

Seventeenth-Century Scottish Parliamentary Rolls and Political Factionalism: The Experience of the Covenanted Movement.

JOHN R. YOUNG

University of Strathclyde

The nature of factionalism within the Scottish Parliament in general and within the Covenanted Movement in particular has remained an understudied topic of historical analysis by Scottish political and constitutional historians. Partly this can be attributed to the relative dearth of research into Scottish parliamentary history; there has been no systematic study of the Scottish Parliament since R.S. Rait's *The Parliaments of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1924) and C.S. Terry's *The Scottish Parliament: Its Constitution and Procedure, 1603–1707* (Glasgow, 1905). Specialised studies have also been hindered by the fact that few official parliamentary voting records have survived for the course of the seventeenth century.

Whilst recent Scottish constitutional publications have sought to redress such an imbalance,¹ parliamentary factionalism has still remained unexplored terrain.² Current historiography of the Covenanted Movement has argued for the dominance of a 'radical mainstream' and a fundamental political division within that movement.³ The increasing historical trend of viewing the conflict of the English Civil War within a wider British dimension⁴ indicates that the Covenanted Movement had an unparalleled and disproportionate influence at the forefront of the political, constitutional and military contexts of the 'Three Kingdoms'.

This article advocates that Scottish parliamentary rolls are a valuable and hitherto untapped seventeenth-century source for scrutiny of Covenanted factionalism as evidenced through the institution of the Scottish Parliament. Given the lack of parliamentary voting data, parliamentary rolls offer an accessible means of identification of Covenanted personnel along party lines. Who were the 'Covenanters'? Scottish historiography has tended to concentrate on the more flamboyant figures of James

¹ *The Parliaments of Scotland. Burgh and Shire Commissioners*, ed. M. Young, (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1992–93).

² For a recent and detailed discussion of seventeenth-century parliamentary factionalism consult J.R. Young, 'The Scottish Parliament, 1639–1661: A Political and Constitutional Analysis' (University of Glasgow, Ph.D., 1993). Vol. 1 contains the text of the thesis, whilst vols. 2 and 3 consist of 69 appendices of empirical parliamentary data in tabular form.

³ A.I. MacInnes, 'The Scottish Constitution, 1638–51: The Rise and Fall of Oligarchic Centralism', *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context 1638–51*, ed. J. Morrill, (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 106–28; A.I. MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanted Movement 1625–1641*, (Edinburgh, 1991), pp. 183–206.

⁴ C. Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil Wars* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 26–58, 109–31, and *The Fall of the British Monarchies 1637–1642* (Oxford, 1991); J. Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (1993), pp. 252–72; MacInnes, 'The Scottish Constitution', pp. 106, 118.

Graham, 5th Earl and 1st Marquis of Argyll at parliamentary rolls, however, for the Scottish localities according to the rolls.

The Covenanted Movement was a mix of radical and conservative strands in Scotland and the curtailment of royal power. This was evidenced at an early stage by Montrose, in an attempt to bring the movement to the radical mainstream.⁵ Pragmatism was subscribed to the Covenanted oath, the Solemn League and Covenant, and the holding of public office. Radicals witnessed the rise of conservatism and the alliance of the conservative with the defeat of the Engagement faction in Edinburgh 1648–49.⁶

Factionalism is examined in the context of the Scottish Coronation Parliament of 1639 are scrutinised in the opposition in the 1633 Parliament. Those who had served in the controversy of the rolls of the sixth session, 1633–34, Parliament, 1644–47, are commencing on 2 March 1648. Members adhering to the Engagement had also sat in the parliament of Charles I (as King of Scots) in January 1647 (Scottish Parliament). This ended within Parliament, 1646–47, southern kingdom. Thirdly, the rolls of 1648 are compared with the rolls of 1648. Following military defeat at the Raid on the Scottish capital, Cromwell, which was vehemently opposed to the 1648 Parliament which defended Charles I in the Restoration Parliament of 1660 are compared with all pre-

⁵ MacInnes, *Charles I and the Revolution 1637–44*, (Newton Aulmead, 1986), I, 254.

⁶ See Young, 'Scottish Parliament', pp. 106, 118.

Graham, 5th Earl and 1st Marquis of Montrose and Archibald Campbell, 8th Earl and 1st Marquis of Argyll at the expense of Covenanting rank and file. Scrutiny of parliamentary rolls, however, facilitates the identification of gentry and burgesses from the Scottish localities according to political affiliation.

The Covenanting Movement was not homogenous; it was composed essentially of radical and conservative strands vis-à-vis the diminution of the royal prerogative in Scotland and the curtailment of royal power within the King's northern kingdom. This was evidenced at an early date in the Cumbernauld Band of 1640, articulated by Montrose, in an attempt to create an opposition party to Argyll and the dominant radical mainstream.⁵ Pragmatic royalists have been classified as those royalists who subscribed Covenanting oaths and bonds (most notably the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant) in order to gain admittance to Parliament and to hold public office. Radicals were in the ascendancy until the mid-1640s. 1645–46 witnessed the rise of conservatism in a parliamentary context, which culminated in the alliance of the conservatives/pragmatic royalists in the Engagement of 1648. The defeat of the Engagement facilitated the establishment of an extreme radical regime in Edinburgh 1648–49.⁶

Factionalism is examined within four distinct areas. Firstly, the parliamentary rolls of the Scottish Coronation Parliament of 1633 and the first Covenanting Parliament of 1639 are scrutinised in the attempt to identify elements of the Scottish constitutional opposition in the 1633 Parliament and those Members of the 1639 Parliament who had served in the controversial Coronation Parliament. Secondly, the parliamentary rolls of the sixth session, 3 November 1646–27 March 1647, of the First Triennial Parliament, 1644–47, are compared with those of the Engagement Parliament commencing on 2 March 1648. Such a comparison seeks to identify those parliamentary Members adhering to the Engagement of 1647–48 in the cause of Charles I who had also sat in the parliamentary session which had voted in favour of abandoning Charles I (as King of Scots) to the English army at Newcastle in November 1646 and January 1647 (Scottish dates) to be disposed of under the jurisdiction of the English Parliament. This enables the identification of the growing conservative element within Parliament, 1646–47, related to unease at the fate of the King within his southern kingdom. Thirdly, the parliamentary rolls of the Engagement Parliament of 1648 are compared with those of the parliamentary session of 4 January 1649. Following military defeat at the Battle of Preston in September 1648 the Whiggamore Raid on the Scottish capital established an extreme radical regime backed by Oliver Cromwell, which was vehemently anti-Engager in its political outlook. This mode of comparative analysis provides for the identification of the radical opposition within the 1648 Parliament which opposed the Engagers' military invasion of England to defend Charles I in the summer of 1648. Finally, the parliamentary rolls of the Restoration Parliament of Charles II in Scotland, commencing on 1 January 1661, are compared with all previous rolls of the Scottish Parliament, 1639–51. Those

⁵ MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, p. 201; D. Stevenson, *The Scottish Revolution 1637–44*, (Newton Abbot, 1973), p. 207; M. Napier, *Memorials of the Marquis of Montrose* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1856), I, 254–5.

⁶ See Young, 'Scottish Parliament', I.

parliamentary Members of the Restoration Parliament who had served in Parliaments of the Covenanting era can therefore be ascertained.

1. What is a Scottish parliamentary roll?

'Parliamentary rolls' are the official terminology of the Scottish Parliament, although registers were kept in manuscript book form.

The Scottish Parliament, unlike its English counterpart, was a unicameral (single chamber) and not a bicameral (two chamber) Parliament.⁷ Episcopacy had been abolished by the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 and ratified by the 1639 General Assembly. Nevertheless, as an integral component of the Scottish constitutional settlement of 1639-41, the clerical estate within the Scottish Parliament was not officially and constitutionally abolished until the enactment of the 'Act anent the constitution of the present and all future Parliaments' of 2 June 1640. Hence the 'Three Estates' were redefined as nobles, gentry (Commissioners of the Shires) and burghesses (Commissioners of the Burghs). From 1639-51 bishops and archbishops were therefore barred from parliamentary attendance (in marked contrast to the experience of the 1633 Parliament where the clerics had played a prominent role in the management of that Parliament). That Parliament was dominant over the General Assembly was reflected in the need for all legislation of the 1638 Glasgow Assembly to be ratified by the Scottish Parliament.⁸

The noble estate was summoned personally by the King, whilst the County Franchise Act of 1587 stabilised the previously unregulated constitutional position of the Commissioners of the Shires. Shire Commissioners were to be elected annually by the freeholders of every shire at the first Sherriff Court after Michaelmas. Each shire was permitted to elect two Commissioners, although voting rights within Parliament centred on the shire per se as a voting unit and not on the individual Commissioners for each shire.⁹ Voting rights of the Shire Commissioners were nevertheless redefined by the parliamentary session of June 1640 which doubled the voting strength of the gentry by allowing each Commissioner of the Shire an individual vote. The parliamentary franchise in the shires was confined to lesser barons and freeholders owning land valued to the value of 40 shillings old extent.¹⁰

⁷ A.V. Dicey and R.S. Rait, *Thoughts on the Union between England and Scotland* (1920), p. 9.

⁸ *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland* [hereafter A.P.S.], ed. T. Thomson and C. Innes (12 vols., Edinburgh, 1814-72), V, 260-1; Rait, *The Parliaments of Scotland*, pp. 6, 168; Terry, *Scottish Parliament*, 10-11; MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, pp. 188, 194; Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*, pp. 124-5; D. Stevenson, *The Covenanters. The National Covenant and Scotland* (The Saltire Society, 1988), pp. 48-9.

⁹ Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, xvii-ii; MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, pp. 7-8; Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*, pp. 166-7; Dicey and Rait, *Thoughts on the Union*, pp. 52-3; Rait, *The Parliaments of Scotland*, pp. 6, 205-6; Terry, *The Scottish Parliament*, pp. 25-7; Sir Robert Gordon, 'Anent the Government of Scotland as it was before the late troubles', in W. MacFarlane, *Geographical Collections Relating to Scotland*, (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1907), pp. 393-4.

¹⁰ A.P.S., V, 260-1; MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, p. 196; Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*, p. 167; D. Stevenson, *The Government of Scotland Under the Covenanters, 1637-1651*, (Scottish History Society, 1982), p. xciii; Rait, *The Parliaments of Scotland*, pp. 206-11; Thomas Thomson's *Memorial on Old Extent*, ed., J.D. Mackie, (The Stair Society, Edinburgh, 1946), pp. 78-86.

The burghal estate was composed of the royal burghs, and were Burghal attendance had been required of Burghs, the body which oversaw the burgh in Parliament was henceforth with the exception of the capital Commissioners.¹¹

Parliamentary rolls indicate the opening day of each parliament. The three sessions of the second Parliament of Estates¹², 22 June 1640, six sessions of the First Triennial Parliament, 1648-51, consisted only recorded for four out of the six sessions. A contemporary commentator at the time of the opening day of a parliament attendance for two of the sessions (26 November 1650 and 1 December 1651).

Whilst parliamentary rolls list the nobles, gentry and burghesses, they do not necessarily reflect trends throughout each of those sessions. For the 1644 Convention of Estates of the 1644 Convention, however, to the opening day of a parliament that those members listed in the

¹¹ Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, xvii-ii; MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, pp. 7-8; Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*, pp. 166-7; Dicey and Rait, *Thoughts on the Union*, pp. 52-3; Rait, *The Parliaments of Scotland*, pp. 6, 205-6; Terry, *The Scottish Parliament*, pp. 25-7; Sir Robert Gordon, 'Anent the Government of Scotland as it was before the late troubles', in W. MacFarlane, *Geographical Collections Relating to Scotland*, (Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1907), pp. 393-4.

¹² A Convention of Estates did not usually it was held for taxation being full Parliament (as in 1625) or only a partial Parliament (as in 1640-1, 1643-4; Rait, *The Parliaments of Scotland*, pp. 6, 168; Terry, *Scottish Parliament*, 10-11; MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, pp. 188, 194; Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*, pp. 124-5; D. Stevenson, *The Covenanters. The National Covenant and Scotland* (The Saltire Society, 1988), pp. 48-9).

¹³ A.P.S., V, 251-2, 258-59, 300-1, 429-430, 440-1, 474-5, 612-3.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, VI, ii, 3-4, 124-6, 277-8 Mar.-10 June 1648, 4 Jan.-16 Mar. 1651 and 23 May-6 June 1651.

¹⁵ Sir James Balfour, *Historical Memoirs of James Balfour*, p. 10.

¹⁶ A.P.S., VI, i, 60, 61, 63, 65.

The burghal estate was composed of the Commissioners of the Burghs, who represented the royal burghs, and were elected annually by their respective town councils. Burghal attendance had been recently refined by the 1621 Convention of Royal Burghs, the body which oversaw burghal interests in the kingdom in general and was behind the lobbying of Parliament for the burghal estate in particular. Each burgh in Parliament was henceforth to be represented by one Commissioner only, with the exception of the capital, Edinburgh, which was permitted to send two Commissioners.¹¹

Parliamentary rolls indicate those nobles, gentry and burgesses in attendance at the opening day of each parliamentary session. Rolls of Parliament are printed for all three sessions of the second Parliament of Charles I, 1639–41, both sessions of the Conventions of Estates¹², 22 June–26 August 1643, 3 January–3 June 1644, and all six sessions of the First Triennial Parliament, 1644–47.¹³ The Second Triennial Parliament, 1648–51, consisted of eight parliamentary sessions. However, rolls are only recorded for four out of those eight sessions.¹⁴ In addition, Sir James Balfour, a contemporary commentator and participator in events, lists details of parliamentary attendance for two of the sessions where there are no official printed parliamentary rolls (26 November 1650 and 13 March 1651).¹⁵

Whilst parliamentary rolls therefore provide invaluable historical data relating to the nobles, gentry and burgesses present on the opening day of a parliamentary session, they do not necessarily provide a coherent indicator of attendance data and trends throughout each of those sessions. Uniquely, ten parliamentary rolls are available for the 1644 Convention of Estates, 3 January–3 June 1644.¹⁶ With the exception of the 1644 Convention, however, every other parliamentary roll, 1639–51, pertains to the opening day of a parliamentary session. Moreover, it cannot be firmly established that those members listed in the parliamentary rolls were actually present in Parliament

¹¹ Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, xvi–xvii, II, 807–8; MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, pp. 12–13; Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*, p. 167; J.D. Mackie and G.S. Pryde, *The Estate of the Burgesses in the Scots Parliament* (St Andrews, 1923), pp. 6–8; Dicey and Rait, *Thoughts on the Union*, p. 48; Terry, *The Scottish Parliament*, p. 52–3.

