestants Attained Unto;. Being Certain Particulars Very Weighty, and of Great Concernment for Them to Consider Seriously, for Their Souls Good.* (Aberdeen, 1665).

Keith, George. *The Way Cast up, and the Stumbling-Blockes Removed from Before the Feet of Those, Who are Seeking the Way to Zion, with Their Faces Thitherward. Containing an Answere to a Postcript, Printed at the End of Sam Rutherford's Letters, Third Edition, by a Namelesse Author, Indeed Not Without Cause, Considering the Many Lyes and Falshoods Therein, Against the People, Called Quakers, Which are Here Disproved, and Refuted; and the Truth of What we Hold Touching Those Particulars Faithfully Declared, According to the Scriptures. By George Keith, Prisoner in the Tolbooth of Aberdeen, with Many Brethren.* (Aberdeen, 1677).

Kiffin, William. *A Confession of Faith, of Severall Congregations or Churches of Christ in London, Which are Commonly (Though Unjustly) Called Anabaptists. Published for the Vindication of the Truth, and Information for the Igonrant. Unto Which Is Added Heart-Bleedings for Professors Abominations: or, a Faithfull Generall Epistle (From the Same Churches) Presented to All Who Have Known the Way of Truth.* Fourth impression, corrected. (Leith, 1653).

King, Daniel. *A Way to Sion Sought Out.* 2nd edn (Edinburgh: Christopher Higgins, 1656).

The King of Scotlands Negociations at Rome for Assistance Against the Common-Wealth of England, As Also Severall Letters of the Chancellour of Scotland to the King Since His Coming Into Scotland, Taken in His Cabinet at the Late Fight Neer Dunbar. (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

The King of Scotland Negociations at Rome for Assistance Against the Common-Weath of England, In Certain Propositions There Made, for, Good on His Behalf; in Which Propositions His Affection and Disposition to Poperie Is Asserted. (London: William Du-gard, 1650).

Laing, David (ed.) *Correspondence of Sir Robert Kerr, First Earl of Ancram and His Son, William, Third Earl of Lothian.* 2 vols (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1875).

Lambert, John. *Forasmuch, as I am Credibly Informed, That Notwithstanding the Laws and Ordinances of Vvar, Proclamations, and All Other Lawfull Means Used to the Contrary, the Private Souldiers, Both of Horse and Foot Continue Still to Run from Their Colours Into England.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1651).

Lamont, John. *The Diary of Mr John Lamont of Newton, 1649-1671.* (ed.) G.R. Kinloch (Edinburgh: The Maitland Club, 1830).

A Large Relation of the Fight at Leith Neere Edenburgh. Wherein Major Generall Montgomery, Colonell Straughan, with Many More of Quality of the Scottish Party Were Slaine and Wounded. The Particulars on Both Sides Fully Related, with a List of the Prisoners Taken, and Number Kild. Also a Perfect Account of Every Dayes Transactions and Engagements Between the Armies, Since Our Armies First Entring Scotland. (London: Ed. Griffin, 1650).

Law, Robert. *Memorialls, or the Memorable Things That Fell Out within This Island of Britain from 1638 to 1684.* (ed.) C.K. Sharpe. (Edinburgh, 1818).

Leishman, M. (ed.) *The Works of the Rev. Hugh Binning.* 3rd edn (Edinburgh: A. Fullarton and Co., 1851).

A Letter from Several Ministers in and About Edinburgh, to the Ministers of London, Concerning the re-Establishing of the Covenant. (Edinburgh: Christopher Higgens, 1659).

A Letter from Some Officers of the Army at Whitehall, to the Chief Officers of the Several Regiments in Scotland, with a Copie of Their Agreement; Together with a Letter from the Officers of the Army in Scotland in Answer Thereunto. (Edinburgh: C. Higgins, 1659).

Letter of the Officers of the Army in Scotland.(Oct. 22). (Edinburgh: C. Higgins, 1659).

Letter to the Lord Fleetwood, from an Officer in the Army. (Edinburgh: C. Higgins, 1659).

A Letter To the Right Honorable William Lenthall Esq. Speaker of the Parliament of England. Giving a True Relation of a Late Great Victory Obtained by the Parliaments Forces Against the Scots Neer Dundee the Taking the Old Generall Lesley, Lord-Chancellour Louden, Lord Crauford Lindsey, Lord Ogleby, and 300 More, Whereof Divers of Quality. As Also a True Relation (With the Particulars) of a Great Victory by Our Forces Neer Worcester Against the King of Scots Army, 5000 of the Enemy Kild and Taken, and the Taking of the Royall Fort in Worcester. (London: Francis Leach, 1651).

Letters from the Head-Quarters of Our Army in Scotland: Being a Diary of All Proceedings in the Army to Octob. 30. 1650. (London: E.G., 1650).

Lilburne, John. *The Engagement Vindicated & Explained. Or the Reasons upon Which Lieut. Col. John Lilburne, Took the Engagement. Published by a Well-Wisher of the Present Authority, on Purpose to Satisfie Scrupulous Mindes in the Lawfulnesse of the Said Engagement.* (London: John Clowes, 1650).

Lilburne, Robert. *By the Commander in Chief of All the Forces in Scotland.* (Leith, 1654).

Lockyer, Nicholas. *A Litle Stone Out of the Mountain. Church-Order Briefly Opened.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).

The Lord Gen. Cromwel's Letter: With a Narrative of The Proceedings of the English Army in Scotland, and a Declaration of the General Assembly, Touching the Dis-Owning Their King and His Interest. (London: Edward Husband and John Field, 1650).

Love the Precious Ointment, That Flowes Down from the Head Christ Jesus, to All His Members; and Makes Them Dwell Together in Unity. (Printed at London, and re-printed at Leith, 1654).

MacTavish, D.C (ed.) *Minutes of the Synod of Argyll, 1652-1661.* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1944).

Maidment, James (ed.) 'Diurnal of Occurences in Scotland.' *The Spottiswoode Micellany.* (Edinburgh: Spottiswoode Society, 1845), 75-208.

Mercurius Scoticus Giving the World Ground upon This Evident Truth, Videlicet, That the Scottish Rebels, the Presbyter, or Kirckfaction Never Intended That Charles the Second Should be Their King. (Rotterdam: P.C., 1650).

Monck, George. *A Declaration of the Commander in Chief in Scotland, and the Officers Under His Command, in Vindication of the Liberties of the People, and Priviledges of Parliament.* Edinburgh: (C. Higgins, 1659).

