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JOHN R. YOUNG
University of Strathclyde

The nature of factionalism within the Scottish Parliament in general and within the Covenanting 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 Covenanting 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 dimension 4 indicates that the Covenanting 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 Covenanting 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 Covenanting 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. Bogh and Shire Commissioners*, ed. M. Young, (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1992-93).
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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 curtailling 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. 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 ascendency 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.

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 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


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 Scotti's 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. Episcopal government has been abolished by the Glencoe 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 Shire) and burgesses (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 clergies played a prominent role in the management of that Parliament). That Parliament was dominated over the General Assembly was reflected in the need for all legislation of the 1638 Glasgow Assembly to be ratified by the Scottish Parliament.

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. 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.

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. Burgh 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 Estates 12, 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 participant 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. Unusually, 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.


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 Burden and the Commission for Receiving the Brobery 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, I 59; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, eds. D. Mason and P.H. Brown (2nd ser., 8 vols., Edinburgh, 1899–1908), VII, 93–4.


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

It is to be remembered that all their persons abovenamed were not present at the first meeting but at most of the meetings they were 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 Kinneir appointed as President.

The 1633 Parliament was composed of 12 clerics (ten bishops and two archbishops), 71 nobles, 45 gentry representing 27 shires and 51 burgesses representing 51 burghs. 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 Gaedhealtacht or at its periphery (Inverness, Cromarty, Tarbat and Banff). Two of the remaining five shires had their geographic domain in the Scottish Border/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.
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 Kinnoull; Chancellor; William Douglas, 6th Earl of Morton; Treasurer; Thomas Hamilton, 2nd Earl of Haddington, Provost Seil; 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 Dunsbar and Lord Cameron. Morton exercised the proxies of the Earl of Argyll and Lords Gray and Kinloss.

Highlands. However, the fact that only one Commissioner could be elected to the Scottish localities (Stirling), constituted three of the most particular were of crucial significance in the heart of Scotland that neither of these three shires could contribute capital and finance towards the management of the Coronation. These three shires political commissioners were amenable to Crown and after the 1633 Parliament to the elections of both shires there was indeed political representation.
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9 marqueses, 28 earls, five viscount, ol, Chancellor William Douglas, 6h 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 Com- missioners 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 centered 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 Covenanting 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 burgess. 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; Dickey 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 Covenanting Parliament of 1639 (Clackmannan, Ayrshire, Fife 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, Sutherland 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 Marquess of Hamilton, and John Stewart, 1st Earl of

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 Dumfries, which had not been represented in the Coronation Parliament, sent an elected Commissioner to that of 1639. Two further burghs (Queensberry and Ayr) were represented in 1639 but not 1633. Kilbrandon, Ayr and Sanquhar, on the other hand, were represented in the 1633 Parliament but not 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; Dickey and Rait, Thoughts on the Union, p. 56; A.P.S., V, 62).
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Traquair, King’s Commissioner. The elections were carried out under the direction
of the Tables: The Tables constituted the political elite of the Covenanting 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 Covenanting
majority in the election of the Commissioners of the Shires and Burghs.29

Therefore what correlation can be established between the parliamentary rolls of
1633 and 1639 and Covenanting 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 Covenanting 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 Covenanting 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
direct use to the Covenanting 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 Covenanting 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

29 The lack of influence in the 1639 elections was a deliberate policy opnion 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
Covenanting Movement within the shires and burghs. MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the
31 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 Kinnaird (Aberdeen) and William Drummond of Raccator (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 Comonplath 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 Ludovic 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 enfolded 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) form Redfrew to Dumbarton due to the scarcity of firewood in Dunbartonshire (Young ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, II, 812-3). Sir George Elphinstone of Blythswood, James Clerk, also had his domain in the west. The gentry representing Borders' thistle were as follows: Sir William Douglas of Cavers (Rosslyn), Sir Robert Gedson of Lag (Dunfries), Sir John Charnet of Annfield (Dumfries) and Sir Patrick MacKie of Lag (Kirkcudbright and Wigtown). The gentry representing Highland thistles were Sir Duncan Campbell of Auchinbreck (Argyll), Sir John MacKenzie of Tarbat (Inverness) and Hector Bannartyne of Kernes, 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 (Baird) represented a far north eastern burgh. William Glendoning (Kirkcudbright), James Williamson (Peebles) and Robert Gordon (New Galloway) formed the grouping of burgesses from the Border. Thomas Bruce (Surling) represented the central belt, while John Semple (Dumbarton) and Gideon Jack (Lanark) represented the west. Matthew Spence (Rothesay) represented a burgh in the vicinity of the western Highland/Lothian divide.
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first Triennial Parliament, 2 March 1648