¹² A Convention of Estates did not enjoy the full constitutional rights of a parliamentary session. Usually it was held for taxation being granted to a monarch as a way of avoiding the convocation of a full Parliament (as in 1625) or only for specific purposes (Dicey and Rait, *Thoughts on the Union*, pp. 43–4; Rait, *The Parliaments of Scotland*, pp. 151–3, 153–8, 493–7, 501). In this instance the holding of the 1643 Convention of Estates was orchestrated by the radical wing of the Covenanting Movement through the media of parliamentary interval committees (which sat between sessions of Parliament) in order to secure Scottish entry into the English Civil War on behalf of the English Parliament in its struggle with Charles I; Scottish R.O., P.A. 14/1, Register of the Committee for the Common Burdens and the Commission for Receiving the Brotherly Assistance, 19 Nov. 1641–10 Jan. 1645, ff. 224–5; P.A. 14/2, Proceedings of the Scots Commissioners for Conserving the Articles of the Treaty, 22 Sept. 1642–8 July 1643, f. 59; *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, eds. D. Masson and P.H. Brown (2nd ser., 8 vols., Edinburgh, 1899–1908), VII, 93–4.

¹³ A.P.S., V, 251–2, 258–59, 300–1, 302, 303–4, 305–6, 308, 331–2, VI, i, 3–4, 60–93, 95–6, 284–5, 429–430, 440–1, 474–5, 612–3.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, VI, ii, 3–4, 124–6, 277–8, 555–6. Rolls are recorded for the following parliamentary sessions: 2 Mar.–10 June 1648, 4 Jan.–16 Mar. 1649, 23 May–7 Aug. 1649 and 7–8 Mar. 1650. Rolls are not recorded for the remaining parliamentary sessions: 15 May–5 July 1650, 26 Nov.–30 Dec. 1650, 13–31 Mar. 1651 and 23 May–6 June 1651. Refer to Young, 'Scottish Parliament', II, 685, 814–18, III, 1207–10.

¹⁵ Sir James Balfour, *Historical Works*, ed., J. Haig (4 vols., Edinburgh, 1824–5), IV, 179–82, 258–62.

¹⁶ A.P.S., VI, i, 60, 61, 63, 69, 71, 73, 83–4, 93. See Young, 'Scottish Parliament', II, 814–18.

on the noted day. In the Restoration Parliament commencing on 1 January 1661 the official parliamentary records state that¹⁷

It is to be remembered That all their persones abovenamed were not present at the first meiting Bot at most of the meittings they wer present thereafter.

Such technical limitations must be borne in mind. Despite these drawbacks, detailed scrutiny of parliamentary rolls still constitutes a valid area of historical analysis and yields important empirical data.

2. *The Parliaments of 1633 and 1639*

Having succeeded to the thrones of Scotland and England, as the first inheritor of the Union of the Crowns following the death of James VI and I in 1625, it took eight years for Charles I to return to his native and northern kingdom to be crowned as King of Scots in 1633. The experience of the royal visit was to have a profound psychological impact on the mentality of the Scottish political nation vis-à-vis an essentially absentee monarch. Opposition to the King's agenda was stifled and the management of parliamentary business was conducted through the institution of the Lords of the Articles. Based on the procedure formalised by James VI in the 1621 Parliament, the 1633 Lords of the Articles were all royal placemen. The focus of Crown control of the Articles was centred on the bishops. Eight bishops, whose appointment was based solely on loyalty to the Crown, chose eight suitable noblemen (who in turn elected the eight bishops!). The combined grouping of eight bishops and nobles then proceeded to elect eight gentry and eight burgesses. Royal influence was supplemented by the employment of eight Officers of State on the Articles, with Chancellor Kinnoul appointed as President.¹⁸

The 1633 Parliament was composed of 12 clerics (ten bishops and two archbishops), 71 nobles, 45 gentry representing 27 shires and 51 burgesses representing 50 burghs.¹⁹ Nine of the 27 shires (33 per cent) sent only one Commissioner of the Shire, although they were constitutionally entitled to elect two Commissioners. Four such shires were geographically isolated and lay within the Gaidhealtachd or at its periphery (Inverness, Cromarty, Tarbat and Banff). Two of the remaining five shires had their geographic domain in the Scottish Borders/south-west (Wigtown and Kirkcudbright). The fact that these six shires were represented by only one Commissioner each can be tentatively attributed to relative geographic isolation and the lack of financial resources to fund two commissioners. In both these categories, this was particularly marked in the

¹⁷ A.P.S., VII, 5.

¹⁸ MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, p. 87; Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*, pp. 167–8; Rait, *The Parliaments of Scotland*, pp. 279–80; Terry, *The Scottish Parliament*, pp. 107–111; Gordon, 'Arent the Government of Scotland as it was before the late troubles', pp. 398–9.

¹⁹ A.P.S., V, 7–9. The 71 nobles consisted of one duke, three marquesses, 28 earls, five viscounts, 29 lords and five officers of state; George Hay, 1st Earl of Kinnoul, Chancellor; William Douglas, 6th Earl of Morton, Treasurer; Thomas Hamilton, 2nd Earl of Haddington, Privy Seal; William Alexander, Earl of Stirling, Secretary; and John Stewart, 1st Earl of Traquair, Treasurer Depute. Traquair exercised the proxies of the Earls of Galloway and Carrick, Viscount Dunbar and Lord Cameron. Morton exercised the proxies of the Earl of Argyll and Lords Gray and Kinloss.

Highlands.²⁰ However, the re only one Commissioner can be the Scottish localities (Stirling, constituted three of the most particular were of crucial significance virtually in the heart of Scotland that neither of these three shires capital and finance suggests that for the Commissioners of the management of the Coronation these three shires political representation commissioners amenable to Crown and after the 1633 Parliament to the elections of both shires there was indeed political representation.

Nineteen nobles were represented were predominantly centred 1st Earl of Traquair, Treasurer 6th Earl of Morton, Treasurer 52 nobles were actually present numerical composition of the between the nobility, the (the Burghs. Excluding nobles members.

No clerics took their place parliamentary estate was not comparison, 50 nobles, 47 (51 burghs (yielding a total Parliament.²⁴ Total number almost identical, whereas the estate, a rise of two gentry, by only one Commissioner out of 25 shires (12 per cent

²⁰ *Ibid.* The lack of finance in 1639 Parliament Wigtown and I

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² James VI had determined to sit in Parliament (Rait, *The Union*, p. 10; Stevenson, *Scottish*

²³ A.P.S., V, 7–9.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 251–2.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 7–9, 251–2. The represented in 1639, two of which geographic isolation and lack of of representation for the shire Highland/Lowland divide. Four the Covenanting Parliament of status of Sutherland refer to four

nencing on 1 January 1661

amed were not present at the
sent thereafter.

ite these drawbacks, detailed
rea of historical analysis and

1639

land, as the first inheritor of
es VI and I in 1625, it took
hern kingdom to be crowned
visit was to have a profound
political nation vis-à-vis an
's agenda was stifled and the
through the institution of the
sed by James VI in the 1621
oyal placemen. The focus of
ishops. Eight bishops, whose
chose eight suitable noblemen
ed grouping of eight bishops
ght burgesses. Royal influence
of State on the Articles, with

bishops and two archbishops),
esses representing 50 burghs.¹⁹
issioner of the Shire, although
ssioners. Four such shires were
l or at its periphery (Inverness,
ve shires had their geographic
and Kirkcudbright). The fact
issioner each can be tentatively
of financial resources to fund
as particularly marked in the

Movement, p. 87; Stevenson, *Scottish*
0; Terry, *The Scottish Parliament*, pp.
for the late troubles', pp. 398–9.
e marquesses, 28 earls, five viscounts,
ul, Chancellor; William Douglas, 6th
gton, Privy Seal; William Alexander,
Treasurer Depute. Traquair exercised
and Lord Cameron. Morton exercised

Highlands.²⁰ However, the remaining three shires which were also represented by only one Commissioner can be regarded as three of the most important shires within the Scottish localities (Stirling, Perth and Kincardine).²¹ Apart from Edinburgh they constituted three of the most affluent shires in the kingdom. Stirling and Perth in particular were of crucial significance in terms of strategic location, being situated virtually in the heart of Scotland and within close proximity of the capital. The fact that neither of these three shires were geographically isolated nor were scarce of capital and finance suggests that political manipulation was taking place in the elections for the Commissioners of the Shires of Stirling, Perth and Kincardine. Given the management of the Coronation Parliament in the interests of the Crown, in each of these three shires political resistance probably existed to the election of two Commissioners amenable to Crown influence. General reprimands in the periods before and after the 1633 Parliament, as evidenced in Scottish Privy Council records, relating to the elections of both shire Commissioners and justices of the peace, indicate that there was indeed political resistance to the Crown.

Nineteen nobles were represented by proxies in the 1633 Parliament. Proxy votes were predominantly centred on and represented by Officers of State;²² John Stewart, 1st Earl of Traquair, Treasurer Depute, exercised four proxies, whilst William Douglas, 6th Earl of Morton, Treasurer, exercised three proxies respectively.²³ Therefore only 52 nobles were actually present in the 1633 Parliament. Such a redefinition in the numerical composition of the noble estate indicates near parity in terms of membership between the nobility, the Commissioners of the Shires and the Commissioners of the Burghs. Excluding noble proxies, the 1633 Parliament was composed of 148 members.

No clerics took their places in the Covenanted Parliament of 1639, although their parliamentary estate was not constitutionally abolished until June 1640. By way of comparison, 50 nobles, 47 gentry representing 25 shires and 52 burgesses representing 51 burghs (yielding a total membership of 149), formed the membership of the 1639 Parliament.²⁴ Total numerical membership between the two Parliaments remained almost identical, whereas there was a comparative reduction of two within the noble estate, a rise of two gentry, and a rise of one burghess. The number of shires represented by only one Commissioner had dropped from nine out of 27 shires in 1633 to three out of 25 shires (12 per cent) in 1639.²⁵ In common with the experience of 1633,

²⁰ *Ibid.* The lack of finance in the Borders/south-west appears to be confirmed by the fact that in the 1639 Parliament Wigtown and Kirkcudbright were represented jointly (*ibid.*, pp. 251–2).

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² James VI had determined in 1617 that a maximum of eight officers of state were to be permitted to sit in Parliament (Rait, *The Parliaments of Scotland*, pp. 279–280; Dicey and Rait, *Thoughts on the Union*, p. 10; Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*, pp. 167–8).

²³ *A.P.S.*, V, 7–9.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 251–2.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 7–9, 251–2. Three shires which had been represented in the 1633 Parliament were not represented in 1639, two of which were Highland shires (Cromarty and Tarbat). The combination of geographic isolation and lack of ready cash to pay Commissioners would appear to explain this trend. Lack of representation for the shire of Dumbarton is surprising, although it is located at the edge of the Highland/Lowland divide. Four shires which had not been represented in 1633 secured representation in the Covenanted Parliament of 1639 (Clackmannan, Annandale, Forres and Sutherland). For the technical status of Sutherland refer to footnote 26 below. The fact that the shire of Forres managed to send two

all shires in 1639 with only one Commissioner were geographically isolated and predominantly Highland (Nairn, Sutherland²⁶ and Bute).

Excluding the noble proxies of the 1633 Parliament, 31 of the 50 nobles (62 per cent), 15 of the 47 gentry (32 per cent) and 12 of the 52 burgesses (23 per cent) recorded in the parliamentary rolls of 31 August 1639 had also been recorded in the rolls of the 1633 Parliament. The high retention rate within the noble estate can be explained simply by the fact that the nobility received a personal summons by the King. The 1639 session also constituted the first convocation of a Scottish Parliament in over six years. Given the tense political atmosphere and the sense of crisis in the nation, such a high turn out of the noble estate is unsurprising.

Covenanting historiography has recognised that there was some (undefined) form of political and constitutional opposition to Charles I in the Coronation Parliament. Formal communication between the estates was banned by Charles I, as were separate meetings of the estates (as was customary), whilst the Convention of Royal Burghs, the focal point of the burghal estate which usually convened while Parliament was in session, was similarly suspended. That some form of opposition was being organised can be ascertained from the fact that the Humble Supplication from the gentry and burgesses criticising the legislative programme of the Lords of the Articles was suppressed. A free and open discussion of that programme in the House was sought. The political fallout of the enactment of parliamentary legislation *en bloc* (through the employment of proxy votes, double voting and personal royal intimidation by Charles) entailed a political challenge within the House led by John Leslie, 6th Earl of Rothes. Rothes emerged as 'spokesman for the disaffected' and had similarly been at the forefront of the parliamentary opposition to James VI in the 1621 Parliament. Particular controversy in the 1633 Parliament emerged relating to the voting divisions cast for the King's legislative programme, as constructed in the Lords of the Articles. Rothes argued that no majority had been secured (the negative and affirmative votes being equal), whilst there was a suggestion of irregularity by the Clerk Register, Sir John Hay of Lands, in his numerical assessment of votes cast for and against. This episode suggests that a significant grouping of nobles, gentry and burgesses had refused to sanction the agenda of the Lords of the Articles.²⁷

The elections to the 1639 Parliament had been void of effective royal influence, despite the efforts of James, 3rd Marques of Hamilton, and John Stewart, 1st Earl of

Traquair, King's Commissioner of the Tables. The Tables consisted with each of the political estates: the ministry. In particular, the representatives of the clergy) and policy formulation. Whilst advice, their input was limited purposes. The lack of Crown in the organisational strength of the majority in the election of the

Therefore what correlation 1633 and 1639 and Covenantin elected to the 1639 Parliament to a block of Covenanting str parliamentary estates in 1639. the gentry and burghal oppo almost certainly did. Given th the strength of the Covenantin by the Crown in the electio secured election for the shires commissioners for shires few i of elements of the 15 gentry a of direct use to the Covenar services.