Munro, A.M. (ed.) *Records of Old Aberdeen.* Vol. 2 (Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1909).

Nickalls, J. (ed.) *The Original Letters and Papers of State, Addressed to Oliver Cromwell.* (London: William Bowyer, 1743).

Nicoll, John. *A Diary of Public Transactions and Other Occurrences, Chiefly in Scotland, 1650-67.* (ed.) D. Laing (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1836).

Nimmo, James. *Diary, 1654-1709.* (ed.) W.G. Scott-Moncrieff. (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1889).

Overton, Robert. *Two Letters from Major General Overton.* (London: Livewell Chapman, 1655).

Owen, John. *The Advantage of the Kingdome of Christ, in the Shaking of the Kingdoms of the World: or, Providential Alterations, in Their Subserviencie to Christ's Exaltation. Opened in a Sermon Preached to the Parliament, Octob. 24. 1651. A Solemn Day of Thanksgiving for the Destruction of the Scots Army at Worcester, with Sundry Other Mercies; by John Owen, Minister of the Gospel.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).

Owen, John. *The Branch of the Lord, the Beauty of Sion: or, The Glory of the Church, in Its Relation Unto Christ· Opened in Two Sermons; One Preached at Berwick, the Other at Edinburgh. By John Owen, Minister of the Gospel.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Parker, Alexander. *A Discovery of Satan's Wiles. Lately Printed and Published in a Booke Entitled, Antichrist (in Spirit) Unmasked, Etc. Put Forth by One James Brown.* (London: printed for Thomas Simmons, 1657).

Peters, Hugh. *Good Work For a Good Magistrate.* (ed.) Brendan Clifford, A programme of the English Revolution. (Belfast: Athol Books, 1992).

Pittilloh, R. *Scotland Mourning: or, a Shorty Discovery of the Sad Consequences Which Accompanies the Delay of the Setling of Judicatories in That Nation.* (London: Printed for L. Chapman, 1659).

Pittilloh, Robert. *The Hammer of Persecution: or, the Mystery of Iniquity In the Persecution of Many Good People in Scotland, Under the Government of Oliver Late Lord Protector, and Continued by Others of the Same Spirit; Disclosed, with the Remedies Thereof.* (London: L. Chapman, 1659).

Pittillok, Robert. *A Short Brotherly Examination of a Sermon: At First Preached by Mr Saloman Saffrey, and After Published in Print; Intituted, Part of a Discourse, Tending Only to Invite Those That Believe in Christ, to be Conformable to Him by Baptisme. But Intending to Disswade from Infant-Baptisme.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).

Presbyterian Assembly of London. *A Vindication of the Presbyteriall-Government, and Ministry: Together, with an Exhortation, to All the Ministers, Elders, and People, within the Bounds of the Province of London, Whether Joyning us, or Separating from us. Published, by the Ministers, and Elders, Met Together in a Provinciall Assembly, Novemb. 2d. 1649.* (London: Printed for C. Meredith, 1650).

Prynne, William. *Sad and Serious Political Considersations, Touching the Invasive War Against Our Presbyterian Protestant Brethren in Scotland, Their Late Great Overthrow, and the Probable Dangerous Consequences Thereof to Both Nations and the Protestant Religion. Which May Serve as a Satisfactory Apology for Such Ministers and People, Who Out of Conscience Did Not Observe the Publike Thanksgiving, Against Their Covenant, for the Great Slaughter of Those Their Brethren in Covenant.* (London, 1650).

Relation of a Great Victory Against Clanricard Near the Shannon. (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Renwick, R. (ed.) *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Peebles, 1652-1714.* (Glasgow: Scottish Burgh Records Society, 1910).

Renwick, R. (ed.) *Extracts from the Records of the Royal Burgh of Stirling, A.D. 1519-1666.* (Glasgow: Glasgow Stirlingshire and Sons of the Rock Society, 1887).

Robertson, J. (ed.) *Ecclesiastical Records. Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark, 1623-1709.* (Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1839).

Row, John. 'Diary.' *Scottish Notes and Queries* 7 (1894).

Row, John. *The History of the Kirk of Scotland, from the Year 1558 to August 1637 by John Row, Minister of Carnock: With a Continuation to July 1639, by His Son, John Row, Principal of King's College, Aberdeen.* (Edinburgh: Printed for the Wodrow Society, 1842).

Rushworth, John. *A True Relation of the Routing the Scottish Army Near Dunbar, Sept. 3. Instant: The Particulars of the Fight, Numbers Slain, and Prize Taken. With an Exact List of Names of the Prisoners.* (London: John Field, 1650).

Rutherford, Samuel. *The Covenant of Life Opened: or, A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace.* (Edinburgh: A. Anderson, 1655).

Rutherford, Samuel. *A Free Disputation Against Pretended Liberty of Conscience.* London: R.I., 1649.

Rutherford, Samuel. *Influences of the Life of Grace.* (London, 1659).

Rutherford, Samuel. *Letters of Samuel Rutherford.* (ed.) A.A. Bonar (Edinburgh, 1863; Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1984..

Rutherford, Samuel. *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist.* (London, 1648).

Rutherford, Samuel. *A Survey of the Survey of That Summe of Church Discipline, Penned by Mr. Thomas Hooker.* (London, 1658).

Rutherford, Samuel. *The Tryal & Triumph of Faith.* (London, 1652).

Saffery, Salomon. *Part of a Discourse, Tending Only to Invite Those That Believe in Christ, to be Conformable to Him in Baptisme.* ([n.p.]: [n.p.], 164?).

Satterston, J. *The Remonstrance or Declaration of the Levellers in Scotland; Concerning, The Estates Agreement with Their Declared King, and Their Protestation Touching the Parliament of England. Agreed upon and Subscribed Unto, at Their Meeting at St. Johnstons, on the 14 of This Instant June, 1650.* (London: Printed for G.H., 1650).

Scobell, Henry. *A True Relation of the Proceedings of the English Army Now in Scotland, from the Two and Twentieth Day of July, to the First of August. Contained in, and Extracted Out of the Several Letters Sent from the Army and Read in Parliament, the Sixth of August, 1650.* (London: Edward Husband and John Field, 1650).

Scotch man. *A Word of Advertisement & Advice to the Godly in Scotland. By a Scotch Man, and a Cordiall Vvel-Wisher to the Interest of the Godly in Scotland, Both in Civils and Spirituals.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1651).