Covenanter Movement but congressional alliance of the two parliaments between November and December had become embroiled in the ecclesiastical structures of the Church of England between the 13th and 14th of the Covenant on the side of the civil war. The Covenanters had become increasingly a parliamentary alliance of a religious and political nature. The Scottish army at Newcastle, the nation of the National Covenant regarding the imposition of the civil war as, per voting divisions of 24 March, and later that month (4,8 million Scots to be paid 100 pounds. Throughout October art of the Scottish diplomatic tradition as well as England) was on the side of the Covenant and the English, the Newcastle Propositions (as more on 16 and 24 December) Parliament on 16 January 1647 of freeholders in Dunbartonshire (Young stone of Blythwood, Justice Clerk, also rector) were as follows: Sir William Douglas of Aitkenhead (Dumbarton) The representatives of Highland shires elected of Tarbat (inverness) and Hector of the burgesses representing eastern Shetland and Robert Cunningham of the burgh, William Glendinning (Kirkcudbright) formed the grouping of burghes being the chief group of the Scottish Parliament, while John Steple (Dumbarton) at the reopening of the Parliament in the new year.

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 the Engagers who were aligning themselves to the conservative wing of the Covenanting Movement in the parliamentary session commencing on 3 November 1646.

Forty-eight nobles, 53 burghs representing 28 shires 34 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

Glasgow University Library, Ossie Collection, Ossie 4460, Some Papers Given in by the Commissioners of the Parliament of Scotland, To the House of Commons 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. (1–6).


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.

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 burgal 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 J 1646 and 2 March 1648.39

That electoral management fact that 25 of the 47 gentry included in the parliament of 1646. The similar figures of a total of 66 Parliament (based on minuut session commencing on 3 Nov. in favour of conservative/Er Commission of the two sets of within the commissioners of the First Triennial Parliament.

During the sixth session, 5 political and factional agent temperature of the Commis large number (though not all) the King. Fletcher of Innerpe in the House would result in (as proved ultimately to be cc ‘the Argillians and the commiss week after Fletcher’s initial a that of 15, a reduction of 50.

The rolls of 3 November breach of parliamentary regu all other burgs were entitled by the 1621 Convention of Parliaments, 1639–45, confi represented by two Commiss dington, Anstruther Easter, I of the Shire Commissioners i political weight had been red had witnessed the emergency curtailing the traditional pow

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. 30

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. 31 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 Argillians and the commissioners of the church intrigued so busily’. 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. 32

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 Covenanting Parliaments, 1639–45, confirm this regulation. Seven eastern burghs, however, were represented by two Commissioners each: Dunder, Linlithgow, St Andrews, Haddington, Anstruther Easter, Dunbar and Crail. 33 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. 34 The 1640s had witnessed the emergence and development of a ‘Scottish Commons’ which had curtailed the traditional power of the nobility within Parliament. 35

---

30 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 Scaple of Foulwood (Dumfriesshire), Andrew Agnew of Lochaw (Wigtown), Sir Ludovic Houston of that ilk (Renfrew and Dumbarton), Walter Scott of Hartwoodburn (Selkirk) and James Campbell of Antiknaghar (Argyll). The seven burgesses who also come into this category are George Porterfield (Glasgow), George Jamieson (Covar), George Garden (Barnsland), Robert Cunningham (Kingham), Gideon Jack (Lanark), John Hay (Elgin) and John Forbes (Inverness).
31 Ibid., VI, i, 612–3, VI, ii, 3–4.
33 A.P.S., VI, i, 612–3.
35 This has been strongly argued in Young, ‘Scottish Parliament’, i.
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’etat 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 tripe 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

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. 358-9; K.M. Brown, Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603-1715 (1991), pp. 133-3; MacInnes, 'The Scottish Commission'.

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, Kirkcudbright, 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 Bannet or James Cook in his absence, for the burgh of Pitcairn.