Geographic analysis of the parliamentary rolls reveals a b and three each from the west was a national one which an appears to hold true in light this pattern, with three burge remaining three burgesses re central belt.³⁰ Several of these

²⁵ (continued) Commissioners in 1639 indicates that geographic isolation and proximity to the Highlands was not a universal trend for lack of parliamentary attendance. This is emphasised by the fact that the burgh of Dornoch, which had not been represented in the Coronation Parliament, sent an elected Commissioner to that of 1639. Two further burghs (Queensferry and Arbroath) were represented in 1639 but not 1633. Kilrenny, Annan and Sanquhar, on the other hand, were represented in the 1633 Parliament but not that of 1639.

²⁶ Charles I had granted a charter to the Earl of Sutherland in 1631 which created Sutherland as a distinct shire; previously it had been incorporated within the shire of Inverness. This grant was ratified by the 1633 Parliament (Rait, *The Parliaments of Scotland*, pp. 216, 233; Dicey and Rait, *Thoughts on the Union*, p. 56; *A.P.S.*, V, 62).

²⁷ MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, pp. 40, 88–89, 132–4. The parliamentary session had ended before the remonstrance could be presented to the House. G. Donaldson, *Scotland James V–James VII*, (2nd edn., Edinburgh, 1987), p. 307; J. Row, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland 1558–1637*, ed., D. Laing (Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1842), pp. 364, 336–7; Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*, p. 168; J. Kirkton, *A History of the Church of Scotland 1660–1679*, ed. R. Stewart, (Lampeter, 1992), p. 13.

²⁸ The lack of influence in the 1 required, he wished to have the opt this out he wanted to ensure 'irreg 170). This policy obviously backfir Covenanting Movement within the s Movement, pp. 166–8; Stevenson, *I*

²⁹ Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*

³⁰ *A.P.S.*, V, 7–9, 251–2. The 1 of Cambo (Fife), Sir Thomas Cror (Linlithgow). Sir Thomas Hope of had his domain in the east coast. Sir in 1633 and that of Haddington in Edinburgh in 1633, but by 1639 h Lord Forrester. The gentry represent (Ayr) and Sir Ludovick Houston o that of Renfrew in 1639. He had b

ere geographically isolated and
ute).

nt, 31 of the 50 nobles (62 per
the 52 burgesses (23 per cent)
had also been recorded in the
within the noble estate can be
ed a personal summons by the
ocation of a Scottish Parliament
re and the sense of crisis in the
nsurprising.

ere was some (undefined) form
in the Coronation Parliament.
d by Charles I, as were separate
Convention of Royal Burghs,
onvened while Parliament was
opposition was being organised
pplication from the gentry and
he Lords of the Articles was
nme in the House was sought.
r legislation *en bloc* (through the
al royal intimidation by Charles)
John Leslie, 6th Earl of Rothes.
and had similarly been at the
the 1621 Parliament. Particular
to the voting divisions cast for
e Lords of the Articles. Rothes
ive and affirmative votes being
y the Clerk Register, Sir John
st for and against. This episode
r and burgesses had refused to

oid of effective royal influence,
1, and John Stewart, 1st Earl of

olation and proximity to the Highlands
his is emphasised by the fact that the
oronation Parliament, sent an elected
nd Arbroath) were represented in 1639
ere represented in the 1633 Parliament

n 1631 which created Sutherland as a
of Inverness. This grant was ratified by
233; Dicey and Rait, *Thoughts on the*

Movement, pp. 40, 88–89, 132–4. The
presented to the House. G. Donaldson,
7; J. Row, *The History of the Kirk of*
ph, 1842), pp. 364, 336–7; Stevenson,
Scotland 1660–1679, ed. R. Stewart,

Traquair, King's Commissioner. The elections were carried out under the direction of the Tables. The Tables constituted the political *élite* of the Covenancing Movement, with each of the political estates represented (nobles, gentry and burgesses) along with the ministry. In particular, the fifth Table (the executive Table, which did not include representatives of the clergy) provided the ultimate tier of organisation, leadership and policy formulation. Whilst the clergy representatives were present for ideological advice, their input was limited with regard to financial, military and diplomatic purposes. The lack of Crown influence in the parliamentary elections, combined with the organisational strength of the Tables, ensured an overwhelming Covenancing majority in the election of the Commissioners of the Shires and Burghs.²⁸

Therefore what correlation can be established between the parliamentary rolls of 1633 and 1639 and Covenancing political factionalism? That 15 gentry and 12 burgesses elected to the 1639 Parliament had direct experience of its predecessor of 1633 points to a block of Covenancing strength within this grouping of the gentry and burghal parliamentary estates in 1639. Not *all* 15 gentry and 12 burgesses *necessarily* formed the gentry and burghal opposition in 1633, but significant elements within them almost certainly did. Given the contemporary political climate in Scotland in 1639, the strength of the Covenancing Movement in the localities and a 'hands off' approach by the Crown in the elections, it seems unlikely that committed royal supporters secured election for the shires and burghs. As David Stevenson commented, 'of the commissioners for shires few if any were open royalists'.²⁹ Moreover, the experience of elements of the 15 gentry and 12 burgesses in the 1633 Parliament may have been of direct use to the Covenancing leadership in 1639 who wished to employ their services.

Geographic analysis of the shire representation of the 15 gentry common to both parliamentary rolls reveals a breakdown of five eastern gentry, four from the Borders and three each from the west and the Highlands. That the Covenancing Movement was a national one which articulated the grievances of Charles I's native kingdom appears to hold true in light of this analysis. Burghal analysis likewise conforms to this pattern, with three burgesses from the west, the east and the Borders, and the remaining three burgesses representing the Highlands, the far north east and the central belt.³⁰ Several of these burgesses, including John Semple (Dumbarton), Gideon

²⁸ The lack of influence in the 1639 elections was a deliberate policy option employed by Charles; if required, he wished to have the option of negating or repudiating the 1639 Parliament. In order to carry this out he wanted to ensure 'irregular' elections by the Covenanters (Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*, p. 170). This policy obviously backfired. It may also have been indirect recognition of the strength of the Covenancing Movement within the shires and burghs. MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenancing Movement*, pp. 166–8; Stevenson, *The Government of Scotland Under the Covenanters*, pp. xiii–xix.

²⁹ Stevenson, *Scottish Revolution*, p. 170.

³⁰ *A.P.S.*, V, 7–9, 251–2. The gentry representing eastern shires were as follows: Sir Thomas Morton of Cambo (Fife), Sir Thomas Crombie of Kemnay (Aberdeen) and William Drummond of Riccarton (Linlithgow). Sir Thomas Hope of Craighall, Lord Advocate (included in both parliamentary rolls), also had his domain in the east coast. Sir Patrick Hamilton of Little Preston represented the shire of Edinburgh in 1633 and that of Haddington in 1639. Sir George Forrester of Corstorphine represented the shire of Edinburgh in 1633, but by 1639 he had been promoted into the peerage and took his seat in 1639 as Lord Forrester. The gentry representing western shires were Sir William Cunningham of Cunninghamhead (Ayr) and Sir Ludovick Houston of that ilk. Houston represented the shire of Dumbarton in 1633 and that of Renfrew in 1639. He had been ordered by the Privy Council in 1633 to transfer as commissioner

Jack (Lanark) and Robert Cunningham (Kinghorn), were to play crucial roles within the burghal estate in the parliamentary forums of the 1640s.

3. *The parliamentary rolls of the sixth session of the first Triennial Parliament, 3 November 1646, and the Engagement Parliament of 2 March 1648*

The escalation of political tension not only within the Covenanting Movement but also with regard to Anglo-Scottish relations and the parliamentary alliance of the two kingdoms came to a head in the forum of the Scottish Parliament between November 1646 and the summer of 1648. The Covenanting Movement had become embroiled in the English Civil War on a formal basis through the Solemn League and Covenant (which sought the imposition of presbyterianism within the ecclesiastical structures of the Churches of England and Ireland and a federal arrangement between the kingdoms) and the Treaty of Military Assistance of 1643 (the military treaty between the two kingdoms ensuring the assistance of the Army of the Covenant on the side of the English Parliament).

The fundamental weakness of the Union of the Crowns had become increasingly apparent throughout 1646 as division emerged within the parliamentary alliance of the two kingdoms as the King became an increasingly important political pawn. Charles was under the jurisdiction and protection of the Scottish army at Newcastle, but had consistently refused to countenance subscription of the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant (primarily regarding the imposition of presbyterianism in his English kingdom). Such a ploy on behalf of the King had the effect of alienating Scottish military protection in order to maintain the Anglo-Scottish military alliance. The Houses of Parliament, as per voting divisions of 24 September 1646, had claimed sole jurisdiction over the King, and later that month offered to pay the Scottish army £400,000 sterling (£4.8 million Scots to be paid in two equal instalments) to leave the southern kingdom. Throughout October 1646 protracted diplomatic negotiations on the part of the Scottish diplomatic contingent emphasised that Charles (as King of Scotland as well as England) was to be disposed of by the joint advice and consultation of the Scottish and English Parliaments respectively. Royal refusal to sanction the Newcastle Propositions (as formally demanded by the Scottish Parliament once more on 16 and 24 December) ultimately resulted in the decision of the Scottish Parliament on 16 January 1647

³⁰ (continued) from Renfrew to Dumbarton due to the scarcity of freeholders in Dunbartonshire (Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 812–3). Sir George Elphinstone of Blythswood, Justice Clerk, also had his domain in the west. The gentry representing Borders' shires were as follows: Sir William Douglas of Cavers (Roxburgh), Sir Robert Grierson of Lag (Dumfries), Sir John Charteris of Amisfield (Dumfries) and Sir Patrick MacKie of Larg (Kirkcudbright and Wigtown). The gentry representing Highland shires were Sir Duncan Campbell of Auchinbreck (Argyll), Sir John MacKenzie of Tarbat (Inverness) and Hector Bannatyne of Kames, younger, (Bute) (at the lower western end). The burgesses representing eastern burghs were as follows: John Williamson (Kirkcaldy), Robert Keith (Montrose) and Robert Cunningham (Kinghorn). Andrew Baird (Banff) represented a far north eastern burgh. William Glendonning (Kirkcudbright), James Williamson (Peebles) and Robert Gordon (New Galloway) formed the grouping of burgesses from the Borders. Thomas Bruce (Stirling) represented the central belt, whilst John Semple (Dumbarton) and Gideon Jack (Lanark) represented the west. Matthew Spence (Rothesay) represented a burgh in the vicinity of the western Highland/Lowland divide.

to withdraw the Scottish army from custody of the English Parliament.

Antagonism on the part of (which was growing as a political only been outmanoeuvred by the 3rd Marquess of Hamilton) 120 March 1647 which culminated in a pragmatic alliance between the Covenanting Movement, at a time designed to restore the authority of the Scottish Parliament, providing a trial period of 12 months in England.³²

That the Engagers were not in the composition of the Estates of the elections of the Convention of the Hamilton faction is absent, but was an element still existed, but was of the Commissioners of the Convention (and were recognised as such in the parliamentary rolls of 3 November 1646, the gentry and burgesses who voted for the Covenanting Movement in 1646.

Forty-eight nobles, 50 gentlemen and 48 burghs are recorded in the total membership of the six sessions of 154. In terms of total membership the previous five sessions of the Convention of the Estates of attendance per estate, the noble estate, the Commission

³¹ D. Stevenson, *Revolution and the Memoirs of Henry Guthrie (C and Actions of James and William Glasgow University Library, Original of the Parliament of Scotland, To of the 24 of September 1646. C. Speeches of the Lord Chancellor*

³² For a detailed discussion of 'Scottish Parliament', I, Chapter (3rd edn., Oxford, 1906), pp. 34 97–8; Donaldson, *James V–James*

³³ *The Diplomatic Correspondence in England and Scotland, 1645–1688*, II, 228.

³⁴ A.P.S., VI, i, 612–3. Five only: Sutherland, Clackmannan,

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 3–4, 95–6, 284

to play crucial roles within
1640s.

First Triennial Parliament,
opened 2 March 1648

Covenanting Movement but
parliamentary alliance of the two
parliament between November
movement had become embroiled
Solemn League and Covenant
in the ecclesiastical structures
parliamentary arrangement between the
1643 (the military treaty between
of the Covenant on the side

owns had become increasingly
the parliamentary alliance of
important political pawn.
the Scottish army at Newcastle,
tion of the National Covenant
regarding the imposition of
roy on behalf of the King had
order to maintain the Anglo-
as per voting divisions of 24
the King, and later that month
(£4.8 million Scots to be paid
kingdom. Throughout October
part of the Scottish diplomatic
Scotland as well as England) was
tion of the Scottish and English
the Newcastle Propositions (as
more on 16 and 24 December)
Parliament on 16 January 1647

of freeholders in Dunbartonshire (Young
stone of Blythswood, Justice Clerk, also
res were as follows: Sir William Douglas
ir John Charteris of Amisfield (Dumfries)
The gentry representing Highland shires
McKenzie of Tarbat (Inverness) and Hector
end). The burgesses representing eastern
shire (Montrose) and Robert Cunningham
in burgh. William Glendinning (Kirkcud-
alloway) formed the grouping of burgesses
parliamentary belt, whilst John Semple (Dumbarton)
ce (Rothesay) represented a burgh in the

to withdraw the Scottish armed forces from England and leave the King in the
custody of the English Parliament.³¹

Antagonism on the part of the conservative faction of the Covenanting Movement
(which was growing as a political grouping within the Scottish Parliament and had
only been outmanoeuvred in the House through the political ineptitude of James,
3rd Marquess of Hamilton) led to a power struggle in the Committee of Estates of
20 March 1647 which culminated in the Engagement Treaty in December 1647.
Based on a pragmatic alliance between the royalists and the conservative wing of the
Covenanting Movement, at the expense of the radicals, the Engagement treaty was
designed to restore the authority of Charles I in his Scottish and English kingdoms,
providing a trial period of three years for the establishment of presbyterianism in
England.³²

That the Engagers were now the dominant force in Scottish politics was recognised
in the composition of the Engagement Parliament. Interference in and management
of the elections of the Commissioners of the Shires and Burghs had ensured that
'the Hamilton faction is absolutely the most powerful in this Parliament.'³³ A radical
element still existed, but was clearly outnumbered by its Engager rivals. If the bulk
of the Commissioners of the Shires and Burghs in the 1648 Parliament were Engagers
(and were recognised as such by the Engager leadership), then comparison of the
parliamentary rolls of 3 November 1646 and 2 March 1648 reveals the core of
gentry and burgesses who were aligning themselves to the conservative wing of the
Covenanting Movement in the parliamentary session commencing on 3 November
1646.