Scotland, Army. *To the Right Honourable the Lords and Others of the Committee of Estates, The Humble Remonstrance and Supplication of the Officers of the Army.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Scotland. Commissioners for Visitation of Universities and for Placing and Displacing of Ministers. *By the Commissioners. For Visiting and Regulating the Universities, and Other Affairs, Relating to the Ministery in Scotland.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).

Scotland. Commissioners for Visitation of Universities and for Placing and Displacing of Ministers. *By the Commissioners for Visiting the Universities, Colledges, and Schooles of Learning in Scotland. Whereas by Our Former Proclamation, Bearing Date the Second Day of August, 1653. Whereas by Our Former Proclamation, Bearing Date the Second Day of August, 1653. All*

Ministers, and Others are Prohibited to Pray for, or, Preach up the Interest of the Pretended King of Scotland. (Edinburgh, 1655).

Scottish man. *The Key of True Policy. or, A Free Dispute Concerning the Conservation of Lately Obtained Liberty: In Reference to the Parliament of England, Not Onely for Securing Liberty Already Obtained, but Also for Enlarging the Same.* (London: J.F., 1652).

Servant of the Common-wealth of England. *An Examination of the Seasonable and Necessarie Warning Concerning Present Dangers and Duties, Emitted from the Commissioners of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, Unto All the Members of That Kirk. June 25 1650: Which Was Printed at Edinburgh.* (London: William Du-gard, 1650).

Sharp, James. *A True Representation of the Rise, Progresse and State of the Present Divisions of the Church of Scotland.* (London, 1657).

Some Reasons Humbly Proposed to the Officers of the Army, for the Speedy re-Admission of the Long Parliament Vvho Setled the Government in the Way of a Free--State. (Edinburgh, 1659).

Some Sober Animadversions, Humbly, and In All Meekness Offered to the Consideration of All Who Truly Fear the Lord, and Enquire in His Ways, in Scotland upon A Testimony and Warning, Emitted by the Presbytery of Edinburgh, Against a Petition Lately Presented to the Parliament, in Defence of the Said Petition. Published to Vindicate Truth, and Undeceive the Simple. (London, 1659).

Stalham, John. *Contradictions of the Quakers (so Called) to the Scriptures of God, and to Their Own Scriblings and Vain Janglings. VVitnessed and Published by John Stalham, Preacher of the Gospel (for the Present) at Edinburgh in Scotland.* (Edinburgh, 1655).

Sterry, Peter. *England's Deliverance from the Northern Presbytery, Compared with Its Deliverance from the Roman Papacy: by Peter Sterry, Once Fellow of Emmanuel Colledge in Cambridge, Now Preacher to the Right Honorable the Councell of State, Sitting at White-Hall.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).

Stockdale, William. *The Principles and Doctrines.* (London, 1659).

The Sum of Saving Knowledge. (Edinburgh, 1650).

Sydenham, Cuthbert. *The False Brother, or, A New Map of Scotland. The Grounds of the Entrance of Our Army Into Scotland Cleared, from Their Own Principles and Actings; Their Main Pleas Impleaded, and Answered.* (London: R.W., 1651).

A Testimony to the Truth of Jesus Christ to the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Goverment of the Kirk of Scotland and to the National Covenant of Scotland and to the Solemn League and Covenant of the Three Nations, England, Scotland and Ireland and to the Work of Uniformity in Religion and Against the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies and Diverse Practices of the Times, Especially Against the Vast Toleration Now on Foot in These Nations by Sundry Ministers of the Gospel in the Provinces of Perth and Fife. (Edinburgh: Society of Stationers, 1660).

To the Generals, and Captains, Officers and Souldiers of This Present Army; The Just and Equal Appeal, and the State of the Innocent Cause of us, Who Have Been Turned Out of Your Army for the Exercise of Our Pure Consciences, Who are Now Persecuted Amongst Our Brethren, Under the Name of Quakers. (London, 1658).

To the Very Honorable the Representative of the Common-Vvealth. the Humble Petition and Remonstrance of Such in Scotland. (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1652).

To You the Parliament Sitting at Westminster, Our Request Is to God That You Rule for His Honour. Here are Several of Our Names, Who Thus Suffers in the Behalf of Many More in the Nation of Scotland. (1659).

Turner, James. *Memoirs of His Own Life and Times, 1632-1670.* (ed.) T. Thomson. (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1829).

Tweedie, W.K. (ed.) *Select Biographies*, vol. I (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1845).

Two Declarations of the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England. Together with Several Proceedings of the Commissioners Appointed by the Parliament for Ordering and Managing Affairs in Scotland. (London: John Field, 1652).

Vicars, John. *A Caveat for Covenant-Contemners and Covenant-Breakers.* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1650).

Weare, George. *The Doctrins & Principles of the Priests of Scotland, Contrary to the Doctrine of Christ and the Apostles Here All May See, the Priests of Scotland, and Their Church, and Their Persecution, Against the Saints, and Lambs, Servants, and Children of God, Which the Lord Moved to go among Them, to Visit the Seed of God, in That Dark Wildernesse Country, Who Has Been as Sheep among Wolves.* (London, 1657).

Wood, James. *A Little Stone Pretended to be Out of the Mountain, Tried and Found to be Counterfeit. Or An Examination & Refutation of Mr. Lockyers Lecture, Preached at Edinburgh, Anno 1651. Concerning the mater of the Visible Church: And Afterwards Printed with an appendix for Popular Government of Single Congregations. Together with an Examination, in Two Appendices, Of What Is Said on These Same Purposes in a Letter of Some in Aberdene, Who Lately Have Departed from the Communion and Government of the Church.* (Edinburgh: Andro Anderson, 1654).

Wood, Thomas. *The Dead-Man's Testament: or, A Letter Written to All the Saints of God in Scotland, Fellow-Heirs of the Blessing with Those in England.* (Leith: Evan Tyler, 1651).

Secondary

Abbott, W.C. (ed.) *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell.* 4 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937-47).

Aldis, H.G. *List of Books Printed in Scotland Before 1700, Including Those Printed Furth of the Realm for Scottish Booksellers, with Brief Notes on the Printers and Stationers.* (Edinburgh: National Library of Scotland, 1970).

Anderson, P.J. (ed.) *Fasti Academiae Mariscallanae Aberdonensis: Selections from the Records of the Marischal College and University, 1593-1860.* 2 vols (Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1898).

B., A. *Reflections on a Late Libel, Intitled Observations On a Late Famous Sermon, Intitled Curse ye Meroz: With a Full and True Narrative of Mr. Hickeringill's Life.* (London: Printed for John Williams, 1680).

Backhouse, James. *Memoirs of Francis Howgill, with Extracts from His Writings.* (York: W. Alexander and Son, 1828).

