

THE RISE, PROGRESS, AND DECLINE

OF

THE QUAKER MOVEMENT IN SCOTLAND.

"To-day no study of origins is considered waste of time that is pursued in earnest".

Preface to T.R. Glover's "The Nature & Purpose of a Christian Society". (Swathmore Lecture, 1912.)

ProQuest Number: 13905230

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 13905230

Published by ProQuest LLC (2019). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.


This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

A Thesis presented for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy,
by
Rev. George B. Burnet, M. A. (Edin.)

I hereby declare that the following Thesis embodies the results of my own special work, and that it has been composed by myself.

17-3-36.



FOREWARD.

The materials for a study of the Quaker Movement in Scotland in its historical setting and background have existed until the present time in multifarious manuscripts, records, pamphlets, books, and other scattered sources of various kinds. The object of the present Thesis is to collate these into a systematic and critical history of the rise, progress, and decline of the Society in Scotland, and to attempt some estimate of its place in Scottish religion.

It has not always been easy to draw the line of demarcation between the Movement itself and the historical Theology connected with it, and the writer feels that in the latter field, useful research might be undertaken in such theological subjects as "The Westminster Confession of Faith and Scottish Quaker Theology of the 17th Century", or "The Contribution of Historical Quaker Theology to the Christian Dogmatic of to-day".

It may seem that the Thesis is unusually long, and that the notes and references are too numerous, but in respect of the latter at least, the writer can only respectfully submit that in his judgement a pioneer work of this kind necessitates detailed documentation, if it is to serve the most useful purpose.

The writer is under a debt of gratitude to the following for their courteous and most valuable help, and hereby acknowledges it with sincere thanks :-

The Librarian of New College, Edinburgh.
The Librarians and Staffs of the University Libraries of Glasgow, Edinburgh, & Aberdeen.
The Keeper of Records of the Edinburgh Corporation.
The Custodian of Records of the Glasgow Corporation.
The Librarian and Staff of Aberdeen Central Library.
The Librarian and Staff of Leicester Central Library.
The Librarians of the Friends' Meeting House Libraries, at Leicester, Sheffield, and Pleasance, Edinburgh.
The Librarian and Staff of Baillie's Institution, Glasgow.
The Director and Staff of the British Museum Library and Manuscript Department.
The Keeper of Records and Staff of the Register House, Edinburgh.
The Officials of the National Central Library.
The Librarian and Staff of the Carnegie Library, Edinburgh.
The Librarian and Staff of the Scottish National (formerly the Advocates') Library, Edinburgh.
The Librarian and Staff of Tullie House, Carlisle.
The Librarian and Staff of the Municipal Library, Dumfries.
The late R. Barclay Murdoch Esq., Glasgow. (for loan of books).
Miss Marian Ellis, 10 West Walk, Leicester. (ditto)

FOREWARD (Continued)

- Rev. James Winchester, B.D., (for some notes on Quakerism in Bannockburn)
- Rev. John Campbell, D.D., and Mr. Fraser, of the Church of Scotland Assembly Library, Edinburgh.
- { Rev. Thomas Connelly, M.A., Minister of Glassford.
- { Rev. Salmond Smith, B.D., Minister of Douglas.
(for permission to consult Session Records)

And very specially to the undernoted for their indispensable help, without which the Thesis could not have been adequately written:-

The Librarian and Staff of the Friends' House Library,
Euston, N.W.

The Librarian and Staff of the Mitchell Library, Glasgow.
The Edinburgh Monthly Meeting of the Society of Friends, and
The Aberdeen Two Month's Meeting (for the privilege of consulting M.S. Minute Books and other invaluable records and original documents.) Particularly would I acknowledge the services of Mr. Colin Macleod, Mr. James D. Milne, and Mr. Alexander M. Rice.

My Wife, and Mrs Lockwood. (for typing.); also Miss Ida Milne.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Prolegomena : Names and Membership. (Pages 1-5)

Book I. — The Cromwellian Period.
1653-1660.

- Chapter I. "The First Seed Sown". (pages 7-9)
- II. "The Earlier or Pre-Fox Missioners of First Period." (pages 10-19)
 - III. "The Society takes root in Edinburgh." (pages 20-30)
 - IV. "In the Midland Area and Glasgow". (pages 31-33)
 - V. "The First Outbreak of Persecution". (pages 34-42)
 - VI. "From Corner to Corner of Scotland". (pages 43-49)
 - VII. "George Fox in Scotland". (pages 50-56)
 - VIII. "The Quakers and the Army of Occupation." (pages 61-67)
 - IX. "The Post-Fox Missionaries of the First Period". (pages 68-70)
 - X. "A Brief Summary of the First Period, with Observations". (pages 71-74)

Book II. — From the Restoration to the Revolution.
1651, 1659-1688.

- Chapter I. "The 'Comedy' of Breda and the Restoration". (pages 75-80)
- II. "The Quakers and Early Acts of the Restoration". (pages 81-86)
 - III. "The Jaffrays and the Development of Quakerism in Aberdeen". (pages 87-92)
 - IV. "The First Wave of Persecution in Aberdeen". (pages 92-96)
 - V. "The Progress of the Movement in Aberdeenshire and the North of Scotland". (pages 97-104)

	<u>Pages.</u>
Chapter VI. "Edinburgh and the Rise of Quakerism in the Borders".	(105-116)
- VII. "The Barclays of Mathers and Urie".	(117-130)
- VIII. "Quakerism in Angus and the Mearns".	(131-137)
- IX. "The Flowing Tide of Persecution in Aberdeen".	(138-143)
- X. "The Conventicle Act, and the Declaration of Indulgence".	(144-149)
- XI. "The Height of the Persecution in Aberdeen".	(150-158)
- XII ditto. contd.	(159-167)
- XIII. "George Keith".	(168-176)
- XIV. "George Keith's View of the Scottish Church".	(177-194)
- XV. "Some Observations, Critical and Interpretative on the Principal Works of Robert Barclay in their Relation to Scotland".	(195-206)
- XVI. "Meeting Houses and Burial Grounds".	(207-219)
- XVII. "In Smoother Waters :1680-1688".	(220-225)
- XVIII. "The Charge of 'Jesuitico-Quakerism', with Special Reference to Scotland".	(226-233)
- XIX. "A Brief Summary of the Middle Period with Observations".	(234-235)

Book III.— From the Revolution to the Middle of the
Nineteenth Century.
1688-c1850.

Chapter I. "The Revolution Settlement and the Advent of Toleration".	(237-241)
- II. "The Quakers and the Covenanters".	(242-259)
- III. "Turbulent Years in Edinburgh and Glasgow".	(260-271)
- IV. "The Condition and Outlook of Quakerism elsewhere in Scotland.c. 1690-1701".	(272-287)

Chapter V.	"Two Decades of Patient Endeavour and Hope, 1701-1721".	(288-303)
-	VI. "Ebb and Flow of the Society in Scotland. c 1721-1740".	(304-312)
-	VII. "The Decline becomes grave. c. 1740-1786".	(313 - 323)
-	VIII. "Quakers in the Highland and Islands, and their Contacts with Jacobitism".	(324-328)
-	IX. "Hope of Revival and Famous Visitors to Scotland, c. 1785-1820".	(329-335)
-	X. "The Quaker Contribution to Social and Humanitarian Activities in Scotland".	(336-347)
-	XI. "Personalities and the Church of Scotland in the Mid-Nineteenth Century".	(348-354)
-	XII. "A Brief Summary of the Last Period with Observations".	(355-356)

Supplementary Chapters.

Chapter I.	"Persecution in Scotland".	(357-366)
-	II. "Organisation and Administration in Scotland".	(367-379)
-	III. "Discipline in Scotland".	(380-392)
-	IV. "Conclusion".	(393-402)

Appendices.

- A. Specimen Copy of "Clearness" Certificate for Marriage.
- B. Act of the Scots Parliament in favour of Lord Forrester against William Osborne.
- C. List of Quaker Writings.
- D. A Note on the Sources.

Bibliography.

"PROLEGOMENA : NAMES & MEMBERSHIP."

It is usually accepted that the Movement known to-day as the "Society of Friends" had its origin as a distinctive religious entity in 1647, the year in which George Fox began his work as a preacher in England at the age of twenty-three. At Mansfield in 1648 the new Fellowship gave itself its earliest name, "Children of (the) Light".¹ The title "Friends in the Truth", or simply "Friends" was used as early as 1652,² although the Society did not formally constitute itself till 1737. "New Lights" was a nickname given to a rebel section of Friends in Ireland in the first decade of last Century. Many of these were disowned for their "modernist attitude" to the formalities of the Society, especially those relating to marriage³.

The traditional origin of the appellation "Quakers" as given by George Fox himself dates from 1650 when Fox, who had come from Chesterfield, attempted to address a religious gathering in the Church of Derby at the close of a "great lecture"⁴. He was summarily arrested and haled before two of the Magistrates. In his apologia, given, as was his wont, with fervid passion, he, prophet-like, called upon the Justices to "quake" at the Word of the Lord : whereupon one of them, Gervase Bennett⁵, caught at the verb, and in scorn stigmatised Fox and his followers as "Quakers"⁶.

The mild acceptance of the title has been called in question and its repudiation even within recent decades has been advocated.

-
1. cf Braithwaite "The Beginnings of Quakerism", (1912) p.44, and Barclay's "Inner Life of the Religious Societies", p.261.-
 2. H.R.E. Vol VI, page 142 (Art."Society of Friends", by W.C. Braithwaite).
 3. cf Rathbone "A Narrative of Events in Ireland", (1804) pp 123-9.
 4. Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol 1, p.41. According to Croese ("General History", Bk.I, p.33) it was the Presbyterian Church.
 5. There is still much difference of opinion as to whether Justice Bennett was a Judge. There is no mention of him in Foss's "Judges of England". But cf. "Camb. Journal," Vol I. pp 394-5.
 6. Fox's "Journal" (Camb.Ed.) Vol I. p.4; cf Besse's "Sufferings" Vol 1. title page, and Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol 1, P.43.
 7. v Wm. Ball's Art. in F.Q.E. Vol.III (1868) P.68. cf.Ibid. P.69.- Agnes Strickland's mention of "Trembleurs" or "a sort of Quakers" among foreign sectaries.

The traditional origin of the term "Quakers" however, requires considerable modification. It seems to have existed before it was applied to any religious sect or faction. Southey in his "Commonplace Book", gives an instance of its earlier use in "Quakers' Grass"⁸. But in 1647, the words "Quakers" was applied not to the first Friends at all, but to a sect of Moslem women, who came to Southwark, who "swell, shiver, and shake, and when they come to themselves (for in all this fitt Mahomett's holy-ghost hath bin conversing with them) they begin to preache what hath bin delivered to them by the Spiritt"⁹. Additional support of the contention that the term "Quakers" antedated Justice Bennett's stigmatisation of the Friends in 1650 seems to be lent by Burns and Nicholson in their record of one, Francis Higginson, who appears to have been Vicar of Kirkby Stephen during the Protectorate. Higginson was a bitter foe of the Quakers, and was instrumental in bringing Naylor to trial at Appleby Quarter Sessions in 1652.¹⁰ Higginson speaks of a people of whom many "in their assemblies, sometimes men, but more frequently women and children, or they who had long fasted, would fall down suddenly as in an epileptic fit, and there lie groveling upon the ground... Whilst the agony of the fit was upon them, they would foam at the mouth, their lips would quaver, their flesh and joints would tremble, and their bellies swell like a blown bladder. In such fit they continued sometimes an hour or two, and when it left them, they roared out with a loud voice and horrible. All which easily accounts for the name of Quakers¹¹ being given to them." The exact date of this recorded utterance is certainly indeterminate, but the latter phrase underlined is the significant one. It clearly implies that Higginson's outburst was prior to Fox's trial before Justice Bennett, - though it could not have been very long before -, and refers to some extravagant and fanatical sect of which sort England had more than its share.¹² in that era of

8. Second Series, (1850) P.123.

9. Clarendon M.S.S.No.2624, per the Oxford English Dictionary, ed. Murray Vol 8, P.15.

10. For the mutual bitterness between Higginson and the "Northern Quakers" as he calls them, v "A Reply to a book which is full of lies and slanders set forth by Higginson, a priest etc" (1654)-(P.49 of, "and appendix to", An Answer to a Book which Samuel Eaton put up to the Parliament, etc".) of Fox's "Great Mystery" (1659) pp.66 ff.

11. The underlining is mine. v Burn and Nicholson "History of Westmorland", (1777) Vol.1, pp. 536-7. cf "A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the Northern Quakers", (1653) P.15.

12. Edwards in his "Gangraena" catalogues the "monstrous opinions and practices" of 176 English sects of the Commonwealth period. This is probably an exaggeration due to confusion of names or tenets. cf McCrie "Sketches of Scottish Church History", Ch.IX, P.313 n, also Henderson's "Mystics of the North-East", PP 191-2.

religious sensationalism. If Higginson's invective had been subsequent to 1650, he must surely have been ignorant of Justice Bennett's appellation, which is inherently unlikely, as the title "Quaker" soon "ran over all England" from Derby¹³ and Fox and James Nayler planted the Quaker standard in Westmoreland (Higginson's own county) as early as 1652¹⁴. Higginson's reason for calling such ecstatic sects "Quakers", was almost certainly the common one prior to the Derby Sessions in 1650. "Quaker" or "Trembler" was then merely a common generic term, used intermittently for centuries in all religions from the time of the neurotic excitement and shaking of the Delphic priestess, to cover well known physical phenomena. Indeed several years later than 1650, when the Friends were becoming well established, not all who were called "Quakers" were connected with the Society of Friends, and during subsequent decades Friends were blamed for some things for which they were not responsible.

Turning now from external evidence of the generic use of the term "Quaker" prior to Derby 1650, we find that with the exception of George Fox and Sewell - and even they seem a little indefinite¹⁵ -, the most notable Quaker authorities are in substantial agreement. Robert Barclay tells us¹⁶ that the name was given because of the trembling and severe inward conflict between the "two contrary tides" of the spirit of evil and the Spirit of God manifest in individual Friends as they worshipped, or when "the power of God broke forth into a whole meeting"¹⁷. When James Nayler was tried for blasphemy at the Appleby Sessions in 1652 before Justice Pearson, he was asked by the latter how it came to pass that people quaked and trembled. "The Scriptures", replied Nayler, "witness the same condition in the Saints formerly, as David, Daniel, Habakkuk and diverse others".¹⁸ Although the Quakers are not specified exactly, it is probable that the Judge had them particularly in mind, and it is certain that Nayler had: also that he did not attribute the origin of their title to Justice Bennett. George Whitehead said that "Persecuting Adversaries" gave

13. Sewell's "History" (1811) Vol 1, P.43.

14. "Journal", (Camb. Ed.) Vol. 1, PP. 51-4.

15. Fox's "Great Mystery", (1659) PP. 61, 110. cf Sewell's "History" (1811) Vol. 1 P.43. where Sewell is rather self-contradictory.

16. "Apology", (14th Ed. 1886). Prop. XI. Sect. VIII. P.257.

17. cf Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol I, P.43. re. some formerly flagrant wrongdoers.

18. Besse's "Sufferings", (1753 Ed.) Vol. II, P.5.

* It is interesting to note in passing that forty years later - in January 1709, Wodrow, in a letter to James Hog of Carnock, calls the Quakers the "elder brethren" of the inhabitants of the Cevennes (the Camisards), several of whom had come over to this country about 1706 after an armed rising against the French Government. While most unlike the Quakers in using carnal weapons, the Camisards were noted for ecstatic phenomena and bodily contortions under one or other of their degrees of "inspiration". Hence Wodrow's reference to those "that pretend to be under the Spirit's workings." 21A.

Friends the soubriquet "because of their Trembling at the Word and Power of the Lord God as many of His Servants and Prophets have done".¹⁹ When William Penn was in Germany, he met an old man Dureus,²⁰ who "for his approaches toward an inward Principle is reproachfully saluted by some with the honest Title of Quaker". And lastly, George Keith, more than 20 years before his defection, wrote in 1670 from his cell in the Edinburgh Tolbooth, "These bodily quakings and tremblings did also seize upon divers, and from this, the name "Quakers" was in scorn cast upon friends."²¹ *

In brief then, the term "Quakers" was a loose generic term used for an indefinite time before 1650. and after that date with reference to non-Quakers.²² Justice Bennett by no means originated it, as is usually supposed, but he crystallised and popularised the word with reference to Fox and his friends, unwittingly making it the title which has stuck to them both in law and popular usage to this day, at home and abroad. The earliest appearance in print of the term "Quaker" is thought to be in Thomas Hall's "The Pulpit Guarded with Seventeen Arguments" (1652), and the earliest legal mention of the term occurs in the Proceedings of the Council of State of 14th June 1654.²³

But while the Society of Friends has never regarded it as a sine qua non to the true apprehension of the Spirit that the worshippers' inward travail should be expressed by visible trembling or outward commotion, they have shown no real dislike to the title. Fox, however, is the notable exception to this general rule. He always hated it, and wrote a letter in somewhat strong language to Justice Bennett, characterising him as "given upp to misname the saints."²⁴

-
19. v "Truth Prevalent", (1701) P.P. 16-17. of "Christian Progress", P.102.
20. "Travails in Holland and Germany", year 1677. (1694) pp.52-3.
21. v "The Benefit, Advantage and Glory of Silent Meetings", P.15. cf J. Crook "Truth's Progress", (1667) P.4; also Brown's "Quakerisme the Pathway to Paganism", P.419.
22. cf Barclay's "Inner Life of the Religious Societies", pp 317-8. The same kind of phenomena were seen in the Methodist Revival and among Jonathan Edwards's converts.
23. Halls "Pulpit Guarded", P 15: and S.P.D., Cal. 1654, P 210.
24. "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol I, P.5. of Bennett's subsequent slander of Fox in London. (v Braithwaite "Beginnings of Quakerism", pp.119-120.)
- 21A. v Wodrow's "Correspondence", Vol I, P 90.

It only remains to add that despite religious sects being most fashionable in those days, the Friends did not regard themselves as a Sect, and official "membership" in a Society was unknown till June 1737, forty-six years after Fox's death. This was rendered necessary for ascertaining who were eligible for poor relief. An intermittent history of imposition and deception lay behind this constitutional change, and after more than one unsuccessful attempt to delimit membership in practice, the London Yearly Meeting decided that "all Friends should be deemed members of the Quarterly, Monthly or Two-weeks Meetings within the compass of which they were living on the first day of June 1737."²⁵

The primary ground of union or rather adhesion amongst the first converts had been extremely nebulous, viz., "union of sentiment in regard to Christ's inward teaching."²⁶ "Anyone convinced by what he heard and living in the spirit of what it meant, became Truth's friend"²⁷, i.e., profession of "convincement" was the only means by which one could be recognised as belonging to the Movement. But in 1737, the London Yearly Meeting, in addition to constituting ordinary membership thus, made a revolutionary change by adopting a resolution that children were "to be deemed members of the Monthly Meeting of which the Father is a member"²⁸. This status of membership which still survives, is known as "Birthright Membership". It signifies that from the moment of birth the children of Friends are ipso facto themselves Friends in name and rights, though there is no little evidence that failure of many to be Friends by "convincement" and in spirit is one cause of the decline of the Society in different parts of the World. "Birthright Membership" is still rather a vexed question which has been more than once reviewed,²⁹ most notably in 1900 on a motion from the Berks and Oxford Quarterly Meeting. But the London Yearly Meeting decided after a full debate to retain the status quo, while emphasizing the need of members' earnest care for their young people,³⁰ lest in the words of Samuel Bownas any grow up "but a traditional Quaker and that by Education only, and not from the Scriptures."³¹

25. "London Yearly Meeting during 250 Years", P.35.

26. Preface to the "Rules of Discipline of the Religious Society of Friends with Advices", (3rd.Ed. 1834) P.VII.

27. E. Brockbank "Richard Hubberthorne of Yealand", (1929) P.82.

28. Minutes of L.Y.M. 1737, (Vol 8) P.318.

29. E.g. F.Q.E. Vol.V (1871) P.216; Helen Balkwill's Art.(Ibid Vol.V. pp.524-533); A.F. Fowler's Art. (Ibid Vo. XXI pp 25-34) etc.

30. "London Yearly Meeting during 250 Years", PP. 81-2.

31. "An Account of the Life, Travels, etc. of Samuel Bownas", (2nd.Ed. Reprinted in 1895) P.5.

BOOK I.

THE CROMWELLIAN PERIOD.

1653 - 1660.

CHAPTER I."THE FIRST SEED SOWN."

Apart from Quakers found in the English Army of Occupation, the very first Quakers known in Scotland were Alexander Hamilton, John Hart - both probably yeomen, and Richard Rae (Ree or Ray), a Shoemaker. Of the triumvirate, Hamilton has slight priority. Hamilton's home was at Drumbow, three miles South of East Kilbride. He was one of "several serious enquirers into the nature of true religion and the purity and spirituality of Gospel worship",¹ who were very dissatisfied with the standards and prevailing formality and atmosphere of the National Church. That their dissatisfaction and secession were not altogether without reason and justification is clear from such contemporary writings as James Guthrie's "The Causes of the Lord's Wrath against Scotland"² and "A Humble Acknowledgment of the Sins of the Ministry of Scotland,"³ both published in 1653. As a result of 'working out his own salvation in fear' and probably also in 'trembling',⁴ Hamilton arrived independently at the Quaker position in 1653.⁵ He and his wife and sister had been esteemed members of East Kilbride Church, which was "a congregation of Independents or Anabaptists,"⁶ whose Minister was Thomas Charteris, a "Protester". The Hamiltons' departure from the congregation was regretted by all, and Charteris, after futile endeavours to win them back, threatened them with excommunication. Notice of this was duly served on the "convinced" Hamilton in 1656, but the sentence was never carried out.⁷

-
1. Besse's "Sufferings", (1753) Vol. II, P 494.
 2. Especially 3 Article, PP 19-32: 5 Article, P 36: 2 Step, P 49: 7 Step, PP 62-65.
 3. An Appendix to "The Causes".
 4. cf Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd ed) P 194: also v Hodson's "Select Historical Memoirs", (1844) PP 177-8 and the "Aberdeen Letter" quoted in Jaffray's "Diary" Note R, PP 167-171.
 5. Parallel cases to Hamilton's are the earlier religious experiences of James Nayler, George Whitehead and Thomas Story.
 6. Scott's "Fasti", (new Ed.) Vol. III, P 267. Charteris held his living by the favour of the Cromwellian faction, and apparently cared more for horses than souls.
 7. Besse's "Sufferings", (1753) Vol II, PP 494-5.

John Hart belonged to Heads, one of three villages in the parish of Glassford in the middle Ward of Lanarkshire.⁸ Hart suffered persecution in Glassford and Hamilton about the middle of the Protectorate,⁹ but curiously enough, there is no account of him in Besse. This is all the more strange, as during the reign of Charles II, he suffered forefaulture. His name appears in the list appended to the Scots Parliament Act of July 1690, "rescinding the forefaultures and fynes since the year 1665", by whatsoever Court or Commission imposed. In accordance with the Claim of Right and for the better settlement of the peace and tranquility of the Kingdom, the Act bears that "the decreets and doomes of forefaulture pronounced against the persons aftermentioned ... shall be voyd, and of no avaiill, force, strength nor effect in all tyme comeing, rescinding and reducing the samine for ever". Accordingly Hart was "rehabilitated, reintegrated and restored to his goods, fame and worldly honour". He was clerk for a time to the Hamilton Monthly Meeting, and registrar also. He had a ready wit and could bring it to bear on contemporary events. He was a witness at several marriages and his name is found in a Minute Book of Hamilton Monthly Meeting in 1671, as a witness to the Deed of disposition of Hew Wood, Nurseryman and Gardener to the Duke of Hamilton, drawn up in favour of the latter's four sons. A curious coincidence may be noted in passing, viz., that there was another John Hart (possibly a cousin) a native of Glassford, and a Covenanter, who was martyred at the Cross of Glasg~~ow~~ow in December 1666.¹⁰

Of Richard Rae, little else is known. He must have removed to Edinburgh after 1663.¹¹ About that year, during the first wave of persecution in Aberdeen, he was imprisoned in the Tolbooth for six months. From 1670 to 1675 he assisted James Brown, the tanner in the Westport and others in trying to secure a Burial Ground and Meeting House, but seemingly met with great difficulty.¹²

The first meetings in Scotland were established in 1653 by Hamilton¹³ at Drumbow, and at Heads by Hamilton and

8.vN. Carlisle "The Topographical Dictionary of Scotland", Vol I.

9. v post Ch.5, PP 2, 5.

10. Thomson's "Martyr Graves of Scotland", Ch.VIII, PP 138-9.

11. Skene's "Breiff Historicall Account", P.3.

12. cf post Bk.III, Ch.XVI, P2.

13. Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol I, P.159.

Hart conjointly in the latter's house. The Minister of Glassford was William Hamilton ("Wise Willie Hamilton"), and although he had done a considerable amount to mitigate the bad ecclesiastical odour in the district which he found on coming to Glassford,¹⁴ there was still sufficient popular dissatisfaction with the Church remaining to provide a seed bed for the sowing of the new Truth fairly successfully.

Meetings were soon after started at Gartshore in Dumbartonshire, 2½ miles East of Kirkintilloch, and at Badcow in the same neighbourhood. These meetings were established for fully a year before they were known to, or linked up with, any Friends in England. But when Fox visited the Badcow Meeting in 1657, it seems to have been comparatively strong in testimony if not in numbers.¹⁵

14. Hamilton's predecessor was deposed for evil living, a case which ranged the parishioners and the Synod of Glasgow against the Presbytery of Hamilton and the General Assembly; while his predecessor, John Bell, was presented only after much opposition and threat. v Scott's "Fast;" (New Ed.) Vol III. P.253.
15. Fox's "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol. I, P.293.

CHAPTER II.

"THE EARLIER OR PRE-FOX MISSIONERS OF THE FIRST PERIOD."

The early Quaker Movement was nothing if not strong in proselytising zeal, and hardly had the new Light obtained a footing in England, before that "dark and carnal people" of Scotland was marked out for missionary enterprise. "After that the Lord God in His infinite love and glorious power had visited our neighbour nation of England with His dayspring from on high... it also pleased Him in the same love to visit this nation of Scotland by sending of His messengers to proclaim the gladsome tidings of Salvation whereby many were gathered from the barren mountains to feed in the pastures of life, and brought into the sheepfold of rest and peace".¹ They sought up every opportunity and method of spreading their message, which they fearlessly propagated in court-room and market-place, in churches and private houses, by open debates with "professors" and by tireless writing. Wherever they went they carried their quills and inkhorns, writing prolifically in hospitable lodgings, in noisy wayside taverns, in prison, and even on board ship.

There is no disputing the fact that these English "First Publishers of Truth", as well as their Scots comrades had abundant enthusiasm, "nascent energy", and physical and moral courage, whatever else they may be held to have possessed or lacked. They were in deadly earnest as envoys of Truth. The two north-country bases in England from which successive "missionary" campaigners into Scotland set out were Westmorland, where Quakerism first obtained a foothold in 1651,² and Yorkshire where it took root in 1652.³ Sometimes these English campaigners itinerated solitary and alone as Robert Barrow⁴; more often in pairs as Caton and Stubbs; Audland and Camm; or in little groups of three to five, as Fox and his companions. The two main routes were (1) through Carlisle, by Canonbie, Dumfries, Douglas, Glassford, and Hamilton to Glasgow, and (2) through the Borders by Berwick, Jedburgh or Kelso to Edinburgh and Stirling.⁵ These early pioneers, known as "the Seventy" were assisted financially at varying periods, apparently according to their needs, from two centres, Kendal and Durham, and later from Balby, Yorkshire. Margaret Fell of Swarthmore Hall was the chancellor of the Western exchequer, and in the Swarthmore M.S.S.⁶ there is a valuable

-
1. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in J.F.H.S.VII, P.91.
 2. Also from Cumberland. v Besse's "Sufferings," (1753) Vol II, Ch. I, P.1
 3. Ibid Ch.IV, P.89.
 4. v His letter to Stephen Crisp and Geo.Whitehead quoted in "Collectitia", P.365.
 5. A fairly complete list of probable routes taken by the English Quakers will be found in the F.S.A. (Scot) Proceedings. 5th Series Vol II, PP 36-44. (Art. by H.R.G. Inglis)
 6. The Swarthmore MSS. Vol.III, PP 499-660, partim.

and detailed collection of over 70 letters to her from her two financial secretaries at Kendal, George Taylor, Ironmonger, and Thomas Willan. These letters on finance cover the period 1654-1658, and while most of them are merely formal statements of income received from Friends in various meetings and of expenditure, there are occasional interesting sidelights on these transactions. The disbursements fell into four categories; (1) for necessary personal outfit or equipment ranging from "britches" and "showes" to the replacing of a confiscated horse; (2) for travelling expenses (3) for the purchase of books; and (4) for judicious relief of Friends in prison or other cases of need as in the instance of the grant to John Camm, who was voted £2. 0. 0. "to himself or others as he sees cause". Lancelot Wardell, one of the Durham treasurers in a statement of accounts which he sent to Kendal showed that out of his funds in hand he had made payments for travelling Friends especially in Scotland, precisely similar in character to those made from Kendal.⁸ But in those first years of pioneering venture for the Truth, the treasury was not always commensurate with missionary zeal, though there is no evidence of any unfair advantage of it being taken, and at least once Taylor and Willan were compelled to "lett friends knowe that the generall Stock at Kendall is disburst and there is great Occasion now, soe manie being moued of the Lord to goe into other Nations, and manie in prisons".⁹ Probably a situation such as this determined Margaret Fell on the change of financial arrangements which she submitted to Anthony Pearson in 1657.¹⁰ In course of time after the establishment of a system of Monthly and Quarterly Meetings, the travelling expenses of "Stranger" Friends were authorised and met by these Bodies.¹¹

The very earliest of the missionaries, the vanguard of the "First Publishers of Truth" were "Friends with the gift of Ministry living in the North-West of England". Estimates of their number vary from sixty-five to seventy-four, but they are usually denominated "The Seventy", of whom about one eighth were women, in spite of the Bauline prohibition, which the Quaker argued was meant to apply only to the silly women of Corinth and never to those who were divinely inspired like the four virgin

7. cf Swarthmore MSS, Vol.III, P.514. ("To James Graeme at Edinburgh for Bookes".)

8. Ibid, PP. 609-610.

9. Ibid. P.519. J.J. Gurney gives a good and clear account ("Observations" Pps 236-8) of how Ministers are called to undertake itinerant missions. This account, though late, is substantially true over our whole period.

10. Letter in Swarthmore MSS, Vol.II, P.201.

11. cf Stephen's "Quaker Strongholds", (1890) P.15.

daughters of Philip the evangelist, (Acts XXI 9), or the women who laboured with Saint Paul "in the Gospel" (Phil IV 3)¹². More than half of "The Seventy" were people of considerable education and personal influence in their home districts, as well as of material substance, less than 40% receiving any kind of grant from the Swarthmore Fund. The necessity of such financial assistance was mitigated however, by the magnificent spirit of independence and self-sacrifice which many showed. They made extraordinary efforts to maintain themselves and their families when absent from home or in prison, while the women left behind acquired a praiseworthy and remunerative efficiency in agriculture, trade, and other "secondary" occupations. A substantial majority of "The Seventy" were closely connected with the land, - proprietors, tenants, and labourers: then came the merchant and professional classes. Two of the women were domestic servants.¹³

It is not altogether easy to reconstruct to-day the fear and internal struggle with which many of these early pioneers received the first intimations of their "call", when "a concern came upon them" to become travelling preachers for the Truth. It was not merely the common missionary hardships experienced in all epochs, - long and frequent absences from home, with scanty and irregular news reaching the "Publishers", with few fixed addresses for any length of time, with nothing like any modern system of postal services, and frequent robbery of mail coaches:¹⁴ derision and vile abuse, sometimes almost unto death, at the hands of the religious and 'worldly' sections of the people alike: imprisonment and excommunication: or a repetition of the whole gamut of Saint Paul's perils (II Cor. XI. 23-28). William Caton certainly did write to Thomas Willan from Leith in 1659, that he felt "as in A forrest or wilderness, where I should bee in great jeopardy, did not the Arme of the Lord's power Compasse mee about... by which I was brought well through the country".¹⁵ Still, these concomitant hardships and dangers were taken by "The Seventy" in their stride cheerfully and courageously as inevitable. It was the domestic aspects of their missionary journeys that touched the quick of their minds, especially in the case of those with direct dependents. There are few details of these early Friends' married life extant, but those which survive are full of significance. Stephen Crisp was

12. Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol II, PP 585-6. cf Keith's pamphlet "The Woman Preacher of Samaria" which presents the case for women preachers in a piquant way. At the same time, early leaders of the movement were alive to the inadvisability of employing them too freely, and any travelling female minister if not satisfactory, was quickly sent back.

13. A valuable study and analysis of "The Seventy" and others is given in the Presidential Address of the F.H.S. 1921 by E.E. Taylor, quoted in J.F.H.S. XIX, PP. 66 ff.

14. cf. "Letters etc. of Early Friends", Ed. A.R. Barclay, (1841) P. 256.

15. Swarthmore MSS, Vol I, P. 394.

"loath to forsake his dear wife and children"¹⁶ to go "to bear witness to that high professing nation "of Scotland, and struggled with his heart and conscience to plead his care of them, and his own unfitness, as multitudes from Moses' day have done, but in vain. In John Banks's "Journal" we are presented with this problem of faith and conjugal duty, perhaps not more acute than many others, in which the writer is torn between a compelling urge to labour away from home and an equal urge to remain and help his wife to shoulder a well-nigh crushing burden.¹⁷ Miles Halhead's wife was chagrined for about a year at his frequent absence from home. "I would to God that I had married a Drunkard", she said, "I might have found him in the Alehouse, but I cannot tell where to find my Husband."¹⁸

There was the present day problem of the missionary's family in the case of Thomas and Elizabeth Holme, whose children were given over to others to allow of the mother continuing her ministerial work. But the separation so preyed upon the father's mind, that he was unable to conceal his hope that the "concern" of his wife to travel would cease to exist. They were badly used in Scotland too.¹⁹ Both however, died early, and the unhappy result of the virtual ignorance of their children was, that the latter "walked not in the steps of their honorable parents"²⁰

On a comprehensive survey however of "The Seventy" and the other "First Publishers of Truth" it is manifest that the secrets of their initial success in spreading the "Inner Light" were their spirit of perfect comradeship, their deep sense of loyalty and mutual responsibility in all their vicissitudes, and their solidarity of aim and purpose. Before the Act of Indulgence in 1672 at least, the necessity which they felt of trying to convince an overwhelmingly hostile public of the Truth that was dearer to them than life, and of presenting an unbroken front against civil and ecclesiastical persecution, welded them into a solid phalanx

Of "The Seventy", at least forty-nine, as far as can be ascertained, went into Scotland.²¹ The majority

16. v Fell Smith's "Stephen Crisp & his Correspondents 1657-1692" (1892) Intro. P.XX. cf Budge "Annals of the Early Friends", P.134.

17. "Journal", (1712) PP.22-28; 36-38.

18. "Sufferings & Passages of Myles Halhead", (1690), P.8.

19. v Broadside "To you the Parliament sitting at Westminster" (1659)

20. F.P.T., P.260.

21. There is considerable disparity between W.F. Miller's list (FFHS XII. PP 79-81) and a list of "The Seventy" given by Taylor in his Presidential address already referred to. But this can be accounted for by the "considerable doubtful margin" which Braithwaite considered to exist. Some on Miller's list were not "publick" - they were not of "The Seventy". John Bowrom, Katherine Evans etc are not in Taylor's list. As several who visited Scotland are according to F.P.T. without dates, the above figures can only be taken at best as fairly approximate.

of these, forty-one, belonged to the pre-Fox group, (i.e. those before Fox's arrival in Scotland) ; three accompanied Fox into Scotland; and probably six were post-Fox missionaries of the first period of the Movement. They were "publick", or duly authorised ministering Friends, but a few of the other "First Publishers" were "not publick", i.e., private itinerants not travelling officially or under any obligation to "give forth a sound". The general reception they got in Scotland may be gathered from Nicoll's²² attitude and language, when he complains of the rise at this time of "great numberis of that damnable sect of the Quakeris quha being deludit by Sathan, drew mony awy to their profession both men and women"²³. In contrast to this was the spirit of hospitality shown to "Stranger Friends" by most Scottish Quakers, and those whom the missionaries found or made "very tender". We have no evidence of when the custom of accompanying and guiding "public" Friends on their journey began, but it is on record that William Miller of Holyrood was one of five Edinburgh Friends about 1734, who, "mutually agree to take our turns or to find one in our steads to accompany Travelling ffrds on their journey".²⁴ In course of time the provision of guides seems to have become the recognised custom, but as this was ultimately considered too oppressive an expense for hosts to bear, the London Yearly Meeting resolved that all such expense as well as lodging where there were no Friends' houses should in future be "defrayed out of the general stock".²⁵ The value of "public" Friends was many sided. They visited the imprisoned; they were spiritual advisers to many in times of crisis: and news carriers and private envoys as well as "Publishers of Truth".

The Journals and other records or fragments of these early missionaries of the Protectorate are thus of the greatest value, for to such sources we are largely indebted for information about the general condition of religion and society in Scotland, and for the knowledge we have of the origin and development of Quakerism during its early years of struggle and persecution in the Northern Kingdom.

It is neither possible nor serviceable here to attempt any exhaustive list or account of the missionaries of the pre-Fox period. A list as complete as it can be made stands already over the signature of W.F. Miller.²⁶ Of some of the early

22. John Nicoll (1590-1667) was a Writer to the Signet in Edinburgh, and bitterly hostile to the Quakers.

23. Nicoll's "Diary", (1836) P.147.

24. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (M.S. Vol 15.)—Back page.

25. Oxley's "Journal", (1837) P.283. This question will be further dealt with in Supplem. Chapter II.

26. Art., "Stranger Friends visiting Scotland" in J.F.H.S. XII, pp. 79 ff.

missionaries we know nothing in their relation to Scotland beyond the fact of their having visited it; of others, the data are very fragmentary; while of others our knowledge is comparatively full and of real value.

To James Nayler, "the reproach and glory of Quakerism", falls the honour of being the earliest Quaker preacher from England of whom any record remains. We are not however, at present concerned with what Carlyle has called "the terrific phenomenon of Nayler",²⁷ but only with his preaching during his military days in Scotland. Enlisting in the Parliamentary Forces soon after the outbreak of the Civil War, he served seven years in Fairfax's Infantry during the English campaign. He was then transferred to the Horse of Major General John Lambert - Lord Lambert as Deacon calls him²⁸ - in all probability on the eve of the Scottish campaign, and received the responsible and difficult commission of Quartermaster in Lambert's army, when the conditions of billeting and rationing²⁹ were no sinecure. Lambert had a high opinion of Nayler's efficiency and integrity,³⁰ as he afterwards testified at his Trial before Parliament. From one of Cromwell's officers, riding in Scotland at the head of his troops, we know that Quartermaster Nayler was present at Dunbar Drove in 1650, for after the battle, he found Nayler preaching to a crowd of people "with such power and reaching energy as I had not till then been witness of". "I was struck with more terror by the preaching of James Nayler" he says "than I was at the Battle of Dunbar".³¹ This was no extraordinary phenomenon then, for most of the Parliamentary soldiers were, alike by religious training and by the active encouragement of Cromwell himself, as good and fearless preachers as they were soldiers.³² Strangely enough, although Nayler was still an Independent and not a Quaker by profession, neither became one till he was "convinced" by Fox in 1651³³ after

-
27. "Letters of Oliver Cromwell", (1888) Vol.III, Prefatory Notes to Letter CCXVII P.213.
28. Deacon's "An Exact History of the Life of James Nayler etc",P.4.
- 29."Cromwell's Army";(1902) Pp.223-4.
30. Burton's "Diary", Vol. I, P.33.
31. James Gough's "Memoirs", PP.54-5. Also quoted in Jaffray's "Diary". (3rd.Ed) P.413. Note A. and Brailsford's "A Quaker from Cromwell's Army" Ch.I, PP 32-33.
32. Clarendon's "History of the Rebellion", (1826 Ed) Vol.V,P.428. cf Neal's "History of the Puritans", (1837) Vol II, P.424;and Carlyle "Cromwell's Letters and Speeches". (1888) Vol II. P.246. (Cromwell's letter to Colonel Hacker at Peebles)
33. Sewell's "History" (1811),Vol I, P. 234 n; and Tuke "Biographical Memoirs", Vol.II, P. 67. (They are wrong in giving 1649 as the date of Nayler's leaving Scotland. Sewell's date of the outbreak of war,1641, is also wrong.

being invalided out of the Army in Scotland,³⁴ he converted to Quakerism this unknown officer of Cromwell. "I could not help staying a little" (to listen to Nayler preaching) he says " though I was afraid to stay, for I was made a Quaker, being forced to tremble at the sight of myself"³⁵. In so far then as Nayler must himself have been a Quaker by 1650 in everything but name, and doubtless "convinced" many others also, he is entitled to the honour of being the first English "Publisher of Truth" in Scotland that we know. There is no evidence that Nayler was ever back in Scotland. Russell in "The Haigs of Bemersyde" is confused in his chronology,³⁶ and there is no need for Jaffray and others to insist that Nayler never came in contact with the little Quaker flock at Drumbowry and Heads, as they had not reached the Quaker position or established meetings till two years after Nayler left Scotland.³⁷

Between 1651 and late in 1653 or the beginning of 1654, there is no record of any other missionary. In the latter year thirteen visited Scotland. Of the labours of half of these there is no information extant. The region covered was practically the Forth and Clyde, the places visited by one or more of the thirteen being Glasgow, Douglas, and Stirling, Edinburgh and Leith. The most notable of the missionaries during this year were Katherine Evans and Sarah Chevers, the heroic women whose terrible sufferings for conscience' sake under the Inquisition at Malta a few years after, is one of the epics of Quaker history, but of whom in Scotland nothing is known; Edward Burrough of Kendal, the "Son of thunder and consolation", before his long mission to London and the South;³⁸ John Bowrom and Christopher Fell of whom mention will be made again; Miles Halhead, William Caton and John Stubbs. At Dumfries, Halhead narrowly escaped serious injury, but he was no stranger to this in England. He had entered the Parish Church (or "Steeplehouse"), apparently during a Communion service, for there were many people "gathered together in a deceitful manner, Howling and Crying & making a great Lamentation, as though they had been touched with a sight of their sins"³⁹ - a phenomenon not then unknown at Scottish sacraments. After the "priest had ended his customary performance in the Steeplehouse", Miles "spoke as he was moved. But "many of them being in great rage," probably because he disparaged the sacrament, he and James Lancaster, his companion, were driven out of the town, and only escaped stoning at the hands

34. cf "Cromwell's Army", P. 272.

35. v note 31 supra.

36. "The Haigs of Bemersyde", Ch. X, P.262.

37. Jaffray's "Diary", P.195.

38. No actual date can be found, but it was about this time.(1654) v Spence MSS. Vol III, Folio 7.

39. "A Book of the Sufferings and Passages of Myles Halhead", (1690) P13

40. Besse's "Sufferings" (1753) Vol II. P.495. —Another suggestion, I think, of the sacrament being celebrated.

of the infuriated women, by wading across the Nith. It must have been low tide, for the river was then navigable for coasting vessels.

Caton and Stubbs were two of the most scholarly of "The Seventy". The former was Secretary at Swarthmore Hall. He abridged and edited an edition of Eusebius' "Ecclesiastical History"⁴¹, which was printed in Rotterdam and published in 1661. Stubbs had been a Roundhead in the Parliamentary forces, but there is no evidence that he ever served in the Scottish campaign, and he was not a "Regular". He was a Classical and Oriental scholar,⁴² and for a considerable time kept a school in Lancaster.

The missionary Friends who visited Scotland in 1655 numbered⁴³ 17, including five who had previously gone in 1653-4. All but three were beneficiaries of the Swarthmore Fund, One, William Stockdale, or Stockdell was Irish. Six according to Besse had either already suffered imprisonment or other form of persecution outside Scotland, or were about to later in the same year. The most notable visitor to Scotland in 1655 was Anthony Pearson of Rampshaw Hall, Durham, one of the Justices who had tried Nayler at Appleby Sessions. This trial led dramatically to the "convincement" of Pearson, who for years kept "correspondence for the discontented party in London and Scotland". But after the Restoration, he recanted his Quaker faith, and in the County Palatine of Durham he signed an affidavit in 1661 to the effect that since the Restoration, he had no part or lot in any correspondence between English and Scots Friends, nor any knowledge thereof.⁴³

During 1656-7, prior to October of the latter year when George Fox himself arrived in Scotland, the influx of Stranger Friends to Scotland was even greater than in 1655, the total amounting probably to twenty-three. In the two instances of John Langstaff and Anthony Pearson, Fox's "Journal" records that they were expected in Scotland "about y^e time" But they did not come.⁴⁴ Parker, however, one of Fox's lieutenants, in his Scottish campaign, was in Scotland several months before his leader. Six of those who came in 1656 received grants in aid from the Swarthmore Fund. A few of the entire number were North again for the second or even third time. There are several notable names among them, but as these

41. The full title of Caton's work is given in his "Journal" (2nd Ed. 1839) P.99. It is also found in Whiting's "Catalogue" Vol. I, P.25, and Smith's "Catalogue" Vol I, P.393. Caton himself called it for brief "An Abridgement".

42. v Webb's "The Fells of Swarthmore Hall", (1867) P.101.

43. S.P.D. Cal. 1661-2, P. 181. v also Braithwaite's "Beginnings", P. 114.

44. "Swarthmore MSS." Vol I, P. 359. (Letter from William Caton to Lancelot Wardell 1656.)

must be dealt with more fully in other connections, they may be omitted here.

The last year or eighteen months of pre-Fox missionary enterprise in Scotland is important for three things. (1) it numbers among its Stranger Friends the first women in Scotland of whom there is any record. Prior to 1656 there were three other women - the Malta heroines and Elizabeth Holme, but of their travels or work in Scotland we know nothing. The evidence for the former, Anne Hargrave (or Hargrove) and Margaret Bradley is certainly inferential, but it is all but conclusive. In a letter to Secretary Thurloe from Leith, dated December 28. 1657, his correspondent, Captain Timothy Langley, complaining that "they still send new ones (English Friends) almost every week into these parts", states that "the two women (unnamed) are now gon West... They spare no pains and voluntarily goe into those places where they may meet with most want of outward things; which makes them the more admired if not adored at their returne by their diciples... Our women Quakers in this towne... have hired a chamber... to meet in, and have another at Edinburgh; soe that they meete dayly... They have great hopes of gaining a lady in Edinburgh, and boast of many converts in the West..."⁴⁵.

(2) In 1656-7, the first persecutions of Stranger Friends in Scotland are recorded, though as has been noted, persecution had already begun in England. The storm centres were Glassford, Strathaven, Rutherglen, East Kilbride and Glasgow chiefly, and with the travelling victims Scottish Friends shared the persecution.⁴⁶

(3) About 1656-7 the flood of Quaker pamphleteering and propagan-dist literature began to make itself felt in Scotland. Even travelling Friends, despite all their hardships and difficulties were prolific writers; and books, tracts for the times, manuscript messages, prophetic denunciations against classes and communities, epistles and miscellaneous pamphlets were broadcast throughout the districts visited. In England it had been a feature of the Society from the time of James Nayler. As a malcontent critic remarked "the Leaders... of your Sect have taken a sinfull liberty to themselves in their printed books... In these printed Libels and in your Manuscripts that flye as thick as Moths up and down the Country the ablest of your party, the Authors of them have said and railed and censured and slandered."⁴⁷ In Scotland the authorities were now becoming alarmed at the amount of sectarian literature that was streaming into the country, in whose dissemination Alexander Parker and later Fox, seemed not unnaturally to have been most assiduous. Monck ordered the Commanding Officer at Leith to place an intromission on both of them, and intercepted a large consignment of books from Newcastle casting fourteen shillings carriage, with a covering letter. This letter and specimens

45. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol VI, PP 708-9.

46. v post Ch.V.

47. v "A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the Northern Quakers", Intro. ("To the Seduced followers of Geo. Fox, James Nayler etc.") PP 2-3.

of the literature aforesaid, Monck despatched from Dalkeith to Secretary Thurloe in February 1657, suggesting that some measures might be taken to prevent the printing of such papers.⁴⁸ But amid the increasingly confused and threatening situation in the country, during the closing years of the Protectorate, Cromwell and his Secretary were too preoccupied to concern themselves with the nuisance of Quaker propaganda. At all events, it was still apparently unabated late in the year 1658, when William Dewsbury paid his first visit to Scotland, and George Watkinson, an ex-captain in the army, who had been cashiered by Monck, wrote to George Fox from Leith, that people "desired to have had ye words written downe y^t W.D. spoake; they were soe taken with y^m. Seu^{ll} of ye papers were dispersed, even soe many as well in our travell could bee gott written".⁴⁹

A consignment of books from Fox in 1659 was reported to have been burnt, and probably was, for Lady Margaret Hamilton failed to discover any trace of them. Only a few⁵⁰ that Fox sent her specially to give to General Monck survived. And two years before, a similar consignment of "true Books" worth £10. 0. 0^s had been seized by Monck and the Council, and never restored.⁵¹

Fox seemed, however, to have been alive to the danger or inexpediency of overdoing such propagandist publications, for soon after his release from Launceston Gaol in 1656, he published a paper of wise counsel at a General Meeting, in which, inter alia, he urged Friends to "take heed of Printing any thing more than ye are required of the Lord God".⁵²

It is impossible to estimate the mileage covered by these "First Publishers of Truth" before the advent of Fox in Scotland, but it must have been great. And under the prevailing physical conditions, it was remarkable. Most of the roads in Scotland were "green" or drove roads, and what main arteries there were, constituted a daily danger to life and limb, so neglected and in Winter impassable, were they.⁵³ No form of transport was safe, and accidents were frequent. Bridges were usually very narrow and steep. These conditions obtained until the 18th century, for the days of Wade, Macadam, and Telford, "the Colossus of Roads" were not yet. Robertson in his "Survey of Kincardineshire" tells us that even as late as 1760 when Robert Barclay M.P., the Father of Barclay-Allardice, the pedestrian, succeeded to the estate of Urie "there was no cart nor wheel carriage of any kind, nor was there even a road".⁵⁴

48. Thurloe's "State Papers", Vol VI, P. 811.

49. Letter in Swarthmore MSS, Vol IV, P.391. 50. Ibid, PP217-8.

51. Broadside "To you the Parliament sitting at Westminster"(1659)

52. Fox's "Epistles", No. 131. (P.104)

53. cf "Proceedings of the Society of Antiquarians of Scot." 5th series Vol II. (1915) PP 18-20. (Art. by Inglis on "The Roads that led to Edinburgh")

54. P. 325.

CHAPTER III."THE SOCIETY TAKES ROOT IN EDINBURGH."

The honour of being the first Quaker apostle to Edinburgh is still in doubt as between Christopher Fell and John Bowrom, though it is likelier that it belongs to the latter. According to John Barclay, Fell, who may have been a Cumbrian was one of "several Gospel messengers from England whose feet were turned" in the direction of Scotland in 1653.¹ Bowrom, a Yorkshireman, reached Scotland soon after his convincement in 1653.² At Edinburgh he preached to the people as he went through the streets and at the Cross.³ Open-air preaching was then an innovation in Scotland as a policy or under normal circumstances, for the few previous instances of it on record, e.g., George Wishart's preaching at the West Port, Dundee, in 1544, during the Plague, or the dying testimony of Walter Mill in 1558 at St. Andrews⁴ can hardly be cited as precedents. We have no knowledge how Bowrom fared with the Edinburgh populace generally, but though the English soldiers were "kind" to him, "the priests were in a rage against him for he was a dread to them".

The soil, however, had been prepared to some extent for the English "public" Friends by one of the earliest native preachers of the "Inner Light", William Osborne (or Osburn).⁶ Of Osborne we unfortunately know comparatively little. He had been a Lieutenant-Colonel in the Parliamentary army, and was now become "a zealous minister amongst the flock" at Edinburgh.⁷ His house was the earliest meeting place of the Society in the Capital of which we have record, and Friends enjoyed this hospitality till 1656, when Osborne removed his home to near Badcow. At all events he was in, or near Badcow in 1657, for Fox relates the well known story of Osborne, himself, and the wayside robbers, and how they probably saved Widders from spoliation.⁸

-
1. Or very early in 1654. cf Fox's "Journal". (Camb.Ed.) Vol I, PP 450-1; and J.F.H.S. Vol XII. P.79.
 2. Or beginning of 1654. Ibid.
 3. "Piety Promoted", Vol I, Part III, P. 233.
 4. Lindsay's "Chronicles of Scotland", Vol II, P. 136.
 5. A "Priest" to the Quakers was an ordained minister of any Church or Order who drew a stipend or emoluments of any kind in virtue of his office. The Quakers were not the only persons who crossed swords with the Scots Clergy. Some of the army Chaplains also did so, and this may have predisposed certain of the soldiers to the Quakers. (cf "Cromwell's Army" 1902, P.325.)
 6. Besse's "Sufferings", (1753) Vol II, P.494; Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol I, P.159.
 7. Ibid, P.181.
 8. Fox's "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol I, PP 303-4.

Immediately after Fox's bloodless victory over the robbers, and before his very brief and only visit to the "Highlands", he records that at Osborne's house they had a good opportunity to declare "ye truth to several people that came" in.⁹

Quakerism at first made a considerable stir in Edinburgh among all classes, - Ministers, serious hearers and enquirers, and the irresponsible mob. The Churchmen quickly began to harden toward their vehement and massed opposition which ultimately crystallised into their curses and appeal to Caesar during Fox's visit, but for the moment they were too busy with their internal ecclesiastical disputes and factions to organise any combined resistance to the new Truth. There was, however, one, John Stalham, a temporary preacher in Edinburgh who was very vigorous with his pen against the Quakers. In his "Contradictions of the Quakers", Stalham charged them with teaching that the Scriptures were not the Word of Truth, nor the ground and motive power of Christian action, but that the law of the New Covenant was written in the heart. He further arraigned them for denying Scriptural warrant for the doctrine of the Trinity; for their teaching of immediate revelation, of conversion through the Inner Light and of perfectionism, and for their customary attitude to social conventions and civil requirements. He criticised or attacked partim Farnworth's "Light risen out of Darkness", and other contemporary Quaker works. Farnworth apparently, in a representative capacity, replied for the Friends to Stalham, as also did an anonymous writer "P.E." in a pamphlet (lost) entitled "The Scriptures Vindication against the Scottish Contradictors". Farnworth's pages written for the "wise hearted" as well as "against all proud, covetous self-seeking, hireling Priests in Scotland", are full of force, not lacking in humour, as when he says that "Paul did not always groan and sigh (for his sin) as dissemblers and Scots do", but the argument is in certain parts very weak, e.g., in his reply concerning the Trinity, and parts of the pamphlet are not only abusive but vitriolic. But the Church herself had no reason to boast or preen her feathers.

Resolutioners and Protesters were ranged against one another and often engaged in battles of fierce invective and mutual recrimination, not only with one another but with Baptists and Sectaries. In addition, Cromwell's policy of interdenominational toleration in Scotland was making the confusion in the Church still worse confounded. A Declaration issued by the Commissioners of the Parliament in April 1652 promised toleration not only to the Church of Scotland, but "to all others who not being satisfied in conscience to use that form, shall serve and worship God in any other gospel way, and behave themselves peaceably and inoffensively therein". Very soon a few ministers and officials declared themselves in favour of the "Independent Way", and attempts were made, not unsuccessfully, to form congregations.¹⁰

9. Ibid, P.304.

10. Firth's "The Last Years of the Protectorate", Vol II, P.101.

§To make this "hellish invention" of toleration worse, an Ordinance of August 1654 promised Separatist Ministers state support,¹² by which "the Commissioners for regulating the Ministry, while employing the stipends of the parochial Churches for the support of the Presbyterian Clergy, were entrusted to 'provide out of the treasury of vacant stipends or otherwise as they shall think fit a competent maintenance for such ministers who have gathered Congregations in Scotland'."¹³ In spite of all this encouragement, however, Separatism never flourished, partly because the soil of Scotland has never been congenial to Independency.

But these serious disputes, together with the quarrels of Resolutioners and Protesters, which not all the endeavours of Robert Blair and James Durham could terminate¹⁴ caused a great deal of confusion and trouble in the country. The general disorder affected not only Edinburgh, but Glasgow, Dundee and St. Andrews' also, for in consequence thereof the Communion was not observed in some of their Churches for a number of years.¹⁵ The spiritual life of the Church as a whole lacked cohesion as we might expect, when one was saying "I am of Paul" and others "I am of Apollos" and "I am of Cephas". It is little wonder that the minds of many more serious and earnest people were repelled from the Church and its factions, especially when the only thing to which all these sects and denominations could bend their energies was their opposition to the Quakers.¹⁶ Coming on the scene when the spirit of religious discontent was abroad, the Quakers in Edinburgh and other parts of Scotland had a great opportunity which would have been more abundantly crowned but for their extravagances of language, custom and action, and their imperviousness to other people's opinions, traditions, and varieties of religious experience. As it was, they began so well in Edinburgh that Nicoll is driven to admit, that in January 1655 and "in sindry uther monethis preceeding and mony monethis following, thair rais up great numberis of that damnable sect of the Quakeris,¹⁷ In March 1656 "multitudes of

11. Baillie's "Letters", Book III, P.309.

12. It was thus that Thomas Charteris, Hamilton's former Minister was an Independent. After renouncing Presbyterianism, he gathered a little flock of Separatists, and obtained from the English Commissioners the wealthy living of East Kilbride.

13. Firth's "The Last Years of the Protectorate", Vol II, P.102; Nicoll's "Diary", P.167.

14. Burnet's "History of his own Time"; (1883) PP 36 40ff etc. cf Walker's "Scottish Theology and Theologians"; (Sec.Ed. 1888) PP 104-5.

15. cf Brown's "History of Glasgow and of Paisley etc"(1795), Vol.I, Ch.V, P.119.

16. L.A. Barclay "Selections from the Writings of Patrick Livingstone" (1847) PP.31-2.

17. Nicoll's "Diary", P.147.

Quakeris increst...And the division of the Ministrie in their judgementis and opiniounes did much contribute to the increse of these errouris."¹⁸ This is corroborated by the lament of the Edinburgh and other ministers in February 1658, in which Dickson, Robert Douglas, Mungo Law and others informed Calamy and Ash, preachers in London, that "there is a great decay of the power of religion and a great increase of prophanity by reason of the condition of the times", so that many "who were at first only embarked by our Brethren in their way, are now turned aside to errour, yea and diverse of those became Quakers".¹⁹

Among the city rabble who cared for none of these things, interest in the Quakers did not simply spring from the usual sources, - curiosity, and the chances that the situation threw up for hooliganism or horse-play. Nicoll's testimony has to be accepted with caution on account of his bitter prejudice against the Friends, but there is little reason to doubt his substantial accuracy when he records the popular belief that the Quakers practised black arts aided by the devil. They thus made a sensational appeal, especially to the masses and the "baser sort", unwittingly no doubt, but none the less definitely. The devil "careyit them from ane place to another. They made swallows to come down from their chimneys and made them to cry out 'My angellis, my angellis'."²⁰ Andrew Lang compares the "miracles" attributed to the Quakers to phenomena of modern Spiritualism.²¹

Whether then "of envy and strife" or of love, the Quaker message and witness undoubtedly exercised some influence in Edinburgh in the mid-Cromwellian period. The next English visitors after John Bowrom were Miles Halhead and James Lancaster in 1654, fresh from their escape from the Nith at Dumfries. They spent ten not very eventful days in Edinburgh and Leith, Halhead speaking to the people "when occasion offered; as also to the garrisons and to the Captains and Officers of the army who were much affected."²² In the light of the very favourable, if not cordial reception that the military seemed to have afforded him, and in the absence of other data, it is not easy to see the appositeness of the rather stern prophetic manifesto which he hurled at them, that the anger of the Lord was kindled against them for having failed to implement their promises made to Him in the day of their imminent peril from their enemies

18. Ibid, PP177-8.

19. "Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh".. Vol I, PP. 342, 343.

20. Nicoll's "Diary", PP. 147-8.

21. "A History of Scotland from the Roman Occupation", (1904) Vol. III, P.276.

22. Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol I, P.159. cf "A Book of Sufferings and Passages of Miles Halhead", (1690) P.13.

and, instead, for having returned Him evil for good and committed violence against those He sent to declare His Word amongst them.²³ It was probably a kind of stock utterance of Halhead's, which he felt called upon to deliver in season and out of season, for, as Besse plainly adds "having performed his duty in this respect", he departed. During his sojourn in Edinburgh, he appeared before Colonel Fenwick, the Governor of the City²⁴, but upon what charge or for what purpose is not known.

The year 1655 was the zenith of Quakerism in Edinburgh during the Commonwealth and Protectorate period, and it was due preeminently to William Caton. Caton paid three visits to Scotland, including Edinburgh, in 1655,²⁵ 1656, and 1659. On the first occasion he was accompanied by John Stubbs for part of the time, and for the remainder by John Slee, another English Friend. Caton was particularly happy in these travelling colleagues, especially as "our travails were great and our sufferings many both in the inward and outward man".²⁶ He reached Edinburgh from Berwick-on-Tweed with Stubbs. "I do believe", he wrote, "scarce any of the brethren that travelled abroad ... ever agreed better than we did, or were more mutual in their service and in other things incident to travellers than we".²⁷ On their arrival in Edinburgh, the first thing that compelled their attention was the unsatisfactory condition of their religious group. "We found things somewhat out of order there through the unfaithfulness of some that were convinced of the Truth, but who did not order their conversation aright, neither did they live as became the Gospel."²⁸ Whether the trouble was divided counsels, lukewarmness in their missionary enterprise, or personal bickerings and jealousies, will probably never be known. But despite the youthfulness of Caton - he was only in his nineteenth year - the endeavours which he and Stubbs put forward to rectify the condition of things were successful, and "through the effectual influence of their ministry, better order was restored".²⁹

The spiritual forces of the Quaker colony being now rallied and reinforced, the Friends were ready to follow the lead of Caton in other ways. Their private or "silent" meetings were frequent, and still held at William Osborne's house, and they had "many gallant" public meetings in the City. The great open-air rendezvous was the Castlehill, where at least twice weekly many hundreds of people including no doubt many soldiers from the Castle

23. Ibid, PP12-13; Sewell's "History" (1811), Vol. I, P.159; and Besse's "Sufferings" (1753), Vol II, P. 495.

24. Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol II, P. 289.

25. Or the end of 1654.

26. "Journal" of William Caton, (2nd Ed. — 1839) P.38.

27. Ibid.

28. Ibid, PP.38-39.

29. Gough's "History of the Quakers", Vol I, P.168.

heard the Quaker message "in much power and plainness" so that the Society increased in confidence and numbers. Nicoll reluctantly corroborates that "thair pretendit sermoundis and hortatiounes" drew "much pepill, sum to heir and sie and sum utheris to reverence thair judgementis, errouris, and opiniounes."³⁰ Converts were made from both English soldiers of the Army of Occupation and from Edinburgh inhabitants, who paraded the streets and squares openly with their new fellow-religionists. In 1658, "the magistrates is to take course with those who go vaging upon the streets and on the Castlehill etc", and to police them and apprehend all who are out of their houses or of Church during sermon.³¹

None of these public assemblies or open manifestations of the "Publishers of Truth" seems to have occasioned any determined opposition, or led to violence or breach of the peace. It was when the Quakers began to invade the Churches that disturbance and tumult really began. The "steeplehouses" and their "hireling priests" they abhorred. To the Quaker it was only a superstitious idea which regarded the "Church" as a specially holy place, or "consecrated houses" where alone the Gospel could be properly preached. John Barclay however, refutes the general view, and maintains³² that however harsh and intolerant "steeplehouse" may sound, its connotation is in no way meant to imply scurrility or opprobrium of the Church and its worshippers, but only to emphasise the comparative lack of distinction or reverence that the Quaker felt for outward temples. The Quaker simply protested against the idolisation of a special "House of God", when the real abode of God is everywhere, especially in the souls and bodies of men which are His temple.

Quakers thus frequently came into conflict with Scottish Church authorities and worshippers. Soldiers were blamed for damaging chairs and furnishings in Churches, and Andrew Lang states that Quakers in Edinburgh interrupted the preachers in Greyfriars' Church.³³ Whether this is accurate or not, a commotion was certainly caused in Old Greyfriars' by a Quaker demand to the Minister³⁴ to prove his calling by signs and miracles, and by vehement incitement of the congregation to deny all ministerial teaching and ordinances, and to repudiate all knowledge acquired by such means in favour of the "Inward Light". It is not surprising that soon after, in 1657, the General Kirk Sessions, including Greyfriars' minuted a resolution "to confer with [Town] Councill anent the quakers whose blasphemous tenets and cariage is likely to bring a judgement if it be not restrained."³⁵

³⁰. Nicoll's "Diary", P. 177.

³¹. General Kirk Sessions Minute of 5th April 1658, quoted in Bryce's "History of the Old Greyfriars' Church Edinburgh", P.101.

³². Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd. Ed.) Note C, P.415.

³³. "History of Scotland", Vol III, P.276.

³⁴. Most likely Robert Trail, but possibly Mungo Law.

³⁵. Bryce's "History of the Old Greyfriars' Church Edinburgh", P.101.

William Caton was impelled, especially on one occasion, to go to the leading place of worship. He waited quietly for the Minister to finish, but had hardly begun to address the crowded congregation before it assumed a threatening attitude, and a "big push" began. On reaching the street, a guard of soldiers with drawn swords was waiting in readiness to rescue Caton from the throng and convey him safely beyond their reach.³⁶ Thus they were thwarted from doing outside what considerations of sanctity and perhaps superstition restrained them from perpetrating inside.

The Church in question was most likely Saint Giles', though the possibility of the Tron must not be excluded. Caton himself calls it "their high place of worship" (cf the "High Kirk") and "the chiefest in the City"³⁷ while Sewell terms it the chief "steeplehouse"³⁸ The East Kirk of Saint Giles' was the regular place of worship, or "exercise" for Cromwell's troops,³⁹ although the Tron was also occasionally used. The latter was practically shorn of its regular worshippers after the Battle of Dunbar, when the soldiers virtually monopolised it.⁴⁰ The congregation which threatened Caton is not likely to have been a military church parade either in St. Giles' or in the Tron, but a general audience which would meet more probably in the former.

The question of Quakers entering places of worship, interrupting preachers, and disturbing services, is one upon which there is a certain amount of misunderstanding and misrepresentation. It is essential that it should be considered in the light of its 17th Century background and conditions, and not with reference to usages and customs of our own time. The Churches in England were then much less restricted in use either on Sundays or on week-days than they are now. By an Act of Mary Tudor's reign the malicious disturbance of a preacher in his discourse or in the celebration of Divine service was made a punishable offence,⁴¹ but the service must be actually proceeding at the time, and this law all through the 17th Century did not extend to proclamations or exhortations after the sermon was over. Provided the preacher had finished, it was perfectly legal and in accordance with the usage and manners of the age to speak thus, and some incumbents were even ready to hold discussions with preachers of other denominations. In Scotland in addition, there was the authority of "The First Book of Discipline" of 1560, which, although rejected by the Scots Parliament, was accepted by the Church and permitted and even encouraged the exercise of prophesying and interpreting the Scriptures in Church after the Minister had done on Sunday, or on a convenient weekday.⁴²

36. cf Acts XXIII, 10.

37. Caton's "Journal", (1839) P.39.

38. Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol I, P.181.

39. Cameron Lees' "St. Giles' Edinburgh etc", Ch.23, P.225.

40. Butler's "George Fox in Scotland", (1913) P.19.

41. Halsbury "The Laws of England", (1909) Vol 9, PP.477-8.

42. v "The First Book of Discipline", (1560) Ch.XII, Capita 2,3,6.
cf "The Book of Common Order", Ch.VI.

Thus the English Quakers had every encouragement to believe that the privilege they enjoyed at home extended to Scotland also. It is undoubtedly true that Fox had set a bad example in his very early days, though he later came to see his error.⁴³ But there is evidence of only a few occasions when Quakers in Scotland created any pandemonium or interruption while the Minister was conducting the service.

(1) In St. Giles', Edinburgh, where Quakers made their appearance and "interrupted the sermons to the great annoyance of the preachers".⁴⁴

(2) In Greyfriars' Church, Edinburgh, most probably.

(3) In Stirling, during Caton's second tour in Scotland when he went to the Parish Church. (Now the Holy Rude Church) He admitted that "being there at the very time when the priest was going about to swear some of them upon some occasion", ~~(possibly the admission of catechumens to Church membership, or a case of discipline)~~ he was "moved to speak and tell them how that Christ said 'swear not at all', but little more would they suffer us to speak in that place".⁴⁵

There is more specific evidence, however, on the other side. At Dumfries, Miles Halhead "was silent until their worship was done".⁴⁶ Neither at St. Giles' nor at Glasgow Cathedral did Caton utter a word until after "the priest had done",⁴⁷ and George Fox, personally, seems to have avoided "steeplehouses" altogether in Scotland, and preferred to hold his public meetings in neutral buildings or in the open. About this time, (1654-5) according to Brown, the Presbyterians complained much of the intrusion of Sectaries, especially of the Quakers railing "on the Ministers in the face of the congregations on the Sabbath day" with impunity.⁴⁸ But this may quite well have been after the service before the people dispersed, and in any case there was no Act in Scotland corresponding to Mary Tudor's. Nor were the persecutions and penalties of the Quakers in Scotland during the Commonwealth meted out upon the ground of interrupting Ministers and congregations during service. In fine, while the amount of disturbance of Scots preachers and people during worship seems to have been negligible, what declamation and trouble there was in the churches took place just after the services, and was due to the English Friends who enjoyed this common and recognised licence at home,⁴⁹ and, encouraged by the "First Book of Discipline" arrogated to themselves the right to have the same in Scotland. In addition, they had the precedent and example set them by Cromwell and his officers of preaching in Churches, even at times to the entire exclusion of the Ministry.⁵⁰ It was common knowledge that Cromwell

43. v Barclay's "Inner Life of the Religious Societies", PP.275, 279. Ch.XII. gives an admirable and concise survey of the whole question.

44. Cameron Lees', "St. Giles', Edinburgh, etc" P.227.

45. Caton's "Journal", (1839) P.45.

46. Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol.I, P.158.

47. Caton's "Journal", (1839) PP.39, 40.

48. "History of Glasgow & Paisley etc", (1795) Vol.I, P.121.

49. cf "Diary of Rev. Ralph Josselin", P.112.

50. cf "Woodstock", Ch.I, PP 17 ff.(Fine Art Scott).

himself had preached in "Christ's Kirk at the Tron" and in St Giles'.⁵¹

But of all that the Quakers did in Edinburgh and elsewhere, the thing that scandalised the inhabitants most was what is known as "going naked as a sign". Nicoll charges them, *inter alia*, with perpetrating this outrage upon public decency circ. 1655,⁵² "Sindrie of thame walking throw the streitis all naikit except thair schirtis, crying 'This is the way, walk ye into it' - utheris crying out, 'The day of salvatioun is at hand.. for the sword of the Lord is drawn..." While this phenomenon of early Quakerism was in no sense peculiar to Scotland, nor its extreme expressions found there, its rationale may be briefly stated.⁵³ It was motivated by, and based upon, a crude and literal interpretation chiefly of Isaiah walking naked and barefoot for three years as a sign at the word of the Lord,⁵⁴ though also of Micah⁵⁵ and others in the Old Testament.⁵⁶ But there were degrees of nudity, and partial undress was at least common enough for many of the Friends concerned to have agreed with Sir. George Adam Smith's later interpretation of "naked" as "unfrocked",⁵⁷ or without the prophet's upper garment of sackcloth, and for this interpretation to be urged against them as early as 1653.⁵⁸ In every degree, however, those who went naked as a sign did so under the firm conviction that they were called by God to be the modern successors to the prophets in an evil and adulterous generation both by utterance and acted parable, and it must be admitted that they submitted to what they conceived to be the Divine requirement only under a compelling sense of duty and with the strongest reluctance and "crucifixion of will". As an acted parable or "sign", going naked signified at least two things, that all who had not come into the "Light" might "see that they were naked and not covered with Truth", and that "priests" might understand thereby that God would strip them of their power and benefices till they were as naked as their Protagonists.⁵⁹ The one thing which mitigated this practice somewhat, as Braithwaite points out, was, that in this rough age it was customary to punish vagrants, including travelling "Publishers of Truth" of both sexes, by stripping them naked to the waist and openly flogging them.⁶⁰

-
51. Butler's "George Fox in Scotland", P.19; Cameron Lees "St Giles' Edinburgh etc", Ch. XXIII. P.225.
52. Nicoll's "Diary", P.147.
53. A fuller treatment of the question is found in the appendix to F.P.T. PP 364-9: Janney's "History of Friends", Vol I, P.476: Blome's "Fanatick History", (1660) (hostile) Book II, Chs I & V, and other works.
54. Isa. XX.
55. Micah I.8.
56. cf Exod. XXXII.25: II Samuel VI.20, 14.
57. "Expositor's Bible"-"Isaiah", Vol.I, P.199.
58. "The Quaeries and Quakers' Cause at the Second Hearing", (1653) Quaerie XII, P.23.
59. cf F.P.T, P.365.
60. "The Beginnings of Quakerism", P.149.

William Caton returned to Edinburgh in 1656, in company with John Grave of Cumberland. He was in very indifferent health when he arrived in Scotland to find that *the* favourable tide of the previous year had begun to ebb appreciably, and "things is Exceedingly out of Order". After William Osborne left Edinburgh, the Friends were without a meeting place. They had been counting on the legal help of Anthony Pearson in securing another, but as he somehow failed to come, the scheme was mis-managed, perhaps worse - by others, and they were all in confusion.⁶¹ It is not improbable that this circumstance had definite repercussions on the spiritual life and witness of the Society. For while Caton had "several good meetings" and fared quite well in open-air gatherings in Leith, things generally were far from healthy, and he wrote to Margaret Fell, his patroness, that "truly the simplyctie is much scattered & ye great Convincement much lost, and many harts hardened. And exceeding hard it will be to get any thing brought forth to perfection Amongst them."⁶² Many who had been previously convinced now found the Cross an offence to them, and the preaching of it foolishness. The gatherings had declined and there were scarcely any fresh convictions except among the English Garrison. "Here hath been severall unwise builders amongst them, which will tend to the ruine and destruction of the whole building, which hath bene daded with untempered mortter."⁶³ And all the time they were among "these uncircumsised Phillistines who are fitt for ye day of slaughttr."⁶⁴ Probably the attitude of the "uncircumcised Philistines" was hardening also towards Caton and Grave whom they regarded only as "stragglng soldiers" and impelled the former to write his well known letter to "the citizens of Edenbrough to take warning while they have time".⁶⁵ It is undated "in Olifere's dayes", but the internal evidence that it belongs to this time is undeniable. It is full of the characteristic Quaker denunciations, maledictions, and telling invective of the early days. "Truth is fallen in the streets and equity cannot enter. The inhabitants of Edinburgh lives in pride and fullnesse and gluttony and drunkennesse... devouring the creation upon their lusts, and yet making a large profession of their Creator in much hypocrisie". But the letter concludes on a more conciliatory and appealing note, and Caton assures them that although he witnesses against "this city which lyes in wickednesse", he is yet "a lover of their soulls". And with this he quitted Edinburgh for another three years.

61. "Letter from Caton to Wardell". (1656) ("Swarthmore MSS" I, PP359-60)

62. Ibid. PP 351-2. No date, except in "Olifere's dayes", but we know it is 1656 from a reference to Grave.

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid, P.359.

65. Ibid, PP 512-3.

About the beginning of February 1657, not long after Caton's departure, John Hall, the first English Quaker reputed to have visited Aberdeen, came to Edinburgh. In a letter to Margaret Fell, written from Paisley, he relates how a Captain from Leith with his wife, and a woman friend, "all daubed wth silver and gold Lace" came to a meeting in the Capital, and one of the women "had A prettie worke upon her spirit". She seems to have been a Baptist, for the Baptists fell into "great rage" and assaulted her "almost night and day excepting when sleepe seeteth upon her", because she refused to join in their worship. The woman may have been the Captain's wife, for a senior officer, Colonel Lidcoate was so angry at what happened "yt he sent to Lithcow to warne ye souldiers yt they Let not us into ye Castle."⁶⁶ Beyond this case of conversion and persecution, we hear nothing of Hall's activities in Edinburgh.

66. "Swarthmore MSS." Vol II, P.287, dated 15-12-1657⁶.

CHAPTER IV."IN THE MIDLAND AREA, AND GLASGOW."

In the upper Ward of Lanarkshire, one of the important places where Quakerism gained an early footing was Douglas. None of the names of its earliest followers there are known, nor when precisely they commenced their witness, but it cannot have been later than about the beginning of 1655. Probably 1654 is not far wide of the mark, for in that year, the Ecclesiastical situation in the Parish became such as to predispose the people to dissent and a more vital religion. Some time during that year,¹ The Minister of Douglas, Archibald Inglis, "a verie good and able youth", who apparently received no stipend, was succeeded by Peter Kid,² whom Principal Baillie of Glasgow dubbed "a silly young man",² who had never been previously seen or heard in the bounds. He had a stormy reception at his ordination by the "Protester" section of the Presbytery of Lanark,³ and English Troopers had to be summoned "once and againe" to clear the Churchyard of heritors and parishioners who tried to barricade the way to the Church, but the majority of the troops while doing their duty were in manifest sympathy with the parishioners.

There are no details of Quaker activity in Douglas extant prior to the coming of William Caton. He visited Douglas during all his three Scottish tours. In the condition of things that he thus found on his first visit, Besse's statement that "he published the Truth without much opposition"⁴ need occasion no surprise, nor his own words that he had "exceeding good service both in the steeplehouse and elsewhere"⁵. Kid, however, was instrumental in getting him turned out of his lodgings and in debarring him from any other, so that he had to go outside the town to find quarters - but how, we have no knowledge.

In 1656, the year of Caton's second visit, those "quho are callit quakers" numbered seven according to the return of the minister of Douglas to the Presbytery for its information and necessary action.⁶ Here, as in Lesmahagow, Hamilton, Glassford and elsewhere, there was persecution quickly to ensue. Despite this, however, the Sect still continued in Douglas, and though it fell to as low as three in 1669, it seems to have so increased in numbers by the beginning of the 18th Century - an unusual thing - that in 1705, the Presbytery directed the Magistrates of the town to repress their conventicles.⁸

-
1. The dates are blank in Scott's "Fasti".
 2. "Letters", Vol III, P.247. But of Jas. Stirling's estimate of him in Wodrows' "Analecta" Vol III, pp. 110-11.
 3. Scott's "Fasti", (New Ed.) Vol. III, P.301. cf the more sensational case of Wells at Shotts Kirk in 1762. For Cromwell's favour to the Protesters, v McCrie's "Sketches of Scottish Church History", (1844) PP 370-2.
 4. Besse's "Sufferings" (1753) Vol II, P.495.
 5. Caton's "Journal" (1839) P.40.
 6. v post Ch.V, PP 40-41.
 7. v post Ch.V, partim.
 8. v post Book III, Ch V, P.296.

Caton returned with John Grave in 1656, and with the support of "the few friends that were convinced" held at first meetings in the Churchyard. They seem to have been well attended when there was no service proceeding, but when Kid was "at his devotion; many of them left us". But later, during a catechising in the Church, Caton was present, and as this was not technically a "service", he was at first permitted to take an unwelcome part. Kid seems to have been not altogether adamant when Caton propounded questions to him, for, "sometimes he said he would answer them, and sometimes he said he would not", or when Caton rushed in to the relief of the discomfited, and answered Kid's questions to them himself. But a limit to the endurance of this disconcerting Quaker was soon reached, as finally the Minister "broke out into a very great rage and passion, and caused the people to turn me out of my lodging, and it is possible he would have done much more if he had had power in his hand".⁹

Another town of which there is some mention in the mid-Commonwealth years is Stirling. There is no evidence of any settlement of Quakerism there prior to William Caton's two visits in 1655 and 1656, and it is probable that the inhabitants had only heard by rumour and hearsay of "that damnable sect" called Quakers, but quite sufficiently to hold their sense of antipathy and animosity in reserve against a first hand acquaintance. Whenever Caton entered "the city", as he always calls it, he was whipped off to the Garrison and thence to the Governor. But he seems to have mollified the Governor who at first was "high", and disarmed his suspicion, for he was not put under any kind of restraint. He was taken again before the Governor on his second visit after disturbing the service in the Parish Church,¹⁰ and this time the latter was again "pretty high against us" not without reason, "and would even have forced us out of the City: howbeit he was then prevented".¹¹ Stirling received the Quakers and their message with unfriendliness and curiosity not unmixed with mistrust, but there was little active opposition to them and no persecution. The inhabitants rather showed a "dour" passive resistance and inhospitality, for Caton and Grave could not obtain any lodging "for our money" in "the city" on the first night of their arrival until the good offices of some soldiers saved the situation, "so incensed were the people against us". On another night the travellers completely failed, and only with great difficulty secured shelter in the country outside.¹² Caton records one meeting; upon a certain green near the "steeplehouse" (probably the "King's Gardens" or "King's Park") unto which "a great concourse of people resorted and a very precious and serviceable meeting we had". But this does not necessarily mean "convincements". Caton seemed to feel, especially at Stirling, that "the Scots were prejudiced against the English," which the English Military Chaplain also probably felt, for he "was very moderate and kind in his way towards me".¹³

9. Caton's "Journal", (1839) P.44.

10.v. ante, Ch. III, P.27.

11. Caton's "Journal", (1839) P.45.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid, Pages 40, 45.

The first mention of Glasgow in Scots Quakerism is in 1655. Thither Caton went from Stirling, and there "he had very good service at that time". He went to "the great Cathedral" and after the service was over, he enjoyed considerable liberty to speak to the people in the Churchyard. And though they were "rude" or would have been if they could, they were kept in good check¹⁴ by the Cromwellian troops "who were pretty moderate towards me". He followed the same route to Glasgow on his second visit to Scotland. The populace he found prejudiced and uninterested in his message who, "could not endure sound doctrine but turned away their ears from hearing the Truth".¹⁵ But the authorities were unusually clement. Colonel Ashfield, the Governor, undoubtedly influenced by his wife who afterwards was "convinced" sent for Caton and interviewed him at his house, and though he was "carried to the main guard" as a matter of formality, he was gratified with the service among the soldiers "who were very civil towards me and ...suffered me to depart in peace to my lodging". One Sunday he visited a certain Church which is unnamed, and after the service he began to harangue the congregation, but was interrupted by the beating of the drums and the departure of the soldiers. Probably it was one of the parade services to which civilians were admitted, similar to those in St. Giles' and Edinburgh Tron. There is no further record of Caton in Glasgow at this time.

14. Ibid. P.40: Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol. I, P.181.

15. Caton's "Journal", (1839) P.46.

CHAPTER V.

"THE FIRST OUTBREAK OF PERSECUTION."

The persecution of the Quakers in Scotland originated in the County of Lanark during the year 1656 to 1657, and was of both kinds, civil and ecclesiastical. Collaboration between cleric and magistrate was both open and clandestine,¹ and no distinction was made between native Friends and "public" Friends from across the Border. For the prosecution and persecution of the latter, a very opportune weapon had come into the hands of the authorities in the "Vagrancy Act" passed by Cromwell's Parliament in 1656.² "Vagrancy" was held to apply not merely to dissolute wanderers and "distressed soldiers", but to all who were found outside of their own district or locality and could give no account of their business or object that was deemed satisfactory to the judgement or caprice of the civil magistrates.³ "Public" Friends who, for the time being, had no fixed abode and no "occupation" except the unpopular and 'suspect' one of propagating their doctrines so obnoxious to these authorities, fell very easily within the meaning and scope of the Act. Cruel advantage was taken of it, and there is evidence that Quakers were punished as vagrants as early as 1656. And the impact of this Vagrancy Act was specially direct upon the Quakers, because, as Firth points out, the proposal of the Government to seize "all masterless idle vagabonds..both men and women" and transport them to colonise Jamaica had been abandoned on Broghil's advice as too risky.⁵ The Quakers were likewise left untouched by the Government's policy of recruiting soldiers from the "vagabonds" and "vagrants", for the French and Swedish services.

The earliest Quaker record of persecution in Scotland still extant is "A Remembrance or Record of the Sufferings of some freinds of truth in Scotland", a MS volume commenced probably about 1670.⁶ The entries, however range from 1656 to 1693. The earliest persecution took place in Strathaven in Midsummer, 1656, when William Stockdale and John Bowrom "declareing the Word of the Lord in the streets", were pelted with mud and stones by the townspeople and driven out.⁷ Later in the same year Stockdale and John Gill, a Cumberland Quaker, together with several other Friends from Glassford district were stoned and roughly expelled "by the rude and crwel multitude" from the Churchyard of Glassford where they had been holding a meeting.⁸

-
1. v D.P.P.S. (in Fox's "Great Mystery", 1659) P.349.
 2. Reaffirmed in 1661 by the Scottish Council. v "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland," (1820) Vol.VII, P.312, Col.2.
 3. Gough's "History", Vol I, PP 223-4. cf Preface to Besse's "Sufferings", (1753) Vol I, P.VII; and D.P.P.S. PP 333,346.
 4. Gough's "History", Vol I, P.224.
 5. "The Last Years of the Protectorate". Vol II, PP 109-110: Thurloe "State Papers", Vol.III, 497; Vol IV, 41.
 6. At 207 Bath St. Glasgow. It is usually known as "A Register of Sufferings".
 7. "General Record of Friends in the West";(MS Vol.16)P.1: MS "Register of Sufferings", P.1.
 8. Ibid.