47 Ibid., 3-4, 124-6.
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5. The Restoration Parliament, 1 January 1661, and the rolls of the Covenanting Parliament, 1639–51

Crushing military defeat of Royalist forces at the Battle of Worcester on 3 September
651, 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
stitutional terms Scotland was not constitutionally incorporated within the

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 Rungaton (Roxburgh), Andrew Agnew of Lochaw (Wigtown), Walter Scott of Hartwood (Selkirk), and Patrick Scott of Thirlestane (Selkirk). William Temple of Foulwood (Dumfriesshire), Sir William Cunningham of Cunninghamhead (Ayr) and Sir Ludovic 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 land representing a Highland shire was James Campbell of Artinglas (Argyll). Sir Arthur Erskine of Southcraigs (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 burghs recorded in the rolls of 2 Mar. 1648 and 4 Jan. 1649 were William Simpson (Dyren), John Williamson (Kirkaldy), George Jamieson (Cupar), Robert Cunningham (Kinghorn), James Alexander (Culross) and George Garmen (Barnstaple). George Porterfield (Glasgow), James Campbell (Dumbarton) and Gideon Jack (Inverness) formed the western grouping. The three Highland burghs were John Forbes (Inverness), John Hay (Elgin) and James McColloch (Tain). Thomas McIver 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. However, Scotland was allocated limited representation in the Cromwellian Parliaments of 1654, 1656 and 1659. 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 Covenanting 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 Scottish 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.

The Restoration Parliament was composed of 75 nobles, 59 gentry representing 31 shires and 61 burgesses representing 60 burghs. Total membership was 195. In

51 Donaldson, James, "James VII", p. 345.
54 A.P.S., VII, 3–4. Three of the nobles (Chancellor Glencairn, 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). 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. 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 dump of nobles previously associated with Argyle and the radical wing of the Covenanting Movement (Eglinton, Cassills, Burrelgh, 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. Three further gentry had track records of radical political

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


56 Ibid. This analysis includes officers of state for the Restoration Parliament. The Earl of Dunbar (1661) had been included in previous parliamentary rolls as Vincent Duillope. Lord Balmerino (1661) had been included in previous parliamentary rolls as Lord Coupar. Two nobles had recently been promoted into the peerage. Lord Halkerton had represented the shire of Kirkcudbright (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 Parleage, ed. Sir J. Balfour–Paul (9 vols., Edinburgh, 1904–14), V, 249). Lord Ruthven had represented Berwick (as Sir Patrick Ruthven of Freeland) in all eight sessions of Parliament, 1639–41, Forfar in the 1644 Convention of Estates, Berwick in two of the six sessions of the First Triennial Parliament and Berwick 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, 124–5, 277–8, 555–6, 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, 289–92). Allan Dunlop (Inverkeithing) and John Rutherford (Jedburgh) are recorded in the burghs (as Sir Patrick Ruthven of Freeland) in all eight sessions of Parliament, 1639–41, Forfar in the 1644 Convention of Estates, Berwick in two of the six sessions of the First Triennial Parliament and Berwick in the sessions of 4, Jan. and 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, 605–6). 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, i, 344–5). 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, 331–2).

57 The 11 gentry associated with the Engagement and/or conservatism are as follows: Sir James Foulis of Colquhoun (Edinburgh), Sir James Lockhart of Lee (Lanark), Sir John Crawford of Kilbirnie (Ayr), John Murray of Polmaise (Stirling), Sir Archibald Stirling of Cariden (Stirling/Linlithgow), Sir Alexander Fraser of Philloch (Aberdeen), Sir William Scott of Andrews (Fife), Sir Alexander Abercrombie of Bankevock (Renfrew), Sir James Sinclair of Murkhill (Caithness), Sir Robert Innes of that ilk (Elgin) and Thomas Mackenzie of Pitsunder.
affiliation. 

58 The remaining lard collaborated with the Cromwellian regime, despite having a conservative political background. 62 Six of the 12 burgesses (50 per cent) appear to have Engager background, 63 whilst a further grouping of five burgesses (42 per cent) had radical track records. 64 The political affiliation of James Montcrieff

58 John Ferguson of Craigdarroch (Dumfries) had served in the parliamentary sessions of 7 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 Archchaton (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. Combining 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 3darnane (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 1644 (relating to the Engagement). Ramsay was appointed as Commissioner of the Cess in 1655, 1656 and 1660, and had attended to the Tender of Union at Dalkeith in 1652 (A.P.S., v, 238-9, 308, 331-2, vi, i, 474-5; Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, ii, 579).