Barclay, John. *Select Anecdotes and Instructive Incidents Taken from Publications of Several Members of the Society of Friends, Chiefly Illustrative of Their Sentiments and Conduct on Various Occasions.* (New York: Isaac T. Hopper, 1833).

Barratt, David B. *Sects, 'Cults' and Alternative Religions* (London: Blandford, 1996),

Baskerville, S. *Not Peace but a Sword: The Political Theology of the English Revolution.* (London: Routledge, 1993).

Beattie, J. *History of the Church of Scotland during the Commonwealth.* (Edinburgh: William Whyte and Company, 1847).

Berry, James, Sir. *A Cromwellian Major General: The Career of Colonel James Berry.* (Oxford, 1938).

Berry, W.G. *Scotland's Struggles for Religious Liberty.* Eras of Nonconformity, VIII. (ed.) C. Silvester Horne. (London: National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, 1904).

Besse, Joseph. *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers.* 2 vols (London: Luke Hinde, 1753).

Bissett, John. 'The Bibliography of Samuel Rutherford.' *Records of the Glasgow Bibliographical Society* 6 (1920): 79-83.

Bower, A. *The History of the University of Edinburgh.* 2 vols (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Waugh and Innes, 1817).

Brailsford, M.R. *A Quaker from Cromwell's Army: James Nayler.* (London: Swarthmore Press, 1927).

Braithwaite, C.W. *The Beginnings of Quakerism.* (Cambridge: CUP, 1955).

Brown, L.F. *The Political Activities of the Baptists and the Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum.* (Oxford: OUP, 1912).

Brown, P. H. (ed.) *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House, 1689-1707).

Buckroyd, J. 'Lord Broghill and the Scottish Church, 1655-1656.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27 (1976): 359-68.

Bulloch, J. M. *A History of the University of Edinburgh 1495-1895.* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895).

Bulloch, James. 'Conformist and Nonconformists' *Transactions of the East Lothian Antiquaries and Field Naturalists' Society* 8 (1960): 70-84.

Burleigh, J.H.S. *A Church History of Scotland.* (London: OUP, 1960).

Burnet, G.B. *The Story of Quakerism in Scotland 1650-1850.* (London: J. Clarke, 1952).

Butler, D.M. *George Fox in Scotland.* (Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1913).

Butler, D.M. *The Quaker Meeting Houses of Britain.* (London: Friends Historical Society, 1999).

Calderwood, David. *The History of the Kirk of Scotland.* (ed.) T. Thomson, 8 vols (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842-9).

Cant, R.G. *The University of St Andrews: A Short History.* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1946).

Capp, B.S. *The Fifth Monarcy Men: A Study in 17th Century English Millenialism.* (London: Faber, 1972).

Carlyle, Thomas (ed.) *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches with Elucidations.* 3rd edn (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1888).

Caton, William. *Journals of the lives and gospel labours of William Caton and John Burnyeat.* (ed.) John Barclay, 2nd edn (London: Harvey and Darton, 1839).

Chalmers, George. *The Life of Thomas Ruddiman, A.M. The Keeper, for Almost Fifty Years, of the Library Belonging to the Faculty of Advocates at Edinburgh.* (London: John Stockdale, Piccadilly and William Laing, Edinburgh, 1794).

Chambers, Robert. *Domestic Annals of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution.* 3rd edn (Edinburgh and London: W. & R. Chambers, 1874).

Christie, G. 'James Durham as Courtier and Preacher.' *RSCHS* 4 (1932): 66-86.

Clyde, W.M. *The Struggle for the Freedom of the Press from Caxton to Cromwell.* St Andrews University Publications, no. 37 (London: Humphrey Milford, 1934).

Coffey, J. *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford.* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997).

Corns, T.N. and D. Lowenstein. *The Emergence of Quaker Writing: Dissenting Literature in Seventeenth-Century England.* (London: Frank Cass, 1995).

Couper, W.J. *The Edinburgh Periodical Press: Being a Bibliographical Account of the Newspapers, Journals, and Magazines Issued in Edinburgh from the Earliest Times to 1800.* 2 vols (Stirling: E. Mackay, 1908).

Couper, W. J. *The Origins of Glasgow Printing.* (Edinburgh: Geo. Stewart and Co., 1911).

Couper, W. J. *Scottish Rebel Printers.* (Edinburgh: The Darien Press, 1912).

Craven, J.B. *Church Life in South Ronaldshay and Burray.* (Kirkwall: William Peace and Son, 1911).

Craven, J.B. *History of the Church in Orkney, 1558-1662.* (Kirkwall: William Peace and Son, 1897).

Crippen, T.G. 'Nicholas Lockyer: A Half-Forgotten Champion of Independency.' *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society* 9 (1929-32): 64-77.

Cunningham, J. *The History of the Church of Scotland.* 2 vols (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1882).

Damrosch, L. *The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus: James Nayler and the Puritan Crackdown on the Free Spirit.* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996).

Davidson, J. *Inverurie and the Earldom of the Garioch.* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1878).

Davies, G. 'The Quarters of the English Army in Scotland in 1656.' *Scottish Historical Review* 21 (1924): 62-7.

Davis, J.C. 'Against Formality: One Aspect of the English Revolution.' 6th Series, 3 (1993), 265-88.

Dawson, W.H. *Cromwell's Understudy: The Life and Times of General John Lambert and the Rise and Fall of the Protectorate.* (London: William Hodge and Co., Ltd., 1938).

Devine, T.M. 'The Cromwellian Union and the Scottish Burghs: the Case of Aberdeen and Glasgow, 1652-60.' *Scottish Themes: Essays in Honour of S.G.E. Lythe.* (eds) J. Butt and J.T. Ward (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1976), 1-16.

Dexter, H.M. *Congregationalism as Seen in Its Literature.* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1880).

Dinnie, R. *History of Kincardine O'Neil.* (Aberdeen: Lewis Smith & Son, 1885).

Dobson, D. *Scottish Quakers and Early America: 1650-1700.* (Baltimore, MD: Genealogical Pub. Co., 1998).

Donald, P. 'Archibald Johnston of Wariston and the Politics of Religion.' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 24 (1991): 123-40.

Donaldson, G. 'The Emergence of Schism in Seventeenth-Century Scotland.' *Scottish Church History.* (ed.) G. Donaldson (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1985), 204-219.

Douglas, D. *History of the Baptist Churches in the North of England from 1648 to 1845.* (London: Houlston and Stoneham, 1846).