As might be expected, Glassford was heavily hit, and particularly two men in it, John Hart and Andrew Brown. Along with one John Lackoke, they were cited at the instigation of William Hamilton, the Minister, before the Justices of Lanarkshire at Hamilton. Hamilton deponed that they had disturbed him in Church as he catechised and blessed the people. This charge the accused denied, asserting that they only required him to "prove himself in the doctrine of Christ". Each, however, was fined twenty shillings sterling, and in default of their payment of this amount and in security for keeping the peace in future, they were sent to Hamilton Tolbooth whence they were removed to Glasgow, imprisoned for twenty-two days and excommunicated.⁹

Brown was again summoned by Hamilton in the autumn of 1657, and appeared at Lanark before William Lawrie J.P. of Blakewood, charged with molesting the Minister in his own manse at Glassford. According to the Quaker version, Brown "came into his [Hamilton's] house to deliver a paper unto him, and the priest thrust him from him and pushed him, and forthwith the priest's servant...thrust him to the door and beat him."¹⁰ The sequel was Brown's prosecution, and in his evidence, Hamilton "declared that he feared his trouble and molestation and required him to keep the peace." It is impossible from the scanty data extant to reach an unbiassed verdict: at all events, Brown was sentenced to twenty-four days imprisonment in the Tolbooth of Lanark.¹¹

In the next two cases, the scene shifts from the Manse to the Church. About the year 1656, George Wilson and John Gill, both from Cumberland, asked the Minister a question three times but he refused to answer. There is nothing to indicate any interruption of the service, but they were arrested by a constable named Claude Marshall, who apparently made no attempt to shield them from "the rude multitud". Wilson was struck to the effusion of blood, "and the preist's servant was very active in persecuting them".¹² The second case was in May 1657, when Richard Esmaid (or Ismay) an English Quaker, accompanied by George Weir "was declaring the Word of the Lord to the people. They were ordered by two local

9. Ibid, and "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol.16) P.1. cf D.P.P.S. (1659) PP 334-5. Lackoke seems to have left the Quakers temporarily in 1669. v "Edin.Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12.) PP 19,21.
- 10 "MS Register of Sufferings", P.2. This was probably the occasion when Hamilton is alleged to have told Brown that were he a magistrate and were it legal, he would behead all Quakers ! (cf D.P.P.S P.333.)
- 11 "MS Register of Sufferings", P.3. cf "General Records of Friends in the West", (MS Vol.16.) P.3.
12. "MS Register of Sufferings", P.1; and "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16.P.1.)

J.P.'s, Hamilton of Raploch and Lawrie, tutor of Blackwood to be incarcerated in Glassford Castle. Marshall, the constable, thrust Esmaid into the stocks apparently on his own responsibility, and subsequently both prisoners were transferred to Hamilton Tolbooth for twenty-two days.¹³

In 1657 also, John Hart was again in Court along with a widow, Janet Hamilton of Westermain. They were accused before the Justices at Lanark by the Minister of Glassford, of entertaining Quakers in their own houses, especially George Wilson, and so of "resetting" law breakers. As they refused to pay their fine of twenty shillings, they were imprisoned for eight days.¹⁴ But Glassford, the cradle of the Quaker movement in Scotland, stood the shock of the first persecutions well. The Sect continued intermittently up to 1669, the number and vitality in the parish and district increasing. Alexander Parker in a letter from Leith to George Fox, written late in 1657, during the latter's visit to Scotland, says, "I passed on to heads [Heads] .. There is a fine sober growing people that keeps together constantly. I was refreshed amongst them to see ye workmanship of God appearing and ye true light shineing and breaking forth amongst them".¹⁵ The Quaker meeting at Glassford grew rapidly to be the largest in Scotland. The statistical returns of 1669 showed there were twenty one male members at Glassford as compared with eight at Edinburgh, six at Badcow, and only three at Douglas.¹⁶

The immediate occasion of the persecution at Douglas in 1656 was the celebration of the first Quaker marriage in Scotland, at which William Stockdale was a witness.¹⁷ The contracting parties, William Mitchell of Douglas and Mary Inglishe (or Inglis) having taken each other as man and wife before witnesses "according to the form and manner of the Saints recorded in the Scriptures", were indicted before the Justices at Hamilton at the instigation of Peter Kid, Minister of Douglas. The unfortunate bridegroom was fined twenty shillings for his "transgression", with the alternative of twenty stripes on his bare body at the Mercat Cross on market day: further, that he be prohibited from "cohabiting" any longer with "that woman". As Mitchell, very naturally, refused to yield, he was put in the stocks in the Market Place for four hours and subsequently handed over to the town bailiffs who shut him up in the Tolbooth. About a month afterwards, a bright idea seems to have

-
13. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS. Vol. 16. P. 3) : MS "Register of Sufferings", P. 2: D.P.P.S/P. 350.
 14. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol. 16. P. 3) : "MS Register of Sufferings", P. 2: D.P.P.S. P. 334.
 15. "Swarthmore MSS" Vol. III, P. 41.
 16. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", 1669. (MS. Vol. 15) P. 13.
 17. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol. 16. P. 1.)

struck Francis Aird, Minister of Dalserf¹⁸ of getting Mitchell handed over to a recruiting Captain for the French Wars. This was effected through an order issued by Gavin Hamilton of Raploch and delivered to the Captain, who removed Mitchell from Hamilton Tolbooth to the Canongate Tolbooth Edinburgh, till he was ready to go overseas. But Justice came to her own, for the bridegroom was released after a time by order of General Monck.¹⁹

In 1657, Mitchell was thrown into the Lanark Tolbooth for eight days on no specified charge.²⁰ Gollon, the Bailiff of Lanark, took away Mitchell's "Bonnet" by order of Jack, the Minister of Carluke, and then drove the Friends from the town at night.²¹

About three years later, in 1659, other marriage cases are recorded, when a certain Quaker, Gavin Stevenson, was imprisoned at Hamilton for about three months, as also was John Hutcheson, for ten weeks.²²

It is not altogether surprising that the authorities contemplated some early legislative action, and although the two most important relevant measures come chronologically in the Restoration period, it will be convenient to note them at this point. In 1661, the same year as the "Quaker Act" was passed, the "Act against Clandestine and Unlawful Marriages" came into force, and although it was intended also for Roman Catholics and others, it affected the Quakers very materially. The Act²³ stipulated that only marriages which are performed, according to the lawdable order & constitution of this Kirk" were legal, and that all persons who were afterward married from whatsoever motive or pretext in a clandestine or irregular manner, whether "by Jesuits, Priests, deposed or suspended Ministers, or any others not authorised by this Kirk" were liable to a flat penalty of three months imprisonment in addition to graduated fines ranging from £1000. Scots for a nobleman to 100 Marks for anyone below the rank of burgess: the income from these fines "to be applied to pious vses" within the delinquents' parishes: the celebrant of such marriages to be banished for life, and those too poor to pay even 100 marks, to be punishable by stocks and irons. In addition to these monetary and corporal penalties, all delinquents were to be subject to the censures of the Church. Under this Act the Privy Council arraigned David Falcobner in 1667 "for marrying

18. cf Scott's "Fasti", (New Ed.) Vol. III, P. 246.

19. "General Record of Friends in the West" (MS Vol. 16.) P. 2. and "MS Register of Sufferings", P. 4.

20. Ibid.

21. Broadside "To you the Parliament sitting at Westminster" (1659)

22. "General Record of Friends in the West" (MS Vol. 16.) PP 5, 6.

23. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol. VII, P. 231, Col. I.

certain persons of his own sect".²⁴ The Act of 1661 was ratified and made more stringent still by the "Act against Unlawful Ordinations" passed in 1672, which imposed upon all who were married by an unauthorised person the additional penalty of losing "any right or interest they may have by that marriage "jure Mariti vel jure Relictae".²⁵ And again the Act of 1661 was ratified and confirmed in the reign of William III, by the "Act against Irregular Baptisms and Marriages" of 1695.²⁶

In East Kilbride, there were two men who suffered for conscience' sake. One was a Westmorland Friend, Richard Pinder, who addressed the assembled congregation, apparently before the service, for there was "no priest with them". He was immediately arrested and haled before the Justice, James Stewart tutor of Castletown, who sent him to gaol in Rutherglen. After three days imprisonment he was "brought forth" and on the following Sunday he was exhibited to the people in the stocks at the Church for five hours: after which, by Stewart's order, he was bandied about from constable to constable till they finally got him across the Border into England. The other victim, Thomas Jack²⁷ was, at the instigation of John Burnet²⁸ Minister of East Kilbride, apprehended and committed to prison in Glasgow in September 1657.²⁹ According to Wodrow, Burnet "had been singularly useful in that parish where there were a great many Quakers and Separatists: and yet by his painful and excellent preachings and other labours, he reclaimed most part of them".³⁰

In Lesmahagow, John Hart, Andrew Brown, and Geo. Weir, were in the arena when they visited the Church in March 1657. Probably at the conclusion of the service, Weir began to read a paper "containing some reasons why he denyed the preists", but he did not get far as John Hume, the Minister of the parish³¹

-
24. R.P.C.S. 3rd.series, Vol II, P.376.
 25. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol. VIII, P.71. Col.II. (Robert Barclay's marriage in 1670, which so angered the Clergy took place between these two Acts, and probably influenced the second in 1672.)
 26. Ibid Vol IX, P.387, Cols. 1,2. A brief but excellent resume of Quaker teaching and procedure regarding marriage is found in Penn's "Select Works", Vol,V PP 223-5.
 27. "MS Register of Sufferings", P.3: cf "General Record of Friends in the West"(MS Vol.16. P.2)
 28. cf Scott's "Fasti", (New Ed.) Vol III, PP267-8.
 29. Broadside "To you the Parliament sitting at Westminster". (1659)
 30. "History of the Sufferings", Vol II, P.227 : Ure's "History of Rutherglen and East Kilbride", P.208.
 31. Hume was later Rector of the High School of Edinburgh. (v Scott's "Fasti"),(New Ed.) Vol III, PP 313-4.

ordered the people "to knock down that excommunicat stranger, where-upon the people did beat them and put them out of the synagogue".³² Weir was savagely used, and outside, the Quakers were "dirtted" with water, stones and lime without any interference by the Minister, his own family even taking part.³³

Returning to Hamilton, we again find Richard Esmaid. He was holding a meeting on the Green, when James Naismith Minister of the First Charge³⁴ passed on his way from Church. It must be admitted that on this occasion Esmaid was needlessly aggressive, for he summoned Naismith to "prove" his call to the Christian Ministry and prove the Quaker a deceiver, which if he failed to do, he was "no Minister of Christ but of the devil". Esmaid was immediately arrested by one of the town bailiffs, a namesake of the Minister, and flung into the Tolbooth,³⁵ apparently without trial. After three weeks, he "was freed of ye bonds at Humleton where.. through much suffering he reignes & made ye truth of good report",³⁶ and conveyed to Glasgow where he was sentenced to two hours in the stocks at the Market Place on two Market days. He had to spend the week intervening in prison. A paper was pinned on his breast on each occasion in the market, but he was gagged only on the first, being free to speak to the people from the stocks on the second day.³⁷ Thereafter he was expelled from Glasgow with threatenings, but he returned, and there is reason to believe that this "good soldier" made some converts there. Others unnamed, were shamefully abused in the town of Kirkintilloch the people being instigated by the Minister, Henry Forsyth³⁸ to stone the Quakers as a work of apostolic merit. In 1659, Hart, Brown, Stevenson and Hamilton, with five other male and female Friends, were imprisoned in Hamilton for twenty-three weeks.⁴⁰

Thus far we have been dealing with individual indictments of Friends for the most part, but there are three well authenticated instances of persecution by ecclesiastical bodies which call for mention.

-
32. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16) P.2: D.P.P.S. P.348.
 33. Ibid, P.329.
 34. cf Scott's Fasti", (New Ed.) Vol.III. P.259. Naismith was later indulged at Glassford.
 35. "MS Register of Sufferings", P.3: "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16.) P.3.
 36. "Swarthmore MSS" Vol III, P.231. (Letter from Robertson to Fox 1657.)
 37. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16.) P.3.
 38. Scott's "Fasti", (New Ed.) Vol.III. P.482.
 39. D.P.P.S. P.329.
 40. "MS Register of Sufferings", P.3.

(1) In July 1656, Alexander Hamilton and John Hart, were summoned by the Presbytery of Hamilton, to answer to a list of accusations. They appear to have been threatened with "Clubb Law" by Naismith of Hamilton, and at his instigation and others', Hamilton and Hart were put in gaol by the Bailiff.⁴¹ Thirty-two Quakers were excommunicated by Mackail of Bothwell and the other members of Presbytery "for saying that the Priests that preach up sin for term of life be Ministers of the man of Sin".⁴²

(2) It seems that prior to 1657, within the bounds of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, excommunications and other manifestos had been published with little effect "among the common people", for at a meeting of the Synod in May 1657, the Quakers were excommunicated as a body, it being enacted that "throughout the Westland presbyteries belonging to that synod it should be procleamed in their steepshouses by the priests that none of their hearers or societie should either buy or sell w^t any of theses persones called quakers nor give them any intertainment in meet, drinke or lodging under the hazard of incurring their displeasure".⁴³ The Ministers, armed with this ecclesiastical weapon, used it so arbitrarily and callously, that one of the Justices of the Peace, Colonel Ashfield interposed, and put a stop to the tyranny. He later became a Quaker himself and held a meeting at his house.⁴⁴

(3) In October 1656, some members of the Presbytery of Lanark raised the matter of "certaine erroneous persons.. callid quakers" spreading error and forsaking the doctrine and discipline of the Church, and the Presbytery instructed the Ministers so affected to submit a list of the Quakers to the Court.

On the 6th November, Peter Kid, Minister of Douglas and John Hume, Minister of Lesmahagow, laid on the table of the Presbytery the lists of their parishioners "quho are called Quakers", the former returning seven, and the latter six. Presumably they were all summoned, but the only one who "compeired" was from Douglas, viz., Mitchell the bridegroom, who repudiated the Confession of Faith and "did sclander the ministrie of the Church", so that the Presbytery ordered the two Ministers to draw up a charge sheet against all the Friends which they should answer the next Presbytery day.⁴⁵ Accordingly on 22nd January 1656/7, although the Quakers "did no compeir", Smith and Browne, the witnesses for Douglas Parish deponed on oath that Mitchell denied water Baptism and Church marriages as marks of the beast, gainsaid

-
41. "MS Register of Sufferings", P.1: "General Record of Friends in the West"; (MS Vol.16.) P.1. cf D.P.P.S. P.333.
 42. Broadside "To You the Parliament sitting at Westminster" (1659)
 43. Unfortunately no minute of this Synod meeting is known to be extant. The earliest minutes of Synod are 1687. Torrance in his Art. on "The Quakers in Clydesdale" ('Glasgow Herald' 14-2-1925) is in error in making the well known story of Alexander Hamilton and Charteris of East Kilbride a sequel to the Synod's excommunication, for Charteris was dead by June 1656. v Scott's "Fast" (New Ed.) Vol III, P.267, and Baillie's "Letters" Vol III, P.323.) / 44. Fox's "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol I, P 303: D.P.P.S. P.334. cf Thurloe "State Papers" Vol VI, P.136 (Monck's Letter to Cromwell.) / 45. "Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark", P.101.

the Fall of Man or any limitation of Divine Grace, and alleged that the preaching of the Gospel in Scotland by the Ministers was Anti-Christian. All the Quakers alike had been guilty of apostasy from the Church and were frequenting "the companie and fellowship of the English Quakers".

Although Kid had publicly cited his erring parishioners to appear at the Bar of the next Presbytery meeting on 4th March, neither they nor those of Hume's flock did so. But Mathie and Twethell, the Lesmahagow witnesses, gave evidence on oath and charged all six Friends with saying that "the presbiteriall kirk is not a Church of Jesus Christ:" that "throwing of water one children is not lawfull", and that "they gett as much good of" Quaker meetings "as of any bodie else", and therefore have deserted the Church.⁴⁶

At length the Presbytery's patience was exhausted and on 30th April 1657, the day decided upon for pronouncing sentence of excommunication, the Presbytery kept a "solemne day of humiliatioun". The Ministers present were Peter Kid, William Somervell of Pettinain,⁴⁷ Robert Birnie,⁴⁸ of Lanark and Thomas Kirkaldie, brother of Kirkaldie of Grange, and Minister of Carnwath.⁴⁹ After Peter Kid preached, William Somervell solemnly excommunicated William Mitchell, Robert Tod, Mary Inglis (the bride of Mitchell) and Elspeth Cappie in Douglas parish: and Catherine Hamilton and her family,⁵⁰ - Catherine, Janet and George Weir in Lesmahagow parish. The severity of the Presbytery's action seemed to have caused some Quaker adherents or sympathisers in Lesmahagow to conform temporarily and receive Baptism, but it failed to crush the New Light in the parish.

Twice within the next decade, the Archbishop of Glasgow wrote to the Presbytery of Lanark requiring all Quakers within its bounds to be duly listed on any and every competent charge with a view to their excommunication.⁵¹ As late as 1702, one John Brown in Raw, who had recanted his Quaker faith in 1657 renewed it, was summoned before the Session and thence was duly excommunicated and "delivered over to Satan" by the Presbytery of Lanark.⁵²

46. Ibid, PP101-2. cf Greenshields' "Annals of Lesmahagow" (1864) PP 159-160.
 47. Scott's "Fasti", [New Ed.] Vol III, P.319.
 48. Ibid, P. 307.
 49. Ibid, P. 289.
 50. "Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark", P. 103.
 51. Ibid, PP 105, 109.
 52. Ibid, PP 135, 137.

The sequel to these excommunications was a Protest and Appeal addressed by the persecuted Scots Quakers to "The Parliament sitting at Westminster" in 1659. The preamble accused the Ministers in addition to excommunicating them, of instigating their landlords to expel them, both of which were calculated to ruin them as honest and inoffensive crofters, artisans or tradesmen. The sympathies of the people were with them, they said, and the people wished to continue trading with them but dared not do so through "slavish fear of their Landlords and these men called Ministers". If the Parliament left the Friends to the mercies of these "rulers", it were serious injustice indeed which God would witness against.

Then follows a large representation of the names of the sufferers and details of their persecutions, most of which have been noted above. 53

53. v Broadside "To You the Parliament sitting at Westminster", (1659.)

CHAPTER VI.

"FROM CORNER TO CORNER OF SCOTLAND."

The purpose of this Chapter is to collate as far as possible a few scattered but important facts and references which are somewhat isolated from the main line of the present history.

The Quaker influence first touched the Orkney Islands when John Bowron the first English visitor to Edinburgh "took another journey to Scotland in 1656 at the age of 29, and arrived in Pomona. There is no record of how long he stayed or of what he did or endured, but only that "at Kirkwall he took shipping for Barbadoes".¹ He was probably in controversy however with James Morrison² Minister of Evie and Rendall over the doctrine of the indwelling of Christ.³

The great "Aberdeen" period of Quakerism which was inaugurated by William Dewsbury during his second visit and which centres round the Jaffrays and the Barclays, does not come till after the Restoration, but the "Inner Light" first reached Aberdeen in 1657/8. Early in the Spring of the year, a Yorkshire Quaker, John Hall, arrived in the City, and found very quickly a kindred spirit in Cornet Ward, the English Officer of the Roundhead Garrison at Aberdeen, to whom he bore an introduction from Captain Freeman of Fairfax's Regiment⁴. Ward, while perhaps not a "convinced" Quaker when Hall came to the City, had unmistakable sympathies with Quaker principles and teaching, and was prepared to sacrifice his position and reputation for them if need be. He gave Hall lodging at his own Quarters and stood by him.

Hall paid two visits to Aberdeen with a short period in Inverness between them. During the first visit two charges were brought against him. (1) On Sunday 15th March in the Church of St. Machar, he "did publicly in audience of all the people contradict the Minister, and called him a deceiver of the people" because the latter would not submit to the Quaker doctrine of perfectionism. Apparently the Minister did not hear Hall out, for the Quaker in a letter to Margaret Fell, wrote that he "spoke to ye priest after hee had done, but hee would not stay but fled"⁵ (2) On that same occasion when "ye people and colledgeners were mett"⁶, Hall referred to the members of the University as "a cage of unclean birds" an unsavoury metaphor not unknown among the early Quakers. More fuel still was heaped on the fire when Cornet

-
1. "Piety Promoted", Vol. I. P.233. Note the curious error of "Birkwall" for Kirkwall.
 2. Scott's "Fasti", [New Ed.] Vol.VII. P.215.
 3. Fox's "Great Mystery", (1659) P.262. Is "GW" George Watkinson or George Weir ?
 4. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol.VI, P.162. (Letter from Major Richardson to Thurloe, 2nd April 1657)
 5. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol.II, P.283. (Letter dated 1655 should really be dated circ.March 1657. 6. Ibid, PP 283, 285.
 7. Fox's "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol.II, P.480.

Ward threatened an English stranger names William Proctor with the Guard House for arguing with Hall. The sequel to these incidents brought out Ward's true sympathies when he was waited upon the next day as the responsible Military Officer by John Seaton, Minister of St. Machar, and Alexander Gordon, representing the students, who appealed to him "to take notice of and redress the wrong done". Ward retorted bluntly that he had nothing to do with Hall in any military capacity whatever and that far from being willing to punish Hall with whom he agreed, or any of his own soldiers who were likewise "moved of ye Lord,"⁸ he repudiated the use of "any carnal sword", and was even ready "for that thing to lay down his tabernacle of clay". The Cornet was also alleged to have expressly agreed with Hall that all the Ministers of the Gospel without exception "were upholders of the kingdom of Satan and of darkness" because they denied perfectionism.⁹ At length, finding Ward quite intractable, John Rowe Principal of King's College,¹⁰ Gordon the undergraduate, and John Seaton wrote a conjoint letter from King's to Major Richardson setting forth the main facts and entreating "your honor to take notice of those miscarriages very unusual here...and redress the wrong which shall be made out by several witnesses."¹¹ Before Richardson could do anything however, Hall had left for Inverness, but the Governor took so serious a view of the Aberdeen incidents that he forwarded the Aberdonians' complaint and appeal to General Monck with a covering letter of his own, and warned Lieutenant-Colonel Mann at Inverness to prevent Hall making "any disturbance there which may be of bad consequence att this tyme".¹²

An inkling of Hall's intention to return to Aberdeen from Inverness must have leaked out, for the three signatories of the above letter informed Major Richardson so. In addition, when the "Priest, Collegians, and Principles" came and "raged against" Cornet Ward after Hall's departure, he said to them in taunt "He was long enough here but he may be coming back soon. You can speak to him yourselves". The authorities had therefore good time to prepare for action, and Governor Richardson lost no time after Hall's return in sending a guard of musketeers to bring him from Ward's lodging to the Tolbooth, where a Court Martial was held. Both Hall and the Cornet were cross-examined after they had both refused to take off their hats. Hall would not state his purpose in coming to Aberdeen, and so "not giving account of anye emploiment, it is evident his business is to gather prosselites".¹⁴ The two charges arising out of his first

8. "Swarthmore MSS," Vol. II. P. 283.

9. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol. VI, P. 146.

10. A notable scholar and Hebraist (v Rait's "The Universities of Aberdeen", (1895) Ch. XIII, PP 158 ff; and Bulloch's "History of the University of Aberdeen", (1895) PP. 123-8.

11. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol. VI, PP 145, 146.

12. Ibid, P. 145. (For Hall's visit to Inverness) v infra P. 46.

13. Ibid, P. 146.

14. Ibid, P. 162. Letter from Major Richardson April 2. 1657.

visit were preferred against him: also that he was a vagabond, Jesuit and spy, but his accusers who were also his judges could not reach any agreement. They removed Hall from Court for a space, which gave him an opportunity to preach to the soldiers and others in the ante-room, and when he was recalled, it was only to be sentenced to be turned out of the town and threatened with penalties if he returned.¹⁵ Although Cornet Ward was now definitely a Quaker, he was not dealt with in any disciplinary fashion by this Court Martial, but he was reported direct by Governor Richardson to the Secretary of State as one of "such men" who were "dangerous in the armie".¹⁶ Hall was escorted two miles out of the town by Cornet Ward, the Marshall and three rankers, and although he thought at first of returning to Aberdeen "and further as I am ordered", it was reported to Monck by April 29th. that "the Quaker Hall is now for certayne gone southward... for altogether."¹⁷

About the late autumn of 1658¹⁸ came the second "public" Friend to Aberdeen, William Dewsbury of Cumberland, one of the early converts of Fox, and among the most notable of his preachers. He had joined forces at Leith at the end of September with ex-Captain George Watkinson, who had been cashiered from the Army shortly before. They travelled to Inverness¹⁹ via Dundee and Aberdeen, and both on their outward and returned journey they were entertained in Aberdeen by a merchant and his wife whom they left "very tender" and "pretty well satisfied".²⁰ But, "no open espousal of the tenets peculiar to the people called Quakers took place till Dewsbury's next and famous visit to Aberdeen at the end of 1662. Between 1658 and 1662, however a "remarkable work of conviction" had been secretly going on in some of their hearts... "through many deep conflicts of spirit"²¹ and this preparation was further advanced by the visit of John Burnyeat of Cumberland about the beginning of November 1658 during his three months' tour in Scotland.²² John Barclay nowhere speaks of Burnyeat's visit being the earliest Quaker visit to Aberdeen, as Braithwaite asserts,²³ though Barclay does state that Burnyeat was the first to mention Aberdeen in the account he has left of his visit to Scotland.²⁴

-
15. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol II, P.285.
 16. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol VI, P.162.
 17. Ibid, P.241. (Letter from Major-General Morgan to Monck, 29th Apr. 1657.)
 18. cf Letter to Margaret Fell from Leith. ("Swarthmore MSS", Vol. I, P. 736.)
 19. According to Braithwaite - "The Beginnings of Quakerism", Ch. XIV, P.364.
 20. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol IV, P. 392. (Letter from Watkinson to Fox from Leith.)
 21. Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd. Ed.) P.197. cf Smith's "Life of Dewsbury", (1836) Ch. XII, PP 162-3.
 22. Burnyeat's "Journal", (1839) P.178.
 23. Braithwaite's "Beginnings of Quakerism", Ch. X, P.228 n. It is Braithwaite who is wrong.
 24. Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd. Ed.) P.195, and Burnyeat's "Journal", (1839) P.178.

The earliest Quakers in Inverness seem to have been one or two Cromwellian troopers of the detachment stationed there, but it was only when Hall reached "the Queen of the Highlands" that they came into the open and were "moved to goe to ye Steeplehouse" with Hall. One went to the Baptists' place of worship also, and announced a meeting the same afternoon at the Barracks, which proved to be "A verie prettie meeting."²⁵ Lieutenant-Colonel Mann was not unprepared for the Quaker advent as has already been noted, and this gave the military Governor, Colonel Daniell, his opportunity. Daniell was still further impelled to prompt action by the activity, simultaneous with Hall's, of Captain-Lieut. Davenport. Davenport, of whom we shall hear further, was a zealous Quaker, even while he remained in the army, and his case was one of the crucial issues which determined Monck to clear Quakers out of the army. Captain Davenport did for Hall in Inverness very much what Cornet Ward did for him in Aberdeen. This officer went to the main guard at the Castle, and invited the troops "to goe here a vagabond fellow of their secte"²⁶ (Hall). When the Governor summoned Hall before him, Davenport went voluntarily along with him, and when the Governor had brusquely set aside Hall's explanation of his mission and commanded him to leave Inverness within twenty-four hours, Davenport left the Court with Hall.²⁷ Like Fox in Edinburgh, however, Hall remained in defiance of the authorities, and, aided and abetted no doubt by his host, the Quaker Captain, held another meeting which was "peaceable". But Daniell was resolute. He threw Hall into prison for the night, and next morning ordered the Marshal to escot him two miles beyond the town.²⁸ The only other visit to Inverness in the early period of which we have any record was that of Dewsbury and Watkinson, already noted. No details of their mission are extant, but they were well received, and "Dewsbury's ministry as always made a deep impresson"²⁹

Ayrshire would have been a severe test of Dewsbury's powers, had he ever visited it, for it presented an unusually inhospitable soil for Quakerism. If Scotland as a whole was "a dark and barbarous country"³⁰ to the new Light, Ayrshire and Galloway were the most "difficult" of all. What records there are in the early period are meagre and significant in their restraint and silences. The earliest Quaker known to visit Ayrshire was William Caton during his second Scottish tour in 1656, after parting with Stubbs. He speaks of the town of Ayr as a "noted place", but when "it was upon me to go to the steeplehouse there" he seems to have had "pretty good liberty", but only through the presence of many soldiers, among whom

25. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol II. P.283. (Letter from Hall to Margaret Fell, circ. Apr. 1657.)

26. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol.VI.(Letter from Daniell to Monck from Perth.3rd. Apr. 1657) P.168.

27. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol II, PP 283-4.

28. Ibid, P.284.

29. Braithwaite, "The Beginnings of Quakerism", (1912) P.364.

30. Caton's "Journal", (1839) P.46.

he received civil treatment.³¹ It is quite possible that there may have been some Quakers or incipient Quakers in Monck's garrison at Ayr before Caton came, but of this we have no authentication. In 1657/8, Thomas Robertson visited Kilmarnock, Irvine and Ayr at the time Fox left Scotland, and "weighed ye service of ye Lord & did not returne till it lay upon me from Him"³².

In 1658, John Burnyeat travelled from Hamilton through Kyle to Ayr, and through Carrick into Wigtownshire as far as Portpatrick, returning through Ayrshire by the same route. No results are claimed. He merely records that "our service was at their steeplehouses and markets and other places where we met with people; and sometimes at Friends meetings where there were any"³³.

Two cases of persecution in Ayrshire at this time are recorded, one at Kilmaurs, the other at Newmilns. A band of Lanarkshire Friends comprising Hamilton, Brown and Hart, along with William Stockdale and George Wilson had come to Kilmaurs early in 1657, and, "where by virtue of an order from William More of Rowallan³⁴ (called a justice of peace) apprehended as vagabonds". They were imprisoned at Kilmarnock and passed from constable to constable till after examination and threatening by Campbell of Cesnock, they were dismissed³⁵. In the second case at Newmilns, two months later, Hart and Wilson again figured, this time along with Christopher Fell. When they went to an inn for lodging about 10.p.m. they were not only refused it, but dragged out of doors and stoned out of the town into the open fields³⁶. This was in obedience to the Synod of Glasgow's decree of excommunication whereby none of "this persones called quakers" should receive "any intertainment in meet, drinke or lodging."³⁷

The two main reasons why Quakerism utterly failed in Ayrshire are not far to seek. The first was the saintly personality and earnest preaching of William Guthrie of Fenwick, which latter, thanks to the protection and favour chiefly of the Earls of Glencairn and Eglintoun, he was able to continue till

31. "Journal". (1839) P.48.

32. "Swarthmore MSS" Vol III, P. 231. (Letter from Robertson to Fox, dated 1657)

33. Burnyeat's "Journal". (1839) PP178-9. The last clause about Friends' meetings does not necessarily signify any in Ayrshire.

34. Sir Wm. Mure of Rowallan, a close friend of Wm. Guthrie of Fenwick.

35. "General Record of Friends in the West" (MS Vol 16.) P.2; "MS Register of Sufferings", P.2.

36. Ibid., and D.P.P.S. P.334.

37. v ante Ch. V, P.40. The Minister of Newmilns at that time was John Nevay, (v Scott's "Fasti", New Ed. Vol III, P.119; and Thomson's "Martyr Graves of Scotland", Ch. VII, PP 127-8)

1664. Fenwick Parish had been detached from Kilmarnock only about three years prior to Guthrie's settlement in 1644, and it was in a deplorable condition.³⁸ "Lying, false swearing, and a host of grossly worse immoralities occupied nearly the whole time of the kirk session meetings."³⁹ Guthrie slowly but steadily turned the wilderness into a garden of the Lord, and the fragrance of Fenwick was felt far beyond its borders. His name became a household word throughout the West of Scotland, and regular attenders at Fenwick Church came from Glasgow, Paisley, Lanark, Hamilton, and beyond. So great was his popularity that one day a pamphlet purporting to be Guthrie's and entitled "A clear attractive warming Beam of Light from Christ, the Sun of Light, leading unto Himself etc" was published in Aberdeen by a misguided devotee. The pamphlet which appeared without his knowledge and authorisation was repudiated by Guthrie, and to counter any effect it might have he published "The Christian's Great Interest" in 1658.⁴⁰ Even after Guthrie's death, this reprehensible practice continued without the least consultation of his nearest relatives or ministerial brethren, so that "Agnes Campbell Relict of the deceast Master Wm. Guthrie" had to issue a general appeal to the Christian reader to "be so farr tender of the truth" (a phrase with a distinct Quaker flavour) as "to have these lately printed under his name in suspicion".⁴¹

The motive or motives underlying this unauthorised publication do not concern us, but the whole matter including Guthrie's famous antidote shows that the influence of his preaching was so widespread and satisfying that it was the paramount religious force in the West, and left a poor chance to any competitor. The Quakers did attempt once to proselytise in Fenwick Parish during Guthrie's absence on business in Angus, but he returned before any conversions had taken place, and according to Dunlop "so confounded those heretics that they despaired of ever attacking with success a flock guarded by so watchful and skilful a shepherd".⁴² In reality Guthrie was already preaching that living relation between men and Christ the Light of Life, which was the very heart of the Quaker's message.⁴³ Even the title of the unauthorised pamphlet bears this

38. cf "Select Biographies", (1847) Vol II, P.36. (Memoirs of Guthrie)

39. "Extracts from Fenwick Parish Records 1644-1699" (Art. by A.C. Jonas in "Proceedings of the Society of Antiquarians of Scotland", 4th series, Vol X, P. 30.) Fenwick, however, was probably no worse than the country as a whole. cf Guthrie in "Sermons in Times of Persecution", PP 145-6.

40. v Thomson's "The Martyr Graves of Scotland", Ch. VI, PP 105-6. and "Select Biographies", (Dunlop's "Guthrie") PP 53-54.

41. Ibid. P.54. and "Analecta Scotica", (1834) Vol I, PP 242-3. No. LXXVII ("Advertisement be Agnes Campbell etc")

42. "Select Biographies". (Vol II, P.43) (Dunlop's "Guthrie"). cf Sinclair's (Old) "Statistical Account of Scotland", Vol XIV, P.57, which probably refers to the same.

43. v A remarkable passage in his sermon on Acts XXVI. 28-30. preached Dec, 30th 1655, which would go far to satisfy a Quaker. (v Smellie's Edition of "The Christian's Great Interest", PP 210-211.)

out. The Quaker mystics and Guthrie had much spiritual vision and experience in common, and many passages of the "Christian's Great Interest", which is anything but Calvinistic, might have come from a Quaker pen.⁴⁴ The truth is that all who came within reach of Guthrie's voice or message, already had in effect this part of the Quaker oracle within the Church, and from a settled pastor. Consequently, they felt no need to look for it elsewhere.

In addition, Guthrie was an exceptional persona grata with the Quakers, especially Keith, owing to his low estimate of the contemporary Scottish Ministry generally. As a postscript to his "Truth's Defence", George Keith republished with approbation a portion of one of Guthrie's writings in which the latter takes his brethren to task and castigates them in love for the sins of the Ministry so prevalent among them.⁴⁵

The second reason why Quakerism never took any root in Ayrshire can be quickly dismissed. Nowhere did the Covenanting Cause grip the whole soul and life of the people more sacrificially. Neither the people nor their persecutors after the Restoration had any time for the Quakers. They were too bent on their own religious conflict. "Friends are suffered to be quiet, but in some places they are very busie with some other people".⁴⁶ The Quakers were neither listened to nor persecuted; they were simply ignored, and the absence of persecution after the Kilmaurs and Newmilns incidents did not swell their number.

Galloway was likewise stony ground to the Quakers, partly because of a corresponding influence to Guthrie's in Ayrshire, which still survived, viz., Samuel Rutherford. Halhead and Lancaster were probably the first Quakers to traverse Galloway in 1654 on their way from Ireland to Dumfries.⁴⁷ Thomas Robertson, the next Quaker to visit Galloway in 1657 found it "all in the enmity; none there in love to the Truth could receive me". He carried on however, some colportage and pamphleteering, and although "a query was raised up in some", little fruit seems to have been gathered.⁴⁸ The next to arrive in Galloway was John Burnyeat some months later, who as already noted reached Portpatrick.

44. e.g. (All in Smellie's Ed.1901) P.10, "My Soul etc"; PP 71-2.§2. PP 96-97; PP 102-3.§X.

45. "Truth's Defence"(1682) PP 250-4.

46. "The Truth Exalted in the Writings of .. John Burnyeat", (1691) P.84. (Letter from Leith, 1684)

47. Ferguson "Early Cumberland and Westmorland Friends"(1871) P.57.

48. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol III, P.231. (Letter from Robertson to George Fox, 1657.)

CHAPTER VII."GEORGE FOX IN SCOTLAND"

George Fox's efforts to evangelise Scotland may almost be said to have begun at Stath in the North Riding of Yorkshire in 1651, when he answered fully the many questions of an unnamed Scots Minister "concerning the light and the soul", for although, after they parted, the Minister in a rebound of passion threatened dire things to Fox, he himself became a Quaker ultimately, and Fox visited his house.¹ But it was not till 1657 that Fox crossed the Border on his first official visit.

Two motives impelled Fox to visit Scotland, (1) He was concerned about a comparatively little headway that the Quaker Movement had made in that country. Despite the large number of missionaries that had visited it, Francis Howgill, who spent there ten weeks in the summer of 1657, reported Scotland still as "a dark and untoward nation" and its people with "little desire after God", a people "false-hearted and bloodthirsty".² The national and religious prejudice of this not unnatural judgement, intensified no doubt by his imprisonment and the rifling of his baggage at Dumfries³ must of course be balanced by the fact that this "false-hearted and bloodthirsty people" had effected a far more thorough and stable reformation than the equivalent English compromise: it had put up as resolute a fight for religious liberty as did the Puritans: it had even sufficient reserves and resources to spare for helping the English Parliament to crush the despotism of Charles I: and it was preparing quietly for further determined opposition to an impacable tyranny that might arise at any moment. This is not to deny however, that there was a good deal in the ecclesiastical situation in Scotland to justify Howgill's partial view, and Fox was dissatisfied with the impact of the New Light upon it. He confided to William Caton in 1656 that he might go to Scotland and naively bade Caton "lay it upon him, which the latter did!"⁴ (2) The second and earlier motive was incidental to Fox's imprisonment in Carlisle Gaol in 1653, where he was incarcerated with thieves, murderers and moss troopers⁵, all of whom were made very loving and subject to me". This forced association with these Border raiders and adventurers left Fox "with drawings on his spirit to go into Scotland".⁶

In September 1657, Fox crossed the Border from Cumberland into Scotland, where he was destined to remain about five months.⁷ His travelling colleagues were James Lancaster, Robert Widders, "a thundering man against hypocrisy & deceite & ye rottennesse of the preists"⁸ who was more zealous than eloquent;⁹

1. Sewell's "History" (1811) Vol. I, P. 76.
2. "A.R.B. Collection" (Euston Library) No. 31.
3. Broadside "To You the Parliament sitting at Westminster" (1659)
4. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol. I, P. 364. (Letter from Caton to Margaret Fell.)
5. For Cromwell's attitude to the moss troopers etc. v Carlyle's "Letters and Speeches" (1888) Vol. II, P. 251.
6. F.Q.E. Vol. LXIV. (1930) P. 212 (Art. on "May Drummond" by Brailsford)
7. Cunningham ("The Quakers", Ch. III, P. 45.) is wrong in stating that Fox crossed the Tweed. It is clear from his "Journal" that it was he who crossed.
8. Fox's "Journal" (Camb. Ed.) Vol. I, P. 292. / 9. cf "Piety Promoted", Vol. I.

and Alexander Parker of Chipping in West Yorkshire, a prolific writer, intimate of William Penn, at whose marriage he was a witness, and close comrade of Fox in his travels in Holland and up and down England.¹⁰ At Fox's request Colonel Osborne came down into Cumberland to act as their guide northwards.

On their first night in Scotland, Fox and his friends lodged at an inn. The story of Fox's visit to the neighbouring Earl, who had expressed a strong desire to see him if he ever came to Scotland, is well known.¹¹ Hodgkin suggests that the scene of this interview when the unknown nobleman, "received us very lovingly", was Carlaverock, the seat of the Earl of Nithsdale, but that Fox did not mention his name in order not to expose him to possible persecution.¹² This identification is not improbable owing to the apparent proximity of the place to Dumfries, which the Quakers passed through the next morning, and the three drawbridges mentioned in Fox's "Journal". In his very full work "The Book of Carlaverock", Fraser unfortunately makes no confirmatory mention of Fox, but if this incident took place at Carlaverock Castle, the Quakers' host must have been Robert, Second Earl of Nithsdale,¹³ eleventh¹⁴ Lord Maxwell, called "the Philosopher", who died unmarried in 1667.

Fox's first clash was with the Church, a thing inevitable. The most enquiring and formative years of his religious growth practically coincided with the dominance of Presbyterianism in England from 1643 to 1648, when Calvinism was rife. It was the teaching of Calvin's "Institutes", not of Hooker, that Fox the youth was given from the pulpit of Fenny Drayton parish Church by Nathaniel Stevens, the orthodox Presbyterian "priest", one of the "Godly and painfull ministers" appointed by the Commonwealth Parliament,¹⁵ and it was from Calvinism that Fox's soul revolted. His first rebellion was not against any Church system or organisation per se nor against any sacramentalism or theory of apostolic succession, nor even against Steven's persecuting tendencies as shown at Market Bosworth in 1649¹⁶ but against the dogmas of Predestination, especially the supralapsarian; Election; the idolatry of an infallible Bible; and the Puritanical Sabbath.¹⁷ He was too much of an Arminian and a Pelagian. If Fox

-
10. Parker accompanied Fox when he was sent up to Cromwell by Col. Hacker. For further details of Parker, v J.F.H.S. Vol VIII, PP 30-2 Thos. Rawlinson is also mentioned as a companion of Fox (F.P.T. P.247 n.)
11. "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol I, P.292.
12. v "George Fox", (1896) Ch. X, P.152.
13. "The Book of Carlaverock", (1873) Vol.I, P.583.
14. Nicholas in his "The Siege of Carlaverock etc" (1828) says he was the 9th Lord Maxwell (P.XXV.)
15. Edward's "Fenny Drayton", PP 39, 41, 42.
16. Ibid, P.45.
17. cf Hodgson's "George Fox", (1896) Intro: P.4.

was not prepared for Scotland, Scotland was certainly not prepared for him. Outwardly peaceable and actually benefiting from tangible advantages of Cromwell's overlordship which they would not admit,¹⁸ the Scottish people chafed bitterly under the firm military regime and beneath the chain of forts which they could not storm. There was a strong underlying antipathy to everything and everybody English, simply because they were English, among every rank and class as a whole, and this made the people cling with greater resolution to their Calvinistic creed and their Presbyterian Kirk and discipline. Fox entered Scotland in pardonable hope, for "as soone as ever my horse set his foote upon... Scottish ground, ye Infinite sparkes of life sparkled about me, &.. I saw ye seed of ye Seedsman Christ". But "abundance of clods, fowle and filthy earth was above it" and "there was abundance of chaffe & dross & dung" for whose removal or rectification drastic expedients were called for.¹⁹ He found "priest and people were puffed up with black airy notions...and that spirit of rebellion which talked of election...and held them in a thraldom and drew all people from the guidance of the Spirit of God in themselves".²⁰ There were undoubtedly grave elements in the Church which were reflected in the general religious condition of the land, and gave anxiety to the discerning. Fox was not altogether unjustified. But the Church was not derelict, nor was Religion. She had a certain rugged strength still. The truth lies between the Jeremiad of the Quakers and the famous rosy picture of John Kirkton.²¹

In Fox's visit to Scotland we are on very familiar ground, for our chief source is Fox's own narrative in his "Journal". Naturally enough he and his companions made straight from the Solway through Dumfries to Lanarkshire, the cradle of the Movement in Scotland, and had a good initial campaign in Douglas, Heads, Badcow and Gartshore with an important visit to William Osborne's house in the middle of it.

The Colonel's house was probably near the foot of the Campsie Fells and there a conference was held which was a kind of miniature 'Westminster Assembly', for the outcome of it was a notable book and declaration of faith. The sederunt consisted of the host, Fox and his three companions, and the six part-authors or compilers of "The Doctrines and Principles of the Priests of Scotland, contrary to the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles", viz., George Weir, John Hart, William Grey, William Lowry, William Mitchell and Richard Esmaid, eleven in all.

"The Scotch Priests' Principles"²² is a document of first importance, published in 1659, the year after Fox left Scotland.

-
18. For Carlyle's advocacy of this v "Cromwell's Letters", (1888) Vol II. Notes appended to letter CLXXXIII PP 300-1. cf Burnet's "History of his own Time", (1883) Book I, P.40.
19. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol VI, 121 (not transcribed) — Letter from Fox to Barclay (1675). v also "The British Friend", (1846) PP 224-5, and cf the parallel passage in "The Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol I, P.310
20. Ibid.
21. "Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland", PP 48-50, 54, 65.
22. Fox's short title for it.

Part of it is a chronicle of early sufferings in Scotland, similar to Besse's, and the larger part consists of vigorous and pungent replies to hostile and unguarded ministerial utterances against the Quakers and to "the preists' principles.. collected out of there owne madd bookes".²³ The title page is a model of condensed epitome, and there is a large amount of personal invective according to the mode of the age. Twelve Scots Ministers of "that dark wilderness country", who presumably were specially noted for their active dislike of the Quakers, and who all belonged to the Glasgow area, were selected for pillory.²⁴ The chief emphasis of the anti-Quaker teaching or activity of each²⁵ is set forth and answered. Most are accused by the writers not only on doctrinal grounds, but as being excommunicators or instigators of persecution "in Cain's way". Only three, however, Hamilton, Aird, and Mackail²⁶ are mentioned incidentally on the latter issue, while Burnet of East Kilbride escapes altogether.²⁷ The Polemic rages chiefly round The "Inner Light", Prayer, the Scriptures, Baptism, Repentance, and especially Election and Predestination. Chief attention is given to Henry Forsyth of Lenzie (Kirkintilloch) and in this section is one of the best Quaker answers to the Calvinistic dogma of Election, full of rude ruthless logic which is likely Fox's own work.²⁸ All through the writing there are also vehement protests against the "Christian zeal" of the Ministers and their people against the "strangers" whom they ought to entertain rather than persecute, and these protests culminate in the tirade which stigmatises the "priests" as true to type and unmistakable successors of their religious ancestry.²⁹ The sum of it all is that "there is a precious thing in these Scots, but there is a filthy, beastly, durty thing lyeth over" !³⁰

In the initial campaign before the Osborne conference was held, one of the most notable of all those "convinced" of the Quaker faith was "Lady" Margaret Hamilton, who was excommunicated later by Somerville of New Monkland and Hugh Archibald of Strathaven, two of "that generation of murdering priests"³¹, and

-
23. "Journal", (Camb. Ed.), Vol II, P. 338.
 24. Ludovic Somerville is not listed, but appears on page 331.
 25. Except Burnet of East Kilbride.
 26. Father of Hugh Mackail. cf Broadside "To you the Parliament sitting at Westminster". (1659), and Ross's "Busby and its Neighbourhood", (1883), P.66.
 27. But cf "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16.P 1) for his imprisoning of Jack the Quaker.
 28. D.P.P.S. (1659), PP 339-342, and 343.
 29. Page 344.
 30. Page 354.
 31. Alexander Parker, "A Testimony of the Appearance of God", P 3.

who later went to warn the Protector and General Fleetwood of the coming day of the Lord.³² After the conference, the Friends held a greater meeting at Gartshore which was the actual beginning of the clash with the ecclesiastical authorities. It was an open meeting, "severall professors" being present. Fox lost no time in attacking the prevalent if not highly popular dogmas of Election and Reprobation³³ and in refuting "ye folly of there preists' doctrines", which he protested were based on an abuse of Scriptures.³⁴ He made the theory of Election a "reductio ad absurdum", especially in the light of the universality of Christ's commission. He pleaded also the universality of the Atonement³⁵ and insisted that the condition of eternal life lay not in any fixed and arbitrary attitude of God to man, but in man's attitude to God in Christ, and in his choice between good and evil. Election if it meant anything Christian, meant not whether God inflexibly and unconditionally chooses us, but whether we voluntarily choose God. Similarly Reprobation was reserved for those who turn Christ's "grace into wantonness" and reject God, and the only and sufficient thing to lead us to the choice of God was belief in the Light of Christ within. So "ye people was opned to see & a springe of life risse uppe amongst ym"³⁶

The Church was quickly roused and took alarm to no small extent, though Fox exaggerates no doubt the extent and intensity of its apprehension. "Great assemblies of priests" (i.e. probably Synods) were hurriedly constituted and drew up a list of five "curses" to be read in every Church and to which the people were to say "Amen"—a formula of a strangely Anglican flavour as Bickley points out.³⁷ The full number is detailed in "The Scotch Priests' Principles" with the Friends' several replies and are as follows :-³⁸

"Cursed be all they that say grace is free, and let all the people say Amen"

"Cursed be all they that say the Scripturs is not the word of God's, and let all the people say Amen"

-
32. I have been unable to identify "Lady Hamilton". Probably "Lady" is a courtesy title given as Torrance suggests to her as the wife of a laird in some side branch of the Hamilton family.
33. Macpherson points out however, that some of the best of the Covenanting preachers of that day were not entirely consistent in their preaching with their adherence to this theological system, and some like Blackadder, Cargill, and notably Wm. Guthrie were grandly inconsistent. (v "The Covenanters under Persecution", Ch. IV, P. 76-77) On the other hand, Croese goes too far in saying that the Church of Scotland not only never taught, but abhorred these doctrines. ("General History" Book I, PP 71-2)
34. "Journal", (Camb. Ed.) Vol I, P. 293.
35. cf Keith's "Truth's Defence", (1678) PP 186-210.
36. "Journal", (Camb. Ed.) Vol I, P. 295.
37. "George Fox and the Early Quakers", P. 158.
38. D.P.P.S. (1659) PP 335-6. cf the incomplete list in Fox's (Camb) "Journal", Vol I, P 295.

"Cursed be all they that say, Faith is without sin, and let all the people say Amen". (Referring to Quaker 'Perfectionism')

"Cursed are all they that say that every man hath a light sufficient to lead him to Christ, and that within him, and let all the people say Amen".

"Cursed be all they that deny the Sabbath day, and let all the people say Amen".³⁹

Such was the text of the Scottish Church's anathema of the Quakers following up the excommunication by the Synod of Glasgow. The man chiefly responsible for this concerted action was Matthew Mackail, Minister of Bothwell, who himself, like his son later, suffered persecution.⁴⁰ "I do verily beleieve", wrote Alexander Parker "that if the Priests in England and Scotland (especially) had but power to execute what malice and envie is in their hearts, there would be a more bloody day than yet hath been."⁴¹

But Fox and his friends were unperturbed by any Presbyterian curses or ecclesiastical furore. In his company, or apart from him, the Friends "spread over Scotland sounding ye day of ye Lord"⁴² Widders went to the Church of New Monkland⁴³ (Airdrie), the Parish of Ludovic Somerville⁴⁴, and gave his testimony "in godly Zeal for the Truth's sake"⁴⁵ Towards the end of the year 1657, and early in 1658, Parker travelled in Angus, Fife and Clydesdale. He visited Forfar and Dundee and then crossed to Cupar-Fife. At this time the English Army of Occupation was being purged of Quakers, and in the Cupar Garrison Parker had no small success. The Commanding Officer had been Captain Watkinson who was cashiered. "There is a Corporall stands pretty firme according to measure" wrote Parker to Fox, "and one of two troopers, and meets together on the first dayes... I had a good service there... there is love in sevrall of ye souldiers, but at ye prsent darre not appear. A Capt wife of ye Castle and Ltts wife stands convinced and ownes ye Truth, and are very willing to come to visite friends when they can gett Liberty."⁴⁶ From Cupar

-
39. cf Croese's interpretation of the Quaker rejoinder to this "curse". ("General History", Bk. I, P. 72.)
40. Scott's "Fast"; (New Ed.) Vol. III, P. 230.
41. "A Discovery of Satan's Wiles and his subtile Devices etc" (1657) P. 13.
42. "Journal", (Camb. Ed.) Vol. I, P. 296.
43. v "The Life and Death, Travels and Sufferings of Robert Widders", (1688) P. 4: "Piety Promoted", Vol I, P. 98.
44. cf D.P.P.S, P. 331; v also Scott's "Fast". (New Ed.) Vol III, P. 271.
45. "The Life and Death etc. of Robert Widders", P. 24.
46. Letter from Leith to George Fox dated 13th January, 1658, in "Swarthmore MSS", Vol III, PP 39-40.

he returned probably by Stirling or Alloa to Gartshore and Badcow where meetings were held and new convincements reported. At Glasgow he seems to have had rather a rough handling, for when he tried to speak in one of "their great steeplehouses", probably the Tron or Blackfriars, after "one of ye dreamers" had finished uttering his dead invented stuff", he was roughly hustled out and followed by a gathering crowd towards the Cross. There Parker was arrested and taken before a Magistrate who refused to hear him and flung him into the Tolbooth for several hours.⁴⁷ At Douglas, Heads, and elsewhere in the West Country, the outlook seemed to Parker much more promising. Subsequently he returned to Edinburgh and Leith, where he was not too encouraged, but still sanguine.⁴⁸ It was probably then that, in common with George Fox the "younger" who was also in Scotland, he had his letters taken from him and destroyed by Monck and his Council.⁴⁹ Parker was also imprisoned by Monck, and Fox the "younger" sent to the Orkneys.⁵⁰ To Parker Scotland seemed on the whole a very tough proposition.

Neither had Fox himself been idle since the "Curses". After he "had gathered uppe ye principles of ye Scotts priests and ye sufferings of freinds",⁵¹ and had seen the Friends in that part of Scotland settled, he left the Gartshore district for Edinburgh. At Linlithgow, where he lodged en route, the cheering conversion of the Inkeeper's wife was offset by a mixed reception from a crowd of officers and soldiers who came in, one officer being specially objectionable and probably far from sober.⁵² After a time in Edinburgh, Fox went to Leith accompanied by William Osborne. The little company of Friends there consisted chiefly of English officers and their wives, several of whom were convinced. The Baptists, as at Perth later, and in Edinburgh immediately after, were "very rude", but in spite of everything adverse, Fox and Osborne had "a fine pretious time".⁵³ The house of a widow named Agnes Alexander was a favourite rendezvous of the Quakers, and in December she was "discharged.. to convey" them "in her chamber q^r frequentlie they mett"⁵⁴ When Fox reached Edinburgh again, there was a great crowd of many thousands "with abundans of preists" round the pyre of a wretched woman who was being burned as a witch on the Castlehill, and he siezed the opportunity to preach to them. The English officers in charge of the Military Cordon regarded the witch's "offence" with scepticism, and the poor victim with pity and sympathy, but allowed the law to take its course.⁵⁵

Meanwhile the Ministers of the Church realising that their Curses were impotent to arrest the spread of the Quaker message and the drifting of many of their parishioners, sent a

47. Ibid, PP 40-41.

48. Ibid, P.41.

49. v Broadside "To You the Parliament sitting at Westminster".(1659)

50. Ibid.

51. "Journal". (Camb.Ed.) Vol.I, P.296.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid, P.297.

54. Robertson's "South Leith Records"(1911) P.109.

55. Fox's "Journal, (Camb.Ed.) P.297; Nicoll's "Diary" Vol II, P.202. cf PP 212-3, 216. Butler claims that the scene was the Tron Square (v"George Fox in Scotland", (1913) P.36.)

deputation post haste to Edinburgh to petition the Protector's Council against Fox, and when Fox returned to his inn from the Castlehill, an officer handed him a summons signed by Emmanuel Downing, Clerk to His Highness' Council in Scotland, citing him to appear on the following Tuesday morning. Thus began the clash between the State authorities and the Quakers, which drew from the latter the bitter taunt against the Church of appealing to Caesar as the Scribes and Pharisees did, and thrusting on to the civil powers the distasteful execution of its own "madness and envy" that its bloodguiltiness and "wicked peace might not be disturbed".⁵⁶

The Council, all but two of whom were Englishmen⁵⁷, had been appointed by Cromwell only two years before, and consisted of nine members including Monck who was the controlling force.⁵⁸ When Fox duly appeared before them they were adamant. But they were not bitter: they were bored. Fox opened the proceedings with a religious salutation. When he was asked the occasion of his coming to Scotland, he replied that it was "to visitt ye seede of God which had longe layne in death & bondage.. yt all in ye nation yt did professe ye scriptures of Christ ye prophetts and ye Apostles might come to ye light, spiritt, & power, as they was in yt gave y^m foorth". Fox admitted he had no "outward busnesse" in the country and refused to bind himself as to the duration of his stay. The Council, in turn, refused to listen to him further, or to give reasons for ordering him to quit the country within 7 days, and being let go, he returned to his inn⁵⁹.

Fox had no intention of obeying the Council's notice to quit, and from the remaining story of his visit in Scotland, Watson is probably justified in saying that "it is likely that the Council cared little whether he obeyed it or not".⁶⁰ At all events, Fox made clear his defiance of the Council in two ways, (1) by the letter he wrote to them shortly after, protesting against what he considered their unchristian dealing in banishing an innocent man that sought their salvation and eternal good, and putting them on the same level "with the wicked envious preists & the stoners, strikers & mockers in the streets".⁶¹ (2) By embarking soon on a long propaganda tour, which, strangely enough, he was allowed to complete at will, and which must have occupied two to three months.⁶²

56. D.P.P.S. PP 349,333.

57. The two Scots members were the Laird of Swinton and Colonel Lockhart. Baillie sneers bitterly at the "English sojourns" and "our complying gentlemen". (Letters Vol III, P.288.)

58. Firth points out, however, that Roger Boyle, Lord Broghil, the President, left Scotland in 1656. (v "The Last Years of the Protectorate", Vol II, P.91.) He was incidentally a close friend of Admiral Penn.

59. "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol I, P.298.

60. J.S. Watson "The Life of George Fox", (1860) P. 189.

61. "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol I, PP 301-2.

62. cf Besse's "Sufferings", Vol II, P.495.

Commencing with a return visit to Heads, where he found the Quakers suffering severely from the effect of the Synod of Glasgow's recent excommunication⁶³, Fox accompanied by Widders reached Glasgow to discover that no one would come to a meeting which had been arranged. So after some open-air preaching, they journeyed towards Badcow and landed back at William Osborne's.

Now comes the most disputed point in Fox's Scottish itinerary, when "we went amongst ye clans⁶⁴ & they were Divelish & like to have spoiled us & our horses & runn with pitchforkes att us; but through ye Lord's power we escapt ym".⁶⁵ Where were "the Highlands"? We can certainly rule out Butler's idea as incorrect, viz., that they were in the near surroundings of Perth.⁶⁶ The scanty data we have seem to indicate some region of the Campsies or Lennox Hills, for (1) We know that Osborne's house was near Badcow and Kirkintilloch, and Fox stated it was "towards the Highlands".⁶⁷ (2) This incident stands chronologically in the "Journal" between Glasgow and Stirling as the Lennox Hills stand geographically between them. (3) Watson infers that Osborne accompanied Fox and his friends from his home, (which was quite feasible), though he could not protect him from the Highlander's pitchforks⁶⁸. (4) This expedition into the "Highlands" lasted only a few hours. It would have been impossible to penetrate into the Highlands of West Stirling and Perthshire proper, but as the Lennox Hills form the Southern fringe of the Ben Lomond system, Fox may perhaps legitimately have said "if he reached the Lennox Hills that he was "among the Highlanders".⁶⁹

Two interesting sidelights on the alleged "devilishness" of the Highlanders - whether on the fringes or in the fastnesses of their territory matters not - may be mentioned in passing. In 1653, Colonel Ashfield, then Sherriff-Principal of Aberdeen sent a letter to the gentlemen of Banffshire, warning them to be vigilant and secure those parts of their lands "which ly near the highlands from the incursion of those looss people which dayly breake downe upon them."⁷⁰

The other is from Thurloe. One of his Scottish correspondents had urged him "to gett the highlands planted with ministers" as the "onlie way to bring them unto civilitie".⁷¹

63. v Ante, Ch.V, P.40.

64. Some editions read "The Highlanders".

65. "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol.I, P.304.

66. "George Fox in Scotland", P.38.

67. "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol I, P.293.

68. "The Life of George Fox", (1860) P.189.

69. The Highland Boundary line cuts Stirlingshire about Killearn and Balfron.

70. E.D. Dunbar, "Documents relating to the Province of Moray", (1895) P.121.

71. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol.IV, P.646.

Thurloe readily accepted this hint, and at his instigation, Cromwell in 1658 granted the sum of £1200. per year for maintaining Ministers and Schoolmasters in the Highland area.⁷²

From "the Highlands" Fox and his companions passed to Stirling, which was "soe closed uppe in darknesse" that they could not get a meeting. The only chance they had to declare their message was to a crowd dispersing from a horse race.⁷³

Leaving Stirling they made their way through Clackmannan and Fife to Burntisland, which had been visited by John Stubbs in 1655.⁷⁴ There an English officer, Captain Pool, his wife and several other officers of the army embraced the "truth". Burntisland was one of Cromwell's early and favourite strategic centres.⁷⁵ Passing then "through several other places" they came to Perth ("Johnstons"). All the four were now together, and Captain Davenport was their host. The populace was reasonable and well behaved as a whole, but the Baptists were very bitter and instigated the Governor to call out the Military to expel four men, which he did by sending an entire company of Infantry to march them out of the place! As the soldiers escorted them through the throngs in the streets and listened to Lancaster and Fox proclaiming their gospel, "they were soe ashamed that they cryed & saide they had rather have gone to Jamaica than to guard us soe."⁷⁶ The troops conveyed the Quakers and their horses in boats across the Tay and left them.⁷⁷ So Fox, Lancaster, Parker, and the faithful Widders⁷⁸ went to "another market town" which was also heavily garrisoned.

The name is not mentioned, but it was almost certainly Dundee. The people were very apathetic - they had suffered so much at the hands of Englishmen already when Monck sacked the town in 1651⁷⁹. But they dared not show any active hostility to the Quakers, for so sympathetic to the latter were the military, that they would willingly have compelled the magistrates to give Fox the Town Hall for his meeting. Friends, however declined such measures, and held their gathering at the Cross instead, where the speakers were Fox, and Parker, who had

-
72. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol VII, P.169.
 73. "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol. I, P.304.
 74. Caton's "Journal", (2nd Ed.) P. 39.
 75. Carlyle's "Letters and Speeches of Cromwell", (1888) Vol. II, Letter CLXXIX, P. 283.
 76. "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol. I, P. 305. Jamaica which Britain had seized from Spain in 1655, was a notorious "white man's grave", where many soldiers had died. v Carlyle's "Letters and Speeches of Cromwell", (1888) Vol III, P. 123, Prefatory Note to Letter CCIV.
 77. Ibid; Tuke's "Biographical Notices", Vol.I. (Vol.III of his "Works") Ch. 10, P.136.
 78. v Fox's "Testimony" to Widders" in "The Life and Death etc. of Robert Widders", (1688) P.27.
 79. v Maxwell's "The History of Old Dundee" (1884), PP 542 ff. cf Hume Brown's "Early Travellers in Scotland", PP 208-9, and Kennedy's "Annals of Aberdeen", Vol I, P.228, and "Dundee Past & Present", 2nd. ed. (1910) PP31-34, 65, 67-69.

been in Dundee already on his visit to Forfar. The "convincements" made were mostly among English immigrants.⁸⁰

How the Quakers got across the Tay and Forth is not known, but they appeared next at Leith, where the Council had issued warrants for their apprehension owing to Fox's departure within the seven days being long overdue. When Fox was apprised of this, he gave his famous answer about the cartload of warrants,⁸¹ and with characteristic calmness and bravery went straight back to his old inn in Edinburgh, where no man "ofred to medle with mee". With him were now Thomas Rawlinson, Parker and Widders. Having a "concern" to return to Perth he set out with Parker and found congenial company at Captain Davenport's house, where there were many officers. The Baptists sent Fox a challenge to debate which he accepted, but stipulated warily that it should be outside the town. Fox kept the tryst along with Davenport, but not a Baptist appeared. So returning to the town, they held a meeting at the Market Cross whence Fox and Parker returned to Edinburgh. Many of the officers then in Perth were either Quakers by conviction, or were "loving to Friends".⁸²

The amazing thing is that Fox and Widders, who had apparently joined him just beyond Edinburgh, were not immediately arrested when they entered the Netherbow Port "as it were against the cannon's mouth or the sword's point". They passed by both sentries unchallenged, traversed the city and emerged again probably by the Potter Row Port to an inn in the suburbs. The next day which was a Sunday, Fox attended "a glorious meeting" in the City at which many officers and soldiers were present, and there was no interference or disturbance from anyone. On the Monday they all set out for home, travelling by Dunbar, where they addressed a large and varied gathering in the Churchyard. This was the last meeting George Fox had in Scotland, and an extraordinary meeting it was, which "ended in ye Lord's power quiett & peaceable"⁸³

It can hardly be maintained that Fox was satisfied with what had been achieved generally, but he prophesied that there would be a great increase of the Quaker Truth in the northern land.⁸⁴ And there was in the Restoration Period. One thing at least is evident, that Fox suffered far less severe persecution and "rabbling" in Scotland than what was constantly meted out to him in England.

80. Tuke's "Biographical Notices", Vol I, P.137.

81. cf Luther's answer about the tiles as devils.

82. "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol.I, PP.306-7. cf Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol I, P.289.

83. "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol. I, P.310. cf Hoyland's "The Man of Fire and Steel", [1932] P.146.

84. "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol. I, P.310.

CHAPTER VIII.

"THE QUAKERS AND THE ARMY OF OCCUPATION."

The Army of Occupation in Scotland is variously estimated at strengths ranging from 7,000 - 8,000 to 18,000, according to exigencies. Cromwell built three citadels at Leith, Ayr¹ and Inverness, and placed strong garrisons in Glasgow, Edinburgh, Stirling, Dumbarton, Linlithgow, Burntisland², Perth, Dundee, Dunottar, Aberdeen, Inverary, Inverlochy and Dunstaffnage³. During practically all the Commonwealth and Protectorate, General Monck was the virtual ruler of Scotland with his headquarters at the Palace of Dalkeith which he leased from the guardians of the Countess of Buccleugh⁴. In spite of the strong resentment of the people at being compelled to sacrifice their national independence to a military dictatorship, Monck was not unpopular. Even Baillie admitted that he had a civil bearing. He was a resourceful unemotional figure with the welfare of the country at heart, and despite his tendency to severity, he was just, fair-minded and approachable. "singular wisdom and carriage to all that had address unto him"⁵. The discipline of the troops was excellent as it was strict and even at times cruel, and the high moral and religious training was as much emphasized as the military; the fear of the Lord being the secret of prowess in the field. The only signs or elements of disaffection proceeded from religious motives, and the strange pot-pourri of sectarian ideals in the Scottish Garrisons, of which the Quaker was not the least. On material and other grounds, however, there was a wonderful loyalty and patience among the troops, even when they were not "paid exactly", as Burnet avers they were, but suffered serious arrears in pay among all ranks and felt their remoteness "in a barren country".

Monck firmly and steadily closed his iron grip on Royalist Scotland, and after the defeat of Middleton's (or Glencairn's) rising⁸ in February 1654/5, a revolt as futile and abortive

1. cf "Cromwell's Army"; (1902) P.300.
2. According to Lamont, however ("Diary", P.23) The Scots had begun to fortify it at the expense of the country.
3. cf Burnet's "History of his own Times"; (1883) P.40: and Baillie's "Letters", Vol III, PP 249-250.
4. cf Guizot, "Life of Monck", P.82, and Gordon's (New) "Statistical Account of Scotland", (1845) Vol I, P. 487.
5. Nicoll's "Diary", P.183.
6. Ibid, P. 33. cf The swift justice meted out to the murderer of James Haliburton in Bemersyde Wood. ("Memorials of the Haliburtons", PP 41-42, quoted by Russell in "The Haigs of Bemersyde", Ch. IX, PP 242-3). cf "Cromwell's Army", Ch. XII, PP 278 ff partim.
7. Carlyle "Cromwell's Letters", (1888) Vol III, Speech 4, P. 93. cf Firth's "Cromwell's Army", PP 199,246; and "The Last Years of the Protectorate", Vol II, P 118.
8. v Graham of Deuchrie's "Account of the Expedition of William the Ninth Earl of Glencairn".(in "Miscellanea Scotica", Vol IV, PP68-69, 77), and Gardiner's "History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate" Vol. II, Ch.XXXII, Esp. PP 416-420.

as Penruddock's Rebellion at Salisbury, he soon completed his military subjugation of the country. It was then that his forces were at their maximum, (18,000). The Highlanders had been very turbulent and lawless, but by February 1656/7 Monck wrote to Thurloe that he had them in good order, and that the people were now "very punctuall in observing of any orders for apprehending any broken men or theeves in that country", and that he believed "the people's mindes are pretty well settled for peace in these parts".⁹ Of all the fortresses in the Lowlands, Leith was the strongest and most strategic, for "it kept the capital of Scotland in awe, could be held by 500 men, was too strong to be breached and could easily be relieved by Sea".¹⁰ So well planned were Monck's military dispositions that he could keep his forts adequately garrisoned at the same time as he took the field with forces sufficient to nip any rising in the bud. He had also organised so efficient a system of espionage and "secret service" that no intended coup among the Royalists or any rumoured landing of the King in Scotland escaped him.

In the Army of Occupation there were a considerable number of Quakers including not a few who became "convinced" while stationed in Scotland, especially among the forces at Leith, Perth, and Aberdeen. Several of the earlier missionaries were soldiers or ex-soldiers; James Nayler may be included in this category when he served in Scotland in 1650; also William Edmundson, the Quaker Apostle of Ireland, who served in 1650 and 1652. Neither had been convinced by then, though Edmundson visited Scotland as a Quaker many years later (1697) with two Cumberland Friends, passing through Dumfries and "Moneygoff" (Minnigaff) on his way to Ireland.¹¹ In addition, John Stubbs and William Dewsbury were ex-service men.

In the popular mind still, the central and distinguishing characteristic of the Society of Friends is its uncompromising hostility to War and carnal weapons of every kind, and it is generally assumed that it has been so all along. On the contrary.¹² What makes the matter stranger still, equally from a psychological and a religious standpoint is the curiously dualistic attitude of Fox. From the very first he had personally given implicit obedience both by precept and example to the literal command of Christ. He believed in, and practised non-resistance most consistently, and yet showed in his own strong and brave figure that Pacifism can be a positive, manly, and heroic thing that wins admiration. Apart from the ingenious design of the authorities to get rid of so troublesome an element as Fox was, by offering him a commission and consequent release from Scarborough Castle, he had won the enthusiastic suffrage of the soldiers as

9. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol VI, PP 52, 686. cf "Cromwell's Letters and Speeches", (1888) Vol II, P.301.

10. Firth "The Last Years of the Protectorate", Vol II, P.89.

11. William Edmundson's "Journal", (1774) PP 3,5, 197.

12. v Art. by M.R. Brailsford in "Contemporary Review", Vol CVIII, (Nov.1915) P.653.

their "Captain" by his indifference to danger, his expert horsemanship and his physical and moral strength to endure hardship and persecution. Yet at first he seems to have seen no need for following out his belief to its logical conclusion. So, far from attempting to influence or incite any of his followers outside or within the Army, he was only zealous to improve the 'status quo' of the latter. In his various general epistles to officers and soldiers, there is as yet no suggestion of condemning their profession, but only a real solicitation that they should fulfil John the Baptist's requirements and be "Souldiers Qualified" knowing "the end of their Souldierie."¹³

In the Army of Occupation there were not a few Quaker missionaries who propagated the Truth and won converts among their comrades in arms. These Quaker soldiers, as Miss Brailsford points out, "were hampered as yet by no humanitarian scruples about their business of killing, whose sanction by Christianity was assumed without question".¹⁴ In Miles Halhead's severe reprimand of the soldiers in Edinburgh in 1654, there is not a word about the ethic of militarism per se.¹⁵ In a letter from Paisley dated 1656, John Hall informed Margaret Fell that "there is souldiers stragled up and downe which is convinced"¹⁶ Howgill in his manifesto to the Army in Scotland, dated July 1657 warns all Commanders and Officers to "take heed of... doing violence to the honest and them that fear the Lord amongst You, for then you bear the Sword in vaine and are no Souldiers for God". There is only a caution here about the abuse of military powers; the possibility and indeed legitimacy of following the profession of arms to the glory of God is clearly implied.¹⁷ Colonel Daniell wrote to Monck in 1657, complaining that his Captain-Lieutenant (Davenport) "is turned one of this sottish stupid generation of quakers"¹⁸, while Monck in his letter from Dalkeith to Cromwell in March 1656/7, advises him that "in Major-General Berrie's Regiment that came lately into Scotland there being three officers quakers and where they are (as I am informed) the greatest part of their troops are quakers".¹⁹ It was only towards the end of Cromwell's time that the Friends began to veer round to their traditional Pacifism,²⁰ but in the army it was by the officers and high authorities that the incompatibility of the Quaker Faith and military service was first revealed, and by the Quaker soldiers as a whole, dismissal from the service was regarded as persecution and base ingratitude which was keenly resented²¹.

-
13. "A Quaker from Cromwell's Army", (1927) P.17. 14. Ibid.
 15. Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol I, P.159.
 16. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol. II, P.288. (15-12-1656.)
 17. F. Howgill's "Tract" "To all You Commanders and Officers of the Army in Scotland especially etc" July 1657. PP 3-4.
 18. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol VI, P.167.
 19. Ibid, P.136.
 20. Brailsford's "A Quaker from Cromwell's Army", (1927) P.25.
 21. cf Howgill's "Protest in, "To all You Commanders and Officers etc", P.3.

But the authorities only thus forestalled what must inevitably and soon have come from the Quaker soldiers themselves. The inherent conflict between the basic principles of their faith and the carnal weapons and policy of the Protector was swiftly maturing.²² The Quakers' attitude of mind too, was found increasingly difficult to square with their duties, and it was this dilemma which laid them open to Major Richardson's rather natural taunt in writing to Monck from Aberdeen - "I fear my lord, these peoples' principles will not allow them to fight if we stand in need, tho' it does to receive paye".²³

There were definite reasons to explain this incongruity. Like all other Sectaries the early Quakers recognised little virtue or good faith outside their own body, and although this strength of narrowness was perhaps essential to the Movement then, and was the necessary foil to the coming latitudinarianism of the Restoration it was not in the best interests of discipline and was not kindly regarded by the High Command. Especially was this so when "their zeal for virtue and true religion often exposed them to the resentment of their Officers and others who hated reproof" as Besse suggests.²⁴ Neither could the Army Chaplains feel themselves altogether detached from the opprobrium and contempt which the Quakers heaped upon their civilian brethren, the "hireling priests". But the real rub came in acknowledging superiors and in obedience to orders. The Inner Light which knew no respect of persons, but was vouchsafed 'without partiality and without hypocrisy' to senior officer and humble ranker alike, was a "levelling principle" which did not conduce to prompt obedience or recognition of distinctions. It might even logically impel men to deliberate insubordination, and it certainly made both needless and wrong to their minds the respectful mode of address and salutations due to a superior officer.

Monck's attitude at first to this "very uncertain generation to execute commands" was one of mild nonchalance. During William Caton's first visit to Edinburgh in 1655, before he proceeded to Stirling, he seems to have found his way to the General's headquarters at Dalkeith, for he "was also... with General Monck who was seemingly moderate and did hear me and received such papers from me as I had to deliver to him".²⁵ But by 1656 Monck had begun to grow suspicious. Strong pressure was being brought to bear on him from several quarters. Colonel Daniell writing to Monck from Perth early in April 1657 told him of his endeavour "to prevente these blasphemous herritickes from corrupting the soldiery" and warned Monck that as the Quakers' "designe is to

22. Boswell, however, tells of Tom Cumming, a Quaker Friend of Dr. Johnson, and not entirely consistent! (cf *Everyman's "Life of Johnson"*, Vol II, P.463)

23. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol VI, P.145. cf "The Incitement to Disaffection Act", 1934.

24. "Sufferings"; (1753) Vol II, P.461.

25. Caton's "Journal", (1839) P.40.

draw soldiers from obedience", he would need to "take special notice" to suppress or curb them. To make his contention still more emphatic, Daniell instanced the case of his subordinate officer Davenport in considerable detail, and lamented that he should thus imperil his years of honourable service.²⁶ Daniell's despatch was followed in the same month by another from Major-General Sir Thomas Morgan, written at Aberdeen. Morgan, while quite as alive to the undesirable influence of Quakers in his forces, does not take so serious a view of them as Daniell does, and his "short and easy method with Dissenters" viz., ordering their discharge, or, in the case of officers, reporting them to Monck, pre-dated the latter's wholesale purging of the army by several months.²⁷ But the General realised full well by now that the situation was sufficiently serious to warrant a full report to the Protector, which was despatched from his headquarters in March 1656/7. He informed Cromwell that he has "latelie received divers letters from many officers heere in Scotland concerning the quakers which they are afraid will encrease much among these forces in Scotland unless your highnesse please to take some course in it".²⁸ There were no officers of field rank or colonels among the Quakers except Colonel Richard Ashfield, the Governor of Glasgow,²⁹ but in Monck's judgement the Quakers would prove "a very dangerous people" if they multiplied in the army, "and be neither fitt to command nor obey, but ready to make a distraction in the army and a mutiny upon every slight occasion".³⁰ Major Richardson of Aberdeen's letter about the same time to Thurloe was to the same purpose.³¹

By the autumn of 1657, Monck had definitely made up his mind to purge the Scots Army of Occupation of all Quakers, Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy men and other Sectaries who were, or might become, subversive of order and discipline. Captain Davenport, after a personal interview with the General, in which he refused to remove his hat - as he forbade his men to do to himself - was promptly cashiered³². While Fox was in Scotland, there was a drastic purge of two troops in Colonel Robert Lilburne's Cavalry Regiment,³³ one commanded by Captain William Bradford, the other stationed at Cupar-Fife under Captain Watkinson. Watkinson himself and Lieutenant Foster of Bradford's troop were summoned to Dalkeith as Davenport was, and for the same lack of military respect were dismissed the service, expressing their joy at suffering for Righteousness' sake. To make sure of a complete comb-out of

26. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol VI, PP 167, 215.

27. Ibid, P. 241.

28. Ibid, P.136.

29. Formerly Governor of Aberdeen and a notable Officer. Became Governor of Glasgow in 1656. (v Littlejohn's "Records of the Sheriff Court of Aberdeenshire", (1907) Vol III, PP 83-85.

30. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol VI, P.136.

31. Ibid, P. 162.

32. Firth's "Cromwell's Army", P.345.

33. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol IV, P.395. cf Clarke Papers, Vol III, PP 122-3

the Scottish forces, Monck thereafter issued an order dated 14th October 1657 requiring a return of all Quakers, whether officers or men, then serving with the troops. This produced a counter-blast from some of the dismissed officers and soldiers of Lilburne's Regiment in which they solemnly protested the primacy of their loyalty to God and their conscience. There were eight signatories to this "Testimony" including "Tho. Parish, chaplain to ye maye"³⁴ But Monck was relentless, and by 1658 his purgation of the disaffected elements was complete.

Monck, however was no persecutor. There was nothing vindictive about him; he was equitable and balanced in judgement. He had fulfilled his purpose from a strictly military standpoint, and that duty done, he had no more to say against the Quakers. No doubt some of the latter since their dismissal from the Army took occasion still to upbraid the officers and charge them with denying the Truth through the fear of losing their commissions,³⁵ and from the following order issued by Monck at St. James' on 9th March 1659, there seems to have been a tendency to reprisals against the Quakers by some of his army - "I doe require all officers and souldiers to forbear to disturb the Peaceable meetings of the Quakers, they doeing nothing preudiciall to the Parliament or Commonwealth of England"³⁶. But the General's attitude was free of recrimination.

When Monck was in Scotland again later in the same year, Caton, who was paying his third visit to Edinburgh, failed to obtain an interview with the Commander and had to be content to give to his Secretary the written substance of what he had to say to him and the officers generally. The Staff Officers who were present were "pretie moderate and civill towards" Caton,³⁷ but clearly neither Monck nor they wished any further direct dealings with Quakers in Scotland. But in the Army in Scotland there was still some sympathy left towards the Friends and some propensity to welcome the Truth. A rumour at Linlithgow that Monck had given orders to hinder Caton's meeting was disproved by the attitude of the soldiers who "were much stirred up to threaten" "some rude people that would have done mischeife"³⁸. Caton spent a good deal of his time among soldiers, but few came to his meetings, "excepting some few officers who did decline from Monck and for the most part such were loving to friends."³⁹ Apparently also there were some fresh cases of convincement after Monck's expurgation, for many officers "threw in there Commissions while I was their & severall were displaced."⁴⁰

34. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol IV, P.397.

35. So Timothie Langley to Thurloe in December 1657 from Leith. ("State Papers", Vol VI, P.709.)

36. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol. III, Letter 141.

37. Ibid, Vol I, P.395. (Caton's letter to Willán from Leith 14-9-1659) cf Caton's "Journal", PP 81-3.

38. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol I, P.399. (Letter from Caton to Fox) cf Caton's "Journal", P.80.

39. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol. I, P.399.

40. Ibid.

The general attitude of the Military in Scotland to the Quakers was very mixed. Some regiments and troops were "very free" of them as Sir Thomas Morgan informed Monck. The higher command ranks were for the most part definitely averse if not hostile.⁴¹ On the other hand there were many convincements among officers' wives and in the ranks, and these formed the big majority of the total convincements during the Commonwealth and Protectorate. There were many evidences of the soldiers' friendliness and sympathy towards the Quakers during these years which ranged from good-natured toleration to being "very tender or loving". When Christopher Fell was imprisoned at Paisley for addressing the Minister after service, and the people threatened the Quakers with knives if they came again, Lieut. Dove of the local Troop of Horse warned the inhabitants that he would use his Cavalry to "beset them in their house so to preserve the peace."⁴² Some times the troops' good disposition was in secret as when soldiers at Aberdeen in 1658 warned Watkinson and Dewsbury that Governor Richardson knew of their presence in the Town,⁴³ but far more often it was overt, e.g., at Forfar, where "the Lt. Kerr and some Troopers continues very loveing" to Parker,⁴⁴ or at Stirling where some soldiers finally procured lodging for Caton and Grave when they were stranded in 1656.⁴⁵ Colonel Ashfield's treatment of Caton in Glasgow, and his arrest of the Synod of Glasgow's tyranny over the West-Country people are perhaps the most classic examples of all.⁴⁶

-
41. E.g. Major Richardson at Aberdeen, Lt.-Col. Mann at Inverness, Col. Lidcoate at Edinburgh. ("Swarthmore MSS", Vol II, P.288.) Col. Daniell at Perth.
42. v Broadside "To You the Parliament sitting at Westminster". (1659)
43. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol IV, PP 391-2. (Letter from Watkinson at Leith to Fox)
44. Ibid, Vol III, P.39. (Letter from Parker to Fox, Leith, Jan. 1657/8)
45. Caton's "Journal", (1839) P.45.
46. v Ante, Ch. V, P.49.

CHAPTER IX.

"THE POST-FOX MISSIONARIES OF THE FIRST PERIOD"

As the army had been the main stronghold and happy hunting ground of the "Publishers of Truth", Monck's wholesale dismissal of Quaker officers and rankers from the Scots forces gave a rather severe though temporary check to the Movement in Scotland, for most of these men returned home to England. The military authorities were now more vigilant of further disaffection, or of any contamination of the troops from external sources;¹ besides which the Cause among the civilian population was not in a prosperous condition. While Caton claimed to have had "good service", he is far from cheerful. The Friends in the Heads district kept their meetings "indeferantt orderly and Constantly, but little Increase there is.. of late Among them"². Generally the meetings were small and drew few strangers. There were a good many 'camp-followers' whose timidity and lack of strong conviction kept them from open identification of themselves with the Movement;³ while even among the "convinced" there was a prevalent and vague apprehension of the future⁴. The only bright spot seemed to be Leith, where Captain Langley morosely complained to Thurloe that the Quakers "that formerly seemed to be becalmed for a season are now congregated againe and seeme to take fresh resolutions as to there converting or rather overturning all things"⁵.

Fox's visit to Scotland did not give any great impetus to missionary activity, and there was no subsequent number of "public" Friends travelling in Scotland comparable to those of the period 1654/6. But among the post-Fox "publishers" there were one or two important figures.

Reference has already been made to John Burnyeat⁶ and his visits to Aberdeen, Hamilton, Ayr and Galloway. Burnyeat who was convinced in 1653, arrived in Scotland about October 1658, and spent three months in Scotland. His mission was to "call People to Repentance out of their lifeless hypocritical Profession and dead Formalities wherein they were settled in the Ignorance of the true and loving God"⁷.

About the same time came the itineration of William Dewsbury and George Watkinson, after the latter had been dismissed the army. In 1642, during his early army days, Dewsbury, who was

-
1. Not always successfully, for Caton e.g. "had good service sometimes Among the souldiers", ("Swarthmore MSS", Vol. I, P. 394.) and Dewsbury reached "the Garrison of Air" (Smith's "Life of Dewsbury" (1836), P. 166.)
 2. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol. I, P. 400. (Letter from Caton to Fox (1659))
 3. Ibid, P. 394. (Letter from Caton to Willan from Leith) (1659)
 4. Ibid, PP 394-5.
 5. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol VII, P. 403. (Sept. 19. 1658)
 6. v Ante, Ch. VI.
 7. v Burnyeat's "Journal", (1839) P. 179; also "The Truth Exalted in the Writings.. of John Burnyeat", (1691 Ed.) P. 26.

then a "Seeker" had visited Edinburgh where he "found nothing but formality"⁸. In 1658, he returned to Scotland by Berwick "with great joy"⁹. At first he travelled alone. He seized the chance of doing open-air propoganda among harvesters with some success, and journeyed into the West as far as Ayr, visiting Friends' meetings at Badcow and Heads. He found Friends only "in measure come into the simplisaty of ye Truth". Thence he returned by Hamilton Glasgow and Stirling to Edinburgh, where he found things rather more encouraging¹⁰. For the rest of his time in Scotland he travelled with Watkinson by Dundee, Aberdëen and Inverness and they were "much refreshed when any would receive the testimony as severall did"¹¹. Watkinson speaks of their being entertained very sympathetically by "one who was called A provost", and his family¹², but the location is unknown. At the end of their tour they came to Burntisland, where they were entertained by a Custom House official, who along with a party of neighbours received their message "frely and was satisfied in every thinge yt was spoaken" by Dewsbury; "also in what they could objecte"¹³.