60 George Steill (Brechin) 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 Lawler (Dunbar) is listed in the rolls of 17 Jan. 1645 and 2 Mar. 1648. Lawler was a member of the 1648 Committee of Estates and his local Committee of War, 1647-8 (A.P.S., vi, i, 288-9, vi, ii, 3-4; Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, ii, 411). John Auchterlonie (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. Auchterlonie served extensively on parliamentary committees including the Committees of War of 1644, 1645, 1648 and 1651. He was also a Commissioner of the Cess in 1655 (A.P.S., vi, i, 3-4, 95-6, 284-5, 400-1, 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 (Lochinver) 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, 400-1, 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 (Kirksdale) 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 Kirts and Valuation of Tents may well indicate that it was indeed Williamson who represented Kirksdale in 1649 (A.P.S., v, 251-2, 258-9, 306-8, 306, 331-2, vi, i, 3-4, vi, ii, 3-4, 284-5, 612-3; Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland ii, 734). A similar problem arises with Alexander Black (Auchenhester Eater); he is recorded in a dual commission for 4 Jan. 1649 (either Black or David 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 (ed.), 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 Seventeenth-
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In tandem wit
the Cromwellian regime, despite of the 12 burgesses (50 per cent) further grouping of five burgesses italical affiliation of James Moncrieff in the parliamentary sessions of 4 Jan. and n (Aryril) had also served in both those sessions n (Argyll) had sat in the first session of the 3 included on the Committee of War for shire and territorial influence of the House 15 of the radical regime of 1649, allows for n, Campbell did take the oath of allegiance oval of English forces from a garrison in 3; Young (ed.), The Parliament of Scotland, ed in three of the eight parliamentary rolls, ament. He had also been included on his N, Ramsay was appointed as Commissioner 'ender of Union at Dalkeith in 1652 (A.P.S., aments of Scotland, II, 579). sv. 1646 and 2 Mar. 1648. He was a member as well as a member of the 1648 Committee of a Cabinet of the Committee of Scotland in 1655, 1656 and aments of Scotland, II, 656). James Lawder n was a member of the 1648 Committee of Scotland, VI, 1, 248-5, VI, ii, 3-4; Young (ed.), The s recorded in the rolls of the 1643 Convention, ament Parliament, Auchenlonnie he Committee of War, 1644, 1646, 1647, 1648 and 1655. He was also a member of ament Convention, 474-5, 612-3, VI, ii, 3-4; Young (ed.), The 41), contains David Spence (Rocherglen). He 7 Jan. 1648, 2 Nov. 1646 and 2 Mar. 1648, 15 and 1648, membership of the 1655, 1656 and 1660 3-2; Young (ed.), The Parliament of Scotland, anment Parliament and was a member of the 1). The Parliament of Scotland, II, 959). John m of the First Triennial Parliament, as well as 3 being a member of his local Committee of War Young (ed.), The Parliament of Scotland, I, 339). the radical parliamentary sessions of 4 Jan. and no the 1649 Committee of Enquiry and m 1, 1645, Convention of Estates, the 1645 n of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649. The 1649 h William Law was to represent the front of the Committee for Plantation of Kerrs and Williamson who represented Kirkcaldy in 1649, VI, i, 3-4, 124-6, 277-8; Young (ed.), The with Alexander Black (Anstruther Easter); he n ick or William Hamilton was to represent the s in the 1649 Parliament indicates that he r Parliament of Scotland, I, 53). George Garden all six sessions of the first Triennial Parliament, n. and 23 May 1649. Garden’s commission for T (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

(continued) Black, Garden was also nominated to the 1649 Commission for Plantation of Kirks and Valuation of Tenants. 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, 260-1, 302, 308, 338-2, 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 Parliament of Scotland, I, 270). Robert Cunningham (Kinmonth) 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 Tenants and had a full portfolio of parliamentary committee membership throughout the 1640s (A.P.S., V, 251-2, 258-9, 260, 302, 308, 338-2, VI, i, 3-4, 124-6, 277-8; Young (ed.), The Parliament of Scotland, I, 170).

James Moncrieff (Craill) 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 Parliament of Scotland, II, 504). A similar lack of application applies to the political inclination of Andrew Glen (Lanarkshire), the burgess not recorded in any parliamentary rolls, 1639-51, but listed in Balfour’s rolls for 12 Mar. 1651. Glen had been included on the 1651 Committee of Estates (Balfour, Historical Works, IV, 258-62, Young (ed.), The Parliament 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 Rapon. 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 Parliament of Scotland, II, 722-3, 725).