Forty-eight nobles, 50 gentry representing 28 shires³⁴ and 56 burgesses representing
48 burghs are recorded in the parliamentary rolls of 3 November 1646. Hence the
total membership of the sixth session of the First Triennial Parliament amounted to
154. In terms of total membership such an attendance level was higher than any of
the previous five sessions of the First Triennial Parliament and was equalled only by
that of the Convention of Estates, 22 June 1643. Similarly, in terms of the breakdown
of attendance per estate, the same scenario applies to the attendance levels of the
noble estate, the Commissioners of the Shires and the Commissioners of the Burghs.³⁵

³¹ D. Stevenson, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Scotland, 1644-1651*, (1977), pp. 72-5, 80; *The Memoirs of Henry Guthrie* (Glasgow, 1747), pp. 231-4, 237-8; G. Burnet, *The Memoirs of the Lives and Actions of James and William, Dukes of Hamilton and Castleheald* (1838), p. 293; A.P.S., VI, i, 669; Glasgow University Library, Ogilvie Collection, Ogilvie 446B, *Some Papers Given in by the Commissioners of the Parliament of Scotland, To the Honourable Houses of Parliament of England. In answer to their votes of the 24 of September 1646. Concerning The disposing of His Majesties Person. To which is added, The Speeches of the Lord Chancellor of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1646), pp. (1)-(4).

³² For a detailed discussion of the power struggle within the Committee of Estates refer to Young, 'Scottish Parliament', I, Chapter 18; *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, ed. S.R. Gardiner (3rd edn., Oxford, 1906), pp. 347-52; Stevenson, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Scotland*, pp. 94, 97-8; Donaldson, *James V-James III*, pp. 336-7.

³³ *The Diplomatic Correspondence of Jean de Montreuil and the Brothers De Bellievre, French Ambassadors in England and Scotland, 1645-1648*, ed. J.D. Fotheringham, (2 vols., Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1898), II, 228.

³⁴ A.P.S., VI, i, 612-3. Five of the 28 shires (18 per cent) were represented by one Commissioner only: Sutherland, Clackmannan, Kirkcudbright, Banff and Caithness.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4, 95-6, 284-5, 429-30, 440-1, 474-5, 612-3.

Whilst taking into account the fact that Scotland was engulfed in civil war throughout 1644–45, the increase in attendance levels over all three estates can be attributed to the power struggle between the radicals and conservatives and concern over the position and status of Charles I as King of Scots.

Fifty-six nobles are recorded in the parliamentary rolls of 2 March 1648. Analysis of gentry and burghal attendance in the Engagement Parliament is complicated by technical deficiencies in the parliamentary rolls (see Appendix of tabular data). Three shires and eight burghs are listed in the rolls, but have no Commissioners named. The implications of such irregularities have been calculated and tabulated along the lines of minimum and maximum attendance figures relating to the shires and the burghs (See Appendices 1 and 2). Minimum attendance figures are based on those nobles, gentry and burgesses who are *definitely* recorded in the rolls of 2 March 1648.³⁶

Based on minimum attendance data, 37 of the 56 nobles (66 per cent), 22 of the 47 gentry (47 per cent) and 25 of the 49 burgesses (51 per cent) included in the rolls of 2 March 1648 are also recorded in the rolls of 3 November 1646. In total, 84 of the 152 Members of the Engagement Parliament (55 per cent) were included in both rolls.³⁷ Therefore over half of the minimum membership of the Engagement Parliament had been included in the membership of the last session of the previous Parliament. This provides a clear indication of the extent of the growth of conservatism and a move away from the stance of the leadership of the radical oligarchy within the parliamentary forum of Scottish politics in 1646–47. Engager dominance of the 1648 elections indicates that the bulk of the 22 gentry and 25 burgesses were aligned to Hamilton, albeit a minority were still undoubtedly radicals. Allegiance was not static; contemporary politicians reacted to contemporary events. By March 1648 Hamilton had capitalized on the move towards conservatism, notably by parliamentary gentry and burgesses, to secure parliamentary ascendancy over Argyll and his faction.

The high retention of personnel within the noble estate provides further evidence of the widespread support for the Engagement Settlement and Charles I by the traditional ruling class of Scottish society. Certainly such retention rates were made easier by the fact that the noble estate, unlike the shires and burghs, was unelected. Radicalism, however, had a limited base within the noble estate, as had been evident throughout the 1640s.³⁸ Allowing for the fact that a disaffected radical element was elected to the Engagement Parliament, of which a majority of that element were gentry and burgesses, it is nevertheless clear that a significantly larger grouping of gentry and burgesses had now crossed over to the Engager camp to defend the cause of the King. Whether this corresponds to a movement towards conservatism in the Scottish localities and burghs, or is mere recognition of efficient management/manipulation of parliamentary elections in both 1646 and 1648 on the part of the Engagement leadership, remains a matter of speculation. Nevertheless, it should also be recognised that a radical grouping of seven gentry and seven burgesses recorded

in the parliamentary rolls of 4 July 1646 and 2 March 1648.³⁹

That electoral management of the fact that 25 of the 47 gentry (53 per cent) included in the parliament of 1646. The similar figure of 25 of the 49 burgesses (51 per cent) displacement of a total of 66 Members of Parliament (based on minimum attendance figures) session commencing on 3 November 1646 in favour of conservative/Engager. Comparison of the two sets of figures within the commissioners of the First Triennial Parliament.

During the sixth session, the political and factional agent of the temperature of the Commission was a large number (though not all) of the King. Fletcher of Innerpefferry in the House would result in a change (as proved ultimately to be correct) of the Argilians and the commission week after Fletcher's initial appointment of 15, a reduction of 50 per cent.

The rolls of 3 November 1646 breach of parliamentary regulation. All other burghs were entitled to elect by the 1621 Convention of the Parliaments, 1639–45, confirmed by two Commissioners: James Dington, Anstruther Easter, and James of the Shire Commissioners. It is clear that political weight had been reduced and had witnessed the emergence of a curtailed the traditional power.

³⁹ A.P.S., VI, i, 612–3, VI, ii, rolls of 3 Nov. 1646, 2 Mar. 1648 (Edinburgh and Argyll), William (Kirkcudbright), Andrew Agnew of Dumbarton, Walter Scott of Hartwood, seven burgesses who also come in (Coupar), George Garden (Burntisland), Hay (Elgin) and John Forbes (Inverurie).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, VI, i, 612–3, VI, ii, 3–4.

⁴¹ *The Memoirs of Henry Guthrie*.

⁴² A.P.S., VI, i, 612–3.

⁴³ Stevenson, *The Government*.

⁴⁴ This has been strongly argued.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, VI, ii, 3–4. Five shires are listed with only one Commissioner: Sutherland, Elgin, Nairn, Kirkcudbright and Caithness.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, VI, i, 612–3, VI, ii, 3–4.

³⁸ See Young, 'Scottish Parliament', I.

in the parliamentary rolls of 4 January 1649 are also recorded in those of 3 November 1646 and 2 March 1648.³⁹

That electoral management and purging was underway can also be evidenced by the fact that 25 of the 47 gentry (53 per cent) and 24 of the 49 burgesses (45 per cent) included in the parliamentary rolls of 2 March 1648 had not been included in those of 1646. The similar figure for the noble estate is 19. Therefore there was a displacement of a total of 66 out of the 152 members (43 per cent) of the 1648 Parliament (based on minimum attendance figures) compared to the parliamentary session commencing on 3 November 1646.⁴⁰ Purging of radical gentry and burgesses in favour of conservative/Engager placemen appears to have been in operation. Comparison of the two sets of data for the gentry and burgesses indicates the division within the commissioners of the shires and burghs during the crucial sixth session of the First Triennial Parliament, 3 November 1646–27 March 1647.

During the sixth session, Sir Andrew Fletcher of Innerpeffer (Forfar), acting as a political and factional agent for the Duke of Hamilton, had tested the political temperature of the Commissioners of the Shires and Burghs and concluded that a large number (though not all) were in favour of policies that were designed to secure the King. Fletcher of Innerpeffer's assessment concluded that if an immediate vote in the House would result in a majority of 30 in favour of the King. Delay, however, (as proved ultimately to be correct), would significantly reduce that majority because 'the Argilians and the commissioners of the church intrigued so bussily'. Indeed, one week after Fletcher's initial assessment such a majority had been quickly eroded to that of 15, a reduction of 50 per cent.⁴¹

The rolls of 3 November 1646 also indicate that the burghal estate was in clear breach of parliamentary regulations. With the exception of Edinburgh, the capital, all other burghs were entitled to send only one Commissioner. This had been regulated by the 1621 Convention of Royal Burghs. Parliamentary rolls of the Covenanted Parliaments, 1639–45, confirm this regulation. Seven eastern burghs, however, were represented by two Commissioners each: Dundee, Linlithgow, St Andrews, Haddington, Anstruther Easter, Dunbar and Crail.⁴² The doubling in the voting strength of the Shire Commissioners in 1640 had aroused the hostility of the burgesses, whose political weight had been reduced in relative terms to that of the gentry.⁴³ The 1640s had witnessed the emergence and development of a 'Scottish Commons' which had curtailed the traditional power of the nobility within Parliament.⁴⁴ In this instance,

³⁹ A.P.S., VI, i, 612–3, VI, ii, 3–4, 124–6. The seven radical gentry recorded in the parliamentary rolls of 3 Nov. 1646, 2 Mar. 1648 and 4 Jan. 1649 are as follows: Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston (Edinburgh and Argyll), William Semple of Foulwood (Dumbarton), William Grierson of Bargatton (Kirkcudbright), Andrew Agnew of Lochmaw (Wigtown), Sir Ludovick Houston of that ilk (Renfrew and Dumbarton), Walter Scott of Hartwoodburne (Selkirk) and James Campbell of Ardkinglas (Argyll). The seven burgesses who also come into this category are George Porterfield (Glasgow), George Jamieson (Coupar), George Garden (Burntisland), Robert Cunningham (Kinghorn), Gideon Jack (Lanark), John Hay (Elgin) and John Forbes (Inverness).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, VI, i, 612–3, VI, ii, 3–4.

⁴¹ *The Memoirs of Henry Guthrie*, p. 234.

⁴² A.P.S., VI, i, 612–3.

⁴³ Stevenson, *The Government of Scotland Under the Covenanters*, p. xxiii.

⁴⁴ This has been strongly argued in Young, 'Scottish Parliament', I.

fed in civil war throughout
estates can be attributed to
ves and concern over the

of 2 March 1648. Analysis
liament is complicated by
ndix of tabular data). Three
no Commissioners named.
ited and tabulated along the
lating to the shires and the
e figures are based on those
ed in the rolls of 2 March

bles (66 per cent), 22 of the
per cent) included in the rolls
November 1646. In total, 84 of
r cent) were included in both
of the Engagement Parliament
on of the previous Parliament.
growth of conservatism and a
radical oligarchy within the
ngager dominance of the 1648
l 25 burgesses were aligned to
licals. Allegiance was not static;
ents. By March 1648 Hamilton
otably by parliamentary gentry
er Argyll and his faction.
estate provides further evidence
tlement and Charles I by the
such retention rates were made
ires and burghs, was unelected.
noble estate, as had been evident
disaffected radical element was
majority of that element were
significantly larger grouping of
ngager camp to defend the cause

ent towards conservatism in the
ition of efficient management/
546 and 1648 on the part of the
ation. Nevertheless, it should also
try and seven burgesses recorded

Commissioner: Sutherland, Elgin, Nairn,

the rolls of the Scottish Parliament provide evidence of the growing political confidence of the burghal estate and its willingness to challenge the increased strength of the shires.

4. The rolls of Parliament of 2 March 1648 and 4 January 1649

The military defeat of the Engagement forces at the hands of Oliver Cromwell and his New Model Army at the Battle of Preston in August 1648 had profound repercussions for the Scottish political nation. The Whiggamore Raid on Edinburgh, essentially a *coup d'état* by western radicals, established a notably radical regime, backed by Cromwell, the basis of which formed the ideological opposition to the Engagement. All Engagers were to be purged and/or barred from public office and their military forces were to be disbanded. The radical regime exercised unopposed political power within Scotland until the aftermath of the debacle of the military defeat at Dunbar in September 1650. The fact that only diehard adherents of that regime were permitted to sit in Parliament allows the identification of the disaffected radical element in the Engagement Parliament.⁴⁵

The parliamentary rolls of 4 January 1649, in common with those of 2 March 1648, contain technical deficiencies. Whilst 16 nobles are listed for the noble estate, no Commissioners are cited for three shires and seven burghs. In addition, ten burghs were represented by a dual commission and another by a triple commission.⁴⁶ Minimum and maximum figures have been constructed accordingly for those shires and burghs listed with no Commissioners (see Appendices 1 and 2). Based on minimum attendance figures (i.e. those nobles, gentry and burgesses *actually* listed in the parliamentary rolls), 14 of the 16 nobles (88 per cent), 12 of the 46 gentry (26 per cent) and 13 of the 51 burgesses (25 per cent) recorded in the parliamentary rolls of the radical Parliament of 4 January 1649 had also been recorded in the Engagement Parliament of 2 March 1648. This amounts to 39 of the total membership of 113 (34 per cent) of the parliamentary session of 4 January 1649.⁴⁷ The political opposition/disaffected radical element to the Engagement contained within the 1648 Parliament has been identified. The assertion that the heartland of the radical regime lay in the west and south-west of Scotland is confirmed by geographic analysis of

this grouping of gentry and nobles. Sixty per cent (50 per cent) represented the remaining gentry contingents from the Highlands and one of the stronger groupings of six eastern shires and the Highlands and only one was not only limited to its home support amongst prominent aristocrats.