Another of "severall friends from England" who was probably with Dewsbury and Watkinson at Aberdeen was George Atkinson" who came through this Nacione sounding forth the day of the Lord"¹⁴.

William Caton paid his third and last visit to Scotland in 1659, reaching Edinburgh with a friend unnamed, probably Stephen Crisp, whence they went next day to Linlithgow. The townspeople were distinctly hostile to the Quakers who had to hold their meetings "by the highway side", and no less to the two travellers who could scarcely purchase any food or lodging¹⁵. But the wife of the governor of the "Castle" (Palace) who was at that meeting, being a kind and charitable woman, prevailed on them to accept her hospitality¹⁶ and after "some more good service in the town" Caton and his companion returned to Edinburgh and Leith¹⁷. From Leith Caton crossed to Burntisland and "had good

8. Smith's "Life of Dewsbury", (1836) P.29.

9. Ibid, P.166.

10. Ibid, and "Swarthmore MSS", Vol.I, PP 736-7.

11. v Ante, Ch.VI, P.45, and "Swarthmore MSS", Vol.IV, P.391, (Watkinson's letter to Fox from Leith 23-8-1658.)

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid, P.392.

14. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting att Urie" in J.F.H.S. Vol VII, P.92.

15. The soldiers sympathising with Caton protected him.

16. cf Colonel Lidcoate's warning to the soldiers to keep Hall out of the "Castle". (v "Swarthmore MSS", Vol.II, P.288.)

17. Caton's "Journal", (1839) P.81, and "Swarthmore MSS", Vol.I. P.394.

service Among some of the wisest of the Scots who sees of the deceite of the vulterous preists"¹⁸, after which he crossed to the West and had several meetings, yisiting Badcow, Heads and Douglas with moderate satisfaction¹⁹.

When Caton returned to England he left behind in the West of Scotland Stephen Crisp. Crisp was a weaver of "unsophisticated"serge in Colchester, a place described by Evelyn in 1656 as "a ragged and factious town, now swarming with sectaries"²⁰. This was his first journey as a travelling minister, and he was most reluctant to undertake it²¹. Crisp spent four or five months in Scotland, travelling on foot throughout the winter, and in conditions rendered more difficult by the movements of the English and Scottish armies and the general confusion of the country since the abdication of Richard Cromwell²². He was sometimes ill-received and ill-treated in Market and "mass-house" especially at Dalkeith, where "had not the soldiers appeared as a stop to your Murderous Purposes against me your works of Mischief had more appeared"²³. On the eve of his departure from Scotland Crisp wrote a vigorous and often acrid diatribe entitled "A Description of the Church of Scotland with a Word of Reproof to the Priests and Teachers..therein". The laity, however, get their due share of censure also²⁴. About January 1660, he returned to Essex.

Captain Langley, writing again to Secretary Thurloe in November 1658, grumbled that everything is "frozen and dead in outward appearance; only the Quakers make a great bustle here.. Yorkshire and those parts adding daily new fewel to there fier"²⁵. Dewsbury was part of that 'Yorkshire fewel' in Leith; so doubtless were two other Yorkshiremen, Samuel Watson of Great Stainforth, near Settle, and Roger Hebden of New Malton, who went together to Scotland about 1660. It was Watson's second visit to Scotland. The popular frenzy and revelling at the Restoration made the country rough but they "had little interruption". They entered Scotland probably by Kelso and returned by Cumberland²⁶.

18. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol.I, PP 399-400.(Letter from Caton to Fox)

19. Ibid.

20. v "Diary", (1859) Vol.I, P.332.

21. v Ante, Ch.II. PP 12-13.

22. v "Memoirs of the Life of Stephen Crisp", (1824) P.53: "A Memorable Account.. of Stephen Crisp", (1694) P.24.

23. v Fell Smith's "Stephen Crisp and His Correspondents", (1892) Intro. P.XXI; Crisp's "A Description of the Church of Scotland etc," (in "A Memorable Account") (1694) P.78.

24. v Infra, Book II, Ch.XIV. partim.

25. Thurloe, "State Papers", Vol VII, P.527.

26. v "A Plain Account of Roger Hebden", (1700) P.130: Fox's "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol II, P.464.

CHAPTER X.

"A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE FIRST PERIOD, WITH OBSERVATIONS."

The results of the Quaker Movement in Scotland during the Commonwealth and Protectorate were not commensurate with the self-sacrificing activity displayed, with so much travel and toil, with the very large number of missionary Friends who were engaged in the enterprise, and with the fervour of a spirit which was disinterested if not always according to knowledge. It cannot be pretended that from the Quaker standpoint, the achievements were other than disappointing. There were quite a number of records of "good service", of districts being "open" and "a seed being among them", of many being "very loving" and "tender" towards Friends, of "pretty works" on peoples' spirits and the like. But these symptoms of curiosity, interest, or sincere sympathy, must be distinguished from convincements of those "who owned the Truth". Of the latter there were comparatively few among the general civilian population, except occasionally by way of reaction from an unwelcome or unsatisfactory ecclesiastical 'status quo' as at Glasgow and Douglas about 1654-5. It was in the Army of Occupation that the Inner Light had its main opportunity, provided through its strong Puritan and democratic idealism a ready seed plot for the Quaker faith. The army often protected its adherents and ambassadors from rough handling and mob violence on the part of an unsympathetic populace. Among the Military there was a considerable number of new converts made. But generally the Quakers were cold-shouldered if not rejected altogether. There were gleams of prosperity certainly, as at Glassford and Burntisland from time to time, at Leith particularly in 1655 and 1658, and during Caton's first visit to Edinburgh after he had set the Quaker house in order. While, however, the results were to them, inadequate and discouraging, the number of convincements, whether among the military or civilian population, was not the measure of the influence of the Movement.

In England the whole temperamental environment, religious conditions and political outlook combined to predispose the people to give the new Faith a welcome at the best, and a tolerant hearing in the main. The advent of Quakerism was not ill-timed. In Scotland it was very largely the reverse, and the same elements militated against its wide or rapid growth. It was born out of due season. There were three leading reasons for this.

I. Scotland was far less accustomed to, and less prepared for, the bizarre or the sensational in religious witness and social life than was England. Her traditional distrust of any ebullition of emotional fervour, and her rather hidebound love of religious decency and order, made her react unfavourably to the Quaker mission, characterised as it was by so much innovation and eccentricity. "Our dear brethren of Scotland", said Thomas Edwards, "stand amazed and astonished, and had they not seen these things could not have believed them"¹. It is beyond

1. "Gangraena", (1646) - "The Epistle Dedicatory", Page facing a 3.

controversy that even in England these extreme elements of early Quakerism and their inordinate passion for unrestrained denunciation and acted parable were a serious obstacle in the way of a great religious concept and ideal becoming a correspondingly great power in the land, and this was truer still in Scotland. It may be to these things as well as to domestic inconsistencies that Caton referred when he spoke of "unwise builders" and "untempered mortar"², for he was one of the most balanced and instructed of the pioneers. The Quakers laid themselves open to natural opposition and showed themselves completely out of correspondence with their environment by their innovation of open-air preaching; by their flooding of the North-East and South-West of the country with violent religious pamphlets; by their going naked as a sign; by their unconventional and ecclesiastically-free ceremony of marriage; by their intrusion for propaganda purposes into places of worship while the congregations were still there; and by their indiscriminate fulminations against Ministers, and the outrageous language that they frequently used both to individuals and communities.

II. It was only to be expected that the Scots people's attitude to everyone and everything English should be one of bitter resentment and smouldering hostility. Not only did the Scots hate religiously all Sectaries ~~swarming over~~ Puritan England, but they disliked them intensely politically. Their antipathy to the Quakers was generally all the greater because, except for a number of Scottish Friends, they were fellow countrymen of the English Army of Occupation, and many of these soldiers themselves were Quakers. The very presence of the Army on Scottish soil more than neutralised the number of conversions effected among the populace by Quaker soldiers and travelling Ministers. Any landed proprietor or larger householder was liable to have one or more Cavalrymen billeted upon him, with food to find for both man and horse, or to pay a heavy monetary equivalent, on the average, 2/- a day. The upkeep of the Army of Occupation³ was very heavy and a severe drain on Scotland, even though her monthly assessments were only about 25% of the total amount required. She was never able to reach the maximum cess of £10000 per month ordered, and when, after Glencairn's rising, Monck was unable to squeeze any more out of the country than £7,300, the levy was standardised at £6,000. in 1657⁴. Economically, the country was undoubtedly poor, except for Glasgow⁵, and felt the weight of the Ironside's heel⁶, but morally and socially, if not religiously she

-
2. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol. I, PP 351, 352. (Undated letter from Caton to Margaret Fell, almost certainly 1656)
 3. For estimated strengths, cf Firth's "Scotland and the Commonwealth" (1895) PP 114-15. Note the excessive number of officers.
 4. Firth "The Last Years of the Protectorate", Vol II, PP 115-17. (Note slight discrepancy in amounts and dates between Firth and Nicoll,—"Diary", PP 144, 173.) cf Burton's "Diary" P. 214.
 5. Baillie's "Letters", Vol III, P. 319. Vol III
 6. cf Burton's "Diary", Vol. II, PP 213-14.

benefited considerably from Cromwell's rule, though contemporary opinion would not recognise it nor respond.⁷ "The Scots" wrote Captain Langley from Leith to Thurloe "continue as malignant as ever" hoping for redemption as they call it. The present good and happy settlement of the present government nothing moves them to alter from their dark principles. The leopard cannot change his spots".⁸

III. During the Commonwealth and Protectorate, the Church held an impregnable position both doctrinally and organically, and it proved too strong and solid a phalanx for the Quaker onslaught to overturn. And its strength was not merely external and legal. This is all the more remarkable in view of the political confusion and the cross-currents of ecclesiastical policy and intrigue that characterised the period. In spite of the mutual recriminations of ministers, and Cromwell's attempt to play off the Resolutioners and Protesters against each other; in spite of the "hellish toleration" of the Protector and the Government's encouragement of Independency and Sectarianism;⁹ in spite of the suppression of the General Assembly¹⁰, the Church was not decadent.¹¹

Doctrinally too as well as administratively, the Church was well entrenched in her Calvinism, a type of religion which peculiarly suited the stern Scottish character, and was authoritative, with its central teaching of the sovereignty of God, and the necessary corollaries of moral rectitude and individual responsibility. It made the Scots people almost, if not quite, proof against that medley of opinions and that restless craving for more inward and vital experiences which prevailed in England and among Mystical and Puritanical Sects generally. Scotland had, in Baxter's phrase "Godliness without any Sect"¹². This is not to affirm that things were ideal, or to deny that Kirkton's well known picture of the times gives a greatly exaggerated impression of the spiritual condition of the Church and country.¹³ Hypocrisy there was, but it was not the most dominant vice. Formality was the most prevalent spiritual sin, though it was by no means universal either in Ministers or people. Such documents as "the Causes of the Lord's Wrath against Scotland" serve to show that the discipline of the

7. cf McCrie "Sketches of Scottish Church History", (1844) PP 374-5.— Criticism of Nicoll's tirade and foot note on P.375; also Sinclair's "Statistical Account of Scotland", (1791-8) Vol VIII. P.210, and J.H. Burton "The Scot Abroad", Ch.III, PP 381,382.

8. Thurloe "State Papers", Vol VII, P.527. (Nov.23.1658.)

9. cf Jaffray's "Diary", (1656) Ch. III, P.56.

10. cf Lamont's "Diary", (1830) PP 56-7; and Firth's "Scotland and the Commonwealth", P.163.

11. cf Neal "History of the Puritans", (1837) Vol.II, P.592; and Orme's "Life of Owen", P.127. cf Nicoll's "Diary", PP 163-4.

12. "Reliquiae Baxterianae", III. 67.

13. "Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland", PP 48-50, 54, 65. cf Law's "Memorials", and Orme's "Life of Owen", P.127.

Church was exercised with a consistency and impartiality that won the esteem of the Nation and made its teaching feared and obeyed.

Certainly Quakerism was sufficiently prevalent in the Midlands and South of Scotland especially to compel the Church to take some notice of it; the courage and dialectical skill of her missionaries and agents were by no means negligible, for the Scottish people have always loved an argument; and the Protector's latent sympathy with them was clear from his retort to the Edinburgh Ministers when they refused to leave the Castle and return to their work - "Are you troubled that Christ is preached? Doth it [Preaching] scandalize the reformed Kirks and Scotland in particular? Is it against the Covenant? Away with the Covenant if this be so... Where doe you finde in the Scripture a ground to warrant such an accusation, That preaching is included in your function?"¹⁴

The Scottish Clergy, like the English, naturally disliked the denunciatory and destructive side of the Quaker preaching, as it attacked in season and out of season not only the distinction of the Ministry as a class from the laity, but the whole economic basis of the Church in a salaried ministry- ("hireling" or "vulturous priests") and in the maintenance of Churches- "steeplehouses"; for which the Quakers saw no need, Such revolutionary teaching might in time have sown the seeds of a sweeping dis-establishment and dis-endowment in a poor country. It was a direct threat to the Ministers' livelihood. But these things, while they did not make the Church fear the Quakers, put her seriously on her guard against them.

These are the chief considerations and reasons why the soil of Scotland was inhospitable to Quakerism under the rule of Oliver Cromwell.

14. "Severall Letters and Passages", (Edin. 1650) P.8.

BOOK II.

FROM THE RESTORATION TO THE REVOLUTION.

1651, 1659-1688.

CHAPTER I.

"THE 'COMEDY' OF BREDA AND THE RESTORATION".

The execution of Charles I sent a thrill of horror and indignation throughout all Scotland¹, and the very next day after the news was received in Edinburgh, the Committee of Estates with uncalculating haste proclaimed his son Charles King at the Mercat Cross. The only reservations they made were that "before being admitted to the exercise of his royal power, he shall give satisfaction to this kingdom in those things that concern the security of religion" according to the two Covenants, and dismiss from his Councils and service all "Malignants" or others suspected of disloyalty to the Covenanting Cause. A commission of the Estates and the Assembly consisting of eight members² immediately set sail from Kirkcaldy³ for the Hague to offer Charles the crown on these terms, but after almost three months absence⁴ they returned "mutch unsatisfied" as Charles had refused to agree to any stipulations. Three of these commissioners were Churchmen, but for our purpose the most important was Alexander Jaffray of Kingswells⁵, Provost of Aberdeen⁶, then one of the few Covenanters of the City or County of Aberdeen and prominent in the counsels of the Covenanting party⁷, who later became the famous Quaker diarist.

Charles's real answer to the Commission was to confer on Montrose the Garter and despatch him to reconquer Scotland for him as he had done for his Father, and thus be able to return in royal triumph, Covenant or no Covenant⁸. But after the hapless Graham with his German mercenaries was defeated at Carbisdale by Leslie, betrayed by Macleod of Assynt, and subsequently executed at Edinburgh⁹, Charles had no choice but to submit to a second Commission of nine or eleven men¹⁰ who went first to Jersey and then to

-
1. cf Letter to Charles II. from the Estates of the Scots Parliament, which refers to "the honour & Justice of that Glorious Martyre your Royall father and our Native and dread Soverane of blessed memorie!" ("Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland," Vol VII. p. 188)
 2. Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), Ch. III, P. 54, and Godwin's "History of the Commonwealth" (1827) Vol III, PP 202-6.
 3. Lamont's "Diary", P. 2.
 4. The next Commission of 1650 lasted about the same period.
 5. cf "Memorials for the Government of the Royal Burghs of Scotland etc", (1685) P. 254; Baillie's "Letters", (1842) Vol. III, P. 507.
 6. cf "Missives to the Provost, Bailies and Council of Aberdeen", (S.C. Miscellany) Vol V, PP 378-81. cf Blair's "Life" ed. M'Crrie, PP 217, 222.
 7. Munro "Memorials of the Aldermen, Provosts and Lord Provosts of Aberdeen", (1897) P. 159.
 8. cf Gardiner's "Commonwealth and Protectorate", Vol I, PP 208-210.
 9. Ibid, Ch. IX.
 10. The exact number is doubtful. cf Whitelocke's "Memorials", Vol III, PP 193, 194.

Breda in 1650¹¹. Of these Jaffray was again one, while another was John Livingstone of Ancrum. All seemed to be conscious that they were bent on a hazardous mission and Livingstone reveals that there was not complete unanimity or mutual confidence between them, while the three ministers and Jaffray especially were uneasy about Charles' casuistry and motives even should he agree to their terms,¹² as the former showed by their informal conferences with him. Significantly enough, none of the Ministers ever interviewed Charles alone¹³.

Jaffray had serious scruples of conscience about being a party to the Treaty and royal signature, and reproached himself for allowing himself to be unduly influenced by other Commissioners and for acting against his better judgement¹⁴. "We did sinfully both entangle and engage the nation and ourselves, and that poor young prince to whom we were sent; making him sign and swear a covenant which we knew, from clear and demonstrable reasons, that he hated in his heart. Yet finding that upon these terms only he could be admitted to rule over us (all other means having then failed him) he sinfully complied with what we most sinfully pressed upon him, :- where I must confess to my apprehension our sin was more than his"¹⁵. That this was no pious imagination or unfounded apprehension is clearly seen in "His Majesty's Declaration to all His loving Subjects..concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs" in October 1660. In this Manifesto issued from Whitehall, the King complains that his hand was forced and leaves no one in doubt of his intention of establishing Episcopacy throughout his whole demain¹⁶. Carlyle satirises the whole proceeding of "compelling Charles to adopt the Covenant voluntarily". "Alas, did History ever present a more irreducible case of equations in this world" than "a divine Law of the Bible on one hand and a Stuart king..on the other"? Such duplicity on both sides he held was a crime. "You will prosecute Malignants and..you adopt into your bosom the Chief Malignant".¹⁷ The "Comedy of Breda" as it has been called was the prelude to a terrible tragedy for Scotland.

The grave suspicion of the Commissioners at Breda, especially of Livingstone and Jaffray was confirmed later by the compulsion of Charles to sign the Covenant simpliciter at Heligoland before he landed in Scotland, and by "The Start". In the five articles of the agreement which Charles signed at Breda, the maintenance of the Covenant and Presbyterian worship and discipline was central and there was no loophole of escape.¹⁸

-
12. cf Gardiner's "Charles II and Scotland", P.105. cf Blair's "Life" p 228.
13. "Life of John Livingstone". (1754) PP 39, 51. cf Smellie's "Men of the Covenant", (4th. Ed.) P.101, and Gardiner's "Commonwealth and Protectorate", Vol I, P.262.
14. Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) Ch. III, P.55., IV. P.57, and note M. P.159. For the oath which Charles took at Breda, v Thurloe, "State Papers", Vol I, PP 147-8.
15. Jaffray's "Diary", *Chap.* III, P.55.
16. Lord Somers "Scarce and Valuable Tracts", 3rd Col, Vol III, (1751) PP 8-16, Esp. P.9
17. Carlyle "Cromwell's Letters", (1888) Bk. 2, PP 154, 155.
18. "History of the Puritans", (1837) Vol II, P.564.

Charles landed at Garmouth at the mouth of the Spey on 23rd June 1650¹⁹ and arrived the next night in Aberdeen. Events then moved in rapid succession until Dunbar Drove, Inverkeithing²⁰, and finally Worcester when Scotland lay almost helpless at the mercy of Cromwell, and Charles was once again a fugitive on the Continent²¹ for nine years, chiefly in Cologne.

The weak and speedy abdication in 1659 of Richard Cromwell, who had neither the will nor the ability to perpetuate his Father's autocratic rule, and the confused struggle between the Army and the resuscitated "Rump" which followed, brought Monck, who was still in Scotland, to see that the time was more than ripe to assume control of the affairs of the nation in a businesslike manner, and on his own responsibility to unravel the tangled skein. He summoned the representatives of the Scottish Burghs and Shires to Edinburgh, and informed them that he was going South for such a purpose. Whatever the Scots may have thought lay behind this move, Monck when he led his army over the Border on New Year's Day 1660, had no more definite thing in mind than to try to establish a stable Government²². He was disinterested and in no way actuated by personal ambition, but was ready to continue loyal to any established rule whatever it should be. It was not until he reached London in five weeks and came into contact with all shades of public sentiment that he arrived at the firm conviction that the country must either have another Cromwell or a Stuart Restoration, which would guarantee the freedom of Parliament. Events in London quickly disabused his mind of the practicability of the former, and he lost no time in opening negotiations with Charles in Holland, the result of which was the "Declaration of Breda". The Declaration²³ opening with a preamble in an unctuous strain, proclaimed Charles' readiness to grant a free pardon for any "crime whatsoever committed against us or our royal father" to all who gave evidence of their unswerving loyalty to him within 40 days, except those specially excluded by Parliament. He likewise promised "a liberty to tender consciences", so that none should be summoned or penalised for religious opinion, unless they proved subversive of the peace of the Kingdom, which indulgence when incorporated in an adequate Bill he profess himself ready to sign²⁴. The Declaration was issued from "our court at Breda" on 14th April 1660, and in May, Charles was proclaimed in London and Whitehall.

The King sailed from Sluys and landed at Dover on the 25th. After reviewing troops at Barham Downs and enjoying a rural carnival of music and dancing at Blackheath, he entered London

19. v "The Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen, 1643-1747", p 114.
20. v W.S. Douglas' "Cromwell's Scotch Campaigns" (1650-1), (1898) Ch. 7, PP 274 ff.

21. cf Neal "History of the Puritans", (1837) Vol II, PP 587-9.

22. cf "The Heart of Midlothian", Ch. VIII, PP 79-80.

23. Gardiner's "Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution", PP 351-2.

24. Ibid.

with great ceremony four days later²⁵. A tremendous wave of reaction set in and a vast majority of the nation went mad with joy. They threw off all restraint, and trampled wildly upon the last remnants of Puritanical piety²⁶. In Scotland the rejoicing was hardly less pronounced, for the country was utterly weary of military domination, civil wars, plots, and intrigues, and the Scots while by no means trustful of Charles' views and record, anticipated a reign of constitutional peace and stabilised conditions²⁷. The hilarious rejoicings and indulgence in the High Street of Edinburgh a fortnight before Charles even entered London, recalled the similar all-night orgies of 1650²⁸. The excesses were certainly less among the various social classes than in England, for the nobility and gentry were poor and could not run to quite the same extremes of riot as their compeers in England.

Still things were bad enough in Scotland, and especially in the Capital. Hill Burton castigates the rough profligacy of the Court at Holyrood²⁹, and Kirkton admits that the Restoration changed the disposition of the people for the worse³⁰. Two vices were specially prevalent, drinking and profane swearing. Under pretext of drinking the King's health, there was a sudden excess in drinking, and many riotous scenes round the nightly bonfires³¹ and free wine-fountains at Market Crosses, took place. To refrain was construed as disloyalty, and "many a sober man was tempted to exceed lest he should be condemned as unnatural, disloyal, and insensible."³² The actual Restoration celebrations were but the inauguration of a period of shameful excess in liquor and other low habits, no less among Statesmen and Churchmen than others³³. Little wonder that Burnet refers to it as "a mad roaring time... when the men of affairs were almost perpetually drunk"³⁴. There is something grimly ironical in Middleton's³⁵ "Drunken Parliament" as John Welsh called it³⁶ passing an "Act against Swearing and Excessive Drinking" in 1661, ratifying and approving "all acts of Parliament made in

-
25. v "England's Joy etc" (1660). (No. 14 of "Stuart Tracts", 1603 to 1693, with Intro. by C.H. Firth, P.425.)
26. Burnet's "History of his own Time"; (1883) Ch.II, PP 60-61.
27. cf Rutherford's "Letters", (1824) Part III, Letter LXII, P.410.
28. Nicoll's "Diary", PP 16-17.
29. "History of Scotland", Vol VII, P.179.
30. "Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland", (1817) P.65.
31. cf "A Plain Account of Roger Hebdon"; (1700) P.130.
32. Kirkton's "Secret and True History", P.65.
33. Neal's "History of the Puritans", (1837) Vol.III, P 101. cf Macpherson "The Covenanters under Persecution"; (1923) PP 42-3.
34. "History of his own Time"; (1883) Book II, P.82.
35. The Middleton of the Glencairn Insurrection, now Earl Middleton.
36. Blackader's "Memoirs", P.105 n.

former times against the said crimes", and establishing a scale of fines from £20. Scots to 20/- according to social status, including 20% of the annual stipend for ministers !³⁷

Accounts of the general moral and religious condition and tone of the Restoration years differ a good deal, and Quaker prophets³⁸ as well as others issued serious warnings. But on the most moderate and conservative estimate it was a distinctly low time, and coupled with the character of the King boded ill for the future of Scotland.

37. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol.VII.(1820) P.262 Col. 2.

38. E.g. Andrew Robeson's "A Word of Pitty to the Prophane and to the Unruly Rulers".(1662) Folio Sheet.

CHAPTER II."THE QUAKERS AND EARLY ACTS OF THE RESTORATION".

The complex nature of Charles II makes it difficult to estimate and appraise his relative sincerity and insincerity. The truth seems to lie between the two extremes of opinion, viz., that he was an abandoned scoundrel who meant not a word of his own Declaration of Breda - as he certainly did not of the Treaty of Breda, which he signed, and contrariwise, that he was more sinned against than sinning, whereas if he had happened to rule in a totally different political and religious environment, his undoubted abilities and his knowledge and approval of the right would have kept him from choosing the wrong. But Charles tried to make the best of both worlds and failed. He was essentially a time-server and prevaricator. Virtue, clemency, and liberty he was not averse to 'per se'; but only as they swam with the stream of political expediency and his own ambitions and predilections. Once let them threaten these and they were doomed, as were those who upheld them, even if they should be friends who had proved their loyalty beyond any doubt. Cromwell's toleration, and what toleration Charles Stuart had, were intrinsically different. The former in virtue of his own intense religious convictions, could and did very largely respect the religious convictions of others, even when they took forms very different from his own. But the latter was a man of no religious conviction or moral backbone at all, and the price of his toleration and indulgence was, on the personal side, liberty and means to maintain a licentious Court and virtually a private "maison tolérée", and on the political side, complete abstention from all interference with his policy.

The Quakers' attitude to the King, which was typical of their bearing all along to constitutional rulers and authorities, irrespective of their merits, is succinctly expressed in their answer to the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy. To the King appointed by God according to his purpose as chief Civil Magistrate, they owed and would give willing and dutiful obedience in "all his just and lawful commands". Under all other commands given direct or through subordinates, which were otherwise, while still purely civil and external, they would "willingly and patiently suffer". But let the King as a tyrant invade God's spiritual realm and they would bear their witness against him, though not in armed rebellion or with carnal weapons, and would refuse to acknowledge his authority or obey him.²

Charles's attitude to the Quakers for the first few months of his reign, and their high hopes in his policy were consistent with the Declaration of Breda³. He was prepared to be fair and

-
1. The outstanding exception to this was the preferment of Thomas Ken, Prebendary of Winchester to be Bishop of Bath and Wells. Charles could respect what he couldn't live.
 2. v "An Answer to the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy" (1660).
 3. of his prompt mandamus to the New England States in 1661, arresting the execution or imprisonment there of the Quakers.

lenient. He was instrumental in having about 700 Quakers released who had been imprisoned during the régime of the Cromwells; several were admitted to the House of Lords to give their reasons for the faith that was in them; while the King frequently received the personal appeals and memorials of prominent Quakers on behalf of their brethren including those of Margaret Fell⁴, Edward Burrough⁵ and George Whitehead⁶. But most important and striking of all was Richard Hubberthorne's conference with the King in which Charles had several pertinent and not unsympathetic questions to ask. This "long discourse" went far to satisfy the King and his Lords-in-waiting of the loyalty, and lawful and peaceable bearing of the Friends, and it contains the famous "mock-heroic" as some would call it, but which doubtless was sincere enough at the time - "Well of this you may be assured that you shall none of you suffer for your Opinions or Religion so long as you live peaceably, and you have the Word of a king for it; and I have also given forth a Declaration to the same purpose, that none shall wrong you nor abuse you."⁷ Toleration seemed almost assured for the Quakers whenever the Convention Parliament was dissolved and the new Parliament could embody it in a statute. Indeed things were very promising for all other reasonable and peaceable Nonconformists generally, when another insurrection of the Fifth Monarchy men sent a clod of earth through the canvas. Instead of toleration for the Quakers, there was now wholesale persecution.

The Fifth Monarchy men were the Fascists of their day. They held that the world had been dominated by four great Empires in succession, the Assyrian, the Persian, the Macedonian and the Roman, and that the time had now fully come to sweep away, if need be by force of arms, the last remnant of the Roman in the English constitution before the new Government got settled down, and set up the fifth Empire of the Saints under the Monarchy of Christ⁸ according to the prophecy of Daniel. II. 44. They gave much

-
4. "Works", PP 202-210, and Fox's "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol I, P.372.
 5. "The Case of free Liberty of Conscience in the Exercise of Faith and Religion"(1661). Burrough held that persecution would not only mean failure, prevalent hypocrisy, and suffering, but even be detrimental to trade, wealth and peace.
 6. E.g. "The Christian Progress";(1725) PP 524-5. Friends were also prolific correspondents and often wrote to Charles II. Letters by Fox, Nayler, Parker, Caton and Henry Fell are instanced in Euston Library Tracts, Vol. 96.
 7. Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol I, PP 428-432; "Something that lately passed in discourse between the King and R.H.". (in "A Collection of the Several Books and Writings etc", PP.268-272. Esp.271.) cf "Testimony of Renwick" ("Sermons", (1777) P.485)
 8. cf Gough's "History", Vol.I, P.274; Sewell's "History";(1811) Vol I, PP437,439.

trouble from the beginning of the Protectorate to Cromwell,⁹ whom they hated for checkmating the advent of Christ, and attempted unsuccessfully two insurrections in 1654 and in 1657.¹⁰ The last attempt to "emit, soot and fire" and "expel carnal sovereignties" led by one, Thomas Venner, a wine-cooper of Coleman Street meeting in January, 1661, roused the whole city of London and came to a swift end.¹¹

This insurrection was not only a disaster to the hope of Toleration for Nonconformity, but it served to reveal the sinister side of the Government's policy, and the insidious and shifty nature of the King. The real intent of the Declaration of Breda, even on the assumption that it was honest, was still regarded with suspicion and intensest dislike by the ecclesiastical dignitaries and Court circles, and every effort was made by Clarendon and his agents to keep this spirit of hatred against Dissent as strong as possible. The Fifth Monarchy Rising was a most opportune lever in their hands for "proving" the disloyalty and danger of all Sectaries. The colour under which the Government justified their sudden and deliberate breach of the royal promise at Breda was the necessity of taking stern action against the Sectaries as a real or potential danger to the State. Nothing was said officially about prosecuting them for their religious scruples. But the flimsy cloak was too transparent, and everyone realised that before long the Authorities would throw it off.

The Quakers quickly found themselves involved in this imbroglio. They were openly accused of being hand-in-glove with the Fifth Monarchists. To Stowe, they were simply Fifth Monarchy men in disguise and lying low, and he banded them both together, but Stowe's hatred of them as "mad and fitter for Bedlam than sober companie" was well known.¹² They were blamed for being "chiefly active in the conspiracy" of 1657 with the Anabaptists,¹³ but Sir John Finch, writing to Lord Conway, stated that the new restrictions following this latest rising "trouble the Quakers and Anabaptists who had nothing to do with this business",¹⁴ Certainly there were a few fortuitous parallels of belief and teaching between the Quakers and the Fifth Monarchy men,¹⁵ but the Quakers had no sympathy with their compulsive or violent methods and disclaimed any connection or implication with them

9. cf Neal's "History of the Puritans", (1837) Vol II, P. 687; and Carlyle's gibe and Cromwell's crushing reply to the Fifth Monarchists in Cromwell's "Letters and Speeches", (1888) Vol III, PP3 and 25-6.

10. Ibid, Vol III, PP 228-9.

11. Neal's "History of the Puritans", Vol. III, P. 72. cf Pepys' "Diary", (Everyman) VOL I, P. 122, and Whitehead's "The Christian Progress", (1725) Part II. P. 241.

12. Stowe "MSS" Vol 186 (4) - "Present State of the Nonconformists", PP 27, 38. (old numbers)

13. S.P.D. Cal. 1656-7, P. 351.

14. Ibid, Cal. 1660-1, P. 471.

15. cf Firth, "The Last Years of the Protectorate," Vol I, Ch. 7, PP 207, 211

whatsoever. The condemned Fifth Monarchists at the place of execution publicly cleared the Friends of any knowledge of, or complicity in, their plot¹⁶; and Fox followed this up by presenting to the King his noted "Declaration from the harmless and innocent people of God called Quakers against all sedition, plotters, and fighters in the World¹⁷".

The Quakers had hailed the Declaration of Breda as a signal of the Millennium, but now they understood how the crucial phrase therein—"which do not disturb the peace of the Kingdom"—had been used as a loophole by Charles and the Government and how "the word of a King" was only a bruised reed. Ninety-one Quakers in Scotland were "imprisoned, stockt, whipped and some banished" for refusing to ~~take oath~~ or recognise "the Priests' practices"¹⁸. Hart, Brown, Stevenson and others were thrown into Hamilton Tolbooth by the Sheriff-Depute of Lanarkshire for keeping meetings, and some were confined nearly six months¹⁹. *But the Country was in no mood to sympathise with their sufferings any more than with the bid they made for toleration from Parliament in 1659.*^{19A.}

Two Quaker Acts were passed, one for England and the other for Scotland. The English one, which deals largely with the problem of Quakers and oaths was passed in May 1662, but had been taken in hand a year earlier²⁰ and is detailed by Besse²¹. The Scots Act passed in January 1661/2 is a forerunner of the Conventicle Act and was ordered to be published at the Mercat Cross in Royal Burghs²². It dissolved and forbade meetings of "diverse persones vnder the name of Quaikers, Anabaptists and fyft monarchie men, avowed enemies to all lawfull authority & Government, who vpon specious and religious pretences at vnlawfull times and places keep frequent meetings and conventicles together". All magistrates and other public officials were to make periodic search "in all places wher any such meitings have been, shall or may be suspected, and to apprehend every such persone who shall keep or frequent those meitings and to comit them to the next prisson" sine die. This Statute was however, never rigidly or universally carried out against the Quakers in Scotland, probably because—

- (1) The authorities discovered before long that the Quakers had nothing to do with Fifth Monarchy men with whom the Scottish Estates classed them in the Act.
- (2) The Fifth Monarchy Movement was dead beyond hope of any resurrection.
- (3) The Quakers became known even better than formerly as a peaceable and law abiding body²³, who, however much they might be

16. Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol I, P.439.

17. Neal's "History of the Puritans", Vol.III, PP75-6.

18. Folio "For the King and Both Houses of Parliament";(1661) P.6.

19. "General Record of Friends in the West";(MS.Vol 16.) P.7.

20. F.P.T., P.356.

19A. cf Blair's "Life", p 338.

21. "Sufferings". (1753) Preface to Vol I, PP XI to XIII.

22. "The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol VII.(1820)P.16.

23. cf "The Truth Exalted in the Writings of ..John Burnyeat etc"; (1691) P.84.(Letter from Leith 1684).

detested, could not be accused of making their domestic or public gatherings the seed-bed of political intrigue or sedition.

For these reasons, the execution of the Act was sporadic and spasmodic. By 1668, Monthly Meetings were being established in its very face, and it gradually became inoperative. Some of its early victims however, were Robert Hamilton of Shawtonhill, Lanarkshire and other Friends who suffered imprisonment at Hamilton "for keeping meetings"²⁴. Another party of Friends were seized by dragoons at the instance of Archbishop Burnet of Glasgow and imprisoned in Glasgow Tolbooth in 1666²⁵.

Of the numerous Acts passed by Parliament and Council in Scotland in the early part of Charles' reign, many did not affect the Quakers, like the Act of Supremacy, the Oath of Allegiance,—except in their refusal to swear, the Corporation Act, the Act Recissory or the Scots' Mile Act; for they always maintained their loyalty to the throne even under bitter persecution, and could not by their very nature and creed rebel; they were no place-hunters; and they had nothing to do with the Church, the Covenants or Ministers as such. But with another category of these Carolean Acts and Orders in Council, the case was quite different, for while they were not framed primarily for the Quakers, nor were rigorously or logically applied to the Quakers at all, as they were to the Covenanters, they could, strictly speaking, have been brought to bear at any time upon the Friends. Instances of this are the "Act concerning Masters of Universities, Ministers etc." 1662²⁶; the "Act against Separation and Disobedience to Ecclesiastical Authority" 1663²⁷ ("The Bishop's Drag-net") and its sequel in 1670²⁸; the Council's Commission and Instructions to J.P.'s and constables regarding vagrancy²⁹; and later, the "Act against such who do not Baptise their Children" 1672³⁰; and the "Act anent Religion and the Test" ("Test Act") 1681. Under the last, Heriot's unfortunate watch-dog suffered more than any Quaker in Scotland, although the Act was directed partly "against all Phanatick Separatists from this National Church, against preachers at hous or feild Conventicles... against disorderly Baptismes & marriages.. and all other Schismatical disorders"³¹, and the Privy Council held all their subordinates, down to parish ministers, "answerable at their highest peril for furnishing annually a complete list of schismatical withdrawers" from Church worship. It is true that sometimes Quakers appear in the parochial lists, but they are either non-committal about the Bond and Test, or absent when cited, seemingly with impunity. This laxity or virtual toleration however

24. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16.) P.7.

25. Ibid, P.12.

26. "The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland" (1820), Vol VII, P.379.

27. Ibid, P.455.

28. Ibid, Vol VIII, P.11, Col 2.

29. Ibid, Vol VII, P.312, Col.2. Several Quaker Missionaries visited Scotland during this reign with comparative impunity.

30. Ibid, Vol VIII, P.72, Col 2.

31. Ibid, P.243.

was precarious to the Quakers, and indeed they could have been found guilty on any of these laws if only because they would not swear. That the Quakers were thus very largely overlooked is attested not only by the absence of summons or convictions under these Acts³², but by Fountainhall, and most of all by Wodrow's grumble. In 1663 an Act of Council was passed to drive them out of Edinburgh³³, on which Wodrow's comment was that "had this good act been prosecute with the same vigour [as] those against presbyterians were, we might in this land soon been freed from that dangerous sect", but "anything that was done was so little prosecute that they spread terribly during this reign"³⁴. Nor was Wodrow induced to modify his opinion through the appointment by the Council of a Commission in 1664, headed by the Archbishop of Glasgow, to consider the most expedient course for dealing with the Quakers, since little or nothing issued therefrom³⁵. To Doctor James Fraser, Wodrow wrote in 1722 "I agravat the severitys used by the prelates and others against Presbyterians from their softness to Quakers and Papists, tho' their own lawes led them to act as much against them as against us"³⁶. Wodrow ascribes this leniency to Romish influence³⁷.

But in the "Act of Indemnity and Oblivion", foreshadowed in the Declaration of Breda and passed in September 1662, it was otherwise. In Scotland it was discovered that His Majesty's "gracious and free pardon" of Breda was "burdened" for no fewer than seven to eight hundred black listed persons³⁸ with the payment of some small sums. This meant that all those specially excepted by Parliament could be included within the ambit of the King's indemnity and pardon for past 'guiltiness' only on payment of substantial amounts. Failing the payment of these large sums within a specified time, the "exceptions" still remained liable to the laws of treason with "their lives and fortunes at His Majesty's disposal"³⁹. Among the victims was Alexander Jaffray of Kingswells, who was assessed at £2,400. O. O., but what his 'crime' exactly was, is uncertain.

32. cf "The Truth Exalted in the Writings..John Burnyeat", (1691)P.84.
(letter from Leith to T.A.1684)

33. cf R.P.C.S.3rd.Series, Vol I, PP 368,666.

34. "History of the Sufferings", Vol I, P.377.

35. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol. I, P.626.

36. "Analecta Scotica", (1834) Vol. I, P.306. Hugh Smith closely agrees with Wodrow. cf "An Apology for Oppressed Presbyterian Ministers", P.65.

37. "History of the Sufferings", Vol. IV, P. 419.

38. "The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol VII, PP 420-429.

39. cf Scott's "Tales of a Grandfather", (1893) P.221.

CHAPTER III."THE JAFFRAYS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF QUAKERISM IN ABERDEEN".

The "Truth" as already noted, was not altogether strange to Aberdeen at this time, but in the Preface to his "Truth cleared of Calumnies", Barclay indicates that in the previous few years the hostile attitude of the Scottish Church to the Quakers had the effect about 1663 of making "some sober and serious professors in and about the same Town... begin to weigh these things more narrowly,.. and to examine the principles and ways of that People more exactly, which proving upon enquiry to be far otherwise than they had been represented, gave them..occasion to see the integrity and soundness of that despised People.... and to become one with them".¹ The visits of Grave, Burnyeat, and especially Dewsbury in 1658, appear to have had no immediate or external results, except that Bailie Molleson's wife "received the Truth" and several other much respected Church people were "alarmed",² but Dewsbury hoped to find among the people in Scotland the bread he was then casting upon the waters.³ The appointed time proved to be very early in 1663,⁴ when Dewsbury back once more in Aberdeen, proclaimed to "these prepared and panting souls" his Quaker gospel, and "open espousal" of it was registered for the first time.⁵ Events had moved rapidly, for on the 19th March, Dewsbury was still a prisoner in York Castle, though he must have been released immediately thereafter,⁶ and Dewsbury's meeting in Alexander Harper, the Aberdeen merchant's house was held in time to enable Alexander Jaffray to remove to Inverurie early in 1663.⁷

The foremost of Dewsbury's converts was the famous Alexander Jaffray (Junior) of Kingswells and Ardtannies, ex-Provost of Aberdeen, one of the "strictest sort of the professors all along",⁸ who had hailed with joy the advent of the "Inner Light" in England. Among the others were Alexander Gellie of Aquhorthies; Margaret Molleson, wife of Bailie Gilbert Molleson, and later mother-in-law of Robert Barclay, the Apologist; Margaret Scott, wife of Bailie John Scott; Elsinet Smith, wife of Andrew Goodall, merchant;⁹ and Isobell Keillo, wife of Alexander Harper.¹⁰

-
1. Preface, Page IV, (in "Truth Triumphant", (1718) Vol I.)
 2. Extracts from "The Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting att Urie", quoted in J.F.H.S. Vol VII, P 92. To "receive" the Truth however, is not to be "convinced".
 3. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol I, P 737. (Letter from Leith to Margaret Fell 23rd Sept. 1658)
 4. Old style - probably about the beginning of April. John Barclay, following Skene, puts the date (end of 1662 i.e. Feb. 1663) too early. v Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P 197.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Smith's "Life of Dewsbury", (1836) P 203.
 7. "A Breiff Historicall Account", (1672) P.2. (Braithwaite's attempt to show ("Second Period of Quakerism", PP 331-2) that Dewsbury did not revisit Aberdeen in 1663, and that the convincements took place in 1658 is inconclusive, and built up on incomplete or erroneous assumptions.) 8. Ibid. 9. Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P 198.
 10. "Minute Book of Aberdeen Meetings" (1672-92) in J.F.H.S. Vol VIII, P 41. (cf Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.21)

A year or two later came "that precious woman" Barbara Forbes, widow of Doctor William Johnston, first Professor of Mathematics in Marischal College¹¹ and uncle of Sir George Johnston, from whom the estate of Caskieben (Keithhall) passed through Alexander Jaffray's hands to the Keiths¹²; Elisabeth Johnston, the Professor's daughter, later the wife of George Keith; and Margaret Forsyth.¹³

The Jaffrays seemed to have no connection with Aberdeen prior to the 16th Century, in the early part of which Robert Jaffray settled there and was admitted a Burgess. Alexander Jaffray, the elder, Father of the Diarist, was also in his time Provost of Aberdeen. The glimpses we get of him in his son's "Journal" are not uniformly favourable, and money and wine seem to have absorbed too much of his interest and affection. He had none of the refinement of his son, but he was a man of ability and vigour, who took a large share in public affairs.

The "Diary" of Alexander Jaffray (the Third) although, strictly lying out with the purview of Quaker history is a document of great importance, whose accidental discovery and rescue at Urie in 1826 has quite a "Tischendorf" touch about it. On a visit to his cousin, John Barclay found the first portion of the Diary in a corner of the Apologist's study "among other MSS. to all appearance much neglected"; and discoloured, making it hard to decipher. The second section was discovered in a very tattered condition among heaps of waste paper in the loft of a neighbouring farmhouse, and identified as the counterpart of the first pocket Journal.¹⁴ With slight emendations, it was given to the world in 1833, bound up with John Barclay's "Memoirs" which is a modified and edited copy of Skene's "A Breiff Historically Account and Record of the first Rise... of Quakerism.. about Aberdeen", in which Jaffray had a share¹⁵, as he had also in the MSS which John Barclay found at Urie¹⁶. Jaffray's motive in writing the "Diary" was that its witness might keep his heart attuned to grace and thankfulness. It is a minute account of his religious introspection and spiritual experience, and with its frequent notes of self-condemnation and struggle for light, is reminiscent of John Bunyan's "Grace Abounding", but it is not without the notes of earnest aspiration and spiritual insight also. Its value would have been enhanced had its narrative, instead of breaking off in

-
11. v Bulloch's "History of the University of Aberdeen", (1895) P.129; Kennedy's "Annals of Aberdeen", (1818) Vol. II, P.112; and Davidson's "Inverurie and the Garioch", (1878) P.164
 12. Ibid, P.365.
 13. J.F.H.S., Vol VII, P.92. Full references to all the foregoing will be found in W.F. Miller's "Dictionary of Scottish Friends".
 14. Preface to the First Edition. (PP III-IV of 3rd Ed. 1856.)
 15. J.F.H.S., Vol. VIII, P.41.
 16. cf Preface to the First Edition. (PP XI-XII)

1661, carried him right into the Quaker fold, but we can hardly expect, as Mr. Munro did¹⁷ that Jaffray even with his intimate knowledge of contemporary politics and movements should "give us some insight into the inner councils of the period" in a subjective apologia of this kind.

It is unnecessary to record here in any detail the non-Quaker period of Jaffray's life, especially with the "Diary" before us, but some brief mention of its landmarks may not be inapposite.

Alexander Jaffray (1614-1673) was well connected. On his Father's side he came of the Erskines of Pittodrie, and by his Mother was descended from the Burnets of Leys, being a cousin of Lord Crimond and second-cousin of Bishop Gilbert Burnet.¹⁸ After a chequered early education, he married at eighteen the daughter of Principal Dun of Marischal, apparently with undeservedly satisfactory results, after which he travelled considerably in England and France. His enthusiasm for the Covenant which he shared with his father, with Brodie of Brodie, Hogg of Kiltearn, James Fraser of Brea and later, with his second father-in-law, the fiery Andrew Cant, Minister in Aberdeen,¹⁹ brought him into adventure and conflict with Royalist elements²⁰ during which he was imprisoned in Huntly and Pitcaple Castles, and found refuge in Dunnottar after Montrose's victory at Justice Mills²¹. Then came the two commissions to Breda, followed by Dunbar Drove where Jaffray was seriously wounded and taken prisoner²². In his captivity he was treated with great consideration, and under the friendship and spell of Cromwell, Fleetwood, and John Owen,²³ his Presbyterianism began to be seriously undermined.²⁴ He became dissatisfied with what he considered the refined vanity and selfish *raison d'être* of the Covenants²⁵, and with the whole conception and polity of a National Church, and despite the conjoint efforts of Rutherford, Gillespie, John Carstairs and James Guthrie, Jaffray was by 1652 an Independent²⁶. From this, it was but a step

-
17. Munro "Memorials of the Aldermen, Provosts and Lord Provosts of Aberdeen", (1897) P.158.
18. W.K. Burnett's "Genealogical Tree of the Family of Burnett of Leys" (the one 't' or two 't's in Burnett is doubtful)
19. v King "Covenanters in the North", P.240; v also Brodie's "Diary", (1863) P.212, and Robertson's "Topography and Antiquities of Aberdeen", Vol IV, P.688.
20. v Spalding "History of the Troubles etc", Vol. I, PP.134, 135, 150 etc
21. Thom's "History of Aberdeen", (1811) Vol I, P.321.
22. cf Jaffray's "Diary", PP 162-3, Note N.
23. F.P.T. P.210 n.cf. Keith's "The Way Cast Up", P.149; and Orme's "Life of Owen", (1820) P.124.
24. "Diary" PP 58-9; cf Carlyle's "Cromwell's Letters", (1888) Vol. II, P.249.
25. "Diary", PP 61, 142. (v post more fully. Book III, Ch. II, PP 3-4.)
26. Ibid, PP 62-66; Note R PP 166-171. cf Keith "The Way Cast Up", PP 2-3 ~~XX~~ and Lowe's "Edinburgh Magazine", Vol I, P.245. v also Blair's "Life", P.300.

to become a Fifth Monarchy man for a short time. He remained high in Cromwell's favour even after the forcible expulsion of Barebones' Parliament in 1653, of which Jaffray was a Scots member, whereafter he settled later in Abbeyhill, Edinburgh, as Director of the Chancery in Scotland.²⁷ At the Restoration, he failed to subscribe the public Bond of the peace, and was imprisoned in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, only to realise soon that there was nothing compromising in the required Bond²⁸. Thereupon Jaffray expressed himself willing to subscribe the Bond to regain his liberty, but on receiving no reply, he lodged a petition for release with "the Lord Commissioner, his grace and the honoble Estates of Parliãt", on grounds of "ane infirm and valetudinarie condition" duly confirmed by medical authority²⁹. On the 17th Jan. 1661, the magistrates of Edinburgh were empowered to release him but only on caution of £20,000. O. O. not to remove out of Edinburgh until the Parliament's further instruction.³⁰ The following March, he narrowly escaped being arraigned for treason, and subsequently returned to Aberdeen. During his four months' imprisonment and immediately after, his mind was steadily gravitating to the "Inner Light"³¹, and in the liberty of the spirit he had not far now to travel.

Jaffray's "Diary" reveals in considerable detail the inner motives and spirit of a singularly gracious and brave personality even in his pre-Quaker days, and these traits were not lessened in the final citadel of his faith and witness. Unquestionably he won his way through crises of doubt and through no little tribulation to the larger trust, but we need not take too seriously his frequent self-reproaching and his hyper-sensitiveness to his own failure and ensnarement by the spirit of evil, which is of the essence of all Saints' experience. If he was severe and keenly critical of himself with a humility that is unquestioned, he learned to be wonderfully magnanimous to others and generous in his judgement even of men whose views he could not sympathise with, nor share. The motives for his rather frequent changes of belief have naturally not passed unquestioned, but with the possible exception of his brief adherence to the Fifth Monarchy, they cannot be called materialistic or carnal. It was simply the story of a soul travelling in birth until it reached that satisfaction and peace which could be described as 'Christ formed in him'³². There was something both of the seer and the priest about Jaffray. His forebodings of the things that were coming on the land were fulfilled with woeful accuracy in the first decade of the Restoration period. The political instability and intriguing; the social and

-
27. cf "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol VII, P.99, Col.2. (Act in favour of Sir. Thomas Hamilton); and Jaffray's "Diary", Note W, PP 174-6. For Jaffray's official connection with Anthony Haig's writ of service, v Russell's "The Haigs of Bemersyde" P.251n
28. Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P.137.
29. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland" Appendix I. PP 3-4; "Diary" P.129. 30. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol VII, P.13; "Diary", P.135.
31. Ibid, PP 134-5, 144, 146, 149-151.
32. cf Munro's "Memorials of the Aldermen, Provosts and Lord Provosts of Aberdeen", P.163.

moral confusion and Bohemianism of the times; and the religious formality and reaction from Puritan fervour weighed heavily upon him, but he ever regarded himself as a member of the body politic and spiritual, and so of having his own share of responsibility for national sin, and his own part to play in national repentance and recovery. To an unusual extent he bore his nation's griefs and carried its sorrows.

The winning of such a notable convert to the Quaker Faith caused something of a sensation especially in Aberdeen and the North-East, where he was so widely known and esteemed. He had served his country and city with honour and distinction, and as he proceeded to bring the full weight of his personal influence, his wealth, and his pen, to the increase of the new Faith, sensation gave place to consternation and then to bitter hostility. Brodie of Brodie held up his hands in pious horror at the "manie errours" into which "Mr. Jaffrey was fallen" and others also, "desiring" to see human frailty in this; how easily we are broken" even outside of the gross pollution of the World³³. And in the civil and ecclesiastical persecution that was imminent, Jaffray was the centre of the storm. He lost, of course, all his magisterial and civil posts.

Before narrating the first outburst of persecution in Aberdeen, two outstanding Friends, of whom later mention will be made frequently, may here be introduced. Patrick Livingstone (1634-1694), a native of Montrose, was convinced in 1658 or 1659. In his late youth while residing in Edinburgh and Leith, and in search of a satisfying faith, he attended meetings of the Protester section of the Covenant, but remained discontented with himself and with them also³⁴. Indeed he was not impressed with any of the warring denominations and sects, whose only common ground of sympathy and action was their unanimous hatred of Quakerism³⁵. That very circumstance seems to have led Livingstone to examine it with an open mind and resulted in a conviction which never wavered. Thereafter he was a member of a little meeting at Embleton near Morpeth for about four years and suffered imprisonment. After his liberation, he lived for some time on the Border with a lonely weaver, James Halliday, who had long been a Quaker. About 1662, he returned North and witnessed at Dundee whence he seems to have arrived early in 1663 at Aberdeen³⁶.

George Keith, the fallen lucifer of the Society of Friends and for nearly 30 years its ablest dialectician and most formidable debater, was born about 1639. He was at first a staunch Presbyterian until apparently through a very similar train of experience to Livingstone's he embraced Quakerism about 1663. The same year he was in the Borders whence he came to Aberdeen to find the persecution of the Friends already begun.

33. Brodie's "Diary" P. 307.

34. L.M. Barclay "Selections from the Writings of Patrick Livingstone" with Memoir, (1847) P. 24. / 35. Ibid, PP 31-32.

36. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in J.F.H.S., Vol. VII, P. 184.

92.

CHAPTER IV.

"THE FIRST WAVE OF PERSECUTION IN ABERDEEN"

The prospect of Quakerism making rapid headway in Aberdeen brought persecution rapidly in the wake of the first convincements. The alarm was raised first in the Church, led by the conforming Ministers, George Meldrum and John Menzies. Of the two, Meldrum was the more vitriolic, the more perhaps because only the year before he had rejected the heroic course and capitulated to expediency and safety. In 1662, he refused to profess and promise canonical obedience to the Bishop¹, for which he was suspended till 1st January 1663, and threatened by the Bishop and the Synod with deposition if he failed to yield before that date². So he turned his back on the Covenant and conformed. He was Rector of Marischal College, and Minister of the Second Charge of Aberdeen; and later of the Tron Church, Edinburgh. He finished his course by becoming Professor of Divinity at the University there, and was twice Moderator of the General Assembly, in 1698 and in 1703.³

Menzies was also an opportunist of whom fuller mention will be subsequently made. He was one of those whom Jaffray took into his confidence early in the previous decade when the latter was hovering between Presbyterianism and Independency⁴, and Menzies after further vacillation actually identified himself for a time with the Movement in Aberdeen, whose aim was to secure a loftier standard of Church membership and a purer administration of the Church's ordinances - especially "sealing ordinances", than could be hoped for in a national polity⁵. This coterie who were declaring for secession from the Church of Scotland, gave a good deal of trouble to Lord Warristoun, Livingstone, Guthrie, Rutherford⁶ and the rest, and Menzies was its ablest disputant as Jaffray and Rowe were its most outstanding members. But by 1663, Menzies' views and policy were safely back in the conforming fold. His next contact with Jaffray was to be a very different one.

The Church in Aberdeen was actuated against the Quakers, not only by fear but by the encouragement of Parliamentary legislation such as the "Act concerning Masters of Universities, Ministers etc;" 1662,⁷ and the "Act against Separation and Disobedience to Ecclesiastical Authority" 1663⁸, setting forth penalties for non-attendance at Parish Churches. In the same year the Act of the Privy Council, whose laxity in operation Wodrow deplored⁹

-
1. Alexander Burnet.
 2. "Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen", ed. J. Stuart, (1846) PP 268-9.
 3. Scott's "Fasti" (New Ed.) Vol. I, P.139; Vol. VII, PP 383, 441. v also D.N.B., Vol. XXXVII, P.217.
 4. "Diary", (1856) P.59.
 5. Ibid, PP.60, 65-66, 166-171. cf Keith "The Way Cast Up," PP 2-3.
 6. cf Ibid, PP 17-20.
 7. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol VII, P.379, Col.2.
 8. Ibid, PP 455-456.
 9. "History of the Sufferings", Vol. I, P.377.

was passed, consequent upon complaints of Quaker meetings in Edinburgh during Divine Worship "seducing many to follow after their mischievous practices"¹⁰. Would that Act not stand with equal validity for Aberdeen? Why should the Church tolerate them any more in the Northern City? Thus armed, Menzies and other local Ministers fulminated sporadically from their pulpits for years against the Quakers, and stirred up only too successfully the "libertines" and the baser sort within and without the Church to persecute the Friends in the street by beating, stoning, tearing their hair, and other vile abuses. *Pitched* battles and reprisals were only prevented by the Quaker doctrine of passive resistance.

The Church thus lost no time in advising all whom it might concern of what they should expect. On the 29th. October 1663, Bishop Alexander Burnet ordained, with consent of the Diocesan Synod, that "all quakeris and uther sectaries and manteaneris of erroneus principles and deserteris of ordinances (after meanis used to reclaim them) shalbe proceeded against with the censuris of the Churche".¹¹ The ecclesiastical powers saw to it that the civil authorities did not fail in their co-operation, and doubtless the Magistrates had not forgotten General Monck's message to them in 1659 on the eve of his march to England, in which he expected them to "preserve the peace of the commonwealth in your burgh", authorised them to suppress all tumults and unlawful assemblies, and desired them to "encourage the Godly ministry and all that truely feare God in the land".¹² In December 1663, the Town Council presided over by Provost Gilbert Gray of Savocho¹³, whom Besse calls "a violent persecutor", ordered George Keith, William Nieper (or Napier) and William Stuart "thrie traffiquing Quakers" to be escorted out of the town and warned that if they returned they would receive such corporal sentence at the hands of the common hangman as the Council might determine.¹⁴ An Act was also passed forbidding any inhabitant to give hospitality to "any of the forsaid persons or any such persons" or harbour any house conventicles under heavy fines, ranging from £60. 0. 0. to 500 marks payable to the Dean of Guild¹⁵.

About the same time, the Magistrates ordered the arrest of Richard Rae, now of Edinburgh, "for keeping conventicles with some of the people within the burgh" and kept him closely confined in the Tolbooth for six months. The magistrates took the unusual step of consulting the Privy Council as to how to "dispose of him" and the Lords ordered him to be kept a prisoner "till further order".¹⁶ Rae is the first recorded prisoner in Aberdeen

-
10. "Transactions of the Glasgow Archeol. Society", Vol V, Part I, Paper VIII, P. 98. (Art. by Charles Taylor)
 11. "Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, & Synod of Aberdeen", ed. J. Stuart, (1846) P. 270; Bell's "Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford", (1662-1688). (1897) P. 29, Section 16.
 12. "Spalding Club Miscellany" Vol IV, P. 384.
 13. Thom's "History of Aberdeen", (1811) Vol I, P. 366. and Munro "Memorials of the Aldermen, Provosts etc. of Aberdeen", (1897) P. 174.
 14. Kennedy's "Annals of Aberdeen", (1818), Vol. I, P. 254.
 15. "Extracts from the Council Register ~~from the~~ of the Burgh of Aberdeen 1643-1747", P. 207.
 16. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol I, PP 369-70.

Keith was not long in returning to Aberdeen in defiance of the magistrates, to carry on his propoganda and visit his friends, but he quickly found himself in ~~the~~ Tolbooth along with Livingstone for the same offence. Keith was imprisoned for ten months and Livingstone for seven, during which time they were abused and assaulted by Peter Strachan, son of the Minister of Kintore, a fellow-prisoner for debt, who purloined their papers and sent them to the magistrates, a course for which he is said to have repented afterwards¹⁷. During this imprisonment Keith wrote his "Salutation of Dear and Tender Love" to his fellow sufferers within and without; two letters full of the new convert's faith in his Cause and joy in suffering for Truth and Righteousness's sake, in which he seeks to hearten and confirm others.

Patrick Scougal, the only worthy Bishop in Scotland in addition to Leighton¹⁸, "and but halfe episcopall in our judgement"¹⁹ was now Bishop of Aberdeen, Burnet having been promoted to Glasgow in the Spring of the year. A year before, Burnet's Synod had threatened deserters of ordinances with the Church's displeasure. On 19th October 1664, Scougal's Synod at King's College made that displeasure articulate and plain by renewing former Acts against "papists, quakers, and sectaries" and ordering that intimation be made at all Parish Churches that every person who "dishants ordinances" on the Lord's Day shall be liable to a fine of twenty shillings for each Sunday's absence, the Session to be responsible for the accurate entry of amounts in a special register and their uplifting²⁰. About this time Keith wrote his "Help in time of Need from the God of Help" to the people of the "so called" Church of Scotland, especially those who had degenerated from the primitive Protestantism of their Fathers. To this pamphlet Jaffray contributes a hortatory preface to "Professors" which is entirely free of that violence and objectionable vituperation so characteristic of Quaker and other polemics in the 17th Century, and which sets forth in the writer's own spirit of magnanimity and solicitation his grave concern for the Church's substitution of tradition for the light of Christ's spirit and of the formalism of a man-made ministry for the freedom of true worship and prophecy.

But Jaffray's very gentleness of nature and the high esteem in which he was held in the community irrespective of his opinions only served to make his ecclesiastical enemies fear his influence and witness the more. His popularity made him dangerous to them, and he became the chief object of their wrath. Accordingly Meldrum and Menzies instigated Scougal and through him His Grace of St. Andrews', and in 1665 Jaffray was cited before Sharp's Court of High Commission²¹ where he upheld his faith with such calm

17. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account and Record", PP 3-4.

18. Burnet's "History of his own Time"; (1883) P.147. Burnet's only fault with Scougal was that he was too subservient to Sharp. cf Keith's "Scottish Bishops"; (1824) P.133.

19. Fountainhall's "Chronological Notes", ed. Scott, (1822) P.23.

20. "Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford"; 1662-1688. ed. Bell (1897).

21. Bell (1897), p. 53.

21. The Court of High Commission was reestablished in 1663 with absolute powers. It consisted of 44 members.

ability and fearlessness that the Archbishop could score no points in argument. Jaffray, however, was sentenced to confinement to his own house and was forbidden to hold any meetings there or proceed elsewhere without the Bishop's license under a penalty of six hundred Scots marks. The sentence was as futile as it was unjustifiable; Jaffray's answer to the Prelate was the same as Peter's to the Sanhedrin²². Neither did Keith escape violence, for when he went to proclaim his faith at the Church of St. Nicholas²³, James Horn the Bellringer, beat him angrily and struck him to the ground at the very same spot where he himself shortly after met a sudden and violent death²⁴.

Towards the end of the following year (1666) Meldrum again returned to the attack in a virulent special sermon in which he is charged with "vomiting forth a new flood of wicked lies and slanders against Truth and friends"²⁵. If it is true that he was afterwards conscience-stricken, as Skene avers, and called in all the copies of his sermon that he could, the charge would not seem to be without foundation. Bishop Scougal, however, appeared to be showing a certain uneasiness about the situation, for he had at times a sense of shame to a lesser degree than Leighton about much that was done in the name of the Church and organised religion. Through the independent representations by some of Jaffray's friends to the Bishop of the irregularity of excommunicating the ex-Provost without any attempt to reclaim him by conference, Scougal suspended proceedings and invited the Quaker leader to an audience. The outcome of this private conference in which Jaffray charged Menzies and Meldrum with abuse and injury to his people, was the Bishop's proposal that the two Ministers should come to a subsequent conference to hear and reply to these charges themselves. Jaffray who not unnaturally distrusted the two aforesaid, stipulated that the Bishop should equalise witnesses on the Quaker side with their opponents'. The Bishop at first refused, but lest his motive should be misunderstood, he at length consented to Jaffray's brother and eldest son being present²⁶.

Meldrum's conduct in the controversy was not creditable. When the protagonists again met under the Bishop's aegis, Jaffray was more than a match for Meldrum. Scougal ordered a copy of the offending sermon to be submitted to the Quakers, but Meldrum who had done his best at the time of its delivery to prevent its dissemination²⁷, defied his Diocesan's instruction and sent Jaffray *in lieu* a paper entitled "The State of the Controversy betwixt the Protestants and the Quakers" along with thirty Queries from the

22. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account and Record", P.4. Jaffray's "Diary", P.203. etc.

23. The old St. Nicholas, prior to 1751. (cf Gordon's "Statistical Account of Scotland", (1845), Vol XII, P.33.)

24. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account and Record", P.4. Besse's "Sufferings", Vol II, (1753) P.497 etc.

25. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.4.

26. Ibid. P.5. Jaffray's "Diary", PP 422-3.

27. Besse's "Sufferings", Vol II, P.498.

Bishop. Meldrum obviously feared the open forum, but after some difficulty, Jaffray and Keith secured a copy of the sermon through a woman's agency, and Keith dragged Meldrum into the open by a vigorous reply to the sermon and the Queries together²⁸. Peace was no nearer.

28. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account and Records", P.5.
Unfortunately, neither sermon nor Queries can be traced.

CHAPTER V.

"THE PROGRESS OF THE MOVEMENT IN ABERDEENSHIRE AND THE NORTH OF SCOTLAND".

Aberdeen and the surrounding thirty miles was the citadel of historical Quakerism in Scotland, and Quakerism stood in strange contrast proportionately to the place that the Covenants held in the North-East¹. Aberdeen, which was under the influence of George the Catholic Marquis of Huntly and the spell of the "Aberdeen Doctors"², shielded itself from the turmoil and struggle of the Covenant behind a patronising Prelacy and an accommodating Erastianism. Even the distinguished ~~and~~ clerical and lay deputies of the Tables who brought the National Covenant to Aberdeen in 1638 were refused admission to the Church and had to preach in the open air from Lady Pitsligo's mansion at Castlegate³. A contemporary gives only fourteen as subscribing the Covenant in Aberdeen, but owing to his marked hostility to Presbytery his figure must be considered quite inaccurate. Probably four hundred to five hundred is nearer the mark⁴. Among the signatories however, were the Provost and Alexander Jaffray the elder, while others also like Fraser of Brea were zealous supporters. Thus although "Christ was scarce named in savouriness and power of the Gospel even in Aberdeen"... Christ had "a few precious names to him"⁵. But the Synod of Aberdeen had no Covenanting Martyrs, and would have been left during the Carolean period in lofty tranquility, but for the invasion and expansion of a Faith which had a rooted antipathy to Episcopacy and Presbyterianism alike. That Quakerism should have had a considerable vogue in the City and County of Aberdeen when for nearly two generations its native Presbyterianism could not hold its own is remarkable, and has never been satisfactorily explained. The persecution of the Friends was doubtless a contributory force, but it was not the "fons et origo".

The ancient Earldom of the Garioch was the first district in the County to receive the Inner Light. Very soon after

1. Grub would put the extra-Covenant area as the half of Scotland beyond the Tay. ("Ecclesiastical History of Scotland", Vol III, P.181). This is only very roughly true.
2. MacMillan's "The Aberdeen Doctors", (1909) Esp. PP 45-63, and 227 ff.
3. Art. by Rogers, "Rehearsal of Events which occurred in the North of Scotland from 1635-1645 in relation to the National Covenant" ("Transactions of the Royal Historical Society", First Series. Vol V. 1877. PP 354-360. Partim.) cf King's "The Covenanters in the North" (1846), PP 53-7; Kennedy's "Annals of Aberdeen", Vol I, PP 198-200; Spalding's "History of the Troubles", (1828) Vol I. PP 57-58; Thom's "History of Aberdeen", (1811), PP 283-4.
4. cf King's "The Covenanters in the North", P.61 n.
5. Rutherford's "Letters", ("Joshua Redeivivus") (1824) Part III, Letter LXVIII, P. 416.

his convincement Alexander Jaffray went to live at Ardtannies, his estate⁶, a mile from Inverurie and within the Burgh, where he established the first meeting North of Aberdeen⁷ and soon gave offence to the local Minister as a "dishaunter of ordinances". The first converts of this meeting were James Urquhart and his wife, Robert Gordon and John Robertson⁸. The contagion quickly spread to Monkeggie or Kinmuck in the Parish of Keith-Hall and Kinkell, where the Minister, Samuel Walker was accustomed to boast that he had two parishioners, a weaver and a poor woman with whom no Quaker could compare for knowledge and uprightness⁹. To Walker's intense chagrin, George Gray and Nancy Sim¹⁰ were the first-fruits at Kinmuck. Gray was a poor and unlettered man, but of unblemished character and natural gifts, who later suffered harsh imprisonment in Aberdeen Tolbooth, and to whom the early Quakers pointed as a classic example of their view that the only qualifications for an efficient, wise, and complete ministry were receptivity to "immediate revelation" and implicit trust in infallible guidance of the spirit¹¹.

Nancy Sim of Ardiharrald held the first meetings in the Parish in her own cottage. Soon Elizabeth Johnston, widow of Dr, Alexander Whyte, arrived in these parts, as also did Patrick Livingstone, probably after his seven months imprisonment. Under Livingstone, convincements multiplied rapidly. He found the little meeting in a rather depressed condition, but was the means of effecting an undoubted revival among them, with the result that Kinmuck meeting became so flourishing that it overflowed from Nancy Sim's house into the open fields, and many were gathered "from the barren mountains of an empty profession to feed in the green pastures of life"¹². Kinmuck was destined to become the largest and most enduring Meeting in the country.

It is but a step from Kinmuck to the Ellon district, and the Presbytery of Ellon almost simultaneously was complaining of "a sprinkling of Quakers" mainly round Tarves and Udney, "having connection with others outside the bounds to the south west"¹³. That the Synod became apprehensive is clear from its order to the Presbytery in October 1663 to proceed against "outstanding papists" and "all Quakers and all other Sectaries and maintainers of erroneous principles" to which an injunction¹⁴ to family and sanctuary worship is added as a counter influence.

-
6. cf Davidson's "Inverurie and the Garioch", P.177; and Smith's "New History of Aberdeenshire", (1875) Vol II, PP 757-9.
 7. "The Westonian" (1911), Vol. XVII, P.121.
 8. Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P.200.
 9. Skene, "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.3.
 10. Besse makes a curious error in calling her Agnes Simon. ("Suffering" Vol II, P.496.)
 11. v the testimonies of Livingstone and ^{of} the Friends of Aberdeen M.M in "A Short Account of George Gray etc" (1692) PP 8, 9, 13-14, 15. cf Barclay's "Apology" (1886), Prop. X.P. 226, and Backhouse and Mounsey "Biographical Memoirs" Vol III, PP 499-505.
 12. Skene's "A Breiff Historicall Account" P.3.
 13. Mair's "Narratives and Extracts of the Presbytery of Ellon 1597-1709" P.180. The "S.W." refers to Kinmuck and Inverurie.
 14. Ibid, P.170.

Nothing further is heard, however, until February 1665, when Strachan, the Minister of Tarves¹⁵ reported that Alexander Gellie of Aquerthies, Jaffray's first convert was a "dishaulter" of worship and refused to have his children baptised¹⁶, while the next year Mr. John Gordon, a Probationer, was appointed, probably as a "trial" for ordination "to handle ane controversie de enthusiasmo as against the quakers, and to distribute his theses tymously".¹⁷

About this time also in the Parish of Alford, the Society had begun to attract attention through Alexander Forbes of Achinhamper, who was 'named' in the Presbytery by James Gordon, the Minister for professing "quakeristrie", ignoring Church services and "resetting persons of that sect in his house". The Presbytery instructed Gordon to serve a writ on Forbes, and asked the Moderator to request the Bishop by letter to have the case brought before the Court of High Commission. There is no record of any trial, but the sequel to the Presbytery's action was that Scougal had both Forbes and Gellie arrested and committed to the Canongate Tolbooth in Edinburgh to serve together their sentence of six months, which was however commuted¹⁸. But this had no effect and the Quakers seemed to become no fewer, for the next year the Presbytery in reference to the Bishop's order of increased vigilance in Parishes decided to forward to him a black list of all professed Quakers for presentation to the Council¹⁹. The Presbytery also served the required summons against Romanists and Quakers within the stipulated time.²⁰

Meanwhile in Inverurie, persecution had been gaining momentum. Jaffray was excommunicated in the Church of Inverurie in 1665²¹, and in 1666 James Urquhart, whose case the Quakers held to provide an unusually startling case of divine nemesis. Urquhart, Jaffray's tenant or principal servant at Ardtannies, had fallen under the censure of the Presbytery, and Forbes the Minister, although he knew the integrity of his parishioner feared the consequences of disobedience to the Court, and in violation of his conscience pronounced the sentence of excommunication against Urquhart. This so unnerved him that he could not preach, to cover which he feigned that he was now subject to hallucinations, but at last confessed that his neurasthenia was a divine judgement upon him. But he continued in office and the climax came when the Presbytery required him to pronounce the same sentence against his own daughter, Jean Forbes, who had become a

15. Scott's "Fasts" (New Ed.) Vol. VI, P.204.

16. Mair's "Narratives and Extracts from the Records of Ellon Presbytery" (1894) P.180.

17. Ibid.

18. Skene "A Breiff Historical Account," P.4; Bell's "Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688" (1897) P.66; "Most Materiall Passages", PP 2-3.

19. Bell's "Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford" P.101.

20. Ibid, P.106.

21. Davidson's "Inverurie and the Garioch" (1878) PP.341,361.

Quaker. Expediency prevailed and he was about to utter the lengthy formula when he suddenly fell dead²². Davidson dismisses the whole story as a manufactured example of "poetical justice", and pleads that it has no corroboration in non-Quaker records or dates so that it can be compared with existing documents²⁵. The fact also that nothing further is known of Jean Forbes, and that her name does not appear on the Registers for Scotland at Friends' House, Euston, seems to strengthen Davidson's contention. But none of these considerations disproves the story.

About this time several Friends were in prison at Inverurie and in 1667, Sir John Keith sent them under guard to Aberdeen, and delivered them to the magistrates. After confining them some time and making them a butt through the streets, they despatched them to Edinburgh, but through the real or simulated infirmity of William Gellie, one of their number, the Quakers put up such a successful passive resistance, not far beyond the town, that the magistrate Alexander, who had escorted them out, was glad to return to Aberdeen and let his prisoners do the same²⁴.

Alexander Jaffray's health was now seriously failing, but in spite thereof he was seized at his own residence of Kingswells in 1668, at the instigation of the Bishop and taken to Banff Tolbooth in default of the fine of 600 marks previously imposed on him by the Court of High Commission for keeping house conventicles²⁵. Jaffray spent a weary nine months at Banff during which he addressed a personal letter to Bishop Scougal warning him to beware of losing his soul in persecution which would only defeat its own purpose, and vindicating his own refusal to pay the fine²⁶. This, Jaffray followed up at the beginning of 1669 with a "Testimony to the Truth" given forth to all but "more particularly intended for the magistrates and inhabitants of the shire and town of Banff". "The Testimony" follows the usual lines of exhortation and warning²⁷. In 1669 the Privy Council on petition ordered his release, his son being surety for him²⁸. The same year brought the valuable accession to the Friends of Lilius Gillespie or Skene of the same family as Principal Gillespie of Glasgow. She married into the Newtyle family about 1660. She was a poetess, and later an intimate friend of Lady Conway of Ragley²⁹. Mrs. Skene was remarkably convinced

-
22. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.6. cf Jaffray's "Diary"; (1856) PP 228-9; and Besse's "Sufferings"; (1753) Vol. II, P.498 etc. For the customary formula of excommunication, v Bell's "Records of the Exercise of Alford"; PP 127-8.
23. "Inverurie and the Garioch", PP 342, 349. John Barclay gives the date as "about the year 1666" but on what authority is not known. (cf Jaffray's "Diary", P.228)
24. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.6; Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), P.229.
25. Skene's "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.7.
26. Ibid, PP 7-8. 27. Ibid, PP 8-10. This writing is not mentioned in either Whiting's or Smith's "Catalogue."
28. R.P.C.S., 3rd Series, Vol III, PP 68-9, 640.
29. "Conway Letters"; (1930) Ed. M.H. Nicholson, PP 435, 438 n.

through the direct impact of the Spirit of God without any intermediate contact with Friends³⁰, and turned against the "painful learned and pious" Meldrum as Brodie called him³¹, and against other preachers, who, she considered, had misled her.

Shortly after, Alexander Skene, her husband, and Thomas Mercer followed her example. The former was a magistrate of Aberdeen, City Treasurer and Dean of Guild, who had been a decided opponent of the Quakers, especially of George Keith, and prominent in the Councils of the Church³³. He was known to Jaffray in the latter's pre-Quaker days, and to Robert Barclay who spoke highly of him even as a Churchman³⁴. Skene's apologia on entering the Society of Friends took the form of a series of questions to the Ministers of Aberdeen, which Barclay incorporates with prefatory remarks in his Proposition on Worship³⁵. Thomas Mercer, the third of the notable converts of the year was late Dean of Guild of Aberdeen, who later was fined £500. Scots "for defaming the town's ministers and imprisoned till he made a palinode."³⁶

About this time both in the City and County of Aberdeen, persecution was adding so materially to the numbers and influence of the Friends that the Church showed great uneasiness and even alarm. At the Spring Diocesan Synod held at King's College in 1667, every Minister was ordered to exert the utmost pastoral vigilance, and each Presbytery to get into touch speedily with delinquent parishioners in parishes, "where profest papists or Quakers are". In the event of continued obstinacy nullifying all efforts to reclaim such delinquents, they were to be "formallie procest with the censure of the Church"³⁷. At the Synod in the following October, it was "ordered that everie Presbiterie within the diocess shall meet on the sixteinth day of this instant, and take up ane exact account of all papists and quakers within their bounds", each Moderator to have his returns in the Bishop's hands at King's College before the expiry of the month³⁸. In 1669, the Bishop proposed to the Synod that "ane fast and humiliatione" be held through the See "for defectione of so many from the truth to poprie and quakerism and for prophanitie abounding"³⁹, while in 1671

30. v Lillias Skene's letter to Macquare in Barclay's "Truth Triumphant", (1718) Vol. III, PP 552-5.

31. "Diary of Brodie of Brodie, 1652-1680", (1863) P. 339.

32. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P. 11. cf Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P. 233.

33. Ibid, PP. 234, 60.

34. "Apology", (1886) Prop. XI, Section XXIV, P. 287.

35. Ibid, PP 287-8.

36. Kennedy's "Annals of Aberdeen", Vol. I, P. 238.

37. Bell's "Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford", (1897) P. 94. cf Enactment of Previous Synod, 1665. (P. 63).

38. Ibid, P. 104.

39. Ibid, P. 140.

the Presbytery of Garioch was ordered to make every endeavour to restrict Quakerism and Friends' Meetings "uithin the parochin of Monkegie and therabout"⁴⁰. In Kinmuck, Quakerism was then making steady headway under George Gray, who appealed to the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting for volunteers to help in the work of convincing many sympathetic enquirers and to encourage the new Meeting which had been opened in John Glennie's house at Colliehill Mill in Bourthie Parish.

In 1671 also, George Keith carried the Quaker message to Old Deer, where he preached in the Churchyard. For this, Keith and another Friend were at the instigation of Alexander Gordon, the Minister, thrown into a filthy dungeon called "The Thieves' Hole", without window or air, and kept a night there.⁴²

There was also considerable ecclesiastical activity in the Presbytery of Ellon. In 1669, Robert Gordon of Aquorthies refused to answer the citation of Strachan, Minister of Tarves, but appeared one Sunday in the Church "to vindicate his principles from the aspersion of delusion" before the congregation. He seems to have left in a year or two for the Echt district, for the Ministers of Kinellar, Skene and Echt were requisitioned to pursue him⁴³. In 1671 Alexander Forbes of Aquorthies and his wife, along with Alexander Glennie of Foveran, and in 1672, John Forbes of Ellon, were all arraigned for scorn of the Church and her ordinances, and after all means for restitution proved abortive, they were duly excommunicated⁴⁴. Forbes when he was before the Ellon Presbytery had read a defence of his religious tenets, and on the strength of this, Friends at Colliehill Meeting resolved to visit Ellon the following Sunday and set up a Meeting at Forbes' house. Ten went, including Robert Barclay and George Keith, and so promising a start seems to have been made that steps were taken to secure a more commodious place of meeting⁴⁵. Forbes' excommunication in no way affected it.

At the end of 1673, Strachan excommunicated another three unnamed persons in Tarves Parish⁴⁶, whereof Fraser, the Minister of Ellon made due intimation to his flock. But it appeared to be to little purpose, for seven years later the Ministers of Tarves and Udney, Strachan and Cockburn, informed the Presbytery that "Quakerisme doeth abound verie much in their parioshes"⁴⁷. Ministers had molestation in Church to contend with

-
40. Stuart "Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen"; (1846) P.295; Davidson "Inverurie and the Garioch", P.339.
41. Jaffray's "Diary"; (1856) P.249; "Record of Aberdeen M.M." 2-5-1672 in J.F.H.S., Vol.VIII, P.43.
42. Skene "A Breiff Historically Account," P.13; Armistead "Select Miscellanies", Vol VI, PP 221-2.
43. Mair's "Presbytery of Ellon", (1894) P.180.
44. Ibid and (For John Forbes) Mair's "Records of the Parish of Ellon", (1876) PP 131, 132.
45. Jaffray's "Diary" (1856) P.249.
46. Mair's "Parish of Ellon", P.131.
47. Mair's "Presbytery of Ellon", P.181.

as that of John Skene in 1674, who sat through the whole service in Foveran Church with his hat on to the "great offence" of the people, and harangued them after sermon. The Presbytery reported the occurrence to the Diocesan Synod that steps might be taken to prevent "such disorderlie carriage of any apostats" in future⁴⁸. Alas ! the Synod had been faced with the same thing before, but in April 1675, with the events of the last few years before them, they ordered enquiry to be made in every Parish if there were any who "haunt the conventicles of preachers lawfullie deposed", or "the conventicles of Quackers, and if there be any Quackers that disturbe the publick worship or affront the minister by revyling him before the people"⁴⁹.

In the following year, the Privy Council sent down a Commission of enquiry to Ellon⁵⁰, consisting of three noble-men, to investigate Quaker and other illegal conventicles. The Bishop sent as witnesses from the Diocesan Synod, Arthur Strachan, Minister of Mortlach, John Hay, Minister of Rathven and the Moderators of Ellon, Turriff and Deer Presbyteries⁵¹. The outcome of the Commission's report was several Quaker imprisonments in Aberdeen Tolbooth and the intensification of all means to distrain property and rents of the Friends to pay their fines⁵². The measure of these steps however, may be gauged from the split in Ellon Presbytery in 1677 over the adequacy of ministerial efficiency possessed by Mr. George Mill, a candidate for Ellon Parish⁵³ in the face of the Quaker menace there. That requisite efficiency on Mr. Mill's own admission proved to be nil and he was rejected, since "the parioch.. is infested uith that heresie at present, and is lyke to spread more therein, if ther be not a minister settled who is seen in ther controversies and also to refute them"⁵⁴. The year 1679 was drawing near when civil persecution of the Quakers both in the City and County of Aberdeen officially ceased, and already it would seem the ecclesiastical authorities were becoming doubtful whether a situation which could not be met with reason, apologetic ability, or Christian common-sense would ever be resolved by persecution or any number of Orders in Synod, or excommunications⁵⁵.

Two of the last instances of persecution in Aberdeenshire occurred in 1676 at Old Meldrum and Kinmuck. During a short interval between imprisonments George Gray had visited Old Meldrum on a market day to bear witness to his faith, and as he was leaving, followed by a crowd, he met his friend Alexander Seaton entering for the same purpose. They were both violently assaulted by John Urquhart, the town Baillie, who probably apprehended trouble from the crowd, though they seemed to have been peaceable enough⁵⁶.

48. Ibid.

49. Ibid, P.173.

50. The Commission again sat at Ellon in 1677. (v Besse's "Sufferings" (1753) Vol II, P.524)

51. Stuart "Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen", (1846) P.310.

52. R.P.C.S.3rd Series, Vol V, P.20.

53. To succeed James Fraser, Minister from 1664 to 1677. (Scott's "Fasti" New Ed, Vol VI, P.190.) / 54. cf "A Short Account of Geo Gray" (1692) P.19. cf Mair's "Presbytery of Ellon" (1698) pp186-7. etc

55. Spasmodic ecclesiastical persecution however persisted in the Account, P.18
 56. Skene "A Breiff Historicall

The case of Mrs Chalmers of Kinmuck was one of common wife-beating on the part of George Chalmers, who, incensed at his wife's new 'credo' entered the Meeting House, dragged her out by the hair and beat her, seemingly on the spot. Both Urquhart and Chalmers are stated to have repented of their offence.⁵⁷

Apart from the Tolbooth of Banff and Gordons-town, which was the birthplace of Robert Barclay in 1648, Banffshire cannot claim much connection with Quakerism, and Morayshire even less. In 1669 Patrick Livingstone, James Halliday and Robert Barclay visited the Synod of Elgin, with what result is unknown.⁵⁸ Brodie tells of the offer of a friend of his, Alexander Fraser, to 'evangelise' Forres and Kinloss in 1673,⁵⁹ but from the rather lengthy criticism of Quakers and the reasoned caution which he gave to his friends, it is doubtful if Fraser ever visited these towns.

Orkney is far out of the main stream of Quaker missionary activity, but it was next visited in 1669 by Livingstone, Halliday and Barclay.⁶⁰ On their way they "travelled extensively in the North of Scotland", but apart from Elgin and the Island of Stroma, no details are extant. Stroma, a small oblong island in the Pentland Firth gave the Friends one Sunday "a notable opportunity with the people"⁶¹ for the Minister of Canisbay, in whose parish Stroma lay⁶² had not ventured across the league of sea from the mainland owing to a rain storm. At Kirkwall, the Friends had one specially "good opportunity".⁶³

57. Ibid P 19.

58. Extracts from "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in JFHS. Vol VII, P 93.

59. "Diary of Brodie of Brodie" (1863) P339. Fraser is not mentioned in Miller's "Dictionary of Scottish Friends".

60. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in JFHS, Vol. VII, P 93. (cf Ibid, Vol XII, P 137 where only Halliday is mentioned.)

61. Ibid, Vol. VII, P 93.

62. Sinclair's "Statistical Account of Scotland", Vol. VIII, P164.

63. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in JFHS., Vol VII, P 93.

CHAPTER VI.

"EDINBURGH AND THE RISE OF QUAKERISM IN THE BORDERS".

From the last year of the Protectorate when Caton and Dewsbury are recorded as visiting Edinburgh to 1663, there is little mention of Quakers in the Capital except as prisoners. But they must have gained some accession to their strength, as "severall meittings of Quakers in Edinburgh both on the week-day and Sabbath in tyme of divine worship" came to the ears of the Privy Council, and the Minutes of its Meeting on 2nd June 1663 contain a resolution of the Lords that the Magistrates of the City be instructed to make strict enquiry about those houses where Meetings are kept and to confiscate the keys if need be; also to ensure that no landlord or heritor "sett [let] any house to such persons in tyme coming as they shall be answerable"¹. In a letter to Anthony Haig's wife from her step-father, dated 3rd December 1663, mention is made of Alexander Chiesly, an Edinburgh Quaker and merchant Burgess who factored Bemersyde during Haig's imprisonment in the Tolbooth. A clerk at the Custom House in Leith was a Friend, and in 1664 was the consignée of a box of Quaker books despatched from London by William Haig for his brother Anthony.³ The number of Quakers cannot have been very large at the best, but they were sufficient in zeal to arouse the authorities to some action and to give the impression of numbers, for in 1665 the Privy Council was informed that "great multitudes of quakers.. frequently and avowedly meet together in Edinburgh to the high contempt of authority and scandal of the professed religion". An influential commission of five, headed by the Archbishop of Glasgow, with two as a quorum, was appointed to devise measures for suppressing these "disorderly meetings", and the Council empowered the Magistrates to seize and imprison all Quakers found at such meetings. Action if taken, seems to have been of little effect in Edinburgh or elsewhere, for in 1669 two separate influential Commissions were appointed by the Privy Council to "consider what fitt course shall be taken" to suppress the Quakers⁴. In the same year, the number of men alone in the Edinburgh Preparative Meeting is given as eight⁵. Fox had inaugurated his policy of Monthly Meetings in 1667, and in compliance with the advice he despatched to Scottish Friends in 1668⁶, the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting was constituted. Edinburgh and the Borders were closely linked for several decades, especially during the Restoration period; and together with the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting, Stichel, Glassford and Lessudwine (St. Boswells) Monthly Meetings and others, formed the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting which was inaugurated also in 1669⁷.

-
1. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol I, P.368. "Several Meetings" however, is almost certainly an exaggeration. There could scarcely have been more than two or so in Edinburgh, and one in Leith.
 2. Russell "The Haigs of Bemersyde", Ch. X, P.276.
 3. Ibid, PP 274, 275.
 4. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol II, P.36. Vol III, PP 22, 91.
 5. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book 1669" (MS Vol. 12.) P.17.
 6. A good account of Fox's new departure and its rationale is given in Braithwaite's "Second Period", PP 251 ff.
 7. "Edin Quarterly Meeting Book, 1669", (MS Vol. 15) PP 13-14. Lessudwine M.M. comprised the Lessudwine and Stichel P.M.s and later became the Kelso M.M.

This Quaker organisation was not overlooked by the authorities. In March 1670 the Magistrates at the order of the Privy Council broke up a Quarterly Meeting of twenty-three Friends at James Brown's house in the West Port⁸, threw them into prison, and confiscated their two volumes of Minutes and Records of discipline and sufferings. Among those seized were Sir John Swinton and Scott of Raeburn⁹. Several were brought before a Committee of the Council next day, but the Committee discovered nothing additional to what they had found in the Records, except documents about the purchase of a Burial Ground and Meeting House in Edinburgh and elsewhere. When the Quakers appeared before a special sederunt of the Council, all were dismissed except James Brown, an unnamed Dumfries Quaker, Scott, and Swinton. The first two were imprisoned in Edinburgh, Scott ordered to be confined in Jedburgh Tolbooth, and Swinton who had recently emerged from a long imprisonment in Edinburgh¹⁰, ordered to be confined in Stirling Castle until or unless he voluntarily exiled himself to the East Indies¹¹.

Some romantic colour and considerable interest is added to this period of Scottish Quaker history by the accession of the "Border Lairds" as they are usually known - Sir John Swinton of Swinton, Walter Scott of Raeburn, Sir Gideon Scott of Highchester and Anthony Haig of Bemersyde, all connected in some way with Sir Walter Scott. Although they are generally reckoned as converts of Fox during his Scottish mission¹², it is very problematical, and the evidence is conflicting. There is no first-hand evidence that Fox or any of his four companions in Scotland in 1657 were ever near Teviotdale or the Merse, except passing through the latter from Dunbar to Berwick, when no Meetings are recorded. If the Border Lairds came into close contact with Quakerism in 1657 or before, it can only have been with some of the English pre-Fox missionaries travelling up through Kelso or Berwick, or through themselves being in Edinburgh when Fox, Parker or Osborne were there. Russell says that James Kirkton the historian, then Minister of Mertoun excommunicated Anthony Haig on his joining the Quakers, and that Haig retaliated by refusing to contribute for that year his chalders of oatmeal from Bemersyde Estate toward the living¹³, but nothing about Fox is deducible from this. Burke states that Sir John Swinton became a Quaker in 1657¹⁴, while Lamont dates his conviction as May 1660¹⁵, and Sir George Mackenzie "upon His Majesty's return"¹⁶. Baillie gives the date as before July 1660 when he was

8. v post Ch. XVI, P. 207.

9. "The Lauderdale Papers", Ed. Airy (1855), Vol II, P. 179. (Letter from Tweeddale to Lauderdale)

10. v infra P. 108.

11. "The Lauderdale Papers", Ed. Airy, Vol II, PP 180-1. cf R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol III, PP 31, 153, 155; and "MS Register of Sufferings", P. 9.

12. E.g. J.F.H.S. XVII, P. 21. Russell's "The Haigs of Bemersyde" (1881) PP 262-3; Hodgkin "A Book of Quaker Saints" (1922) P. 231. etc.

13. "The Haigs of Bemersyde", P. 268.

14. "Landed Gentry" (12th Ed.), P. 1823. cf. Lyon Turner's "Original Records", P. 759.

15. "Diary" (1830) P. 92.

16. "Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland" (1821) P. 48.

arrested in London¹⁷, while Sir Walter Scott suggests that his famous ancestor turned Quaker after his arrest and on his way to Scotland either "from conviction or to screen himself from danger"¹⁸. The weight of evidence certainly points to about the Restoration time, but all that we can be certain of is, that Swinton became a Quaker not later than 1660. As for Walter Scott of Raeburn, and Sir Gideon Scott of Highchester, Sir Walter believes that they were among Fox's proselytes when he visited Scotland¹⁹ but of this there is no corroborative evidence.

Sir John Swinton, 19th Baron Swinton, (c 1621 ?- 1679) was Great-great grandfather of Sir Walter Scott, through his Mother, Anne Rutherford.²⁰ He was a man of education, accomplishments and great natural ability, who began his varied career on the Committee of War for Berwickshire. He was elected M.P. for the Merse in 1649. After Worcester, he completely changed politically and religiously. Baillie charges him flatly with joining others in deliberate manoeuvres to prevent the mobilisation and efficiency of an army for King Charles to oppose Cromwell's invasion,²¹ as previously he had opposed sending Commissioners to Breda. He was summoned to appear before the Parliament at Perth to answer the charge of treason, but as he did not obey he was forefaulted²². His estates were made over to Lauderdale, but the summons itself was irregular and had its sequel forty years later. Meanwhile Swinton who was "formerlie cryed vp for pietie"²³, became dissatisfied with Presbytery and turned an Independent, for all of which he was duly excommunicated by the Assembly in 1651²⁴. After Dunbar, he sided overtly with Cromwell, planned the surrender of Edinburgh Castle²⁵, and became "the man of all Scotland that had been the most trusted and employed by Cromwell"²⁶. He was appointed one of the seven Judges or Lords Commissioners for the administration of justice, which replaced the Court of Session; A Commissioner on the Union negotiations; and, except for Lockhart of Lee, the only native member of Cromwell's Council of State for Scotland in 1655²⁷. In addition to holding these and other offices, he was a Scots Commissioner to the English Parliament.

With the Restoration, Judge Swinton's tide of fortune ebbed swiftly. He had "by a strange hypocrisie or tentation turned

17. v infra P. 408.

18. "Tales of a Grandfather"; (1893) P. 221.

19. Copy of a M.S. "Letter to a Northern Friend" from Abbotsford in 1829, in "The Friends Monthly Magazine" (1830-1) P. 186.

20. Ibid.

21. "Letters III"; (1842) P. 114; Balfour's "Annals", Vol IV, PP 79-80.

22. Mackenzie, "Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland"; (1921) P. 47. Burnet curiously mistakes Stirling for Perth. ("History of his own Times" New Ed., (1883), P. 85.

23. Lamont's "Diary"; (1830) P. 26.

24. Baillie's "Letters III"; PP 316-7. etc. The ban was lifted according to Nicoll and Baillie in 1656.

25. Ibid P. 125.

26. Burnet's "History of his own Times"; (1883) P. 86. cf Sir Walter Scott's Letter in the "Friends' Monthly Magazine"; (1830-1) P. 186.

27. Lyon Turner, "Original Records", PP 758-9.

Quaker"²⁸ before July 1660, when he was arrested at a Quaker's house in London, thrown into Newgate, and six months later shipped in the same vessel to Scotland as the Marquis of Argyll. On arriving in Edinburgh, Argyll was respectfully escorted to the Castle, but Swinton, "being ane fanatik persone and ane quaker" was haled by the Town officers to the Tolbooth accompanied by a hostile crowd²⁹. Swinton was more fortunate than the hapless Campbell, to the intense annoyance of Wodrow, who blamed "the Queen Mother and the Papists"³⁰. Without any further warrant or warning, the former was brought before the Parliament on the old attainder of ten years previously to receive his sentence, and he came very near to sharing the Marquis's fate. Appearing at the bar in simple Quaker garb, and renouncing all legal assistance or pleas open to him, he moved the whole house by his eloquence, modesty and selfless dignity. Pleading guilty to the crimes laid to his charge, he submitted that he had committed them while "in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity", but now that God had called him to the "Light", he acknowledged freely both the crimes and the justice of whatever penalties the Court might inflict³¹. This great apologia, coupled no doubt with Middleton's hatred of Lauderdale, secured Swinton's acquittal by the Royal mercy, but did not release him from imprisonment, forfeiture and confiscation³². It was a long and dreary detention, and when his health became undermined with the close confinement of the Tolbooth, he successfully petitioned to be transferred to Edinburgh Castle. There his influence became the deciding factor in the conversion to Quakerism of Colonel David Barclay of Urie, who was also a prisoner then in the Castle³³.

Swinton was at last freed in 1667, but two years later he was ordered by the Privy Council, as a keeper and frequenter of dangerous and subversive conventicles, to enter Stirling Castle as a prisoner, where none but his son should have access to him. Between this imprisonment and his second brief period in the Edinburgh Tolbooth³⁴ Swinton was in Aberdeen on Barclay's wedding day, and narrowly escaped mob violence³⁵.

Some of the last years of his life were under a cloud. He gave trouble to the Society for several years through his adherence to the Parrot Schism in the East and North of England³⁶; his proselytising zeal rendered his family relationships

-
28. Baillie's "Letters" III, P.447. cf Lamont's "Diary", (1830) P.129. and Mackenzie's "Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland", (1821) P.48. for Swinton's change of views.
29. Nicoll's "Diary", P.309. etc.
30. "History of the Sufferings", Vol I, P.65.
31. Note I to "The Heart of Midlothian" cf Burnet's "History of his own Time", P.85, and Mackenzie's "Memoirs of the Affairs", (1821) P.48. / 32. Swinton was also before a Committee of the Privy Council in 1663, along with Anthony Haig. 33. v post Ch.VII, P.119.
34. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol.III, PP.31,156.
35. J.F.H.S. Vol VII. P. 93. cf "The Lauderdale Papers", Ed. Airy, Vol II, PP 177-8.
36. cf Braithwaite's "Second Period", PP 228-244; Fox's "Journal", (Camb. Ed) Vol II, PP 314-5; and Brodie's "Diary", (1863) P.409.

not of the happiest³⁷, and a moral lapse held him from Friends for a time.³⁸ But he died in 1679 at Borthwick, Lancs. reconciled and united to the Society³⁹. More than a decade after Swinton's death in July 1690, the Scottish Parliament passed an "Act Rescinding the Forfeiture of the deceist John Swintone of that Ilk"⁴⁰. The Act bears that as the summons of 1651 was quite irregular and that the decree of forefaulture was reaffirmed on wrong and illegal grounds in 1661, both decrees be rescinded and annulled, and the estate be restored to the heir.

Judge Swinton's apprehension was the beginning of a series of persecutions chiefly of the more conspicuous members of the Society in the Borders as well as Aberdeen and the North. The next Border laird to suffer was Anthony Haig of Bemersyde (1639-1712) On his Father's side Sir Walter Scott was connected with the Haigs through Margaret Haig and the Haliburtons of Dryburgh⁴¹. The house of Haig traces its descent from Petrus de Haga in the 12th Century, and Anthony, eldest son of David Haig and Hibernia Scholes was born in Holland⁴². He seems to have been of a deeply religious nature from his earliest years. Succeeding to the estate of Bemersyde⁴³ in 1654, he found it heavily burdened and in great difficulties, and to restore it to stability was his concern and labour through many years. This was interrupted by over four years imprisonment which he suffered for his Quaker faith. He had probably embraced the Inner Light in 1657, as he was from then till 1662 involved in disputes and litigation over the emoluments of Mertoun Parish with Kirkton, then the Minister⁴⁴. How far Kirkton and Thomas Donaldson, Minister of Smailholm, may have been responsible for Anthony Haig's arraignment is uncertain⁴⁵, as also is the specific charge against him. It was, however, the Earl of Home, Sheriff of Berwick, who had him and Andrew Robertson, another Border Quaker thrown into the Tolbooth of Duns, whence they were

37. cf "Tales of a Grandfather"; (1893) P.221.

38. cf Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book, (MS Vol 15) PP.31-35, and Fox's "Journal", (Camb.Ed.) Vol I, P.466.

39. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) P.26 - (Swinton's last testimony.)

40. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol IX, PP 221-222.

41. Russell "The Haigs of Bemersyde", P.116, and Douglas' "Baronage of Scotland", (1798) P.131.

42. "The Haigs of Bemersyde"; (1881) P.308.

43. For description of the house and estate v Ibid. PP 308-312, 1-2, 4-8; MacGibbon and Ross, "Castellated and Domestic Architecture", (1892) III, 220, V, 234; Crockett "The Scott Country", (1911) P.328, and Hannan "Famous Scottish Houses", (The Lowlands) Ch.IV., which sets forth the reasons why Scott dates Bemersyde house only from c 1535. But as the house has been frequently altered, it was probably a residence from about the 12th Century. Anthony Haig, however during his Quaker years lived at the Thrid Tower, as Bemersyde was occupied by the Haliburtons.

44. Russell "The Haigs of Bemersyde", PP 268-270.

45. Ibid, P. 267. cf. R.P.C.S., 3rd Series, Vol II, P.135.

transferred to Edinburgh and for this "good service" the Earl was thanked by the Privy Council.⁴⁶ The Council of 2nd June 1663, appointed the Lord Advocate with Lord Tarbett and Sir Robert Murray as a special committee to summon and examine Haig, Andrew Robertson and Swinton as being Quakers, scaldalous and prejudicial to ecclesiastical and civil authorities alike, and "to consider the papers that have bein intercepted passing betuixt them and others, and what correspondence they have had either with these in England or elsewhere, to the prejudice of the Church and State; and for this effect gives power to cite and receive witnesses, and all other maner of probation and to report to the Council"⁴⁷. Meanwhile the young Laird lay in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, but his imprisonment does not seem to have been very close or rigorous⁴⁸.

In August 1664, Haig and Robertson petitioned the Council for release, and upon a report by the Lord Advocate's Committee, the prayer was granted on condition that during their liberation they were law-abiding and abstained from all Quaker conventicles and propaganda⁴⁹. Apparently the Friends broke these conditions, for in November the Council ordered the Sheriff of Berwick, or the Sheriff-Substitute of Roxburgh to have them again arrested for keeping unlawful conventicles and being guilty of "daylie traffick in deluding and subverting diverse of his Majesties leidges to their corrupt and erroneus opiniones"⁵⁰. The same month Robertson was arrested by Murray, Warden of the Tolbooth of Edinburgh and shut up again⁵¹.

Either the Lord Advocate's Committee took a long time to make their investigations and report, or the Privy Council was dilatory in acting upon it, for only in November 1665, did the latter resume proceedings on the Quaker case. The Committee's findings embodied in the report were, that the Quakers were guilty of contravening the Quaker Act of 1661 and the "Act against Separation and Disobedience to Ecclesiastical Authority" of 1663;⁵² that "the foresaid sect being most dangerous" and subversive to Church and State, were punishable as the Lords of Council thought fit; that repressive measures against the spread of Quakerism should be taken, to which end all who were in prison on these grounds, especially Anthony Haig and Andrew Robertson⁵³ should be arraigned before the Council for contravention of the above Acts of Parliament and "a lybell be draune at the instance of his Majesties Advocat and

46. Ibid, Vol I, P.339.

47. Ibid, P.368.

48. Russell's "The Haigs of Bemersyde", P.277.

49. R.P.C.S. Third Series, Vol I, P.596.

50. Ibid, P.616.

51. Ibid, P.626.

52. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol VII, PP 16,455.

53. There is no mention of Swinton this time.

given to the saids persons, to sie and ansuer at such tymes and dyets as the Councill shall think fitt". The Lords approved the Committee's report and "ordaine letters to be direct against the said Anthony Hegue and -----Robinson, and all other Quakers against whom information shall be given⁵⁴". Again, apparently, little or nothing was done to give it effect, as in February 1666, the Committee urged that the Quakers should be proceeded against as excommunicated persons with confiscation of their estates, and that the Council direct such Ministers ~~as~~ had first hand relevant evidence "especially ~~and~~ Donaldson and [Kirkton]" to lay it before the Lord Advocate for drawing up a libel against Haig and Robertson⁵⁵. But either through the flimsiness of the evidence or a growing clemency of the Council to the Quakers, nothing was done, Only about a week later, Robertson had to be released from the Tolbooth on surety of £200. because he was "desperatly sick"⁵⁶. Haig, however, was kept a prisoner until on petition for his freedom, he was released on parole to Holland in 1667 to attend to his business interests⁵⁷. Ultimately after one or two more acts of petty persecution, he was liberated unconditionally and returned to Bemersyde.⁵⁸

It is a slight exaggeration to say, as Russell does, that "with his exit from prison Anthony Haig's public testimony for Truth came to an end"⁵⁹, and further on this author modifies his own statement to the effect that if the Laird "had not by this time abandoned altogether the particular sectarian propensities of his earlier years, he had at least ceased to render himself obnoxious to the powers that were"⁶⁰. That there was a serious decline at least in Haig's zeal cannot be gainsaid, and Russell cleverly marshals the facts and reasons he had for his contention⁶¹. The view of the Society is well exemplified in the letter of reproach and lament which he received from his old friend James Halliday at Aberdeen in the Autumn of 1668⁶², and may be held to confirm Russell. The Lessudwine Meeting also was sericusly concerned at his "having turned aside from the truth and loved this present world". He had "fled the Cross and shut his eyes" and Raeburn and Rae were commissioned to see him⁶³. Also the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting of August 1670 having "Anthoune Haige's conditione" before them decided to "wait some time to see how it may be w^thim before they wrytte against him".⁶⁴ On the

54. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol II, P.105.

55. Ibid, P.135.

56. Ibid, P.139.

57. Ibid, P.378.

58. Douglas in his "Baronage" gives a sketch of Anthony Haig's career which is as ludicrous as it is untrue. It is an unusual piece of ~~historie~~ phantasy. (P.135)

59. "Haigs of Bemersyde", (1881) P.287.

60. Ibid, P.289.

61. Ibid, PP 287-289, 255.

62. Lamont's "Diary", (1830) P.129.

63. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol No.12) PP 19, 22.

64. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book 1669", (MS Vol No.15) P.22.

other hand he still maintained his friendship with Chiesly and David Falconer,—his factor during the imprisonment years⁶⁵, and later, Robert Barclay's brother-in-law; while as late as 1691, when he had a far more acute controversy with his son Zerubabel than Swinton had with his, one of the "chief avenues to distinction" that "his father's peculiar religious notions closed against" the young heir was the army⁶⁶. These same "notions" however, did not temper his love of frequent litigation with his neighbours latterly, nor his acceptance in 1678 of an appointment as a Commissioner of Excise and J.P. for Berwick⁶⁷, and the verdict on the whole cannot be that Anthony Haig upheld his Quaker faith and principles to the end.

Andrew Robertson seems to have done so. In 1668, he was released by the Privy Council in order to exile himself to New England, failing which he was to return to the Tolbooth⁶⁸.

The third of the trio of Sir Walter Scott's Quaker forbears was Walter Scott first Laird of Raeburn, the most bitterly persecuted of them all. He was a third son of Sir Wm. Scott of Harden and Lessudwine (St. Boswells) and Great-great grandfather of the Novelist⁶⁹, his wife being Isobel MacDougal of Makerston. Both were "infected with the error of Quakerism", but the dates of their convincement are obscure. For nearly five years Raeburn was cruelly persecuted and 'the man's foes were they of his own household', viz., his elder brother, Sir William Scott of Harden, aided and abetted by his brother-in-law MacDougal. They had apparently great power and influence with members of the Privy Council and used it unmercifully in the effort to remove the 'stain' which they considered⁷⁰ on the family honour.

Raeburn was imprisoned for a short time in Kelso in 1665, probably at the instigation of the two conspirators. But there is no uncertainty about his next incarceration in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh the following year. The Tolbooth thus knew all the three outstanding Border Lairds. It was a grim and noisome civil fortress, familiarised to all by the "Wizard", and which even at the end of the 18th Century, according to Hugo Arnot was a miasma, seemingly housing its own sewage⁷⁰.

Previous to this, however, and in all likelihood about the time of Raeburn's imprisonment in Kelso, Harden and MacDougal secured an Act of the Privy Council dated 22nd June 1665 granting the former authority to remove the three children of Raeburn "from the custody and society of the saids parents" and

65. Russell "The Haigs of Benersyde", P.292.

66. Ibid, P.319.

67. R.P.C.S. Third Series, Vol. VI, P.21.

68. Ibid, Vol.II, P.428.

69. Scott's "Memoir of his Early Years", (1808) P.4: and Note I. to "The Heart of Midlothian", P.541. (Fine Art. Scott.)

70. Arnot "The History of Edinburgh", (1816) Book II, Ch.IV, PP.229-30. (The Tolbooth was pulled down with the Luckenbooths in 1817.)

have them educated at Harden's own residence "or any other convenient place"; their Father to be served with a writ for their maintenance⁷¹. The "other convenient place" as it happened, was a school in Glasgow where they were "frie from all infection in their young years from the principalls of quakerisme" and were "principled with the knowledge of the true religion". But for a year no amount of maintenance had been fixed, whereupon Harden again petitioned the Privy Council, praying in addition, that as Raeburn was daily hardening others and being himself "hardened in his pernicious opinions and principalls without all hope of recovery unlesse he be separat" from these Quakers and others, he be transferred elsewhere⁷². One of those "hardened" by Raeburn was his fellow prisoner, Anthony Haig, to whom he showed kindness by monetary loans and otherwise in these difficult years at Bemersyde⁷³. The Council granted both prayers of Harden's petition in awarding him £1,000 Scots per annum out of his brother's estate, payable each Whitsuntide, for the education and maintenance of Raeburn's children, and in ordering the Father to be transferred to Jedburgh Tolbooth, where he might have a chance to be reconver-
ted.

To further this laudable aim, the Council charged the Magistrates of Jedburgh to segregate Raeburn from all persons, even suspected of Quakerism, and detain for punishment any who might contravene their orders⁷⁴. This was modified in another three years, in June 1669, when the Council permitted his wife to visit him⁷⁵. The year following, Raeburn was at last set free, but was confined to his own lands and forbidden to hold any Quaker Meetings under a penalty of £100.⁷⁶

In spite of all he had suffered and endured for his Quaker faith, Walter Scott found it too narrow in his later years, and by 1677 or 1678 had abandoned it altogether. The Lessudwine Meetings had been kept at his house, but when Christopher Story and Edmund Winn, two travelling English Friends, visited him in that year, Scott refused to have the Meeting held in his own house or to attend it in any neighbouring Friends, "alleging that Meetings were but a Form and every Man might worship God as well in his own House as in a Meeting".⁷⁷ His defection broke up the Lessudwine Meeting, and a deputation sent by the Quarterly Meeting to see him effected nothing.

But the Privy Council's activities regarding the Border Lairds⁷⁸ was by no means a register of the condition of

71. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol.II, P.57; Note I of "The Heart of Midlothian". cf Chambers' "Domestic Annals of Scotland" Vol II, P.311.

72. Ibid PP 177-8; also Note I of "The Heart of Midlothian".

73. Russell "The Haigs of Bemersyde", PP 278 n, 291-2.

74. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol II, PP 178,187.

75. Ibid, 3rd Series, Vol.III, P.31.

76. Ibid, PP 114-115.

77. "A Brief Account of the Life of..Christopher Story", (1726) PP 33-4. cf "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book" (MS Vol 75.) P.39.

78. Besse, strangely enough, makes no reference at all to the Border Lairds.

things in the Borders and in Edinburgh during the middle Sixties, for Archbishop Burnet of Glasgow, who had succeeded Fairfoul in 1664, wrote to Lord Arlington⁷⁹ from the Capital in October 1665⁸⁰, complaining bitterly that it was more than time "for his Majesty to quicken us in our motions and mynd as of our duety", inasmuch as many Friends had "come of late from England into this countrey who doe much hurt, especially in the Counties of Mers and Teviotdale" and "draw together great companies of disorderly persons whose spirits they embitter by their rebellious lectures and sermons". The next month Arlington conveyed the Royal command to Lord Widdrington, Governor of Berwick, to receive and commit to the common gaol of the town "all such persons as shall be sent or committed thither for seditious and unlawfull Meetings on ye Scotch side, especially such as shall be found of ye English Nation among them". He agreed with Burnet that "the Quakers..have been observed of late to be more then ordinarily insolent...in those parts", which "gives ye greatest disturbance to ye quiet of his Majesty's Government and ye Publicke"⁸¹.

It is clear however, that although the Quakers were then an element for the Government to reckon with in the South-East of Scotland, their persecution was of a rather desultory kind confined chiefly to the more spectacular Friends, for the hands of the authorities were well-nigh full with the Covenanters' rebellion, and the centre and West of Scotland was seething and on the verge of open hostilities at Dalry and Dumfries, followed by Rullion Green. This is evident from the discontent Burnet evinces in the same letter at the laxity of Sheriffs and other officers in arresting offenders, as also from the perfunctory way in which the Council persecuted Haig and Raeburn. Burnet, however, had Patrick Livingstone and John Hart imprisoned in Glasgow for a day for writing to him asking him to "prove and qualify himself to be a minister of the gospell"⁸². But the great majority of the Quakers were virtually left alone and even allowed to travel to other parts. Such was George Keith who had journeyed to Aberdeen and back in 1663/4 and again North in 1667⁸³ although he was imprisoned in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh in 1666; Sir Gideon Scott of Highchester, brother of Raeburn, and also a protagonist of Kirkton; Elizabeth Douglas of Tilquhillie⁸⁴, and William Haig, the younger brother of Anthony; also his son, Obadiah.

The result of this lax policy was naturally that in 1669 the shires of Roxburgh and Berwick were still "much frequented and disturbed by quakers", so that the Council after eliciting

79. A member of the "Cabal".

80. "Extracts from State Papers relating to Friends 1654-1672", Ed. Penny, (1913) P.241. cf S.P.D. Cal.1665-6, P.24.

81. "Extracts from States Papers relating to Friends 1654-1672", Ed. Penny, P.242. cf S.P.D. Cal 1665-6, PP 47 and 2.

82. "M.S. Register of Sufferings", P.4, and "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16) P.13.

83. v "Record Book of Friends" of the Monethly Meeting att Urie," in J.F.H.S.Vol VII, P.92.

84. Ibid.

further information from the Sheriffs, appointed a Commission to recommend a suitable course of action⁸⁵. But nothing seems to have issued therefrom.

William Haig (1646-1688) early convinced of Quakerism, chose a commercial career in preference to a military. While Anthony Haig was in prison, his brother prospered in London under the wise counsel and resource of Gavin Lawrie, a London Quaker merchant⁸⁶, and in his visit to Scotland, before he finally settled in New Jersey, we find him at Bemersyde and in Edinburgh⁸⁷. William's Quaker faith seems to have been firmer and deeper than Anthony's, and in that faith he died. His son Obadiah when home in Scotland married in 1701 the grand-daughter of Baillie Skene, Laird of Newtyle, but as none of William Haig's family left any issue, the Quakerism of the Haig family presumably came to an end with Obadiah's death⁸⁸.

The Robertson family of Bridgend, near Kelso, were prominent in Border Quakerism at this time⁸⁹, but one more notable figure and materially the most influential of all remains to be mentioned, viz., Charles Ormiston (c 1625-1684) merchant and banker in Kelso. He was convinced probably in the early years of the Restoration. In 1666, an Order in Council was passed warranting his arrest and imprisonment in the Tolbooth along with Raeburn, and after two years in prison, he successfully appealed to the Council for his release⁹⁰. He was one of the Friends imprisoned in March 1670 for meeting in James Brown's house, but on petitioning the Council, they were both released in about five weeks' time with severe cautions⁹¹. The Kelso Meeting was thereafter settled at his house and the Earl of Roxburgh persecuted the Quakers by using the Town Militia to expel them from their Meeting House, imprisoning several, and locking their door, but in vain.⁹²

Russell credits Ormiston⁹³ with being agent and merchant for a half of the Border gentry, the significance of which is indicated by the fact that he had "large bonds over many properties at a rate of interest which almost swallowed up the whole money rental"⁹⁴. We need go no further than the Laird of Bemersyde for an instance of this inalienating perforce⁹⁵ to Ormiston all his rights in his wife's estate of Harieheugh, and the banker had occasion more than once to address strong letters to Anthony Haig for his defaults in rendering his dues. The default

85. R.P.C.S.3rd Series, Vol III, PP 17,22.

86. Later he became Lawrie's son-in-law. v further Jaffray's "Diary", PP 286-288.

87. Russell "The Haigs of Bemersyde", PP 280,281.

88. J.F.H.S. XVII, P.25.

89. "Piety Promoted", Vol.I, Part 2, PP 205-6.

90. R.P.C.S.3rd Series, Vol II, PP 135, 411.

91. Ibid Vol.III, PP 155,162.

92. "Piety Promoted", Vol I, Part 2, P.204.

93. Russell "The Haigs of Bemersyde", P.280.

94. Ibid, P.300.

95. Ibid, P.307.

for which Haig charges his son with responsibility may never have been repaid in the life time of either Ormiston or the Laird. At all events the difficult financial relationship between the families had not ceased for years after their death⁹⁶.

The Ormistons even had a link with Sir Walter Scott, for doubtless it was Jane Ormiston Waldie, the Grand-daughter of the first Charles Ormiston who was the "Lady Waldie" of Scott's pleasant early memories⁹⁷. She, however, was not a Friend, having married out of the Society.

96. Ibid, PP 323,347.

97. Lockhart's "Life of Scott"(1839) Vol I, P.160.

CHAPTER VII.

"THE BARCLAYS OF MATHERS AND URIE".

With the period of the "Border Lairds," the Barclays, and George Keith's middle years, the heyday of the Quaker Movement in Scotland was reached. Robert Barclay, the intellectual centre is epitomical of the Movement at its best all round, and for nearly a quarter of a Century he made his tremendous influence felt inside and outside the Society and the Country. Penn regarded him as "sound in judgement, strong in argument, cheerful in travails and sufferings, of a pleasant disposition, yet solid, plain, and exemplary in his conversation"¹. Sewell's estimate of him is very similar². Even Croese speaks of him with respect³, and no Friend was more highly regarded and even revered outside the Society, not excepting Fox.

The family of Barclay traces its ancestry back to Rogerius de Berchelai, named in Domesday Book in 1086 as Lord of the Manor of Berchelai⁴, and in Scotland to Theobald de Berkeley, a Norman who settled about Arbroath in the time of David I⁵. The seventh descendant from Theobald, Alexander de Berkeley changed the name to Barclay. The family seat for about three hundred years, obtained by his marriage with Catherine, sister of William de Keith, Marischal of Scotland, was Mathers in the Parish of St. Cyrus, though this period is greater than the age of the ruined Kaim or Fortress of Mathers, a second Dunnottar, whose grim "sanctuary" origin is ascribed to the David Barclay of the reign of James I⁶. In 1647/8, Colonel David Barclay, son of the last Laird of Mathers and twelfth in descent from Alexander de Berkeley, purchased from William Keith, seventh Earl Marischal the estate of Urie in Fetteresso Parish with various lands in Dunnottar Parish, old Mathers having had to part with his demesne under financial embarrassment.

David Barclay (1610 — 1686) born at Kirtonhill in the Parish of Marykirk seemed almost predestined to Quakerism, for he was an unusually precocious and religious child⁷. On completing his education, he travelled in Germany, where he enlisted as a volunteer in the Scots Mercenary forces of Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden⁸, and attained the rank of Major for distinguished service. Returning to Scotland on the eve of the Civil War in 1639, he was soon appointed a Colonel of Cavalry in Montrose's Army, and after his successes at Banff and Inverness, he was made Commandant of the shires of Ross, Sutherland and Caithness, all of which he forfeited after the Royalist disaster at Preston and the Declaration of the "Engagement" illegal⁹.

1. Testimony at beginning of "Truth Triumphant", (1717) Vol. I, P. LVIII.
2. "History", (1811) Vol. II, PP 216-7, 472.
3. As also of Keith ("General History," Book I, PP 150-2)
4. C.W. Barclay "A History of the Barclay Family," (Pedigree in appendix, PP II, III.)
5. "Genealogical Account of the Barclays", (1740) P. 5. cf Barron "Baron Court Book of Urie", Intro XL.
6. "History of the Barclay Family", Vol. II. PP 160-4, and Sinclair's "Statistical Account of Scotland", Vol XI. PP 102-3.
7. cf MSS at the end of Barclay's "Works" formerly in the Library of Sir John Rodes, dated 1691-2 (v Armistead's "Select Miscellanies" Vol VI. P. 323. 8. For Gustavus' Brigade, v Defoe "Memoirs of a Cavalier," "Everyman," PP 52. 82-3, 143, etc.)

Barclay's
Short Ac-
count of the
and Writ-
ings of Barclay,
pp 4-8.

Meanwhile David Barclay had married in 1647, Catherine Gordon, daughter of Sir Robert Gordon of Gordonstown¹⁰, and Grand-daughter of the Earl of Sutherland. She was thus the third-cousin of Charles I. Sir Robert, for the distinguished part he took in planting Nova Scotia, in 1625, had been created by Charles I, its Premier Baronet¹¹, and he was also Vice-Chancellor of Scotland. The Colonel soon after purchased Urie¹², and although he still took an active part in public affairs, he gave up all his military activities. Before the titles to the transfer of the newly acquired estate were completed, it was sequestered along with those of the attainted Earl Marischal, and claimed by Parliament as part of the latter's forfeited estate. Shut out therefrom, Barclay thro' the influence of his wife's noble relatives became successively a Member of Parliament for Angus and the Mearns, and Sutherland, and thus obtained some concessions for himself and other distressed gentry and landowners.¹³ He was also appointed a trustee of forfeited lands in Scotland¹⁴ in which office he was very popular, and got the Government then in power to restore all the nobility and gentry to their fortunes. During this period, the Barclays lived almost entirely at Gordonstown, six miles from Elgin, and there, their eldest son Robert was born¹⁵.

After his wife's death in the Spring of 1663, Barclay having now retired altogether into private life, seems to have spent some time in London. He was then passing through a trying period of disillusionment, and in the turmoil of his mental and spiritual conflict he sought untiringly for some creed and practice of true essential Christianity¹⁶. He had heard Fox preach in 1648, and at length through an open study of the New Testament, he found the religious experience that satisfied him in the Quaker faith, and in London he became "convinced" albeit secretly¹⁷. This however, was only the culmination of a long process of religious unsettlement, for Barclay was ever of independent mind, and as far back as April 1653, he had been ordered by the Synod of Moray to be "processed" because he had "professedlie declined from the doctrine and discipline of this Kirk denying it to be a Kirk"¹⁸.

Very soon after his return to Scotland he was summarily arrested along with Sir. James Stewart, ex-Provost of

-
10. Douglas, "Baronage of Scotland" (1798), PP2-4.
 11. Gordon "A Concise History of the House of Gordon", (1890) PP 64-5; Shaw's "History of the Province of Moray" (1882), Vol. II, PP 63-4, and 76; "Scottish Notes and Queries"^{1st series} Vol XII. P.63.
 12. Urie Manor was rebuilt over 20 years later by Barclay in the Scots Baronial style at its grimmest. It is not mentioned by MacGibbon and Ross in their "Castellated and Domestic Architecture".
 13. His services to the Countess Marischal and her family - v Barron "The Baron Court Book of Urie", Intro. XXVII, and "History of the Barclay Family" Vol III, PP 49-50.
 14. Masson's "Life of Milton", Vol IV, PP 561-2.
 15. Not in Edinburgh as Sewell states (History", 1811. Vol II. P.216) "Piety Promoted" makes the same error.
 16. Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd Ed.) P.219. 17. Ibid, P.220. cf J.F.H.S. Vol VII, P.91. etc. 18. Dunbar "Documents Relating to the Province of Moray", (1895) P.40. (Date 5th April 1653.)

Edinburgh, and Lieut.-Col. Wallace. The Royal Warrant issued from Salisbury through Lauderdale, and dated 23rd August 1665, ordered them to be incarcerated in Edinburgh, Stirling or Dumbarton Castle but made no reference to any charge¹⁹. Barclay was committed to Edinburgh. The offence as it transpired was the political one of having been a trustee of forfeited lands "under the Usurper"²⁰.

Among Barclay's fellow prisoners was Sir John Swinton, with whom he shared a cell in the overcrowded Castle of Edinburgh, and if the former had still any slight hesitancy about his new faith as seems to be suggested, it was quickly resolved, for Swinton became "ane pretious instrument" in assisting and strengthening the old soldier to make public and open avowal of the Inner Light. So zealous indeed was Swinton in propaganda that the Governor of the Castle ordered him into solitary confinement for several weeks²¹. Barclay it was believed, had a narrow escape from forfeiture of estate and even life, from which he was saved by the strong intervention of Commissioner Middleton,²² but he was well nigh ruined through his long imprisonment which lasted four years, nearly three of which were spent in Edinburgh Castle. At the expiry of the latter period Barclay petitioned for release, but the King's reply sent to the Privy Council through Lauderdale was favourable only on the condition that Barclay signed the same Bond of peace as Stewart and Wallace, otherwise "yow shall remove him to some other prison, for we will not have our castle of Edinburgh made a prison"²³. As Barclay refused to comply, he was ordered to transfer himself to the Tolbooth of Montrose under penalty of five thousand marks²⁴. There he presented another petition for release on account of the serious straits of his family, but for another year only a partial release was afforded him within the bounds of the town, on caution of five thousand marks, and the Magistrates were cautioned to be "carefull no quakers frequent his companie except his owne sone"²⁵.

Barclay had forseen the serious disorder of his property and Estate²⁶, and in the Summer of 1667 he sent North his son Robert who had also been convinced in Edinburgh Castle while on.

19. v MS in British Museum (Add. MSS 23, 123, f 168)

20. "The Baron Court Book of Urie" Intro, XXVII.

21. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting att Urie" in J.F.H.S. VII, P.91. etc. cf Skene's "A Breiff Historicall Account", P. 5.

22. Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), PP 218-9. etc.

23. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol. II, P.428.

24. Wodrow's surmise that Barclay was concerned in the Pentland Rising is quite erroneous. (cf "History of the Sufferings", Vol. II. P.108.)

25. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol. II, PP 432-3, 457. Barron is thus in error in stating that David Barclay was released in 1666 and returned to Urie. ("Baron Court Book of Urie", Intro XXVII) So is Mrs. Wilson-Fox (v "History of the Barclay Family", Vol. III, P.67.)

26. For one evidence of his prolonged absence prior to 1669, cf "Baron Court Book of Urie" P.88. The Court Book shows that Barclay had the usual difficulties encountered by lairds.

a visit to his Father in Edinburgh Castle, to live at Urie. Accompanying him went the Barclay's estate agent, David Falconer, who held a similar appointment at Bemersyde and Harieheugh.²⁷ Falconer, who was very well connected²⁸ was convinced at Edinburgh in 1660, and had several times suffered imprisonment for his principles. He later married Margaret, the sister of Christian Molleson, Robert's wife. Robert Barclay and Falconer established the first meetings for worship at Urie²⁹, and attended the Monthly Meeting at Aberdeen. When David Barclay returned a free man and settled at Urie in 1669, he built the famous Manor House and a Meeting House close by, in the teeth of the Council's prohibition to keep Quaker Meetings. It served as a place of worship for over a hundred and twenty years, and in the same year, a half-yearly public or "open" meeting was set up at Urie, to which Alexander Jaffray was a frequent visitor. For the next six years or so, the Barclays were allowed to live quietly at Urie.

In 1676, when the magistrates of Aberdeen abused their prerogative and violated the intention of the Privy Council's Declaration against outlaws by throwing Friends into the Tolbooth for two months, Barclay was the spokesman in their trial before the three Commissioners of the Privy Council. But in vain; he and his Friends were heavily fined, and in default of payment were imprisoned³¹. A subsequent Commission ordered their release upon distraint of their goods to the amount of their fines.

The first half of the next year was dark with persecution for Barclay. In February he was arrested at a Meeting and imprisoned in the lower Gaol of Aberdeen, from which in March he was transferred with others to the Chapel Prison outside the town³². The next month he was ordered to be confined within his residence of Urie and the Parish of Fetteresso, and prohibited from holding or attending any house conventicle on pain of further prosecution³³; the natural result of which was that he was again imprisoned in June. It was indeed changed days for the venerable Laird of Urie, when beside the rigours of filthy gaols, he had to meet the scorn and ostricism of former friends and the jeers and wild abuse of the irresponsible rabble³⁴. But when one of his friends lamented that he should be subjected to such indignities in his old age, the brave old cavalier showed in his reply how completely he had sublimated his militant principle. He said he felt more satisfaction as well as honour in being so insulted for his

27. Russell "The Haigs of Bemersyde", (1881) P.277. Millers's statement in J.F.H.S. Vol VIII. P.42 that Falconer was Barclay's factor from 1661-8 is erroneous. Falconer was in the Borders then.

28. J.F.H.S. Vol. VIII, PP 41-42 n.

29. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in J.F.H.S. Vol VII, P.92.

30. Ibid; Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P.243.

31. Ibid, PP 265-8. These and the remaining details will be given fully in Chaps. XI and XII. post.

32. Besse's "Sufferings", (1753) P.519. / 33. Ibid, P.524.

34. cf Whittier's well-known poem "Barclay of Urie".

religious principles, than when, a few years ago, it was usual for the Magistrates as he passed the City of Aberdeen to meet him on the road and conduct him to public entertainment in the Town House, and then escort him out again to gain his favour³⁵.

The year 1679, which saw the end of organised persecution and interference with the Quakers' liberty and worship in Aberdeen coincided with the Royal Charter from Windsor Castle erecting the lands of Urie into a free Barony³⁶, with civil and criminal jurisdiction, to Barclay and his heirs, which was ratified by Act of Parliament³⁷ six years later shortly before his death³⁸. Thus to David Barclay in his declining days came "clear shining after rain".

Robert Barclay (1648-1690) had the same sterling qualities as his Father, the same pioneer type of mind, the same independence of spirit, the same powers of resistance, and the same indomitability of will. He was the most 'polished' of all the early Scots Friends. After the best local education obtainable in Elgin district, he was sent at an unusually early age to the Scots College, Paris³⁹ to be under the care of the Rector, his uncle, and namesake, Robert Barclay. He excelled so much in the subjects of the curriculum, Classics, Rhetoric, and Divinity, and "gentlemanly accomplishments", as well as in debate that his precocity quickly won the admiration alike of his uncle and his fellow students. But the aim of the Scots College was avowedly proselytising, and it has all along been a controversial matter whether he actually embraced Romanism or not. Quaker writers and authorities are practically unanimous that he did not, while other writers like Cunningham⁴⁰, catching at his reference to "forsaking the Church of Rome"⁴¹ are dogmatic that he did. Barclay's own words are not completely decisive, "My tender years and immature capacity not being able to withstand and resist the insinuations that were used to proselyte me to that way, I became quickly defiled with the pollutions thereof; and continued therein for a time"⁴². That he fell under the spell of the Church of Rome, as he was circumstantially within it, is clear, but he never became a true Catholic "fully persuaded in his own mind".

That he would probably have become a convert however, had he remained long in Paris was fully realised by his Mother on her deathbed, for by her last wish David Barclay set out for Paris after her death to bring his heir home. In this his Mother-

-
35. Bevan, "A Short Account of the Life and Writings of Robert Barclay", (1802) P.9.
36. For a survey of the jurisdiction and pertinents of a Scots Barony and the processes and powers of a "Curia Baronis"; v "Baron Court Book of Urie", Intro., V-XI, XIV-XVII. cf Innes, "Lectures on Scots Legal Antiquities"; (1872) Lect. II PP 42 ff.
37. "The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol. VIII. P. 531.
38. The old house of Urie was demolished in 1855.
39. A foundation of the Bishop of Moray in 1325, to which Morayshire lads had preference cf "Scottish Notes and Queries", 3rd Series. Vol II, PP 67-9.
40. "The Quakers", (1868) P.74. / 41. "Universal Love" (in "Truth Triumphant" (1717), Vol. III, P.187.)
42. Ibid, P.186.

-in-law, Lady Gordon more than concurred, and urged him not to let "the hope of worldly gain persuade" him, or allow his brother's bounty to lose him his son⁴³. Rector Barclay was angry and left no stone unturned to retain his nephew even to the promise of his large heirdom and more. Robert was resigned, but David Barclay was adamant, and the Rector was left to bestow his patrimony on the College and other institutions.

For about a year after he returned to Scotland in 1664, Robert Barclay was "in the wilderness". He was a mere boy of fifteen, but his father had such faith in him that even after his own convincement he made no attempt to coerce him to the Quaker faith⁴⁴, believing that his son should work out his own salvation to conviction for himself. He was even designedly sent by his father to visit his mother's relatives, some of whom were Episcopalians, some Romanists, and others Presbyterians⁴⁵. In his childhood, he had been reared in the strictest school of Calvinism at Gordonstown; as a student in Romanism, but "in both these Sects, I had abundant occasion to receive impressions contrary to ... [the] principle of Love"⁴⁶. For some time after he returned from Paris he identified himself with no religious society, though he took the liberty to hear several, especially those of latitudinarian views⁴⁷. In 1666, when he was in Edinburgh, he obtained leave to visit his father in the Castle, but Swinton and James Halliday used their proselytising opportunity to such good purpose, and young Barclay was so influenced by his father's suffering for conscience's sake, that he was almost won, and the Governor vetoed his visits just in time⁴⁸. Naturally therefore, he gravitated to one of the Edinburgh Quaker Meetings which the Privy Council Act had failed to suppress, where about the year 1667 he was convinced, not by preaching or argument⁴⁹, but by the mysticism and "secret power" of the silent worship⁴⁹.

Barclay's convincement immediately gave his passion for learning a new impulse and bent, and realising that the Society needed an advocate who could meet learned theologians on their own ground, refute their arguments, disabuse them if possible of their blind prejudices⁵⁰, and erect the Quaker faith into a logical and constructive system, he set to work for about three years to perfect his knowledge of Greek and Hebrew and to study thoroughly the early history of the Church and the Fathers. All this bore fruit supremely in "The Apology", but it prepared him for his whole writing period 1670-1679, which synchronised with, and was interrupted by, his many travels and imprisonments and conflicts.

43. Letter in "The Theological Review", Vol. XI. (1874), P. 539. (Alexander Gordon)

44. cf. Croese's "General History," Part I, P. 151, followed probably by Cunningham, who is all wrong here. ("The Quakers", P. 74.) v also Jaffray's "Diary" (1856) PP 222-3 etc.

45. Emmott "The Story of Quakerism" (1916) P. 113.

46. "Universal Love" (in "Truth Triumphant" (1717), Vol. III, P. 187)

47. Ibid. 48. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in J.F.H.S. Vol. VII, P. 91.

49. "Apology" (1886), Prop. XI, P. 255. 50. cf. Preface to "The Anarchy of the Ranters". (In "Truth Triumphant" (1717) Vol. III, P. 324)

51. Smith's "Catalogue" Vol. I, PP 173-186.

Barclay's marriage to Christian Molleson at her Father's house in February 1670⁵², the first Quaker one in Aberdeen created a perfect furore in which angry Ministers, the Bishops, and even the Privy Council were more or less involved besides the Quakers themselves, whose Monthly Meeting was broken up by the mob. But the uproar ceased as suddenly as it arose, and no proceedings before the Privy Council were taken, possibly on account of the bride's father, Baillie Molleson, who was not a Friend⁵³.

The only occasion on which Barclay "received a charge" to symbolise his prophetic message was about two years later, shortly before his imprisonment at Montrose⁵⁴ when he was impelled to walk through some of the principal streets of Aberdeen in sackcloth and ashes to call the populace to repentance, other Friends accompanying him to carry his hat and cloak⁵⁵. Immediately after he wrote from Urie "A Seasonable Warning and serious exhortation to..the Inhabitants of Aberdeen"⁵⁶, explaining the purpose of his strange action against which he had sorely struggled in vain, and urging the citizens to turn from their religious formality and love of the World to true repentance and love of God.

Barclay's life was full of the most varied activity and adventure, but everything he did or purposed was the result of what he believed to be a "pure" inward moving of the Spirit. In 1673 he was in England at the Yearly Meeting, and again in 1674 with Patrick Livingstone, when with John Gratton of Derbyshire, they visited Ludovic Muggleton⁵⁷, the notorious cursing prophet of the Muggletonian fanatics with whom Friends came frequently into violent impact, to be duly and "dispassionately damned" at his hands. This was followed the next year by a more famous controversy of another kind, the debate between Barclay with George Keith, and the students of Marischal College, Aberdeen⁵⁸.

The year 1676 was a momentous one for Barclay and the Friends, as it saw the commencement of his influence in Court circles on their behalf. He set out for London paying ministerial visits to Friends and meetings on the way, whence he crossed to the Continent on his first visit. Part of the purpose of this journey, of which no complete record is extant, may have been to further the publication of his "Apology", for it was first issued in Latin from

-
52. Barclay's letter to Christian Molleson is a fine example of Quaker letters of this type and contains the well known sentence "Before all, I can say in the fear of the Lord that I have received a charge from Him to love thee". (v Cadbury, "Robert Barclay" PP 33-4; also "History of the Barclay Family" III. P. 109.)
53. cf "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in J.F.H.S." Vol. VII, P. 93.
54. v infra, Ch. VIII, P. 133.
55. Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), P. 246. etc.
56. "Truth Triumphant" (1717) Vol. I. PP 193-7, repeated in many Quaker histories since.
57. Gratton's "Journal" (1720), PP 72-3. Braithwaite gives a good Bibliography of Muggletonianism in "The Second Period of Quakerism" P. 244 n.
58. v infra, Ch. XI, P. P 153-154.

the Amsterdam Press that year. The event of the tour, however, was the commencement of his friendship with Elizabeth, Princess Palatine (1618-1680) to whom he was already related by blood through the house of Gordon. She was the eldest daughter of Elizabeth Stuart, sister of Charles I, and Frederick, Elector Palatine of the Rhine who became "the Winter King" of Bohemia. Princess Elizabeth, mathematician and philosopher, was one of the most learned and cultured women of her day, a pupil and intimate friend of Descartes, a Protestant by birth and temperament, and of a deeply religious nature. Barclay tried hard to convince her, but although she showed her strong sympathy with Friends and their Faith, she never joined the Society⁵⁹.

He visited the Princess at her home in Herford, Westphalia after travelling in Holland and Germany, and received a gracious welcome from her and her companion in waiting, Countess Hornes. There is little account of what transpired except that Barclay "had some satisfactory opportunity of conference on religious subjects⁶⁰" and that she "took occasion to inform herself of all the Quakers' opinions"⁶¹. On leaving her, he presented her with a copy of the "Apology". But the friendship thus formed had important sequels. So great sympathy for, and interest in, the persecuted Friends had Barclay kindled in Elizabeth's heart, that she commissioned him to bear a letter to her brother Prince Rupert, urging him to use all his influence to effect the release of the large number of Friends then in prison. Fortunately for Barclay, he was thus armed, for on reaching London in June 1676, he learned that his Father and several other Friends had been thrown into the Tolbooth of Aberdeen⁶². He interviewed Prince Rupert "who was civill to me"⁶³ and seizing the opportunity to crystallise the general intent of his sister's letter, Barclay secured Rupert's promise to assist him when he presented "ane address I intend to make to the King on behalf of my Father and about forty more of our Friends that are about some months ago imprisoned in Scotland for Conscience's sake", all of which he duly reported to Elizabeth.⁶⁴

The Prince promised his sister to do his best, which gave her great hope, for "I know he will perform it; he has ever been true to his word"⁶⁵. Barclay was admitted to the Royal presence and presented his Petition anent "the State of the Case of the People called Quakers in Scotland", showing how "some deputies of the Council have stretched the laws against conventicles to the highest degree of severity", and praying for "some present relief

59. It is interesting to note however, that her childhood's nurse was Elizabeth MacDougal of Stodrig, wife of James Haig of Bemersyde and grandmother of Anthony Haig. (v Russell "The Haigs of Bemersyde", PP 127, 439-441.), and that the Princess and Countess Hornes had friendly correspondence with Lillias Skene ["Letters etc. of Early Friends" 1841, P. 257.)

60. cf Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), P. 270.

61. Ibid, P. 282. (Letter to Prince Rupert.)

62. v ante P. 120.

63. Cadbury's "Robert Barclay", PP 44-45.

64. Ibid.

65. Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), PP 281-2 (Letter from Princess Elizabeth to Barclay July 1676.)

to those harmless sufferers to prevent that utter ruin which in all probability will attend so many of them that live by their labour and trade"⁶⁶. Unhappily for Barclay, Prince Rupert was unable, through indisposition to be present in the audience chamber. The Bishops in the Council, led by Sharp were the chief obstructors of any inclination that Charles may have had to release the Quakers⁶⁷, and the only result was that the King shelved the whole matter simpliciter on to "the right honourable the Lords of his Majesty's Privy Council in Scotland"⁶⁸. Lauderdale of course, troubled himself no further about the prisoners, although Barclay had also requested Princess Elizabeth to use her influence with the Duchess of Lauderdale⁶⁹ to have them set at liberty. Nor was the Duke of York whom a friend counselled Barclay to try as "the only man whom Lauderdale would bear to midle in his province"⁷⁰, able to interpose with any success, although later he became very intimate with Barclay and Penn, and was of immense benefit to the Quakers.

Lauderdale had led Barclay to believe that he was giving him a mandate for the release of the Scots Friends which Barclay was to present to the Council in Scotland⁷¹. This was in August 1676. But the Quaker was speedily disillusioned, and the premonition of ~~an~~ arrest on his return to Scotland, which he communicated to Princess Elizabeth in September⁷² was soon fulfilled. In November he was put in Aberdeen Tolbooth with three others⁷³ for attending Meetings, and there he remained till March 1677⁷⁴, but being a man of very even temper, 'stone walls did not a prison make' for him. There he wrote his "Universal Love considered and established upon its Right Foundation", besides many letters to the Princess Palatine on the Quaker Faith⁷⁵ and to others. When she heard of his imprisonment, she wrote again to Prince Rupert the famous "hat" letter, - which indicates that her information was unduly alarming and exaggerated - begging him to "do anything to prevent their destruction"⁷⁶. Instead of winning any immediate release, however, Barclay was removed from the Tolbooth with his Father and several others to the Chapel Prison in March 1677⁷⁷, where he remained for more than a month.

66. Ibid, P.271.

67. Letter from Barclay to Princess Elizabeth, quoted in Cadbury's "Robert Barclay", P.49.

68. Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), P.271.

69. Fell Smith's "Stephen Crisp and his Correspondents 1657-1692" (1892) P.22.

70. "Vindication" (1689) in "Reliquiae Barclaianae", P.67.

71. Letter from Barclay to Crisp from Colchester MSS, given in Jaffray's "Diary" (1856) P.272.

72. Letter from Edinburgh, dated 6th Sept. 1676, quoted in Cadbury's "Robert Barclay", P.49.

73. Jaffray's "Diary" (1856) P.282; Besse's "Sufferings", (1753) Vol II P.517. etc.

74. Ibid, P.519

75. v "Reliquiae Barclaianae", Partim.

76. Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), PP 282-3.

77. Besse's "Sufferings" (1753), Vol. II, P.519.

His most notable letter during these weeks was to "James Sharpe, Archbishop of St. Andrews (so called)" in anticipation of the Quakers' Address to the Privy Council⁷⁸. Barclay having been informed that the Metropolitan was the "chief author" and instigator of their sufferings⁷⁹, as James Mitchell considered him the 'bête noir' of the Covenanters, vigorously refuted his persecuting policy from the early Fathers as well as from the Friends' own non-resistance, and inasmuch as no amount of persecution was able to break them, appealed to Sharp to let his moderation give their Petition its best chance before the Council⁸⁰. The Archbishop may have done so⁸¹; but for Barclay at least, Prince Rupert's influence at last prevailed, and although he was in danger of exchanging the Chapel Prison for Banff Tolbooth in April 1677⁸², he was at last released⁸³. This was his last imprisonment except for a brief one of three hours in 1679, when the civil persecution of Friends in their meetings at Aberdeen ceased⁸⁴.

Soon after obtaining his release, Barclay joined Fox and Penn and other Friends in a missionary tour on the Continent; "the only time when we hear of the three Quaker leaders being together"⁸⁵. They visited Rotterdam, Leyden, Haarlem and Amsterdam, holding many meetings which were eagerly attended by noble and plebeian alike. Barclay with Penn and two others then set out for Herford. They lodged at an inn, spending the greater part of each day in intercourse with the Princess at the Castle, where meetings were also held for the staff, and at the end of their visit for the general public⁸⁶.

Barclay returned alone to England in the Autumn of 1677, and although the Duke of York had only consented before to use his good offices for the release of the Barclays and not of Friends generally, Robert Barclay approached him again, and inasmuch as Lauderdale's promise had meant nothing, and the imprisonment of Friends was rather increased, asked the Duke "to write effectually to the Duke of Lauderdale in that style wherein Lauderdale might understand that he.. did really intend the thing he did write concerning should take effect", or else "excuse himself the trouble"⁸⁷. The Duke of York gave Barclay a letter from St. James' to Lauderdale asking him to treat the Barclays as favourably as possible owing to their Royal blood, though "they have the misfortune to be Quakers!" But the letter evidently served no purpose⁸⁸.

-
78. Jaffray's "Diary"; (1856) PP 306-7; and Besse's "Sufferings"; (1753) Vol. II, P. 527.
79. cf "Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife", P. 184.
80. Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), PP 307-9; and Besse's "Sufferings"; Vol. II, PP 525-6.
81. This is questioned, cf Bevan "A Short Account of the Life etc. of Robert Barclay" (1802), P. 47.
82. Besse's "Sufferings" (1753), Vol. II. P. 528 etc.
83. cf post Ch. XII, P. 163.
84. Besse's "Sufferings" Vol. II, P. 533.
85. Cadbury's "Robert Barclay" P. 59.
86. Bevan "A Short Account of the Life etc. of Robert Barclay"; (1802) PP 50-52.
87. Ibid. PP 53-54 (Letter from Barclay at Theobald's to Princess Elizabeth).
88. British Museum Add. MSS 23138 f 61, and "The Lauderdale Papers", Ed. Airy Vol. III, PP 87-8.

The latter part of Barclay's life was spent in the domestic affairs of his Estate and of the Society, during which he was several times in London and a good deal at Court in the interests of the Friends. On one return journey from the Metropolis, after placing his son Robert in George Keith's school at Theobalds, he was waylaid by highwaymen and only saved himself by his presence of mind from serious injury or death⁸⁹. No Friend except William Penn enjoyed such high favour at Court and in Government circles,⁸⁹ but it was through no sycophantry or compromise of his ideals and standards with the principalities and powers. On the contrary, Barclay showed a courage and a plainness of speech which would have endangered lesser men⁹⁰, and he would not even bow like Penn in the presence of the great.

In 1681, when East New Jersey was offered for sale, it was purchased by Penn and eleven others and as most of the shareholders then and later, of whom Barclay was one, were Quakers, it became virtually a Quaker settlement. In 1682 it was granted a Charter⁹¹, and Barclay was invited to become Governor, but he would only accept it on the condition that he was not obliged to go in person, but administer the affairs of the Province from home through a Deputy-Governor. The first Deputy he appointed at a salary of £400. O. O. was a London lawyer named Rudyard, who was later replaced by Gavin Lawrie, Father-in-law of William Haig, but in respect of Barclay, the Royal Commission stated that "such is his known fidelity and capacity that he has the Government during life, but that no other Governor after him shall have it longer than for three years"⁹².

He set himself to promote many schemes for the emigration and prosperity of new settlers, most of whom were persecuted and imprisoned people from the Homeland. These included Covenanters from the Whigs' Vault at Dunnottar which was technically in Urie Estate though outside Barclay's baronial jurisdiction. A significant reference to the Quaker influence in New Jersey was made by one, Mure, a prisoner in the Canongate Tolbooth, who was about to be banished to the Plantations - "if we be sent to New Jarsie, we may meat with temptaciones from Qwakres to twrne owt of the right way of the Lord to their delwsiones"⁹³.

Barclay's intimacy with the Duke of York was meanwhile steadily deepening. James had become a member of the Scots Privy Council in 1679, and the Apologist was frequently at Holyroodhouse in conference with him. One result of this favour with Royalty was that the Quakers enjoyed comparative tranquility

89. Bevan "A Short Account etc. of the Life of Robert Barclay", (1802) PP 63-4.

90. cf His Dedication of the "Apology" to Charles II.

91. Winsor's "History of America", (1886) Vol. III, P. 437 ff. (This corrects Russell. Lawrie was not the first Governor. cf "The Haigs of Bemersyde P 312.) cf Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) PP 286-8.

92. Ibid, P. 342; Winsor's "History of America", (1886) Vol. III, P 436.

93. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol. VIII, PP 706-7.

89A. Shields calls Barclay a "Court Parasite." v "Faithful Contendings" (1780) P 68.

while the fiercest years of the Covenanters' persecution "the Killing Times" were ensuing after the **Sanquhar** Declaration, and even when James became the last Stuart King, he showed Barclay the same marks of friendship as before. Another fruit of Barclay's influence at Court was his successful vindication of Sir Ewen Cameron of Lochiel. Lochiel had married Jean Barclay, his youngest sister, at Edinburgh in 1685⁹⁴. Shortly after, he was charged with treason, and the Duke of Gordon snatched the opportunity to lay claim to his lands. After fruitless attempts to enlist the aid of various influential people on his brother-in-law's behalf, Barclay urged Lochiel to make a direct approach to His Majesty and followed this up by obtaining from the King personally a full hearing of the case under the umpirage of three noble lords. The business was long and involved, but in the end Barclay succeeded in having Cameron's name cleared and his lands restored to him⁹⁵.

There can be no question that Robert Barclay and Penn's intimacy with James VII. gave appreciable momentum to the popular opinion long held that the Quakers were only Jesuits in sheeps' clothing⁹⁶, and while in the nature of things as well as from internal evidence this was clearly impossible, Barclay did little to mitigate the suspicion. Indeed he rather seemed to feed it. He drew up and presented to the King personally an Address of acknowledgement and loyalty by the mandate of, and on behalf of, the General Meeting at Aberdeen for the Declaration of Indulgence in 1687⁹⁷; his attitude to the Seven Bishops on his visit to them in the Tower⁹⁸ was not part of the flood of widespread popular sympathy for them, and can be described as little more than benevolent neutrality; he accepted an annual pension of £200. sterling from the King - the only Quaker to get one;⁹⁹ while in his "Vindication" of his connection with the Stuarts¹⁰⁰ he avowedly declared "that I love King James, that I wish him well, that I have been and am sensibly touched with a feeling of his misfortune, and that I cannot excuse myself from the duty of praying for him". Although the storm of persecution against Friends had now largely abated, and Barclay's person and goods were safe, he was not immune from bitter criticism and even slander to which attacks his "Vindication" is a reply.

He paid his final visit to London in 1688, preaching at Gracechurch Street in May and "visiting and serving his friends to the utmost of his power". He placed his son at Court,¹⁰¹ and on the eve of the Revolution after the release of the Bishops, took his famous farewell of the doomed King at Whitehall when the

94. Douglas "Baronage of Scotland", (1798) P.330.

95. "Memoirs of Sir Ewen Cameron of Lochiel" (1842) PP 220-8. cf also Fountainhall's "Chronological Notes", Ed. Scott, (1822) P.258.

96. This question is discussed infra in Ch. XVIII.

97. "Records of the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting in J.F.H.S." Vol VIII. PP 62-4. cf Luttrell "Brief Relation", Vol I, P.407.

98. Sewell's "History", (1811) Vol II, P.444.

99. Fountainhall's "Chronological Notes", Ed. Scott, (1822) P.243.

100. In "Reliquiae Barclaianae", P.69.

101. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie", in J.F.H.S. Vol VII, P.189.

King observed that "the wind was then fair for the Prince of Orange to come over," and Barclay replied that "it was hard that no expedient could be found to satisfy the people"¹⁰². It must have been soon after his return north that Barclay with other Friends visited Fetteresso Church. The Minister, John Milne, would not wait after service to hear Barclay's reply to his aspersions against the Friends, but "fled as ane hireling raging and revyling". Like Patrick Livingstone, who also went to Fetteresso he was assaulted¹⁰³. His last missionary tour from the quiet life of Urie was into some parts of the North of Scotland in 1690, accompanied by James Dickinson of Cumberland¹⁰⁴. Only less than four years before, the redoubtable David Barclay had passed away in triumph and peace at Urie,¹⁰⁵ and now his son was already sickening in the zenith of his days¹⁰⁶. After their return to Urie Barclay fell ill. He was attended on his deathbed by Dickinson, through whom he sent last messages to all Friends, but especially to George Fox and the Cumberland and Swarthmore people¹⁰⁷. On the 3rd October 1690, he died at the Scottish Swarthmore in his 42nd year, universally mourned, leaving the Society staggering under its loss¹⁰⁸. Mrs. Barclay survived till 1725, the 76th year of her age.

Robert Barclay does not seem to have been easily disposed to the exercise of his lawful functions as a feudal lord, perhaps through some conscientious difficulty in reconciling it with his Quaker principles, especially after his Father's death, but Robert Barclay secundus (1672-1747) "the much honoured Robert Barclay" was free of all such scruples, and attended meetings of the Baron Court as frequently and dutifully as any overlord might be expected to do, and controlled the affairs of his demesne with honour and even-handed justice. But his genuine Quaker faith came out in his insistence upon the laws against the killing of hares and game with certain kinds of weapons¹⁰⁹, and his practical concern for the relief of the poor within the Barony¹¹⁰. In 1740 he published "A Genealogical Account of the Barclays of Urie", followed by some doctrinal writings. He died at his house at Springhall near Urie in March 1747¹¹¹.

Robert Barclay secundus was the last outstanding Quaker of the Barclay line, and worthily maintained the traditions of his fathers.¹¹² His sister married Alexander Jaffray of Kingswells, grandson of the Diarist, while the other three sisters married into the family of the Forbes of Aquorthies in 1699. His son

102. Bevan "A Short Account of the Life etc. of Robert Barclay"; (1802) P.72.

103. "Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting at Urie" in J.F.H.S. Vol VII, P.184.

104. Bevan "A Short Account of the Life etc. of Robert Barclay"; P.73.

105. Sewell's "History" (1811), Vol II, PP 430-2.

106. v His letter to his friend, Sir David Carnegie, in the 7th report of "Historical MSS Commission", Appendix, P.724, No.65.

107. Chalk's "Journal of Wilson and Dickinson" (1847) P.123 n.cf Dickinson's "Journal" (1745) P.44.

108. v Testimonies at the beginning of "Truth Triumphant"

109. Barron "The Court Book of Urie" PP 100-101, 118-121 etc.

110. Ibid, PP 103-4. 111. v "Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book" (MS Vol 14. P.198-9.), and J.F.H.S. Vol VII, P.190.

112. Ibid, PP 188-9.

"Robert the Strong" who was suspected of Jacobite sympathies, married his second-cousin, Una Cameron of Lochiel (born 1701¹¹³). Their son, Robert Barclay-Allardice, who through alliance in marriage with the Allardices took the name, succeeded to the Estates of Urie in 1760. He was a noted agriculturist¹¹⁴ and Member for Kincardineshire, and granted feu-charters on very advantageous terms for commencing the new town of Stonehaven. His eldest son, Captain Barclay-Allardice was the famous pedestrian whose feat at Newmarket in 1809 in walking a thousand miles in a thousand consecutive hours is referred to by Scott in St. Ronan's Well¹¹⁵ fifteen years after, while the marvel was still fresh. He was the last of the Barclays of Urie and at his death in 1854, the estates were purchased by Alexander Baird of Gartsherrie. The Barclays of the Barclay-Gurney Bank, descended from David Barclay of Cheapside, second son of the Apologist, lie outside our scope here¹¹⁶. After 1854, the Barclay line returned to England whence it came.

113. Aberdeen M.M. Register,(MS Vol.7. Euston.)P.43; Barron "The Baron Court Book of Urie", Appendix,P.194; Douglas' "Baronage of Scotland"(1798), P.330.
114. Sinclair's "Statistical Account of Scotland", Vol.XII,PP 598 and 601, and Robertson's "Agricultural Survey of Kincardine" PP 323-350.
115. Ch.XXX,P.324 (Fine Art. Scott)— Mr. Touchwood to Captain Jekyl.
116. Bidwell's "Annals of an East Anglian Bank", P.26. etc.

CHAPTER VIII.

"QUAKERISM IN ANGUS AND THE MEARNs"¹

The earliest reference to Quakerism in Angus is made by Brodie when he laments that a certain Gordon of Lunan and Christian Russell had fallen into Quakerism in 1656 which he "did spread before the Lord".² This was followed by Alexander Parker's visit to Forfar in 1658³, and Patrick Livingstone, although he spent most of his "convinced" life in Aberdeen, Ireland and England⁴, was a native of the Mearns. The first mention of any settlement in these parts was a meeting for worship which was early established in Kinnaber, two miles from Montrose, and maintained for several years⁵. Its actual date of origin is uncertain; likewise its founders, but it may have been inaugurated prior to the Restoration by the Laird of Kinnaber who was a Quaker before 1660⁶, possibly through having been influenced by Parker at Forfar or by Dewsbury on his first journey to Aberdeen in 1658. The rise of the Inner Light in Aberdeen in the Restoration decade would certainly have an influence on the Mearns where Jaffray was also well-known. As an offset to Robert Petrie of Portlethan, who was Provost of Aberdeen from 1667 to 1670, and in whose period of office the Quakers suffered severely⁷, there was probably about then the accession of Catherine, daughter of James Allardice of that Ilk and her husband, John Fullerton of Kinnaber who became so strong in favour of Quakerism that the Presbytery of Brechin after taking all the usual steps in the effort to reclaim them, excommunicated both and their domestic staff "for adhering to the scandalous errors of Quaquarism" and the Ministers of the Presbytery "did inhibit their parochiners to haunt or keep company with them".⁸ It is not improbable that a community of sympathy between the Allardices and the Barclays led to a close connection between the families later⁹.

In 1667, the first meeting for worship at Urie was inaugurated by David Falconer and Robert Barclay, and in 1669 the General Meeting was established in David Barclay's former dwelling house before he rebuilt Urie Manor. At the first General Meeting four converts¹⁰ were registered, the most notable of whom

-
1. Excluding principal references to Urie and the Barclays.
 2. "Diary" (1863), P.178.
 3. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol.III, P.39. (Letter from Parker to Fox, Leith, 13th February 1658.)
 4. Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), PP 368-9.
 5. "Records of Aberdeen Yearly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. VIII, 42.
 6. Law's "Memorials" (1818), PP 107-8.
 7. Munro "Memorials of the Aldermen, Provosts and Lord Provosts of Aberdeen" (1897), P.179.
 8. Roger's "Social Life in Scotland", Vol II, Ch.12, P.191. cf Jervise "Memorials of Angus and the Mearns", Vol.II, Part Fifth, Section I, P.143.
 9. Barron "The Baron Court Book of Urie" Appendix, P.194, for the wife of Barclay-Allardice. The Allardice Estate was sold to Viscount Arbuthnott in 1854, and merged in the Arbuthnott Estates.
 10. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting att Urie" in J.F.H.S. VII, PP 92-3.

was Robert Burnet, tutor¹¹ of Leys, who later gave considerable trouble to the Society, and was finally disowned¹². Other convictions followed later in the year.

These happenings did not escape the notice of Sharp and the Synod of Fife. In 1667 they were goading the Minister of Fetteresso to proceed against the Quakers even to the "highest censures of the Kirk", and in April 1669 the Synod, alarmed at the number of Friends' conventicles in this Parish and the Quakers' attitude to Ministers and public worship, urged all Ministers to be specially vigilant over their flocks "till a course be taken be the magistrat with these disorderly persons".¹³ In October 1668 Fetteresso made an example of two parishioners, Thomas Craigie and John Durrett, who "were before the pulpitt for hearing two of the Quakers' sermons att Urie, and were received"¹⁴.

By 1672 the Movement had gained a footing in Montrose, and as the future of Kinnaber Meeting seemed somewhat in doubt, the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting in May appointed Sir John Swinton and three other Friends as a deputation to visit the Meetings for worship in both places and confer with them as to "what might be most agreeable to Truth and conducive to our Testimony in the fear of the Lord"¹⁵. This proved to be for the moment that the Monthly Meeting should be held at Montrose on the last Sundays, and that Friends should assemble at Kinnaber on the remaining Sundays of the month¹⁶. But it is very doubtful if Kinnaber was retained as a regular centre, as little further is heard about it,¹⁷ while the centre of activity and persecution was laid almost immediately after at Montrose.

An English Friend, Samuel Cater, of the Isle of Ely, was incarcerated at Montrose about January 1672, "for the Testimony of Truth", where he wrote a general "Salutation" of love and fellowship to "all the faithful Brethren and Sisters"¹⁸. On the 12th of the same month the house of William Napier, the mariner where Quaker conventicles had frequently met to the "disturbance of the peace and quyet of the burgh", was entered by the Town's officers

11. "Tutor" in Scots Law meant the Guardian of the person and estate of a boy under 14, and a girl under 12. (v Bell's "Law of Scotland", Sects. 2067, 2071.)
12. v infra, P. 137.
13. "Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife", PP 184-185, or "Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of St. Andrew's and Cupar", PP 86, 87.
14. Fetteresso Kirk Session Records, quoted in Ibid, P. 87 n.
15. "Records of Aberdeen Yearly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. VIII, PP 42-3.
16. "Some Service and Sufferings", P. 1.
17. cf "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P. 38.
18. Smith's "Catalogue", Vol. I, PP 390-1.

There they found from twenty to thirty assembled, of whom they arrested fifteen including Napier¹⁹. Among those present were John Swinton and Robert Barclay, Napier's guests who had visited the Meeting. When Napier was summoned before the magistrates, Swinton and Barclay insisted on accompanying him, and, along with Napier and three others, were summarily thrown into the Tolbooth by the Provost as aiders and abettors of an unlawful gathering held behind closed doors²⁰. The imprisoned Friends determined to send a letter to the Provost, Baillies, and Council of Montrose, protesting against their detention, and charging the latter with having acted high-handedly and ultra vires, and testifying to their impotence to break their prisoners' spirit²¹. But the Magistrates having petitioned the Privy Council for direction as to the next steps to take with the prisoners, received from the Council a reply of thanks and cordial approbation for their summary action with instructions to detain them all in gaol during the Council's pleasure, except Napier, who was to be transferred to the Tolbooth of Edinburgh with all relevant information about him²². But Napier was successful in buying his freedom on a thousand pounds Scots security almost immediately, and the Magistrates of Montrose were ordered to release him²³. Apparently, however, he broke his bond and attended a Quaker Meeting, for in September, he and two of the other prisoners who presumably had remained in Montrose Tolbooth all these months were released by the Magistrates on the order of the Privy Council.²⁴ By December 1672, Swinton and the remainder were liberated from Montrose on giving bond of a thousand marks to appear before the Council on a certain day²⁵.

For about four years after this date, there was a lull in the persecution of Quakers in the Mearns, but internally there were indications of trouble and disaffection. In Summer 1673, there was almost a notable case of discipline, viz. that of Robert Burnet, tutor of Leys, and in 1676, the recantation of the Laird of Kinnaber.

Robert Burnet of Muchells, fourth son of James Burnet of Craigmyle, was the only member of the family of Leys²⁶ recorded as a Friend. Convined at Urie in 1669, he was summoned before the Privy Council as a dangerous and seductive agent, "for contraveening the lawes and acts made anent quakers under the payne of rebellion"²⁷. He seems to have had unusual conscientious scruples

-
19. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol III, PP441-2. cf "Some Service and Sufferings," P.1.
 20. Ibid, P.1-2.
 21. Ibid, PP 2-3.
 22. R.P.C.S. Third Series, Vol III, PP 441-2.
 23. Ibid, P.448.
 24. Ibid, P.605. 25. Ibid, P.615. cf "Records of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. Vol VIII, P.44.
 26. W.K. Burnett's "Genealogical Tree of the Family of Burnett of Leys" of Chambers, "Domestic Annals of Scotland" (2nd Ed, Vol II, P.313) Burnet had the best of reasons for not wishing to lose his ward altogether. (cf J.F.H.S. Vol VIII, P.55 n.)
 27. R.P.C.S. Third Series, Vol III, PP 30-31.

about his influence over his ward and nephew, Sir Thomas Burnett, and in order to clear himself of all suspicion of proselytising, he arranged in 1670 to have him sent to Glasgow to be educated under the care and supervision of his own cousin Gilbert, at that time Professor of Divinity. Before, however, the plans were complete, Sir Thomas's Mother had him removed from all his Father's friends, whereupon the tutor of Leys carried his case before the Privy Council, who found in his favour and ordered the restoration of his Ward to him, Quaker though he was.²⁸ He cannot have been a deeply-rooted member of the Society, for when there was every likelihood of schism at Urie and his separation from the Meeting there, it was only after an influential Quaker conference held at Muchalls in August 1673, when all differences were ventilated and there was "a plain reckoning" that a happy solution was reached and the threatened trouble averted.²⁹

About two or three years later, the Laird of Kinnaber under pressure of his family's desire for Church worship and the influence of bereavement, was persuaded to frequent the services at Kinnaber himself. He ultimately decided to sever his connection with Friends, appealed to David Lyall, the Minister to loose him from the ban of excommunication, and made what was considered a rather sensational confession of the past errors of his ways in presence of the congregation³⁰. Meanwhile the clouds were blowing up for a renewal of persecution in Angus and the Mearns. In the autumn of 1676, the second Commission in Aberdeen appointed by the Privy Council ordered the release of the Quakers then in prison on distraint of their property to the amount of the fines imposed by the first Commission, which they still refused to pay³¹. This duty of distraint was entrusted to Captain George Melville, with the help of the Military if need be. At the end of December he arrived in the Mearns to execute the Council's warrant against David Barclay of Urie and William Spark of Dunnottar. Barclay refused to recognise the shire of Kincardine as within the bounds of the Commission's authority, and consequently the validity of Melville's warrant upon the Urie lands at all, but in spite of this, Melville added illegality to illegality by pointing ten working oxen in the ploughing season, besides other cattle and a quantity of corn which he had valued at Stonehaven³². As Melville however, could obtain no market for the cattle and was compelled to retain them till the Spring of 1677, their gross value to the Council was considerably depreciated³³. Spark, who had been fined £40³⁴ had been allowed by one of the Commissioners to return home on business which when George Keith, the Sheriff-Depute of the Mearns:

28. Ibid, P. 163.

29. "Records of Aberdeen Yearly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. Vol.VIII, PP45-6.

30. Law's "Memorials" (1818), P.108.

31. v ante Ch. VII, P120.

32. "Most Materiall Passages", P.37.

33. For the manner of their final disposition—a story not without its element of humour—v infra, Ch. XI, PP 157-8.

34. "Most Material Passages", P.17.

learned, he imprisoned Spark at Stonehaven³⁵. The latter was now released on Melville pointing his flaxen whalebone to the value of £50.³⁶.

About this time Montrose Tolbooth became again familiar with the Friends. The holding of Meetings was a crime still in the eyes of the civil authorities and of Lyall the Minister who seconded them. In addition to imprisoning several they deprived others of their livelihood and threatened those who were disposed to assist them with charity. Any attempt to preach out of the Tolbooth windows was immediately frustrated by boarding up windows and plugging air passages. Among the local victims was James Nicoll, a tailor who was bereft of his trade³⁷; Robert (or James) Scott, David Donaldson and David Wallace. Scott (c 1625-1699) a native of Montrose, was several times thrown into the Tolbooth. In Stonehaven where he settled later, he was almost driven out by ecclesiastical persecution, but through David Barclay's influence he remained, and in spite of his unpopular Faith steadily won a high place for himself and his business in the community through his upright character and honesty in trade. His latter years were spent in peace and freedom, for the cessation of organised persecution preceded his death by 20 years³⁸, and his son John also became a convert to the Quaker Faith³⁹ through Patrick Robinson of Linlithgow⁴⁰.

In the Parish of Arbuthnott several converts to Quakerism had been made, but the seed was largely sown among thorns. Among the few steadfast was Donaldson, blacksmith on the Allardice Estates, who was dismissed by Lady Allardice at the instigation of Alexander Arbuthnot, the Minister of the Parish⁴¹. He was one of a small group of young men in that neighbourhood who ceased to attend the Church and frequented Quaker gatherings. Among his close friends were David Wallace, a native of Stonehaven and his brother, sons of a farmer in Arbuthnott Parish. David was convinced in Urie Meeting House. All three, while they seem to have suffered no severe persecution, had much hardship and contumely to endure not only from the Church but even from their own families. Wallace's memory of Scripture references was so unusual that he was nicknamed "The Concordance". He bore a good name in Stonehaven and was a tower of strength to the Quaker Cause and to all travelling Friends who reached these parts⁴².

There was naturally a good deal of intercourse between Aberdeen and her immediate neighbours, and among Aberdeen

35. cf "Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife", P.180.

36. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 37-8.

37. "Some Service and Sufferings", P.3.

38. Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) PP 378-380.

39. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting att Urie" in J.F.H.S. Vol VII, PP 96-7.

40. For Robinson v also post Book III, Ch. II, P.249.

41. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting att Urie" in J.F.H.S. VII, P96.

42. Ibid; Jaffray's "Diary", PP 380-1.

Quakers who shared in this persecution were notably two, Alexander Seaton, another friend of Scott and Wallace, and Andrew Jaffray of Kingswells. Seaton (c 1652-1723) a scion of the Seatons of Meldrum and related to the Forbes of Aquorthies, was a native of Cuttle Craggs in the Parish of Daviot⁴³, and during his student days at King's College Aberdeen was one of the four students convinced in the Barclay-Keith debate with the men of Marischal in 1675⁴⁴. He endured much imprisonment at Aberdeen and suffered also in Glasgow. Seaton is one of the Quaker Apostles of Ireland where he laboured for about 46 years till his death. While visiting Friends in the Tolbooth of Montrose in 1677, he was himself detained a prisoner.⁴⁵

About this time also the Laird of Kingswells had a "concern" to bear his testimony in Montrose Church, which happened to coincide with a special campaign of invective from the pulpit against the Quakers which Lyall, the Minister, had been conducting. The next day being a Sunday, Jaffray waited in the Churchyard till the congregation began to leave, when he entered the Church and confronted Lyall with plain and downright dealing for abusing his pulpit thus. But he "that had troubled all Aberdene" was roughly seized and beaten and put in solitary confinement for three days in one of the dungeons under the Church⁴⁶.

In 1682, came the last controversy between the Quakers and Robert Burnet, tutor of Leys. His second marriage, that year at the age of 62, with Miss Helen Arbuthnot⁴⁷ a girl of 25 set the match to the tinder, and his "marriage with a woman of the World and by a priest" was quickly pronounced a "great Scandall and Reproach to Truth"⁴⁸. Several letters passed between the contending parties to no purpose, and two deputations sent by Aberdeen Monthly Meeting proved completely abortive as they failed to obtain an interview with Burnet. The only reply of the latter to these disciplinary proceedings was a strange⁴⁹ pot-pourri of prevarication, irrelevance and polite defiance, which of course failed to give "the best satisfaction" to the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting to which the case had now passed⁵⁰. It was in truth an impasse. The Friends exhausted every weapon and resource from their armoury. But Burnet could see in their whole position only a hopeless anomaly, viz., that while they disavowed any wish to lay "the best foundation of an evil Seed of difference betwixt thee and thy wife", and indeed expressed themselves as glad that God had made Helen Arbuthnot "a comfortable and obedient wife" to himself, being "desirous it may so continue"⁵¹

43. "Piety Promoted", Vol II, PP 231-2.

44. Contra, the editor of "The Diary of Jonathan Burnyeat" (1857) may refer his conviction to Aquorthies while on a visit. (P.42 n) cf Jaffray's "Diary," PP 376-8.)

45. "Some Service and Sufferings", P.3. / 46. Ibid, PP 3-4.

47. W.K. Burnett's "Genealogical Tree of the Family of Burnett of Leys". / 48. "Records of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. V III, PP 55-56. / 49. Ibid, PP 57-8.