Douglas, J.D. *Light in the North: The Story of the Scottish Covenanters.* The Paternoster Church History. (ed.) F.F. Bruce. (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1964).

Douglas, W.S. *Cromwell's Scotch Campaigns: 1650-1651.* (London: Elliot Stock, 1899).

Dow, A.C. *Ministers to the Soldiers of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962).

Dow, Frances. *Cromwellian Scotland: 1651-1660.* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1979; John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1999).

Dunlop, A.I. *The Kirks of Edinburgh 1560-1984.* (Edinburgh: Scottish Record Society, 1988).

Durston, C. *Cromwell's Major-Generals.* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001).

Durston, C. and J. Eales, *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press, 1996).

Durston, C. "'For the Better Humiliation of the People": Public Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving during the English Revolution' *The Seventeenth Century* 7 (1992):129-49.

Emerson, E.H. 'Calvin and Covenant Theology.' *Church History* 25 (1956): 135-44.

Escott, H. *A History of Scottish Congregationalism.* (Glasgow: The Congregational Union of Scotland, 1960).

Evans, B. *The Early English Baptists.* 2 vols (London: J. Heaton & Son, 1862-4).

Ferguson, J.H. *Politics, Quaker Style: A History of the Quakers from 1624 to 1718.* (San Bernandino: Borgo Press, 1995).

Ferrie, W. *Notices of the Life of the Rev. John Carstaires.* (Edinburgh, 1843).

Firth, C.H (ed.) *The Last Years of the Protectorate, 1656-1658.* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1964).

Firth, C.H. *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England.* The World's Classics, 536: Oliver Cromwell (London: OUP, 1956).

Firth, C.H. and G. Davies. *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army.* 2 vols (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940).

Flinn, Michael (ed.) *Scottish Population History from the 17th century to the 1930s.* (Cambridge: CUP, 1977)

Fogelklou, Emilia. *James Nayler the Rebel Saint, 1618-1660.* (trans.) Lajla Yapp (London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1931).

Forrester, D. and D. Murray (eds). *Studies in the History of Worship in Scotland.* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1984).

Furgol, Edward M. *The Regimental History of the Covenanting Armies 1639-1651.* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, Ltd., 1990).

Gardiner, S.R. *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate 1649-1656.* 4 vols (London: Longmans & Green, 1903).

Gentles, I. *The New Model Army in England, Ireland and Scotland, 1645-1653.* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992).

Goldwater, E.D. 'The Scottish Franchise: Lobbying During the Cromwellian Protectorate.' *The Historical Journal* 21 (1978): 27-42.

Goodare, J. *The Government of Scotland 1560-1625.* (Oxford: OUP, 2004).

Goodare, J. *State and Society in Early Modern Scotland.* (Oxford: OUP, 1999).

Grainger, J.D. *Cromwell Against the Scots: The Last Anglo-Saxon War, 1650-1652.* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1997).

Grant, A. *The Story of the University of Edinburgh during the First Three Hundred Years.* 2 vols (London: Longman, Green and Co., 1884).

Grant, F.J., Sir (ed.) *The Faculty of Advocates in Scotland, 1532-1943.* (Edinburgh: Scottish Record Society, 1944).

Greaves, R.L. and R. Zaller, (eds). *Bibliographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the 17th Century.* 3 vols (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1982-4).

Green, I. *Print and Protestantism.* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

Gribben, Crawford. 'Defining the Puritans? The Baptism Debate in Cromwellian Ireland, 1654-56.' *Church History* 73.1 (March 2004): 63-89.

Grub, G. *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland.* 4 vols (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1861).

Guizot, F.P.G. *Memoirs of George Monk.* (trans.) J.S. Wortley (London, 1838).

Hannen, R.B. 'Cupar, Fife, 1652-1659.' *Baptist Quarterly* 10 (1940-1): 45-9.

Hardman Moore, S. 'Arguing for Peace: Giles Firmin on New England and Godly Union.' *Unity and Diversity in the Church* (ed.) R. N. Swanson. Studies in Church History 32. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1996), 251-61.

Henderson, G.D. 'The Idea of Covenant in Scotland.' *Evangelical Quarterly* 27 (1955): 2-14.

Henderson, G.D. *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland.* (Cambridge: CUP, 1937).

Henderson, G.D. 'Some Early Scottish Independents.' *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society* 12 (1933-6): 67-79.

Hewison, J.K. *The Covenanters.* 2 vols (Glasgow: John Smith and Son, 1913).

Hill, Christopher. *God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution.* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1970; Penguin, 2000).

Hirsch, E.F., 'John Cotton and Roger Williams: Their Controversy concerning Religious Liberty', *Church History* 10 (1941), 38-51.

Historical Manuscript Commission. *Report on the Laing Manuscripts preserved in the University of Edinburgh.* (ed.) Rev. Henry Paton. 2 vols (London, 1914).

Howie, John. *The Scots Worthies: Their Lives and Testimonies.* (Edinburgh: Blackie & Son, 1876).

Hoy, W.I. 'Entry of Sects Into Scotland: A Preliminary Study.' *Reformation and Revolution.* (ed.) D. Shaw (Edinburgh, Saint Andrews Press, 1967).

Hughes, Ann. "'Popular' Presbyterianism in the 1640 and 1650s: the Cases of Thomas Edwards and Thomas Hall." *England's Long Reformation: 1500-1800.* (ed.) Nicholas Tyacke, The Neale Colloquium in British History. (London: UCL Press, 1998; UCL Press, 2000), 235-260.

Hughes, Ann. 'Public Disputations, Pamphlets and Polemic, 1649-60.' *History Today* 41 (February 1991): 27-33.

Hughes, Ann. 'The Pulpit Guarded: Confrontations Between Orthodox and Radicals in Revolutionary England.' *John Bunyan and His England, 1628-88.* (eds) Anne Laurence, W.R. Owens and Stuart Sim (London: Hambledon Press, 1990), 31-50.

Innes, C. (ed.) *Fasti Aberdonenses* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1854).

Irons, J.C. *Leith and Its Antiquities.* 2 vols (Edinburgh: Morrison & Gibb Ltd., 1897).

Johnson, B. 'On Church and Sect,' *American Sociological Review* 28 (1963): 539-49.

Johnston, J.C. *Treasury of the Scottish Covenant.* (Edinburgh: Andrew Elliot, 1887).

Kendall, John and John Tompkins. *Piety Promoted.* 5 vols (London: James Phillips, 1789).