The decrease of 40 peers in the almost constant attendance list (based on minimum and maximum figures) established by the Whiggamore reaction against the noble-dominated shires and burghal parliament of 1648 (the 46 gentry (72 per cent) at 4 January 1649 had not been to the three radical nobles who were of those not included in the

5. The Restoration Parliament

Crushing military defeat of 1651, combined with the loss of Scotland's status as a conquering constitutional terms Scotland's protectorate until legislation was passed in 1657. Two bills of union had been passed when the Barebones' Parliament in April 1653 and the ordinance of union was enacted.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, The six gentry represented (Roxburgh), Sir Thomas Kerr of Craghead, Sir Thomas Kerr of Craghead, Sir Thomas Kerr of Craghead, Sir Thomas Kerr of Craghead, Sir Thomas Kerr of Craghead, Sir Thomas Kerr of Craghead. William Semple of Foulw and Sir Ludovick Houston of that ilk represented Roxburghshire was James Campbell. Sir Archibald Johnston of Warriston had represented Argyll in the Engagement patronage of his political ally Archibald Johnston.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4, 124-6. The 1649 were William Simpson (Dumfries), Cunningham (Kinghorn), James Cunningham (Glasgow), James Campbell (Dumfries), three Highland burgesses were James Thomas McBarnie was the one B

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4, 124-6.

⁴⁵ Scottish R.O., P.A. 11/7, Register of the Committee of Estates, 22 Sept. 1648-Jan. 1649, ff. 1-7; Glasgow University Lib., Ogilvie Collection, Ogilvie 668, *A True Account of the great Expressions of Love from the Noblemen, Ministers & Commons of the Kingdom of Scotland unto Lieutenant General Cromwell, and the Officers and Soldiers under his command. Whose mutual love each to other is hoped to be the beginnings of a happy Peace to both Nations. Declared in a Letter to a friend* (London, 1648), ff. (3)-(7); Donaldson, *James V-James VII*, pp. 338-9; K.M. Brown, *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Royal Union, 1603-1715* (1992), pp. 132-3; MacInnes, 'The Scottish Constitution'.

⁴⁶ *A.P.S.*, VI, ii, 3-4, 124-6. The shires of Bute, Kincardine and Banff are listed, but no Commissioners are named. The seven burghs recorded with no Commissioners are Lauder, Kilrenny, Annan, Lochmaben, New Galloway, Dingwall and Dornoch. Dual commissions for the burgesses took the form of providing a substitute Commissioner in the absence of the elected Commissioner: e.g., John Williamson or James Law in his absence, for the burgh of Kirkcaldy. The triple commission similarly adopted the format of James Richardson or Alexander Bennet or James Cook in his absence, for the burgh of Pittenweem.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 3-4, 124-6.

of the growing political confidence
the increased strength of the

48 and 4 January 1649

ie hands of Oliver Cromwell and
in August 1648 had profound
Whiggamore Raid on Edinburgh,
d a notably radical regime, backed
ical opposition to the Engagement.
m public office and their military
exercised unopposed political power
of the military defeat at Dunbar
ents of that regime were permitted
disaffected radical element in the

common with those of 2 March
bles are listed for the noble estate,
ven burghs. In addition, ten burghs
rother by a triple commission.⁴⁶
ructed accordingly for those shires
ndices 1 and 2). Based on minimum
urgesses actually listed in the parlia-
12 of the 46 gentry (26 per cent)
d in the parliamentary rolls of the
een recorded in the Engagement
9 of the total membership of 113
nuary 1649.⁴⁷ The political oppo-
ment contained within the 1648
the heartland of the radical regime
onfirmed by geographic analysis of

of Estates, 22 Sept. 1648-Jan. 1649, ff. 1-7;
True Account of the great Expressions of Love
Scotland unto Lieutenant General Cromwel,
love each to other is hoped to be the beginnings
end (London, 1648), ff. (3)-(7); Donaldson,
r Province? Scotland and the Regal Union,
nstitution.

re and Banff are listed, but no Commissioners
rs are Lauder, Kilrenny, Annan, Lochmaben,
or the burgesses took the form of providing
missioner: e.g., John Williamson or James
commission similarly adopted the format of
is absence, for the burgh of Pittenweem.

this grouping of gentry and burgesses. Of the 12 gentry recorded in both sessions, six (50 per cent) represented Borders' shires and three represented western shires. The remaining gentry contingent was composed of two Commissioners of the Shires from the Highlands and one from the east respectively.⁴⁸ Burghal analysis reveals a stronger grouping of six eastern burgesses, combined with three each from the west and the Highlands and only one from the Border's region.⁴⁹ Hence radical strength was not only limited to its heartland in the south-west, but could also command support amongst prominent and affluent eastern burghs.

The decrease of 40 peers in the noble estate from 56 to 16, combined with the almost constant attendance levels of the Commissioners of the Shires and Burghs (based on minimum and maximum figures) clearly indicates that the radical regime established by the Whiggamore Raid in September 1648 constituted an anti-aristocratic reaction against the noble-dominated Engagement. The purging of Engagers from shires and burghal parliamentary representation is emphasised by the fact that 33 of the 46 gentry (72 per cent) and 37 of the 51 burgesses (73 per cent) in the rolls of 4 January 1649 had not been included of those of the Engagement Parliament. Allied to the three radical nobles who had not attended the 1648 Parliament, the total figure of those not included in the 1648 rolls amounts to 73 (65 per cent).⁵⁰

5. *The Restoration Parliament, 1 January 1661, and the rolls of the Covenanted Parliaments, 1639-51*

Crushing military defeat of Royalist forces at the Battle of Worcester on 3 September 1651, combined with the capture of the Committee of Estates at Alyth, ensured Scotland's status as a conquered nation without a legally constituted government. In constitutional terms Scotland was not constitutionally incorporated within the Protectorate until legislation was enacted by the second Protectorate Parliament in April 1657. Two bills of union had collapsed firstly due to the dissolution of the Long Parliament in April 1653 and a second bill introduced in October 1653 had not been passed when the Barebones' Parliament was dissolved in December of that year. An ordinance of union was established in April 1654, following the Instrument of

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, The six gentry representing Borders' shires were as follows: Sir Andrew Kerr of Greenhead (Roxburgh), Sir Thomas Kerr of Cavers (Roxburgh), William Grierson of Bargatton (Roxburgh), Andrew Agnew of Lochnaw (Wigtown), Walter Scott of Hartwoodburn (Selkirk) and Patrick Scott of Thirlestane (Selkirk). William Semple of Foulwood (Dumbarton), Sir William Cunningham of Cunninghamhead (Ayr) and Sir Ludovick Houston of that ilk (Dumbarton) were the three western gentry present in both sessions. Houston of that ilk represented Renfrew in 1648 and Dumbarton in 1649. The one laird representing a Highland shire was James Campbell of Ardkinglas (Argyll). Sir Arthur Erskine of Scottiscrag (Fife) and Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston (Edinburgh) constituted the two eastern gentry. Johnston of Wariston had represented Argyll in the Engagement Parliament; he could only secure election in 1648 through the patronage of his political ally Archibald Campbell, 1st Marquess of Argyll.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4, 124-6. The six eastern burgesses recorded in the rolls of 2 Mar. 1648 and 4 Jan. 1649 were William Simpson (Dysart), John Williamson (Kirkcaldy), George Jamieson (Coupar), Robert Cunningham (Kingham), James Aitken (Culross) and George Garden (Burntisland). George Porterfield (Glasgow), James Campbell (Dumbarton) and Gideon Jack (Lanark) formed the western grouping. The three Highland burgesses were John Forbes (Inverness), John Hay (Elgin) and James McCulloch (Tain). Thomas McBirnie was the one Borders' burgess present in both sessions.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4, 124-6.

Government, but this had not reached the statute book before the first Protectorate Parliament had likewise been dissolved.⁵¹ However, Scotland was allocated limited representation in the Cromwellian Parliaments of 1654, 1656 and 1659.⁵² The collapse of the Protectorate in England paved the way for the restoration of the monarchy in England. In 'British' terms the Restoration was essentially an English political event. Whereas the Covenanted Movement had been at the heart of the British political and military agenda of the 1640s, the military occupation of the Cromwellian era had ensured that in terms of the British archipelago the political reality of Union of the Crowns in 1660 had been firmly redefined in the direction of the southern kingdom.

In the aftermath of the restoration of Charles II in England (Charles II had already been crowned as King of Scots on 1 January 1651, although he had been declared as King of Great Britain, France and Ireland and by the Scottish Parliament on 5 February 1649) a large contingent of the Scottish nobility and gentry flocked to London in order to cultivate political favour around the King. In terms of the political administration of Scotland, the 1651 Committee of Estates was recalled as an interim provisional government, after a consultative process with the Scottish political nation gathered in London, until it was deemed expedient for a Scottish Parliament to be held. This was complemented by the fact that Charles had named his new Scottish ministry in July 1660, dominated by former Engagers. At this early stage it was nevertheless recognised that the Scottish constitutional settlement of 1639–41 was to be bypassed and that the King alone had sole power of summoning and convening Parliament. The Committee of Estates sat in the Scottish capital, Edinburgh, from 23 August until 8 December 1660. It had been originally planned to convene the Scottish Parliament on 23 October; this was then rescheduled for 8 December, but had to be postponed once more until the King's Commissioner, John, 1st Earl of Middleton, arrived in Edinburgh on 31 December. The Scottish Restoration Parliament duly met on 1 January 1661.⁵³

The Restoration Parliament was composed of 75 nobles, 59 gentry representing 31 shires and 61 burgesses representing 60 burghs. Total membership was 195.⁵⁴ In

⁵¹ Donaldson, *James V–James VII*, p. 345.

⁵² W. Ferguson, *Scotland's Relations with England: A Survey to 1707* (Edinburgh, 1977), pp. 166–7; J.A. Casada, 'Scottish Members of Parliament, 1659', *Notes and Queries*, XVIII, (1971), 295; J.A. Casada, 'The Scottish Representatives in Richard Cromwell's Parliament', *Scottish Historical Review*, LI, (1972), 124–47; H.N. Mukerjee, 'Scottish Members of Richard Cromwell's Parliament', *Notes and Queries*, CLXVI, (1934), 65; P.J. Pinckney, 'The Scottish Representation in the Cromwellian Parliament of 1656', *Scottish Historical Review*, XLVI (1967), 95–114; F.D. Dow, *Cromwellian Scotland 1651–1660* (Edinburgh, 1979), pp. 50–1, 148, 149–53, 185–6, 237, 238–9, 329; *The Stuart Constitution 1603–688*, ed. J.P. Kenyon (2nd edn., Cambridge, 1987), pp. 308–13; Brown, *Kingdom or Province?*, pp. 137, 141–2.

⁵³ Dow, *Cromwellian Scotland*, pp. 268–70; R. Hutton, *Charles II King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 136–7; *The Lauderdale Papers*, ed. O. Airy, (3 vols., Camden Soc. new ser. XXXIV, XXXVI, XXXVIII, 1884–85), I, 32–3; Sir George MacKenzie of Roschaugh, *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1812), pp. 9–10; John Nicholl, *Diary of Public Transactions, 1650–1667*, ed., D. Laing (Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1836), pp. 298, 304–5, 310; *Scottish R.O.*, P.A. 11/12, Register of the Committee of Estates, Aug.–Oct. 1660, ff. 2 +; P.A. 11/13, Minute Book of the Committee of Estates, 9 Oct.–8 Dec. 1660, ff. 1–18; Dalhousie Muniments, G.D. 45/14/110/(2)–(3); National Library of Scotland, MS. 2263, Salt and Coal: History of Events, 1635–62, ff. 240–1; Watson Collection, ff. 26, 33; *A.P.S.*, VII, 3.

⁵⁴ *A.P.S.*, VII, 3–4. Three of the nobles (Chancellor Glencairn, Crawford–Lindsay, Treasurer, and

terms of both numerical compo
figures for 1st January 1661 w
Parliament, 1639–51 (including
all three estates (particularly th
II, as King of Scots, the reintroc
institutions, as a result of libera

Thirty-four of the 75 nobl
and 12 of the 61 burgesses (2
Parliament had also been liste
membership was so marked wi
is unsurprising given the lack
by the small number of noble
return to royalism in 1660–1
former Engagers, although th
with Argyle and the radical wi
Burleigh, Lothian and Leven
had been associated with the
Covenanting Movement.⁵⁷ Th

⁵⁴ (continued) Bellenden, Treasurer
Register, Sir John Fletcher, King's Ar
in the rolls as officers of state.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, V, 251–2, 258–9, 300–1,
474–5, 612–3, VI, ii, 3–4, 124–6, 27

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* This analysis includes off
(1661) had been included in previou
had been included in previous parlia
promoted into the peerage. Lord H
Falconer of Halkerton) in the Conve
Triennial Parliament. He was create
any of the available parliamentary roll
The Scots Peerage, ed. Sir J. Balfour
represented Perthshire (as Sir Patrick
Forfar in the 1644 Convention of
Parliament and Perthshire in the sess
in 1651 (*A.P.S.*, V, 251–2, 258–9, 30
440–1, 474–5, 612–3, VI, ii, 124–6
Scotland, II, 605–6). In addition, Ar
Parliament. Glen is not recorded in
James Balfour's roll for 13 March 16
John Rutherford (Jedburgh) are rec
rolls for 4 June 1644 and 24 July 1
Aug. 1639 to 23 May 1649. For c
individuals who sat in the Restorati
II, 603–4). All three burgesses have
(Anstruther Easter) is listed in a dual
1661. As per the rolls of 4 Jan. 1649 c
Easter in the House (*A.P.S.*, VI, ii, 1
1640–1, but never took his seat (*Th*
recorded in any of the parliamenta
305–6, 308, 331–2).