50. cf "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book"; (MS Vol 15) P.47

51. "Records of Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. VIII, P.59.

they yet simultaneously used every means in their power to compel his admission of evil before Heaven and scandalous offence to men in being married to her outwith the Society. Each party was essentially justified from their respective points of view, and in default of any answer from Burnet to the final warning and appeal of the Quarterly Meeting, he was duly disowned⁵².

About four years later there is a record of a small Quaker following in Bervie, where occasional Meetings were held probably from Urie⁵³. In 1689 the now "antient David Falconer" ex-factor of Bemersyde and Urie and his family left Edinburgh and settled for several years in Kirtonhill, where a small Meeting was established and maintained for the duration of their abode⁵⁴.

-
52. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book," (MS Vol.15) PP 48-49.
 53. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting att Urie" in J.F.H.S. VII, P.96.
 54. cf "Letters etc. of Early Friends" (1841), P.256 (Letter from Robert Barclay to Sarah Fell.)

CHAPTER IX.

"THE FLOWING TIDE OF PERSECUTION IN ABERDEEN".

The persecution of the Quakers which was steadily increasing in volume and intensity all over Britain was no deterrent to the cause, but as always, an incentive. It was in the thick of it that Fox, after his release in 1666 from Scarborough Castle, set himself to stabilise and systematise its witness by the organisation of Monthly Meetings. It was necessary now to consolidate the influence of travelling or "public" Friends and to strengthen the service of resident Friends in each locality by some such plan of unification. It was the first step towards the mobilisation of the Quakers' scattered forces and energies, and was necessary in addition for internal discipline. In the beginning of 1668, when Fox was travelling in Lancashire, he sent his mandate "into Scotland advising Friends to settle their men's Monthly Meetings"¹. The records of Women's Meetings in Scotland are unimportant.

This organisation was the real 'fons et origo' of a long-standing problem in the Society and of much trouble which sprang from it, and though at first the unique personality and unchallenged influence of Fox gave the system weight and authority, it later brought into the arena the innate Quaker contradiction of thought between any kind of arrangement or organisation on the one hand, and the "pure" inspiration and direct guidance of the Spirit on the other. Thus came the division and revolt inspired by William Rogers which occupied so much of Barclay's "Anarchy of the Ranters"², and the Wilkinson-Story schism. But to every reasonable and intelligent Friend the benefits of organisation and discipline, and indeed the necessity, were unquestionable³.

Meetings for discipline were first regularly established in Scotland⁴ in 1669. The Urie Monthly Meeting about the beginning of the year was the earliest⁵, followed by Edinburgh Monthly and Edinburgh Quarterly Meetings not later than August 1669.⁶ The June Quarterly Meeting became the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting. In 1670 the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting commenced a Register of Births and Deaths⁷,

Meanwhile persecution in Aberdeen and the North-East was increasing. In July 1667, Jaffray and Keith were cited before the Privy Council for holding meetings, and Donaldson, Minister of Smailholm and the Archbishop of Glasgow were required

-
1. "Christian Discipline of the Religious Society of Friends," Part III, P. XXII. ("Church Government?")
 2. v post Ch. XV.
 3. Hodgson's "Select Historical Memoirs" (1844), Ch. XXV, PP 221-4. etc.
 4. "The South of Scotland" means Scotland south of the Tay and East of the Clyde-Annan. There seems to have been some sort of forerunner of M.M.s at Bayliston, near Kintore in 1667. cf J.F.H.S. VII, 92.
 5. cf Jaffray's "Diary", P. 243.
 6. v "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) P. 17, and "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P. 13.
 7. "Register of Births and Burials 1681", (MS Vol 11) P. 1. etc.

to furnish the Lord Advocate with all the evidence possible against him to frame a libel⁸. As already noted the Church also was becoming exceedingly restless and apprehensive throughout the County both in Synod and Presbyteries. On 6th October 1668, only about a month before Jaffray was despatched to the Tolbooth of Banff, Bishop Scougal laid before the Diocesan Synod "severall processes of excommunicatione led in the respective presbitries against papists and quakers, and uther scandalous persones", which were accordingly approved and given effect to through the several Moderators of Presbyteries. The sentences were to be executed by the Minister in whose Parish the processes were led, after due intimation in the Parish Church, and if need be in the Church of any other Parish in which the excommunicand might be residing as "a fugitive from discipline".⁹ In the Presbytery of Aberdeen, Alexander Gellie, Jean Williamson, Barbara Forbes, and Elizabeth Johnston came under the ban as having "feillin from the truth of God and unitie of the Church into the pernicious errors and unchristiane practices of..Quakers"¹⁰.

The convincements of Lillias Skene in the Autumn of 1669, and later of Skene and Mercer were as sensational as Jaffray's, and enraged the Churchmen more than ever, especially Meldrum and Menzies, who brought again all the pressure they could to bear upon the civil and judicial authorities. Doubtless the Friends in Aberdeen in common with others received Robert Barclay's opportune General Epistle as a "weighty" message in season though its common tenor, the 'day of the Lord', does not differentiate it from most of the circular exhortations of Quaker leaders¹¹.

At the beginning of March 1670, the Privy Council alarmed at the number of meetings in Aberdeenshire, especially on Sir John Keith's Estate, ordered the Sheriff of Aberdeen to "examine the haill matter" and imprison the leaders and the tenant of Pettis-mill if they refused bond to appear before the next Council; also to prevent any such meetings in future and punish the householders concerned. Blank warrant forms were to be sent to the Bishop of Aberdeen for the arraignment of Quakers contracting disorderly marriages¹². That same month there were threats of mob violence in Aberdeen which were accentuated, as already noted, by Barclay's marriage. Pursuant to the Council's order "some of the magistrates being stirred up by the preists" sent officers to disperse the Monthly Meeting. The male Friends were all arrested, and on appearing before the Magistrates in the Council Chamber resisted all the latter's efforts to dissuade them from meeting for worship. After

8. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol.II, P.313.

9. "Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen" (1846), PP 286-7.

10. Ibid, PP 286, 288.

11. "Swarthmore MSS", Vol.VI, (original) No.63, dated 3rd of 8th month (1669).

12. R.P.C.S. Third Series, Vol III, PP 148-9.

the names of those coming from the country districts were taken; however, the Quakers were released. Hardly had they rejoined the women Friends in the Meeting which was still in session when they were haled again before the City Council, severely reprimanded for contumacity and contempt of civil authority, and, with the exception of Robert Barclay and Livingstone, all imprisoned in the lower Tolbooth¹³. Among these were William Gellie and James Forbes, possibly the Colonel Forbes of Jaffray's early days¹⁴; while the most active sympathisers with Menzies and Meldrum were Provost Petrie—now about the termination of his office, who was Menzies' brother-in-law¹⁵; Gray of Savoeh an ex-Provost; Andrew Burnet, and two individuals of the same name, James Skene, distinguished by the sobriquets of "Black James" and "White James"¹⁶. Through their agency principally if not entirely, the Council of Aberdeen passed in April an Act against letting houses to Quakers and Romanists or entertaining them in any way¹⁷. Referring to the inefficacy of various Acts of Parliament, Privy Council, and their own Burgh Council to suppress Quakerism, this Act bore generally that no inhabitant should have any hospitable or business dealings with any Quaker or Jesuit under a flat penalty of 500 Scots Marks, plus other censure or punishment according to his social status, and further, that no Quaker or Romanist citizen should have any such relationships with the public without the sanction and license of the Magistrates. This Act, in consideration of the neglect of former injunctions and the defiance of magisterial authority, as also of the continued willingness of the Magistrates to reclaim all "who are obstinate and disobedient to the just and good government..of this kingdom, and acts of council of this burgh", bore that the terms of the previous Act be reaffirmed with corresponding penalties.

This was followed by another measure, the Act anent Quaker Meetings¹⁹ of 16th March. This Act referring to the continuance of Quaker Meetings in contravention of the bye-laws, bore that all male Friends found at the next Meeting should be arrested and imprisoned "ay and whill they obleidge themselves to forbear", and that to prevent female Friends assembling, the doors of all Meeting places should be locked and the keys confiscated to keep "this brughe..free of thair conventiones".

The strength of the Quakers' passive resistance however rendered these measures and threatened penalties largely abortive. In addition, the imprisoned Quakers in Aberdeen and also a number in Inverurie having successfully petitioned the Privy

-
13. Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), PP 242-3; cf "The Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting att Urie" in J.F.H.S. Vol VII, PP 93-4.
 14. Jaffray's "Diary", P.52. 15. Petrie's own subsequent degradation from office and imprisonment in Aberdeen Tolbooth was regarded as another notable instance of 'nemesis' by Friends, and brought about a change of spirit in him. (v Skene "A Breiff Historically Account", P.13) / 16. Ibid. / 17. Ibid, and "Extracts from the Council Register of .. Aberdeen", (1872) PP 261-2.
 18. E.g. respectively "Act concerning Masters of Universities etc", 1662; Privy Council Act 1667; and "Act anent Quakers 1663" (Ibid P.207 / 19. "Extracts from the Council Register of Aberdeen 1643-1747" (1872), P.265; Mackintosh, "History of Civilisation in Scotland", Vol III. P.264.

Council, the Council ordered the Sheriffs and the Magistrates in both places to release them upon caution within a month²⁰. This instigated Meldrum and Menzies to an audacious 'coup' which was equally abortive and procured them only an unexpected snubbing. When the High Court of Justice came to Aberdeen in 1671, Meldrum, who preached the Circuit Sermon, used every artifice to incite their Lordships "to exercise the utmost severity against the Quakers representing them after his usual manner as a most dangerous and pernicious sect"²¹. This he followed up, along with Menzies, by invading the Judges' chambers, the Bishop also being present, and informed them that the Magistrates had on several occasions broken up the Quakers' Meetings and sentenced them to fines, imprisonment, and, even in some cases, to banishment. According to Skene and Besse the Justices were so unfavourably impressed with the cruelty and malicious spirit of the Ministers that they gave them no answer²², and when the Quakers cited, did appear before the Court, the charges against them were dismissed. That there is no reason to doubt the accuracy of this is borne out by what was probably a sequel viz., that about this time the Scottish Justices abandoned the usual practice in suits for debt of putting the defendant on oath to clear himself where proof failed, and substituted a simple declaration of the truth from all Quakers prosecuted for debt. This removed a fundamental obstacle to the Quakers' practice and to their obtaining justice, and saved them from much victimisation, a concession which was then unknown in England and elsewhere.²³.

These happenings coupled with notable convictions and the ineffectiveness of the Acts of the Burgh Council, produced something like desperation in the minds of all the Town's Ministers to get rid of Quakers once and for all. Forming themselves into a deputation to the Bishop, they urged him to take speedy action. The Bishop summoned the Diocesan Council, which framed an address or petition to the Lords of His Majesty's Privy Council at Edinburgh "to take some effectually course to curb and ridd the Land of the Quakers that were so increasing among them"; and in February 1672 appointed as Commissioners to support the same David Lyall, Minister at Aberdeen and James Gordon, Minister at Banchory-Devenick²⁴. Unfortunately, for the Synod, their spokesman in spite of their every endeavour "to represent...the grievances of the Church in this Diocie against quakers and papists"²⁵ signally failed to get any fresh order of Council as an instrument against the Friends, and were dismissed with fulsome thanks and a rather cynical reference to the "Act against Separation and Withdrawal from the Public Meetings for Divine Worship" of August

20. R.P.C.S. Third Series, Vol III, P.162.

21. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account," P.11; Besse's "Sufferings" (1753), Vol II, P.499.

22. Ibid, P.500. Menzies also sometimes overstepped himself and defeated his own ends. (cf "Queries to the Inhabitants of Aberdeen"- Appendix to "Truth Cleared of Calumnies" in Barclay's "Truth Triumphant" Vol I, P.92, Quest.6.)

23. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account" P.12. cf Besse's "Sufferings" (1753), P.500. / 24. Skene, "A Breiff Historicall Account" PP 11-12. 25. "Records of the Meeting of the Excercise of Alford", Ed. Bell, (1897) P.204.

1670²⁶, though Bishop Scougal's version is very different from this²⁷. This was followed by a rebuff from the Provost and Council of Aberdeen when the Ministers appealed to them in turn. The latter were told bluntly to prosecute their own 'métier' and attend to their own affairs, as the above Act gave the civil power no authority to act until the Ministers had given satisfactory evidence that they had performed their function of admonition in vain. Thereupon Meldrum and Lyall commenced a house-to-house admonition, when their prosecuting zeal was suddenly cut short for a time by the Declaration of Indulgence²⁸.

The Declaration, however, did not cover the question of Quaker burials in private or "unconsecrated" ground. This was not, strictly speaking, an ecclesiastical or religious matter, but a civic, although materially it had a definitely ecclesiastical import, and consequently, even while the Declaration was in force, this new source of trouble and persecution kept the war raging between the Church and City Council, and the Friends in Aberdeen²⁹. It was a loophole which the Ecclesiastics were more than glad to seize; but which perhaps impelled Robert Barclay the more to traverse the streets of Aberdeen in sackcloth and become "a spectacle to men".

Barclay's acted parable was not motivated by despondency, but by the rising tide of hope and expectancy which animated the Friends this year, after the admitted setbacks which their ecclesiastical and civil opponents and persecutors had received, culminating in the Declaration of Indulgence. The number of Friends in the Aberdeen Meeting alone, apart from any of Urie or Kinmuck was at least twenty-four (fourteen women and ten men) at the beginning of 1672³⁰, a considerable number as Scottish statistics go. Brodie at least quaintly confessed himself sobered by the "mani most chois Christians especiali at Aberdeen", who were "taken away by delusion and error"³¹. The Quakers judged themselves so greatly "prospered by the Lord both as to their number and as to their growth in the Truth"³² that the necessity now arose of Meetings for Discipline, of keeping records, and of securing a permanent Meeting-House. It was in March 1672 and in 1674 that the first Records of the Aberdeen Monthly and Quarterly Meetings were made respectively, and the very valuable MSS Book of the rise and progress

-
26. Skene, "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.12.; R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol.III, PP 480, 481-2; "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol VIII, PP 11-12, and Appendix P.3, Col.2.
27. Mair's "Narratives and Extracts from the Records of the Presbytery of Ellon" (1894), P.180.
28. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.12. and Besse's "Sufferings" (1753) Vol.II, P.500.
29. Detailed reference to this will be found infra in Ch.XVI.
30. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.12. cf "Records of Aberdeen Yearly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. VIII. P.40.
31. "Diary—1652-1680" (1863) P.313.
32. "Records of Aberdeen Yearly Meeting" in J.F.H.S, VIII.P.40.

of Quakerism in Aberdeen and neighbourhood was compiled by several Friends, including Alexander Jaffray and Elizabeth Johnstone and written up by Alexander Skene³³ in 1672.

The Quakers secured their first Meeting House in Aberdeen in 1672, but there is a flat contradiction in the early Records as to how it was obtained. According to Robert Barclay Junior, his father the Apologist, bought the Meeting House, defraying the major part of the cost himself and supplementing it with money he obtained from Viscountess Conway of Ragley³⁴, while according to a Meeting Record of 19th March, Skene and Mercer rented a suitable Meeting House on behalf of the Friends from Robert Bruce, a College Regent, for £43. per annum, from which they had to remove at Whitsuntide 1673 to quarters in Alexander Skene's own house³⁵. The incongruity has never been solved.

On the whole then, the Quakers had distinctly the best of it during this second period of persecution in Aberdeen, and they were the more encouraged by a letter from William Dewsbury to all Scottish Friends written from Warwick on 29th October 1672, in which he doubtless thought specially of his spiritual children in Aberdeen, exhorting them in brave constancy and unity of spirit to "shine forth as the morning stars to enlighten the people in that nation", and to be faithful, "for the Lord hath a great people in Scotland."³⁶

For a brief period the Friends' Meetings in Aberdeen enjoyed respite. They had indeed to contend with some petty hooliganism from College students and others³⁷ and with objectionable outbursts of blasphemy in their meetings from one David Rait who was apparently bordering on religious mania and was a tool of the students, obviously in sympathy with the Clerics³⁸. But when the King tore the Great Seal from the Declaration of Indulgence in March 1673 he opened another more rigorous and cruel chapter still for the Friends in the Northern City.

33. "The Records of Aberdeen Yearly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. Vol. VIII, P.41. (Referred to in these pages as Skene's "A Breiff Historiæall Account".)

34. "Genealogical Account of the Barclays of Ury" (1740) P.47. cf. J.F.H.S. Vol VII, P.15.

35. "The Records of Aberdeen Yearly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. Vol VIII, PP 41, 45.

36. Quoted in Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), PP 251-2.

37. cf Barclay's "Apology" (1886), Prop. XI, P.268, and "Queries to the Inhabitants of Aberdeen," Quest. 14. ("Truth Triumphant" (1717) Vol I. P.94.)

38. "Records of Aberdeen Yearly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. Vol VIII, PP 43-44, 45.

CHAPTER X."THE CONVENTICLE ACT, AND THE DECLARATION OF INDULGENCE".

By the year 1670, the Government both in England and Scotland was hardening in its policy to suppress with the utmost rigour the volume of dissent which was steadily growing in spite of previous Parliamentary Acts and measures; Municipal enactments, and unofficial proscription and oppression. All gatherings without the King's warrant and authority were suspected and denounced as dangerous and subversive of authority in Church and State; Conventicles of any kind were seminaries of sedition and disaffected plotting under the cloak of Religion; and any deviation from the prescribed limits of civil life or worship was disintegrating and treasonable and must be stamped out.

On 13th August 1670, His Majesty's second Parliament in Edinburgh passed the "Act against Conventicles"² of which it may be said as Marvell said of its English peer that it was "the quintessence of arbitrary malice". It was as craftily and ably sponsored by Lauderdale as was the English Act by Sheldon, and left as few loopholes. The Scots Act in its calculated and exclusive severity³ covered both house- and field conventicles. Any "outed" ministers unlicensed by the Council, or any other persons unauthorised by the Diocesan Bishop were forbidden to pray or preach except in their own houses and to their own families exclusively. Every other service of religion was a "Conventicle". Whoever conducted it was to be imprisoned till he found caution of 5,000 marks⁴ not to offend in like manner again, or be banished permanently at His Majesty's pleasure, and everyone of his hearers was to be heavily fined according to a sliding scale of social status and imprisoned till they paid their fines, and further at the Privy Council's will. A concession of 50% was granted to a householder in respect of his wife or children attending a house conventicle alone, but this was offset by a double fine imposed on any host or hostess of such illegal gathering. Magistrates of Royal Burghs were liable to whatever penalties the Privy Council thought fit to impose for any conventicle within their jurisdiction. The Magistrates could either pass on their financial obligation to the immediate offenders direct, or the latter might be required to pay their impositions direct to the agents of the Privy Council at the discretion of the same.

But the maximum severity of the Act was felt in respect of field conventicles, which, as being probably armed, were the most dangerous and seditious of all. Whoever dared to preach or conduct such an illegal service in the open or in any house so

-
1. E.g. In Scotland the Commission and Instructions to the J.P.'s and Constables of 1661 ("Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol. VII, PP 310, 311) as well as to the early Acts of Middleton's Parliament and the Privy Council Act fixing responsibility for attendance at Church on landlords etc. (v R.P.C.S. 3rd Series. Vol. II, PP 202-4)
 2. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol VIII, PP 9-10, and Appendix P.3.
 3. cf "Laing's "History of Scotland"; (1819) Vol. IV, P.63.
 4. Circ. 245. at present value.

crowded that the audience overflowed out of doors, or whoever rallied people to these Meetings was liable to the capital penalty with confiscation of his estate. All heritors or ringleaders were to be fined double the amount imposed for house conventicles, and anyone who arrested an outlawed preacher or "whip" was to receive from the Treasury a reward of 500 marks and an indemnity from the charge of murder for himself or his colleagues, in the event of the death of any preacher or his associate during the course of arrest. Strict imposition was laid on all Sheriffs and other civil authorities to try every person within the Act and punish him to its full extent as they should be accountable to the Privy Council; while any such authorities who showed the slightest neglect of stringency or diligence in the prosecution of their duty were themselves liable to whatever penalties the Privy Council might decide. The Act was to remain in force in the first instance for three years, and His Majesty was hopeful that his subjects would give "such cheerful obedience to the Laws as there shall not be long use of this Act".

The Conventicle Act was almost immediately preceded by the "Act against such who shall refuse to depone against Delinquents"⁵ particularly against those who when duly cited, delay or withhold information on oath against any involved in conventicles, or who aid or abet fugitives or rebels. The Conventicle Act was likewise speedily followed by the "Act against Separation and Withdrawal from Public Worship" which was its complement⁶. It was also to be in operation for at least three years.

There is a good deal in those Acts applying *a priori* to the Quakers, but in point of fact they were either so neglected or so perfunctorily administered in the case of Friends that they might almost be said to be dead letters⁷. They were primarily directed to the harrying of the Covenanters, and the energies of the Privy Council were so concentrated upon quelling the armed dissent and rebellion in the country that it appeared to remember about the Quakers only now and then. It is clear from Mackenzie's reference to the "Deponing Act"⁹, in which he speaks of "the fanatticks"—, the common term used to denote the Covenanters that this Act was meant to be applied to them rather than to the Quakers. Neither was the Act against the neglect of public worship prosecuted with any vigour against the Quakers, for as late as March 1672 the Privy Council had to instigate the Sheriff of Aberdeen to put it into execution and strictly punish them in conformity with it.¹⁰

5. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland"; Vol. VIII, P. 7, Col. 2.

6. Ibid P. 11, Col. 2.

7. *vide infra* P. 148.

8. cf "Letters Illustrative of Public Affairs..to George Earl of Aberdeen" (1851), PP 109-110. (Letter from John Graham of Claverhouse)

9. "Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland" (1821) P. 189.

10. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol III, P. 481.; cf Chambers "Domestic Annals of Scotland", Vol. II, PP 344-5.

The Scots Conventicle Act was not nearly so mercilessly or consistently applied to Quakers as the corresponding Act was in England, especially in London¹¹. During the time of Cromwell, there were occasional out-of-door Meetings of Friends in Scotland, but after the Restoration their gatherings were invariably indoors unless they were expelled from their Meeting place, while on the contrary there was "not so much as a house conventicle heard of in the West of Scotland" among the Covenanters.¹² To the Quakers, therefore, whose conventicles were neither armed nor open and seditious, the section of the Act in respect of House assemblages could alone be relevant. Even under that section however, the persecution of Friends was not rigorous except in Aberdeen, of which more will be presently detailed. Certainly there were eleven Quakers imprisoned in Kelso in 1673 for meeting illegally, including Thomas Robertson of Bridgend, a well known Border supporter, but as the Council could not hear the case then, it practically instructed the Earl of Roxburgh to do so and release them "if he shall find cause"¹³.

The case of William Napier, the Montrose Seaman, may be taken as another instance of the comparative official leniency to the Friends. Hitherto the Burgh had been "frie of the meitinges of quakers", but now the public peace was alleged to be threatened, and "great confusion and tumult was lyk to have bein made". Napier and his friends might have been expected to suffer more seriously than they did, and the Privy Council showed a fair consideration in liberating Napier even on the cautionary Bond of £1,000 Scots, so that he might not sustain the loss of his projected voyage¹⁴. There is no mention of exorbitant fines, and only the larger half of those gathered at Napier's abode were incarcerated at all. So slack even in Aberdeen did the authorities seem to the Diocesan Synod in face of the Quakers' "insolence" that the Sheriff was overtured to have the Municipal "Act anent the Quaker Meetings"¹⁵ put into force.

The Quakers stoutly maintained that the Conventicle and other such Acts were never meant to apply to them at all, notably on the occasion in Aberdeen in 1676 previously mentioned, when David Barclay and his fellow-Quakers appeared before the Commissioners of the Privy Council. In May of that year, the Privy Council issued a Proclamation reaffirming former Acts of Parliament against conventicles - the Trilogy of 1670-, and requiring their execution

-
11. Neal's "History of the Puritans", Vol III, PP 164-6; Penn's(?) Strictures on the English Act were however, equally true of it. v "Some Seasonable and Serious Queries etc" by "A Friend to Truth and Peace" (1670).
 12. "Letters Illustrative of Public Affairs".. to George, Earl of Aberdeen, (1851) P.64. (Letter from John, Bishop of Edinburgh No. LIV, 1682. The difference of date makes no essential difference otherwise) 13. v "Piety Promoted", Vol I, PP 205-6; and R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol IV, P.33.
 14. Ibid, Vol III, PP 441-2, 448, 605.
 15. v ante Ch. IX, P. ~~440~~ and Davidson "Inverurie and the Garioch"; (1878) PP 341-2.

by Sheriffs and Corporations. The Ministers and Magistrates of Aberdeen thereupon lost no time in arresting at their worship and imprisoning in the Tolbooth a considerable number of ~~the~~ Friends even before receiving a copy of the Proclamation¹⁶. Apart from their action being unwarrantably swift and premature, the Quakers contended that the authorities stretched the Proclamation ultra vires as it was only intended for Covenanters outlawed by the Privy Council¹⁷. The prisoners were served with a warrant to appear before three Commissioners at the Council Chamber of Aberdeen to answer charges of contravention of the "Withdrawal from Worship Act", and with keeping seditious and unwarrantable Meetings and House Conventicles" at the dwellings of four Quakers and at regular stated intervals from May 1674, in contumacious and wilful disobedience to the Conventicle Act. The Counsel for the Crown at the Trial was Patrick Hay, Advocate Depute for Scotland. Both the aforesaid Acts having been prorogated till 1676 and again from 1676 indefinitely at His Majesty's pleasure, the charge against the prisoners was read which, commencing with a narrative of the said Acts, proceeded to arraign the defendants in terms thereof and under the penalties attached thereto¹⁸.

Into the dialectical niceties, technical objections, and legal and terminological quibblings of the case, there is no need to enter. What is of importance is the written Manifesto which the Quakers laid before the Court in addition to their verbal defence voiced by David Barclay, the former of which shows considerable forensic skill. The considerations advanced in the Manifesto and the Case itself as a whole, provide a good and fair exposition of the Friends' attitude to constitutional authority, and of their principles of citizenship and worship¹⁹.

The Quaker people universally disclaimed that their meetings were ever held out of any contempt of authority or any misconception of virtue in law breaking for its own sake. They were held for conscience' sake according to the beliefs and ideals of their religious experience. They readily admitted the possibility of gatherings being held for sinister and seditious ends under the cloak of Religion²⁰, as indeed they knew to be the case among the Fifth Monarchy Men and others, but they emphatically dissociated themselves from all motives and purposes of sedition or underground plotting²¹. Their meetings were 'bona fide' Meetings for silent worship or spiritual exhortation - that and nothing more; and while many were private they were quite open and unbarricaded.

16. Besse's "Sufferings" (1753), Vol. II, P.503. John Barclay states that it was done on the mere word of a traveller. (Jaffray's "Diary" (1856), P.265.)

17. ~~xxxx~~ Besse's "Sufferings", P.507.

18. Most Materiall Passages", PP 5-9.

19. Ibid, PP 11-13.

20. E.g. "A Declaration from the People of God called Quakers etc ", in reference to the Conventicle Act. (Vol N. No.5. Friends' Library, Euston) cf Fox's similar declaration to the King in 1661 v ante Ch.II.PP3-4.

21. cf Stubbs, "A True Declaration of our Innocency", (1670) P.3.

Their whole life was committed to the way and spirit of peace and the disavowal of force, weapons, or even reprisals. Their gatherings might be irregular and uncanonical in the eyes of the Church and State, but none of their witness or activity was seditious²² or subversive of the government or well-being of the Nation. No reputable State or Parliament had any real intention of interfering with, or penalising through Conventicle Acts or other similar measures any man's prerogative to make contact with God or his fellows in any inoffensive way of his own choice, but only of checking the abuse of that natural right. To the Parliament of Scotland in passing the Act of 1670 was such credit charitably given.²³

On the aforesaid grounds, they claimed, the Conventicle Act could not be intended for them; in addition, it was aimed at outed Ministers and their flocks, whereas in many of the Friends' Meetings there was no preaching, exposition or audible prayer at all. The Manifesto then proceeds to offer the adduction of evidence to prove that Lauderdale said the Act "was only to curb the Presbyterian Meetings in the West Country" and not the Quakers at all.

The Quakers' contention that these penal Acts of 1670 and other cognate measures were irrelevant to them is further strengthened by the evidence that the Privy Council instigated no repression or persecution of their meetings in Edinburgh or the West of Scotland, and that several Friends who were early arrested and imprisoned under the Conventicle Act were quickly released on parole indefinitely, to appear only when cited. The Privy Council Commissioners in Aberdeen, it was argued, had no precedent, from the Council's disdain of Quaker Meetings in Edinburgh especially, to take such severe and unnecessary measures in 1676 as they did, nor the Magistrates of Aberdeen to support them²⁴. Nor was there an army of informers and parasites hot upon their trail to make profit out of a nefarious "trade" as in England²⁵. Informers and spies were mostly reserved for the Covenanters. The Quakers made no secret of their whereabouts.

The Quakers' contention that the Conventicle Act was not designed for, or applicable to, them, must then be considered valid in the main. They might be deemed potentially dangerous in some respects, not altogether without reason - e.g. in their avowed Pacifism, which was not exactly a 17th Century virtue, and in their sturdy non-respect of persons, but in actual experience they

22. At Exeter, Fox warmly refuted the charge thus in effect, "You speak of the Quakers spreading seditious books and papers. I answer, we have no seditious books or papers. Our books are against sedition and seditious men". ("Journal" Camb. Ed. Vol. I, P. 232.) v also partim Barclay's address to Charles II. (Preface to the "Apology".) 23. Besse's "Sufferings" (1753), Vol. II, PP 506-7.

24. Ibid, P. 507.

25. cf "Transactions of the Royal Historical Society," 4th Series Vol. XV. PP 211 ff. (Art. by Walker on "The Secret Services under Charles II. and James II") ; Neal's "History of the Puritans" Vol III, PP 202-3; Besse's "Sufferings", (1753) Vol. I, P. XXVII.

were known to be a patient, brave and non-vindictive people, more to be tolerated than feared. House conventicles they certainly kept, but not seditious and dangerous ones which the Act clearly purported, and field conventicles they had none. Lauderdale was advised that in Scotland the Quakers might prove "more dangerous than men are aware of"²⁶, but their simplicity and innocence were not counterfeit to discerning Authorities, and Lauderdale soon realised how groundless were any apprehensions he might have had.

The Declaration of Indulgence to all His Majesty's "loving subjects" was issued by and with the advice of the Cabal on 15th March 1671/2, the eve of the war with Holland, with the purpose of eliminating all possible trouble at home during the foreign hostilities, and perhaps because, as Whitehead suggests, the King was becoming superstitiously alarmed at the continuity of calamity²⁷ "since our happy Restoration". The Declaration after admitting the futility of the policy of persecution and safeguarding the position of the Church of England, suspended instanter the operation of penal laws in religious affairs against every kind of Dissenter or Recusant, and authorised meetings of all Protestant Non-conformists in licensed places to any required number with teachers approved by the Cabal, provided that all such meetings were open and free²⁸. The Declaration had little effect in Scotland except in Aberdeen. In Edinburgh and among the Friends of the West and South of Scotland it was really superfluous, as they were comparatively unmolested²⁹. In other parts it was ignored in the letter or contemned in the spirit. In the Mearns, Quakers were imprisoned for months in 1672³⁰ and in Aberdeenshire proceedings were still taken by Ecclesiastical Courts³¹. In April 1672 Scougal in effect told the Clergy in Ellon Presbytery to pay no attention to the Declaration of Indulgence - "I shall further add that what you may have heard concerning late occurrences relating to our neighbour kingdome should not slack our case in our own spheare and station", nor was the injunction in vain³². In the City of Aberdeen, however, according to Besse, the Declaration put a check on the activities of Meldrum and Lyall³³ and gave the Quakers a welcome respite.

But it was not for long. The Royal prerogative was strongly held to have overstepped itself and Parliament was up in arms. The Declaration was a recissory measure sweeping away penal statutes which could be suspended or repealed only by Act of Parliament. By the 8th March 1673/4 when the King could no longer hold out, the Declaration of Indulgence was dead.

26. "Lauderdale Papers", Ed. Airy, Vol. II, P. 181.

27. "Christian Progress", PP 346-7.

28. The text of the Declaration is given in Besse's "Sufferings", (1753) Vol. I, P. XXVIII: and Neal's "History of the Puritans", Vol. III, PP 178-9. Law also gives the gist in his "Memorials", (1818) P. 45.

29. v ante, P. 46. 30. v ante, Ibid.: Ch. VIII, PP. 152-3.

31. v ante, Ch. V, P. 102. 32. Mair's "Narratives and Extracts" from Ellon Presbytery 1597-1709" (1894), P. 180.

33. "Sufferings" (1753), Vol. II, P. 500.

34. cf Whitehead's "Christian Progress" (1725), Part II, P. 366 etc.

CHAPTER XI."THE HEIGHT OF THE PERSECUTION IN ABERDEEN".

The Declaration of Indulgence was an adroit attempt of Charles II to start 'de novo' in religious toleration. But the repercussions of the broken faith of Breda were too strong and involved for him to succeed, and the scope of his toleration to include and foster the machinations of his own real co-religionists were too instinctively and universally suspected, and roused the Parliament to an unassailable determination to annul it.

Exactly two months after the capitulation of the King, Alexander Jaffray died at his mansion of Kingswells aet. 59, and was buried within its grounds a few miles from the City, "on whose highest offices he had conferred more honour than he had received from them"¹. This was the first serious loss to the Cause in Scotland, which was felt and expressed none the less poignantly that there were no official "Testimonies" then in vogue in Scotland. About three months later, his wife, the daughter of Andrew Cant, followed him to the grave, and according to Barclay it was Jaffray's passing which brought her so near the end to open "convincement"².

Jaffray did not live to see the height of the persecution of Friends in Aberdeen, and in Scotland, but he foresaw and warned them that "a winnowing and trying time was coming shortly"...but that "a faithfull remnant should be preserved and brought through the fyery tryall."³ During this period from 1673 to 1679, especially the latter three years, the reaffirmed 'Conventicle Act' and the 'Withdrawal from Worship Act' were more systematically and ruthlessly applied than ever before. Of no other years of the Quakers' troubled history were even Croese's words truer when he admits that everywhere they were libelled and lampooned, often by the vilest sort of men, made an object of low jest and ridicule among boon companions in their cups, and caricatured by stage actors and all kinds of nomadic jugglers and clowns⁴.

The renewal of the persecution in Aberdeen sprang out of the convincement of Andrew Jaffray and several others about two months before his father, the Laird of Kingswells, died. The Church returned to the fray and, at its instigation, the Chief Magistrate and others invaded a Monthly Meeting at Kirkgate two days before the actual revocation of the Declaration of Indulgence, blacklisted all present, and despatched their agent, one William Gordon, to the Privy Council in Edinburgh to gain the

-
1. "The British Friend" (1846) Vol. IV, P. 284. (Art. on Jaffray.)
 2. Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) PP 259-60.
 3. Skene, "A Breiff Historicall Account", P. 16.
 4. "General History of the Quakers" (1696) Book II, PP 95-6.

Council's *active* support. Gordon succeeded, and Donaldson, the messenger of the Council duly arrived in Aberdeen with a summons against twenty of the male Quakers, who appeared at the bar in Edinburgh on 7th July, and were heavily fined in varying amounts. The fines were remitted to Hugh Neilson, an apothecary of Edinburgh, but while he was still busy in legal processes for the realisation of these, a Proclamation of the Royal Commissioners and Council was issued, remitting all penalties and fines for Nonconformity, except such as were already paid or guaranteed. As neither alternative applied to the Quakers, they were for the moment acquitted⁵.

This Proclamation did not, however, affect the rising tide of persecution. In April, the struggle between the Magistrates and the Quaker community over the Gallowgate Burial Ground had been renewed⁶ and while the Magistrates again importuned the Privy Council against the Quakers, the Ministers had craved Archbishop Sharpe's support, in their allegation that several Quaker burial-places involved a loss of revenue prejudicial to both Church and Municipality. The Friends also submitted to the Council a "Bill" of complaint, and "Information against the said magistrates for their raising the dead children", a moderate and carefully worded document⁷. The Privy Council, however, declined to intervene, dismissed the case, and left the authorities of Aberdeen to their own resources of persecution. But indirectly, the Council gave them soon a weapon to wield. When the Conventicle Act was prorogated about this time, the Privy Council appended a Bond to be subscribed by every householder, guaranteeing the loyalty and conformity of all under his roof.⁸ Friends Meetings in Aberdeen were again repeatedly disturbed, and at length in 1674, after they had refused as often to subscribe the Bond, the Magistrates' patience was exhausted, and they had them forcibly ejected from the Meeting House. But on the Magistrates' and town's officers' departure, the Quakers calmly filed back and resumed their worship under Robert Barclay and George Keith.

The authorities had no alternative but to fine the Quakers in accordance with the Act and the Bond, but of course no payment was forthcoming. William Gellie and Thomas Dockery, an English "public" Friend⁹ were thereupon arrested and imprisoned in the Tolbooth. The next step was to proscribe at the Market Cross all the others who had local estate or property as rebels against the State, and declare their personal belongings forfeited to His

5. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", PP 14-16. cf R.P.C.S 3rd Series, Vol. IV, PP 61-2, 75-77.

6. For which v infra, Ch. XVI.

7. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", PP 16-17.

8. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol IV, PP 197-200, 252.

9. His home was near Swarthmore, Lancs. v Besse's "Sufferings" (1753), Vol. II, P. 29. cf "Piety Promoted", Vol. II, P. 63, where he is stated to be a Cumbrian, and to have visited Scotland five times. v also "Most Materiall Passages", P. 3.

Majesty's use. This was seconded by the resolution of the Diocesan Synod to move the Sheriff to have the Act of the City Council anent Quaker Meetings¹⁰ put into force against the Quakers for their "insolence"¹¹.

The Quakers, however, were only Pacifists in respect of material force and violence. They were never in the habit of meeting either opposition or injustice with a spineless and dumb submission. They gave their moral sense and utterance full scope, too full sometimes. A Declaration and Appeal addressed to the Privy Council and signed by both the Tolbooth prisoners, affirming their essential loyalty to the Government and their conscientious objections to the Bond, brought a certain modicum of relief, for on 11th November a letter was received by the Magistrates of Aberdeen from the Lord Chancellor Rothes, ordering Gellie and Dockery to be liberated, with a warning against any further contraventions of the Conventicle Act¹². "And" added Rothes, "yow are to proceed against them or any others that shall be found guilty of these disorderly meetings". That such were often literally disorderly cannot be denied, for the attitude and coercive policy of the Magistrates towards the Quakers, coupled with the hatred of them fomented by the pulpit, gave too much opening and encouragement to College students, the irresponsible street rabble, and half crazy disturbers of the peace like David Rait¹³ to charge into the Friends' peaceable assemblies and create bedlam¹⁴. The onus naturally fell upon the worshippers, and this was not the least way in which they had to suffer for their principles.

It was ^{not} unnatural that in the whirlpool of popular prejudice and bitterness, as well as from the reticence and mysticism of the Quaker faith, ignorance or misunderstanding of their essential teachings should have prevailed. In the attempt to supply an obvious desideratum, Robert Barclay published in 1675 his "Theses Theologicae" which, Proposition by Proposition, was the basis of the "Apology" and offered to the open-minded members of the community a succinct but lucid statement of Quaker doctrine and practice¹⁵. It was dedicated to all Clergy irrespective of denomination, and especially to all Scholastics and students of Divinity, appealing to them "not to feed..the wisdom and vain pride

-
10. "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen 1643-1747", (1872) P.265.
 11. Davidson's "Inverurie and the Garioch", (1878) PP 341-2.
 12. Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen 1643-1747", PP 289-90; R.P.C.S. Third Series, Vol.IV, PP 293-4.
 13. Rait had his last bout of abusing Friends in 1674 before he became a definitely mental case. v Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.17, and cf "The Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting at Urie" in J.F.H.S. Vol.VII, P.95.
 14. cf Barclay's "Apology" (1886), Prop.XI, P.267.
 15. This was the first English edition. "The Theses" first appeared as a Broadside in Latin, published at Amsterdam in 1674.

of this World but to starve and oppose it"¹⁶. This was hardly paving the way for Barclay's offer to defend his "Theses" publicly against "such persons as had so traduced them". None of the Ministers of Aberdeen accepted the challenge, but the Divinity Students of Marischal College came forward, whether on their own initiative or, as John Barclay suggests, at the instigation of the Ministers, will probably never be certified. It was arranged that a public Discussion or "Open Forum" should be held between representatives of each side on 14th April 1675¹⁷ from 2.p.m. to 5.p.m. Greyfriars' Church, the first choice of place, could not be obtained; Marischal, or the "New College" was unsuitable being "a small poor place"¹⁸; and at length it was agreed to hold the discussion in Alexander Harper, the Quaker's Close¹⁹.

This episode is one of the most frequently repeated in Quaker Chronicles, though Sewell scarcely notices it. The authentic and original account, "A True and Faithful Account of the Most Material Passages of a Dispute betwixt some Students of Divinity (so called) of the University of Aberdeen and the People called Quakers" was published in anticipation of a version by the students, by four Quaker witnesses in Aberdeen, Alexander and John Skene, Thomas Mercer and John Cowie²⁰. The spokesmen for the students were John Leslie, Alexander Sherriff and Paul Gellie, all Masters, and for the Friends, George Keith and Robert Barclay. A code of eight articles or rules of debate were submitted and signed by both sides²¹. Only signatories could speak and rule 7 allowed each party to secure a Præces or Umpire to maintain orderly procedure, but to be without "any decisive judgment".²² The students selected Andrew Thomson, advocate; the Quakers, Alexander Skene.

After an preliminary explanation by Barclay of how the Debate was brought about, Sherriff, who was chiefly responsible therefor, opened the Discussion proper, taking the precaution of stressing the students' youth and comparative inexperience in opposition to "the great Prophets and Preachers of the Quakers". Argument centred chiefly round Immediate Revelation (Prop II); the Scriptures, (Prop.III); Worship and Inspiration (Prop.XI) and Baptism (Prop.XII). The Debate was conducted on conventional lines and the validity of syllogisms was often sharply denied or upheld. Discussion, however, sometimes became fevered and sidetracked into purely irrelevant or technical wranglings; and interruptions were frequent, especially from the Bishop's chaplain.

16. "Epistle to the Friendly Reader"

17. "The Record Book of the Monethly Meeting att Urie" in J.F.H.S. VII, P.94, gives the date as 25th April.

18. "Kirk's Tour in Scotland 1677" (1892), P.22.

19. Harper and his wife both apostatised about three years later. (1678) v Skene's "Brëiff Historicall Account", PP 20-21.

20. First Edition (1675) is in the National Library, Edinburgh.

21. "Quakerism Canvassed" (1675), PP 1-2.

22. "A True and Faithful Account", P.7.

Rule 4, that academic terms should be avoided or explained in simple English to the audience, was several times invoked. Neither side was satisfied with the results of this 'open forum' in Harper's Yard²³, but the Quakers were much superior in knowledge of the Scriptures, and "on points" probably had the best of the Debate such as it was. The departure of Prées Thomson at 5.p.m. was a signal for confusion, and all orderly discussion was over. The students refused Keith's proposal for a return public Discussion on the "Confession of Faith"; the situation rapidly degenerated into a rabble, and the students, boasting of their victory, incited the baser sort at least among the audience, numbering several hundred, and by appeal to the "argumentum baculinum" brought the proceedings to an end in utter disorder. In the mêlée, the Quakers were pelted with turf and stones, and Barclay and Keith both sustained minor injuries.²⁴

There were several sequels to this "Dispute" and it coloured events for the next four years. Menzies did his best to actuate Scougal to protest to Sharpe and the Privy Council, and to have the Quakers sentenced and such discussions declared illegal. There was pertinence in the Quakers' retort that the need for such action was hardly an argument in favour of the students' boasted triumph, and against the ingenuous and reasonable offer of the Friends to debate with Menzies, Meldrum and Mitchell²⁵. The interesting immediate sequel of the Debate was that four students who had taken no part therein, Robert Sandilands²⁶, James Alexander, Alexander Seaton²⁷ and Alexander Paterson²⁸ were converted to the Quaker Faith, joined the Society, and published signed declarations of the grounds upon which they had changed their religious tenets²⁹. Fox received the news at Swarthmore³⁰.

Accessions to the Quaker Cause in Aberdeen were not numerous, but they were steady. In October 1675, the City Council in the light of past Acts and measures penalising Quakers passed another bye-law that no Quaker or Romanist, whether resident or incoming should at any time be admitted a Burgess or Freeman of the Burgh, except the sons of Burgesses of Guild who succeeded to their paternal estate; these not to be disqualified³¹. Since the

23. Bevan "A Short Account of Robert Barclay" (1802), P.28.

24. "A True and Faithful Account" (1675) PP 49-50

25. Ibid, PP 54 ff.

26. Sandilands apostatised from Quakerism about the same time as Keith, and almost certainly under his influence. He wrote against the Aberdeen Friends in 1700, but was ignored.

27. cf ante Ch. VIII. P 136, and "Piety Promoted", Vol. II, PP 231-2. Seaton is also mentioned in Besse's "Sufferings" (1753), Vol. II, P. 508.

28. He lived later in London, where he died, v J.F.H.S. Vol XI, P. 25 n.

29. Appendix to "Quakerism Confirmed" (1717) (v "Truth Triumphant", Vol III PP 181-2.) cf Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P. 18.

30. "Journal", (Camb. Ed.) Vol. II, P. 311.

31. "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen 1643-1747" (1872) P. 292.

Harper's Close Debate, public feeling had been running stronger than ever against the Friends, and on Christmas Day, the Magistrates ordered the Town's Officers to remove the signs hanging in front of five of the Quakers' shops³².

In March 1676, the great offensive against the Society in Aberdeen began, immediately consequent upon the Privy Council's Declaration issued in March. In March twenty-three Friends were apprehended and imprisoned; in April ~~six~~, and in May ~~four~~; nearly all at their Meetings. This gives thirty-three by name, according to Besse³³. Robert Barclay's estimate of forty-two by September is accurate³⁴. On the 26th May they were arraigned at the instance of Sir John Nisbet of Dirleton and Patrick Hay before the three Commissioners, the Earl of Errol, Earl Marischal, and Sir John Keith of Keithhall, and gave in their Manifesto³⁵. But as everyone refused to give any affidavit not to frequent meetings any longer, they were all found guilty of contravention of the 'Conventicle Act' and the 'Separation from Worship Act' to some degree, and heavily fined in accordance therewith, in proportion to their social standing and estate. Three were even penalised on three distinct counts, while John Skene and Keith were ordered to give bond of 5,000 marks not to preach again, or be banished the Kingdom³⁶. In default of paying the fines, the Quakers were remanded in prison, and when they preached from the windows to the Townspeople who crowded around, several of them were removed to the Higher Prison, including Andrew Jaffray, who was one of the chief sufferers during this period, and the windows of the Lower Prison boarded up by the Magistrates' orders³⁷. Barclay, who had just returned from his visit to Princess Elizabeth, and learning of the suffering of his forty Christian soldiers, presented his address and petition to the King³⁸ only to have it formally referred to Lauderdale and the Scottish Council, and his own expectations of the Council liberating the Friends were quickly dissolved.

The Council which met in Edinburgh on 7th September had before it both Barclay's Address to His Majesty and the Memorial addressed to Itself from the Quakers in and around Aberdeen, pleading that they had already been confined in gaol for six months on no valid or precautionary ground, and praying their release and the suspension of their fines until the Council's further consideration³⁹. But so far from intervening in the case which their Commissioners had 'sub judice', the Privy Council strengthened them by three additional appointments, Sir Richard Maitland of Pittrichie,

32. "Records of the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. Vol. VIII, P. 54.

33. "Sufferings", Vol. II, P. 503. All men. Women were not imprisoned.

34. Letter from Barclay to Princess Elizabeth from Edinburgh, 6th Sept. 1676, in "Reliquiae Barclaianae", (1870) P. 5. cf Ibid, P. 8. Keith's number is an underestimate.

35. v ante, Ch. X. P. 144. / 36. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 14-17.

37. cf Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P. 18.

38. v ante, Ch. VII. PP 124-5.

39. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 18-20.

Baird of Auchmedden and Ogilvie of Aboyne. When the enlarged Bench sat at Aberdeen, the prisoners were again called before them, only to refuse more resolutely than ever through the Skenes to enter into any bond not to assemble for worship or to profess any loyalty that was not qualified by the fear of God⁴⁰. The Lords decreed thereupon that their fines should be paid to Captain George Melville as the price of their freedom, and that if the Quakers failed to pay within seven days, Melville was empowered to distrain their goods to the amount of the fines and then release them. As however eight had been imprisoned since the trial, the Commissioners ordered them to be released immediately with a caution, among them being John Forbes of Aquorthies, John Thomson, an old Royalist soldier, and Robert Sandilands, the quendam student of Divinity⁴¹.

The three bitterest persecutors of the Friends during these years in Aberdeen and district were Captain Melville, an old trooper of Colonel Barclay, Baillie Alexander Burnett, Sir George Skene of Fintry and Rubislaw, the new Provost, who taking advantage of blame wrongly laid on the Quakers for a fire in the Tolbooth, made their confinement more rigorous still. Melville lost no time in getting to work. Commencing with a shoemaker called Thomas Milne⁴³, he siezed £90. worth of his commodities to realise the prisoner's fine of £30., and released him. Milne was present at the roup of his goods at the Market Cross, and when they were undervalued to approximate more nearly to the fine, knelt and prayed publicly that those responsible for this dishonourable act might be forgiven. This, Skene so resented as a personal indignity that he put Milne in the Tolbooth for another four days, an act which served to procure the Quakers no little sympathy and to call forth two letters of expostulation to the Provost from John Skene and Robert Burnett of Lethendy who were still in the Gaol⁴⁴. A similar letter of solicitation and appeal was addressed by some of the prisoners to Melville⁴⁵, but he not only ignored it, but procured a new and more stringent mandate from the Privy Council's Commissioners then in session at Turriff, empowering him to employ armed messengers and soldiers if need be⁴⁶.

John Skene being now a particularly marked man was the next victim, but when fourteen of Melville's armed men, not satisfied with the shameful purloining of Skene's merchandise, threatened to batter an-entrance to his dwelling house, the latter succeeded in his protest to the Magistrates and the distraint was confined to his shop stock. But within another two months Melville made another raid on the shop making a total distraint to the value of

40. Ibid, PP 20-22.

41. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 22-24. cf Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P.274.

42. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 24-25, and Munro "Memorials of the Aldermen, Provosts, and Lord Provosts of Aberdeen", PP 180 ff.

43. Milne is also prominent in the Gallowgate Burial Ground controversy. v post, Ch. XVI. PP 208-9.

44. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 28-32.

45. Ibid, PP 26-8.

46. Ibid, PP 33-4.

£230. for a fine of a £100. Similarly raids were carried out at the houses of Keith and Alexander Somerville, and after a brief cessation, while Melville went into hiding from a warrant for debt issued against him, he seized cattle from Alexander Skene again far in excess of the fine and legal expenses; also oxen from Andrew Jaffray and goods from Andrew Galloway. It was easy enough for Melville to distrain property, but he had sometimes great difficulty in getting any purchasers at the Market Cross, as in the case of John Skene's goods for which he could not find a valuator, and of Skene's cattle which would not sell even as butcher meat in a public slaughter-place⁴⁷. In February 1677, he laid George Gray the weaver under distress of £28. for a fine of 20 marks, while the soldiers looted his linen, and other Friends he impoverished illegally by amounts ranging from £40. to £140⁴⁸. But while the Quaker doctrine commanded no general assent, the populace had a rough sense of justice and showed it in the face of both Church and Magistrates. The allegation that the preaching from the windows of the Upper Tolbooth of Patrick Livingstone and James Halliday, who had just arrived from England and been incarcerated, resulted in no valuator being found for Skene's property may be exaggerated, but people undoubtedly thronged the prison walls below to hear the prisoners preach, and the resentment of the authorities was increased thereby⁴⁹.

In November 1676, Robert Barclay, who had recently come North from London was thrown into the Tolbooth also, along with three others taken at a meeting, but for some reason of which no record remains, his Father seems to have been released and allowed to return to Urie⁵⁰. Melville followed him up, but the impossibility of finding any purchaser for the cattle which he seized from the old Laird⁵¹ had a rather humorous sequel.

After the public Debate in Harper's Close, Barclay and Keith had forestalled the students by publishing "A True and Faithful Account of the Most Material Passages". In the same year, Leslie, Sherriff, and Gellie published their ex-parte account of the "dispute", "Quakerism Canvassed; Robert Barclay baffled", accusing the Quakers, not unnaturally of treason and blasphemy, and of giving "an luculent demonstration of their impudence by publishing a forged and false account of our late dispute"⁵². The students' book took a long time to appear after the Quakers', as no publisher could be found willing to take the risk, and in the end, the students only with the greatest difficulty got it printed in Edinburgh at their own expense. To their surprise and chagrin almost the whole impression was left on their hands. They drew up a Petition to the Commissioners of the Council, explaining their loss and craving some relief from the Exchequer which the influence of Archbishop Sharpe helped them to obtain but not in the manner they

47. Ibid, PP 34-37.

48. Ibid, PP 37,39.

49. Ibid, PP 36-7.

50. It may have been due to Robert Barclay's influence in Court Circles.

51. v ante, Ch. VIII, P. 134, Note 33.

52. "Quakerism Canvassed", Preface, P.1.

expected. The Commissioners served an order on Melville to reimburse the Marischal men out of Quaker fines he had in hand, and Melville having no money left gave them David Barclay's now attenuated oxen and cattle which were at length sold to repay "Quakerism Canvassed"⁵³.

The reply issued by Friends in 1676 to "Quakerism Canvassed" was entitled "Quakerism Confirmed" and was in two parts. The earlier one was anonymous, and internal evidence shows it to be of composite authorship, probably Alexander Skene's for the most part. The later is by Barclay and Keith⁵⁴, but it is doubtful if they had any part in the former⁵⁵. The first challenges the truth and accuracy of "Quakerism Canvassed" as to what took place at the Debate and after; the latter is purely doctrinal, meeting the students on their own theological ground which was in good part Menzies' and Meldrum's also⁵⁶. These polemics on both sides have all the characteristic marks of 17th Century controversies; a battle of proof texts; challenges and counter-challenges which would put opponents on the horns of a dilemma; frequent charges of self-contradiction and fallacious argument; delight in tripping each other up in dialectic niceties; and the usual lack of restraint in language and of ascribing good motives. "Quakerism Confirmed"(II) ranges in more or less detail over all the "key" doctrines of Quaker theology, but the most cogent of the eight sections are those on the validity of Baptism; and the Ministry and its commission, including some pointed observations on the "Apostolic Succession". The temper and behaviour of the students consequent to Keith and Barclay's offer to Menzies, Meldrum, and Mitchell, to debate publicly, does not seem to have been very controlled or fitting⁵⁷, and the students' rage over the failure of their own polemic to make any wide appeal may have impelled Baillie Gilbert Black to seize all he could of "Quakerism Confirmed" from the printer, John Forbes.⁵⁸ The fact that Forbes was printer to the Town and University of Aberdeen⁵⁹ would only aggravate his action, and the Council not only approved of Black's interference, but through Baillie Leslie sought the Bishop's advice⁶⁰. This was not the only raid Black made upon publishers.

53. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 38-9.

54. This is the one usually referred to.

55. Keith was then in London, and Joseph Smith disclaims Barclay's part-authorship. ("Catalogue", Vol. I, P. 178.) But cf Part II, - Preface in "Truth Triumphant" (1718), Vol. III, P. 50.

56. cf Ibid, Vol. III, P. 176.

57. cf Ibid, PP 174 ff. Smith however, mentions that another student called Cowie was convinced at Aberdeen ("Catalogue", Vol. I, P. 32)

58. "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen 1643-1747" (1872) P. 294. cf "Quakerism Confirmed", (Part I) P. 4.

59. v Aldis, "A List of Books Printed in Scotland before 1700", (1904) P. 113.

60. "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen", (1872) P. 294.

CHAPTER XII."THE HEIGHT OF THE PERSECUTION IN ABERDEEN"(Continued)

In the same year in which the great offensive against the Quakers was launched in Aberdeen and district, the first "Meeting for Sufferings" was established in London¹. No country correspondents were appointed from Scotland, but three correspondents for the towns, viz., William Welch, Sir John Swinton and Gaviñ Lawrie². By the beginning of 1677, Melville's campaign of distraint and confiscation was proved to be utterly ineffectual, for no bond would the Friends give to discontinue worship according to their conscience, neither did these losses and hardships deter them. Accordingly in February another spate of imprisonment began. David Barclay was again seized with John Forbes, Robert Milne and Gray, and thrown into the Tolbooth³. About a month later, Andrew Jaffray⁴ was rearrested. Thus all the four leading Friends,—the Barclays, Keith, Livingstone, and Andrew Jaffray were simultaneously imprisoned. Their confinement was not however uniformly close. Certain of them were liberated from time to time, but hardly were they free before they were back in Gaol for rejoining their Meetings or otherwise contemning the law. The irrepressible Livingstone in particular was a constant problem to the authorities⁵ throughout his three years' incarceration, for whether in or out of the Tolbooth they felt him to be equally a nuisance to themselves, and his influence and propaganda equally potent to his Cause⁶. While nearly all the men were in prison the Meetings were maintained with perfect regularity by the female Quakers and children at the usual places and times, and John Barclay claims that not only did these assemblies increase, but that during the whole course of the persecution the Magistrates were unable to prevent a single public Friends' Meeting being held⁷.

The prisoners physical powers of resistance throughout the rigours and nauseating conditions of their prison life and the cruelty of their spoilers, seemed to have been remarkable, and to this their courage and high-spirited faith contributed materially⁸. Their confinement neither damped their ardour nor lessened their activity. They maintained their worship with a heightened zeal and abandon, inspired by their bonds like Paul and Silas, and on one occasion when they were shut up in the dark cellars below the Court House, they astonished the City Fathers above by singing psalms,—a rare feature of their usual Meetings, hardly known to the

-
1. For aim and functions of the "Meeting for Sufferings," v Braithwaite "Second Period", PP 281-6.
 2. "Letters etc. of Early Friends", (1841) Ed. Barclay, P. 349.
 3. "Most Materiall Passages", P. 39.
 4. For some reference to his personality, v Jaffray's "Diary", (1856), PP 384-6.
 5. v "A Brief Account of the Life of.. Christopher Story", (1726) PP 34-5.
 6. cf Jaffray's "Diary", PP 326-7. cf "Piety Promoted", Vol. I. P. 114.
 7. Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P. 329.
 8. Ibid. PP. 329, 317.

outside community.⁹ Their esprit was sustained by the receipt of many epistles of sympathetic exhortation and confident prediction from leading and lesser Friends alike. The earliest recorded by John Barclay is from Pennington in July 1676¹⁰; Hector Allen wrote from Leith in January 1677¹¹; Richard Rae, one of the earliest Scots Quaker pioneers¹² and first Quaker prisoner in Aberdeen dispatched a letter to the "dearly beloved Friends in and about Aberdeen"¹³ the same month, to be followed by Gavin Lawrie in February¹⁴ and by George Fox in July¹⁵. Fox's was, however, an encyclical for all the Friends in Scotland. An undated letter from Penn is clearly contemporary with the above. It came to the "Brethren imprisoned at Aberdeen for the testimony of Jesus" in answer to news from George Keith, and Penn is so optimistic that he beholds "the aurora of the day of the Lord over Scotland"¹⁶.

But not only were the prisoners in the Tolbooth recipients. Their output of correspondence and other writing was considerable¹⁷. Gray wrote a beautiful and simple letter of exhortation unto love, consistency, and unity, to the Meeting at Colliehill Mill near Ellon¹⁸ in May 1676¹⁹. Robert Barclay wrote many letters - several to Princess Elizabeth - from the Tolbooth, as well as "Universal Love"²⁰. The first writing by Keith which is certified to have been printed - "A Salutation of Dear and Tender Love", - was written from the same prison in January 1665²¹. He corresponded with Robert Barclay, Henry Moore, and others, and while still a prisoner, wrote "The Way Cast Up" and "The Way to discern the Convictions Motions etc of the Spirit of God", the latter of which was an addendum to "The Way to the City of God" written while he was confined in Edinburgh Tolbooth seven years earlier.²² Although

9. cf Ibid, P.326, and Keith "A Salutation of Dear and Tender Love" (1665) Second letter, P.7; and "Reliquiae Barclaianae" (1870), PP IX-X, - Letter from Keith to Barclay, dated 12-3-1676.

10. Letter I at end of "Most Materiall Passages".

11. Jaffray's "Diary", PP 302-3.

12. cf Barclay's "Apology" (1886), Prop. X, PP 221-2. This allusion may easily be to Rae.

13. Jaffray's "Diary", PP 299-300.

14. Letter 3 at end of "Most Materiall Passages".

15. Letter 4 in Ibid.

16. Letter 2 in Ibid. These examples must only be a part of all the prisoners received.

17. Omitting letters of expostulation and protest to various authorities.

18. v ante, Ch. V, P. 102.

19. "A Short Account of.. George Gray", (1692) PP 27-30. (Another copy is in Jaffray's "Diary", PP 338-9.

20. v ante, Ch. VII, P. 125.

21. Smith's "Catalogue", Vol. II, P. 18.

22. Ibid, P. 21.

no printers name, place or date is assigned to Keith's reply to Henry More's criticisms of his "Immediate Revelation"²³ Professor Nicolson assigns Keith's "Short Observations" to his Aberdeen Tolbooth days²⁴. Alexander Skene wrote his Preface and Postscript to Keith's "Way Cast Up"; Patrick Livingstone his "Goodwill to the People in and about Aberdeen" a little later; and Andrew Jaffray his two Exhortations with Warnings to Aberdeen²⁵.

It may be assumed that the Quaker prisoners in the Tolbooth of Aberdeen, like Swinton in Edinburgh Castle, lost no opportunity of preaching the Inner Light to their fellow prisoners. But no prison walls could circumscribe their audience. This, together with Melville's failure incited Provost Skene and Bailie Burnett to the harshest measures they could adopt, although the other Magistrates would not wholly concur²⁶. As a deputy to the Privy Council Commission then in session, Burnett so inveighed against the offensiveness of Friends' preaching from the Tolbooth windows to the populace below that the Commissioners ordered the removal of five of their chief spokesmen to the Chapel Prison outside the City. But Skene and Burnett in the suspicion that this might only relieve the prisoners' hardships, delayed it, and nailed up the windows of the Higher Prison. At last, however, they carried out the Commission's order, but substituted David Barclay for Livingstone in the quintette. At the same time they removed other seven to the severer conditions of the Upper Gaol²⁷.

The first party were not confined in the Chapel Prison proper, but in a dark, exposed, and caged annexe where the most ordinary humanitarian instincts of the turnkey were roughly censured by the Provost²⁸. The Upper Tolbooth party, however, were in a harsher environment still, so huddled together in the most suffocating and insanitary conditions with every window boarded up, that when another batch of Quaker worshippers returned to the Tolbooth, they could not be crushed into the Higher Prison but were accomodated with the debtors in the vaults below. Even in the face of medical warning, Burnett swore he would pack the Quakers like salmon in a barrel, or as close as the fingers on his hands²⁹.

These cruelties and indignities, however, were not received with passivity or silent acquiescence either by the prisoners or their friends outside. One of the commonest grounds upon which they were persecuted was that they were secret Romanists or dangerous Jesuits in disguise, and in 1675, Keith replied in

23. Ibid, PP 22, 919.

24. "Conway Letters, 1642-1684" (1930), P.435.

25. v infra, PP 162, 164.

26. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 39-40. cf Besse's "Sufferings" (1753), Vol.II, P.519. This was not the only instance of Burnett's highhandedness, cf R.P.C.S, 3rd Series, Vol.VI, PP 26-7.

27. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 40-42.

28. Ibid, P.42.

29. Ibid, PP 42-43.

"Quakerism no Popery" to John Menzies, one of the foremost champions of this view. A vigorous series of 'open letters' followed to various people. In May 1676, Gray addressed "a Warning to the Priests of Aberdene" following the usual lines of the Quaker diatribe against a paid and trained Ministry, and concluding with a protest against the Aberdeen Clergy's contention that Grace is not a 'sine qua non' of any Christian Ministry³⁰. In March 1677, three other epistles appeared almost simultaneously. One to Provost Skene, which is anonymous and dateless - though the date can't be mistaken -, protests against the use of his powers as Chief Magistrate in overcrowding the prisoners as the law did not require³¹. The second is Robert Barclay's letter to Archbishop Sharpe³², who to the Quakers as to others was the quintessence of 'spiritual wickedness in high places' and whom the Aberdeen Friends held as chiefly responsible for their afflictions and bonds through his malign influence with both civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and through his hindrance of any favourable answer from the Privy Council to the Friends' Address. The latter, however, had no sympathy with the mode of his death "by the cruell Presbiterians in fyffe"³³. Towards the end of Barclay's letter there is a sinister prediction amounting almost to a prophecy of his assassination on Magus Muir "by thy other antagonists"³⁴. The third epistle written on the last day of March was "a Word of Warning to the Magistrats and inhabitants of Aberdene" from Lillias Skene in which she urges the bankruptcy of the policy of persecution and enters her protest against "these cold nasty stinking holes, where ye have shut them up" away from the families who "deeply suffer" with them³⁵.

In May, Andrew Jaffray issued the first of his "Serious Exhortations" to the Magistrates and inhabitants of Aberdeen and its purlieus, deprecating the Church's teaching in opposition to the Quaker doctrine of Perfectionism and calling on them to cease persecution of "the work and servants of the Lord".

Meanwhile in April 1677, the Privy Council sat again at Ellon, but Burnett's pretext for the inhuman overcrowding and other hardships not being accepted as satisfactory in the face of other evidence, the Commissioners, in an adroit attempt to serve both masters, ordered the removal to the Tolbooth of Banff of nine Friends including Robert Barclay, Keith, and Livingstone. At the same time the Lords decreed that David Barclay, Alexander Skene, Robert Burnett of Lethendy, Gellie and Jaffray be under 'open arrest' in their respective estates and parishes and forbidden to

30. "A Short Account of George Gray, etc" (1692), PP 21-6.

31. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 44-45. / 32. Ibid, PP 52-5.

33. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.19. cf ante, Ch. VII, P. 126.

34. Alongside of this may be set an eerie experience which Robert Barclay and his sister-in-law had at Craill one early morning on their way to Edinburgh, only a few days before the murder. An unearthly howling noise kept breaking forth from the Church, but ceased on investigation. Law vouches for the authenticity of this weird phenomenon. (v "Memorials", (1818) P.148, n.)

35. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 45-9.

house or attend any illegal conventicles³⁶. The five accepted their liberty, but refused to commit themselves to any such restrictions. But the transference of the other nine to the Sheriff of Banff was held in abeyance by Barclay's letter to Sharpe, and by the Aberdeen Friends' appeal to the Lords of the Privy Council in Edinburgh, setting forth their sufferings during the previous year by spoliation and the harshest conditions of imprisonment, and craving release by the Council³⁷.

In response to this Petition, the Lords issued through Rothes an Order in Council to their Northern Commissioners dated the 4th April, requiring a report on the prisoners and their distraintments by 1st May and instructing the Magistrates of Aberdeen ad interim to secure them fit accommodation³⁸. The Order in Council produced an extraordinary situation of confusion at Aberdeen, in which the Magistrates were at loggerheads with the Deputy-Sheriff, the former insisting that the Commissioners' order for the removal of the prisoners to the Tolbooth of Banff should be carried out; the latter contending that the Order in Council superseded the Commissioners' authority and must have priority. As each party grappled legally with the other and neither would handle the prisoners, Robert Barclay, Keith and four others went before a Notary Public and succeeded in establishing their claim to freedom³⁹. In respect, however, of those prisoners, who perforce remained in the Tolbooth, the Magistrates continued to defy the Privy Council's Order, and Walker, the Officer to the Provost, even forbade the occupants of the Lower Prison to give any Quakers access, so that Gerrard, who was the bearer of the Address to the Privy Council lodged another protest against the Magistrates before Mowatt the Notary⁴⁰. For answer, the Magistrates joined forces with the six Commissioners and wrote to the Council defaming the Quakers, and demanding that the Council should not hear Barclay or others who had gone on the prisoners' behalf to Edinburgh.

To make confusion worse confounded, the Diocesan Synod, then convened at Aberdeen, was stung into active participation with the Magistrates and Commissioners. It seems that several members of 'the cloth' were seen from the Tolbooth windows visibly the worse of liquor in the streets below, and the Quakers were not slow to press home among the populace outside the inconsistency of their own imprisonment with the indecorous conduct of the Clergy. This public rebuke so enraged Churchmen that several wrote direct to the Privy Council against the Friends, and the Magistrates solicited the active help of Archbishop Sharpe. The concerted onset of all these forces resulted in the Council giving way and

36. Ibid, PP 50-1. (John Barclay suggests that this relief may have been due partly to the King's recommendation to the Privy Council through Lauderdale, but this is doubtful.)

37. Ibid, PP 55-6.

38. Ibid, PP 56-7. cf R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol.V, P.148.

39. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 56-7. cf Besse's "Sufferings", (1753) P.528.

40. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 58-9, 61-3.

remitting the whole business of the Quaker prisoners again to the Northern Commissioners⁴¹, whom It urged to continue "suppressing the saids disorders and to be carefull that the Acts of Parliament be putt in execution...specially against those who are ringleaders and men of note of the saids quakers". Barclay and Keith were ordered to be reimprisoned, but it is doubtful if this was carried out. The Council at the same time pacified the Magistrates of Aberdeen.⁴²

On the 16th May, three Commissioners, the Earl of Errol, Sir George Keith, and Sir Patrick Ogilvie of Aboyne, met at Aberdeen and naturally ratified and expedited the delayed sentence against the Friends⁴³. A very temporary lull in the persecution was however, at hand. The Deputy-Sheriff, John Forbes, who was responsible for the delivery of the prisoners to the authorities at Banff, had no love of such measures, and the guard, interpreting liberally his orders to treat the Quakers with every consideration on their journey thither, even allowed them to visit their friends and to hold religious meetings on route, at which some of the escort themselves were converted to the Inner Light. The reception of the prisoners by the Bailies of Banff was more like the welcome of honoured visitors than the admission of prisoners, neither did the Magistrates rest till they had procured their release through the Sheriff and Commissioners. Very reluctantly and from motives of expediency the Provost of Aberdeen made a gesture of simulated leniency by releasing all the others remaining in the Tolbooth⁴⁴, their leaders being already at liberty from Banff or through Robert Barclay's successful suit.

But the Quakers gloried in tribulation⁴⁵ and any freedom granted was to them only a new incentive to 'suffer for righteousness' sake'. And Skene's umbrage against them had not abated. The spark to the tinder was supplied by Andrew Jaffray who almost as soon as he was discharged performed, half-clad, a very offensive acted parable in the streets of Aberdeen on Market Day as a symbol of the sin and abomination of the religious ordinances of a persecuting and vice-condoning Clergy and people to Almighty God. For this and for scattering copies of his first "Serious Exhortation" at the Market Cross, he was quickly haled again to prison⁴⁶. From the Tolbooth he wrote a second "Warning and Serious Exhortation"⁴⁶ on the 6th June expounding the meaning of his acted parable, and pleading justification of his 'folly for Christ's sake' as a solicitous warning to all to repentance and amendment. Jaffray however, was to live to win the affection and veneration of the citizens in these same streets of Aberdeen⁴⁸

41. Ibid, PP 64, 68.

42. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol V, P.159.

43. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 69-70. (For text of this confirmatory order of Besse's "Sufferings", Vol.II, P.530.)

44. Ibid, PP 72-74, 71.

45. cf "Salutation of Dear and Tender Love" (Letter 2, P.7.)

46. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 74-5, and "A Serious and Earnest Exhortation..to the People of Aberdeen"; (1677) P.4 note.cf Jaffray's "Diary", PP 314-5, and "Thomas Kirk's Tour in Scotland 1677" (1892), P.22.

47. Both these "Exhortations" are included in the above as given by Smith. "Catalogue", vol.II, P.6.)

Jaffray's imprisonment was followed by another series of arrests of his friends and colleagues at their Meetings. During June, thirteen were "thronged up" into the Tolbooth, including David Barclay, Livingstone, Gray, and Gerrard. In September two other Quakers were committed; in October, ten including Seaton, who had been rearrested, John Watson, a Cumberland Friend⁴⁹ and James Findlay, a West-Country visiting Friend. Gerrard, who was liberated and had left Aberdeen temporarily, was in his absence distracted for the burial of his dead child in the Gallowgate ground, and on his return home was summarily apprehended in November⁵⁰.

Owing to a big gap in Skene's "Breiff Historicall Account" from 1676-1679⁵¹, there are not many details extant of the persecution from then until the Friends' liberation two years later. Livingstone, Gray and Jaffray were particularly active in preaching to the populace out of their prison windows especially on Market days, which so incensed the Magistrates that Baillie Burnett had them thrown into the Iron House, a close vaulted chamber in the roof of the Tolbooth which was used as the condemned cell for murderers and dangerous felons. It had no light or air except through a long hole in the massive wall, which was largely blocked by a double grating. It was alive with white maggots and other vermin. In this foetid 'thieves' hole', the three Quakers were confined for several weeks through the heat of the summer of 1678, but although they were four or five storeys above the street, Jaffray and Gray were able to make themselves heard to a steadily growing audience below⁵². At length the authorities realising that the Iron House did nothing to serve their ends⁵³ sent the brave trio back to the Lower Gaol. Patrick Livingstone's voice not being able from the Iron House to rise above the din of bartering in the Market Place below, so that the people could hear him, he put the burden of his message into a pamphlet addressed to the inhabitants of Aberdeen, especially the "great plenty of people"⁵⁴ outside the prison windows, and entitled "Good Will to the People in and about Aberdeen". In the same year, the City Council, following the example of Edinburgh, passed an addendum to their Burgess Act of 1675 requiring from all new Freemen on their admission an oath that they would profess and maintain the Protestant Faith as then held and authorised by the Church of Scotland, denying Popery and Quakerism, and all other heresies⁵⁵.

But the end of the official civil persecution in Aberdeen was not far away. In 1679, Sharpe, Meldrum, Menzies, Mitchell, and the Chancellor, the Laird of Haddo, the last of whom had fought in vain in the Privy Council to have the Meeting House and School at Kinmuck razed to the ground⁵⁶ all died or were

49. F.P.T. (1907), P. 53.

50. "Most Materiall Passages" PP 75, 78. / 51. P. 18.

52. "Most Materiall Passages", PP 78-9. L.A. Barclay's "Selections from the Writings of Livingstone etc" (1847) PP 10, 14.

53. cf Ibid, PP 200-2. (Livingstone's Letter to Burnett defying him to do his worst against the Friends) / 54. Ibid, P. 189.

55. "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen 1643-1747" (1872) P. 299.

56. Skene's "A Breiff Historicall Account", P. 19, and v post, Ch. XVII, P. 322.

suspended from office. In the meantime, Robert Barclay, who had been absent from Aberdeen since he regained his liberty, had not been idle, and what he failed to effect on the Tolbooth and Chapel Prisoners' behalf before the Privy Council in Edinburgh, he succeeded in accomplishing through his influence in Royal and Court circles. By 1679. James, Duke of York, with whom Barclay was becoming increasingly intimate, was a member of the Scots Privy Council, albeit an unconstitutional one, and in his frequent visits to Holyrood, the Quaker Leader kept his Royal Highness informed of the suffering of the Friends. There can be little doubt but that the Duke of York talked or wrote to Lauderdale in a style which Maitland could at last understand, and that it was very largely through James's influence, strong though not wholly disinterested, that official and organised persecution of the Society by Council and Magistrate came to an end in Aberdeen. For in the loyal address to King James in 1687, presented by Barclay from 60 Aberdeen Friends at the time of the King's Declaration of Indulgence, Barclay attributed the opening of the prison doors in 1679 to his Royal influence with the Government of that country⁵⁸. A third reason for the cessation of civil persecution was doubtless that the Quakers' tenacity, patience and ceaseless moral resistance even with the presence of apostates within the camp had wearied out the exertions of the Authorities to crush them⁵⁹. On 4th November, seventeen of the Aberdeen Friends were taken to prison for the last time from their Meeting for worship and released in three hours⁶⁰.

Thus ended a story of sufferings which in Munro's words "forms neither an entertaining nor creditable chapter in local history"⁶¹. The only exception to the cessation of civil persecution was that under the Burgess Oath, which continued till 1714. In 1699, Alexander Galloway was fined £20. Scots by Baillie Ragg for carrying on his business after being disqualified as a burgher⁶².

With the exception of Livingstone, who, considering his witness in Scotland was now accomplished, returned to England⁶³, the Aberdeen Quakers resumed their full Monthly Meetings early in 1680⁶⁴. In the previous December, Robert Barclay wrote to Fox from Edinburgh, giving him the welcome news and suggesting that if the Generalissimo could come North in the Spring, it would be a

57. cf ante, Ch. VII, PP. 127-8.

58. The Address recorded in the Minutes of Aberdeen M.M. is given in J.F.H.S. Vol. VIII, PP 63-4.

59. Skene's "A Breiff Historicall Account", P.20; and Bevan's "A Short Account of Robert Barclay", (1802) P.57

60. "Most Materiall Passages", P.81.

61. "Memorials of the Aldermen, Provosts, and Lord Provosts of Aberdeen" (1897), P.179. cf Barclay's "Apology" (1886), Prop. XIV, P.357.

62. "Extract Complaint of the Dean of Guild Aberdeen 1699" (Aber. Bundle of MSS, No.65 (1))

63. "Most Materiall Passages", P.77. Livingstone lived at Nottingham and London. He died in Kensington in June 1694.

64. "Records of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting" in J.F.H.S. Vol VIII, P.55.

great help to the Scots Friends in the inevitable problems of a transition period, for "several things go cross and are so now in divers places; and I know no man's presence could so easily remedy it as thine"⁶⁵. What effect such a visit from Fox might have had on the whole future of the Movement in Scotland it is idle to speculate, but it was not to be.

65; Barclay's "Letters etc. of Early Friends"(1841), P.258; Webb "The Fells of Swarthmore Hall"(1867), PP 279-80.

CHAPTER XIII."GEORGE KEITH".

A good many incidental references have already been made to George Keith, but it is necessary now to give some further account of his Scottish and Quaker days, and to form some estimate of the strength and weakness of his remarkable personality and gifts.

Keith was born near Aberdeen, probably about the year 1638/9. He was a contemporary of Gilbert Burnet, the future historian and Bishop of Salisbury¹ at Marischal College, Aberdeen, where he graduated Master of Arts after a course marked by distinction in Oriental Languages, Philosophy and Mathematics. Designed for the Scottish Ministry, he was apparently not ordained, but for some time held a post as tutor and chaplain in a noble family. Besse designates him as a Portioner or small landholder of Biedlestown². There is no direct evidence of how or when he was first drawn to Quakerism³, or that he was convinced by Dewsbury. In a letter to Anne, Viscountess Conway of Ragley, Warwickshire, dated 14th July 1671, Henry More, the Cambridge Platonist, wrote that "a sober person, a Bishop's son in Scotland told me that George Keith says that the reading of my 'Mystery of Godliness' first turned him a Quaker"⁴. If there is any truth in the report, we may conjecture that the Bishop's son was probably Henry Scougal afterwards the author of "The Life of God in the Soul of Man"⁵. "The Mystery of Godliness" was published in 1660, and More confesses to a suspicion that Keith had read the book, though unfortunately, he thought, not to his greatest profit⁶. All that is certain is that Keith became convinced about 1662 or 1663, for in the latter year when he returned from the Borders, he was already in the Society⁷, and in 1664 suffered his first imprisonment in the Tolbooth of Aberdeen. After a shorter imprisonment in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh in 1666, he was back in his home City, vigorously replying to the Bishops Thirty Queries⁸ in the face of Dean of Guild, Alexander Skene.

After Robert Barclay's convincement in 1667, Keith, who was about ten years his senior and an even riper scholar, ran in double harness with the Apologist for more than a decade. Both had been born and reared in the atmosphere and tenets of Calvinistic Theology, and it will be necessary to note in a subsequent chapter something of how Keith reacted on Barclay and what he contributed to the Apology.

1. "History of his own Time" (1883), P. 670.

2. "Sufferings" (1753), Vol. II, P. 508.

3. Unless perhaps by Grave, Burnyeat, or Dewsbury, prior to 1660; cf ante, Ch. III, PP 87, 91.

4. Nicolson "Conway Letters" (1930), P. 341. cf Henderson, "Mystics of the North-East"¹⁸

5. cf "Truth's Defence" (1682), P. 72. Bishop Burnet reissued with Preface¹⁸ "The Life of God" in 1691, which Pinkerton characterised as "a work of eminent piety without enthusiasm".

6. Nicolson "Conway Letters" (1930), P. 341. / 7. cf ante, Ch. IV, P. 93.

8. v ante, Ch. IV, P. 96. Smith doubts if this reply was ever printed I have been unable to trace any copy of it.

Keith's activities were mainly local up to the public Debate at Harper's Close in 1675, during and after which he bore his full share of malignment along with the other Friends, although the students had avowed themselves free of "personal criminations".⁹ Later in the year he was in England, and it was about this time that Keith's important and fateful friendship with Viscountess Conway, daughter of The Speaker and sister of Lord Chancellor Finch; also with Doctor Henry More and the Neo-Platonist circle began to develop apace. When Keith first met Lady Conway remains uncertain, but he¹⁰ was not infrequently a guest at Ragley for considerable periods as was also Robert Barclay. She was perhaps the most erudite and intellectual woman of her day in England¹¹, 'prima inter pares' of a brilliant family. A born philosopher and metaphysician, she could weigh, appraise and analyse any system of theological or philosophical teaching with a mind singularly free of bigotry or sectarian bias, and she first became deeply impressed with the general soundness and sufficiency of Quaker doctrine through reading the controversial works of the early Friends.

This strong predisposition was reinforced by her acquaintance with the most notable leaders of the Society, and the high level of consistency of their teaching with their lives which she experienced. Then began the splendid, solicitous and most courtly struggle between Lady Conway and More, each striving to save the other's soul. More had no great love, much less enthusiasm for the "prodigiously melancholy" Quakers. Fox he couldn't abide¹². But he made an exception of Penn. for whom he had a great liking and admiration as a worthy antagonist, and in his writings he found much that was "very sober" and "very nobly Christian"¹³. More realised how much ground there was common to Neo-Platonism and the Inner Light, and went so far as to say with a qualification that "the Quakers' Principle is the most Safe and Seasonable here, to keep close to the Light within a Man"¹⁴, but deplored the eccentricities and worse which marred "those excellent things they profess".

In doctrine More's chief cleavage from Quakerism -or perhaps it would be truer to say from George Keith - was not on account of his suspicion of their strong "Familist" opinions and sympathies, but on Christology, Keith was then expounding to Lady Conway at Ragley his doctrine of the Incarnation, "the extension of the soul of Christ" or the projection of Christ as man into the World still, which was set forth a little later in "The Way Cast Up"¹⁵.

9. "Quakerism Confirmed" (in "Truth Triumphant", Vol. III, P. 89)

10. "Conway Letters", P. 407. etc: Folio Sheet reprinted also in J.F.H.S VII, PP 49-51; cf Shorthouse "John Inglesant", (1902) Ch. XV, where Ragley is Oulton, Lady Conway is Lady Cardiff, etc. The picture of Lady Conway is none too favourable. (Chs. XVII, and XV.)

11. F.Q.E. (1874) P. 198. Art. by S.H. Steevens on "Anne, Viscountess Conway" (1902) P. 189.

12. Ward's "Life", PP 193-7, 201. cf "John Inglesant",

13. Ward's "Life", P. 349. (Letter to Penn.)

14. Ibid, P. 247. cf Art by Tallack in F.Q.E. Vol. 23, PP 187-199. (1889).

15. 1677. Sections X to XII, PP 123-146 partim. cf "The Way to the City of God", PP. 128 ff.

Simultaneously, Keith and More were carrying on a correspondence on the subject, with which Lady Conway kept herself closely informed, and while More's replies to her overture¹⁶ to weigh Keith's position carefully served for the moment to make her hesitate somewhat¹⁷ they did not arrest her imminent conversion to the Inner Light, especially as she was clear that it had consciously at least, nothing to do with "The Family of Love", which she also detested as having "many bad people amongst them"¹⁸. In spite of all that More could advance, she wrote, "I must professe y^t my converse wth them is upon a contrary account to receive health and refreshment from y^m."¹⁹ Viscountess Conway's conviction was a severe blow to the learned Doctor, and though his first reaction was to launch an attack against the "crooked and perverse teaching of Quakerism", he maintained to the last his friendship with "that incomparable Person"²⁰ who had proved herself so signally his match²¹.

During all her married life, Lady Conway had very poor health, and suffered frequently from acute neuritis. With none did she find such community of brave and patient affliction or so quiet and restful fellowship as with the Friends, and this comforting intercourse moved her heart irresistably to Quakerism²². But on the intellectual side, she certainly owed her conviction principally to Keith, her closest Quaker friend and mentor, indeed almost her confessor. Her circle included Penn²³, Isaac Pennington, three of whose letters to her are preserved²⁴, and Robert Barclay whom she assisted to build the Meeting House in Aberdeen.

From 1675/6, till 1679, except for the journey to Holland and Germany, Keith was in and out of prison with his comrades at Aberdeen, bearing a strenuous witness with his pen and influence, and taking his full share of hardship and trial even to the last three hours in the Tolbooth in November 1679²⁵. In the previous February, Viscountess Conway had died, and from about 1682 began his complicated and stormy transition period out of whose ferment at last came George Keith, Quaker, Separatist, and finally Anglican Priest.

16. "Conway Letters," P. 408.

17. Ibid.

18. cf however, Barclay's "Religious Societies of the Commonwealth", (1879) P.26.

19. "Conway Letters," P.421, and J.F.H.S. Vol VII, P.53.

20. Ward's "Life", P.203. cf "The Gentleman's Magazine" (Nov. 1906.), PP 469-470.

21. Some light on the curious misunderstanding of the Aberdeen students that the Friends claimed More as one of the "Society is given in 'Quakerism Canvassed' (1675), P.66, and 'Conway Letters', P.425 and 425n. cf also 'Conway Letters', P.409 and J.F.H.S.VII, P.51.