Kenyon, J., J. Ohlmeyer and John Morrill (eds) *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland and Ireland 1638-1660.* (Oxford: OUP, 2002).

Kinloch, G.R. (ed.) *Ecclesiastical Records of the Presbyteries of St. Andrews and Cupar 1641-1698.* (Edinburgh: Abbotsford Club, 1837).

Kirkton, James. *The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland.* (ed.) C.K. Sharpe (Edinburgh: John Ballatyne, 1817).

Knoppers, L.L. *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print 1645-1661.* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000).

Knox, R.B (ed.) *Reformation, Conformity and Dissent.* (London: Eppworth, 1977).

Knox, R.B. 'A Scottish Chapter in the History of Toleration.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 41 (1988): 49-74.

Korbin, D. 'The Expansion of the Visible Church in New England: 1629-1650', *Church History* 36 (1967), 189-209.

Laing, Malcolm. *The History of Scotland.* 4 vols (London: J. Mawman, 1801).

Landsman, Ned C. *Scotland and its First American Colony 1683-1760* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).

Laurence, Anne. *Parliamentary Army Chaplains, 1642-51.* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1990).

Lenman, B. *The Jacobite Clans of the Great Glen, 1650-1784.* (London: Methuen, 1984).

Liu, Tai. *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660.* International Archives of the History of Ideas: 61. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973).

Lockhart, S.M. *Seven Centuries: A History of the Lockharts of Lee and Carnwath.* (Carnwath, Lanark: S. F. Macdonald Lockhart, 1976).

Lomas, S.C. (ed.) *The Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell.* 3 vols (London: Methuen & Co., 1904).

Lynch, Michael (ed.) *The Oxford Companion to Scottish History.* (Oxford: OUP, 2001).

Macinnes, A.I. *The British Revolution, 1629-1660.* (Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

Macinnes, A.I. 'Covenanting Ideology in the Seventeenth Century Scotland.' *Political Thought in Seventeenth Century Ireland.* (ed.) J.H. Ohlmeyer (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), 191-200.

Macinnes, A.I. 'The Impact of the Civil Wars and Interregnum: Political Disruption and Social Change within Scottish Gaeldom.' *Economy and Society in Scotland and Ireland*, (eds) R. Mitchison and P. Roebuck (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988), 58-69.

Mackie, J.D. *The University of Glasgow, 1451-1951.* (Glasgow: Jackson, Son & Co., 1954).

Maclehose, James. *The Glasgow University Press 1638-1931.* (Glasgow: University Press, 1931).

MacPherson, J. *The Doctrine of the Church in Scottish Theology.* (ed.) C.G. McCrie, The Sixth Series of the Chalmers Lectures. (Edinburgh: MacNiven & Wallace, 1903).

Maidment, James (ed.) *Historical Fragments, Relative to Scottish Affairs, from 1635 to 1664.* (Edinburgh: Thomas Stevenson, 1833).

Makey, W.H. *The Church of the Covenant: Revolution and Social Change in Scotland.* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1979).

Mann, A.J. *The Scottish Book Trade 1500-1720: Print Commerce and Print Control in Early Modern Scotland.* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000).

Marshall, J.S. *The Life and Times of Leith.* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, 1986).

Masson, D. (ed.) *The Registry of the Privy Council of Scotland.* (Edinburgh, 1896).

Mathieson, W.L. *Politics and Religion.* 2 vols (Glasgow: James MacLeHose & Sons, 1902).

Maxwell, A.S. (ed.) *Scottish Quaker records,Society of Friends. Register of Births, Proposal of Marriage, Marriages, and Deaths. 1647-1878* (Aberdeen, 1960).

McCoy, F.N. *Robert Baillie and the Second Scots Reformation.* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).

McCrie, Thomas. *The Bass Rock: Its Civil and Ecclesiastical History.* (Edinburgh, 184-).

McCrie, T. and T. Thomson. *Lives of Alexander Henderson and James Guthrie with Specimens of Their Writings.* (Edinburgh: Printed for the Assembly's Committee, 1841).

McGregor, J.F. and B. Reays, (eds) *Radical Religion in the English Revolution.* (Oxford: OUP, 1984).

McKay, W.D.J. 'George Gillespie and the Westminster: The Defence of Presbyterianism.' *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 13 (Spr. 1995): 51-71.

Meikle, James. *The History of Alyth Parish Church.* (Edinburgh, 1933).

Miller, W.F. 'Financial Statements Sent to Swarthmore, 1654 and 1655.' *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 6 (1909): 49-52, 82-5, 127-8.

Miller, W.F. 'Notes on the Early Records of Friends in the South of Scotland from 1656 to About 1790.' *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 1 (1903): 69-73, 117-130.

Miller, W.F. 'Notes on the Meeting Houses of Edinburgh.' *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 6 (1909): 27-33.

Miller, W.F. 'Stranger Friends Visiting Scotland, 1650-1797.' *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 12 (1915): 79-83.

Mitchell, Alexander F. and James Christie, (eds) *Records of the Commission of the General Assembly.* 3 vols (Edinburgh: Scottish Historical Society, 1890-1909).

More, Ellen S. 'Congregationalism and the Social Order: John Goodwin's Gathered Church, 1640-60', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 38 (1987), 210-35.

Morrill, John. *The Nature of the English Revolution.* (London: Longman, 1993).

Morrill, John (ed.) *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution.* (New York: Longman, 1990).

Morrill, John (ed.) *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s.* (London: Collins & Brown, 1992).

Morrill, John (ed.) *The Scottish National Covenant in Its British Context.* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990).

Morrill, John. 'Seventeenth-Century Scotland.' Review of *Cromwellian Scotland, The Church and the Covenant, Church and State in Scotland 1660-1681* (Dow, Frances; Makey, Walter; Buckroyd, J.) *JEH* 33.2 (April 1982): 266-71.

Morrill, John. 'Textualizing and Contextualizing Cromwell.' *Historical Journal* 33 (1990): 629-39.

Morrison, P.G. *Index of Printers, Publishers and Booksellers in Donald Wing's Short-Title Catalogue.* (Charlottesville, Va: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1955).

Mullan, David G. *Religious Controversy in Scotland* 1625-1639. (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1998).

Mullan, David G. *Scottish Puritanism, 1590-1638.* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

Murray, Thomas. *The Life of Samuel Rutherford.* (Edinburgh: William Oliphant, 1828).

Naismith, R. *Stonehouse: Historical and Traditional.* (Glasgow: Robert Forrester, 1885).

National Register of Archives (Scotland). *City Churches, Edinburgh.* (Edinburgh: National Archives of Scotland, 1999).