⁵⁷ The 11 gentry associated with
of Colington (Edinburgh), Sir, Jame
Murray of Polmais (Stirling), Sir Ar
of Phillorth (Aberdeen), Sir William
(Banff), Sir James Sinclair of Mur
MacKenzie of Pluscardine (Elgin).

te book before the first Protectorate
ever, Scotland was allocated limited
1654, 1656 and 1659.⁵² The collapse
or the restoration of the monarchy in
essentially an English political event.
at the heart of the British political
occupation of the Cromwellian era
lago the political reality of Union of
d in the direction of the southern

II in England (Charles II had already
651, although he had been declared
nd by the Scottish Parliament on 5
tish nobility and gentry flocked to
nd the King. In terms of the political
of Estates was recalled as an interim
ss with the Scottish political nation
tient for a Scottish Parliament to be
Charles had named his new Scottish
Engagers. At this early stage it was
tional settlement of 1639–41 was to
ower of summoning and convening
e Scottish capital, Edinburgh, from
a originally planned to convene the
en rescheduled for 8 December, but
g's Commissioner, John, 1st Earl of
er. The Scottish Restoration Parlia-

of 75 nobles, 59 gentry representing
hs. Total membership was 195.⁵⁴ In

urvey to 1707 (Edinburgh, 1977), pp. 166–7;
and *Queries*, XVIII, (1971), 295; J.A. Casada,
ment', *Scottish Historical Review*, LI, (1972),
Cromwell's Parliament', *Notes and Queries*,
tion in the Cromwellian Parliament of 1656',
Cromwellian Scotland 1651–1660 (Edinburgh,
The Stuart Constitution 1603–688, ed. J.P.
Kingdom or Province?, pp. 137, 141–2.
1, *Charles II King of England, Scotland, and*
ed. O. Airy, (3 vols., Camden Soc. new ser.
ge MacKenzie of Rosehaugh, *Memoirs of the*
ll, *Diary of Public Transactions*, 1650–1667,
18, 304–5, 310; Scottish R.O., P.A. 11/12,
ff. 2 +; P.A. 11/13, Minute Book of the
house Muniments, G.D. 45/14/110/(2)–(3);
story of Events, 1635–62, ff. 240–1; Watson

lencairn, Crawford-Lindsay, Treasurer, and

terms of both numerical composition per estate and total membership, the attendance
figures for 1st January 1661 were higher than all previous sessions of the Scottish
Parliament, 1639–51 (including Conventions of Estates).⁵⁵ Such keen attendance of
all three estates (particularly the nobility) can be explained by the return of Charles
II, as King of Scots, the reintroduction of the Scottish Parliament and other national
institutions, as a result of liberation from the yoke of Cromwellian occupation.

Thirty-four of the 75 nobles (45 per cent), 15 of the 59 gentry (25 per cent)
and 12 of the 61 burgesses (20 per cent) recorded in the rolls of the Restoration
Parliament had also been listed in parliamentary rolls of 1639–61.⁵⁶ That common
membership was so marked with the nobility in comparison to the other two estates
is unsurprising given the lack of radicalism within the noble estate (as exemplified
by the small number of nobles in the 1649 Parliament, for example) and its clear
return to royalism in 1660–1. The bulk of the 34 nobles were royalists and/or
former Engagers, although there was a small rump of nobles previously associated
with Argyle and the radical wing of the Covenanting Movement (Eglinton, Cassillis,
Burleigh, Lothian and Leven for example). Eleven of the 15 gentry (73 per cent)
had been associated with the Engagement and/or the conservative wing of the
Covenanting Movement.⁵⁷ Three further gentry had track records of radical political

⁵⁴ (*continued*) Bellenden, Treasurer Depute) along with three gentry (Sir Archibald Primrose, Clerk
Register, Sir John Fletcher, King's Advocate, and Sir William Bellenden, Treasurer Depute) are recorded
in the rolls as officers of state.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, V, 251–2, 258–9, 300–1, 303–4, 305–6, 308, 331–2, VI, i, 3–4, 95–6, 284–5, 429–30, 440–1,
474–5, 612–3, VI, ii, 3–4, 124–6, 277–8, 555–6, VII, 3–4.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* This analysis includes officers of state for the Restoration Parliament. The Earl of Dundee
(1661) had been included in previous parliamentary rolls as Viscount Dudhope. Lord Balmerino (1661)
had been included in previous parliamentary rolls as Lord Coupar. Two nobles had been recently been
promoted into the peerage. Lord Halkerton had represented the shire of Kincardine (as Sir Alexander
Falconer of Halkerton) in the Convention of Estates, 1643–4 and five out of the six sessions of the First
Triennial Parliament. He was created Lord Halkerton in 1646 but is not recorded in the noble estate in
any of the available parliamentary rolls of 1648–51 (*Ibid.*; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 235;
The Scots Peerage, ed. Sir J. Balfour-Paul [9 vols., Edinburgh, 1904–14], V, 249). Lord Ruthven had
represented Perthshire (as Sir Patrick Ruthven of Frieland) in all eight sessions of Parliament 1639–41,
Forfar in the 1644 Convention of Estates, Perthshire in two of the six sessions of the First Triennial
Parliament and Perthshire in the sessions of 4. Jan. and 23 May 1649. He was promoted into the peerage
in 1651 (*A.P.S.*, V, 251–2, 258–9, 300–1, 302, 303–4, 305–6, 308, 331–2, VI, i, 73, 95–6, 284–5, 429–30,
440–1, 474–5, 612–3, VI, ii, 124–6, 277–8; *Scots Peerage*, VII, 386; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of*
Scotland, II, 605–6). In addition, Andrew Glen represented the burgh of Linlithgow in the Restoration
Parliament. Glen is not recorded in any official parliamentary rolls for 1639–51, but is recorded in Sir
James Balfour's roll for 13 March 1651 (Balfour, *Historical Works*, IV, 258–62). Allan Dunlop (Irvine) and
John Rutherford (Jedburgh) are recorded in the burghal estate for 1 Jan. 1661. Dunlop is recorded in the
rolls for 4 June 1644 and 24 July 1645, whilst Rutherford is recorded extensively in the rolls from 31
Aug. 1639 to 23 May 1649. For clarification purposes it should be stated that these are *not* the two
individuals who sat in the Restoration Parliament (Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 219–20,
II, 603–4). All three burgesses have not been included in common membership analysis. Alexander Black
(Anstruther Easter) is listed in a dual commission for 4 Jan. 1649, as well as a single commission for 1 Jan.
1661. As per the rolls of 4 Jan. 1649 either Alexander Black or William Hamilton could represent Anstruther
Easter in the House (*A.P.S.*, VI, ii, 124–6). Young states that Black had been elected to serve in Parliament,
1640–1, but never took his seat (*The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 53). In accordance with this, Black is not
recorded in any of the parliamentary rolls for 1640–1 (*A.P.S.*, V, 251–2, 258–9, 300–1, 302, 303–4,
305–6, 308, 331–2).

⁵⁷ The 11 gentry associated with the Engagement and/or conservatism are as follows: Sir James Foulis
of Colington (Edinburgh), Sir James Lockhart of Lee (Lanark), Sir John Crawford of Kilbirnie (Ayr), John
Murray of Polmaise (Stirling), Sir Archibald Stirling of Carden (Stirling/Linlithgow), Sir Alexander Fraser
of Phillorth (Aberdeen), Sir William Scott of Ardross (Fife), Sir Alexander Abercrombie of Birkenboig
(Banff), Sir James Sinclair of Murkhill (Cathness), Sir Robert Innes of that ilk (Elgin) and Thomas
MacKenzie of Pluscardine (Elgin).

affiliation.⁵⁸ The remaining laird collaborated with the Cromwellian regime, despite having a conservative political background.⁵⁹ Six of the 12 burgesses (50 per cent) appear to have Engager background⁶⁰, whilst a further grouping of five burgesses (42 per cent) had radical track records.⁶¹ The political affiliation of James Moncrieff

⁵⁸ John Ferguson of Craigdarroch (Dumfries) had served in the parliamentary sessions of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649, whilst Sir Robert Gordon of Embo (Sutherland) had also served in both those sessions as well as that of 7 Mar. 1650. John Campbell of Ardochattan (Argyll) had sat in the first session of the first Triennial Parliament, 4. June 1644, and had also been included on the Committee of War for Argyllshire in 1648 and 1649. Combined with the geographic and territorial influence of the House of Argyll, membership of that committee under the auspices of the radical regime of 1649, allows for Campbell to be labelled as having a radical past. Nevertheless, Campbell did take the oath of allegiance of 1661 and was involved in the supervision of the removal of English forces from a garrison in Argyllshire (*A.P.S.*, VI, i, 95-6, VI, ii, 124-6, 277-8, 555-6; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 89-90, 239, 284).

⁵⁹ Sir Gilbert Ramsay of Balmaine (Kincardine) was included in three of the eight parliamentary rolls, 1639-41, and one of the six sessions of the First Triennial Parliament. He had also been included on his local Committee of War in 1648 (relating to the Engagement). Ramsay was appointed as Commissioner of the Cess in 1655, 1656 and 1660, and had assented to the Tender of Union at Dalkeith in 1652 (*A.P.S.*, V, 258-9, 308, 331-2, VI, i, 474-5; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 579).

⁶⁰ George Steill (Breachin) is included in the rolls of 3 Nov. 1646 and 2 Mar. 1648. He was a member of the Committee of War for his locality in 1647 and 1648, as well as a member of the 1648 Committee of Estates. Steill collaborated to a certain extent as he was a Commissioner of the Cess in 1655, 1656 and 1660 (*A.P.S.*, VI, i, 613-3, VI, ii, 3-4; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 656). James Lawder (Dunbar) is listed in the rolls of 7 Jan. 1645 and 2 Mar. 1648. Lawder was a member of the 1648 Committee of Estates and his local Committee of War, 1647-8 (*A.P.S.*, VI, i, 248-5, VI, ii, 3-4; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 411). John Auchterlony (Arbroath) is recorded in the rolls of the 1643 Convention, five of the six rolls of the First Triennial Parliament, and in the 1648 Engagement Parliament. Auchterlony served extensively on parliamentary committees including the Committees of War of 1644, 1646, 1647 and 1648, and the Committees of Estates of 1644, 1646, 1648 and 1651. He was also a Commissioner of the Cess in 1655 (*A.P.S.*, VI, i, 3-4; 95-6, 284-5, 440-1, 474-5, 612-3, VI, ii, 3-4; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 28). Four of the eight rolls, 1639-41, contain David Spence (Rutherglen). He is also recorded in the rolls of the 1643 Convention, the rolls of 7 Jan. 1645, 3 Nov. 1646 and 2 Mar. 1648. Spence secured membership of his local Committee of War in 1647 and 1648, membership of the Committees of Estates of 1648 and 1651 and was a Commissioner of the Cess in 1655, 1656 and 1660 (*A.P.S.*, V, 251-2, 258-9, 308, 331-2, VI, i, 3-4, 284-5, 612-3; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 653). John Ross (Nairn) is listed in the rolls of the Engagement Parliament and was a member of the 1648 Committee of Estates (*A.P.S.*, VI, ii, 3-4; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 595). John Henderson (Lochmaben) is listed in the rolls of three sessions of the First Triennial Parliament, as well as those of the Engagement Parliament. Henderson was likewise a member of his local Committee of War for 1647 (*A.P.S.*, VI, i, 284-5, 440-1, 612-3, VI, ii, 3-4; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 339).

⁶¹ James Borthwick (Edinburgh) is listed in the rolls of the radical parliamentary sessions of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649, plus that of 7 Mar. 1650. Borthwick was nominated to the 1649 Committee of Estates (*A.P.S.*, VI, ii, 124-6, 277-8, 555-6; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 62). John Williamson (Kirkcaldy) is noted in five parliamentary sessions, 1639-41, the 1643 Convention of Estates, the 1648 Engagement Parliament and the radical parliamentary sessions of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649. The 1649 rolls stipulate that Williamson's commission was a dual one (either Williamson or James Law was to represent the burgh). The fact that Williamson secured membership of the Committee for Plantation of Kirks and Valuation of Teinds may well indicate that it was indeed Williamson who represented Kirkcaldy in 1649 (*A.P.S.*, V, 251-2, 258-9, 305-6, 308, 331-2, VI, i, 3-4, VI, ii, 3-4, 124-6, 277-8; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 734). A similar problem arises with Alexander Black (Anstruther Easter); he is recorded in a dual commission for 4 Jan. 1649 (either Black or William Hamilton was to represent the burgh). The fact that Black had been deemed suitable to serve in the 1649 Parliament indicates that he was of radical persuasion (*A.P.S.*, VI, ii, 124-6; Young, *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 53). George Garden (Burntisland) is included in six out of eight rolls, 1639-41, all six sessions of the first Triennial Parliament, the 1648 Engagement Parliament, and the sessions of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649. Garden's commission for 1649 was also a dual one (either Garden or John Brown was to represent the burgh). In common with

(Crail) cannot be ascertained f

Despite the zeal for the restoration elections to the Restoration Parliament not be eradicated. On the other if not all, of those gentry and burghs have modified their political allegiance. Pragmatism, self-interest and the regime, may have been paramount in the management of the elections to the employment of the gentry in the process commenced in late November. A contemporary observer, Sir James procedure. Letters were dispatched informing him who was to be elected. A nominated royalist laird would win the elections of the desired Commissioner that in several shires such a man with a radical political heritage. The were dealt with by the House of the Crown.⁶⁴ In tandem with

⁶¹ (continued) Black, Garden was also Valuation of Teinds. Garden also secured an impressive record of parliamentary commissions 300-1, 302, 308, 331-2, VI, i, 95-6, 284-5 (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 270. His parliamentary rolls, 1639-41, the rolls of the First Triennial Parliament, 1643-41, and his commission of 1649 is a dual one (either Cunningham was elected to the 1649 Commission or a full portfolio of parliamentary commissions 302, 308, 331-2, VI, i, 3-4, 124-6, 277-8).
⁶² James Moncrieff (Crail) is recorded Nov. 1646 (*A.P.S.*, V, i, 73, 612-3; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 270). Evidence applies to the political inclination of his parliamentary rolls, 1639-51, but listed in the 1651 Committee of Estates (Balfour, *History of Scotland*, I, 277-8). The parliamentary rolls list 'Alexander' relates to Alexander Wedderburne of King's Blackness. Wedderburne of Blackness was or acting as a royalist agent in 1660, he had a full Assembly, was a member of the Committee of Estates, been a member of the Scottish diplomatic corps rolls of 24 July 1645, 26 Nov. 1645, 3 Nov. 1645; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 239.