The commissions to William Murray of Stenhouse and Sir Archibald Murray of Blackbarony, younger, (both Peebles), James Crichton of St Leonard and Robert Ferguson of Craigdarroch, (both Dumfriesshire), Sir John Urquhart of Crammont and Thomas MacKenzie of Pluscarride (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 Parliament of Scotland, I, 239). No rival election was noted in the parliamentary commission for the share 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 share of
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 Glencarn, 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 Ballie, 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 shires 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, Dougal Stewart of Kirkton (Bute) was replaced by another representative, James Stewart of Kirkton, by the time the Restoration Parliament convened on 1 January 1661.67 In addition, John Campbell of Glenurchy had been chosen as one of the Commissioners of Argyllshire at the electoral diet of 28 November 1660. Although Campbell of Glenurchy 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 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.


67 Dougal Stewart of Kirkton 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 Kirkton represented the burgh in Parliament on 1 Jan. 1661 (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/7/2; A.P.S., VII, 4).


Scottish parliamentary rolls can be translated into real movement as evidenced through the commissions listed for the Recollum in the following passage:

The Scottish Parliament was in session for the first time in 1661, continuing until 1667. The formal membership was the same as in previous sessions, with the addition of John Urquhart of Cromarty for Inverness and Alexander Macbrayne for Aberdeen. The burgh of Montrose was represented by six members, of whom one was elected by the burgh and five by the shire. Haddington, where the office of the clerk was held, was represented by two members, one of whom was elected by the burgh and the other by the shire. The number of members for the county of Fife was increased from five to six, with one member being elected by the burgh and the other five by the shire.

Thomas Watson was committed to a year’s imprisonment for his part in the Rye House Plot. He was subsequently released on bail and his case was heard in the House of Lords. However, he was found guilty and sentenced to death. His execution was delayed until 1662, when he was finally brought to the scaffold at Westminster. His death was a great blow to the Whigs, who lost one of their leading figures.

The Restoration of the Monarchy in 1660 brought about significant changes in the political landscape of Scotland. The monarchy was restored, and the power of the nobility was reinforced. The Parliament of Scotland was re-established, and the power of the burghs was weakened. The Restoration Parliament was dominated by the interests of the landed gentry, and the commoners had little representation. The period was marked by debates over the powers of the monarchy and the role of Parliament.

The Restoration Parliament was dominated by the interests of the landed gentry, and the commoners had little representation. The period was marked by debates over the powers of the monarchy and the role of Parliament.

The Restoration Parliament was dominated by the interests of the landed gentry, and the commoners had little representation. The period was marked by debates over the powers of the monarchy and the role of Parliament.
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66 Thomas Watson was commissioned as per 8 Dec. 1660 to represent Anstruther, Wester, but that burgh and burghs 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 Parliament 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 Parliament 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 Parliament 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 Nickers as the appropriate representative (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/76/3; A.P.S., VII, 5). 'Patrick Nickers' is not recorded in Young (ed.), The Parliament 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 Parliament 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 I:

Attendance Figures of the Three Estates, 1648-1651

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Experimentation Roll</th>
<th>Name of Estates</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 March 1650</td>
<td>A.D. V. 4th</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 March 1650</td>
<td>A.D. V. 3rd</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 May 1649</td>
<td>A.D. V. 2nd</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 January 1649</td>
<td>A.D. V. 1st</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 March 1648</td>
<td>A.D. V. 4th</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 1647</td>
<td>A.D. V. 3rd</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Nobility Movement per session</th>
<th>Gentry Movement per session</th>
<th>Burgesses Movement per session</th>
<th>Total Movement per session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 March 1648–4 January 1649</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-1 (Maximum)</td>
<td>+1 (Maximum)</td>
<td>-40 (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 January 1649–23 May 1649</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>-1 (Minimum)</td>
<td>-1 (Minimum)</td>
<td>-39 (Minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May 1649–7 March 1650</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1 (Maximum)</td>
<td>+1 (Maximum)</td>
<td>+5 (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+3 (Minimum)</td>
<td>+1 (Minimum)</td>
<td>+6 (Minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1 (Minimum)</td>
<td>+7 (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-20 (Minimum)</td>
<td>-20 (Minimum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.