Neal, Daniel. *The History of the Puritans.* 2 vols (London: Printed for Thomas Tegg and Son., 1837).

Nelson, C. and M. Seccombe. *British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1641-1700.* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1987).

Nuttall, Geoffrey F. 'Presbyterians and Independents Some Movements for Unity 300 years ago.' *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* 10 (1952), 4-15.

Nuttall, Geoffrey F. 'Relations Between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in England.' *Studies in the Puritan Tradition* (December 1964): 1-7.

Nuttall, Geoffrey F. *Visible Saints: The Congregational Way 1640-1660.* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957).

Ogilvie, J. D. 'A Bibliography of the Resolutioner-Protester Controversy, 1650-59.' *Transactions of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society* 14 (1930): 57-86.

Ogilvie, J. D. 'Papers from an Army Press, 1650.' *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions* 2 (1938-45): 420-3.

Orme, William. *Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Religious Connexions of John Owen, D.D.* (London: Printed for T. Hamilton, 1820).

Paterson, J. *History of the Counties of Ayr and Wigton.* 2 vols (Edinburgh: James Stillie, 1864).

Paul, R.S. *The Lord Protector: Religion and Politics in the Life of Oliver Cromwell.* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1964).

Peacey, Jason. *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum.* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

Penney, Norman. (ed.) *Extracts from State Papers Relating to Friends 1654 to 1672.* (London: Friends Historical Society, 1913).

Peterkin, Alexander (ed.) *Records of the Kirk of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: John Sutherland, 1838).

Peters, Kate. "'The Quakers Quaking': Print and the Spread of a Movement." *Belief and Practice in Reformation England.* (eds) Susan Wabuda and Caroline Litzenberger, St Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 1998. 250-67).

Phillips, C.E.L. *Cromwell's Captains.* (London: W. Heinemann, 1938).

Plomer, H.R. *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers Who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641-1667.* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1907).

Pope, R.G. The half-way covenant: church membership in Puritan New England. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

Pottinger, M. 'Cromwellian Soldiers in Cannesbey, 1652 to 1655' *Caithness Field Club Bulletin* 11 (1993), 5-8.

Price, J. *The Mystery and Method of His Majesty's Happy Restauration.* (London: James Vade, 1680).

Printing Patents: Abridgements of Patent Specifications Relating to Printing 1617-1857. (London: Printing Historical Society, 1969).

Rait, R. S. *The Universities of Aberdeen: A History.* (Aberdeen: James Gordon Bisset, 1895).

Rapaport, Diane. 'Scottish Slavery in 17th-Century New England.' *History Scotland* 5.1 (2005), 41-52.

Reay, Barry. *The Quakers and the English Revolution.* (London: Temple Smith, 1985).

Reid, A.G., (ed.) *Andrew Hay of Craignethan's Diary, 1659-1660.* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1901).

Rigney, James. 'To Lye upon a Stationers Stall, Like a Piece of Coarse Flesh in a Shambles': the Sermon, Print and the English Civil War.' *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature*

and History 1600-1750. (eds) Ann Hughes, A. Milton and Peter Lake. Politics, culture and society in early modern Britain. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000).

Rogers, P.G. *The Fifth Monarchy Men.* (London: OUP, 1966).

Ross, James. *A History of Congregational Independency in Scotland.* (Glasgow: James MacLeHose & Sons, 1900).

Row, W. *The Life of Mr Robert Blair.* (ed.) T. McCrie (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1848).

Sachse, W.L. 'The Migration of New Englanders to England' *American Historical Review* 53 (1948), 251-78.

Schmidt, L.E. *Holy Fairs: Scottish Communions and American Revivals in the Early Modern Period.* 2nd edn (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001).

Scott, H (ed.) *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae.* 7 vols (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1915-1928).

Scott, J. 'Baptists in Scotland During the Commonwealth.' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 3 (1929): 174-85.

Scott, J. 'Baptist Witness During the Commonwealth.' *History of the Baptists in Scotland.* (ed.) G. Yullie (Glasgow: Baptist Union Publications, 1926), 24-35.

Scott, Jonathon. 'What were Commonwealth Principles?' *The Historical Journal* 47,3 (2004):591-614.

Sessions, W.K. *Stephen Bulkley, Newcastle's First 'Long-Stay' Printer.* History of the Book Trade in the North. (York: Ebor, 1997).

Shepherd, Christine. 'University Life in the Seventeenth Century.' *Four Centuries: Edinburgh University Life, 1583-1983.* (ed.) Gordon Donaldson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1983), 1-15.

'Sir William Lockhart of Lee', *North British Review* 36 (February-May 1862), 88-117.

Smith, C. Fell. *Stephen Crisp and His Correspondents.* (London: E. Hicks, Jr, 1892).

Smith, David L. 'New Perspectives on Britain's Civil Wars.' *The Historical Journal* 46.2 (2003): 449-61.

Smith, J. *The Church in Orkney.* (Kirkwall: W.R. Mackintosh, 1907).

Smith, Lesley M. 'Sackcloth for the Sinner or Punishment for the Crime? Church and Secular Courts in Cromwellian Scotland.' *New Perspectives on Politics and Culture in Early Modern Scotland.* (Edinburgh, 1982), 116-32.

Smith, N. *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion 1640-1660.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

'Some Early Sufferings in Scotland.' *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 21 (1924): 68-72.

Spalding, John. *Memorialls of The Trubles in Scotland and England. A.D. 1624-A.D. 1645.* 2 vols (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1829-51).

Spalding, R. *Contemporaries of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605-1675.* Records of Social and Economic History, New Series XIV. (Oxford: The British Academy, 1990).

Spottiswoode, John. *The History of the Church and State of Scotland.* 4th edn (London: R. Royston, 1677).

Sprott, G.W. *The Doctrine of Schism in the Church of Scotland.* (Edinburgh, 1902).

Sprott, G.W. *Worship of the Church of Scotland During the Covenanting Period, 1638-1661.* (Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood and Son, 1893).

Stark, W. *The Sociology of Religion.* Vol. 2, *Sectarian Religion* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967).

Stephen, W. *History of the Scottish Church.* 2 vols (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1896).

Stephen, W. (ed.) *Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh and Some Other Brethren of the Ministry.* 2 vols (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1921-30).

Stevenson, D. 'Conventicles in the Kirk, 1619-37. The Emergence of a Radical Party.' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 18 (1974): 99-114.