⁶³ MacKenzie, *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland*, I, 239.
⁶⁴ The commissions to William Munro younger, (both Peebles), James Crichton (Dumfries), Sir John Urquhart of Cromarty approved on 4 Jan. 1661 (*A.P.S.*, VII, 2). If Ferguson of Craigdarroch recorded in the *Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 239). No rival election of Peebles as per Nov. 1660. Crichton of S 20 Nov., although a rival election was later

the Cromwellian regime, despite of the 12 burgesses (50 per cent) further grouping of five burgesses political affiliation of James Moncrieff

in the parliamentary sessions of 4 Jan. and and) had also served in both those sessions n (Argyll) had sat in the first session of the 1 included on the Committee of War for thic and territorial influence of the House es of the radical regime of 1649, allows for ss, Campbell did take the oath of allegiance oval of English forces from a garrison in ; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*,

ided in three of the eight parliamentary rolls, ariament. He had also been included on his it). Ramsay was appointed as Commissioner 'ender of Union at Dalkeith in 1652 (*A.P.S.*, *Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 579).

ov. 1646 and 2 Mar. 1648. He was a member as well as a member of the 1648 Committee Commissioner of the Cess in 1655, 1656 and *Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 656). James Lawder awder was a member of the 1648 Committee , VI, i, 248-5, VI, ii, 3-4; Young (ed.), *The s recorded in the rolls of the 1643 Convention, ie 1648 Engagement Parliament. Auchterlony he Committees of War of 1644, 1646, 1647 48 and 1651. He was also a Commissioner of 474-5, 612-3, VI, ii, 3-4; Young (ed.), *The -41, contain David Spence (Rutherglen). He olls of 7 Jan. 1645, 3 Nov. 1646 and 2 Mar. of War in 1647 and 1648, membership of the issioner of the Cess in 1655, 1656 and 1660 2-3; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, agement Parliament and was a member of the l.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 595). John ns of the First Triennial Parliament, as well as se a member of his local Committee of War oung (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 339). the radical parliamentary sessions of 4 Jan. and nominated to the 1649 Committee of Estates *Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 62). John Williamson -1, the 1643 Convention of Estates, the 1648 ns of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649. The 1649 rolls her Williamson or James Law was to represent of the Committee for Plantation of Kirks and Williamson who represented Kirkcaldy in 1649 , VI, ii, 3-4, 124-6, 277-8; Young (ed.), *The vith Alexander Black (Anstruther Easter); he is ck or William Hamilton was to represent the serve in the 1649 Parliament indicates that he e Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 53). George Garden all six sessions of the first Triennial Parliament, n. and 23 May 1649. Garden's commission for was to represent the burgh). In common with**

(Crail) cannot be ascertained from the available evidence.⁶²

Despite the zeal for the restoration of the monarchy and the management of the elections to the Restoration Parliament, pockets of radicalism still prevailed and could not be eradicated. On the other hand, it can also be tentatively suggested that some, if not all, of those gentry and burgesses with a radical political background may simply have modified their political allegiance in response to changing political circumstances. Pragmatism, self-interest and the desire to secure influence under a new royalist regime, may have been paramount in the minds of many Members. Effective royalist management of the elections to the Restoration Parliament was conducted through the employment of the gentry in the localities for fractional purposes. The electoral process commenced in late November 1660 and continued throughout December. A contemporary observer, Sir George MacKenzie of Rosehaugh, described this procedure. Letters were dispatched to the most influential royalist laird in each shire informing him who was to be elected as commissioners for that particular shire. The nominated royalist laird would then convene the electoral meeting and secure the elections of the desired Commissioners. In light of this electoral procedure, it is clear that in several shires such a manoeuvre had failed to prevent the election of gentry with a radical political heritage.⁶³ Indeed, four cases of disputed elections in the shires were dealt with by the House on 4 January 1661 and all were settled in favour of the Crown.⁶⁴ In tandem with electoral manipulation in the shires went a

⁶¹ (continued) Black, Garden was also nominated to the 1649 Commission for Plantation of Kirks and Valuation of Teinds. Garden also secured membership of the 1649 Committee of Estates and possessed an impressive record of parliamentary committee membership throughout the 1640s (*A.P.S.*, V, 251-2, 258-9, 300-1, 302, 308, 331-2, VI, i, 95-6, 284-5, 429-30, 440-1, 474-5, 612-3, VI, ii, 3-4, 124-6, 277-8; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 270). Robert Cunningham (Kinghorn) is listed in five of the eight parliamentary rolls, 1639-41, the rolls of the Engagement Parliament, and those of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649. His commission of 1649 is a dual one (either Cunningham or John Boswell was to represent the burgh). Cunningham was elected to the 1649 Commission for Plantation of Kirks and Valuation of Teinds and had a full portfolio of parliamentary committee membership throughout the 1640s (*A.P.S.*, V, 251-2, 258-9, 302, 308, 331-2, VI, ii, 3-4, 124-6, 277-8; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 170).

⁶² James Moncrieff (Crail) is recorded in the rolls of the 1644 Convention of Estates and the rolls of 3 Nov. 1646 (*A.P.S.*, V, i, 73, 612-3; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 504). A similar lack of evidence applies to the political inclination of Andrew Glen (Linlithgow), the burgess not recorded in any parliamentary rolls, 1639-51, but listed in Balfour's rolls for 13 Mar. 1651. Glen had been included on the 1651 Committee of Estates (Balfour, *Historical Works*, IV, 258-62; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 277-8). The parliamentary rolls list 'Alexander Wedderburne' as the burgess representative of Dundee. This relates to Alexander Wedderburne of Kingennie and Easter Powrie and not Sir Alexander Wedderburne of Blackness. Wedderburne of Blackness was one of the most influential figures within the burghal estate. Although acting as a royalist agent in 1660, he had a formidable political track record; he had attended the 1638 Glasgow Assembly, was a member of the Committees of Estates of 1640, 1641, 1646, 1647, 1648 and 1651 and had been a member of the Scottish diplomatic delegation for the Treaty of Ripon. Wedderburne is listed in the rolls of 24 July 1645, 26 Nov. 1645, 3 Nov. 1646 and 2 Mar. 1648 (*A.P.S.*, V, i, 440-1, 474-5, 612-3, VII, 3-4; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 722-3, 725).

⁶³ MacKenzie, *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland*, p. 12.

⁶⁴ The commissions to William Murray of Stanhope and Sir Archibald Murray of Blackbarony, younger, (both Peebles), James Crichton of St Leonards and Robert Ferguson of Craigdarroch (both Dumfries), Sir John Urquhart of Cromarty and Thomas MacKenzie of Pluscardine (Inverness, Elgin) were approved on 4 Jan. 1661 (*A.P.S.*, VII, 2). Robert Ferguson of Craigdarroch is the same individual as John Ferguson of Craigdarroch recorded in the rolls of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649 (*ibid.*, VI, ii, 124-6, 277-8). This is due to a technical error made in the recording of Ferguson's full name in 1649 (Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 239). No rival election was noted in the parliamentary commission for the shire of Peebles as per Nov. 1660. Crichton of St Leonards and Ferguson of Craigdarroch had been elected on 20 Nov., although a rival election was later held on 27 Nov. Two rival elections took place for the shire

complementary process of political pressure in the burghs. Rothes had been attempting to secure a political base in support of John Maitland, 2nd Earl of Lauderdale in the burghs throughout November 1660. To facilitate his campaign Rothes had recruited the influential Sir Alexander Wedderburne (Dundee), one of the most prominent figures within the burghal establishment, to whip up support. William Cunningham, 9th Earl of Glencairn, Chancellor, also appears to have been involved in the exertion of electoral influence in the shires and burghs. The end result, in both the shires and the burghs, was successful. According to Robert Baillie, minister of Kilwinning, a close ally of the Marquess of Argyll and a leading figure within the Church of Scotland throughout the Covenanting epoch, 'the chancellor so guided it, that the shyres and burroughs' elected only those 'that were absolutely for the king'.⁶⁵

Unlike the period 1639–51 (where there was a plethora of parliamentary sessions) which suffers from a severe lack of manuscript evidence relating to parliamentary commissions, commissions are fortunately available for the Restoration Parliament. Detailed consideration of those commissions reveals that 47 of the 59 gentry (80 per cent) and 59 of the 61 burgesses (97 per cent) commissioned to sit in the Restoration Parliament actually took up their seats.⁶⁶

Further scrutiny of parliamentary commissions reveals that apart from the cases of disputed elections only one laird who had been officially commissioned by his shire, Dougall Stewart of Kirkcoun (Bute) was replaced by another representative, James Stewart of Kirkcoun, by the time the Restoration Parliament convened on 1 January 1661.⁶⁷ In addition, John Campbell of Glenurquhy had been chosen as one of the Commissioners of Argyllshire at the electoral diet of 28 November 1660. Although Campbell of Glenurquhy did not take his seat in Parliament on 1 January 1661, no replacement had been forwarded for him.⁶⁸ Analysis of shire commissions also reveals that four shires (Banff, Bute, Clackmannan, Orkney and Shetland) elected one Commissioner at their electoral diets. Each of these four shires was similarly represented by only one Commissioner in the parliamentary rolls of 1 January 1661. In addition three further shires (Dumbarton, Nairn and Sutherland) have no manuscript

⁶⁴ (continued) of Inverness on 29 Nov., paralleled by two similar rival elections for Elgin on 22 Nov. The election for 20 Nov., although a rival election was later held on 27 Nov. Two rival elections took place for the shire of Inverness on 29 Nov., paralleled by two similar rival elections for Elgin on 22 Nov. The election for the shire of Inverness had taken place on 29 Nov., but by the time the Restoration Parliament convened Hugh Fraser of Belladrum had been replaced by Colin Mackenzie of Redcastle. Sir John Urquhart of Cromarty retained the remaining commission for Inverness (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/2/17/3, P.A. 7/25/11/5/1–2, P.A. 7/25/17/3–4, P.A. 7/25/23/3/1–2, P.A. 7/25/26/3; A.P.S., VII, 4; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 263, II, 458). Two disputed elections had taken place on 3 Dec. relating to the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright. The issue was taken on board by the Restoration Parliament on 8 Jan. 1661 which ordered a Commissioner to be elected. A further election was duly held on 5 Feb. whereby David MacBrair, the initial choice of 3 Dec., was elected. MacBrair took his seat in the House on 13 Feb. (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/20/4/5/1–2/6; A.P.S., VII, 10, 32; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 444–5). Scottish R.O., Supplementary Parliamentary Papers, IX, 1661, P.A. 7/9/2–6, provides a detailed account of the background to the cases of the disputed elections.

⁶⁵ R. Baillie, *Letters and Journals, 1637–62*, ed. D. Laing (3 vols., Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1841–2), III, 463; *The Lauderdale Papers*, I, 38.

⁶⁶ Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/2–34 (shires), P.A. 7/25/35–101 (burghs); A.P.S., VII, 4–5.

⁶⁷ Dougall Stewart of Kirkcoun had been elected as the sole representative of the shire of Bute (although it was legally entitled to elect two Commissioners) on 27 Nov. 1660. James Stewart of Kirkcoun represented the burgh in Parliament on 1 Jan. 1661 (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/7/2; A.P.S., VII, 4).

⁶⁸ Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/3/3; A.P.S., VII, 4; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 98.

commissions listed for the Restoration Parliament. Each in the role of commissioners pertaining to the burgh Restoration parliamentary roll.

Manuscript parliamentary commissions before indicate that party discipline was a lesson from the turmoil of the

Scottish parliamentary rolls of the study of seventeenth-century Scotland. That there was a shift toward Burghs in 1646–48 has been Engagement in the 1648 Parliament personnel who were included. Within the perspective of the the period 1639–51 witnessed to be matched in the post-1660 history of the British archipelago the Scottish Covenanting Movement. Scottish parliamentary rolls can be translated into real movement as evidenced through

⁶⁹ Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/6/3 P.A. 7/25/25/1, P.A. 7/25/33/1–

⁷⁰ Thomas Watson was commissioner for the burgh of Montrose. However (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/82/2–3) The clerk in the Restoration Parliament representatives of three burghs. Within of 1 Jan. 1661 the burghal representatives after Haddington in the parliament who had been duly elected on 1 Dec. or simply made an error in notation. 7/25/58/3, P.A. 7/25/65/2; A.P.S. Patrick Bissett was elected on 1 Dec. Patrick Nisbet as the appropriate representative Nisbet' is not recorded in Young error on the part of the clerk who eldest son of the deceased John I. Galloway in the Restoration Parliament. The parliamentary rolls, however, I A.P.S., VII, 5; Young (ed.), *The clerk, it would therefore also*

ghs. Rothes had been attempting
1, 2nd Earl of Lauderdale in the
campaign Rothes had recruited
(e), one of the most prominent
support. William Cunningham,
ve been involved in the exertion
and result, in both the shires and
iaillie, minister of Kilwinning, a
re within the Church of Scotland
so guided it, that the shyres and
for the king'.⁶⁵

lethora of parliamentary sessions)
vidence relating to parliamentary
for the Restoration Parliament.
that 47 of the 59 gentry (80 per
issioned to sit in the Restoration

veals that apart from the cases of
cially commissioned by his shire,
by another representative, James
arliament convened on 1 January
y had been chosen as one of the
of 28 November 1660. Although
Parliament on 1 January 1661, no
s of shire commissions also reveals
kney and Shetland) elected one
our shires was similarly represented
olls of 1 January 1661. In addition
utherland) have no manuscript
nilar rival elections for Elgin on 22 Nov.
eld on 27 Nov. Two rival elections took
imilar rival elections for Elgin on 22 Nov.
9 Nov., but by the time the Restoration
ced by Colin Mackenzie of Redcastle. Sir
ar Inverness (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/2/17/3,
2, P.A. 7/25/26/3; A.P.S., VII, 4; Young
uted elections had taken place on 3 Dec.
n on board by the Restoration Parliament
A further election was duly held on 5 Feb.
cted. MacBrair took his seat in the House
. VII, 10, 32; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments*
mentary Papers, IX, 1661, P.A. 7/9/2-6,
the disputed elections.

ng (3 vols., Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh,

101 (burghs); A.P.S., VII, 4-5.
representative of the shire of Bute (although
1660, James Stewart of Kirkcoun represented
7/25/7/2; A.P.S., VII, 4).
(ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 98.

commissions listed for the Restoration Parliament, but all three are noted with two commissioners each in the rolls of that Parliament.⁶⁹ By way of comparison, commissions pertaining to the burghs, in general, adhere to membership according to the Restoration parliamentary rolls.⁷⁰

Manuscript parliamentary commissions relating to the Restoration Parliament therefore indicate that party discipline had been maintained. The Crown had learned its lesson from the turmoil of the Covenanting years.