22. "Conway Letters", P.421-2.

23. Ibid, PP 408-9.

24. "Letters of Isaac Pennington", (Barclay's Ed, 1828) PP 125, 128, 250.

25. Besse's "Sufferings", (1753) Vol.II, P.533.

It is one of the queer ironies of history that the seeds of Keith's defection and final apostasy should have been sown at Ragley, the very scene of the conviction of his noble convert. More, it seems, spent most of his time, outside of Christ's, at Ragley, not only in high intercourse with Lady Conway but in the solitude of its famous woods to which he owed considerable portions of his learned works²⁶. There, as in Cambridge less frequently, Keith was from time to time thrown across his path. The other disintegrating influence upon Keith's mind and life was the Viscountess's friend and private physician, Baron Francis Mercurius Van Helmont, a strange intellectual Bohemian, half wizard and half philosopher, who dabbled in magic and science, a sort of 'medicin malgre lui'²⁷. Keith's position as the most philosophical among the Friends, was unique. Assuming some truth at any rate in the report that More's "Mystery of Godliness" brought him into the Quaker fold, Keith must have had many opportunities at Ragley of having his strange misinterpretation of More's treatise insidiously undermined and modified, while in contact with Van Helmont's fixed belief in the transmigration of souls, and the profound problems which Neo-Platonism, as expounded by More and others, threw up, Keith's Quaker foundations began to rock gently, almost imperceptibly at first.

More's criticism of the limitations and metaphysics of the Inner Light was the more subtle and dangerous because the Doctor was fully aware of everything that could be urged in its favour, and agreed and sympathised with much of the Quaker system, whereas purely iconoclastic judgement would have entrenched Keith more deeply than ever. Thus in these long conversations at Ragley, he was led to examine too precisely and from other angles the meaning of terms and concepts which Quakerism constantly used, "revelation", "spirit" and the like; and a critical reading of his later apostate attacks on his former faith, as "The Deism of William Penn" and "Reasons for Renouncing Quakerism and entering into Communion with the Church of England", can hardly fail to leave one convinced that the real beginnings of this revolutionary change were made at Ragley and in correspondence with More. Thus was the strange cycle of irony and fate completed, and the converter was himself being almost unconsciously converted. The man who lured him in was the man who lured him out.

For the next decade or so to the beginning of his American period, his orthodoxy was outwardly unchallenged, though secretly in some quarters not above suspicion. Croese holds, not without reason that Keith believed in the transmigration of souls but did not openly avow it²⁸. Keith had private schools for a short period at Edmonton and then at Theobalds. In 1684, he was

26. Ward's "Life", P.202.

27. "The Gentleman's Magazine", Nov. 1906. PP 466-472; "John Inglesant", CHs.XV and XVII partim. etc.

28. "General History of the Quakers"(1696), Book II, Part II, PP 38-40.

imprisoned for five months in Newgate for refusing to swear²⁹. He emigrated to New Jersey the same year as Surveyor-General where he remained about five years. In 1689, he settled as a schoolmaster at Philadelphia, and that was the turning point in his meteoric career and the beginning of the Separation. There were three great schisms in the history of Quakerism - the Wilkinson-Story; the Keithian; and the Hicksite. Of these the saddest and the most needless was the Keithian³⁰. The literature and sources relative to Keith from his apostasy onwards occupy no fewer than twenty-five pages in Smith's "Catalogue" and "Supplement"³¹.

After his release from Newgate, Keith's patience under the persecution of the Friends seems to have become exhausted, and shaking the dust of England off his feet, he sailed for the land of liberty. Although the orientation of his mind was quickly changing now, he was still esteemed as a Friend when he was chosen by the American Quakers for the post at Philadelphia. He even defended openly the principles of the Society against Cotton Mather^{31A} and the Presbyterian and Independent Churches of New England. But the death of Fox and Barclay in 1690 left no one in his own judgement as a rival to himself for World leadership,³² and the lack of instant and confident recognition of this tacit claim embittered him still more. His whole position, temper and bearing were already becoming suspect and causing much uneasiness. According to Sewell, special exception was taken to his doctrine of the transmigration of souls which 'willed out'³³. From that point, the breach widened rapidly. Keith took up a censorious attitude to much that seemed to him unsound and illegitimate in American Quaker discipline and teaching. He attacked the American Friends for teaching the all-sufficiency of the Inner Light for salvation and allegorising³⁴ the whole of Christ's earthly life and sufferings and his Resurrection as a representation of the Christian's experience and mission, to the denial of his actual manhood. This, the Friends denied. Some retaliated by charging him with preaching two Christs as conjointly necessary to salvation, the position which he had reached from his doctrine of "the extension of the soul of Christ" by which, as Lady Conway wrote to More, he attributed "more to the externall Person of our Saviour than I think any ever hath done"³⁵. Things went from bad to worse, and Keith not content to confine his passion and controversy to the religious sphere, invaded the political, sank to hurling opprobrious personalities at Deputy-Governor Lloyd and other magistrates³⁶

29. Besse's "Sufferings" (1753), Vol. I, P. 473.

30. This part of Keith's career lies outwith the scope of the present Thesis, except for one or two passing references and will be dealt with very briefly. It is, however, not the least interesting part of his life.

31. PP 24-50 and 211-12 respectively.

31A A friend of Woodrow. For a letter from the latter on his "History of the Sufferings," just published, v "Correspondence" Vol III p 18.

32. Penn, hopelessly entangled politically, was 'sub umbra' and absconded.

33. "History" (1811), Vol. II, P. 493. Nearly all Sewell's references are to his apostate days.

34. cf Burnet's "History of his own Times" (1883), P. 670.

35. cf "A Serious Call to the Quakers..to return to Christianity," (1706)

36. Sewell's Sect. 4 "History" (1811), Vol. II, P. 494.

in his clash with them, and generally made himself obnoxious to all except the considerable section of sympathisers he gathered together.

After the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting had disowned him, he organised these into the body known as "The Christian Quakers" and commenced a sort of itinerary Agapé, "a consolatory repast from house to house"³⁷. Although this Agapé did not exceed or clash with Barclay's view of its legitimate use³⁸, it may almost be interpreted as one of the foregleams of his final separation from the Society³⁹. In vain, James Dickinson, who had come out with Wilson from England, contended publicly with Keith at Philadelphia⁴⁰; in vain did his old friends at Aberdeen try 'to make sorry with a letter' "our ancient Friends George and Elizabeth Keith", entreating them for the sake of the best in their Scottish past to heal the breaches in the saddened ranks.⁴¹ Early in 1694, Keith was glad to leave America, and carried the controversy to England. The London Yearly Meeting which lasted this year for 14 days gave him a most patient hearing and every justice, but reached the verdict that the fault lay at his door. They required him to call in all his works in which the Society had been calumniated, or publish his disavowal, and to use every sincere endeavour to heal the open ragged wound⁴². Things looked hopeful, but before the next Yearly Meeting any expectation of a settlement was virtually shattered by his conduct in the interval, and at the Meeting itself Keith appeared in so truculent a mood and so intractable a frame of mind that the members concluded that the limit had been reached, and unanimously agreed to confirm the judgement of the Friends at Philadelphia and disown him⁴³. He in turn "disowned" the Society and set up a Meeting at Turner's Hall, preaching vigorously against the Quakers while retaining their dress and speech and administering the Sacraments. In 1700 he sent to the Aberdeen Friends a copy of his "Deism of William Penn";- "which I desire you to read impartially and without prejudice" - with a covering letter of "very serious and Christian Expostulation with his old Friends", in which he prays that their eyes may be opened! That same year he entered the Church of England, and after he returned from another visit to America where he had served as one of the first Missionaries of the S.P.G., he was presented by Tenison, the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1704 to the living of Edburton in Sussex where he died in poverty in 1716. The tradition of Keith repenting on his deathbed of having ever left the Society of Friends must still be considered as lacking sufficient reliable evidence. Keith's last days were certainly not altogether ways of pleasantness or paths

-
37. Fell Smith's "Stephen Crisp and his Correspondents", (1892) P.12. and "The Presbyterian.. Churches in New England.. Brought to the Test" (1691), PP 187, 188. / 38. "Apology", (1886) Prop. XIII, Sect. 8. Barclay of Relgate thinks that some sort of Agapé must have existed in the very early days of the Society (cf "Inner Life" P375) or perhaps all along at Aberdeen or elsewhere. (Ibid, PP 376-7.)
39. For other latent tendencies of Keith to Separation. v "The Way Cast Up", Sect I, P.8.; P.15. / 40. Chalk's "Journals of Thos. Wilson and James Dickinson", (1847) PP 29-30.
41. Hodgson's "Historical Memoirs" PP 311-2. / 42. MS Minutes of L.Y.M Vol. II (1694, Euston), PP 54-5. / 43. MS Minutes of L.Y.M. Vol. II (1695, Euston), PP 91-4. cf D.N.B. Art. "George Keith", Vol. XXX. P.320.

of peace⁴⁴.

Keith's spiritual pilgrimage was that of a man of extraordinary religious enthusiasm and brilliant intellectual gifts, but lacking in ballast. For almost the whole of the Restoration-to-Revolution Period he was one of the four corner pillars of World Quakerism, the others being Fox, Penn, and Robert Barclay, and the most versatile if not, as Burnet thought⁴⁵ the most learned of them all. In controversial power he was easily the foremost. Barclay and Penn were more solid, but Keith was more agile and dexterous. He could snatch his weapons for his slashing returns out of almost any armoury and make his opponents' darts ricochet back upon themselves⁴⁶. His very brilliance kept him an intellectual explorer in spite of himself, and to this extent he had always about him a certain disloyalty to circumscribed systems and fixed opinions, although he was almost unconscious of it except in his crises of transition. His perennial love of learning and sense of its value which are constantly apparent in his writings, his reported debates, and his intercourse with some of the foremost savants and literati of his day, never made his attitude to, and use of, book learning and academic training entirely consistent with the common Quaker view of these things, even in his Ministry. He tried to persuade himself that his ability and education were very ordinary and nothing to boast about⁴⁷, but that did not rob him of the consciousness that he could use his learning to telling advantage to refute or to discredit an opponent. Keith cannot be called a representative Quaker; he was too philosophical to be true to type, and of Barclay the same thing may be said, perhaps in lesser degree.

Nor was Keith the quintessence of Quakerism theologically all along. He never shook himself entirely free of the vestigia of his early Presbyterianism, and although he "was too much leavened with the Errors of Quakerism", yet "I thank God I never had the worst of their Errors nor ever denied any of the Fundamentals of Christianity as they have done"⁴⁸. Indeed, as Braithwaite points out⁴⁹, the religious experience of the Inner Light among certain of the Scots Friends was never what might be called "standardised". There was too much latent Calvinism in their blood for the Inner Light to dominate their whole experience as completely as that of English converts from among the Seekers and the Independents. Keith was perhaps the least mystical of all the leading Friends. His acceptance of Quakerism and Barclay's also, differed from the customary one in this that while the latter

- of "Second
Period of Quak-
erism", P 334.
44. v Smith's "Catalogue", Vol. II, P. 43 (Addendum to Keith's Will).
cf "The Friend", Vol. X, P. 3. — A bitter ex-parte MS of Snashall
reprinted, about the last years and death of "this miserable
creature" George Keith.
45. "History of his own Time" (1883), P. 670. Burnet's estimate of
Keith's connection with the Society - 36 years - is however
excessive. / 46. E.g. "Truth's Defence", (1682) P. 35, 37, 39 etc.
47. "Quakerism No Popery" (1675), PP 4-5.
v "Truth's Defence" (1682), P. 69. / 48. Postscript to "A Serious
Call to the Quakers" (1706). cf Keith's "Letter to the Quakers in
Aberdeen" (1700), in which he blesses God "for preserving me sound
in the Truth".

was a reinterpretation de novo of apostolic and primitive Christianity, owing nothing consciously at least to the theological accretions of later centuries, theirs was a thorough-going effectuation to its logical conclusion of an inadequate and partial Reformation, though not out of harmony with all that they considered sound and sufficient in Protestant doctrine and practice. This different way of approach made Keith's fervent adoption of Quakerism a long spiritual "fancy", an acquired religious taste, one of a series of soul-attitudes and mental reactions rather than a growth into an esoteric Faith. The wonder is that his Quakerism took such deep root and lasted so long, but while there is no reason to doubt its self-sacrificing sincerity, it must be admitted that there ran through it all "a thread of attachment to the exteriors of belief and practice which after his first enthusiasm really determined his course"⁵⁰.

Keith vigorously defended the honest sincerity of his change of beliefs and denied all lower motives in joining the Communion of the Church of England.⁵¹ He may have regarded England as a more strategic centre for attacking the system of his old colleagues and followers than Scotland, which it certainly was, for while Quakerism was still a force to be reckoned with in the former in 1700, it was already showing signs of serious decline in the latter. But his choice was immaterial to the Society, and no change would have freed him from the natural Quaker view of his apostasy as due to the pride and self-exaltation which gradually sprang from an unwatchful and deceived heart. That it was a serious blow and undermining influence to the Quaker teaching of Perfectionism was sorrowfully and of necessity recognised⁵², and in its own way it was as damaging to the cause as the case of James Nayler. Keith's reactions were always violent. Even in his early Aberdeen period of Quakerism he had an aggressiveness about him that was uncommon. This quality of "rebound" made him as dangerous an opponent of Quakerism as he had been a fearless and brilliant advocate. He replied to his own earlier works, and along with others did much through his pamphlets and sermons to neutralise the relief and benefit of the Toleration Act for Friends. His examination of the System was much more searching than that of any other Separatist, and at times almost ruthless to the point of unfairness and uncharity. He had deeper insight into its implications and consequences than even J.J. Gurney.

It is just at this point that the Keithian Separation can best be appreciated as a matter of regret not only to the Friends but in the Cause of Religion generally, for he did not make good in the Church of England. The hot temper and the unrepentant

50.D.N.B. Art on Keith, Vol XXX, P.321.

51."Reasons for Entering the Church of England",(1700)PP 6-9.(The arguments is often specious but thin, and some of the "reasons" sound hollow.)

52.e.g. Hodgson "Select Historical Memoirs"(1844),PP 307-8; 314-5. etc.

lack of restraint which he had shown in the Philadelphia controversy led more than anything else to the final destruction of 1695⁵³. Keith there showed a pugnacity and lack of magnanimity which could neither administer corrections or reproofs with brotherliness, nor receive admonitions with meekness and good grace. In the face of either provocation or sharp controversy, he admitted that he "could not contain"⁵⁴, while Henry More confirms the later general view of the Friends in writing Keith down to Lady Conway as early as 1670 as being "so rudely and injudiciously schismaticall"⁵⁵. There was not a world of difference between the beliefs and opinions of the Friends and the "Christian Quakers". "His doctrines in the generall, are, I think, owned by all sound friends", wrote Gouldney to Sir John Rodes before the London Yearly Meeting of 1694⁵⁶. Keith's dissatisfaction with the amount of laxity prevailing in the Society, and his resolution to tighten up discipline and effect certain reforms, were shared largely by Friends in Ireland and the North of England⁵⁷. The proposed changes were sound and timely, and had Keith been a 'persona grata' or even shown as a matter of wise expediency a sweet reasonableness and patient leadership, his constructive criticism and policy would have met in all likelihood with a large measure of success, for "his system contained developments, parts of which have since been adopted or might, in the opinion of some Friends be followed with benefit to-day"⁵⁸. A larger forbearance and wiser diplomacy would have secured to Keith and the Society the most of what he saw was necessary to achieve, and composed outstanding differences still waiting ultimate solution. His aim was right, but his spirit and methods of stampede and the barrack-square were wrong, and so the inevitable happened, when he might have remained the recognised leader of an enriched and stronger Society.

The only orthodox Friend that he seems to have retained any love and regard for was his old comrade Robert Barclay, whose writings he apologised for criticising "as I did greatly love and esteem" him, "who I believe was one of the soundest Writers among the People called Quakers" and in the main "a true Christian". Naturally, of course, he had to class Barclay with himself as being "byassed and misled" by "gross perversions" which they both took on authority for "Divine Inspirations"⁵⁹.

-
53. cf Barclay's "Inner Life of the Religious Societies", (1879) P 375n, and Bownas' letter to Keith, dated August 1702, (v "Life and Travels of Samuel Bownas") (2nd Ed. Reprinted 1895) P.64.
54. Keith's Appendix to Croese's "History" (1696), P.18.
55. "Conway Letters", (1930) P.307.
56. v "Quaker Postbag" (1910), P.57.
57. Braithwaite "Second Period of Quakerism" (1921), P.483. cf "Reasons for Entering the Church of England", P.4.
58. ~~Third~~. Braithwaite's "Second Period of Quakerism", P.483.
59. "The Arguments of the Quakers..Examined and Refuted" (1698) Part I, Sect III, P.4.

CHAPTER XIV.

"GEORGE KEITH'S VIEW OF THE SCOTTISH CHURCH"¹

George Keith is chosen here as expressing more fully and characteristically than any other Quaker writer the Society's views of the structure, authority and polity of the Church of Scotland in the 17th Century, and the common attitude of Friends to its worship and witness. These views are not herewith criticised as a whole or appraised apologetically or dogmatically, but are merely set forth in essence as historical records with occasional comments.

The attitude and spirit of the Church as a whole towards the Quakers and their Faith in this Century was bitter in the extreme. It would have been surprising had it been otherwise. In the battle of invective and defamation the prize must be awarded to Church writings, and some of the Church's is so disagreeable that it hardly bears repetition², but matches English controversial writing at its lowest level of vituperation. In these rough times when the most libellous and violent abuse was the very meat and drink of controversy, the spirit and language of the Scots Quaker writers compare favourably with much of their opponents'; Keith is comparatively well-mannered and Barclay is gentlemanly. But it must be remembered that even at the best the current language of the day was highly coloured, partly by the passions that persecution aroused all round, and partly by identification of the love of one's neighbour with the virtue of speaking plainly to him for his own good !

The Erastian and Conforming section of the Church was by no means indifferent to the growth of Quakerism, as recent Chapters on persecution in Aberdeen and the Mearns have shown. No less indifferent was the Covenanting Section³, and even in the midst of its own ceaseless persecution it found time to sound the bugle of alarm and disburse anathemas freely. By this "desperate Quakerism", the Church of Christ felt itself troubled and many defiled in this abyss of all abominations⁴. Macquarie cannot understand why people who abjure Prelacy and heresies of all kinds can dare the Almighty by tampering and dallying with it⁵. Let men follow the example of John Livingstone and others, refusing even admittance to any "that hold blasphemous principles", and showing them how offensive they were to Christian nostrils⁶. Let none imagine with a foolish pity that they were only a breed of poor innocents, harmless and well meaning, nor mistake for "purity" their whiteness of leprosy. In truth, the superstition of "that monstrous

-
1. Much of this chapter is cognate to Book III, Ch. 2, post.
 2. E.g. in the Postscript to Rutherford's "Letters", 3rd. Ed., P.258. cf. "The Way Cast Up", P.67.
 3. v post, Book III, Ch. 2.
 4. Poscript to Rutherford's "Letters", 3rd Ed, P.257.
 5. Ibid, P.258.
 6. cf Ibid, P.119, and "The Way Cast Up", PP 74-5.

brood" was "pure devilisme ", allied to the black arts and "hatched in Hell by the Father of Falsehoods and Lies"⁷; a heresy, which was a miasmal quintessence "of almost all the grosse Errors which hitherto have annoyed the Church of God"⁸.

On the Church side, the literature of the controversy was chiefly, Macquare's "Poscript" to the 3rd Edition of Rutherford's Letters; Fleming's "Fulfilling of the Scriptures"⁹; "The Westminster Confession of Faith"; Durham's "Revelation"; and John Alexander's "Examination of the Principles of Jesuitico-Quakerism". On the Quaker side there are principally Keith's "Salutation of Dear and Tender Love"; "Help in Time of Need" with Jaffray's "Preface"; "Immediate Revelation Not Ceased"; "Quakerism No Popery" with Barclay's "Epistle to the Reader"; "The Way Cast Up" with Alexander Skene's "Preface" and "Postscript"; "The Way to the City of God" and "Truth's Defence"; with Stephen Crisp's "Description of the Church of Scotland", written in the year of the Restoration and Lillias Skene's "Expostulatory Letter" to Robert Macquare, written from Newtyle in 1678.¹⁰ Barclay's contröversials will be referred to in a subsequent chapter,

Keith went straight back to the Reformation which he naturally views in a very 'ex parte' way, and from which he culls what seems at least to suit his purpose. For the sake of the anticlimax which he was about to stress at considerable length, he conceded, not altogether reluctantly, that the Reformation produced ecclesiastically some sweeping and most desirable changes, and spiritually an undeniable rise in the barometer of National faith and duty. The "more gross abominations of the Whore were discovered and quit", and many were "accepted of the Lord in that day according to their faithfulness" to the "beams of His heavenly light"¹¹. For much of the moral rigour and religious intensity of "The First Book of Discipline" Keith must have had a real admiration, and had it been passed by the Scots Parliament into law, much of Keith's invective against Ministers, preaching, place-hunting and amoluments might never have seen the light. He eagerly assumed¹² Fleming's¹³ opinion that it reflected great honour on the Nation that princes like Knox and Wishart prophesied by spiritual revelation and were apostolic and "extraordinary instruments" of the Spirit, for it lent weight to his case for the continuity of "Immediate Revelation"¹⁴. But these things only made the Quakers

-
7. Postscript to Rutherford's "Letters," 3rd. Ed., PP 258, 259. cf Hunter, "The Teaching of Calvin" Ch. VIII, P. 149.
 8. Alexander's "Jesuitico-Quakerism" (1680), - "The Preface to the Reader", P. 5, quoted by Keith. ("Truth's Defence", P. 11.)
 9. The "Postscript" is written anonymously, "indeed not without cause", and Keith does not mention Fleming by name.
 10. "Truth Triumphant" (1718), Vol. III, PP. 543 ff.
 11. "A Salutation of Dear and Tender Love" (1665) P. 1.
 12. "Quakerism No Popery" (1675) P. 25.
 13. "Fulfilling of the Scriptures" Vol. I, PP 405 ff, and 388.
 14. cf "Immediate Revelation Not Ceased" (1668) PP 118-120.

the more ready to see limitations in the Reformation. The Scottish Church was "never cleanly extricate" out of Popery, and "only cut off some of the grossest branches and fruit that was most obviously putrified"¹⁵. The Reformation was but "a wide riddle that did let through much more chaff and straw than true corn"¹⁶. He could summon even "that great seer" Samuel Rutherford to admit the defectiveness of the Reformation, that in great part only the letter of religion is reformed, so that the Lord cannot build his Zion in Scotland "upon this skin of reformation" so long as our scum remaineth and our heart-idols are kept"¹⁷. Now in his own day the great backsliding of the Church and the crucifixion of Christ in Scotland which some of the Reformers foresaw, had come¹⁸.

Keith accused the Church of Scotland in the Restoration years of apostasy from even the standards of a generation before, in the heyday of Presbyterianism, much more from those of the Reformers and the Apostolic and Primitive Church. But no settling down in the wilderness could ever make it a garden, nor the idolatry of the golden calf be true religion. How deplorable was the condition of the most part of them!¹⁹ They had fallen from the Church of the Reformation in which at least the "pestilent synagogue..that horrible harlote, the Kirk malignant" was never mistaken for the invisible Church of the Spirit²⁰, to the Church of Laodicea, and so betrayed the best in their fathers and in themselves²¹. How differently the Reformers with their realisation of spiritual essentials would have treated the Quakers who were in their true succession²²! But the spiritual reaction and defection into which the Church had sunk from the Reformation times and even from the days of Jacobean and Laudian tyrannies, had given it the brand of the persecutor, a mark of every "national" Church²³, with the result that simultaneously it persecuted and ostracised the Friends as zealously as Rome persecuted her enemies²⁴; and inconsistently treated with indulgence and great laxity of discipline the most unworthy and questionable of its own "Christian" members and clergy²⁵. Was not the Church then as Erastian as ever in principle

-
15. Barclay's "Postscript" to "Quakerism No Popery", Sect. XIII, P.103. cf Jaffray's attitude ("Diary", (1856) P.61.)
16. "The Way Cast Up", Sect. III, P.32.
17. Ibid, PP 31-32; and "Joshua Redeivivus" (1824), Part II, Letter 32, P.318.
18. "A Salutation of Dear and Tender Love", PP 1-2. cf "Help in Time of Need", PP 20-21. 19. Ibid, PP 11-13.
20. "The Scots Confession of Faith" (1560) in Knox's "Works" Vol. II, PP 109, 110.
21. "Help in Time of Need" P.18.
22. Ibid, PP 16-17. cf Page 41.
23. cf "The Way Cast Up", PP 192-3, 197, and 37-40.
24. cf "Help in Time of Need", P.16.
25. Ibid. cf Crisp "A Description of the Church of Scotland" written in 1660 and published in 1694 in "A Memorable Account" PP 98-9. Crisp is more extreme than Keith and overproves his case. No section of the Church in its entirety was as bad as this. With Crisp cf "The Way Cast Up", PP 35-6, 32.

and practice alike, with her recognition of the Royal suzerainty²⁶, her hollow exchange of canonical vestments for Geneva robes²⁷, and her establishment upon forced uniformity and mere human power? Where lay her superiority in her priestly aberrations, idolatrous practices, vain covetousness, and the forced public maintenance of her ministry to the old Roman Babylon?²⁸ Was not any kind of State connection the absolute denial 'ipso facto' of the true spirituality of the Gospel and the Christian freedom of the worshipper?²⁹

The principal doctrinal grounds upon which all sections of the Church in Scotland hated the Quakers in the 17th Century were the Friends' opposition to the whole Calvinistic 'plan of salvation', embracing the doctrines of Predestination, Election, and limited Atonement; their vigorous denial of the dogma of the total depravity³⁰ of human nature; their denial of the Sacraments as means of grace³⁰; their Christology; their elevation of the immediate and sovereign authority of the Spirit above the Scriptures as the supreme rule of faith and life; and of course their whole doctrine of the Ministry. Only the briefest reference can be made here to the chief doctrinal grounds on which the Quakers arraigned the Scottish Church and pronounced her apostate, the offspring of Hagar, not of Abraham. The very foundation of the Quaker system was that while the Holy Spirit lives, immediate revelation or direct inspiration can never cease. They were coeval. This the Reformers were acknowledged to have held, but their successors, like Durham, denied³¹. Wherein then lay the consistency of holding Rutherford's or Livingstone's prophecies and Rutherford's Letters so sacrosanct? ³² Was not the very Spirit Himself limited to Scripture? But what could this denial of Immediate Revelation do but undermine the essential basis of all true religion³³? Was the plain truth not admitted by the author of "The Fulfilling" and by Rutherford in his pre-Westminster days³⁴ to his own refutation later?

The Church failing, as it did, to grasp and experience this fundamental, it followed that everything else in her belief and life was erroneous and out of joint! Here lay the secret of her new idolatry, Bibliolatry, scarcely better than the old Romish Mariolatry. By exalting the letter of Scripture above the Spirit, the Church as a teacher had become a blind leader of the blind. The Scriptures were not the "Word of God"; Christ was the Word. The Scriptures were only the external declaration of the Eternal Word, and the Church in both its Clergy and Laity were just like the Jews of old; "ye search the Scriptures for

³² Clearly not applicable to the Covenanters, but Keith makes no discrimination as will presently appear. v "Help in Time of Need" P. 44. / ²⁷. Ibid. P. 53.

³³ Ibid. P. 15.
³⁴ cf. Ibid. P. 15.
³³ Ibid. P. 15.
³⁴ cf. Ibid. P. 15.
³³ Ibid. P. 15.
³⁴ cf. Ibid. P. 15.

²⁶ 28. Ibid. PP 26, 52-3. cf "The Way Cast Up" P. 41; "Queries to the Inhabitants of Aberdeen" (Appendix to Barclay's "Truth Cleared of Calumnies"-"Truth Triumphant" Vol. I, PP 94-5) of William Emerson's "Questions for John Bewick" of Stanhope. (No date but probably c 1650.) / ²⁹. cf Barclay's "Inner Life", P. 525 and Allen "State Churches and the Kingdom of Christ" Ch. IV, PP 25ff.
³⁰. cf Crisp "Description of the Church of Scotland" PP 87-9, 91-7, and "The Way Cast Up", PP 63-4. / ³¹ cf however Ibid, PP 166, 194-5, and 200-1, quoting Fleming; Fleming "Fulfilling of the Scriptures" (7th Ed.) Vol I, PP 472-5; also "Quakerism No Popery", P. 25.

in them ye think ye have eternal life...and ye will not come to Me that ye might have life"³⁵. History was simply repeating itself. Even "Master" Rutherford was driven to admit that "the Bible beguiled the pharisees, and so may I be misled"³⁶, but curses to the Quaker who said such things !

If the Church unfairly charged the Quakers with denial of the historic Jesus of Nazareth, born of a woman, and with preaching nothing but a natural indwelling "light" or "seed" of Christ in every man's soul³⁷, Keith retaliated by charging the Church with deliberately choosing the line of least resistance through a purely formal profession of faith in a historic Jesus and an isolated exalted Christ in Heaven, and so with avoiding the challenge and cost of setting up His Kingdom within the heart³⁸. When Immediate Revelation was ceased, could anything be more natural for the Church than to belittle the inward Christ and condemn the Friends for their alleged rejection of the Incarnation ? The Church could not see that although Christ was admittedly not in unbelievers "according to that special presence and revelation as He is in the saints and believers," it was as idle to maintain that he was not in unbelievers at all as that the stars did not exist because they were invisible on a dark and cloudy night. The Light shone in darkness which comprehended it not. As the shadow of the Earth obliterated the light of the sun at midnight, although it was in the firmament all the time, so the darkness of the earthly mind hindered the soul of the unbeliever from seeing the Sun of Righteousness. The real 'rub' of this Quaker doctrine from the Church's side was that if Christ were already in one sense or another present in every man, even the wicked, wherein lay the need of his conversion and salvation ? From the Quakers' side it challenged the Calvinistic dogma that no man could by any grace of God refrain from breaking the Commandments in thought, word or deed each day, and consequently that the Holy Spirit could not indwell even the saints. How could the Church's teachers reconcile the presence of the devil in all wicked men with the absence of Christ in all good men ? If the devil were ubiquitous in men's souls, should Christ be any less so ?³⁹ On some points, Keith was more orthodox than his traducers and far in advance of the current theology of his times.

To Presbyterians, Keith had a strong antipathy. In fact he was reluctant to call them 'Presbyterians' at all; "Pseudo-Presbyterians" was the more fitting term⁴⁰. They showed no

35. cf Barclay "Truth Cleared of Calumnies", (in "Truth Triumphant", Vol.I, P.29.)

36. "The Way Cast Up", P.177. (Quoting "Joshua Redeivus" 1824, Part I, Letter XII, P.32)

37. cf "The Way Cast Up", PP 80-4. (Answer to Macquaire's Summary of Quaker Christology.) and P.103; also L. Skene's "Letter to Macquaire" in "Truth Triumphant", Vol.III, (1718) P.546.

38. cf "Help in Time of Need", P.22.

39. cf "The Way Cast Up", PP 161, 163, 63-72. cf "The Way to the City of God", P.160.

40. "The Way Cast Up", P.62.

superiority to Episcopalians in government, in the tyranny of their rule, or in the bestowal of titles of address⁴¹. The Church was culpably apathetic, indeed blood-guilty in not pressing home the advantage and gains of forty years before in some parts of the country, especially the West. They only reverted to type so that instead of making them a power in the land, the Lord withdrew his Spirit from all except the remnant of faithful choice souls still loyal to his inward leading. Even in the Church which was full of thick darkness such a considerable remnant still survived⁴², but this could not constitute the Presbyterian order of which they were the cream, a true Church of Christ, for it was not worthy of them. Few indeed had been the Churches and Sects of Christendom without their Calendar of Saints or "people" whose citizenship is in Heaven", but that could not prove a Church Christian. To Keith, Thomas à Kempis' "Imitation of Christ" was "a more usefull book for spirituall doctrin than all the Presbyterian books in the World that ever I saw, and I believe hath fewer errors in it," but that did not equate the Roman Church with the true Body of Christ⁴³. So with the "national" Church of Scotland in the Restoration Period. She had her Wishart and Robert Bruce and John Welsh⁴⁴ from the past to boast about, but if they could rise from the dead, would the "professors" be persuaded now when they understood their real message and testimony?⁴⁵ The whole basis of the Church's membership was wrong and her standards unsound. There was no attempt to make true inward Godliness and Christian practice the recognised qualifications of membership⁴⁶. She was simply a cave of Adullam; a "mungrel Church, patched up of the profence rable of the World", built of dead stones⁴⁷, in need of "a right and thorow Reformation". The worship being compulsory, the whole system inevitably bred hypocrisy from generation to generation, many of the congregation being the worst people in the Parish without the slightest intention of amendment or long-ing to be born "not of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man but of God". A "Church" could never be a heterogenous parochial multitude kept together by the sanctions of arbitrary laws, but only a spiritual and voluntary fellowship of converted or at least "convinced" people⁴⁸ separated from the World⁴⁹.

41. "Help in Time of Need", PP 52-3.

42. "The Way Cast Up", PP 32-4. cf PP 44, 61.

43. Ibid PP 48-9. of *"The Standard of the Quakers Examined,"* (1702) PP 414-5; also

44. Cf Ayr. R.M. Jones. "Later Periods", Vol I, PP 39, 57.

45. "The Way Cast Up", P.198. Keith claimed a large community of faith and experience between Bruce etc. and the Quakers.

46. This problem is still unsolved.

47. cf "Help in Time of Need", PP 72-3, 52. Crisp "A Memorable Account", P.77, and Parker "A Discovery of Satan's Wiles", PP 5-6.

48. cf Barclay's "Apology", Prop. XI. PP 269-70. Barclay of Reigate in his "Inner Life" (PP 370-1) distinguishes between "convincement" and "conversion," though for Quakers they are usually taken as synonymous. It should also be noted that their own subsequent birthright membership virtually rendered the Quakers themselves 'a mixed multitude'. / 49. cf Calvin's view of moral conduct as a condition of Church privileges.

It was for the Covenant and the Covenanters among Presbyterians that Keith's most stinging lash was reserved, both for the open rebels and for the 'Indulged'; though the Episcopalians did not escape. It is not always easy to distinguish which section Keith is addressing, and only internal evidence gives a clue. He hits out indiscriminately. And in a polemic, one does not expect the most accurate and careful statements and balanced judgment all through. He complained, not altogether unjustifiably, that Macquaire and his friends condemned the Quakers at second-hand⁵⁰, through blind fury or wilful ignorance, but Keith is also indictable for not a few most unfair, niggardly, and even absurd things which he alleged against the Covenanters. In truth however all sections came within the ambit of the Quakers' scorn or anathemas who "followed not with us." "Have ye not again... through your cities men set up- mostly also scandalous in their conversations- at such hours of the day or night to read a set form of prayer..."⁵² a probable thrust at the 'King's Curates' and certain dignitaries like Sharpe and Fairfoul. The Aberdeen Erastians and other conformists to Episcopacy were upbraided by Keith for undermining the honesty and truth of the Reformers' reasons given for quitting Rome by recognising and identifying themselves with the Episcopal church, and for being hypocritical turncoats.⁵³ Twice had the Scots Church, despite her faith in the Divine authority of Presbytery, received and condoned Prelacy.⁵⁴ Had the Conformers not apostatised by trampling down their Covenant but suffered for their inherited principles of Reformation, their testimony would have been of far greater value and the prisons would have been as full of them as they were then of the Quakers, who were bearing what renegade Church people ought to suffering. Of what avail was it to justify their conformity from Scripture when such temporising was only evidence of a troubled conscience which strove in vain to serve two masters?⁵⁵ But Keith proved too much when he asserted that out of a thousand parishes "so farr as I can understand or learn, there is not One parish in all the Nation that hath kept it self intirely free from conformity", and that nonconformists were infinitesimal.⁵⁶ Above all others perhaps the Quakers despised the "Indulged" ministers most, and accused the civil authorities of issuing Indulgences to keep "both presbiterie and episcopacy (as it were) in ane eqwiblrle and both in subjectione to themselves."⁵⁷

One might have expected that after such castigation of all who had yeilded to Conformity and Indulgences, the Quaker mind would have shown some clemency, if not admiration, for the loyal people of the Covenant who suffered far more grievously than Friends

-
50. "The Way Cast Up", P 73. cf Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd ed) PP 147-8 in this connection. Macquaire refused to reason with Jaffray or discuss any of his views with him.
51. "His judgment of Rutherford will be alluded to in a later chapter.
52. "Help in Time of Need", PP 24-5.
53. Ibid, PP 28-9, and "The Way Cast Up", P 40.
54. Ibid, PP 51-2. 55.v "Help in Time of Need", PP 38-40.
55. "The Way Cast Up", PP 52. Even his modification of this statement on the same page is no nearer the truth.
57. "General Record of Friends in the West ", (MS Vol No 16) P. 14.

in Scotland for conscience' sake. Not so, although Keith allowed that some of the Covenanters were actuated by pure motives in bearing their religious testimony, ineffectual though it was⁵⁸. By their fiery zeal which was not of the Spirit, by conferring too much *with* flesh and blood, by pressganging poor and ignorant people willy-nilly into signing the Covenant,⁵⁹ and by their attempts to sweep the whole nation into enthusiasm for a sacred and impregnable Cause, they had only built an edifice of 'wood, hay, stubble' on a 'sandy foundation'. And now that the whole structure had come roaring about their ears,⁶⁰ they were so blinded by the dust and debris and so panic-stricken and confused that they could not discern the spiritual cause of it all.⁶¹ Even those who did not conform took their sufferings with a bad grace, and kicked 'against the pricks'. Most of the ministers through base cowardice deserted their flocks, some crossing the sea⁶² others lurking in secret places where they let the people come to them for 'hole and corner' conventicles.

The Quakers had a real contempt for secret meetings and conventicles to escape the foe.⁶³ It must be granted that in this they had some moral right and consistency, for they stood their ground, and with the utmost determination of passive resistance bore their testimony openly, and in faith of final retribution let their enemies do their worst. As soon as they were released from prison they would return to their Meeting Houses, and if these were pulled down they would assemble in silence on the rubble heap outside.⁶⁵ But it is sometimes forgotten that the Quakers, being unarmed, were not in the same danger as the Covenanters. The former were lawbreakers certainly, but they were not rebels or outlaws. It was on the count of armed resistance to any authority, however bad, that the Quakers opposed the Covenanters. They held no brief for Charles II, but they ran completely counter to the 'Jus Populi Vindicatum' and took serious exception to the Covenanters assuming arms, alike on grounds of civil loyalty and of religious principle, because it was "sedition against their Lawfull Prince"⁶⁶ and sedition against Christ whose 'Kingdom was not of this

-
58. cf "Help in Time of Need", PP 47-8. cf. Lillias Skene's Letter to Robert Macquarie (in Barclay's "Truth Triumphant", Vol III, P 543.)
59. A false charge. Far from there being compulsion, there were certain definite restrictions. (cf M^c Crie, "Sketches of Scottish Church History", (1844) P 221.)
60. Through the King's Restoration and the broken pledges of Breda.
61. cf "The Way Cast Up", PP 77-8—a thrust at Macquarie who found asylum in Rotterdam for several years. Keith might in fairness have mentioned Rutherford as a notable exception when he refused the Chair of Divinity at Utrecht. (cf "Joshua Redevivus" (1824) Part II, Letter LIX, P 348—to Colonel Ker.) Many of the rank and file of Scots Covenanters did the same. Smellie estimates the total number of voluntary exiles at the large figure of 7,000. ("Men of the Covenant", 4th ed (1904) P 410.)
62. cf "The Way Cast Up", P 52. For the Covenanter position regarding armed resistance v "Jus Populi", (1669) PP 40 -6, etc.
63. cf "Help in Time of Need", sect 2, PP 41-2.
64. Barclay's "Apology" (14th ed): Prefatory Epistle to the King, PV.
65. cf "Reliquiae Baxterianae" (1696), Part II, PP 436-7.
66. cf "The Way Cast Up", P 52. For the Covenanter position regarding armed resistance v "Jus Populi", (1669) PP 40 -6, etc.

World' and Who therefore proscribed any attempt to advance it with carnal weapons. Had not the Covenanters the precedent of the Lollards of Kyle as a Christian pattern and method?⁶⁷ Armed resistance could only foment more strife and bloodshed and undermine the Cause of the Kingdom.⁶⁸ To justify the lawfulness of war against the Supreme Magistrate was in flat contradiction to the teaching of Christ and the practice of the early Christians, as Tertullian showed.⁶⁹ The Presbyterian Church had more blood upon her head than any other save the Roman, and to extol the sufferings of rebel Covenanters as Rutherford and Macquarie did was not enough without enquiring why they were persecuted. Investigation would show that in scarcely a single case did the Covenanters suffer for purely spiritual ends and testimony, but for implication in political machination, so that their sacrifice was in no sense vicarious.⁷⁰ They were in reality no martyrs at all whose blood is the seed of the true Church. If only they had let God give them redemption and raise them up out of the holes and caves of the earth where they had lain so long buried as in the grave',⁷¹ what a day of glorious visitation might Scotland not have seen? But the vineyard was now taken from them and given to others.

In 1679, the year of the close of the intensive persecution of the Quakers in Aberdeen, Alexander Skene addressed a "Plain and Peaceable Advice" to the Covenanters, on the futility and sin of armed resistance. This policy of promoting their Cause and "pretended Reformation by the power of the Sword in which ye are confirmed by some of your Preachers" was calculated only to involve themselves in greater sufferings without gaining their end of religious freedom, and others also (viz the Quakers) who had endured frequent long imprisonments for the same ideal. This evidence of the Presbyterians' zeal for God and the hazard of their lives, liberties, and estates "in such a glorious Cause as they call it" was not all it seemed. Not only the clear teaching of Scripture, and God's control of Israel's fortunes but the principles of the early Church Fathers and even the insight of men like Marcus Aurelius all united to show that "the surest ordinary means of defence is true peace with God, grounded upon faith in Him and a good Conscience." If only the Reformed Church in Scotland had had the vision and daring to take her stand by the simple and primitive faith of Apostolic times and eschew all carnal weapons and war as an instrument in fulfilling her mission, as did her Master, not only would the land of Scotland have been saved decades of useless bloodshed and violent reprisals but the whole spiritual quality of the Church's work and witness would have been immeasurably enhanced and been successful. Let the Church lay aside her arms and commit her Cause to God, and no longer "dream, neither be perswaded by men that ever the Lord will honour Men of War and Blood to promote the Gospel of peace" Surely nothing would more readily induce rulers to grant liberty of worship to all whose differences

67. "Help in Time of Need", P44. cf P 49.

68. cf Barclay's "Inner Life of the Religious Societies", P 476.

69. "The Way Cast Up", P 53.

70. *Ibid*, PP 53-5. Another example of Keith's unbalanced statement, for though the Covenanting struggle had a distinctly political side to it, most of its ordinary adherents had no understanding of, or participation in, this, but suffered for their own individual conviction and conscience. cf R.L. Stevenson's Essay "The Pentland Rising", ("Works" Vol xxiv, PP 119-120.)

71. cf "Help in Time of Need", P71.

were not inconsistent with the peace of the Nation.

For after all, in suffering persecution the Covenanters were only being 'hoist with their own petard', a thing calculated to make them "sensible.. that persecution for conscience' sake was a marke neither sensible nor proper to a civill magistrate professing Christianitie."⁷²

Keith's strictures on the ministry and theological training in Scotland did not materially differ from the Quaker attitude to 'priests' in general, and sprang from their allegation that direct apostolic revelation was ceased. He virtually challenged the Church of his day to make clear the authority of her ministerial orders thus in effect: "Are these derived from an unbroken historical succession through the Roman Church, as Durham, Gillespie, and Menzies contend, or are your ministers' call and commission a direct anointing from Jesus Christ by His Spirit?"⁷³ Is the continuity of apostolic authority which you claim an ecclesiastical or a spiritual continuity? If the former, then although the Reformation was not perfect, you are no true children of it at its best, but are still in the lineal descent from Papal Rome, which is our contention all along: if the latter, then your teaching that immediate revelation and inspiration are ceased is thereby exposed and refuted. As you refuse immediate revelation and the validity of our direct ministerial authority from Christ, we must assume that you accept the alternative, especially as you claim like Rome that your Presbyterian Church is an exclusive channel of grace and salvation.⁷⁴ Small wonder it is that you say grace is not essential to your ministry."

This denial by the Church of the indispensibility of saving grace was the most serious corollary of the belief that Immediate Revelation was then ceased, and it finds its classic expression in 'Truth Cleared of Calumnies', Barclay's first work and his reply to William Mitchell of Foot Dee. Barclay's contention against the Scottish ministry was that "the whole Esse or Being of it may be without saving grace or true holiness; you [ie. Mitchell] expressly affirming that holiness is not necessary to the being of a minister but that a man may be a minister of the Gospel who ought to be received and heard, though he have not the least grain of holiness."⁷⁵ In extreme cases what services would ensue! But against Stephen Crisp's sweeping arraignment that the Scottish Ministers, (and officebearers) violated most if not all the Scriptural qualifications of their calling,⁷⁶ must be set some slight discrimination on Keith's part. He agreed with Fleming that Robert Bruce was an honourable and welcome exception⁷⁷ and his admiration of Wishart

72. cf "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16), P 11.

73. cf Walker's "Theologians of Scotland", (1888) PP 189-195.

74. cf "Quakerism No Popery", P82; "Help in Time of Need", PP 27-8; "The Way Cast Up", PP 165-6, and Barclay's "Apology Vindicated", ("Truth Triumphant" Vol III 407). cf Mitchell Hunter "The Teaching of Calvin", Ch. VIII, PP 147-8.

75. "Truth Triumphant", (1718) Vol I, P 70. cf "Help in Time of Need", P29, and Calvin's "Institutes", Bk IV, Ch. III P323.

76. "A Description of the Church of Scotland" 1660 (1694) in "A Memorable Account", PP 79-82. cf "The Way Cast Up", PP 172-3.

77. cf Ibid, P 202.

and William Guthrie is clear. Keith and Skene protested that far from hating or opposing bitterly any true ministers of Christ, they esteemed and honoured them for their work's sake. But few they were who were weighed and emerged successfully from the Quaker's balance, for all their pretensions and self-styling as "ministers of the Gospel."⁷⁸ What were the vast majority of them but merchants of Babylon:⁷⁹ place-hunters and money-grabbers, scrambling for preferment and maintained in lucrative livings, not by efficiency but by popular superstition and the strong hand of the State? Was this to live of the Gospel?⁸⁰ And since their office and positions were nothing but vested interests, they feared the illimitable light of the Spirit and warned their flocks against direct revelation, for they knew that if once the people received the immediate teaching of Christ in their hearts, they themselves would quickly fare like Demetrius of Ephesus.⁸¹

The Quakers consequently poured scorn on the Presbyterian "call" to the ministry or to a congregation, for to them the ministers were only proud time-servers trying in vain to "make the best of both worlds"; cruel bigots whose own sufferings could not exorcise the spirit of warfare against others who did not agree with them. Keith held that no "call" could be of God unless it was born of an experience similar to Bruce's,⁸² and that Wishart and Huss and the Church of the Reformation generally believed in a free and uncanonical ministry. If the genuine "call" to minister were from God whose Spirit is not bound, why should even women be debarred from exercising the gift of the Spirit? Was not the Woman of Samaria a better and more qualified preacher "than any of the Men Preachers of the Man-made ministry in these three nations",⁸³ and were there not precedents for true women preachers among the Scots Presbyterians like Margaret Mitchelson of Edinburgh?⁸⁴

Keith and Barclay's experience with the Divinity Students of Aberdeen did not predispose the Friends to see any absolute value or discipline in the Scottish system of training for the ministry. At the best it was "much ado about nothing" essential and at the worst, a positive deterrent and "quenching of the Spirit". Keith had most to say about it in "Truth's Defence" in

78. cf "The Way Cast Up", PP 169-71, 173, 196-7: Skene's "Preface", P.1.

79. "A Salutation of Dear and Tender Love", P.1.

80. cf "Help in Time of Need", PP 35-6, 75, and Howgill "To all you Commanders in Scotland", (1657) P 3. etc. Cromwell and Fox, years before, were united with the Quakers in this view of the Presbyterian ministry on both sides of the Border. (v. Carlyle's "Cromwell's Letters and Speeches", (1888) Vol. II, Letter CXLVII, P 206, to Dundas, Governor of Edinburgh Castle.)

81. cf "Help in Time of Need", P 33, and "The Way Cast Up", P 167.

82. cf Ibid, P 195, and Wodrow's "Life of Bruce", (ed, with "Sermons" by Cunningham, 1843) PP 7-10.

83. v. Keith "The Woman Preacher of Samaria".

84. "Quakerism No Popery", P 82.

answer to John Alexander of Leith,⁸⁵ and Barclay in the Tenth Proposition of his Apology. The former is lit up by some gleams of dry humour and clever satirical thrusts. The Quaker's whole contention was, that inner sanctification of life and the "necessity laid on the called of God to preach the Gospel" were the primary desideranda of the minister, and constituted its very "esse"; not learning and human training.⁸⁶ It was however an error to suppose that the Friends ruled out scholarship or proficiency in the arts or theology per se for the ministry. It was only when such human training was made a substitute for the direct equipment of the preacher's mind and soul by the Spirit, and idolised as an "infallible rule to make" him a minister of Christ,⁸⁷ that learning was absolutely disallowed. The tongue of the learned to speak a word in season to the weary (Isa 50⁴) came through the discipline of the Spirit, not of the Schools. The latter were tolerated only in a subordinate and secondary place, otherwise men like Caton, Howgill and Samuel Fisher, not to mention Keith and Barclay themselves, would logically have had to be disqualified from exercising any ministry. All Quaker denunciations of learning must be read in view of this orientation of ministerial qualifications,⁸⁸ and also in the light of Barclay of Reigate's valuable critique of the Quaker's view, in which, incidentally, he points out that their hostile reaction to ecclesiastical training for the ministry was aggravated by the enforcement of the Church's teaching at the point of the civil sword.⁸⁹

In agreement with the "primitive Protestants and Reformers" who did not consider a college-bred ministry essential, and indeed found its impracticability at times to be an asset, Keith accused Durham of taking exactly the opposite view and making the acquired arts a 'sine qua non' of the Christian ministry instead of holiness of life and communion with God, the scriptural qualification. Where was the difference in the Church's contempt in

85. An Episcopalian, who took upon himself to reply for the Scottish Ministry generally to Seventeen Queries addressed to them by J.S (John Skerte?) or other Quakers. Alexander's self-assumed advocacy was clearly unappreciated. (cf "Truth's Defence". Append. PP239-250, and Ch. XI, P 211.) It is the most patronising and supercilious of all Keith's Scottish works, and perhaps the most finished.
86. cf "Immediate Revelation...not Ceased", P83; Hew Wood "A Brief Treatise of Women's Meetings", PP 30-1; and Barclay's "Apology", Prop X, § XLX.
87. "Truth's Defence", PP 31, 39-41.
88. cf. "Help in Time of Need", PP75-6; "Truth's Defence", P32: cf. Crosfield M.SS. (Euston Library) P.1. (George Fox's "Queries" No4); Claridge's "A Plea for Mechanick Preachers etc", (1727) § V, P45 and Vll P54; Heltar's "Reasons for Quitting the Methodist Society", (1778) PP32-3; Allen's "State Churches and the Kingdom of Christ", (1853) Supplementary Ch.1, PP573-5; etc.
89. "Inner Life", PP502-5.
90. "Truth's Defence", P29. and "Revelation", PP185-8. Keith is neither accurate nor fair to Durham.

his own day for the Quakers from that of the Roman Church for their fathers? What was the former's standard of "Trials" for the ministry - empty sound and hollow words, or grace and power? ⁹¹ In truth, their own qualifications for the ministry were higher than those of the Church's trained clergy. Congregations did not need a "trained" ministry, especially as so much "philosophy" was only a matter of plain and obvious common sense or obsolete altogether. ⁹² People knew long before such ministerial "training" was invented how to worship and learn God's truth by the "dictate" of the Spirit. ⁹³ In any case, the vast majority of ministers did not maintain what proficiency in language they had, and as the essential meaning of Scripture was plain, even in inaccurate translations, many intelligent worshippers might have become like David, "wiser than their teachers". ⁹⁴

To identify in effect a scholastic training with a capacity to apprehend the things of the Spirit was as gross an insult to Church members as was the assertion to the Quakers that "Ignorance was the mother of their devotion". ⁹⁵

Keith's views on the Worship and Preaching of the Scottish Church are of a piece with what has been said of her doctrine, ministry and polity. They were focussed on two main issues. (1) The Quakers' doctrine of Immediate Revelation and Direct Inspiration precluded them from belief in any fixed or pre-arranged worship or preaching. The Holy Spirit must be given "carte-blanche" in their assemblies. Tested by this standard, they did not judge the then Presbyterian worship to be any advance in spirituality on the Episcopal or the Roman. ⁹⁶ The Presbyterian profession of faith in the guidance of the Spirit only made their incongruities the more apparent. Why all this reading, study and meticulous preparation of sermons to avoid speaking nonsense, and yet extempore expressions of nonsense and "roving imagination" without the Spirit, called "Prayers", than which the honest use of a "sound" liturgy would be less offensive and sinful? And why was it deemed lawful to sing by a book and yet unlawful to pray by a book? ⁹⁷ The singing of Psalms, indeed any passage of Scripture, the Friends allowed and practised at the instant leading of the Spirit, but singing "with Meeter or Tooting Rhymes Artificially composed" they condemned as unscriptural. ⁹⁸ "Sermons" in the usual sense and measured by an hour glass, they had none, but only "messages" or "exhortations", if the Spirit moved them. Keith refers approvingly to Bruce's habit of silence before he preached and to Flemings' "damaging criticism of Robert Blair's first sermon as lacking the Spirit of God

91. "Help in Time of Need", PP 31-2.

92. "Truth's Defence", PP 42-44.

93. Ibid, P 30.

94. cf Ibid, PP 33-5.

95. Ibid, PP 36-7.

96. cf Skene's citing of Knox's saying to Queen Mary, that "in the preaching place, he was not master of his own tongue, but behaved to speak as God commanded him". (Preface to "The Way Cast Up", P12)

97. "The Way Cast Up", PP 65-6: cf "Help in Time of Need", P 33.

98. "Truth's Defence", P 158. cf "Sermons in Time of Persecution", (Cameron) P 337.

for all it was "very polished and disgusted", which deeply impressed Blair.⁹⁹ And prayer in the Spirit, the capacity for which the Church had lost, was a very different thing from "a dry complementing of God."¹⁰⁰ This was all it was in the Church and the decadent moral and intellectual condition of the people generally was a reflection of its worship and teaching,¹⁰¹ to which there were few exceptions.

(2) There was a deep cleavage between the Friends' conception of the purpose of worship and the qualifications of worshippers, and the Church's traditional view. By statute law every ordinary service of worship in the national church was "public" and by unwritten law recognised as "open" to all irrespective of their religious views. None could be debarred from participation in worship-Communion excepted-, unless they were under the ban of the Church and not even then if they were summoned to appear at the "stool of repentance".¹⁰² As the Church had only one kind of ordinary service¹⁰³ and non-attendance¹⁰⁴ a punishable offence, any congregation was necessarily "a mixed multitude" of "wheat and tares". In the "Westminster Directory of Public Worship" the hope was clearly inferred that it might be predominantly if not exclusively the former, but there was a certain incongruity in laying down that it was the duty of Christians to praise God publicly in Psalms, with understanding and grace in the heart, and also that no means was to be neglected to enable the whole congregation to join therein.¹⁰⁴ In any case apart even from the unconverted, the "saved" were by the Church's teaching neither "wholly free from sin" nor imperfection,¹⁰⁵ so the worship had to be for all as "not having already attained or being already perfect", whose very presence was their plea and whose need was their prayer.

Keith does not seem to allow sufficiently for the necessary distinction drawn by Calvin and still held by the Scottish Church, between the visible and invisible church,¹⁰⁶ except to assume that they coincided mainly in the Society of Friends! Keith as representative of the Society generally, held that a gathering for worship ought to be essentially an assembly of the saints inasmuch as without the Holy Spirit's presence and light,

99. "The Way Cast Up", PP 195-6

100. "Help in Time of Need", P 26.

101. cf Ibid, P 35.

102. A circumstance out of which Keith tried to make capital in the case of adultresses who had to speak "upon the Stool of Repentance (so-called)" before an assembly of God's people where the Church would debar any godly woman from preaching. (cf "Quakerism No Popery", P 83.

103. As cpd with the Friends' private meetings and their "open" or 'testimony' meetings. If a private meeting for worship was invaded by any rabble or persecuter, it would continue, but the invaders were not held as taking part in the worship.

104. ("Of singing of Psalms"), PP 64-5, Last §.

105. As Quaker writers repeatedly point out.

106. "Institutes", Vol. III Bk 1V, P 288, § 7.

all things were vain and unprofitable. 107 The Church put the cart before the horse in allowing "unbelievers and ungodly who have not so much as tasted of the least beginnings of true Faith and Repentance" to participate in "working and operative exercises of the Christian Religion, such as to pray and to sing psalms" in the hope of bringing them to salvation and holiness. Christ's promises were by no means given irrespective of faith, and apart from the direct inward motion of the Spirit, were impossible of fulfilment. Reading was allowable to the unconverted, but not prayer or praise, for how could these captives sing the songs of Zion in a strange land, 108 or with "the Spirit and the understanding? Incidentally, John Banks takes the same line some years later when he counsels all singers of Psalms to learn first how to weep and mourn for their sins so that when they do sing, it may be in the Spirit and to the glory of God. 109 Even Peden at Woodside unconsciously supported the Quakers when he "charged his Hearers that none of them open their Mouth to sing but those who could do it knowingly and believingly". 110

The snag of this criticism in view of the compulsory worship then obtaining probably never occurred to Keith, but he betrays a certain consciousness of inconsistency and incompatibility in his position. His theory really gets beyond its depth when he says, "Indeed I willingly acknowledge all unbelievers and ungodly should pray and worship God, but I say it should be in the order and way commanded of God and not as they practise, viz, they should convert and pray, repent and pray, believe and pray." 111 (In that case, they are no longer "unbelievers and ungodly".) The argument is not strengthened by his ascription of wrong or lying motives to worshippers, and by what is really a circumscribing of the Spirit of God. 112 Keith and Barclay failed to see that some of the Psalms of "blessed David" (eg Psalms 6, 38, 51) were entirely fitting in the mouth of the ungodly. The only valid point in Keith's position was to point out a continuous danger in the life of the Church, viz, the tendency of people who develop a habitual attendance at worship to become "Gospel hardened" and lapse into an insidious and dead formality, or into a sentimental religiosity which they mistake for Godliness. 113 so that

107. cf Crisp "Description of the Church of Scotland" in "A Memorable Account", PP76,79.

108. cf "The Way to the City of God", PP 52-3: "Truth's Defence", PP158-60, 162-3. cf Barclay "Truth Cleared of Calumnies", (in "Truth Triumphant", Vol. I. 1717, PP 55-6.), and Barclay "Inner Life of the Religious Societies", P 526n.

109. "A Gentle Correction for Singers". (whole pamphlet.)

110. "Some Remarkable Passages of..Peden", (1734) P 17.

111. "The Way to the City of God", P 53. cf "Truth's Defence", P 162. ("It is the most clear that.. they are not to pray while remaining wicked")

112. "The Way to the City of God", P 53.

113. Ibid, PP 53-4.

"though they keep up a form of religion, they will have nothing to do with it as a force." 114

In the Church's lack of missionary enterprise however Keith discovered a wider chink in her armour. Xavier went to China, he said, but the Scottish ministers "commonly nest themselves at home" and "I never heard of any of them go and preach to heathens where the Name of Christ hath not outwardly been mentioned, as many in the Popish Church have done" 116 But the 17th century Church in Scotland was as devoid of missionary zeal as the 18th. The contemporary reasons or rather, extenuating circumstances for this religious self-concentration and parochialism were as in Calvin's day obvious enough, but neither in principle nor in practice did the Quakers allow that a domestic conflict with tyranny and persecution constituted a sufficient reason for neglecting any effort to carry the Gospel to other lands and peoples. A number of Scottish ministers were certainly abroad in Holland 117 and elsewhere, but these they counted only craven refugees and not missionaries at all. The Quakers amid their own persecution showed a proselytising zeal which the Church could not claim and probably would not have possessed even had she not been "hunted and harried" at home. Yet had the Church in 17th Century Scotland shown keen missionary enterprise, she could legitimately have found much in the Quaker doctrine of unconscious saving grace independent of any knowledge of historical or doctrinal Christianity, to criticize and fulminate against. For while the Church believed that "such as have not the Scriptures or some to preach to them or baptise them must of necessity perish; unless the Lord make use of some extraordinary means," 118 the Quakers held that "people that sat in darkness" could see and embrace the "great light" of salvation, in vacuo, as it were, apart from any express revelation of Jesus of Nazareth or human agency. 119 This was in effect to throw the entire onus and effort upon God and to destroy the missionary motive and urge. That the Quakers themselves in the light of this should have been so resolute and courageous propagandists is one of the anomalies of history.

To the Quakers the Scottish people were in more desperate need spiritually and morally than even unevangelised peoples, on the principle of Divine judgment being proportionate to light and opportunity. (S. Matt XI. 21-4.) Let Scotland prepare to meet her God "in the way of His judgments and repent", for He was "weary with forbearing", yet had He a heart of pity and kindness

114. II Timothy III 5. (Moffatt's Translation.)

115. She still conformed to Calvin's indifference to foreign missionary enterprise or indeed to the pressure of any problem in heathendom (v. Hunter "The Teaching of Calvin," Ch VIII, PP 153-4.)

116. "The Way Cast Up", P 172.

117. eg John Livingstone, Trail, Brown of Wamphray, and M'Ward. (Macquarie) cf ante P 8.

118. "Quakerism No Popery", P 97. cf "Truth's Defence", PP 197-200. and Hunter "The Teaching of Calvin," Ch VIII, P 150.

119. cf "The Way to the City of God", PP 150-7. etc.

towards her as He remembered the best in her past. 120 Keith and his friends were very sanguine, indeed most confident about the conversion of Scotland. "Even in Scotland" the great world movement¹²¹ toward true and essential Christianity was to make itself felt and all opposition be overthrown. But the coming revival which Keith felt in the air was not coming through the apostate Church in Scotland or her hireling ministers. They were becoming exposed and discredited. Times were changing and the people becoming more critical. They were placing less implicit faith in the oracles of their preachers, and the excesses of the latter in denouncing and calumniating the Friends was only serving to predispose many to give the "Inner Light" a fair hearing and even a welcome.¹²² But the ascendancy of Quakerism in Scotland could only come along a thorny road,¹²³ and in his address to his friends from the Tolbooth of Aberdeen, Keith exhorted them to stand fast and endure whatever came in the pure testimony of the Truth. 124 It was an age of furious controversy and much wordy as well as physical battling, but beneath all this foam, indifference to the heart of the "Truth" was a rampant national sin. In an apostrophe to the people of Scotland, Keith told them that it was of the Lord's mercy that He brought on the land these days of calamity, to exhibit the bankruptcy and avarice of the Church's Leaders and Ministers, and prepare the way for substituting His pure fountain for her "pudled waters". 125 Christ the true Light was "again risen in this Island" and His Day proclaimed through the despised Quakers.¹²⁶ Let none despise the hoped-for revival coming through themselves, for only the Friends could bring Scotland into the Land of Promise whose vintage they had already tasted: only through them would the Lord rebuild his true Zion in the land,¹²⁷ because only through the light of Christ in the consciences of all its people,—their cardinal doctrine—could a "cleanly perfect and thorough Reformation"

120. "Help in Time of Need", PP 69-70. Keith's allusion to the terrible moral and spiritual ^{state of the} country is confirmed by many Covenanters (v Macpherson. "The Covenanters Under Persecution", PP 45-7.)
121. The then prevalent attitude in Scotland to this Quaker dream was adequately expressed 150 years later by Lord Jeffrey after reading Clarkson's "Life of Penn", only the change of one word being necessary. "We cannot bring ourselves to wish that there were nothing but Quakers in the world, because we fear it would be insupportably dull". (Edinburgh Review", Vol XXI. P460.) The word to be changed is "dull" for "dangerous".
122. "The Way Cast Up", PP 67, 74.
123. cf "Help in Time of Need", PP 14, 38.
124. "A Salutation of Dear and Tender Love", PP 2-6. cf Skene's "P-S" to "The Way Cast Up", (P212)
125. "Help in the Time of Need", P 43.
126. cf "The Way Cast Up", P 55-7 etc.
127. cf Ibid, P 60.

be at last achieved.¹²⁸ The Church had failed and was doomed because it could not realise that salvation was not an act of God but a continuous process, that Truth was progressive, and that conservatism was a deadly sin.¹²⁹ Truth and the Church were seldom bedfellows. Truth always had many enemies to overcome but in the vanquishing of these it could alone live.¹³⁰ Let "Scotland prize the day of her visitation and return to God", and come out from the enemies of the Truth before it was too late.¹³¹ For neither the Covenant nor the Church of the Covenant would ever reform or rehabilitate Scotland,¹³² since it "was never a true Gospell Church". The attempt would be as futile as any effort to rebuild the walls of Jericho. Would the Presbyterians repair the breaches and rebuild the ruined fabric of the Church more firmly than ever? God had laid their stately buildings in the dust, for all that was not of His building He would raze and never would their old Church be reared aloft again.¹³³ God would no more allow those whose hands were polluted with blood to build His Temple than he permitted David. Only those who were purged from "the Spirit of blood and of much other filthiness" would establish anew the glory of Zion.¹³⁴

That the Quaker predictions and expectations of her own ascendancy were unfulfilled is apparent from the steady decline of the Movement in Scotland.¹³⁵ As for the Church, her recovery was a slow and painful process, if indeed for more than the next century and a half it can be called a "recovery" at all; and it must still remain a problem of history whether she would not have rebuilt the walls of Zion in Scotland more strongly and enduringly and been delivered from the dead hand of 18th century Deism, Rationalism and "Moderatism" if she had chosen to meet the World's principalities and powers" by following, if not the Quaker "heresy", at least the Quaker way of life.¹³⁶

-
128. cf "Help in Time of Need", PP 55, 72. Keith held as firmly as Calvin for his own body the dictum "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus", (cf Hunter, "The Teaching of Calvin", Ch VIII, P 148.) but he admitted also Calvin's enforced qualification. (Ibid, P 150. cf "The Way Cast Up", pp 32, 47, 50, and Ante P 192, note 118.)
129. cf Skene's "PS" to "The Way Cast Up", PP 205-8.) and Preface, PP 12ff.
130. Skene's "Postscript", PP 210-12.
131. "Help in Time of Need", P 71. cf Crisp "A Description of the Church of Scotland", PP 101-2.
132. cf "The Way Cast Up", P 58: "Help in Time of Need", P 59. cf Jaffray's Attitude to the Covenant. (ante, Bk II, Ch III, P 89.)
133. cf "Help in Time of Need", PP 53-4, 47.
134. "The Way Cast Up", PP 55-6.
135. V. post, Book III. The main reasons for this will be considered later.
136. cf "Friends and Independents", (1836) PP 1-2.

CHAPTER XV.

"SOME OBSERVATIONS, CRITICAL AND INTERPRETATIVE ON THE
PRINCIPAL WORKS OF ROBERT BARCLAY IN THEIR RELATION
TO SCOTLAND."

The purport of this chapter is not to give an exposition or critique of Robert Barclay's system of Theology or to estimate his place in the historical Theology of Scotland, but to indicate certain important and significant aspects of his writings as these affect the Quaker Movement in the land, and its impact on the national Church.

Barclay's genius ripened at a remarkably early age. By the time he was twenty-eight he had made a name for himself as a brilliant controversialist, and a responsible and erudite scholar and theologian, recognised as such even by the unwilling Churches. His writing period extended over nine years from 1670 to 1679,¹ thus coinciding with the height of the persecution in Aberdeen and district, and commencing just after his marriage. "Truth Cleared of Calumnies," his first work, was called forth by the long and bitter controversy between the Aberdeen Friends and William Mitchell, catechist of St Clement's Chapel-of-Ease at Foot Dee, which issued in a polemic of the latter entitled "A Dialogue betwixt a Quaker and a Stable Christian." Mitchell adequately representing the animus and heat of the contemporary City pulpit against the Friends, maligned them as the worst species of blasphemers, possessed of the devil, and dangerous heretics, menacing alike to the Ministry and Magistracy. Barclay's Tract is an incisive and spirited reply in which he criticises the imaginary-dialogue structure of Mitchell's Controversial as a most unfair 'ex parte' statement, instead of what it should have been, as indicated by the title, viz the transcription of a real contest with a real Quaker. Then like a galloping horseman plucking out pegs from the ground, Barclay seizes on the vital points of the 'Dialogue' in turn, usually quoting Mitchell, and deals in his own trenchant way with most of the customary subjects of controversy- the senses in which Christ is in men; the supremacy of the Spirit over the Scriptures; Justification by faith and works; the rationale of Perfectionism; the Sacraments and Ministry of the Church; the doctrine of Original Sin and the Salvation of children; and the life of prayer. But Barclay's last pages especially, are bitingly clever and in certain details uncontrovertible, such as his tilt

I. Most of his works comprising "Truth Triumphant" are minuted in "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie", in JFHS. VII, PP 94, 96.

at 'Paper Members' and Antinomianism, and his challenge to Mitchell to show whether the ecclesiastical "Falstaff's ragged regiment" of those days belonged to the Church or the Quakers. Let the true test of the respective quality and merits of Churchmen and Friends be the empirical one!²

Appended to "Truth Cleared" are twenty 'Queries' nominally addressed to the 'Inhabitants' of Aberdeen and all like-minded with them, but actually directed to Iyall, Meldrum, and Menzies, the "Three Priests in Aberdeen who have lately most appeared in Pulpit against them called Quakers."³ The 'Queries' so far as is known were ignored.

It would appear that just after this, Barclay was involved in controversy with his maternal uncle, Charles Gordon. When John Barclay was at Urie, he found in the library a thick manuscript quarto bound in leather, entitled "Questions proposed by Mr Charles Gordon concerning the Quaker's principles, to Robert Barclay: with his answers thereunto, and Mr Charles, his considerations of the said answers: copied out of Mr Charles his papers by his brother Mr Robert Gordon; 1678"⁴ Barclay considers Gordon to have been a skilled theologian and metaphysician; a worthy protagonist of his learned nephew.⁵

The life of Robert Barclay the scholar and controversialist was now becoming as busy and energetic as Keith's had been in the previous decade. In 1671 Mitchell, "this Cavilling Catechist" as Barclay calls him, returned to the attack with certain "Animadversions" in reply to "Truth Cleared of Calumnies". Barclay naturally designated Mitchell's second polemic as feeble and unsatisfactory and after hesitation as to whether he should take any notice thereof, he decided to write a "succinct Reply" to the 'Animadversions,' entitled "William Mitchell Unmask'd," in which he sets out to show "the staggering instability of the pretended stable Christian." In it Barclay covers almost exactly the same ground as in "Truth Cleared", but "William Mitchell Unmask'd" is more analytical and contains many references to, and citations from, the early Fathers and the theologians of the Reformation. It adds little to its predecessor except some amplification of one or two matters like the moral basis of sin especially as applied to children, and concludes with a characteristic piece of Quaker inveective unusually strong for Barclay, in which he turns Mitchell's remark about raking in the dunghill against him and says of the 'Animadversions' that "no Doubt a

-
2. "Truth Cleared of Calumnies": (In "Truth Triumphant," Vol I, PP87-9)
 3. Ibid, P96. / 4. For Robert Gordon, cf Miller's MS "Dictionary of Scots Friends", P 101; and Smith's "Catalogue", Vol I, PP 850-1. Gordon, like Keith after him, left the Society of Friends.
 5. Jaffray's "Diary", P 434. (Note U.)

Dunghill is a very fit Term for such a dirty Product, as is these drossy Dregs of his dark Understanding":⁶ This second tract seems to have silenced Mitchell once for all.

In 1673 appeared Barclay's "Catechism and Confession of Faith" the first official Quaker counterblast to the "standard" Calvinism of the Westminster "Confession of Faith" and the "Longer" and "Shorter" Catechisms of nearly thirty years before. To the approval and acceptance of the latter by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1647, Barclay offset his 'Catechism and Confession' as "approved of and Agreed unto by the General Assembly of the Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles, Christ Himself Chief Speaker In and Among them". That it was "A True and Faithful Account of the Principles and Doctrines" of those "who are reproachfully called by the Name of Quakers" through no gratuitous assumption of the author merely, is seen from the censoring by others of his translation of it into Latin, which was published at Rotterdam in 1676. The Friends fully realised the strategic importance of this first public statement of the Quaker Faith, and the Morning Meeting appointed Richard Richardson, one of its members to "compare the Latin with the English, and if it be true to print it".⁷ The "Catechism and Confession" was widely circulated among young people. It went through at least eighteen English editions or reprints between its first date of publication and 1837, not all however being identical,⁸ and was translated also into French, Danish and Dutch to follow up the wide acceptance of the Westminster Assembly's publications in these lands. The "Catechism" contains 234 questions with answers in the plain language of Scripture, without addition or comment; and the "Confession" twenty three Articles, almost entirely built up of Scripture quotations. Barclay follows throughout the Authorised Version despite its errors and imperfections in translation, so that he might take noundue advantage as a Scholar or linguist over the ordinary reader.⁹ The whole work is very lucid in its method and in its purpose, which is to counteract and answer the main charge levelled at the Quakers by the Church, viz "that they Vilify and deny the Scriptures and set up their own Imaginations instead of them";¹⁰ and also to give a plain account of Quaker principles and credenda according to the Scriptures, which was "not very difficult to do".

Barclay claims for his "Catechism and Confession" a much greater internal consistency and a truer harmony of its Articles with the Scriptures than are to be found in the Catechisms

-
6. "William Mitchell Unmasked". (1718ed) ("Truth Triumphant", Vol I, P 191.)
 7. Wright "The Literary Life of the Early Friends 1650-1725", PP101-2
 8. Smith's "Catalogue", Vol I, PP 174-5.
 9. "Advertisement to the Reader" in "Truth Triumphant", Vol I, P319.
 10. Ibid, P 205. This charge was not without foundation in respect of a small section of the Society itself, and Barclay answers these as effectually as his opponents in the Church.

and Confessions of "the many Professors". He probes the beliefs of the Romanists, Socinians, Arminians and Pelagians, and concludes that the Quakers are the only real or orthodox Protestants, and no heretics. But it is for the Calvinists and their "Westminster Confession" and "Catechisms" that Barclay's chief fire is reserved.

Whereas both his "Catechism" and "Confession" commence with God, the "Westminster Confession of Faith" begins with the Scriptures as the only Rule. Yet although the Presbyterians exalt the Scriptures on a pedestal, they strangely deny the universality of the Atonement or of the principle of Divine Grace, both of which the Scriptures expressly teach, and uphold the necessary permanence of true and saving Grace in a believer, and the impossibility of apostatising from it, which the Scriptures most plainly deny.¹¹ The attempt also to prove from the Scriptures that Divine Revelation is ceased or that it is coextensive with the written Word is fatuous and a false deduction from insufficient premises. For many things were never written (St John 20³⁰, 21²⁵ — it is surprising he did not add 16^{12,13}.) Similarly the chapters in the "Confession of Faith" on the Sabbath and the Sacraments, Barclay alleges, are fallacious and unwarranted.¹²

Undoubtedly the Quakers approximated to the Church most of all, if not indeed exclusively, in the matter of Discipline. The temptation to compare "The Anarchy of the Ranters" (1674), that brilliant little treatise on Quaker government, practice, and discipline, with the system and discipline of the Scottish Church in the 17th and 18th centuries, must however be resisted here, as "The Anarchy" is in no way specially connected with Scotland or Scots Quakerism. It will suffice to say that it was the first Quaker work of its kind,—long prior to any of their books of 'Christian Discipline'—and the theoretical counterpart to Fox's system of Monthly Meetings six years before. It was written to vindicate the Society on the one hand from the charge of fanaticism and disorder under colour of the private direction of the Spirit, and on the other hand from the accusation of violating the rights and liberty of the individual conscience by the discipline of the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings, and so restraining the operations of the Spirit. It was a masterly reconciliation of the authority of the Body with the privileges of the member, and its appearance was timely.

In 1674 the "Theses Theologicae", "provoking all

11. of "Catechism", Chs V & VIII.

12. "A Catechism and Confession". (In "Truth Triumphant", Vol I, PP 315-319.)

the scholars of Europe and Great Britain"¹³ was published as a Latin broadside in Amsterdam. It appeared in English in the following year just prior to Keith and Barclay's disputation with the Aberdeen students. The 'Theses' followed naturally on "The Catechism and Confession" and like it was translated into several languages. The former is a brief and succinct statement of Quaker doctrine, supported by Scripture references, but this time in the author's own words. It had a good reception and Barclay made it the basis of his "Apology", each Proposition of the Apology being a more or less full expansion of the corresponding one in the 'Theses'

"An Apology for the True Christian Divinity", his most outstanding work, which for most people is Barclay was written in Latin and published at Amsterdam in 1676. The original edition bears a twofold title; one partly in Latin and partly in Dutch; the other wholly in Latin. The latter is the most convenient - "Theologiae Verè Christianae Apologia, Carolo Secundo, Magnae Britanniae etc Regi, a Roberto Barclaio Scoto-Britanno oblata". According to Penn, it appeared "at the Close of a long and sharp Engagement" between the English Quakers and a confederacy of adverse critics of almost all persuasions, and was designed to prevent future controversy.¹⁴ For Barclay the medium of the Latin tongue was a natural one, since he had been trained in the Latin Schools of the Continent, and Quakerism in its appeal and constituency was anything but parochial or nationalistic.

In 1678 John Brown, the Covenanter, minister of Wamphray published his "Quakerism the Pathway to Paganism" in answer to Barclay's "Theses" and "Apology", and this hastened the first English edition of the latter in the same year, for Barclay's Latin "Apology" had no chance with the ordinary reader against Brown.¹⁵ From then to 1886 the Apology passed through fourteen editions, and in 1815 an abridged edition was brought out by George Harrison. A Latin copy was presented to Peter the Great when he was in England at the dockyards of Deptford, and in 1700 the London Yearly Meeting authorised the translation of sundry copies into the French language to be proceeded with.¹⁶ The remarkable thing is that no book has been held in higher repute among Friends although it lacked the official imprimatur, not having been censored and formally approved by the Second Day Morning Meeting. But it received the official sanction of the Society as an accredited exposition of its Faith in 1692 when "Truth Triumphant" as a whole was "passed" and authorised. In addition to Penn's esteem, many of the early writers and leaders of the Society have upheld its

13. "A True and Faithful Account". (1718 ed. in "Truth Triumphant"; Vol III, P 8.)

14. "Truth Triumphant", (1718) Vol I. "Preface to the Reader," P. XXX.

15. There are however some differences in detail between the Latin and the English editions.

16. Minute Book of L.Y.M., 1700, P309.

excellence, including Fox, Andrew Jaffray, Whitehead, Patrick Livingston and Alexander Seaton, and also from not a few sources outside the Quaker fold approbation and praise have come. The most notable are Sir James Mackintosh;¹⁷ John Norris, Rector of Bemerton, Wiltshire, who, while a discriminating critic of Barclay's Theology, stamps him "a very great man" of the finest intellect, of whom any Church might be proud;¹⁸ and even Voltaire, who concedes that the 'Apology' is as well executed as the subject would permit.

None of these encomia are excessive. Quakerism had now reached the stage when it began to be definitely self-conscious both experimentally and theologically and it came to be felt that the multifarious letters and pamphlets floating about failed to do justice to it and that the essence of its teaching and witness was so largely calumniated because it was so little understood. The vague mysticism and naïve individualism of Fox could not have perpetuated the Quaker Faith for very long in the strong controversial atmosphere of the 17th century. If its propaganda was to increase and win converts, the heterogeneous and scattered materials of the Faith which had been struggling through its adolescence had to be reduced to a systematic and logical system and expressed in the current theological terminology, so that the age would both appreciate its meaning and respect its message. The man raised up for this hour and this task of translating Quakerism into a dogmatic and giving it its place in the World of Theology was Robert Barclay. As Macquarie expressed it in his Postscript to Brown of Wamphray's polemic "None of them [the ministers] had a compleat systeme of all their wicked dreames to answer, till the Author of these 'Thesis' and 'Apologie' undertook to give it us".¹⁹ And the Apologist was only twentyeight, two years older than Calvin when he published his *greater* "Institutes".

Barclay had all the natural gifts and qualifications necessary for such a task. Despite his youthful years, he was a carefully trained and accomplished scholar; he was deeply read in Classical and Patristic Literature. He had the typically Scotch mind at its best in its love of exact logical sequence and comprehension; he had, probably to a greater degree than any other Friend, a cool and balanced judgment not blinded by foolish prejudice and passion, and a penetration which was able to get to the very heart of his subject and expound it with clarity of method and a plain yet forceful style. And he was essentially

-
17. v "Revolution in England", P 169.
 18. v Braithwaite's "Second Period", PP 392 -4.
 19. v "Quakerism the Pathway to Paganism", P 561.

master of this Quakerism 'with the spirit and with the understanding also'. It may be excessive to say that he is the only "great original theologian" that Scotland has produced,²⁰ but a master he certainly was.

Henry Tuke claimed that at least prior to 1804, Barclay's 'Apology' was the only book given by the Society to many of the public libraries of Europe as well as to sovereigns and ambassadors,²¹ and in the writer's own experience it is the only doctrinal authority of Quakerism which is easily obtainable in good second - hand booksellers to-day. It is, more than any other work, the standard book on the Quaker Faith and has been re-edited and reprinted more than any other, to the conversion of no mean number to the Inner Light. The underlying truth of the whole Apology is that real religion though it may be expressed in a Theology can never be based on any Theology or record of Revelation, not even the Scriptures, but must be a direct discovery of God in the human heart of the seeker himself, and so an essentially inward and spiritual thing, inspired and motivated by the Spirit. God's work in every human soul is a 'fait accompli', and only the resistance of the soul to His inward light can keep it from the discovery of God and from assimilating the qualities of life and eternity.

The historical motive of the 'Apology' however was not only to expound and defend Quaker Theology per se, but to controvert the prevailing Theology of the day whether Roman or Genevan, in both of which Barclay was well trained. The "Apology" was a direct challenge to the "Westminster Confession of Faith" and the "Shorter Catechism", which were the maturest and most recent formulations of Calvinistic and Puritan religious conviction, and thus the "Apology" could not fail to be of great service to itinerant and 'public' Friends, especially in Scotland. When Alexander of Leith in his "Jesuitico-Quakerism Examined" challenged the Quakers to give any instances of articles or definitions in the "Confession" or "Catechism" that were not "Scripture sentence materially or formally considered" Keith replied that this had been done repeatedly in England, and in Scotland particularly by Barclay, and by himself in "Immediate Revelation not Ceased".²² The Friends also denied Alexander's charge that they were opposed to all Confessions and Catechisms, and maintained that these were useful in the Church, but ought only to formulate things of which men were inwardly persuaded by the Spirit of the Lord.²³

The most amazing thing about the survival of the Apology however, is that while Barclay by general consent wrote the

20. "Theological Review", Vol XI, (1874) P 528.

21. "The Christian Observer", Vol III, (1804) P 71.

22. "Truth's Defence", P 172.

23. Ibid, P 173.

"standard work" on Quakerism, he almost unconsciously amended the pure pristine Theology of its earliest seers and experimental believers. The latter as Rufus Jones shows in a passage of limpid beauty²⁴ willed to throw themselves as it were upon the spiritual ether. They fain would make their mind and soul a religious 'tabula rasa', unscored by any vestiges of current Calvinism or outworn and traditional theological "notions". But Barclay's Quakerism was Quakerism with a 'little of something added'. He could never entirely eliminate from his personality the Scottish temperament and the Scottish theological background in which he was reared. Behind all his exposition of the quintessence of Quakerism as the Inner Light and Power of God seeking out all men, he makes his reader conscious of his belief in the innate depravity of human nature as well. He pushes past the earlier Friends back to the doctrine of Augustine regarding the nature of man as fallen, and the Reformers' reformulation of it. Man "in his natural corrupt fallen condition" lies, as it were, stupefied in a dark pit, scarcely sensible of his own misery, and utterly dependent upon God for his salvation. To God's delivering power the undivided credit and glory are due. All that man can do is to wait passively for the moving of the Spirit or the shining of the Light to come, and not resist it when it comes.²⁵ But Reid is right in his contention that neither the 'Theses' nor the 'Apology' is an inclusive or exclusive "marrow" of historical Quaker belief, though whether there is too much of the advocate and too little of the expositor about Barclay as he holds, is not so clear.²⁶

What Barclay is really doing in the 'Apology' is trying to discover how Quakerism stands with the Reformers' doctrines, especially the Genevan, and to adjust the new as far as possible to the old. He challenges the prevailing Protestant system, not, as earlier Quaker writers had done, to see itself as only a dead and corrupt obstruction to the pure and living Word of God in men's souls - as miasmal as that of Rome, - but rather to shake itself awake to appreciate how it would triumph if it dovetailed itself into the living principle of the Inner Light. Thus alone could "this corruptible (though not corrupted) put on incorruption and this mortal (though not dead) put on immortality". This "Calvinism of Barclay the Scotchman," as Edward Grubb expresses it, is lamented by Rufus Jones, although he admits that Barclay's re-orientation of Quaker belief is "done with real genius". Jones and Professor Marjorie Nicolson both regard it as a retrograde step from which the return is painful and difficult, and they hold that if only Barclay had followed instead "the fresh and transforming path which the spiritual reformers, the real forerunners and progenitors of the

24. Intro to Braithwaité's "Second Period", P XXXII.

25. "Apology", (1886) Props V-VI, Sect XVII, PP 104-6.

26. Mosheim's "Institutes of Ecclesiastical History", PP 849-850, note 4.

Children of the Light had discovered", or even re-interpreted the Quaker Faith in the ampler liberating light of Cambridge Platonism, with which Quakerism had so much in common, the later history of the Friends would have been very different, and indeed the wellbeing of all spiritual religion to-day.²⁷ But the recurring question among the Friends as to whether Barclay has prolonged the life of the Society or not, must be left to others to discuss.