Stevenson, D. 'Deposition of Ministers in the Church of Scotland, 1638-1651.' *Church History* 44 (1975): 321-335.

Stevenson, D (ed.) *The Government of Scotland Under the Covenanters.* (Edinburgh: Scotttish History Society, 1982).

Stevenson, D. *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Scotland, 1644-1651.* 1977. (London: Royal Historical Society; John Donald Publishers Ltd, 2003).

Stevenson, D. 'A Revolutionary Regime and the Press: the Scottish Covenanters and Their Printers, 1638-51.' *Union, Revolution and Religion in 17th-Century Scotland.* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1997).

Stevenson, D. *St Machar's Cathedral and the Reformation.* Occasional Papers No. 7. (Aberdeen: Friends of St Machar's Cathedral, 1981).

Stuart, J. (ed.) *Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie, 1631-1654.* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1843).

Stuart, J. (ed.) *Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen.* (Aberdeen: Spalding Club, 1846).

Taft, Barbara. 'The Humble Petition of Several Colonels of the Army: Causes, Character, and Results of Military Opposition to Cromwell's Protectorate.' *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 42 (1978-9): 15-41.

Terry, C.S (ed.) *The Cromwellian Union.* (Edininburgh: Scottish History Society, 1902).

Thomson, T. *Life of James Guthrie.* (Edinburgh: [s.n.], 1846).

Todd, Margo. *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland.* (London: Yale University Press, 2002).

Tolmie, M. *The Triumph of the Saints: The Separate Churches of London 1616-1649.* (Cambridge: CUP, 1977).

Toon, P. *God's Statesman: the Life and Work of John Owen.* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1971).

Torrance, J. 'The Early Quakers in North-East Scotland.' *Transactions of the Banffshire Field Club,* (1936): 67-87.

Torrance, J. 'The Quaker Movement in Scotland.' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 3 (1929): 31-42.

Trevor-Roper, H.R. 'Scotland and the Puritan Revolution.' *Religion, the Reformation and Social Change.* 2nd edn (London: Macmillan, 1972).

Underhill, E.B., (ed.) *Confessions of Faith and Other Public Documents: Illustrative of the History of the Baptist Churches of England in the 17th Century.* (London: Haddon Brothers & Co., 1854).

Underhill, E.B (ed.) *Records of the Churches of Christ Gathered in Fenstanton, Warboys and Hexham, 1644-1720.* (London: Hanserd Knollys Society, 1854).

Underwood, T. L. *Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb's War the Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England.* Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. (Oxford: OUP, 1997).

Waddington, John. *Congregational History, 1567-1700, in Relation to Contemporaneous Events, and the Conflict for Freedom, Purity, and Independence.* (London, 1874).

Walker, Edward. *Historical Discourses, upon Several Occasions: Viz. I. The Happy Progress and Success of the Arms of K. Charles I. By Sir Edward Walker, Together with Perfect Copies of All the Votes.* (London: W.B., 1705).

Walker, J. *The Theology and Theologians of Scotland.* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1872).

Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England.* (Oxford: OUP, 1999).

Watson, James. *James Watson's Preface to the History of Printing 1713.* (James Munro. Greenock: Thomas Ray, 1963).

Watt, T. *Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1550-1640.* (Cambridge: CUP, 1991).

Wheeler, J.S. 'Sense of identity in the army of the English republic, 1645-51' *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century* (eds) A.I. Macinnes and J. Ohlmeyer (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2002), 151-68.

White, B.R. 'John Pendarves, the Calvinistic Baptists and the Fifth Monarchy.' *Baptist Quarterly* 25 (April 1974): 251-274.

White, B.R. 'The Organisation of the Particular Baptists, 1644-1660.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 17.2 (1966): 209-226.

Whitelocke, Bulstrode. *Memorials of the English Affairs: or, An Historical Account of What Passed from the Beginning of the Reign of King Charles the First, to King Charles the Second His Happy Restauration.* 4 vols (Oxford: OUP, 1853).

Whitley, W.T. *A Baptist Bibliography.* (New York: G. Olms, 1984).

Wilson, D. *Memorials of Edinburgh in the Olden Time.* 2 vols (Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1891).

Wilson, J. *Dunning: Its Parochial History, with Notes, Antiquarian, Ecclesiastical, Baronial, and Miscellaneous.* 2nd edn (Crieff: D. Philips, 1906).

Wilson, J.F. *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars 1640-1648* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

Wodrow, Robert. *Analecta: or Materials for a History of Remarkable Providences; Mostly Relating to Scotch Ministers and Christians.* 4 vols (Glasgow: Maitland Club, 1842-3).

Wood, M. (ed.), *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh 1642 to 1655.* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1938).

Wood, M. (ed.), *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh 1655 to 1665.* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1940).

Woolrych, A. *Commonwealth to Protectorate.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

Worden, B. 'Oliver Cromwell and the Sin of Achan.' *History, Society and the Churches: Essays in Honour of Owen Chadwick.* (eds) D. Beales and G. Best (Cambridge: CUP, 1985).

Worden, B. 'Providence and Politics in Cromwellian England.' *Past and Present* 109 (1985): 55-99.

Worden, B. *The Rump Parliament, 1648-1653.* (Cambridge: CUP, 1974).

Worden, B. 'Toleration and the Cromwellian Protectorate.' *Persecution and Toleration: Papers Read at the Twenty-Second Summer Meeting and the Twenty-Third Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society.* (ed.) W.J. Sheils (London: Ecclesiastical History Society, 1984), 199-233.

Yule, G. 'Developments in English Puritanism in the Context of the Reformation.' *Studies in the Puritan Tradition* (December 1964): 8-27.

Yule, G. *The Independents in the English Civil War.* (Cambridge: CUP, 1958).

Theses

Carter, R. B. 'The Presbyterian-Independent Controversy with Special Reference to Dr. Thomas Goodwin and the Years 1640-1660.' 2 Vols, PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1961.

Chatfield, D.F. 'The Congregationalists of New England and Its Repercussions on England and Scotland, 1641-2.' PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1964.

Holfelder, K.D. 'Factionalism in the Kirk during the Cromwellian Invasion and Occupation of Scotland, 1650 to 1660: the Protester-Resolutioner Controversy.' PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1998.

Seymour, M.J. 'Pro-Government Propaganda in Interregnum England, 1649-1660.' PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 1987.

Thompson, G.L.S. 'The Origins of Congregationalism in Scotland.' PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1932.

Yeoman, L.A. 'Heart-Work: Emotion, Empowerment and Authority in Covenanting Times.' PhD Thesis, University of St Andrews, 1991.