6. Conclusion

Scottish parliamentary rolls constitute a valuable and underused historical source in the study of seventeenth-century political factionalism. Inroad has been made in the quest for a Scottish constitutional opposition in the Coronation Parliament of 1633. That there was a shift towards conservatism by the Commissioners of the Shires and Burghs in 1646-48 has been clearly demonstrated. The radical opposition to the Engagement in the 1648 Parliament has been clearly identified, as has Covenanting personnel who were included in the membership of the Restoration Parliament. Within the perspective of the history of the Scottish Parliament as a national institution, the period 1639-51 witnessed the zenith of Scottish parliamentary development, only to be matched in the post-Revolution era of the 1690s and the early 1700s. The history of the British archipelago in the Civil War period is arguably dominated by the Scottish Covenanting Movement. Within the wider British perspective, therefore, Scottish parliamentary rolls provide a corpus of empirical parliamentary data which can be translated into real political analysis of factionalism and party within that movement as evidenced through the institution of the Scottish Parliament.

⁶⁹ Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/6/3, P.A. 7/25/7/2, P.A. 7/25/9/2, P.A. 7/25/12/2-3, P.A. 7/25/24/1-2, P.A. 7/25/25/1, P.A. 7/25/33/1/-2; A.P.S., VII, 4-5.

⁷⁰ Thomas Watson was commissioned as per 8 Dec. 1660 to represent Anstruther Wester, but that burgh and burgess are not recorded in the rolls of 1 Jan. 1661 (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/38/4; A.P.S., VII, 5; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 719). No electoral commission is recorded/has survived for the burgh of Montrose. However, John Ronald represented Montrose in the Restoration Parliament (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/82/2-3; A.P.S., VII, 5; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 595). The clerk in the Restoration Parliament appears to have made mistakes concerning the names of the representatives of three burghs. William Simpson was elected on 24 Dec. to represent Dysart. In the rolls of 1 Jan. 1661 the burghal representative for Dysart is listed as William Seaton. Dysart is listed immediately after Haddington in the parliamentary rolls; Haddington's Commissioner was indeed a William Simpson who had been duly elected on 1 Dec. 1660. Therefore the clerk has either confused Simpson with Seaton or simply made an error in noting down the names when the rolls were called (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/58/3, P.A. 7/25/65/2; A.P.S., VII, 5; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, II, 630, 639). Patrick Bisset was elected on 1 Dec. 1660 to represent the burgh of Lanark. The rolls of 1 Jan. 1661 list Patrick Nisbet as the appropriate representative (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/78/3; A.P.S., VII, 5). 'Patrick Nisbet' is not recorded in Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*. This would again appear to be an error on the part of the clerk when the rolls were being called out. On 1 Dec. 1660 Robert Dickson, eldest son of the deceased John Dickson, minister of Kells, was elected to represent the burgh of New Galloway in the Restoration Parliament. Young also identifies Robert Dickson as the elected Member. The parliamentary rolls, however, list John Dickson as the relevant Member (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/84/2; A.P.S., VII, 5; Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of Scotland*, I, 185). Given the noted unreliable record of the clerk, it would therefore also appear that he has had made a similar blunder in the case of Dickson.

APPENDIX 1: Attendance figures of the Three Estates, 1648-1651

Analysis of attendance per estate according to available sederunts of Parliament

Date of Parliamentary Roll	Reference	Nobility	Number of Shires	Number of Commissioners	Number of Burghs	Number of Commissioners	Total Membership
2 March 1648	A.P.S., VI, ii, 3-4	56	(1) 29 (Maximum) (1) 26 (Minimum)	(2) 53 (Maximum) (2) 47 (Minimum)	(3) 56 (Maximum) (3) 48 (Minimum)	(4) 57 (Maximum) (4) 49 (Minimum)	166 (Maximum) 152 (Minimum)
4 January 1649	A.P.S., VI, ii, 124-6	16	(5) 29 (Maximum) (5) 26 (Minimum)	(6) 52 (Maximum) (6) 46 (Minimum)	(7) 57 (Maximum) (7) 50 (Minimum)	(8) 58 (Maximum) (8) 51 (Minimum)	126 (Maximum) 113 (Minimum)
23 May 1649	A.P.S., VI, ii, 277-378	20	(9) 30 (Maximum) (9) 28 (Minimum)	(10) 53 (Maximum) (10) 49 (Minimum)	(11) 58 (Maximum) (11) 49 (Minimum)	(12) 59 (Maximum) (12) 50 (Minimum)	131 (Maximum) 119 (Minimum)
7 March 1650	A.P.S., VI, ii, 555-6	23	(13) 30 (Maximum) (13) 16 (Minimum)	(14) 57 (Maximum) (14) 29 (Minimum)	(15) 57 (Maximum) (15) 24 (Minimum)	(16) 58 (Maximum) (16) 25 (Minimum)	138 (Maximum) 77 (Minimum)

Formulae:

Maximum figures for number of shires/burghs = number of shires/burghs listed with Commissioners + number of shires/burghs listed with no Commissioners
Maximum figures for number of Commissioners = number of Commissioners of Shires/Commissioners of Burghs listed + maximum possible number of unlisted Commissioners (one for each burgh listed, but with no Commissioners named)

Minimum figures for number of shires/burghs = number of shires/burghs listed with Commissioners (two for each shire listed, but with no Commissioners named)

Minimum figures for number of Commissioners = number of Commissioners of Shires/Commissioners of Burghs listed.

NOTES

- (1) 29 shires are listed in total; of these three shires have no Commissioners named (Clackmannan, Kircardine, Inverness). Excluding these three shires, the minimum number of shires represented thus equals 26.
- (2) The number of Commissioners of Shires listed excluding the above three shires (as per (1)) is 47. If the above three shires sent two Commissioners of the Shire each, then the maximum possible total is 53 (i.e. 47 + (3 × 2)). Five shires sent only one Commissioner each (Sutherland, Elgin, Naim, Kirkcudbright, Caithness).
- (3) 56 burghs are listed in total; of these eight burghs have no Commissioners named (Aunstruther Easter, Rendrew, Peebles, Rothesay, Kiltrenny, Annan, Sargubar and New Galloway). Excluding these eight burghs, the minimum number of burghs represented thus equals 48.
- (4) The burgh of Edinburgh sent two Commissioners of the Burghs, thus, the maximum possible total equals 57 and the minimum total = 49.
- (5) 29 shires are listed in total; of these three shires have no Commissioners named (Bute, Kincardine and Banff). Excluding these three shires, the minimum number of shires represented thus equals 26. Two shires sent only one Commissioner each (Caithness, Kirkcudbright).
- (6) Excluding the above three shires (as per (5)), the number of Commissioners is 46. Assuming the above three shires (as per (5)) sent two Commissioners each, the

Formulae:

Maximum figures for number of shires/burghs =

Maximum figures for number of Commissioners = number of shires/burghs listed with Commissioners + number of shires/burghs listed with no Commissioners

Shires/Commissioners of Burghs listed

(13)₁₆ (Minimum) (14)₂₉ (Maximum) (15)₂₄ (Minimum) (16)₂₅ (Maximum) 138 (Maximum) 77 (Minimum)

Minimum figures for number of shires/burghs = number of shires/burghs listed with Commissioners
Minimum figures for number of Commissioners = number of Commissioners of Shires/Commissioners of Burghs listed

+ maximum possible number of unlisted Commissioners (one for each burgh listed, but with no Commissioners named)
(two for each shire listed, but with no Commissioners named)

NOTES

- (1) 29 shires are listed in total; of these three shires have no Commissioners named (Clackmannan, Kincardine, Inverness). Excluding these three shires, the minimum number of shires represented thus equals 26.
- (2) The number of Commissioners of Shires listed excluding the above three shires (as per (1)) is 47. If the above three shires sent two Commissioners of the Shire each, then the maximum possible total is 53 (i.e. $47 + (3 \times 2)$). Five shires sent only one Commissioner each (Sutherland, Elgin, Nairn, Kirkcudbright, Caithness).
- (3) 56 burghs are listed in total; of these eight burghs have no Commissioners named (Anstruther Easter, Renfrew, Peebles, Rothesay, Kiltenny, Annan, Sanguhar and New Galloway). Excluding these eight burghs, the minimum number of burghs represented thus equals 48.
- (4) The burgh of Edinburgh sent two Commissioners of the Burghs, thus, the maximum possible total equals 57 and the minimum total = 49.
- (5) 29 shires are listed in total; of these three shires have no Commissioners named (Bute, Kincardine and Banff). Excluding these three shires, the minimum number of shires represented thus equals 26. Two shires sent only one Commissioner each (Caithness, Kirkcudbright).
- (6) Excluding the above three shires (as per (5)), the number of Commissioners is 46. Assuming the above three shires (as per (5)) sent two Commissioners each, the maximum possible total is $46 + (3 \times 2) = 52$.
- (7) 57 burghs are listed in total; of these seven burghs have no Commissioners named (Lauder, Kiltenny, Annan, Lochmaben, New Galloway, Dingwall and Dornoch). Excluding these seven burghs, the minimum number of burghs represented thus equals 50.
- (8) The burgh of Edinburgh sent two Commissioners of the burghs. Thus, the maximum possible total equals 58 and the minimum total equals 51.
- (9) 30 shires are listed in total; of these two shires have no Commissioners named (Bute and Banff). Excluding these two shires, the minimum number of shires represented thus equals 28. Seven shires sent only one Commissioner each (Sutherland, Clackmannan, Nairn, Peebles, Kirkcudbright, Ross and Caithness).
- (10) Excluding the above two shires (as per (9)), the number of Commissioners listed is 49. Assuming the above two shires (as per (9)) sent two Commissioners each, the maximum possible total is $49 + (2 \times 2) = 53$.
- (11) 58 burghs are listed in total; of these nine burghs have no Commissioners named (Anstruther Easter, Pittenweem, Anstruther Wester, Annan, Kiltenny, Lochmaben, New Galloway, Dingwall and Dornoch). Excluding these nine burghs, the minimum number of burghs represented thus equals 49.
- (12) The burgh of Edinburgh sent two Commissioners. Thus, the maximum possible total equals 59 and the minimum total equals 50.
- (13) 30 shires are listed in total; of these 14 shires have no Commissioners named (Dumfries, Dunbarton, Elgin, Nairn, Bute, Ayr, Kincardine, Kirkcudbright, Aberdeen, Forfar, Banff, Inverness, Argyll and Caithness). Excluding these 14 shires, the minimum number of shires represented thus equals 16. Three shires sent only one Commissioner each (Sutherland, Clackmannan and Ross).
- (14) Excluding the above 14 shires (as per (13)), the number of Commissioners listed is 29. Assuming the above 14 shires (as per (13)), sent two Commissioners each, the maximum possible total is $29 + (14 \times 2) = 57$.
- (15) 57 burghs are listed in total; of these 33 burghs have no Commissioners named (Stirling, Kirkcaldy, Montrose, Anstruther Easter, Burntisland, Inverkeithing, Brechin, Irvine, Jedburgh, Kirkcudbright, Wigton, Pittenweem, Dunfermline, Anstruther Wester, Selkirk, Renfrew, Lanark, Arbroath, Peebles, Crail, Rothesay, Nairn, Forfar, Rutherglen, North Berwick, Cullen, Lauder, Kiltenny, Annan, Lochmaben, Sanguhar, New Galloway and Dingwall). Excluding these 33 burghs, the minimum number of burghs represented thus equals 24.
- (16) The burgh of Edinburgh sent two Commissioners. Thus, the maximum possible total equals 58 and the minimum total equals 25.

Provincial Inf
The Case

S

Recent years have seen a co the late seventeenth and eig increasing recognition that without a better understandi statute book, historians' kno essay of mine explored the v for legislation to promote ec In many ways local initiative pressure on the legislature. I been the subject of increasin Revolution of 1688.³ In this it was important because m based on local communities, specialization. Part of the rea of some historians with V legitimately, from pressure London companies.⁴ Nor c historians working on the Er is that of the impact of Wes

* I must place on record my th comments on the ideas which for were governed by my desire in a national events.

¹ Much of this has been as a r for which see *idem.*, 'Towards a 312-21.

² S.N. Handley, 'Local Legisl 1689-1731', *ante*, IX (1990), 14-.

³ For example, *Stilling The G 1689-1750*, eds. L. Davison, T. essays by Davison and Keirn; A.G. 1690-1790 (1992); P. Langford, *idem.*, *A Polite and Commercial 1 Power. War, Money and the Engl*

⁴ An apposite example is the which cites several articles on spec for its primary material. Since the door for writing it from the pers

APPENDIX 2:

Analysis of the numerical composition of the Scottish Estates, 1648-1651

Movement per session in the numerical composition of the Scottish Estates, 1648-1651 (as per available parliamentary rolls)

Date	Nobility Movement per session	Gentry Movement per session	Burgesses Movement per session	Total Movement per session
2 March 1648-4 January 1649	-40	-1 (Maximum) -1 (Minimum)	+1 (Maximum) +2 (Minimum)	-40 (Maximum) -39 (Minimum)
4 January 1649-23 May 1649	+4	+1 (Maximum) +3 (Minimum)	+1 (Maximum) -1 (Minimum)	+5 (Maximum) +6 (Minimum)
23 May 1649-7 March 1650	+3	+4 (Maximum) -20 (Minimum)	-1 (Maximum) -25 (Minimum)	+7 (Maximum) -42 (Minimum)

NOTES

Movement figures for the gentry and the burgesses are calculated on the basis of the respective maximum and minimum figures listed in Appendix 1. Thus, the maximum movement figures for the gentry between the sessions of 23 May 1649 and 7 March 1650 = 57 (Maximum) -53 (Maximum) = +4. Likewise, the minimum movement figure for the same period = 29 (Minimum) -49 (Minimum) = -20.