The most external evidence of the importance of the 'Apology' as an event in the theological world was the number of 'replies' to it and defences of it in the generation following. These 'replies' and 'defences' were legion. But the only three which fall within our province were probably those of the greatest consequence as well - Brown's "Quakerisme the Pathway to Paganisme"; Keith's "The Standard of the Quakers examined"; and Barclay's own reply to Brown, "R B's Apology for the True Christian Divinity Vindicated".

Brown of Wamphry² made the earliest attack on the "Thes&s" and "Apology" in 1678. Opening with a vitriolic "Epistle to the Reader" in which the author well nigh exhausts the available stock of epithets that can be hurled at the Quakers, and summons the Church to gird itself for the fight, he replies to the Propositions seriatim. He concentrates particularly on Barclay's combined Fifth and Sixth Proposition, devoting six chapters (VII-XII) to inveighing against the universality of the Atonement and salvation and holiness through the response to the innate light of God in the soul. To Brown "the height of the Quakers' divinity is what a Natural Conscience can teach a Maneater".²⁸ Brown's treatise is pure neat Calvinism all through, and naturally he finds much common ground between Quakerism and the early heretical sects. It is a heated and very ex-parte thesis and does more than any other contemporary work to make intelligible the underlying antipathy of the Covenanters to the Quakers.²⁹ Its virulence and that of Macquaire's "Postscript" may be explained on the ground that they sensed in the departure of the "Apology" from the primitive spontaneous Quakerism a more insidious danger and proselytising influence than any earlier work had been. The "Apology" could not be lightly or scornfully dismissed as empty English fanaticism, though in several places in his treatise Brown shows an attitude of superciliousness and sidetracks Barclay's issues.

George Keith's "The Standard of the Quakers examined", published in 1702, is in striking contrast to Brown's polemic as an answer to Barclay. It is a far more powerful work and more

27. cf Jones' "Introduction" to Braithwaité's "Second Period", pp xliv and xxxiii; also Nicolson's "Conway Letters", (1930) p 380.

28. "Quakerism the Pathway to Paganism", Ch X, p 233.

29. cf Patrick Walker's in "Six Saints of the Covenant"; (1901)

damaging to Barclay's case because it is on the whole a temperate and much more calmly reasoned criticism of that great Work, and does not fall into Brown's error of proving too much. The appeal of Brown's "Pathway" was exhausted in the fiery century and controversial vortex in which it was born and flourished: Keith's "Standard" may still be regarded as the only classical argument against Barclay that is really telling. Keith had also the great advantage over Brown of having known Quakerism thoroughly from the inside, and not the least interesting side of the 'Standard' is the psychological, in which the Keith of 1702 tried to estimate and answer the former Keith of a quarter of a century before.

Keith who was ten years Barclay's senior claims to have exercised an important influence over Barclay's thought and many of his arguments. Barclay he avers, also followed him "in many or most of his Distinctions and Terms not to be found in the Quakers' Books that wrote before me", and was heavily in debt to his collection of illustrations and quotations.³⁰ The claim is to a fair extent valid. The most famous of the illustrations in the 'Apology' is the story of Hai Ebn Yokdan, the Eastern seer who lived in an island solitude from early childhood, free from all converse of man, and exemplified par excellence the truth of immediate and direct Revelation of God and profound mystical fellowship with him.³¹ The story had been translated out of the original Arabic into Latin by an Oxford scholar named Pocock and entitled "Philosophus Autodidactus". Keith in turn rendered Pocock into English and it is generally assumed that Barclay got the story from Keith's version, though it is possible he may have taken it straight from the Latin.

Barclay's reply to Brown, entitled "R B's Apology for the True Christian Divinity vindicated from John Brown's Examination and pretended Confutation thereof.." is as restrained and sober in its tone and language as Brown's "Pathway" is violent. The chapters follow the sequence of the original "Apology", and point by point he meets Brown and frequently nails him to the counter. He does not hesitate to tell Brown in effect, quietly though very plainly, that the latter's abuses and furious and "violent railings" were too often a substitute for sound argument and valid criticism, "for it is either by supposing things not proved by him, by Concluding things not following from my Assertions, or by manifest Perversions, all improved by the Height of Abuse, to render the Things that displease him absurd and ridiculous,"³² that he proceeds. The "Vindication" is virtually a second "Apology" and perhaps it is the best specimen of all the 17th century Controversials for its fairness and moderation either within the pale of Quakerism or without it. Barclay was

30. "Standard of the Quakers examined", (1702) PP 22-3.

31. "Apology", (1886) Prop V-VI, sect XXVII, P 136.

32. "Vindication", Sect VII. (In "Truth Triumphant", (1718) Vol III, P382)

not a natural or born fighter like Keith. He loved peace and retirement. He confesses that on this occasion "no delight in controversy hath induced me to undertake this treatise, but pure necessity to vindicate the Truth professed by me from the many gross perversions wherewith this author hath abused it".³³ And as Brown's "Pathway" has now all but fallen into oblivion, so also this excellent little polemic which answers it is likewise never read except in that connection.

Any further Works of Barclay hitherto unmentioned in these chapters are irrelevant to the present purpose, eg the Epistle to the Ambassadors at Nimeguen.³⁴ It is only necessary to make a few observations in conclusion on the 'Revision' controversy, which began in October 1846, when the eleventh edition of the "Apology" was in contemplation.

It may be argued legitimately that there was a 'prima facie' case for revising and modernising the "Apology", inasmuch as any formulation or systematising of doctrine must necessarily be made in accordance with the metaphysical fashion of the period, so that if the metaphysical system in which the Truth is encased becomes withered or out of date, there is every danger that the Truth will die with it unless it be released and rehoused. And certainly 19th century religious enquiry did not run in 17th century channels, nor was it expressed in Aristotelian syllogisms.

There can be no doubt that the Beaconites were the instigators of this movement to modernise and revise the 'Apology', if it were to continue as the supreme oracle of the Society at least.³⁵ Actually there were three parties to the controversy among the Friends — those who advocated revision and modernising; those who strongly opposed any kind of tampering with Barclay's masterpiece; and those who thought the time had come for ceasing to republish and circulate it in any form. The large majority adhered to the second course while the Beaconites and those who sympathised with them seemed to divide their allegiance between the first and third. The originator of the whole idea, the editor of the London "Friend" took the first line, — for revision. But he lost a lot of support he might have gained by criticising the form of the "Apology" as unsuitable for the less-educated classes and charging Barclay with straining some of his Scripture proofs too far,³⁶ which support he might have gathered if he had advocated revision on the plea of a completely changed metaphysical environment. The chief protagonist of the 'abolitionist' view was Dr Edward Ash who published a pamphlet anonymously in 1849 setting out his reasons for

33. "Preface to the Reader", first page.

34. It may however be recalled in passing that James Brown, tanner in the West Port, left in his Will 1000 marks to Barclay for writing and publishing his books.

35. cf "The British Friend", Vol VII, (1849) PP 129-130.

36. cf "The British Friend", Vol IV, (1846) P 297.

objecting to the republication and circulation of the "Apology". Leaving Ash and his adherents on one side, the main arguments for and against revision may be briefly epitomised as follows:-

For Revision.

(1) Barclay's Work as it stands is now too scholastic and logical, making it unsuitable for the ordinary man - Friend or not- who venerates it as a relic and leaves it unread.

(2) Quakerism has considerably changed since 1678, hardly less than the general outlook, and if the "Apology" is to expound still "the majesty, the compass and the unity of Divine truth" it must be brought more into line with contemporary thought.

Against Revision.

(1) Revision would rend the Society, in Britain at any rate, for the "Apology" has been the sheet anchor of the Quaker Faith and has stood unrefuted for nearly two centuries.

(2) It would be a breach of propriety and historic justice to take such far-reaching liberties with the works of any deceased author as to remould them according to the mind of another. Abridgement or amplification might equally weaken the original. In any case, to attempt to revise or modernise the "Apology" would ruin its individuality and value as a historical document and doctrinal standard.

(3) The "Apology" is certainly a child of its age, but like other historical documents it must be allowed to stand in its own right and speak for itself. Even with the utmost care, revision of a great Work is seldom a complete success, and usually entails some damage or loss.

(4) The people who advocate revision and modernising most strenuously are probably the least capable of carrying out this task. Friends of the deepest insight wish it least. Let the modernists attempt to restate the Faith for their own age as Barclay did for his, and set their effort alongside the "Apology". No one could object to that, but let them leave the "Apology" inviolate.

Thus the great book remains substantially to-day as it left the pen of Robert Barclay.

CHAPTER XVI.

"MEETING HOUSES AND BURIAL GROUNDS." ¹

A "Meeting House" as distinct from a "meeting place" is a building specially erected or rented to accommodate any local body of Friends for meetings of worship or administration: a meeting place might be a Friend's private dwelling or even any site in the open, loaned or appropriated on occasion for Quakers' religious gatherings. The earliest meeting places in Scotland coincided with the genesis of the Movement at Heads and Drumbow, followed quickly by those at Gartshore and Badcow.² The first recorded meeting place in Edinburgh was Colonel Osborne's house, while the chief open-air rendezvous were the Cross and the Castlehill. After Osborne removed to the Badcow district,³ the meetings were probably held in the house of James Brown, tanner at the West Port⁴ as most of the marriages between 1670 and 1681 were celebrated at his house.⁵ He was a prominent and zealous Quaker pioneer in the Capital, a man of some substance, and generous withal to the Body as a whole and to individuals like Keith, Halliday and Robert Barclay, who were all beneficiaries under his Will.⁶ Similarly there were meeting places, or more or less regular rendezvous in various other parts where the Society obtained a foothold, Hamilton, Ardtannies, Kinmuck, Colliehill, St. Boswells, Kinnaber and others.

The first Scots Meeting House was built at Urie in 1669 upon David Barclay's return from Edinburgh. But Edinburgh was clearly meant to be the Headquarters of the Society, for immediately after a system of Meetings for Discipline had been established in Scotland in the same year,⁷ committees of Friends residing in the "North", "South", and "West" of Scotland were appointed by the newly-formed General Meeting for South Scotland to "recommend it to all particular persons...go are of abilitie that they contributte for the buriall place at Edr Wt a meeting howse", James Brown to be treasurer. At the same time⁸ General Meeting recommended to the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting to provide funds for a temporary meeting house.⁸ But the provision of both necessities

-
1. This chapter as ranging over most of the ground of the present thesis might perhaps have been placed more fittingly among the Supplements; but as it deals with a good amount of history in this Restoration period, it is placed here.
 2. v ante, Bk I, Ch I, PP 8-9.
 3. Ibid, Ch III, P 20.
 4. One of the five gates of Edinburgh.
 5. But not immediately. (cf ante Bk I. Ch III, P 29.) Almost certainly there was another private house in between. cf, also "Edin. Monthly Book 1669," (MS Vol 12) PP 27-46 partim.
 6. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 316.
 7. cf ante, Ch IX, P 138.
 8. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book" (MS Vol 12.), P 18. and "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book 1669", (MS Vol 15.) P 14.

for some unexplained reason hung fire for nearly six years.⁹ An attempt by the Monthly Meeting to expediate matters in September 1670 by commissioning Brown and Richard Rae "to use yr utmost care & diligence for effectuating the thing"¹⁰ and again in 1672 proved abortive, and the fact that nothing further is reported even about the "convenient rowme for a Meeting"¹¹ that they were recommended to secure, confirms the probability that the meetings were all held in the Tanner's own house during that decade.

Meanwhile in Aberdeen where persecution was the order of the day, stirring events were taking place in the longest and most famous of several struggles in Scotland between the Friends and the Civil authorities,—aided and abetted by the Ecclesiastical,—for the right of the former to bury their dead in "unconsecrated" ground. The Quakers regarded it, not altogether without justification, as an ecclesiastical vested interest or monopoly which the Church was determined to safeguard if she could. The income accruing from burials in the parochial kirkyards went to maintain the fabric of the churches, at least in Scotland, and in this both the Civil authorities and the Ecclesiastical had a stake.¹²

In January 167 $\frac{1}{2}$, some months prior to the Aberdeen Friends securing their first Meeting House,¹³ the first round of what may be called "the Gallowgate Case" began.¹⁴ Thomas Milne, a humble shoemaker who had been a very early convert to Quakerism in Aberdeen and had been summoned before the Kirk Session in 1661 to no purpose, buried the corpse of his child in a piece of land on the East side of the Gallowgate, formerly a kailyard, which the Friends had purchased from Alexander Harper as a private cemetery. After three days' interment, the body was removed by order of the Provost¹⁵ and Council and reburied in the Futtie (Foot Dee) Chapel burial ground, with quite unnecessary gruesomeness.¹⁶ Milne was ordered to be deprived of his civic liberty 'sine die', his shop to be closed, and he himself banished from the Burgh within three months. The stone walls and gate enclosing the Gallowgate

9. E.G. v "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12.) PP 19,21,29,30.

10. Ibid, P 27.

11. Ibid, P 31. (2nd month.)

12. cf "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen 1643-1747," (1872) P 277.

13. v ante, Ch IX, P 143.

14. cf Ibid, P 142.

15. Robert Forbes of Rubislaw.

16. Skene "A Breiff Historicall Account", P 13. cf Mackintosh "History of Civilisation in Scotland", Vol III, PP 264-5. (Futtie Chapel was the progenitor of St Clement's Church.)

ground were also to be demolished.¹⁷ Such a simple solution however was not to transpire, for if Milne did quit the City he was soon back, and in the following August history exactly repeated itself. On this occasion he was fined £20 Scots payable to the Dean of Guild, imprisoned till the fine be paid, or his merchandise correspondingly distrained, and then expelled from Aberdeen.¹⁸ On the same day an Act of Council was rushed through the City Chamber, ordaining that, inasmuch as the ancient and recognised place of local sepulture had always been "that plate of ground round about...the old and new Kirks", no one should on any pretext whatever "burie their defunct" who had departed this life within the Burgh, in any other place than the common Kirkyard, at the usual rates, without special licence from the magistrates, under pain of a fine at the magistrates' pleasure: also that the walls of the Gallowgate burial ground were to be demolished and the enclosure revert to a kailyard.¹⁹

But the Quakers refusing on religious grounds to have any trafficking with "man made priests" or their services and ceremonial, carried on their interments with quiet determination, and as a burial place must be enclosed, they lost no time in restoring the wall. It is unnecessary to note each detail of the ebb and flow of the strife. Baillie John Scott²⁰ was the executor of the orders of the City Fathers, and Alexander Harper, the merchant, the chief instigator and leader of the Friends in what can only be described as several years of intermittent guerilla warfare. The Council was repeatedly defied, but it continued to raze the wall each time it was rebuilt and to remove every corpse of children and aged alike interred in the Gallowgate ground.²¹ About the middle of 1677 occurred the case of Robert Gerard's child, during the father's absence from home, for which he suffered punishment on his return.²² All along, the Quaker policy was one of passive resistance and they bore these hardships very patiently until at last in 1679 the Privy Council, with pressure brought to bear upon it, gave the Friends the liberty they had struggled to obtain.²³ In February 169 $\frac{1}{2}$ Elsinet Goodall one of the Aberdeen pioneers²⁴ "was peaceably and honourably buried in Friends' burial ground in this city on the 23rd day", and "our burials.. now.. are as peaceable and quiet as any other".²⁵

17. "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen 1643-1747," (1872) P 277.

18. Ibid, PP 280-1.

19. Ibid, PP 282-3.

20. cf Ante, Bk III. Ch III, P 87.

21. "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen", (1872); and Skene "A Brieff Historicall Account", PP 14., 16-17.

22. v Ante, Ch XII. P 165.

23. Skene "A Brieff Historicall Account", P 14, and Ante, Ch. XII, P 166.

24. cf Ante, Bk. III, Ch. III, P 87.

25. cf Records of the Aberdeen M.M. 21-12 mo. 169 $\frac{1}{2}$ quoted in Jaffray's "Diary, P 415, Note D:

When Thomas Mercer the late Dean of Guild died in 1697 it was solely owing to his relatives' infringement of his last wishes that he was not laid in the grave prepared by the Friends at the Gallowgate, but in the new churchyard.²⁶ An exact parallel to this was the case of Andrew Philipshell of Gorbals about fourteen years later, some of whose relations, aided by neighbours and the mob, took his body contrary to his Will that it be interred in Partick Burying Ground, and buried it in the churchyard of the Gorbals.²⁷

During the period of contention over the Gallowgate Burial Ground, three other Friends' cemeteries were established; at Gartshore, Shawtonhill, and the Pleasance, Edinburgh. The Quarterly Meeting wished a Burial Ground at Gartshore, and at length a walled enclosure near Wester Gartshore Farm, three miles from Kirkintilloch was presented to the Friends by the owner, Robert Smailley about the end of 1673. In 1675 he gave the original Title Deed to Hew Wood,²⁸ gardener to William, third Duke of Hamilton. Wood was a leading Friend at Hamilton Meeting and a prolific writer, who joined the Society at Glasford before 1669.²⁹ This Title Deed is thought to be lost, but Wood as trustee on behalf of the local Friends or "keeper of the rights of Gartshore burial ground" is mentioned several times in the Hamilton Meetings Records. The number of Quakers in the Gartshore Meeting was always small and in consequence the number of the interments also, a family of the name of Gray easily predominating. In 1871 the Gartshore Estate was purchased by Mr Alexander Whytelaw, but as the Friends still resident in 1878 took for granted that the old burying place was theirs by repairing the dyke, the laird was willing it should remain so. There have been no burials since 1884.³⁰

It was proposed to acquire a Burial Ground at Glasford in 1671, but the scheme was not proceeded with.³¹ Instead, Shawtonhill Burial Ground between Glasford and Chapleton, a larger area than Gartshore, was bought from Andrew Hamilton, a Friend in 1675, and completed at a total cost of about £137 Scots³²

26. "The Diary of John Rowe", Principal of King's College, reprinted in "Scottish Notes and Queries", Vol VII, (1894) PP 164-5.
27. "Minute of Edin. Q.M. anent Insults in the South", in Aber. Bundle of MSS. No 66. (2)
28. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16.) P 20.
29. cf "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book 1669", (MS Vol 12.) P 17.
30. "Transactions of the Glasgow Archeological Society", Vol V, Part I, Paper VIII, PP 106-8. (Art on "The Quakers of Glasgow and their Burial Grounds" by Chas Taylor.)
31. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book" 1669, (MS Vol 15.) P 24.
32. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16) PP 20, 22.

It was violated and despoiled twice by Covenanters, in 1679³³, and in 1688.³⁴ Prior to 1800, Shawtonhill was used by Quakers in Glasgow and Hamilton as well as Glasford, and the Glasgow Friends still claim it as their possession. By a Deed of 1745 the tenant of Shawtonhill Farm is obliged to keep half the dyke in repair and pay the Society a small rent for grazing.³⁵

The projected Burial Ground in Edinburgh after long delay, at length materialised in 1675. In the interval the Friends seem to have added to the "ad hoc" Committee. David Falconer³⁶ who had had valuable experience as factor to Anthony Haig and David Barclay,³⁷ and who was now rapidly taking a leading place in the Edinburgh Society. Falconer, it would appear, galvanised the Committee into action and probably in the latter half of 1674, half an acre of land in the Pleasance was secured on deposit of a first instalment to the heritable proprietors James Naismith and William Hogg, Writers. Funds had been accumulating and in January 1675 when the Monthly Meeting "box" was opened, £37 were disbursed, £8 to pay Naismith his last instalment, and £29 to David Falconer "to clear charges about sd buriall ground"³⁸ The entire outlay was 860 merks or about £48 sterling, apart from the gate which was added to the enclosure some months later, and necessary implements which amounted to another £3 stg. At the Monthly Meeting in October the Deed of Conveyance and other relative papers were "laid on the table" by Falconer, and William Miller "The Patriarch", gardener at Holyrood and sire of a long line of prominent Quakers, was appointed trustee. The anticipated opposition from the City Council, as in Aberdeen, came in December 1675. The burial places of townspeople were Greyfriars' and the Canongate Churchyards, and the Council characterising as "of ill example" the prospective interments in the Pleasance, issued a prohibition "to burrie in any place within the town or liberties yrof but in ye ordinary burriall place," and ordered the Bailies of the Cannongate to put it into execution.³⁹

33. Ibid, P 26.

34. Ibid, P 35.

35. "Transactions of the Glasgow Archeol. Society", Vol V, Part. I, Paper Vlll, P 106: and "Glimpses of the Early Quakers in Scotland", (Typed MS) Appen, PP33. ff.

36. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12.) P 34.

37. v Ante, Ch Vll, P 120.

38. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12.) Last page.

39. "Register of the Edinburgh City Council", Vol 28, (1674-7) page 125.

The Quakers as usual ignored the Manifesto, for the first recorded burial, that of Christian Allen, wife of Hector Allen, the Leith skipper took place in November 1680,⁴⁰ but there is no record of reprisals or petty persecution by the authorities as in the Burgh of Aberdeen. In March 1676 however, a proclamation was issued at the Market Cross against Popish meetings, Quaker meetings, and conventicles, with certification that all who kept them in houses, frequented them, or had them within their land were to be severely fined.⁴¹ This was as ineffectual in checking Quakerism as dozens of similar measures, national and municipal, while the Burials Act of 1681⁴² would only affect friends in respect of the maximum number of mourners allowed.

If it was not easy for the Edinburgh Friends to secure a Burial Ground, it was more difficult still to obtain a satisfactory and permanent Meeting House, and their fortunes in this respect were very chequered. Apparently they resolved to build one at this time, for a subscription list was opened in October 1675, which, with periodical collections up to 1679 realised nearly £76.⁴³ This sum was utilised to purchase a property in the West Port, which was partly occupied by James Brown,⁴⁴ but was discovered to be inconvenient as a meeting House. In 1681 Brown died,⁴⁵ leaving among other bequests to the Society 2000 marks (£111) towards the purchase of a good Meeting House,⁴⁶ when foolishly the Monthly Meeting purchased his own dwelling house only to find it equally unsuitable for the purpose. However the latter was in use almost certainly in November 1681 as appears from an offer to the Meeting by two other Quaker tanners to lease Brown's old house and accommodate the Friends until they got more convenient premises. That same meeting did, "hereby empower Maurice trent and David Falconar to speak & agree wt ane honest Mason to build a good large meeting howse on the end of the bwriall ground towards the street, & Likewayes to consider how money may be raised from the 2 howses upon q^{ch} freinds money lyes for the accomplishing of the same; & to give Acco^t to every monthly meeting of their diligence & procedour in that matter"⁴⁷

What hindered the "good large Meeting House" from being erected in the Pleasance then must remain a mystery,

-
40. "Register of Births and Burials" (1681), (MS Vol 11.) P.1.*(Back)
 41. Laws "Memorials"; (1818) P 89.
 42. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", Vol. Vlll, P 350.
 ("Act Ristring the exorbitant expense of Marriages, Baptisms, and Burials")
 43. v "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12.) P 34, and "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book." (MS Vol 15.), P 41.
 44. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12.) PP 41, 43.
 45. "Register of Births and Burials 1681", (MS Vol 11.) P 1*(Back)
 46. "Edin Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 316.
 47. Ibid, P 44.

for there is a break in the Minutes from 1683 to 1688⁴⁸ and nothing further is mentioned prior to 1683. Indeed practically nothing of these years is known except that Bartholemew Gibson, the King's smith and farrier in the Canongate was then the leading figure in the Edinburgh Society. When the Minutes resume in 1689, the Friends are still accomodated in the West Port, the keys of the Meeting House being in the hands of one of their number, John Hopkirk, who was also to act as factor of "the other hous below". It is not unlikely that this was the same house occupied by James Brown and afterwards by the two Quaker tanners, Neill and Fisher.⁴⁹

During the last thirty years or so of the 17th Century, a few domestic or semi-private Burial Grounds were laid out by Friends of means and higher social standing, to safeguard the graves of their dead in the years of persecution. Of these the earliest was the "Howff" of Urie, on the top of a low green hill overlooking Urie Glen, a mile from the old House. The "Howff" was on the Urie estate, and David Barclay constructed a vault for the sepulture of his own family, leaving the rest of the ground for the interment of local Friends. After the death of the Apologist in 1690, a Mausoleum was erected over the Barclay vault, in which there are seven Barclay tombs altogether from Colonel Barclay's (1686) to Captain Robert Barclay-Allardice's, the last of the line, who died in 1854.⁵⁰ Alexander Baird of Gartsherrie who then purchased the Urie estates, extended the Mausoleum as a private Burial House for the Baird family, which is still in use. The Monthly Meeting Records of Urie give obituary notices of several Friends interred in the Urie "Howff" for the thirty years following Robert Barclay's death, the most noted of whom were Margaret and David Falconer and Alexander Spark, besides an English travelling Friend, John Bain.⁵¹

Of the private Ground at Kingswells where Alexander Jaffrey the diarist was buried on May 8th 1673,⁵² very little is known. No stone marks his grave which, in contra-distinction to Robert and Christian Barclay's, was the usual Quaker custom. Lillias Skene, the most noted Friend of Aberdeen who died in 1697, aged 71, also lies at Kingswells beside her husband. Kingswells, one of the 'Freedom Lands' of Aberdeen was in the hands of the Jaffrays from about 1590 to 1854. Andrew Jaffray and other members of the family are also interred there.

Woman
^

-
48. These minutes may easily have been carried off and destroyed by some marauding band of Covenanters who did a similar thing at Shawtonhill in 1679.
49. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12.) P 59.
50. cf Barron's "The Baron Court Book of Urie", PP192-5 and "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting att Urie" in JFHS. Vol VII, P 186. There is a good photo. of the tomb-stone of Robert Barclay and his wife in Cadbury's "Robert Barclay", facing page 89.
51. JFHS. Vol VII, PP 185-188.
52. cf "The British Friend", Vol IV, (1846) P284.

The Burial Ground which was probably formed about 1655 has ceased to be used long ago.

The private Burial Ground of the Skenes of Parkhill, Dyce, which stood close to the Don was laid down in 1688⁵³ by Alexander Skene of Dyce⁵⁴ for the interment of his wife Anna Johnston,⁵⁴ and enclosed soon after. A Mausoleum as at Urie was built later. The last of the direct line of the Skenes to be interred therein was Andrew who died in the year of Waterloo, and thereafter the Mausoleum was for long the family Ground of the Gordon-Cumming-Skenes of Parkhill.⁵⁵

Hew Wood prepared a small Burial Ground in his own garden for himself" and for any onest frind." There both he and his wife were laid in 1701, and 1705.⁵⁶ In his Will, Hew Wood bequeathed his house and Burial Place at Hamilton"for the service of Truth". The Edinburgh Yearly Meeting appointed Daniel Hamilton trustee. But there is no further record of this property.

It may be observed here also that there was an 'open' Burial Ground in Donside, viz Kinmuck and two Meeting Houses which are occasionally mentioned in records, viz Old Meldrum and Kinmuck. The date of the acquisition of Old Meldrum Meeting House is uncertain, but in the 18th Century Records of the Aberdeen Meeting,⁵⁷ mention is made of the benefactions of John Elmslie. Kinmuck as already noted was early and well organised as a society but again the date of the acquisition of the Meeting House and Burial Ground is unknown.⁵⁸ It was however important enough to have a stable attached to it⁵⁹ In 1761 the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting appointed four of their number to inspect Kinmuck, "particularly that the Meeting House be in proper repair both within and without"⁶⁰

About the end of the 17th Century, there was a considerable amount of activity in different parts. In 1691 about four years after the first meetings in Glasgow began to be held in" an Honest Friend's House", the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting agreed to a Meeting House being secured in Glasgow to the rent of

-
53. Not to be confused with Alexander Skene, ex-magistrate of Aberdeen, Keith's collaborator.
54. "Digest of Births.. and Burials for Scotland", Division 3, under 'S'.
55. "Scottish Notes and Queries", 3rd Series, Vol XII, (Feb 1934) PP 19-20.
56. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 18) P 17.
57. JFHS Vol VIll, P 119.
58. cf Ibid.
59. "Minute Book of Kinmuck Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 5.) P 169
60. "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4.) P254.

which it promised to contribute.⁶¹ In 1692 Hamilton Monthly Meeting also resolved to contribute £10 Scots.⁶² About three years later in November 1695, the Glasgow Quaker community borrowed a sum of money to purchase a Meeting House with "one Room dedicated for friends to Meet in",⁶³ and appealed successfully to the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting to be surety for any portion of the interest that they might not be able to meet.⁶⁴ In February 1697 through the advocacy of Hew Wood the Quarterly Meeting consented to the Hamilton Monthly Meeting rendering independent help to Glasgow,⁶⁵ and Hamilton Meeting also gave consideration to an appeal from Glasgow for assistance in meeting the heavy cost incurred in repairing the Meeting House, viz £113 Scots. But Friends in the Western Area seemed to display no special enthusiasm to contribute, and the Friends of Hamilton after shelving the matter for another eight months, contributed in the end the (January 1698) only £44 Scots. of the total outlay. The reason of the reluctance may have been the significant fact that the Glasgow Friends had George Swan, the Gorbals landlord and innkeeper among their number, who also was their treasurer.⁶⁶ In February 1700, the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting launched a fund to erect a stable for Friends horses and a caretaker's house at Aberdeen,⁶⁷ while at the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting in April 1701, Robert Beattie, a delegate from Montrose represented the necessity of purchasing or renting a Meeting Room there. The Yearly Meeting sanctioned the taking of a convenient Meeting House ad interim and promised to contribute to the rental.⁶⁸

There must have been difficulties of tenure or otherwise, for in 1710, Beattie, Napier and others pressed for help at the forthcoming Aberdeen Yearly Meeting in securing a permanent Meeting House at Montrose, for "wee believe there is not a more peaceable people & Loves more to come to freinds' meetings in Scotland than there is in this place".⁶⁹

The opening years of the 18th Century were far from propitious to the Society in Edinburgh. The persecution and mob violence to which the Quakers were subjected will be noted in a

61. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 60.
 62. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16.) P 37.
 63. "Hamilton Meeting Book" (1695), (MS Vol 14.) P. 4
 64. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 75.
 65. Ibid, P 79.
 66. "Hamilton Meeting Book" (1695), (MS Vol 14.) PP4 (3rd and 4th Months) & 5.
 67. "Minute Book of Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4) PP17-18, & "Aberdeen Cash Book 1691", (MS Vol 43) end of Volume.
 68. "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4) PP"21-2".
 69. MS Letter from Napier and Beattie to the Yearly Meeting at Aberdeen 1710. (Bundle 60.(25) of Aber. MSS.)

later chapter.⁷⁰ Here however reference must be made to the lawsuit of Barbara Hodge v Friends, which was protracted from January 1704 to November 1707. In 1703 one "poor Barbara Hodge" - a recipient of parochial relief - commenced an action against Bartholemew Gibson and William Miller, claiming that the property in the West Port owned and occupied by the Quakers as their Meeting House was 'de facto' and 'de jure', hers, left in bequest by her aunt. The Quarterly Meeting appointed William Miller and Charles Ormiston to act as their representatives and supervisors of the case, Miller to be treasurer ad hoc. An advocate named Fringle held the Friends' Brief. Fortunately for them Fringle was able to produce the title and conveyance Deeds of the property, and although Hodge's Counsel disputed their validity, the Court upheld them. There was a possibility at one stage of the case of the plaintiff winning it as Miller would not swear, but after a long wordy battle between Counsels on the wisdom and sufficiency of absolving Quaker witnesses from the usual oath and accepting a plain declaration instead, the Lords of Session "thought this pursuer's right very lame and defective and that the formula offered was upon the matter an oath and therefore allowed him [Miller] to depone in terms thereof."⁷¹ In May 1705 Barbara Hodge had tried to effect a settlement with the Quakers for a sum of £80 Scots to be paid in charity, but they preferred to let the law take its course, and at last in November 1707, Hodge's plea was dismissed.⁷²

The Quakers were thus allowed to retain their property in the West Port for what it was worth. It seems to have been a poor speculation, for it was in almost constant need of repairs either through the delapidation of age or through damage by the rabble.⁷³ In 1706 extensive renovations to the roof were carried out in which the Yearly Meeting was pretty obviously defrauded by an unscrupulous craftsman who was indeed "a knowing workman", for in 1714 it threatened to collapse, and when William Miller who this time was entrusted personally with the supervision of the necessary repairs to the roof, together with other work necessitated by the violence of the mob, presented his bill for £88 stg,⁷⁴ it was felt that nothing more would be required for a good period of years. In spite however of this large outlay, none of the rooms above the Meeting House were let in 1719 "upon acct ye Loft of 3d story not being in Repair, so it's ye minde of Friends yt ye said Loft be taken upp & Repaired"⁷⁵ Thus the Friends struggled on till 1729 putting money into a bag with holes, when at length a new Meeting House to accomodate about six hundred was erected in Peebles Wynd a narrow lane then off the

70. v post Bk III, ChIII, partim.

71. An evidence of the need of extending the Affirmation Act to Scotland.

72. Lord Fountainhall's "The Decision of the Lords of Council and Session from June 6th 1678 to July 30th 1712", (Folio 1761) Vol II, PP304-5: and "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) PP 136, 145-6, 161.

73. Ibid, PP150-1.

74. Ibid, PP199, 204.

75. Ibid, P222.

Cowgate. The total cost £210 stg. was defrayed partly by the sale of the old Meeting House which was purchased by William Miller for £85 and partly by subscriptions.⁷⁶ Thus, after three-quarters of a century the Quakers had their first permanent Meeting House which brought a new impulse of enthusiasm to them and made them "inclinable" to restart the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting which had lapsed for many years.⁷⁷

Contemporaneously with the Peebles Wynd Meeting House came a new one in Glasgow at Stirling Square, in the wedge between High Street and Ingram-Cannon Street. Negotiations were begun in 1728, and on a satisfactory report of two representatives of the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting,⁷⁸ the Yearly Meeting of 1729 agreed to pay the Quaker owner John Purdon of Partick the first instalment of £60 stg. for part of the property, viz the lower part of the house then in use as dancing school, together with the adjoining parlour and half of the garden. The Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting was to assist the Glasgow Friends to meet the balance of the purchase price, and required Purdon to give the Society the first offer of the remainder of the house and garden if he decided to sell them, and to keep the roof and upper story of the house in good repair.⁷⁹ For some reason unexplained, these terms failed to satisfy the Glasgow Monthly Meeting, and after advising the next Yearly Meeting accordingly, the Glaswegians defaulted in paying up their share to Purdon, who reported it at the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting in February 1730.⁸⁰ As Glasgow Monthly Meeting took no notice of the Quarterly Meeting's first representation, the latter reprimanded Glasgow Friends, pointing out that it was fulfilling its part of the bargain.⁸¹

For about three years correspondence passed between the Quarterly Meeting and the Glasgow Quakers, all to very little purpose. The bad debt remained and legal difficulties over the Title Deeds and sale of the old Meeting House in Glasgow delayed matters still further. The new Meeting House enterprise seems to have caused a split in the Glasgow Monthly Meeting, and for five out of six Quarterly Meetings from 1731 to 1733, Glasgow sent no representative, so that she was "reprehended", and instructed to bring her differences before the next Quarterly Meeting if still unsolved.⁸² The Glasgow Meeting had resolved that Purdon should be paid, and the Quarterly Meeting squared everything up with him,⁸³ but of the Glasgow Quaker's liquidation of the debt there is no further word. In February 1733 when John Purdon announced his

76. Ibid, PP268-9: cf Cassell's "Old and New Edinburgh", **CH XLIX**, P382: Story's "Journal", (1747) PP667, 668. The work was supervised by Joseph Miller. (V "Memorials of Hope Park", P 6.)

77. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 270

78. Ibid, P264. 79. Ibid, P 265.

80. Ibid, PP 267, 269. cf Also items in "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16.), PP63-66. It was not lack of funds that was the cause. For conveyancing Deed of Purdon's house, V "Register **Book** of Sasines", Folio 189-190, 6th July 1731.

81. It is a curious jumble of Latin and English. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) PP 269.273.

82. Ibid, PP 274-286, partim.

desire to sell the remainder of the Stirling Square house, the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting advised the Glasgow Friends to purchase it if possible in order to keep the entire property within the Society, and from the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting funds in 1734, the amount necessary "for infeſting William Miller Junr & Charles Ormiston junior in the Meeting House of Glasgow and Seasing [Sasine] thereon" ⁸⁴ was forthcoming, but more the Yearly Meeting declined to do for the Glasgow Friends. ⁸⁵ The old Meeting House was eventually sold in 1751, ⁸⁶ and Charles Ormiston of Kelso and William Miller, senior and junior, appointed trustees of the succeeding one. ⁸⁷

The garden round the Meeting House at Stirling Square became a Friends' Burial Ground as shown in Mc.Arthur's "Plan" of Glasgow in 1778. The Stirling Square Ground was not however the only one in the district, although the sole one in the city. John Purdon of Partick of whom mention has already been made, came of an old family which is mentioned in the **Burgh** Records of Glasgow in 1589, ⁸⁸ and which appeared from 1652 ⁸⁹ as property owners in Partick, then a village demesne two miles from the city round the old Kelvin Bridge. In 1711 fully twenty years before the Stirling Square Burial Ground was opened, John ("Strawney") Purdon presented 308 square yards of land at the "Goat"-the present Kelvin Street- to the Society in Glasgow as a Quaker cemetery. The Deed of Conveyance was drawn up by James Bowman, notary, ⁹¹ but appeared not be completely valid, as in 1733 a collection had to be made among Friends to make their right to burial secure. ⁹² The first interment at Partick was that of Purdon's wife, "Quaker Meg", the singular wife of an eccentric husband. The funeral was carried through with the greatest difficulty as the rabble filled in the vacant grave and "it was with much struggle and great abuse that the said friend got the Corps Interred at last". ⁹³ About 1721 the "Goat" cemetery was enclosed with a stone wall whose building George Swan supervised and to which he contributed. Another subscriber was Alexander Paterson one of the four students convinced at Harper's Close, Aberdeen, by Keith and Barclay in 1675, who had been settled for many years as a schoolmaster in London. ⁹⁴ Partick

-
84. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12.) P 121.
 85. "Edin Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) PP 287, 293.
 86. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12.) P 131.
 87. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book, (1730) (MS Vol 13.) P 139.
 88. "Extracts from the **Burgh** Records of Glasgow", (1573-1642) Pl44.
 89. RPCS. Second Series, Vol VIII, P 239.
 90. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 180.
 91. The Title Deed was lost for many years but was discovered in Cumberland in 1847 and returned to Glasgow. It is now at 207, Bath Street.
 92. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16.) P 55.
 93. Minute of "Edin. Quarterly Meeting anent Insults in the South", (1711) in Bundle of Aberdeen MSS No.66 (2), which dates the Ground circ. 1704
 94. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 227: and JFHS Vol XI, P 25, Note 9. (Art. on "George Swan of Glasgow" by Miller.)

Ground was free from outrage and damage all along, for the new century had brought more ecclesiastical and civil toleration, though the crowds at Quaker funerals were hardly respectful or reverent.⁹⁵ Interments were discontinued at Partick in December 1857, but the little "Gad's Acre" though reduced in size since then still remains, being preserved in perpetuity.⁹⁶

The Glasgow Friends continued to meet at Stirling Square till early in 1791 when it was sold for £300,⁹⁷ but subject to the condition that the remains in the Burial Ground should not be "disturbed in all time coming". The Society did not purchase another Meeting House, and with Partick so near did not require another Burial Ground. Instead they worshipped in a rented house in Charlotte Lane and the proceeds of the Stirling Square property went to assist in the erection of the new Meeting House in Edinburgh.⁹⁸ In 1789 when Peebles Wynd and the adjacent area were marked down for demolition to make way for city improvements including the South Bridge, the Edinburgh Quakers were bought out for a compensation of £375 excluding interest, and the old project of "a good Large Meeting Howse" was realised in the present place of worship in the Pleasance within the old Burial Ground, where it might have stood long before.⁹⁹ The contract for its erection at a cost of £475 between George Miller's committee on behalf of the Society and the contractors, Alexander Paterson and Thomas Dott, was signed towards the end of 1790.¹⁰⁰ The building was well advanced by the end of the month and finished in good time for the recently established "General Meeting" in 1791. Meanwhile, the Friends had worshipped for a year in a house in Blackfriars' Wynd.

In Glasgow there is a hiatus between 1811, when apparently the Friends ceased to meet in their rented Meeting House, and 1815, when the Meeting House at Portland Street was built and opened.¹⁰¹

-
95. cf "Transactions of the Glasgow Archeol. Society", Vol V, Part 1. Paper VIII, P 112. (Art by C Taylor, "Quakers of Glasgow and their Burial Grounds")
96. In 1894 when street improvements took place, an agreement between the Partick **Burgh** Commissioners and the Friends was arrived at by which the Council agreed to take over the care of the Ground in perptuity and pay the Society an annual quit-rent of a shilling. In 1903 the wall was replaced by an iron railing and gateway, and in 1911 a Memorial Tablet was affixed to the gate. (v Ibid: The "Glasgow News" of 12th December 1911, page 6; and "Scottish Notes and Queries", Vol IX (April 1931), P 69 (Art by C Taylor on "Partick Quakers")
97. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book". (1730), (MS Vol 13.) P 139.
98. Ibid P 155. cf Brown's "The ~~Religious~~ Religious Denominations of Glasgow", P 75.
99. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book 1730", (MS Vol 13.) PP106, 116, 117-8, 119, 128, 130-1. (cf Post, Bk III, ChIX. P 330)
100. Ibid, page 137. cf "Edin Two Month's Meeting Accounts", (1789 to 1826), (MS Vol 50) PP 1, 3.
101. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Minutes 1794", (MS Vol 29.) P 363.

CHAPTER XVII."IN SMOOTHER WATERS": 1680 - 1688. "

For the last eight years or so of the Restoration Period, from about the time of the Battle of Drumclog to the Revolution the Quakers in Scotland enjoyed a lull, when they were practically immune from persecution and even irresponsible violence from the rabble; in the South and West because the Government was becoming increasingly absorbed in the intensified struggle to crush the Covenanting rebels, and in Aberdeen and the North-East because, as already noted, the civil persecution of the Friends ceased in November 1679, and the authorities wearied of the futile oppression of a harmless and clean people, would lend no support to the spasmodic efforts of ecclesiastical bigotry and intolerance to perpetuate it. In Edinburgh, there were two isolated instances of persecution before the Revolution. One was the distraint from Bartholemew Gibson the King's farrier in the Canongate in 1680 of twenty nine shillings' worth of pewter and other utensils "for that which they cal the anewity for the preist".¹

The other was a raid made by the rabble in February 1686 on the Quaker's meeting in the West Port when " they made such noise and used so ill the quakers that the adjacent guairdes were called to suppressse the tumult". An unfortunate young bookbinder named John Reid, who was not a Friend but had entered the Meeting House with a comrade out of curiosity, was embroiled in the tumult and hurt, although he was innocent of any part thereof. He was whipped off to the Military Guardhouse where he spent a fortnight, and a similar period in the Canongate Tolbooth. He petitioned the Privy Council to be heard in his own defence and was examined by the Lord Advocate and Graham of Claverhouse who ordered his release on a caution of 500 marks guaranteed by his employer.²

The immediate fruit of this freedom from persecution was the establishment of the first Quaker schools in Scotland, a project that for years had lain near to the heart of Friends. The history of Quaker educational policy and ideals has been a rather fluctuating one, but here only a brief reference to the 17th century part of it is necessary. The attitude of the Society to University education and all kinds of "human" learning as an essential qualification for the Christian ministry has already been set forth, and it is not surprising that the opinion that the Friends " despised and descried" all scholastic learning and book-knowledge and even practical arts per se, was widely prevalent, if not universal. Ellwood was not the only one to discover the falsity of this popular misconception and reproach levelled at the Quakers.³ George Fox, although he could boast of no particular

1. "MS Register of Sufferings", P 11.

2. RPCS. 3rd series, Vol XII, PP 154, 159.

3. v " The History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood, written by Himself"; (1827) P 92.

education and had only picked up by the way what he had, cherished a high sense of the value of school education. He held that all children should be taught "whatever thinges was civill & usefull in ye creation"⁴ and he carried out his belief as early as 1668 by founding schools at Waltham Abbey and Shacklewell. Besides advocating the teaching of languages, he was a pioneer far ahead of his day of "Nature Study" and elementary chemistry,⁵ while Penn favoured the teaching of applied mathematics and practical arts.⁶ Latin was freely taught, although care was taken to avoid classics that were considered sensual and degrading. Barclay, while emphasising that increase of knowledge and proficiency in letters by no means signified increase of true religion, or in the ministry was any substitute for the grace of God and the seal of the Spirit, vindicated the value which the Reformers placed on language for purposes of translation and urged that they be taught "for other very good reasons, as maintaining a commerce and understanding among divers nations by these common languages."⁷ In effect the essential Quaker principle of education was that it must always be kept as a good and respectful servant and never allowed to become an overweening master. It must produce no schism in the souls of the pupils or "draw their Minds into the World while their Bodies & their publick Profession remain amongst Friends", so that "they rest not in a bare Educable Form of the Truth, without having regard to their inward Travail of the Soul and to their growth in the power of Godliness."⁸

In 1678 the earliest Friends' School in Scotland was projected at Aberdeen in which reading, writing and languages were to be taught, and pupils were solicited through the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings.⁹ But through some unexplained delay, nothing was accomplished until 1681 when two schools were opened. The one was an elementary school in Aberdeen under a mistress Margaret Ker, whose equipment seemed to be willingness of heart to do her best rather than professional efficiency. The school had not a propitious start, but the "weighty Friends" of the Quarterly Meeting, including Lillias Skene and Isobel Gerard, supported the teacher vigorously even to "dealing with" disloyal parents who withdrew their children from her tuition.¹⁰ The other was the famous Kinmuck School "for the Latin toung and other Comendable Learning under John Robertson who was settled in Allan's Croft",¹¹ and appointed to the post at £100 per annum, although he had four years later to claim £40 arrears from the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting.¹²

4. "Journal", (Camb.ed.) Vol II, P119. cf "G ffs directions to Schoolmasters of Children." (Swarthmore MSS Vol VII, P170) / Webb, "Fells of Swarthmore Hall", (2nd ed. 1867) P321. (Letter from Thomas Lower to David Lloyd 1716.)
6. cf Janney's "Life", P 199; and "Some Fruits of Solitude", P23.
7. "Apology", (14th ed. 1886) Prop X, Sect XLX, PP220-1.
8. Crisp's "An Epistle of Tender Counsel and Advice" (in "A Memorable Account", (1894) P435. cf General Epistle from Edin. Q.M. dated 1692, at end of "General Records of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16.)
9. "Edin. Quarterly Minute Book", 1669 (MS vol 15.) PP40, 41.
10. Minutes of Aberdeen QM. 4th No. 1682, and 12th No. 1682/3 in JHFS. Vol 11.
11. v MS Inventory of Writs of Kinmuck. (Bundle 66 (19) of Aber. MSS) P110.
12. Minutes, 4th no. 1685-JHFS Vol 11. P106.

Kinnuck was a strong Quaker colony about this time ¹³ and the School prospered. The local Presbytery and Diocesan Synod were intensely annoyed at the foundation of this new institution, and Aberdeen Synod ordained, mainly in reference to Quakers, that "the seditious and disorderlie preachers and keepers of conventicles within the bounds" were to be prosecuted with all diligence.¹⁴ That same year Bishop Scougal died and was succeeded in the See of Aberdeen by George Haliburton, Bishop of Brechin and formerly minister of Coupar-Angus¹⁵ who was even more zealous than his predecessor to crush the "insolencie" of the Quakers. In February 1683, Haliburton along with his lieutenant the Laird of Haddo, appeared before the Privy Council,¹⁶ complaining against the erection of Quaker "schools for training up their children in their godles and hereticall opinions"; of meeting houses; and in some instances of burial grounds, and petitioning the Lords to demolish the School and Meeting House which the Quakers had built in the parish of Kinkell and to reform "their insolencies in severall other places within this Diocess". But the Council were not disposed to adopt extreme measures since these were neither legal nor practicable, and the Bishop left the Chamber with the threat to raze the Kinnuck buildings on his own authority.¹⁷ The Council however realising that it must make some semblance of taking action, referred the matter to the Magistrates of Aberdeen and the Sheriff of the County, and required them to make investigations among the leading Quakers and the proprietors of the land at Kinnuck on which the Meeting House and School stood, and report to the Council. The Lords also reminded the Church with a fine irony that it "should doe what is incumbent to them in provideing against such disorderlie persones with ecclesiasticall censures".¹⁸ To encourage the Church, the Council's Committee for Public Affairs had an order from the Council sent to the Sheriff-Depute of Aberdeen to prohibit Robertson or any other Quaker keeping school within the Diocese of Aberdeen without a licence from the Bishop; also that any householder in whose abode the Friends met in Aberdeen should be "discharged" from holding any further meetings under heavy penalties and the locking up of his house. The Magistrates were likewise enjoined to regard and duly¹⁹ punish all such householders as keepers of illegal conventicles.

-
13. cf Records of Aberdeen Yearly Meeting in JFHS.VIII, 54.
 14. v Mair's "Narratives and Extracts from the Records of the Presbytery of Ellon 1597- 1709", PP 174-5.
 15. v Dowden "The Bishops of Scotland", Appendix, PP 402-3.
 16. cf Other direct approaches to the Privy Council ("Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford", P204: (1897) and "A True and Faithful Account", (1675) P 53. (after Harper's Close Dispute)
 17. Skene, "A Brieff Historicall Account", P 19.
 18. v "Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford 1662-1688", ed Bell, (1897) P340; and Mair's "Narratives and Extracts from the Records of the Presbytery of Ellon 1597-1709"; (1894) P 181. cf RPCS, 3rd series, Vol VIII, P37; and Chambers' "Domestic Annals of Scotland", Vol II, P 447.
 19. RPCS, 3rd series, vol. VIII, P380.

The Bishop and the Diocesan Synod at King's College ordered the Presbyteries to commence forthwith " a process of excommunication against the most remarkable and turbulent of the Quakers in their bounds, and this without any respect of the persones, whatever may be their qualities or conditiones". Moderators of Presbyteries were also required to instruct Clerks to furnish the Bishop and Synod with a complete list of "papists, quakers and other disorderly persons" in each parish within the bounds of the Presbytery.²⁰ But there is no evidence whatever that these civil or ecclesiastical threats or projects had any tangible effect upon the Quakers of Aberdeen and the North East.²¹ Indeed had the "Test Act" of 1681 been applied to the Quakers with penalties, there would have been no necessity for Bishop Haliburton to try to have it enforced through his petition to the Privy Council. But like so many other Carolean measures, the Test Act was a dead letter as far as the Friends were concerned. Its lash was reserved for the Covenanters. As these suffered and died in multitudes at this time, so the Friends had respite throughout Scotland. In 1682 the Minutes of the London Yearly Meeting record that in Scotland " Truth prospers" and " friends are in love and unity." ²² John Burnyeat who was back in Scotland in 1684, the first year of the "Killing Times" had " a very peaceful and prosperous journey". He spent about three weeks in the North with John Tiffin, a Cumberland Friend, and held meetings almost daily without any interference or molestation, as also in Edinburgh and Leith.²³ He "got very well through the West of Scotland and met with no disturbance."²⁴ Friends he learned were allowed to assemble in peace all over the country.

The Church in the North East was glad to follow the line of least resistance, professedly from motives of Christian long-suffering and charity;²⁵ in reality because its toleration was an enforced one. At the "privie censure" of the Presbyteries in the Diocesan Synod in 1685, the stringent measures enjoined by the latter in 1683 and the threats of excommunication had dwindled to the Lord Bishop seriously exhorting " the brethren to look to themselves and to their severall flocks... and that they be carefull to guard their people against apostacie to poperie and quakerism".²⁶ The impotence of the Church against Friends was still further emphasised when the Addition to the Burgess Oath of 1678²⁷ was partly rescinded in favour of Quaker entrant burgesses in

-
20. "Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford", PP340-1; and " Narratives and Extracts from the Records of the Presbytery of Ellon", P 181.
21. cf post BkIII, Ch.V, P 297, and JFHS VIII, 118 (Legacy left for Kinmuck School in 1717.)
22. MS Vol I, P 121; cf Letter from John Burnyeat to American Friends from Hartford, dated 19-4-1682 in " The Truth Exalted in the Writings of.. John Burnyeat", (1691) P 154.
23. Letter from Leith to his "brother" T.A. of London, dated 6-8-1684. (in "The Truth Exalted", PP83-4.)
24. Burnyeat's "Journal", (1839) P 244.
25. cf "Narratives and Extracts from the Records of the Presbytery of Ellon", (1894) P 181. 27. cf ante, ChX1. P154.
26. "Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford" (1897) p368.

1686.²⁸ During all the persecution of the Quakers in Scotland in the Restoration period as well as in the latter years of respite and toleration, numerous travelling and "public" Friends came from England.²⁹ Apparently there is no record of any between 1659 and 1669 except Dewsbury, though Miller gives several conjectural ones, some of whom are very probable.³⁰ These included, about fifty-one may be said to have toured in Scotland from 1660-1688, seven of whom were women, but this figure can be regarded only as roughly approximate. Many names of Stranger Friends given in "The First Publishers of Truth" and elsewhere as visiting Scotland are little more than names, without any details of their itinerary or experiences, and without dates, a common deficiency in Quaker chronicles. Several of the earlier travellers, eg Samuel Cater, James Halliday, Thomas Dockray and John Watson suffered imprisonment or other persecution, but in the main the missionaries fared moderately well. Miller gives a pretty full list,³¹ and here only one or two of the most notable not hitherto mentioned may be referred to particularly. In 1671 Leonard Fell of Swarthmore, probably some relation of the Judge's family³² was a witness to a Friend's marriage at Drumbow. John Banks who crossed and re-crossed from Ireland several times, landed at Portpatrick with his colleague John Watson in December 1676. Somewhere on their way to Douglas they lost their bearings in the snow among the hills, and spent and weary, reached the house of William Mitchell late at night. Next day a meeting was held although "there were but few Friends belonging to that place", and from Douglas the travellers passed through North Lanarkshire, visiting Hamilton, Drumbow and Badcow on their way to Edinburgh and Leith. They were also at Prestonpans. At Edinburgh they "had two heavenly meetings, though there were some wild scoffing people among the rest, yet the Lord's power chained them down."³³

In 1679 Peter Fearon and George Rooke, two Cumberland Quakers visited Scotland. These were the Friends whom Fox counselled to travel on foot, as their horses would in all probability have been commandeered by the Covenanters or the Dragoons. Their itinerary does not seem to have been marked by any undue hardship or molestation, although the Friends that they visited— in places not specified—suffered from the Dragoons in common with others.³⁴

28. v "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen (1643-1747)", P 307: CF Munro, "Memorials of the Alderman and Provosts of Aberdeen", P 182.

29. cf Jaffray's "Diary", P 248.

30. Art. "Stranger Friends visiting Scotland, 1650-1797", in JFHS Vol XII, PP 82-3

31. Ibid, PP 137-40. Some visited Scotland several times but are counted only once, (eg Fell, Dickenson, etc.)

32. cf Webb, "The Fells of Swarthmore Hall" (1867) P 310.

33. John Bank's "Journal" (1712) P 65.

34. "A Collection of Testimonies" (1760) PP 171-2.

Four years later James Dickenson of Lowmoor,³⁵ near Carlisle crossed the border with a young companion who "had a concern" to go with him, - the first of five tours Dickenson had in Scotland spread over the next forty years. They travelled to Aberdeen where they met with Rooke and held uninterrupted meetings in spite of the Diocesan Synod, one of these being on an emigrant ship bound for New Jersey, among whose passengers were several Quakers. After traversing the North and registering some "convincements" they returned by the West of Scotland home.³⁶

The activities of these missionaries may have contributed to the establishment of a Friends' Meeting in Glasgow in 1687. Fox had tried in vain to gather one thirty years previously but now "there is a Little Weekly Meeting newly set up in Glasgow (one of the most considerable Cities of our Nation); where the bitter and dark Spirit of the professors and presbyterian Priests did reign in a mighty Dominion of Death, to the keeping out of Truth so long as it could".³⁷ By 1687 they were unable to exclude the Society from the city any longer.

That year James VII realising that he had stirred a hornet's nest no less in Scotland than in England by his virtual abolition of Parliaments and the advancement of Romanists to positions of power and trust, sought to "legalise" his policy. Accordingly he determined to assert "our sovereign authority, prerogative royal, and absolute power, which all our subjects are to obey without reserve" to free his co-religionists from the crippling disabilities of the Tests by releasing other Dissenters also. On the plea that none of his four predecessors had been able to effect a practicable and happy uniformity in religion, James issued on 4th April 1687 a "Declaration for Liberty of Conscience"³⁸ to Dissenters, followed by the Proclamation of 5th July, whereby all "penal and sanguinary laws against Non-conformity would be immediately suspended, and his subjects should be free to meet in private houses or recognised chapels and Meeting Houses, provided nothing treasonable was preached or spoken, the Meetings were open to the public, and Justices were advised of them."³⁹ Field conventicles were still debarred as before. "Moderate Presbyterians", Quakers and Roman Catholics were those who benefited from this toleration in Scotland. No one was deceived by the King's motive in these measures, but the Quakers had good cause to welcome them. The Address of acknowledgment and appreciation which Robert Barclay drew up and presented to the King in London on behalf of the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting has already been noted.⁴⁰ The address is as near an approach to flattery as Quakers might be expected to submit to.

35. Ferguson "Early Cumberland and Westmoreland Friends" (1871), PP114-6.

36. Dickenson's "Journal" (1745) PP 15 — 16.

37. "Epistle from the Edinburgh YM to the London YM" 3rd month 1687. ("Epistles Received 1683-1706", Vol I. P44.)

38. v Robertson, "Select Statutes", PP 388-391.

39. cf Wodrow "History of the Sufferings", Vol IV, PP426-7. cf also Blair's

40. v ante, Ch. VII, P128.

"Life", P567.

CHAPTER XVIII.

"THE CHARGE OF 'JESUITICO-QUAKERISM' WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE
TO SCOTLAND."

Any comprehensive treatment of this big subject, even in outline, would, to a considerable extent, lie outside the scope of the present thesis, but its place as a factor in the Quaker Movement in Scotland must be indicated. The charge levelled against the Quakers in the 17th and 18th centuries of being secret agents and emissaries of the Church of Rome, or Jesuits in disguise,¹ was almost universally exploited by the religious and political enemies of the Society of Friends, to render the latter odious and suspect, and to discredit their witness. Robert Barclay knew no other weapon of calumny more common, "so that I hardly remember I ever saw a book amongst those many hath been written by our opposers, which hath not some reflexion of this kind in it".² "Jesuitico-Quakerism", the term by which it is most conveniently called was coined by John Alexander of Leith in his "Pretended Examination" to which Keith replied in "Truth's Defence", but the phenomenon itself was considerably earlier.

The author of this famous popular hoax was in all probability the Rev. Ralph Farmer, minister of St. Nicholas' Church Bristol, a Presbyterian,³ and the occasion of its birth was the first Quaker mission to Bristol in 1654 under John Camm and John Audland. The manifest success of the venture led to a violent wave of antagonism which was fomented by Farmer and others and led to rioting which might have become very serious. Further publicity was given to the new theory by Prynne's pamphlet "The Quakers Unmasked, and clearly detected to be but the Spawn of Romish Frogs, Jesuits, and Franciscan Fryers, sent from Rome to seduce the intoxicated Giddy-headed English Nation", and after an affidavit had actually been sworn that some of the Quaker preachers were Franciscan friars from Rome⁴ who had planned at London in the previous Autumn to visit Bristol, the Magistrates issued warrants in every ward of the city on 25th January 1654 to search for and arrest on suspicion, Camm, Audland, Fox, Naylor and Burrough.⁵ Even Richard Baxter, with whom certain leading Friends had a regrettable and unedifying controversy, believed them to be secret Friars begotten of the Papacy and "set upon the propagating of the substance of Popery".⁶

There was just enough apparent affinity between Romanism and certain aspects of Quakerism to disseminate this strange

-
1. eg v. Deacon's "An Exact History of the Life of James Naylor", P 5.
 2. "Quakerism No Popery". (1675) ("Epistle to the Reader" by Robert Barclay, P 1.)
 3. cf Braithwaite, "The Beginnings of Quakerism", P 172.
 4. cf Prynne "The Quakers Unmasked", P 2.
 5. The Text of the "Warrant is found in Besse's "Sufferings", (1753) Vol I, P 40.
 6. "The Quakers' Catechism", (1655) esp. P C3. cf "Reliquiae Baxterianae", (1696) Part I, P 77.

libel, and that was strengthened by fancied correspondences of doctrine and by incidents and 'mots' which gave all the colour of circumstantial evidence. The principal underlying causes of the charge of " Jesuitico-Quakerism" may be summarised as follows:-

(1) Opponents of the Friends who had an axe to grind freely batted on the credulity of the people, and various kinds of childish or 'tall' stories were circulated to persuade the unthinking that the Quaker was " the Papist's Younger brother" and the junior son of Satan. Examples of this are found in John Menzies and Robert Law's writings. Menzies' tale of the unmasked Quaker in Kinnaber family⁷ may or may not have some connection with Law's story of the Laird of Kinnaber's 'confession' when he returned from Quakerism to the fold of the Church, the sum of which was, that the Quaker leaders not only had converse with Satan and correspondence with the Pope and "the chief of the Papists", but were largely subsidised from Rome, and that the Laird himself had been one of the treasurers of the Friends and not a very honest one either!⁸ Nor did the Popish Plot of 1678 do anything to diminish the stigma.

(2) About 1661, according to Sewell,⁹ many Roman Catholics and Jesuits began to pay public court to Friends as the best and most self-denying of all the heretical sects and to lament their continued separation from Mother Church, "which gave occasion to their enemies to divulge that there was an affinity and collusion between the Quakers and the Papists."¹⁰

(3) The incidence of the Movement of mystic " Quietism" which arose in the Roman Church in the 17th century and is principally identified with Miguel de Molinos, Madame Guyon and Fénelon brought to many men's minds a strong suggestion of spiritual affinity, teaching, and sympathy between these Catholic mystics and the Quakers. There is undoubtedly much that bears a close resemblance to the doctrine of 'Immediate Revelation' and the sovereign inward control of the Spirit, in the "Guida Spirituale"¹¹ and in Madame Guyon's "Autobiography" and " Method of Prayer" ¹²but the fact that all three were essentially more Protestant than Catholic, and were condemned by the Church as heretics, would not wholly free the Quakers from being suspect as Romanists in disguise, and one in spirit with the Quietists. Additional evidence seemed to be lent to this in the 18th century when Quakerism in Scotland and England alike lost its adventurous and militant spirit and folded itself into Quietism more completely than ever.¹³ To this change "The Method of Prayer" materially contributed.

7. " Roma Mendax", P 21, cited by Keith in "Quakerism No Popery";(1675): P 80.

8. Law's "Memorials";(1818) P 108. 9."History(1811), Vol.1, PP487-8.

10. This 'gesture' however may not have been made in Scotland as Roman Catholicism was proscribed there till the "Roman-Catholic Relief Bill" of 1829 abolished civil penalties.

11. Especially Part I, Ch. XLV, XV, XVI: & Part II. ChII, IV, VII, IX, XI.

12. v also Vaughan's " Hours with the Mystics"(1893), Vol II, BKX, Ch I and II partim: and R.E Welsh on "Madam Guyon and the Quakers" in " Classics of the Soul's Quest," PP331-2.

13. There was a Quaker translation of Madam Guyon's "Method" issued in 1775, though possibly an earlier translation had existed among Friends. The 1775 edition was printed for TMills, grandfather of Lord Macaulay. It is generally known as "the Bristol translation."

* Robert Blair stated plainly that "most of their [the Quakers'] heresies were Popish heresies", and even went so far as to say that in 1670 some Quakers in Scotland declared themselves Popish. 16A.

(4) The early Quakers and the Roman Catholics were closely linked in the public mind through being oppressed or 'distressed' by many of the same penal measures and test laws. Even where in certain Acts, eg the "Clandestine Marriage" Act of 1661 and the "Test Act" of 1681, the Quakers are not specifically mentioned, it is not difficult to see that they are bracketed in the mind of the framer and the public alike.¹⁴ Almost invariably however, 'the unholy twins' the "Papists" and the "Quakers" are "named" together in municipal Bye-laws and ecclesiastical Enactments. Instances of the former are the Aberdeen "Act against Setting [Letting] Houses to papists and quakers", 1670; and the 'Addition to the Burgess Oath', 1678;¹⁵ while the "Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford" are full of the latter.¹⁶ This phenomenon however ceased at the Revolution.

(5) External similarities, or apparent coincidences of certain doctrines and elements in worship, influenced by radical misunderstanding and fallacious logic were largely responsible for the charge of Jesuitico-Quakerism.* Even men like Baxter seemed unable to exercise any discrimination between the very differing motives and intentions of these apparent affinities between Quakerism and Romanism. He gives as his tenth reason for not being a Quaker that they in many doctrines "do so openly comply with the Papists that we may plainly see that the Jesuites and Fryers are their Leaders!"¹⁷ Many early pamphlets like "Hell broke Loose", Blom's "Fanatick History" and "The Snake in the Grass" reason ingeniously or heatedly if not always convincingly to establish these identifications. The religious public of the 17th century might be excused for a resultant confusion of mind on these matters, especially when a leader of the calibre of Penn allowed himself to say to James II. that there was no difference between their religions except the trimmings, while at the same time protesting against the absurdity of branding himself as a Papist and Jesuit. Any detailed theological examination of the correspondences, real or fancied, of Quaker and Roman doctrine or practice lies beyond our present purpose, but one or two examples may be indicated. Leslie attacks the infallibility of the Inner Light as equally erroneous to the infallibility of the Church vested in the Pope.¹⁹ The prerogative which the one claimed as the Supreme Authority over Faith and the Interpretation of divine Truth even above the Scriptures, was as undesirable as the similar prerogative of the other. Leslie charges the Friends with an idolatry blasphemous far beyond Rome's in their worship of one another, on the ground that the Real Presence of Christ is within each. He accused Fox of calling himself the Son of God, and Audland

-
14. v "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", (1820) Vol VII, P231, col.1: Vol VIII, P243.
15. "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen 1643-1747" (1872), PP 261, 299.
16. eg PP63, 94, 106, 204, 368.
17. "One Sheet against the Quakers", P 8. \ 16A v "Life", (1848) P 533. cf Woodrow's "Correspondence", Vol I, P170.
18. P30.
19. "The Snake in the Grass", (1698) Sect VI, PP 31ff.

of addressing Fox as 'Holy One',²⁰ and unfortunately there was the melancholy history of James Nayler to intensify this. Again, the Romanists denied that the ministers of the Reformed churches were true ministers at all, that their ordinances were authorised and sealed by Christ, or that their congregations were part of the genuine Body of Christ. The Quakers also denied these things; ergo, the Romanists and Quakers were one!²¹ And lastly, because the Church of Rome in the most solemn act of the Mass adored the Host in absolute silence, and Quakers too worshipped often in perfect silence; ergo, the Quakers were Romanists in disguise.

As might be expected, the natural Quaker reaction to all this was vigorous and convincing. Some of it anticipated the charge. As early as 1656 Fox was writing to the Pope (Alexander VII) "and to all his train of Idolatries" a "warning from the Lord" in which he inveighed against the dark heavy weight of deluding superstition and the whole gamut of idolatrous worship of crucifixes and images. This was only one of several addresses to the occupants of St. Peter's chair, and of other arraignments of Popery.²² The most striking of these, and probably the most amusing to the contemporary religious World outwith the Society of Friends was a Questionnaire drawn up for Innocent XI, which Sewell translated into Latin at Fox's request, and despatched in 1679 to His Holiness under a covering letter,²³ with what result is not recorded.

In 1660 Wm. Caton addressed an epistle from Amsterdam to Charles II. which detailed thirteen reasons why it was absurd to charge the Friends with being Romanists, especially as some accused of being Jesuits had never learned the terminology of Jesuitry, nor understood what a "Popish Recusant" was.²⁴ Barclay maintained that the Quakers more than any other Protestants denied the gross errors and superstitions of ~~the~~ Popery, were the most thorough-going of all Reformers, and could in no sense be said to stand for a return to Rome.²⁵ Keith's attitude to the Church of Rome was one of definite antagonism. She was the principal member of the "Scarlet Whore, Mystery Babylon," in whom dwelt, most of all, the spirit of Antichrist. Friends could never favour Her upon these grounds nor because of what they had suffered at her hands.²⁶

(6) Not less significant than the aforementioned general grounds on which the charge of Jesuitico-Quakerism was based, was the intimate personal friendship of two of its foremost leaders, Penn and Barclay with the King or the Heir of the Throne. The secret intercourse of

20. Ibid, Sect VIII, PP 112 ff, and Appen, PP 369-70.

21. cf "The Quakers Catechism", (1655) Page facing C2: and "Hell Broke Loose", P 30.

22. v Smith's "Catalogue", Vo. I, PP 651, 656, 666 etc.

23. Sewell's "History" (1811), Vol II, PP 376-381.

24. "An Epistle to King Charles the II," (1660) P 5. (Tract in Eusto

25. "Quakerism No Popery", Sect XIII, (by Barclay) PP 102-8. n)

26. "Truth's Defence", (1682) PP 232-3.

* As late as 1710, Wodrow said that there was no doubt that the Quakers had "a correspondence with the Jesuits, particularly Mr Pen." 28A.

Penn with James II.²⁷ is a deeply interesting study, but a brief reference must suffice here. Penn had great influence at Court, for the Duke of York, as Duke and as King, had always shown him favour and taken him into his confidence for his own as well as his father's sake. Penn took the fullest advantage of this unusual privilege to press for the principle of complete liberty of conscience for every Non-conformist in the land and for the realisation of his ideal. He realised the risk which he ran when he upheld ^{the} same religious liberty for Roman Catholics as for Quakers and other Dissenters.²⁸ But he reached his objective when the "Declaration of Liberty of Conscience" came into force in 1687. Whatever may have been his secret thoughts about the King's motives and machinations, he and the Society of Friends could not be blamed for hailing the Declaration with as much satisfaction and jubilation as the Cameronians, and indeed most ~~of the~~ Presbyterians, reacted to it with fury and apprehension. The Declaration was accepted as a culminating evidence of Jesuitico-Quakerism.* All the legends about Penn's education at St. Omer,²⁹ his priesthood as a Jesuit, his marriage by Papal dispensation, as well as his resolute though vain attempt to reconcile the enraged James and the Fellows of Magdalen, were revived and intensified. Penn and the Quakers were in league with Rome! Burnet was one of the few who thought otherwise, for although he had no great liking for Penn and thought him too plastic in James's hands, yet "I have known him long, and I think myself bound to acquit him, as far as one man can judge of another"³⁰

A measure of the same suspicion fell also on Barclay, but little more need be added to what has been already written.³¹ He certainly hated Roman Catholicism especially its cruelty and persecution, "the worst part of Popery". But some of his closest friends were Catholics and the essentially Christian distinction which he drew between loving them as fellow-men and hating their religious system³² served only to increase suspicion toward him among religious communities who were antagonistic alike to his own views and to any toleration being extended to the common foe. Thus Barclay and the Friends with him came "under the lash of envy, malice and slandering tongues."³³

Despite all this popular suspicion and malice the Quakers can never be regarded as Jacobites with the exception of Penn,³⁴ on sentimental grounds. Their principles of non-resistance and traditional loyalty to the reigning monarch would alone have prevented them. Even in Penn's case however, J.M Rigg who wrote the article on him in the "Dictionary of National Biography" was unable to discover any solid grounds for regarding Penn as

27. cf Croese's "History", Book II, P 106.

28. eg "Select Works" (1782), Vol IV, P394 etc. ("Good Advice to the Church of England".) 28A of Wodrow's "Analecta" Vol I P 293, (and his "Corres-

29. cf Dobrée "Wm Penn, Quaker and Pioneer", (1932) PP 296-7. pendence" Vol I P 170

30. "Original Memoirs", (ed. Foxcroft) P 218: cf "History of his Own Time", (1883 ed.) P 441.

31. v ante, Ch VII, PP 127-129.

32. v "Vindication" (1689) in "Reliquiae Barclaianaee", PP 64-5. (cf Keith's attitude to individual Catholics like a Kempis and Francis Xavier.)

33. Ibid, P 62.

party to the intrigues of the Jacobites," nor does he think the Government ever seriously entertained the current fama.³⁵ But Colonel Barclay and Mrs Wilson-Fox state that Robert Barclay Secundus and Alexander Jaffray were imprisoned for a month in Aberdeen Tolbooth, charged with a Jacobite plot, but on being proved innocent were released.³⁶ In both Rebellions the Quakers evinced their loyalty to the Throne. In December 1715 the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting issued a public Testimony against imputations cast on Friends, "that all charitable people that have any candour or sobriety may believe that we own no Siding with parties, nor Plotting.. nor drinking and pledging of healths so cold, nor Running to Camps and assisting at weapon shaws or rendezvous with guns or other carnal weapons... or any other restless turbulent behaviour in this sad time... and we heartily disown all such as goe one in these or such like practices."³⁷ After the '15 an Address of thankful approbation and homage was sent to George I. in 1716 by the London Yearly Meeting,³⁸ contemporary with an Address of congratulation from the Church of Scotland.³⁹ After the '45 an even more explicit and humble Address was forwarded by the Annual Assembly in London to George II. which went as far as any Quaker utterance, could well go,⁴⁰ and bore 'interalia' that "as none among all thy Protestant subjects exceed us in an aversion to tyranny, idolatry and superstition of the Church of Rome, so none lie under more just apprehensions of immediate danger from their destructive consequences, or have greater cause to be thankful to the Almighty for the interposition of His Providence in our preservation." ⁴¹ The Church also addressed its congratulations to His Majesty. On one thing at last the Church of Scotland and Friends were agreed!

The attitude of the Society of Friends to the Church of Rome and the Reformation as represented in the writings of Keith which has already been dealt with, must be borne in mind in the light of this question of Jesuitico-Quakerism also. A few additional observations may however be made to amplify the Quaker mind on the Roman Church and this charge. There are several references to the question in Scots Quaker literature or portions of works relating thereto, but only two Scottish works specifically written to meet it—a pamphlet by Keith in 1664 entitled, "To such as either ignorantly or maliciously falsly accuse us (who are called Quakers) as being Papists & houlding many popish Oppinions";⁴² and

35. JFHS. VI, P56. (1909)

36. "History of the Barclay Family", Vol III, PP 199-200.

37. Testimony in Bundle No.60(9) of Aber.MSS. cf "Aber.Monthly Meeting Book" (MS Vol 3), PP 66-7.

38. v Gough's "History", Vol IV, P 167: Sewell's "History", Vol.II, PP 617-8.

39. "Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland" 1638-1842, ed Pitcaim, P 510. (Act VI 1716.) cf A similar address after the '45. (P 685, Act V, 1746.)

40. cf "London Yearly Meeting during 250 Years", (1919] P 47.

41. Given in Gough's "History", Vol IV, P 336.

42. I cannot trace this pamphlet. It is not in Euston Library or B.M. Smith queries whether it was ever printed, ("Catalogue", Vol II, P18)

* and himself, according to M'Creie, a convert from Popery. 42A

[Faint, mostly illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]

"Quakerism No Popery"; (and Section VIII of Barclay's "Anarchy of the Ranters".) The occasion of the first is unknown but the origin of the second was the publication in 1674 of an attack upon the Church of Rome, "Roma Mendax" by John Menzies, Professor of Divinity at King's College, Aberdeen, * In it the writer, replying to a Jesuit called Dempster also took occasion to compromise, and reflect upon, the Quakers as being secret Jesuits in doctrine and teaching, and indicated that "Roma Mendax" was but a prelude to an exhaustive exposure and refutation of Quakerism by his colleague-minister the "learned and judicious" George Meldrum.⁴⁵ There is no record that the projected work ever appeared.

In "Quakerism No Popery", Keith denied that there was any real parallelism between the grounds of Menzies' indictment of Dempster and those of his allegations against the Quakers.⁴⁴ He seized upon Menzies' canon that "the same sentiment held upon different accounts may be hereticall in the one and not in the other". "Very well, if then I doe show that in those alleadged instances or any others he can alleadge wherein we seem to agree with Papists, they and we hold them upon different accounts; it doth manifestly follow from John Menzies his own mouth that those sentiments or doctrines may be hereticall and Popish in Papists and not in us called Quakers."⁴⁵ All through "Quakerism No Popery", Keith kept in view his design to show the different senses or intent in which Friends held these doctrines from the Roman Church.

Menzies found the Quakers guilty of Heresy on eight counts, showing that "many of the Quakers' Notions are undoubtedly Popish Doctrines; and that "the whole work of Quakers is to break the Reformed Churches."⁴⁶ Most of the series concern the Scriptures, and sin and Justification, of which the most important was concerned with the ground and means of Salvation. The old Calvinistic charge that the Quakers denied original sin and taught Justification by a righteousness wrought within them and by good works, was natural and inevitable, and recurred times without number. The Friends denied that it was through any "natural light" or innate goodness of their own that men were justified, but by the indwelling of Christ, "the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the World"; "the Lord our Righteousness", and while they held that "Gospel" works were effectual secondarily to Justification, they carefully discriminated between their own conception of Justification by works and the Roman Catholic conception, and vigorously dissociated themselves from the latter.⁴⁷

42A v Wodrow's "Correspondence", (1843) Vol II, P 222n.

43. "Quakerism No Popery". ("Epistle to the Reader", by Robt Barclay, PP 4-5.)
44. cf "Quakerism Confirmed", (in "Truth Triumphant" 1717, Vol III, P 70) where Keith and Barclay contend that the Students' arguments against them are in no way superior to Dempster's arguments against Menzies, nor their (the Quakers') answers inferior to Menzies."
45. "Quakerism No Popery", PP 4-5.
46. "Roma Mendax", PP20-1: "Quakerism No Popery", P 3.
47. cf "Truth Cleared of Calumnies". (in "Truth Triumphant" 1717, Vol I, PP 35-8: 39ff.)

Not unnaturally the Quakers pressed home the refutation of their Presbyterian antagonists' charges with a "tu quoque". As early as 1658, Edward Burrough indicted Protestant ministers for having a spirit and policy differing nothing from Rome's in quality but only in degree, especially in persecuting and imprisoning opponents,⁴⁸ and colour was lent to this prevalent charge by the pageantry with which the Magistrates of Aberdeen welcomed home the Catholic Marquis of Huntly and his Norfolk bride about twenty years later.⁴⁹ Probably the clergy of Aberdeen did participate in what after all was a purely civic reception to a local Noble, without any religious significance, but the Quakers could only see inconsistency and undue partiality in the respective treatment by both authorities of themselves and the Romish Marquis.

Barclay's controversy with Mitchell and the Scottish ministers generally on this issue, concerned doctrine more particularly,⁵⁰ especially the pivotal question of Justification, while Keith seeks to discredit the authority of Menzies's orders as derived from Rome.⁵¹ An anonymous collaborator with Keith and Barclay accuses Menzies and his fellow clergy of having ten times more in common with the Roman Church than the Quakers have, especially in their beliefs about the Trinity and the Sacrament of Baptism, and on the practical side, in their training for the ministry, ordination to orders, sermon preparation, emoluments, judicial swearing and active support of war.⁵²

48. Intro. to "The Great Mystery of the Great Whore", ("The Epistle to the Reader") P 23.
49. " Most Materiall Passages", PP 49-50.
50. cf " Truth Cleared of Calumnies". (in "Truth Triumphant" 1717, Vol I, P 39.)
51. "Quakerism No Popery", P 82.
52. Ibid, PP 96-102.

CHAPTER XLX."A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE MIDDLE PERIOD
WITH OBSERVATIONS."

The First Period of Quakerism in Scotland, as elsewhere ushered upon the stage an enterprise of remarkable hope, surprises and courageous abandon. In the Middle Period that enterprise began to take shape as a "Movement". It grew steadily in numbers and influence and reached the stage of organisation, for mulation and consolidation, but in the very success of its witness and spirit in educating the people of that day towards an ampler ideal of democracy and toleration, the Society was unconsciously paving the way for its own decline from the dynamic and militant life it had lived to the quiescent existence and ultimately the static "system" of the Third and last Period.

In the Cromwellian Period (1653-1659) the chief centres of witness and activity in Scotland were Edinburgh and Lanarkshire, other places being more or less incidental through missionary tours and the stationing of soldiers of the Army of Occupation. In the Restoration Period (1660-1688) Aberdeen and the North-East was the stronghold of Quakerism, though Edinburgh and the Borders were by no means negligible. Statistics are impossible to estimate with any accuracy owing to gaps in Records and the absence of sufficient data, but on the side of the organisation there is ample information about this Period, when the first Monthly, Quarterly and other meetings were inaugurated, the first Meeting Houses and Schools were erected, and nearly all the Burial Grounds acquired.

The Middle Period in Scotland was the time of the great families and the greatest native Figures, Jaffray, Keith, the Barclays, Swinton, Raeburn, Livingstone and the Skenes. No other country of its size showed such a distinguished array of Friends drawn from the high-born and educated classes of the community as Scotland. And Scotland contributed two of the great international quartette, Robert Barclay and George Keith.

This Period was the epoch of the greatest writings in Scotland and beyond, for no authors in the whole history of Quakerism excel Barclay and Keith in importance. The early period was the period of Testimonies and Apologiae: this was essentially the period of Controversials and Works of Exposition.

In reviewing the persecution of the Quakers in Scotland under the Stuart kings, one of two additional features call for notice and comment. The Government never regarded the Quakers as really dangerous to State or Church, but only as a troublesome, eccentric, and generally harmless sect, to be ignored with contempt as far as possible, except when local authorities pressed for some immediate action. Up to 1676 the Privy Council took comparatively little to do with any prosecution or persecution of Friends, and even when it did, its action was phlegmatic and half-hearted, signifying little or nothing in the end, as in the case of Anthony

Haig and Andrew Robertson which dragged on for over three years;¹ the complaint of Archbishop Burnet to Arlington about Border Friends in 1665² or the case of the twenty Aberdeen Friends in 1673 who were suddenly freed from their fines to the disappointment of Neilson the Edinburgh apothecary.³ It was the Church that was the real persecutor or would-be persecutor of the Quakers, especially in Aberdeen and the North East, and the Civil Authorities usually took action only when incited or goaded by the ecclesiastical Powers. Even then, they could and did on occasion evince an impatience and aversion to organised religious bigotry, most notably in the chilly reception which the High Court Justices gave to Meldrum and Menzies at Aberdeen in 1671,⁴ and the snub which the Provost and Town Council gave to Lyall and Gordon, the envoys of the Diocesan Synod, subsequent to their slight by the Privy Council in 1672.⁵

Such was the policy of the Civil Authorities towards the Quakers- if "policy" it can be called, until 1676 when the last concentrated offensive against the Quakers began, the signal for which was the Declaration of the Privy Council issued in March. Civil and ecclesiastical powers combined in vain to stamp out Quakerism, for no exertions of the Commissions or excommunications by the Church, or Melville's distraint of goods, or imprisonment or ostracism, proved the least effective in lowering the Friends' morale, or decreasing their missionary zeal and witness. After 1679 when the civil persecution ceased, the Privy Council lent no ear or support to the persecuting spirit which still animated the Church in Aberdeen.⁶

It is noteworthy that throughout the persecution of the Quakers in Scotland under the Stuarts, much more humane treatment was accorded to women Friends than in England and abroad. Only an occasional instance of assault or undue molestation like that of Mrs Chalmers of Kinmuck is recorded, and there is no evidence of women being imprisoned as elsewhere, or of children maintaining their meetings alone because all their parents and adult friends were in gaol.

-
1. v ante, Ch VI, PP 109-112.
 2. v Ibid, P 114.
 3. v ante, Ch XI, P 151.
 4. v ante, Ch IX, P 141.
 5. Ibid, P 142.
 6. cf ante, Ch XVII, P 222.

BOOK III.

FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE MIDDLE OF THE
NINETEENTH CENTURY. 1688- c1850.

CHAPTER. I."THE REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT AND THE ADVENT OF TOLERATION."

For the Quakers, least of all, was the Revolution Settlement necessary, as they were practically immune from persecution and tyranny in Scotland during the last eight years of the Stuart dynasty. Yet notwithstanding all the three "Indulgences" of 1687, issued through "our .. prerogative royal and absolute power", they lay under the same political insecurity as anyone else. But apart from their general principle of accepting loyally, and living peaceably under, whatever king might be appointed to reign over them by Divine decree, without any meddling in the affairs of the State,¹ they were far-seeing enough to know that in the flight of James VII and the swiftly-maturing plans for the accession of William Henry, Prince of Orange and Count of Nassau, they would have their religious liberty confirmed beyond all doubt, and guaranteed by the will and determination of the overwhelming majority of the nation.

In October 1688 about a month before he left the United Provinces, William sent from his court at the Hague a Declaration to Scotland² of the reasons inducing him to Appear in Armes for Preserving of the Protestant Religion and for Restoring the Lawes and Liberties of the ancient Kingdome of Scotland". The Declaration² opening with a preamble on the hopeless impasse produced in any nation by the overt violation of its laws and fundamental civil and religious rights, bore His Highness' "tender" sympathy with the deplorable condition of the Northern Kingdom under the arbitrary rule of the Stuarts, the implacable cruelty of the Council, and the conversion of Justice to Terrorism. William hated Romanism and offered himself to the Scots as defender of their cherished Protestantism and champion of their civil freedom. But though he was reared a Calvinist he pinned his faith to no ecclesiastical order for its own sake. He was a Latitudinarian to whom Toleration was a political necessity and to whom any Church system must be made elastic enough to embrace his policy and serve his well-intentioned purposes.

In November 1688 the Prince of Orange landed at Brixham, and in January 1689 the English Convention offered the crown of England to William and Mary which they accepted under the "Declaration of Right". The Scots Convention of Estates without a Royal Commissioner met at Edinburgh in March, drew up the similar "Claim of Right" and on 11th April, William and Mary

1. cf Sewell's "History" (1811), II, P 535.

2. "Cameronian Papers", 1679-1700. (Laing MSS. No344 in Edin. University Library.) Printed. v also Wodrow, "History of the Sufferings", (1830) Vol. IV, PP 470-2.

were proclaimed monarchs of Scotland also.³ Thus in the words of the Earl of Crawford to the Earl of Melville, came "a king framed in all respects to our heart's wish, and alreadie acknowledged by every good man to be a blessing to all the Protestants the world over; so that if we be not a happie people at this juncture, I despaire of ever seeing that joyfull tyme"⁴ But Crawford was more enthusiastic over William III than most.

The Toleration Act⁵ of 24th May 1689 applied to England only. The corresponding emancipation for Scotland came in the "Act Ratifying the Confession of Faith and Settling Presbyterian Church Government"⁶ and the "Act Rescinding the Laws for Conformity".⁷ The former Act as annulling chiefly the "Deponing against Delinquents" Act of 1670,⁸ and the "Test Act" of 1681,⁹ had no material bearing on the Quakers either in respect of these, or of its constructive Presbyterianism. By the latter Act however, which went much further than the "Toleration Act", Friends were freed from all the late penal laws under which they were arraigned or liable to be arraigned, inter alia, the "Conventicle Act", the "Separation from Worship Act", the "Act against Disorderly Baptisms," and generally all other Acts, clauses and provisions in Acts whatsoever, made since the yeare 1661 inclusive against nonconformity". This included the rescinding of the "Quaker Act" of 1661 which is not specifically included in the list. Friends of course, especially "Public" or travelling Friends were still apprehensible under the old Vagrancy Acts, as is obvious from the instructions to the constables of Lanark issued by the Baillie and Council in 1695¹⁰ and other similar instructions, but Toleration was now the order of the day and there is little record of Friends being arrested or penalised by any Civil Authority. Chiefly by the Church, which still tried spasmodically to drive the machinery of persecution without the fly-wheel, and by the turbulent and irresponsible mob in Edinburgh and Glasgow,¹² was the peace of the Quakers interrupted. r/

-
3. Lockhart's "Memoirs concerning the Affairs of Scotland", (1714) PP 1-2.
 4. "Letters and State Papers chiefly addressed to George, Earl of Melville", (1843) P 41, No 38.
 5. The Text of the Act is given in Besse "Sufferings", (1753) Vol. I, Preface PP xvi ff; "A Collection of Acts of Parliament.. relative to .. Quakers, from 1688", (1757) PP 3-10: Neal's "History of the Puritans", III, PP 576-81 etc.
 6. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", (1820) Vol. IX, PP 133-4, and 117-131.
 7. Ibid, P 198.
 8. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", (1820) Vol. VIII, P7, Col-2.
 9. Ibid, P243 Col.1.
 10. v "Extracts from the Records of the Royal Burgh of Lanark AD 1150-1722", (1893) 20th June 1695. (P 255)
 11. cf infra, P 240.
 12. v post, Ch. III.

The Revolution Settlement although it brought freedom from persecution and intolerable religious anarchy to a weary and tormented nation, did not usher in such a tranquil and happy era in Scotland generally as the Earl of Crawford anticipated. The very moderation for which the King stood and which he recommended through his Lord High Commissioner to the re-convened General Assembly in 1690,¹³ produced certain anomalies which made for dissatisfaction and unrest. The 'Establishment' and 'Rescinding' Acts of 1690 satisfied neither the Episcopalians, despite the subsequent indulgence shown to many of their clergy in the "Act for Settling the Quiet and Peace of the Church" ¹⁴ nor placated the Cameronians and not a few more moderate Covenanters, who were angry at the omission of any mention of the Covenants and the non-revocation of the Act Rescissory.^{14A} As it was politically a time of unsettlement and turbulence, so also the two decades after 1688 were a critical and complicated period for the Church, and but for the ability, sagacity and courage of Carstairs, especially over the "Oath of Assurance" issue, disaster might easily have overtaken the country. Socially and religiously alike, the post-Revolution years brought little improvement in the deplorable condition of the country throughout the last two Stuart reigns, and several contemporary Acts of Assembly throw light on the difficulties of the Church, and the spiritual and moral state of the people. The weaker side of the policy of Comprehension was revealed in such Acts as the "Act Anent Irregularities" ¹⁵ dealing with "vagrant unfixed ministers, many of whom are lying under ecclesiastical censures", and the "Act Anent Students",¹⁶ which clearly implied the urgent need of tightening up both the spiritual and academic qualifications of candidates for the ministry and in respect of the former desideratum, justified to a considerable extent Keith and Story's¹⁷ strictures on clergy and theological students alike. Several Acts against "Prophaness" deplore a crass indifference to religious ordinances, and the prevalence throughout the nation of Sabbath-breaking, idle swearing and cursing, blasphemy, drunkenness and fornication,¹⁸ while "the small success of the Gospel that's to be observed everywhere at this time" and various national calamities impelled the Assemblies of 1700 and 1701 to order a "Solemn Fast and Humiliation" to be observed for the appeasing of the Lord's wrath. ¹⁹

-
13. v "The Hope-Johnstone MSS," (1897) PP159-160 ("Correspondence of Wm Earl of Crawford", No 148-"Draft Instructions by King William to the Commissioner to the General Assembly 1690")
14. 1693. (v "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", (1820) Vol.1X, P 303. ^{14A} cf Shields, "Faithful Contendings." (Howie's Preface PP VIII-IX)¹⁴⁴
15. Pitcairn's "Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland", (1696). P254, No. XXIII.
16. Ibid, PP253-4, No. XXII.
17. Story's "Journal", (1747) P 94.
18. Pitcairn's "Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland", eg 1694, P241, No. CIII; 1697, PP 261-2, No. XI; 1698, P 276, No. XV. cf Renwick's "Sermons", PP 165-6, and Cameron on "Sermons in Times of Persecution", PP 325-6.
19. Ibid, 1700. PP290-1, Act V, and 1701, PP305-6, No IX.

One might have expected that when the Church had so much to do to set her own house in order, she would have let the Quakers alone, especially in view of the fact that after 1690 her sentences of Excommunication were robbed of their effective sanctions in civil penalties.²⁰ But She could not wholly allay the itch of oppression and controversy. In 1689 Professor Jamison^(or Jameson) of Glasgow attacked the beliefs and customs of the Quakers in a vigorous polemic entitled "Verus Patroclus", in which the "judicious reader" is shown how their "chief tenets are enervat and their best beliefs annihilat". The controversial weapon employed is the time-honoured "proof-text" system; Barclay's "Apology" and "Vindication" are assailed, and the subjects discussed range from "their great Diana of immediate revelation" to the Scriptures, Original Sin and the Sacraments. After an unexplained lapse of years, Robertson the Kinmuck schoolmaster issued in 1694 an equally vigorous reply entitled "Rusticus ad Clericum or the Ploughman rebuking the Priest."²¹ The duel was renewed in 1700 when Robertson issued "Some Manacles for a mad Priest" in answer to Jamison's preface to "Nazianzeni Querela".²² It is difficult to decide which of the combatants in this prolonged theological cock-fight bears the palm for abusive epithets.

In 1695 the General Assembly passed an "Act anent Quakers"²³ recommending all ministers and the subordinate Courts "to use all proper means for reclaiming them, and in case of their obstinacy to proceed against them with the censures of the Church, and specially against the ringleaders that are traffickers for seducing of others". According to a paper from Alexander Seaton to the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting in 1696, the method to be pursued by the Church was to cite the Quakers before the several Presbyteries and put them through a series of questions. The Quarterly Meeting decided that Friends should ignore these summons officially, and submit the queries they received to the Monthly Meetings, but any individual was "left to his freedom" to testify against the queries before a Presbytery if he wished.²⁴ The Act of course was only a case of "parturiunt montes" without even the birth of a "ridiculus mus", for the Church had now no civil sanctions to enforce it.

It would appear however that neither the Quakers nor the Church was wholly prepared to 'live and let live' in this new era of Toleration. The old practice of intrusion into churches and denouncing the preacher and his message in face

20. They might however still affect the Quakers indirectly, for Kirk Sessions were still formidable in respect of their own influence.

21. Frances Swinton or Sonemans took a practical interest in the publication and distribution of this polemic. (cf JFHS. II. 30.)

22. cf "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol, No. 15.) PP87, 100, and

23. "Acts of the General Assembly", 1695 P 248, No. X.

24. "Edin Quarterly Meeting Book, (MS Vol, No. 15.) P 77.

Wodrow's "Correspondence", Vol I, P 472.

of the congregation after the service, still survived. In February 1698/9 Martin Shanks, minister of Newhills lodged a complaint with the Presbytery of Aberdeen and Kincardine o' Neil that on the previous Sunday a considerable body of Quakers gathered in the churchyard during service and just before the Benediction invaded the Church, when Margaret Jaffray of Kingswells, granddaughter of the Diarist cried aloud "Doe not believe that Deceiver", and that she was sent of God to tell them that He was about to destroy all Idolatrie and will worship, and a great deal more to that purpose." She was quietly ejected, but renewed her hanague outside, and " occasioned much Tumult among the people to the great dishonour of God, the prophanation of his Day, and the allienation of the people's minds from the Gospell and a Gospel Minrie: The sd Margaret promising to come again in manner foresd." The Presbytery on Shanks's petition considered the whole case, and appointed a deputation of three members to accompany him in tabling his complaint before the Magistrates of Aberdeen " in whose Liberties and jurisdictione the sd parish of Newhills is." 25

It is very probable that the terms of the "Act anent Intrusion upon Kirks" ²⁶ passed by the Assembly of 1694 refers partly if not exclusively to Quakers, through they are not actually named: but if that be the case, it indicates a continued Quaker policy for several years after the Revolution. John Barclay and Sewell have something to urge in vindication or extenuation of it, ²⁷ but while the motive was good, the practice even by contemporary opinion, was not approved or excused.

-
25. " Records of the United Presbries of Aberdeen & Kincardine O' Neal," (Vol.IV of Aberdeen Pres.Records) P 35. cf P 43.
 26. "Acts of the General Assembly", 1694 P 243, No.XVI. .
 27. Jaffray's " Diary", (3rd ed) Ch.XIX, PP387-9.

CHAPTER II.

"THE QUAKERS AND THE COVENANTERS."

The present chapter is placed here because although most of it belongs properly to the second period of Scottish Quakerism, it overlaps into the years immediately following the Revolution, and thus may be considered most conveniently at this point.

Toleration was not a 17th century virtue. Only a rare seer could discern it now and then as a fore-gleam on the distant horizon, but for the generality of even the saints it was a thing undreamed of and unknown. The conditions of the times were too turbulent and fevered, and the sterner and more rugged, if narrower, loyalties, were the contemporary equivalent of "loving the Lord with all the heart and soul and strength and mind". The Sectaries refused to countenance the Church's claim to any exclusive authority of 'the Keys',¹ or to belief in any historical continuity of orders as a necessary prerequisite of men's salvation; while the Church both in Scotland and England holding "in common with the Romanists that there was but one visible Church of which the National Churches were provinces"¹ and clinging to the dogma of "extra ecclesiam nulla salus" found it alike impossible and blasphemous to acknowledge the existence of any other "churches" or rival organisations as even part of the Body of Christ.² In an epoch when beliefs were no mere intellectual assents, but were held as dearer than home and fortune and life itself: when Creeds were burned into the very marrow of the soul as essential to salvation and eternal bliss, men could hardly be expected to be dissatisfied with, or critical of, their Faith, whatever might be its defects, or show any dubity in its infallibility and sufficiency. Such a religion, forged on the anvil of suffering, patient endurance, and unshakable trust in God, had an almost inherent tendency towards an intolerant, though not necessarily a persecuting, spirit.

The attitude of the Society of Friends to the Covenanters was a somewhat mixed one, which indeed is not surprising in the light of what follows.³ Even allowing for the difference of intensity in the persecutions meted out to each, it must be granted that the spirit of toleration shown by the Quakers to their adversaries was greater and more consistent than that of

-
1. Macpherson "The Covenanters under Persecution", P 147.
 2. Doctrinaire Toleration was not indeed wholly unknown. More's "Utopia", in which a magnificent picture of religious toleration was drawn on the eve of the Reformation, is the classical example. But when More emerged from Utopia to real life, and Toleration became a practical issue, he showed himself as merciless a persecuter as any other.
 3. v infra, PP 244-6.

the Covenanters. With the exception of William Guthrie who came very near to understanding the essence of the Quaker faith, the Covenanters showed a truculence and odium towards the Friends whose only difficulty was to find language sufficiently damnatory to assign them and their beliefs to "their own place".⁴ Nor did the Covenanters' offensive cease with anathemas and imprecations: it issued in insults and persecutions both before and after the Revolution. In opposition to this, the fundamental principles of the Friends ruled out material force and retaliation of any kind unless in written polemics. Indeed except for occasional recriminations as between Keith and Macquarie, the Scots Quakers both in their writings and generally, show a relatively high level of Christian charity, forbearance, and a reasonableness which was far in advance of the religious intolerance of the times.

Alexander Jaffray may be said to be the earliest of the Scottish Friends to make a pronouncement on the Covenants. He was not actually a Quaker for at least another decade, but he was well on the way towards the Inner Light.⁵ Jaffray, who had been a Covenanter, contended in these days of his Independency that the great mistake which the Covenanters made was to regard the Genevan system of doctrine and polity as a static and perfect whole, bearing exclusively the imprimatur of Christ, and thus to embalm and encase it in a Covenant, that no rude hands of Prelacy or Popery might touch it. So certain were the Covenanters of the complete sufficiency and finality of Presbyterianism as the only way to Heaven, that they not only foreclosed any development of it, but were ready to denounce as "damnable heretics" any who suggested such a possibility. Jaffray, while admitting that Presbytery might be "a step nearer to the way of Christ than Episcopacy" denied such exclusive claims. To postulate the growth of light through God's Spirit would be in no way derogatory to "that precious and worthy man Calvin": to maintain a rigid and undeveloping deposit of religious belief either for religious or utilitarian ends was tantamount to idolatry which was fatal.⁶ Notwithstanding this, Jaffray, when a prisoner in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh in 1661 and on the eve of his conversion to Quakerism, showed a fine charity toward "many good Christians in the west, whose carriage though I could not approve, yet I would not willingly have concurred in the severity that was likely to be used in the censuring of them"⁷ He visited Robert Traill, James Guthrie and Macquarie, all prisoners in the Tolbooth. With Guthrie he had a very "free and plain" discussion on "The Causes of the Lord's Wrath against Scotland" and the whole question of the spiritual legitimacy of a "national" Church, especially as promoted by the Covenants.⁸ Macquarie however

-
4. eg Livingstone. ("Select Biographies" I, P253, Sect. 13.)
 5. cf ante, Book. II, Ch. III, P67; and "Diary", (3rd ed) P148 (top).
 6. Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd ed) PP 61-3.
 7. Ibid, P 137.
 8. Ibid, P 142.

Jaffray found in no mood to discuss or reason about anything outwith the Church's theology. ⁹

Keith as already noted was far less gracious toward the Covenanters than Jaffray, though he was a decidedly abler disputant. His general bearing to the "Men of the Covenant" may be not inaccurately expressed in the lines of the Linlithgow Royalist Litany—

"From Covenanters with uplifted hands,
From Remonstrators with associate bands,
Good Lord, deliver us."¹⁰

To the Covenanters as a whole he was harsh and censorious, but while many of his judgments on their motives and aims were gratuitous, niggardly, and contorted, and some of his charges completely beside the mark,¹¹ he was loyal to the Quaker principle of rendering tribute to whom tribute was due and distinguishing those whom Friends held to be sheep or goats, both among the clergy and laity of the Church. "There have been holy and spirituall men in the Presbyterian Church that have known communion with God in spirit in a blessed measure and were faithful in the talents given them of God: I believe their soules are entered into everlasting rest, and their memory is as a box of precious oylment among others of the Lord's witnesses"¹² According to Alexander Skene, the Quakers "ever had a reverent esteeme of all faithfull ministers that in simplicity and sincerity of Heart have endeavoured to preach the Gospel: though in many things short of these blessed discoverys God hath manifested to us"¹³ while Sewell testified that only those "teachers" who were barren of Christian fruits and prolific in nothing but words, were held to be censurable.¹⁴ In this category of "holy and spirituall" Presbyterians, Keith placed William Guthrie¹⁵ and John Welsh,¹⁶ and most observations on other famous Covenanters are his. Durham he never forgave for his "Casuistic Divinity" as the author of the "Fasti" calls it, or for teaching that divine grace is not essential to the ministry.¹⁷ He pilloried Livingstone of Ancrum for "sentencing himself with his own hand to banishment" and for rebuffing and refusing to listen in Rotterdam to an old friend who had turned Quaker. on the

9. Ibid P 148.

10. Kirkton's "Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland", (1817) P 127.

11. v ante, Bk. II, Ch XLV, PP 183-184.

12. "The Way Cast Up", P 50: cf also references in Bk. II, Ch. XLV, P 182, n 42 ante.

13. Preface to "The Way Cast Up", (1667) P 11. cf Hew Wood's "Treatise of Women's Meetings", (1684) P 32.

14. "History", (1811) Vol. I, P 128.

15. "Truth's Defence", P 250.

16. v "The Way Cast Up", P 47.

17. Durham has the distinction of being pilloried in "The Scotch Priests Principles" (1659) (P 330) as a "minister of darknesse, who puts no difference between the children of God, and the children of the devill."

ground that he was a blasphemer.¹⁸ Neither does he spare Macquaire in "The Way Cast Up". But for "Master" Rutherford, Keith seems to have conceived a particular dislike, probably because he understood him least. Keith's references to Rutherford are not bitter but in the nature of a remonstrance and lament for his large contribution to the defection of true religion in Scotland! Keith considered that the Westminster Assembly of Divines ("Dryvines") was the watershed of Rutherford's spiritual life and witness.¹⁹ Prior to these four years that he sat in the Jerusalem Chamber, Rutherford evinced in his earlier Letters from Aberdeen his close proximity to, if not identity with,²⁰ many of the doctrines and the spirit of the Friends, particularly the indwelling presence of Christ as Man in all the saints,²¹ and the immediateness and cogitivity of the Spirit's Revelation and Inspiration.²² Even the very terminology that Rutherford used was Quaker, yet any reference to " the Seed" coming from the Quakers, Keith complains, is condemned as " horrid blasphemy", while in Rutherford it passed as orthodox.²³ It was the Westminster Assembly which made Rutherford a changed man in Keith's estimate. There he declined from his early ideals and visions of truth to " cry down all such immediat revelation and to affirme that God had committed his Counsell wholly to writing," and that divine Grace could keep no man wholly from daily sin.²⁴ Thus Rutherford became spiritually decadent and a compromising opportunist. It would not be difficult to answer Keith's statements or inferences for the most part. He takes Rutherford too seriously in the latter's self-derogatory allusions,²⁵ as we must beware of doing with all the saints, and unfortunately for Keith's theory of a sort of pre-Westminster perfectionism in Rutherford, such allusions are given as early as 1637.²⁶ The "Letters" are frequently cited or quoted in "The Way Cast Up", but only to counteract Keith's apprehension of a new bibliolatry,²⁷ to cavil at acknowledged faults of taste and style in them,²⁸ to gather real or fancied agreement with Quaker tenets,²⁹ or to criticise the great Covenanter's doctrines.³⁰

18. "The Way Cast Up", PP 74-6.

19. Ibid, P20.

20. Ibid, PP149-151.

21. cf Ibid, PP 147 ff.

22. eg Ibid, PP17-20: 146-7: 183-5.

23. Ibid, PP 151-2.

24. Ibid, Sect XV, PP 186, 189.

25. eg "Joshua Redeivus", (1824) Part.III, Letter LXVI, P 415.
(To William Guthrie.)

26. eg Ibid, Part I, Letter XLVI, P 75. (To Baillie Kennedy.)

27. "The Way Cast Up", PP 5-6: 183.

28. Ibid, P 182.

29. eg Ibid, PP 30-1, and 146 ff.

30. Ibid, PP 177-182.

And all this, not because it is likely that Rutherford ever entered the lists personally against the Friends, but because Macquaire went out of his way to attack them in his Postscript to Brown's "Quakerism the Pathway to Paganism" and in that of the third edition of "Joshua Redevivus".

But the balance of a comparative charity and restraint still remains in favour of the Quakers. They may have seldom seen any Cross of Christ in other sufferings but their own, but they had so learned that way of the Cross as to repudiate any policy of vindictiveness or even reprisals, much less of persecution. Further evidence of this is found in Anthony Haig's 31 generous treatment of his wife's cousin George Home of Bassendean, a notable Border Covenanter, on two different occasions, "at a time when every opportunity was taken by Lauderdale and his coadjutors to oppress the persons and despoil the estates of the Covenanting gentry." 32

Lillias Skene in her letter from Newtyle to Macquaire in 1678³³ shows Quaker charity and controversy at its best. She admitted her sympathy with many of the "Nonconformists" who were suffering purely for conscience' sake, including Macquaire himself, and her willingness to believe that the Covenanter's bitterness and prejudice against the Quakers, unparalleled in Scotland, sprang from misinformation and ignorance. While deprecating Macquaire's two "Postscripts" and rebuking him for the spirit of them, she expressed her solicitation lest in the day of the Lord he was found among those who beat their fellow-servants, and appealed to him to recognise that a national Church, a man-made ministry and the spirit of bitter contention and persecution were all symptoms of a spiritual degeneracy, from which the Quaker witness and way would emancipate him if only he understood and followed it. It was a worthy letter, worthily written.

Lastly, Robert Barclay petitioned the Privy Council that he might get for his plantations in New Jersey "such whigs as were to be banished" from Dunnottar or elsewhere.³⁴

The companion picture is not so happy. The queer anomaly of the Friends being ostracised, cruelly abused and persecuted by the Covenanters even amid their own sufferings, will be considered presently: meantime a number of facts and incidents

31. cf Douglas, "Baronage of Scotland", (1798) P 135.

32. Russell "The Haigs of Bemersyde", (1881) P 278.

33. In Barclay's "Truth Triumphant", (1718) Vol. III, PP 543 ff.

34. Fountainhall's "Chronological Notes", ed Scott, (1822) P 115. One of those transported to New Jersey was John Fraser, later minister of Alness. (v Mackay "The Church in the Highlands", (1914) PP146-7. v also "A Cloud of Witnesses", P 530.

may be recorded. The earliest mention of Covenanters as instigators of persecution is in "The Scotch Priest's Principles", where Hamilton of Glassford, Aird of Dalserf and Mackail of Bothwell were cited as walking "in Cain's way".³⁵ Wodrow's attitude to the laxity of the Privy Council in 1663 to "that dangerous sect" which "spread terribly during this reign", has already been noted.³⁶ In 1666 a number of Quakers were apprehended by dragoons at Heads and ordered to the Tol-booth of Glasgow by Archbishop Burnet 'qr they continued about fourteen weeks'.³⁷ In 1677 John Brown, minister of Wamphray a notable Covenanter and spiritual father of the Cameronians who helped to ordain Richard Cameron at Rotterdam, entered the lists against the Friends. Of his voluminous writings which were in "high estimation"³⁸ in Scotland, the famous "Quakerism the Pathway to Paganism" was a counter-blast to Barclay's "Apology", first published in Latin in 1676 at Amsterdam. It is a vigorous and pungent example of 17th century controversial but would have gained in cogency and effectiveness if personal vituperation had been less frequently a substitute for sound logic, and Friends had not been so wholly given over to the Evil One. Barclay is a "Fool", an "Ignoramus", a "presumptuous and blasphemous miscreant", while the "prodigiously profane and arrogant seck of Rurragad-Quakers" are "lucusts", of whose ministry the devil makes use, "...breathing forth nothing but that putrid Poison, that innate Serpentine Venome".³⁹ Brown's polemic had the effect of speeding up the first English translation of the "Apology" which was printed in Holland in 1678, and of calling forth from Barclay in 1679 a refutation, a kind of second "Apology" entitled "R.B's Apology for the True Christian Divinity Vindicated", through which the author hoped that "the more Moderate, Sober, and Serious among the Presbyterian Preachers" would 'judge righteous judgment', especially since they themselves had "felt the Fruit of J.B, his Violent, Furious and Unchristian Temper in his Fomenting Divisions among them, and encouraging Cameron by his Letter; whom they repute an Heady Turbulent Incendiary, and the Effects of whose Work, strengthened by J.B., have produced no small Mischief, both to the Cause in general and to many poor People, who have been thereby Ruined".⁴⁰

In the same year, 1679, whether before or after Drumclog is uncertain,⁴¹ John Nisbet of Hardhill at the head of a party of men visited Shawtonhill Farm, attacked the farmer, Robert Hamilton,⁴² and leaving him lying unconscious, they ransacked his

35. v ante, Bk. I, Ch. VII, P 53. Hamilton accepted indulgence later.

36. v ante, Bk. II, Ch II, P 86.

37. "MS Register of Sufferings" P.4, and "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16) P 12.

38. Sinclair's (old) "Statistical Account of Scotland", General Appendix, Vol XXI, P 452.

39. "Quakerism the Pathway to Paganism", ("Epistle to the Reader," PP 1&3)

40. Advertisement to the "Apology Vindicated", ("Truth Triumphant", (1718) Vol III, P 258.) v ante also re, the "Apology Vindicated", Bk. II, Ch. XV: cf Barrow's reference to the Cameronians in "Collectitia" (1824) P 366: also "Memoirs of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, (1892) P 54.

41. Probably after.
42. cf Anderson's "Historical and Genealogical Memoirs of the House of Hamilton", (1825) P 404.

house and purloined his papers. Then following the precedent of the Magistrates of Aberdeen in 1672, they desecrated the little Quaker Burial Ground, breaking down the stone dyke and felling the trees;⁴³ an outrage which was hardly compatible with Nisbet's personal testimony that, stern in principle as he was, he still thought it his "duty to be tender" of any who followed erroneous principles, "as they had souls", and that he "could never endure to hear one creature rail and cry out against another, knowing we are all alike by nature".⁴⁴ This irruption into Shawtonhill farm was not isolated, but one of a series of similar felonies committed by Covenanters about that time. John Hart, then clerk of Hamilton Monthly Meeting was their unwilling host, and was robbed of his horse and other possessions. His brother was assaulted. Andrew Brown of Collieshall had his dwelling severely damaged and goods commandeered, one of the troopers adding that "he had done a worse deed than pistolled him".⁴⁵

John Shaw, a neighbour of Hew Wood, had his house broken into, was made a prisoner and cruelly threatened by his captors; while Hew Wood suffered many indignities at the hands of Covenanters. Several times he and his family were seriously menaced and Wood himself assaulted. Under the pretext of searching for arms they ransacked his house, quartered themselves uninvited, and seized all that was useful for their horses and themselves.⁴⁶

In the Revolution year some Covenanters again descended on the Shawtonhill Cemetery, demolished the wall which had been rebuilt after 1679, and cut down the trees. But much more serious things happened in Hamilton in December 1688. An armed band of Covenanters under William Dalziel of Redmere entered Hew Wood's house, broke up a meeting violently and maltreated several Quaker women by dragging them out, especially one Janet Simpson, widow of William Mitchell of Douglas.⁴⁷ The week following, the meeting was again disrupted violently by the Cameronians or "mountain regiment", records and books carried away, and the male Friends haled to prison, where however they remained only a few hours on account of the sympathetic and menacing attitude of the townspeople and the fear of rioting.⁴⁸ James Gray of Drumbowry was robbed of £30 to £40 in money and chattels, and his wife was threatened by an armed band which invaded their house. On two consecutive days John Hart of Glassford had his house violently attacked and damaged by armed local men, under the pretence of searching for contraband weapons, and valuable papers and books to the value of £20 stolen, - a serious loss-

43. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS. Vol.16.) P 26. The damage done was £55 Scots.

44. "The Scots Worthies", (1874 ed) P 351. According to "A Cloud of Witnesses" however, Nisbet did not protest or testify against the Quakers in the Grassmarket.

45. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol.16) P 26.

46. Ibid.

47. Janet Simpson was apparently the second wife of Mitchell. (cf ante, Bk.I, Ch.V. P36)

48. "MS Register of Sufferings", PP 11-12.

some of which the marauders burnt at Hamilton Cross, with a threat to extirpate Quakerism out of the land. Twice in one night after ten o'clock, the house of George Weir at Dalserf was entered by armed freebooters from the parish and Lesmahagow, and he and his lodger, James Miller, were shamefully robbed. Twice in the following year, Weir suffered similar invasions, during the latter of which, a meeting at his house one Sunday was entered by a party of young men mostly from Stonehouse, on the alleged authority of a Captain Hay of Angus' regiment. Several Quakers were assaulted and all violently abused and threatened.⁴⁹ In Linlithgowshire also the Cameronians subjected the Quakers to cruel usage in 1688. On a Sunday afternoon they broke into a meeting in a Friend's dwelling house in Grangemouth, assaulted the preacher, Patrick Robinson of Linlithgow to the effusion of blood and drove the audience out like cattle. On the Friends resuming later, the Earl of Angus' men returned and beat and dragged Robinson out while he was in the act of praying for them. The next Sunday the same mass-assault was repeated, and the Cameronians mounted guard over the Quakers to prevent them returning.⁵⁰

Passing over at this point the serious disturbance of the Cameronians at the West Port Meeting House in Edinburgh in 1689 and the persecuting activities of "Bass" John Spreull at Glasgow in 1691,⁵¹ mention may be made of another tumult at Hamilton in January 1692. On a Sunday afternoon Hew Wood with two English itinerant Friends, Thomas Story of Justice Town and John Bowstead of Aglionby, Cumberland⁵² arrived in the town from Glasgow where they had been roughly handled by the Town Sergeants, but not by the Church rabble.⁵³ At Hamilton they were joined by local Friends and by Thomas Rudd, a Yorkshire Friend⁵⁴ who had come from Aberdeen, and walked through the streets as a small procession two by two, while Rudd proclaimed his usual warning to repentance. The aggressive interference of Fairy the town officer was the signal for uproar, and incited and aided by "that furious sect.. called Cameronians.. among others.. the sons of William Telford, deacon of the Prebyterian Church at Hamilton, the mob assaulted and maltreated the Quakers seriously. Rudd was imprisoned for defiance of Fairy: John Bowstead was pushed down the gaol stair and dragged about by the hair. James Miller, a local Friend was savagely assaulted outside the Gaol and his nose broken; Hew Wood was abused and flung about, "which was the more inhuman, he being an ancient Man, a Neighbour, and had not said any Thing to provoke them, unless to persuade them to Moderation," and Story had his side injured in the mêlée. Marshall, the senior Bailie to

49. Ibid.

50. Ibid, P 15.

51. These will be referred to in the following chapter.

52. "Piety Promoted", (ed Evans 1854) II, Part VI, Pl60.

53. v post, Ch. III, PP 264-5.

54. Rudd seems to have suffered more severely in England however than in Scotland. (cf Smith's "Catalogue", Vol. II, PP 515-6.)

whom Bowstead appealed made no attempt to quell or disperse the rabble, though he offered the Friends temporary shelter. But when the Quakers emerged again the crowd was still waiting, and prominent in it in hurling abusive epithets as well as filth and stones at the Quakers were the wives, families and servants of leading townsmen. Thus ended a disgraceful Sabbath day, leaving no doubt in the Quakers' minds of whether they or their persecutors bore the real onus of the Sabbath desecration. On the Monday morning the fray was renewed: Rudd was pelted with dung and the members of a family called Hamilton were particularly hectoring. The rabble attempted to throw Rudd into a well, and after beating the whole knot of Friends, dragged them to the Market Place where they might have suffered grievous injury had not some "sober and well-minded Persons of the Episcopal Way" intervened effectively. After that, Rudd was left in peace till he left the Town in a day or two. Story, before leaving wrote a personal letter of remonstrance to Robert Hamilton, and addressed an open letter of protest to the Presbyterians at the Town of Hamilton, enquiring how long they intended to "trample under foot the Blood of the Everlasting Covenant, and adore their own Inventions."⁵⁵

The anomaly of the hatred and persecution meted out to the Quakers by the Covenanters amid their own terrible sufferings and calamities has often been referred to by writers of varying sympathies and opinions. According to "A Cloud of Witnesses" more than a dozen protested or testified against the Quakers and their Faith with almost their last breath, including Archibald Alison, Marien Harvie, Andrew Pittilloch, John Main and John Richmond.⁵⁶ Whether such hatred and persecution are the more deplorable before or after the Revolution must remain an open question. Neal seems to be oblivious or ignorant of the fact that in Scotland at least, such treatment by the Covenanters preceded as well as followed the Revolution. "What greater hypocrisy", he asks, "than for those who were oppressed by the bishops to become the greatest oppressors themselves, so soon as their yoke is removed?"⁵⁷ What his comment would have been had he known the rest, must remain a matter of conjecture. The early Quakers themselves had scant sympathy with the ministers "outed" in 1662, and regarded their expulsion as retribution for the usage that Friends received from the Church in the Cromwellian period. "At what rate", an early chronicler enquires in 1662, "would they now value a day of toleration or libertie of conscience which they formerly exclaimed against many a yeare and abridged others off?"⁵⁸ For those who conformed in 1662, or took advantage of the first Indulgence in July 1669, the Quakers' lack of sympathy deepened into scorn,

55. Thomas Story's "Journal", (1747) PP 74-77.

56. PP 63, 141, 171, 332, 342, etc.

57. "History of the Puritans", Vol. II, P623.

58. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS. Vol. No 16.)

for "thes indulged preists" being neither "sensible of the dispensatione of the tymes nor of their owne conditione" joined hands " w^t the episcopal teachers(so called)" in reproaching and warring against the Truth.⁵⁹ The Covenanters' "bowels of compassion" seemed dried up. Nisbet of Hardhill, despite the cruall usage of his family after Bothwell Bridge, the diabolical treatment of his young son James by a party of dragoons in 1681, and his own persecution which ended in the Grassmarket⁶⁰ was capable of leading a mass attack on a lonely farmer and of the desecration of a little Quaker cemetery that was harming no one. Brown of Wamphray, notwithstanding his close imprisonment in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh and his exile 'sine die' as the price of his life⁶¹ must needs lash Barclay and the Quakers from Holland and with all the invective he could command; while John Spreull imprisoned on the Bass and heavily fined at the instance of the Privy Council returned in 1687 to his former business in Glasgow and to the persecution of Quakers.⁶² Even James Skene of Skene when being examined before the Privy Council kept off his hat" because they kept off, that they might not say that I was a Quaker"- so bitter was his contempt for the Friends' custom.⁶³ To Shields, Quakerism was a "damnable heresy"^{63A}

It was a grievous surprise to the Quakers as evidenced in the Memorial presented by the Glasgow Friends to the Privy Council in 1691 that the Revolution and the re-establishment of Presbyterianism had brought no change of heart or policy towards them, but that " those who had complained most thereupon should now be found acting the parts of their own persecutors against the petitioners."⁶⁴ After the Grangemouth Assault in 1688, the Quakers complained bitterly about " the usage we received of their hands, who out of a pretended zeal for God and the reformation of religion had voluntarily regimented themselves from a sense of being oppressed and persecuted for Conscience' sake".⁶⁵ But this was an age of intolerance when persecution was a very principle of life, and those who differed from others in religious matters gave or expected little clemency whenever occasion offered. Beliefs and loyalties ran in deep narrow channels which they had hollowed out of hard rock of tribulation. Dogma was steeped in blood, or encased in gold and ambition. Churches and sects almost without exception

59. Ibid.

60. "A True Relation of the Life.. of John Nisbet..". (In " Select Biographies", Vol.II, (1847) PP380, 408-9.)

61. "The Scots Worthies", (1874) PP 286-8.

62. " Transactions of the Glasgow Archeol.Society", Vol.V, Part.I. (Art. by Taylor on "The Quakers of Glasgow and their Burial Grounds"- Paper VIII, PP 102-3.)

63. "A Cloud of Witnesses", P 82. ^{63A.v} "Faithful Contendings", P 300.

64. "MS Register of Sufferings", P 19. Chambers' " Domestic Annals of Scotland", Vol.III, P 58.

65. "MS Register of Sufferings", P15.

championed liberty only for themselves, or ideally, like Sir Thomas More, and the Covenanters, following in principle though not in excess of cruelty, the precedents of the Pilgrim Fathers' descendants in New Plymouth and the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay, were, in the Quakers' judgment at least, akin more than they believed to the Roman Church whose law of necessity persecution for heresy is. Of this the Quakers were not slow to remind Presbytery. It will not do merely to say that "the intolerance of the Covenanters, if it indeed deserves that name, was all on the side of liberty",⁶⁶ In motive and intention it was, but in actual effect it could produce nothing more at best than the absence of civil tyranny. Let it be granted that the Covenanters' intolerance was one of the most excusable in history and as admirable as Intolerance can well be. But it was still Intolerance, and Intolerance cannot generate liberty: it can only breed or perpetuate intolerance, as the persecution of the Quakers by the Cameronians subsequent to the Revolution shows. The Revolution itself was not the outcome of Intolerance. But under the Stuarts, Intolerance was a consistent and accepted virtue in terms of the life and thought of the times. Even Wodrow whose only complaint of the handling of the Quakers by the authorities was, that it was not severe enough,⁶⁷ seemed to have a glimmering of this in later life, and in a letter to Dr. James Fraser, dated 1722,⁶⁸ he vowed regret for any appearance of a persecuting spirit in him and asserted his growing abhorrence to it the longer that he lived. He was afraid that his unrevised "History" might intensify persecution, but he disclaimed all such intention, and hoped it would do no harm.

Various elements entered into the Covenanters' active hatred of the Quakers. In these days of superstition there was a strong propensity to identify unusual religious fervour, or "enthusiasme", and extraordinary phenomena with manifestations of the Devil. The Quakers were regarded like Elymas the sorcerer as "full of all subtilty and all mischief, children of the devil, ceasing not to pervert the right ways of the Lord".⁶⁹ The story of Peden and the raven at the Quaker Meeting in Ireland is too well known to need recapitulation. "I always thought there was devilry among you", said Peden to his landlord, "but I never thought that he did appear visibly among you till now I have seen it".⁷⁰ John Livingstone declared that "Quakerism overthrows all the grounds of Christian religion", and that there is "much devilry among them".⁷¹ James Fraser, Laird of Brea, through "taking but too great a liberty to converse with Quakers" was almost converted to the Inner Light, and the reaction following upon a whole week's wrestling

66. Mc Crie's "Sketches of Scottish Church History", (1844) P 268.

67. cf Colville, "Byways of History", Ch. VIII. P 235.

68. "Analecta Scotica", (1844) Vol I, P 306.

69. Acts XIII. 10.

70. Walker's "Six Saints of the Covenant", (1901) Vol. I, PP 129-130: Law's "Memorials", (1818) PP 108-9etc. (The raven was long after recognised as the symbol of the devil. cf Mackay "The Church in the Highlands, (1914) PP 189-90.)

71. v "Select Biographies" 1, P 253.)

with himself produced perhaps the most pointed and concise disclamation of the Quaker Faith to be found in Covenanting literature. Fraser was not so bitter as Keith could be, but he was quite as dogmatic, and saw in the Quakers only a "foolish people" stirred up by God to recall His people to essentials of faith and practise which they had largely let slip.⁷² Keith seized the opportunity of Macquaire's similar attack in his Postscript to Rutherford's "Letters" to make a vigorous counter-charge of inconsistency against the Church. Taking Fleming's "Fulfilling of the Scripture" as his authority, Keith cited the phenomena of the "Stewarton Sickness" of 1625 and the Revival at the Kirk of Shotts in 1630 as Pentecostal precedents in Scotland of the Quaker belief and experience, and as a sufficient and valid foundation of that very Faith which the Church of his own generation was anathematising and persecuting.⁷³ The moral is plain. Wherein lay the consistency of "crying up the appearance of God in that time", and of joining with the profane rabble now in blasphemously calling the same "unusuall motions" of the Spirit in Quaker worship and faith "the signes of some diabolicall Possession"?⁷⁴

The Covenanters hated and feared the superstition of Rome no less than the superstition of the devil. Hence the Cameronians especially proscribed and persecuted the Quakers on the ground of their alleged "Jesuitico-Quakerism", and because of the deep suspicion that rested on the whole Society through the intimacy of Barclay and Penn with "that Popish Duke" of York, and King. The very fact that the Quakers so openly welcomed the Toleration and Indulgence granted by James VII condemned them, for Renwick spoke for all the Covenanters when he deprecated Toleration as a treacherous and iniquitous thing.⁷⁵ As "stated enemies of Christ" the Quakers were bracketed with the Romanists by the Cameronians in a hatred and adhorrence which they considered a Christian duty.⁷⁶

But the Covenanters hated the Quakers principally on grounds of doctrine. The attitude of William Cuthill of Bo'ness was typical. In his last Testimony at Edinburgh he castigated Cromwell for giving toleration to all Sectaries, not least to "the abominable and blasphemous Quakers...whose religion is nothing but refined Paganism at the best: yea I think it is much worse."⁷⁷ A few considerations underlying the Covenanters' animus may not be irrelevant here. It is not difficult to see how the Quaker doctrine of Scripture which subordinated the testimony of the Scriptures to the principle of the Spirit's Light or the infallibility

72. Ibid II, PP 191-3.

73. cf also the strange coming of the Spirit in Robert Bruce's house during prayer, which Keith instances in "The Way Cast Up", PP 197-8.

74. Ibid, PP 189-192.

75. Renwick's "Sermons", (1777) P 417.

76. v Renwick's "Sermons", (1777) P 589: "Sermons in Times of Persecution", (Cameron) PP 318-9. There is a veiled reference here to James Nayler.

77. "A Cloud of Witnesses", (1871) P 182.

of Immediate Revelation, ran full tilt against the Covenanters' dogma of a Bible which dropped complete from Heaven, the inspired 'ipsissima verba' of God, infallible and equally authoritative from cover to cover, a law-code complete and uniform. The real trouble was that the Quaker theologians—especially Barclay and Keith—touched the sensitive spot of Scottish Calvinism,—a subconscious fear in its devotées of the scope and operations of the Holy Spirit, which produced a kind of spiritual reflex action in their faith and indeed in all Protestants'. Certainly the Westminster Confession of Faith, as Barclay was not slow to point out,⁷⁸ admitted, albeit somewhat reluctantly, that the Holy Spirit in our hearts was the ultimate Guarantor of the truth and validity of the Scriptures, and William Guthrie⁷⁹ and Hutcheson⁸⁰ went far in the same direction. But these considerations did not alter their main position of virtually restricting the Spirit's activity, and foreclosing His possible future operations and motions by those in the past. This came out particularly with reference to the controversy about the finality of the Canon of Scripture. The Quakers were conceived to hold themselves in readiness through their belief in the continuity of Immediate Revelation to add to, or subtract from, the Canon arbitrarily at any time, and thus as Wedderburn expressed it, to father on the Spirit of God "all the horrid Inventions and Imaginations of Man's own heart...and speak Lies in His Name"⁸¹ "We absolutely deny", said Hugh Smith of Eastwood, "that the Spirit bringeth new revelations in matters of doctrines, worship, and Government: but only that He opens the eyes and enlightens the understanding that we may perceive and rightly take up what is of old recorded in the Word by the same Spirit."⁸² Barclay while flatly denying any necessary finality of the Canon or warrant of Scripture for its contents, and anticipating the modern interpretation of Revelation XXII. 18, the Calvinist's great proof-text for the Canon, insisted that the Friends accepted the Scriptures as giving "a full and ample testimony to all the principal doctrines of the Christian faith" and rejoined that far from craving any revelation of a new gospel and new doctrines, all that the Friends pleaded for was "a new revelation of the good old gospel and doctrines."⁸³ The two Apologies were so near at this point and yet so far!

Macpherson points out how a more consistent and complete practical surrender of the Covenanters' to their own master-principle of the Headship of Christ would not only have meant a drastic modification of their use of Scripture, especially the Old Testament, but would have brought them appreciably nearer to the Quaker policy and spirit of non-retaliation and the abjuration of force and reprisals. As it was, the Old Testament was freely resorted to as authority and inspiration for wreaking vengeance on a

78. "Apology", (14th ed. 1886) Prop.III, P 48.

79. v "The Christian's Great Interest", (ed. Smellie 1901) P 100. cf also PP37, 18.

80. v "Forty-Five Sermons on the CXXX Psalm", P 315.

81. "David's Testament Opened up", PP 280-2.

82. "An Apology for...oppressed Presbyterian Ministers", (1677) Intro: P 11.

83. "Apology", (14th.ed) Prop.III, PP 62-5.

tyrannical foe, and stories like the massacre of the Canaanites and the murder of Sisera by Jael were unquestioned, even above the authority of Christ and the Apostles, as justifying any kind of violence to those who fought against "the Crown Rights of Jesus"⁸⁴ With such a theory of plenary inspiration, the Quakers, who were the modern pioneers of Progressive Revelation, would have no traffic whatsoever, nor with the logical expression and corollaries thereof; and this did more than anything else to fan the hostility of the Covenanters against them and subject the latter to every kind of vituperation that the Covenanting leaders could devise. M'Ward coupled them with atheists and their Faith as "the subtlest device yet broached for the overthrow of the Christian Religion"⁸⁵; and Livingstone refused them the name of 'Christian'⁸⁶ and levelled them with betrayers of Christ;⁸⁷ Cameron condemned Quakerism as "derogatory to the sufferings of Christ"⁸⁸; and Shields denied that any Quaker could ever win a martyr's crown by dying "for that which is mere truth and duty", because they were "heretical as to the most part of the fundamental truth of the gospel of Christ"⁸⁹

In policy and politics there was likewise a deep cleavage between the more extreme Covenanters and the Quakers. The whole problem of allegiance to the Crown and obedience to the Civil Power during the years of persecution sprang from the old fundamental principle in the Scottish tradition that the rule and authority of Kings and Councils was fiduciary and in no way absolute or of Divine right.⁹⁰ In the "very pertinent, wise and good"—and we may add 'prophetic'—sermon preached at the King's coronation at Scone in 1651 by Robert Douglas, the principle of Conditional Loyalty was made very clear.⁹¹ The two greatest enunciations of the theory were "Lex Rex", and Sir James Stewart's "Jus Populi Vindicatum" which were condemned to the bonfire together. Both were "full of seditious and treasonable matter" which became the constitutional liberties of later generations. "Lex Rex" which was directly inspired by George Buchanan's "De Jure Regni" and indirectly by John Major's political philosophy worked out the thesis that royal power was not an unconditional largesse from Heaven given to kings, but "a birthright of the people borrowed from them" to be used for the weal of the entire commonwealth. The

84. cf "The Covenanters under Persecution", PP 145,64. The same use of Scripture was held earlier to justify Cromwell's massacres in Ireland. John Brown bases his argument for armed rebellion in the "Apologetical Relation" almost entirely on the O.T. and Classical literature.

85. "The True Nonconformist", PP 368-9.

86. "Select Biographies", I, P 253.

87. "Sermons in Times of Persecution", P 529.

88. Ibid, P 352.

89. Ibid, P 511.

90. Brown's "Apologetical Relation", PP 122-4.

91. "The Sermon Preached at Scoone, Jan 1st. 1651."

"Jus Populi" was even more "seditious" because it was the work of a lawyer and so more professedly legal. It surveyed the whole field of the theory and principles of democracy and the resistance of tyranny and injustice. The State was merely the means to an end of a nation's peace, prosperity, and freedom. No form of government was sacrosanct or immutable by Divine decree. It lay wholly with the people to choose what form it should take, and to change it when they wished,⁹² and under any form. Parliament was nothing but the Executive of the people's will.⁹³ Kings had no proprietary⁹⁴ rights over their kingdoms nor lordly domination over their subjects. On the contrary, if either a ruler or a legislative Body broke all or even the main conditions of their Trust, or repudiated the contract in virtue of which they had been placed in power by the nation, they were no longer a prince or government to whom any loyalty or obedience was due, and thus must be legally resisted by their subjects corporatively or singly, and in virtue of the most elementary natural law of self preservation, might be openly defied even to armed rebellion, assassination or outlawry.⁹⁵ At the same time such expedients must only be resorted to as a last resource and under the gravest necessity since anarchy was as dangerous and deadly as tyranny, equally against the ordinance of God, and respect for magistracy and constitutional law was essential to the community.⁹⁶

It is unnecessary to pursue the varying degrees of acceptance of these principles within the ranks of the Covenanters and the dissensions resulting therefrom, especially after Bothwell Bridge. Sufficient to say that in the reign of Charles.II. in Scotland an unparalleled political and religious situation had arisen which the Covenanting Presbyterians with a very few notable exceptions,⁹⁷ felt to be ample justification for the application of their doctrines. Even as early as 1661 James Guthrie boldly maintained to the end that the conduct of the Government was such as to release the King's subjects from their obligation of obedience.⁹⁸ But the moderate Covenanters within the bounds of the "Jus" position were loyal and respectful enough to the person of the monarch and the Government as such. They were not bent on "punishing" even wicked kings but only on resisting their claims of supremacy and absolutism and all that flowed from that. While however to the Covenanters as a whole, Charles.II. was a tyrant and usurper,⁹⁹

92. "Jus Populi", Ch.V.

93. "A Hind Let Loose", PP303-4. cf Brown's "Apologetical Relation" PP 128-9.

94. Shields, "A Hind Let Loose", P303. "Jus Populi" PP 146, 148-9.

95. cf "Jus Populi", PP97, 140-3; Brown's "Apologetical Relation", P163; cf Renwick's "Sermons", PP 86, 91-2, and "A Short Memorial of the Sufferings of the Cameronians," (1690) P 15.

96. Shields' "A Hind Let Loose", PP 300-1. "Jus Populi", PP263-7. Brown's "Apologetical Relation", PP 153-4.

97. v infra, P259.

98. Wodrow's "History of the Sufferings", (1828) Vol.I, PP 171-3.

99. eg M' Ward, "Earnest Contendings", PP 33, 131, 174, 334.

it was left to the more extreme among them, especially the left Cameronian wing, to abjure all allegiance to Charles on the grounds of his gross immorality and unfitness to be a king.¹⁰⁰ The Moderate section is perhaps best represented in the Hamilton "Declaration" of 1679, and the Left Wing in the Torwood "Excommunication" of 1680¹⁰¹ and the two Sanquhar "Declarations".

With the political principles and policy of the Covenanters, the Quakers were definitely in disagreement. To the Covenanter the choice of the king was originally and fundamentally the people's choice;¹⁰² to the Quaker the choice was originally and fundamentally God's. "The setting up and putting down kings and governments", wrote Sewell, "is God's peculiar prerogative, for causes best known to himself."¹⁰³ In consequence it was a Friend's duty to give his loyal allegiance to the sovereign, and a law-abiding life devoid of offence, to the Civil Powers as ordained of God, irrespective of the character of the one or the administration of the other. Barclay in his remarkably sane and outspoken Address to Chas. II. in 1675¹⁰⁴ ascribed to the Lord all the chequered history that led up to the royal accession, and while he left the King in no doubt that Friends could ever play the sycophant or flatterer, even to the use of "Your Majesty", while being very ready to "discharge their consciences" in exhortation and reproof of kings when necessary, he succeeded in conveying his admonitions and warnings to Charles' mind in a manner consistent with his Divine appointment and in language which certainly is not Cameronian.

The Quakers as already noted frequently, were no moral or social invertebrates, and while they were condemned as unchristian for refusing to take any part in Church politics or state affairs, they were very much alive to contemporary events and issues.¹⁰⁵ They had quite as keen a sense of injustice as the Covenanters and were as resolute in expressing it before Justices and Magistrates as many a poor moorland martyr would have been, had he got the same chance. They went all the way with the Moderate Covenanters in their allegiance and respect to the Monarch, and further. Where the Quakers parted company with men of the Covenant was in submitting to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake and in proscribing all plotting, conspiracy, insurrection and "all treacherous, barbarous and murderous designs whatsoever."¹⁰⁶ The Covenanters were written down in 1679 as

100. v (Cargill) "Sermons in Times of Persecution", PP 404-7.

101. Ibid, PP 411-13.

102. "Jus Populi", PP 85-7.

103. "History" (1811), Vol. II, P 535. cf Barclay's Letter to Chas. II. (in "Apology" (1886) P. VII.)

104. Prefaced to the "Apology". Written from Urie.

105. cf Leighton's attitude to the tyranny of his times. The Quaker passive resistance was a very positive force which presumably Leighton also quietly contemned. (cf Macpherson, "The Covenanters under Persecution", PP 53-4.)

106. Sewell "History" Vol. II, (1811) P 535.

*

It is significant to note that the United Societies argued for the need of their organisation within the Scottish Church from the existence, inter alia, of the statutory Quaker Meetings. - "And for public church-meetings, where have they the opportunity to administer these gifts unto one another except they turn Quakers?". Whether the Societies took the idea of these meetings from the Quakers' is undetermined. But there is a close correspondence between their unit Society meetings, "Shire" meetings, and General Meetings; and the Quaker Monthly, Quarterly, and Yearly Meetings, not only in system, but in such things as secrecy, moral discipline of the members, and the Questions put to all members of a General Meeting, whose answers were obligatory. These Society Meetings, always "modelled after the wonted manner", were, however, held in a variety of places. 109A.

"the seditiowse in their late rebellion against Authoritie", and Drumclog is described as the "titular presbiterians in the West Sowth and severall other places," who had been a long time "seditiously inclined", breaking out "in open rebellione against the present awthoritie by opposing and asawltng there forces"¹⁰⁷ Any attempt to vindicate in theory or practice the lawfulness of armed resistance to the Supreme Magistrate was to the Quakers the negation of the teaching of Christ and of the practice of the early Church.¹⁰⁸ Remarkably enough, there were three Covenanters who shared their position in this particular, -Blackadder who "deprecatd the presence of arms at conventicles" and believed passive resistance to be the most active and effective testimony: Fraser of Brea, who "saw no call to arms and preached against rebellion"; and Pringle of Greenknowe who objected to war itself and the profession of arms.¹⁰⁹

In certain things the Covenanters and the Quakers came very near together and even coincided, though they little realised it.* The spiritual diaries of some of the former show close affinities of imagery and even of language to the mysticism of the Inner Light, eg William Guthrie who showed himself no stranger to 'Immediate Revelation' and Inspiration,¹¹⁰ Livingstone in his belief that "when the mind is full of light, the heart is full of love and the conscience full of peace";¹¹¹ and Samuel Rutherford in a host of his 'Letters'. The inward peace and joy of suffering for righteousness' sake was no less strong and buoyant in Covenanter leaders and rankers alike than it was in the Quakers. Keith's unfair impugment of the Covenanters for taking their sufferings with a bad grace and rebelling against their afflictions can only have been the outcome of prejudice or very inadequate knowledge of their lives and devotional writings,¹¹² while his denial to them of any real reproach of Christ or martyrdom because of political elements in their struggle for liberty, only shows how imperfectly he appreciated the motive and intention of their soul and the fact that religion and politics may be the two inseparable sides of the shield at any time.¹¹³ In point of fact, the witness and spirit of the prisoners of the Greyfriars Cage, the Bass, or Dunnottar, or the martyrs of the Grassmarket and the Gallowlee, of which "Naphtali", Wodrow, and "The Cloud of Witnesses" are replete, fall in sheer gladness of heart, victory of faith and pardoning love, not a whit short of the Quaker prisoners' and sufferers'. In Tolbooths the latter made famous, -Aberdeen, Banff and Hamilton- John Hart, David Barclay, Swinton, the Jaffrays, Gray, Milne and Keith himself

-
107. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS.Vol 16) PP 25,26.
 108. cf Keith "The Way Cast Up", P53, and ante, Bk.II, Ch.XLV, PP 8-9.
 109. Macpherson "The Covenanters under Persecution", PP 119-120.
 110. v "The Christian's Great Interest", (1901) PP 102-6.
 111. "Select Biographies", I, P280.
 112. cf Ante, Bk.II, Ch.XLV, P184. (It may be noted however that "A Cloud of Witnesses" was not published till twenty years after Keith had apostatised from Quakerism.)
 113. cf Ibid, P. 165.
 109a. v Shields, "Faithful Contendings Displayed" (1780) PP XVIII, 12ff, 44.

bore their witness bravely, but no more so than the Covenanters, In the deep places of the soul, all these "that came out of great tribulation", were more at one than they knew.

In their polemics and struggle for religious liberty the Quakers and the Covenanters had a certain community of spirit if not of method, the same love of independence, the same rugged sense of justice, the same insistence on the elemental rights of man, the same faith in immortality, and, less fortunately, the same passion for divine retribution and something almost amounting to delight in seeing the sure vengeance of the Almighty in every calamity which befel their persecutors.¹¹⁴ While the Covenanter added to the Sword of the Spirit, the sword of Caesar; the Quaker disclaimed the latter entirely. But which was the mightier in the Scriptures or could use them to better advantage in smiting the foe or comforting themselves— the "Society People" or the "despised people called Quakers"— must be left undecided. Differing radically in their respective views of the authority of the Book, both drew from it their firm opposition to what they considered unlawful dues, — the Covenanters, the Cess; and the Quakers, Tithes. Both refused to swear oaths,¹¹⁵ and Shields who regarded the payment of fines as a sin against God and His people alike,¹¹⁶ joined hands with the Friends. And lastly, both had a thorough-going belief in human equality, renouncing all respect of persons and accidents of birth and station. To the Covenanter this came through the Headship of Christ: to the Quaker it came through the universal 'Inner Light'.

114. cf Grub's " Ecclesiastical History of Scotland", (1861) Vol.III. P 268. Grub was not particularly friendly to the Quakers.
115. Shields' " A Hind Let Loose", PP 468ff.
116. Ibid, P 727-8.

CHAPTER III."TURBULENT YEARS IN EDINBURGH AND GLASGOW."

The backwash of intolerance and violent abuse of the Quakers in Scotland after the Revolution was felt with peculiar severity in Edinburgh and Glasgow, ~~lasting~~ for about twelve years, from 1689 to 1701 or 1702, and after that less intensely till 1714.¹ James VII's withdrawal of most of his army to England to meet the invasion of the Prince of Orange left the Country and the Capital exposed to widespread disorder from the rising tide of anti-Jacobite passion and popular commotion. In the South-West this fury was released in the "rabbling" of the "King's Curates". In Edinburgh an excited mob thronged the City, which, after one unsuccessful and costly attempt to raze Holyrood Abbey, carried the assault against the small Jacobite guard, ransacked the Church, laid in ruins the Jesuit College,—rooms in Holyroodhouse, plundered religious and private houses, smashed and destroyed every relic of Popery in the Capital, and finished up by burning the Pope in effigy at the Merkatt Cross amid an orgy of liquor from the Chancellor's vaults.²

The state of tumult thus generated in Edinburgh and maintained in spite of the possession of the Castle by the Jacobites found a natural quarry the next month—January 1689— at the Friends' Meeting House in the West Port. The well-established and hateful association of Jesuits and Quakers in the popular mind would alone explain this sequel to the ruin of the Abbey. On Sunday morning, the 17th, a party of Cameronians who had assumed guard at the West Port, invaded the Quakers' Meeting and ordered them to disperse in the name of the "Covenant". After a sharp altercation with Bartholemew Gibson,³ the Friends' leader, concerning their authority, the Cameronians threatened them with forcible expulsion by musketeers, and as the Quakers resolutely maintained their passive resistance, protesting that "if this was the fruits & effects of their sufferings it looked but like a bad reformation", the Cameronians fell violently upon the whole gathering. The men were violently ejected first, many being thrown to the floor and dragged out; then the women, after which the door was locked and the key purloined. The din and commotion drew upon the Cameronians the imprecations of the tenant below whose husband lay dying, for their shameful treatment of "a harmless innocent peopl", and for such profanation of the Sabbath, and after she had been angrily threatened, the Cameronians withdrew, well satisfied with the vindication of "their Covenant to root out all deluded heriticks."⁴ The Quakers nothing daunted, finished out

1. v post, Ch. V, P 295.

2. Balcarres' "Memoirs", (1841) PP 15-17. cf Stevenson's "Chronicles of Edinburgh" 617-1851", PP 171-2: etc.

3. As the late King's farrier, Gibson, who was well known to be a Quaker, would not increase his popularity thereby.

4. "MS Register of Sufferings", PP 13-14.

their meeting on the turnpike stair, after which Bartholemew Gibson interviewed the Earl of Leven⁵ who ordered the key to be restored that same afternoon.

Such outrages upon the peaceful assemblies of Friends, some of them worse than the scene at the West Port and Grangemouth were all too common in Scotland during the last decade of the 17th century. Many of the features of Masson's famous word-picture of the magnificent patience and dogged witness of the Friends amid the most heartless maltreatment⁶ were as true of Scotland as of any other country. Neither "men nor devils" could stifle their worship or kill their testimony, nor yet the "several small shot" which came "in at the window" of the Edinburgh Meeting House from the Castle above.⁷ In this last respect the Friends suffered in common with others, so that on 30th May, the Privy Council gave "warrant to the magistrates.. to cause raise dunghills betwixt the Castle and the towne to cover the town from the shott of the garisone"⁸

Among the Friends who were roughly handled at the West Port in 1689 was Frances, widow of Sir John Swinton of Swinton, a cultured East Lothian lady⁹ who was thrown to the floor and had her ankle sprained. She was a spirited woman and told her Cameronian persecutors that "ther Covinant with hell and agreement with death should not stand, and their fruits did discover what spirit they were of"¹⁰ Apparently they did not forget her censure, for two years later when driving from the Meeting, she and others were stoned through the "grase mercket" by the Covenanting rabble who had molested and struck Friends all meeting time. Both doors of Lady Swinton's coach were broken "with great stons" and two of the occupants injured, her Ladyship "hardl escaping". The Friends lodged a Protest with the Provost and Magistrates, vigorously denying that they were against either Government or Gospel as was alleged, although they declared the day of the Lord, and requiring the Magistrates to give them better protection from profane abuse and maltreatment. The meetings for worship would be maintained cost what it might, even to the effusion of blood.¹¹

During 1691-2 the principal arena of Quaker persecution was Glasgow¹² which was influenced not least by the publication of "Verus Patroclus",¹³ in 1689. In June 1691,

5. David, Third Earl. (v Burke's "Peerage and Baronetage", 1927. P1430.)

6. "Life of Milton", Vol VI, PP587-8. cf Barclay's "Apology", (1886) Prop XI, Scot XIII.

7. "Epistles Received", (1683-1706) Vol.1, PP 121-2.

8. RPCS.3rd series, Vol XIII, P 392.

9. v Burke's "Landed Gentry", P.1824.

10. "MS Register of Sufferings", P 14.

11. "MS Register of Sufferings", P 16.

12. Then reputed to be the finest town in Scotland, superior to the Capital even, and with a population of about 12000. (cf Macgeorge "Old Glasgow: the Place and the People", 3rd ed, P252, P 91, Footnote 2.)

13. v ante, Ch.1, P240.

Christopher Story of Kirkclinton¹⁴ near Carlisle, who in his pre-Quaker days tried to dispute with Robert Barclay near Longtown,¹⁵ visited Glasgow in a Scottish tour with Thomas Blair to find the people "so barbarous" that he "did not think there had been any such in the three nations". Along with ~~the~~ three Scots Friends, John Milner of Gartshore, James Milner of Hamilton and John Houston of Glasgow, they repaired to the house of another Quaker called Neill (or Neil) where they held a meeting. The disorderly and motley crowd which surrounded the house was sharply divided among themselves, but through the conciliatory attitude of the Friends, the hectoring element was held in restraint for a time. Probably nothing further would have transpired had not John Spreull tobacco-merchant and quondam Covenanter who had been tortured by the "Boot" and knew the Bass Rock intimately,¹⁶ burst into Neill's house, dragged Story and his companions into the street where they were nearly lynched, and haled them off before the Magistrates, followed by a frenzied mob who pelted the Quakers with stones and garbage and hurled at them "Jesuit dog" and other abusive language. Bailie Brooke however dismissed the Friends and asked Spreull to see to their safety. But "Bass John"¹⁷ was in no mood to gratify the Bailie or to face the mob again, and "left us to the rabble" who stoned us all along the street to the house of James Bisben, innkeeper, yea hundreds of men, women, boys and girls followed us casting stones, coal, and dirt at us Sodom-like, notwithstanding all their profession". On emerging from the inn, the Friends were subjected to the same vulgar manhandling until they reached the Drygate.¹⁸ Story and Blair found an asylum at Hew Wood's house in Hamilton where they wrote a manifesto to the Glaswegians entitled "A Looking Glass for the Inhabitants of the Town of Glasgow",¹⁹ detailing the evil treatment meted out to them in this modern Sodom and praying for forgiveness on their persecutors.

The "Looking Glass" however availed little, for subsequent troubles arose in the same year. In January 1691^{1/2} Robert Barrow, a Westmorland Friend who visited Scotland twice,

14. No relation to Thomas Story of Justice Town.

15. Ferguson "Early Cumberland and Westmorland Friends" (1871), P89

16. cf Aikman's "Annals of the Persecution in Scotland" (1842), P425. RPCS 3rd series, Vol. XlII, P42. According to "A Cloud of Witnesses", Spreull was an apothecary. (P81).

17. The Quakers saw a just retribution in the warrant issued against Spreull for illegitimate trading in the City four years later, when he was summoned with others to appear before the Council. (v "Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Glasgow 1691-1718", (1908) P 161.)

18. Then on the edge of the city.

19. The "Looking Glass" is the original authority for the above mentioned events. It is reproduced in "The Life of Christopher Story", (1726) PP69-75, and elsewhere in whole or in gist.

wrote from Kingswells to Stephen Crisp and George Whitehead²⁰ telling of how the Glasgow rabble abused him and other Friends "very rudely last time, throwing dirt and stones". The "last time" is indefinite, but probably it was the same occasion on which Bailie John Aird with the town's officers visited the Quakers' Meeting House and stood by callously while the mob that had followed them wrecked the place and used the broken furniture as missiles against the worshippers.²¹ In November two Ruling Elders of the Church named Pollock and Carmichael, with town officers and a crowd invaded the Meeting House again, haled seventeen Friends before Bailie Sloss and thence to prison, where - with the exception of two English visiting Friends, James Halliday and Robert Wardell who were driven furth the town at night, - they were kept for periods up to twelve days without mittimus.²² The seats in their Meeting House were confiscated, and Provost Peddie, according to Lord Blantyre, threatened that if the Quakers were found again in their Meeting House, he would put them all in prison until the King's pleasure.²³ Shortly after, mention is first made in Quaker records of two well known innkeepers, James Thompson and George Swan neither of whom was a member of the Society, though the latter was destined to be. Thompson was fined ten marks Scots on conviction of having sheltered Friends and threatened to fire on the mob outside his house, which the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting being naively and "fully Gonvinced that it was meerly for Receaving them into his hous doe y^r for think fitt to Reimburs him of the sd ten marks."²⁴ Swan, reputed to be an illegitimate son of Charles II, and a natural cousin of another notable Quaker, Jane Stuart,²⁵ seems to have been brought up in Edinburgh where he was probably apprenticed to Bartholemew Gibson.²⁶ After his marriage he settled in Glasgow not later than 1687, and became an innkeeper in the Gorbals, then a village forming part of the Barony of Blythswood. He prospered and became a wealthy owner of property and the old Manor House on the East side of Main Street Gorbals, which he built in 1687, bore the initials of Swan and his wife,²⁷ a bigoted Presbyterian." His name is first mentioned in Quaker records as affording temporary shelter to Friends during a popular uproar against them in Fenruary 1692 led by an amazon called Margaret Steven and her "whit regiment". But Swan not being a convinced Friend himself, yielded to the orders of Bailie Corbett

-
20. v "Collectitia", (1842) PP 365-6. cf F.P.T., P 261.
 21. "MS Register of Sufferings", P 19. The probable date is Sept-Oct 1691. (cf JFHS Xll. 140.)
 22. Ibid.
 23. "MS Register of Sufferings", P 22. cf "Collectitia", P. 366, and Chambers' "Domestic Annals of Scotland", III, P 58.
 24. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book" 1669, (MS Vol.No 15) P 63. v also "Edin Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol.No 12) P 64.
 25. v Art by M.R. Brailsford in JFHS X, PP 263-8.
 26. cf Art by W.F. Miller in JFHS XI, P22.
 27. Fairburn's "Relics of Ancient Architecture etc in Glasgow" ("Descriptive Letterpress" P 1. and Plate 4.) In a list of Gorbals feu duties, Swan is described as a "hammerman". (Marwick and Renwick's "Charters and other Documents Relating to the City of Glasgow" (1906), Vol.II. P434.)

and exposed the Quakers again to the rabble which "fell upon us and had like to have murdered us with hands and stons and great rungs." 28

The Quakers were naturally stung with a sense of injustice in the rabble being allowed to behave towards them in a manner which, *mutatis mutandis*, would otherwise be a riotous assembly and punishable as such. Even so, the Friends would have endured in silence such "french dragooning and furious Rabelizing"; but they feared that such silence would seem to condone or justify the attitude of the Magistrates in conniving at these persecutions or encouraging them. Consequently in November 1691, after the tumult in which Halliday and Wardell figured, thirteen of the Quakers petitioned the Scots Privy Council for protection and redress,²⁹ which produced no result whatever, except that the Council recommended the Magistrates to restore forms to the Meeting House that had been confiscated.³⁰ As little effect had the Memorial which the former Lady Swinton, now the widow of Aaron Sonemans,³¹ sent to William III. anent the persecution of the Glasgow Quakers.

On 19th March 1692, Thomas Story with Hew Wood and Bowstead held a meeting in Glasgow before their visit to Hamilton already mentioned,³² when three of the Town Sergeants at the instance of the Provost (Peddie) went to disperse it. After little more than a half-hearted attempt to eject Wood and other Friends, the officers used the famous threat "It is just upon the stroke of Twelve, and the Kirks are ready to break loose, and if you be not gone before the Rabble come, they will tear you in Pieces, and we shall not be able to hinder them", which brought from Bowstead the pertinent rejoinder, "Do your Kirks consist of Rabble that they will come with such Violence so soon as the Clock or Dial assigns the Hour?"³³ It was doubtless an exaggerated threat though no vain one, for in 17th and 18th Century Glasgow, till about 1750 Church attendance was enforced with more than the usual stringency and both during and after divine service, public street and private house alike were open to the sergeants-at-arms and the ecclesiastical agents.³⁴ Practically all the "rabble" then were Church adherents if not members. As it was, the Friends got off lightly on this occasion when the Kirks "scaled", and with interruptions were able to conclude their meeting. The "rabble" were divided

28. "MS Register of Sufferings", P 21.

29. "MS Register of Sufferings", PP 19-20.

30. cf Barrow's Letter in "Collectitia", P 366.

31. Sonemans, a Dutch Friend was an intimate of Robert Barclay. cf JFHS.II. PP30-1.): Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P 342: and Douglas, "Baronage of Scotland", (1798) P 131.

32. v ante, Ch.II. PR 249.

33. Story's "Journal", (1747) P 74.

34. Macgeorge's "Old Glasgow", (3rd ed.) P 184.

in their attitude and after the Meeting the crowd made no attempt to assault or molest them on their way up to Cannon (now Ingram) Street.³⁵ But the populace more than made up for their lenience in the May following. Several Town officers "and a good company of rude people" invaded the Friends' meeting on an order from the Magistrates, and dragged them out to the rabble "who abused us in a very pitiefull manner". Even hospitality at a nearby hostelry was denied the Friends. Three weeks later on May 29th, "one of them called Elders," Thomas Pollock, and Town's officers again dragged out the Quakers "man by man" to the waiting hands of Margaret Steven and her amazons whom they had requisitioned and "who beat and pinched our bodies". In June, Bailie Gloss returned to the attack breaking in, like Spreull, to John Neill's house and dragging him out to the street, whence he and the Provost committed Neill and his friend Houston to solitary imprisonment. This was followed later in the month by a riotous mob expelling the Friends from their meeting place and stoning them along the streets and over the bridge "to ye Gorbels", the Magistrates doing nothing to check it. In July, Bailie Cumming, accompanied by two Church elders and sergeants at arms, again invaded the Friends' worship and put eight in prison, some for fifteen days.³⁶

In Edinburgh, Bowstead had different experiences that same year. Immediately prior to this Glasgow visit, he and Story reached Leith from Urie after a memorable crossing in the Ferry from Kinghorn, during which an Edinburgh minister, named James English, who had conformed and re-conformed, was effectively silenced and pacified by the fearless and timely arguments of the Friends.³⁷ In Edinburgh at the West Port Meeting House and in the streets, Bowstead and Story, in common with other Friends were abused and pelted with garbage by the rabble, the Magistrates showing the same unconcern as in Glasgow.³⁸ In the beginning of February 1692, they attended the Quarterly Meeting in Edinburgh which Thomas Rudd had anticipated by several days' wandering through the streets and colleges crying, "Woe to the sandy foundation". When all three were on a round of farewell calls before leaving, Rudd suddenly left his companions at William Miller's house at Holyrood and returned to his declamations in the Town. At first they felt no "concern" to prolong their stay with Rudd, but ultimately decided to search for him. They discovered him in a basement shop in the High Street into which the mob had thrust him, and Bowstead, a powerfully-built man quickly freed him by a 'tour de force' and setting Rudd on a stone by the Mercat Cross, he and Story mounted guard over him as he preached. There they met with a

35. cf Taylor's Art. on "The Quakers of Glasgow and their Burial Grounds" in "Transactions of the Glasgow Archeol. Soc.," Vol. V, Part I, P 99.

36. "MS Register of Sufferings", PP 21, 22.

37. Story's "Journal", (1747) P 73.

38. Ibid.

mingled reception from the crowd, and after Rudd with his friends had passed down the Canongate and addressed the soldiers marshalled by the Magistrates in front of its Tolbooth in case of riot, he was summoned by the chief Bailie, Charteris, and committed to the Edinburgh Tolbooth. Story's pages give several interesting and valuable sidelights on the prison-system of the day, which if unhealthy, does not seem to have been so excessively severe as formerly. Story and Bowstead were allowed to visit and sup with Rudd,³⁹ and the latter was permitted to bear his witness freely before his fellow-prisoners, who included John Kerr an Episcopal incumbent at Roxburgh, who had been "rabbled" at the Revolution, and several Episcopalianists who had been rioting on account of the suppression of their 'curates'. The next morning, despite Bowstead's bold address to Charteris in which he urged the inconsistency of the Presbyterians in persecuting Friends, and Rudd's refusal to bind himself to quit Edinburgh for good, the fair-minded Bailie released Rudd. The latter, nothing daunted, but elated, immediately returned to his street-preaching in which his companions somewhat reluctantly accompanied him. They found a ready and great audience in the Canongate and after the meeting they visited by invitation the Countess of Kincairn and Lady Collington who received them sympathetically. Thereafter, they set out for the North of Scotland.⁴⁰

The Magistrates of Edinburgh however were getting uneasy about these recurrent riots and demonstrations irrespective of how they were occasioned, and in the following month, March 1693, the Privy Council issued a "Proclamation against Tumults in Edinburgh,"⁴¹ in which, for the protection of loyal subjects, all riotous assemblies in the Burgh or Suburbs, were prohibited by day or night, and citizens were required on the appearance of such to remain within doors on pain of being charged with complicity, or of wounds or death by the armed forces.

The latter part of the year 1692 saw much more clement treatment of the Quakers in Glasgow by the authorities possibly through their fear of another petition of Friends to the Privy Council. Since the Petition of 1691 there had been no imprisonments,⁴² but in 1693 petty persecution broke out afresh.

39. Light is thrown upon this by the enactment of the Lords Commissioners of Justiciary in 1671 whereby the Magistrates were forbidden to receive prisoners committed to the Tolbooth unless those giving them in charge were responsible for their maintenance, and prosecuted them at their trial. (cf Scott-Moncrieff's "Records of the Proceedings of the Justiciary Court, Edinburgh 1661-1678," (1905) Vol. II, PP 31-2.)

40. Story's "Journal" (1747), PP 54-9 etc. Other accounts are all drawn from Story, except a brief allusion to Rudd's imprisonment in "MS Register of Sufferings", P 23.

41. v Copy of the Proclamation dated 1693, in the National Library, Edinburgh.

42. "Records of the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting" in JFHS VIII, P70.

Meetings were frequently broken up by the town guard and the mob, and Andrew Jaffray, Patrick Livingstone and John Carlisle of Blackwell,⁴³ a Carlisle Friend, are instanced as suffering in this way.⁴⁴ Halliday and an English Friend named Hall were more abused still in July when the Provost committed them and fifteen other Friends of both sexes to a "neasty" prison room newly vacated by prostitutes, after two Church Elders and several sergeants at arms had disrupted their meeting and were about to leave them to the mercies of the crowd.⁴⁵

John Gratton, who, with Barclay and Livingstone, had the famous interview with Muggleton, was in Scotland in 1694 with Halliday, and "felt the Scotch people in a bitter envious spirit in several places", particularly at Edinburgh and Glasgow, in both of which Friends' Meetings were stoned. At Glasgow, Gratton found "the people were wicked".⁴⁶ There seems to have been a temporary lull in 1695, but the following year there was a recrudescence of the trouble in Glasgow. The General Assembly "Act against Quakers" of 1695 encouraged ministers of the City to decry them anew as blasphemous and devil-possessed, to urge their people to shun them like the plague and to treat them as "heathen and publicans", with whom no social or business contacts should be made on pain of exclusion from the Lord's Table.⁴⁷ College students of all faculties must have delighted in the rude recreation of throwing Quaker meetings into confusion, but the Friends singled out theological students as the most reprehensible.⁴⁸ Elders of the Kirk were not behind in showing the orthodox spirit and policy toward the Friends, and they carried their bigotry sometimes to cruel and immoderate extremes like Pitkeithlie and Hay,⁴⁹ even to forbidding tradesmen and innkeepers to supply them with food and drink.⁵⁰ The Magistrates forbade any letting or sub-letting of accomodation to Quakers, and no Friend's house or person was safe from damage or assault by the town rabble, nor was the abode of any who sheltered them. Neither women Friends nor strangers to the City were inviolate, and brutal assault and bloodshed irrespective of sex were common.⁵¹ John Gillespie, a Glasgow Elder went to the house of George Swan, who, to his wife's intense chagrin had turned Quaker probably two years before this, and ordered Mrs Swan to beat any Quakers that came to the house and her husband too if he encouraged them! To which Story quaintly adds,

43. cf "Piety Promoted", (1854) I, Part IV, PP 383-5.

44. "Records of the Aberdeen Y.M." in JFHS VIII, P 71; and "MS Register of Sufferings", P 23.

45. Ibid.

46. Gratton's "Journal", (1720) P 125.

47. Story's "Journal", (1747) P 95.

48. Ibid, P 94.

49. Ibid, P 95.

50. Ibid, P 96.

51. Ibid.

"And in this she proved obedient; for in my Presence she dragged a Friend of the Town who came to see us off his Seat by the Hair of his Head upon the Floor, and trampled him under her Feet, tho' he had given her no other Provocation than by his coming into the Room to see us, being Strangers among them."⁵² It certainly seemed, as Story contended, that it was the intention and aim of both Civil and Ecclesiastical authorities to root Quakerism out of the City of Glasgow. The Friends prepared a Memorial of their sufferings for presentation to His Majesty with a humble Address, praying that the "oppressed people of God", his "loyal and dutiful subjects", might be redressed against their persecutors "who thus dishonour the Almighty, the King, Magistracy, and themselves by their own un-christian Doings."⁵³ The Address however does not seem to have been presented as the Quakers were doubtful of its consistency with their policy.

Many things that Story alleged as true of Glasgow during this period were no less apposite to Edinburgh and other places. Things were on the whole quiet in Edinburgh in 1696 when Story visited it, and Friends were practically unmolested in their meetings and in the street,⁵⁴ but for the next three or four years, the main centre of tumult changed again to the Capital. The chief figure in the Nineties was William Miller "the Patriarch" the first of the long and honourable line of the Millers of Craigentinny and Hope Park which valiantly endeavoured to stem the tide of declining Quakerism in Scotland. He came to Edinburgh from Newark (Port-Glasgow) about the time of the Revolution with his wife Margaret Cassie, a scion of the House of Urie, and settled as gardener at Holyrood House to which post he had doubtless been helped through the agency of the Duke of Hamilton⁵⁵ and his gardener at the Palace, Hew Wood. Miller seems to have been by 1695 clerk to both the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings of Edinburgh, and his detailed Minute Books are the principal authorities for the events of these years.⁵⁶

Early in 1697 the Quaker meetings began to be again violently disturbed, though, as John Fothergill a Yorkshire travelling Friend testifies, without any material hurt.⁵⁷ The worshippers however were often rudely ejected and forced to conclude their meetings on the stairhead outside, or even in the street below, where they were further exposed to danger from the mob, but bore their testimony hopefully. The Magistrates on being appealed to for protection against young vagabonds dancing, using atheistic language, and otherwise abusing and threatening Friends at their

52. "Journal", (1747) P95. Mrs Swan however was quite different when Story again visited her house in 1717. He found her then "very loving and courteous, all the old Enmity being slain but still in Communion with the Presbyterians." (Ibid, P 588.)

53. Ibid, P 97.

54. Ibid, P 93.

55. v Burke's "Peerage and Baronetage" (1927), P1103.

56. Art by W.F. Miller in JFHS. II, P 107: "Memorials of Hope Park"

(1886) P2.
57. "Life of John Fothergill", (2nd ed, 1773) P24.

meetings, only aggravated their burden by authorising Bailie Hali-burton to confiscate the Meeting House key. Nor would the Provost and Council return it. For six months, from April to October, the Friends had to hold their worship in the open street at the foot of the turnpike stair, and their Meetings for Discipline at Bartholemew Gibson or William Miller's house.⁵⁸ According to family tradition, Margaret Miller during these months preached in the open air with her husband on one side and her son on the other as body-guard.⁵⁹

Then began a series of Petitions and Remonstrances to local and national authorities for reparation, which were largely unavailing. The Friends petitioned the Privy Council as acknowledged "quiet and peaceable subjects under a king who loves not that any should be oppressed for conscience' sake", to grant them freedom of conscience and speedy and effective redress against their adversaries "lest necessity force them to apply to the King for protection."⁶⁰ The Council contented itself with remitting the Petition to the Provost and Magistrates of Edinburgh to deal with as they should "find just and right".

In May the Meeting for Sufferings in London was instrumental in getting an Injunction through the Secretary of State to the Chancellor and the King's Advocate for Scotland which Gibson and Miller "or any other frind" were desired to call and claim "as they see fridom". But as to whether Edinburgh Friends failed to call or to procure it, there is no record, and nothing seems to have issued from this.⁶¹ Nor was Gibson and Miller's attempt to regain the key from the Town Council any more successful, but was met with a threat from two of the Magistrates to build up the door of the Meeting House and prohibit the Quakers from assembling there for all time.⁶²

A year later, about May 1698, an appeal was made direct to William III. by the Friends, but despite his fair promises "the tumultouse rabel continoueth to molest us at our mittings notwithstanding of our dear frinds in England of ther representing of it to the King and to others that is in athority... yet no ease hath been as yett not withstanding of all pretences to that efect."⁶⁴

58. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book" 1669, (MS Vol No 15) P81, and "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book" 1669, (MS Vol No 12) PP 71, 72. cf Friends Petition to the Privy Council in MS. RPCS "Acta" 1697, P 184.

59. She died in 1702. v "Register of Births and Burials 1681"; (MS. Vol. 11. P 8. For her husband's "Testimony" to her cf "Memorials of Hope Park", P3; and JFHS. II, P 108.

60. MS. RPCS "Acta", 20th April 1697, (P 185.)

61. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book" 1669, (MS. Vol 15.) P83.

62. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book" 1669, (MS. Vol 12.) P 71.

63. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book" 1669, (MS. Vol No 15.) P89.

64. Ibid, P 90.

Meanwhile in October 1697 the flat below the Meeting House in the West Port had fallen vacant and the Friends secured it as a place of worship, though Meetings for Discipline were still held in private houses, and at length in 1698 they recovered the key from the Magistrates and were able to re-occupy their old quarters.⁶⁵ But the latter were as negligent in protecting them as ever, for the rabble flung bales of powder into the middle of their assembly and otherwise maltreated them.⁶⁶ In February 1699 this 'Scum of the whol city' was reinforced by the "Suttman" and the College students, and complaints to some of the Senatus only seemed to make them worse.⁶⁷

To the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting of 1699 came James Dickenson on his third tour in Scotland after visiting the West and North. He was accompanied by Jonathan, son of John Burnyeat, then a mere boy of twelve but advanced far beyond his years, and probably the youngest minister on record in the Society. At Edinburgh the crowd was "very rude and wicked and laboured to disturb us" so that they were "under great sorrow to see the wickedness of the people", and "a concern came upon Jonathan Burnyeat to write 'A Warning' to the inhabitants of that place."⁶⁸ In addition, the students were again proving offensive.⁶⁹

The year 1701 was a troubled one in both cities. Frequent mention is made in the Edinburgh Records of the brutal conduct of the populace to Friends in the street and in their Meeting House and of malicious damage to their property, and John Fothergill who was travelling again in Scotland "amongst a hard, self-conceited, and in some places an envious people", found a "wicked spirit" prevailing in Edinburgh which sought to disturb meetings and drown the speaker's voice. "Yet at times" he adds, "the power and authority of Truth arose over those wicked endeavours... and some of the worst would go away, and others lend some attention to the testimony of Truth"⁷⁰ Things came to a climax in January, 1701/2 when the students raised a riot, battered in the oak doors of the Meeting House with hammers, and, followed by a mob of several hundreds of men and boys, assaulted and threatened Friends within, even Bartholemew Gibson, now an old man of seventy-four. In vain was the Magistrates' intervention sought and the captain of the Town Guard, Captain Robinson, "rather smiled at it."⁷¹

65. cf Ibid, P 84.

66. Ibid, P 90.

67. Ibid, P 91.

68. v Dickenson's "Journal" (1745), PP 124-6; and "Some Account of the Gospel Labours of Jonathan Burnyeat", (2nd ed. by Chalk, 1857.) PP 5-6. I can find no trace of the "Warning", and fear it is not extant.

69. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 105.

70. "Life of John Fothergill", (1773) PP 31-2.

71. "Edinburgh Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol No 12.) PP 85,86.

In Glasgow, Fothergill relates that a crowd, after disturbing the Quaker meetings badly one Sunday, hounded the Friends along the street bawling and pelting them with stones and slime, while people who crowded round their doors en route seemed full of amused satisfaction rather than reproof. This moved an English soldier to proclaim aloud three times in herald style, "Behold the godly Town of Glasgow, how they entertain Strangers." This ironical outburst had a salutary effect on the spectators and Fothergill claims that this sounded the knell of the popular disturbances against the Quakers in Glasgow.⁷²

The most remarkable feature of these years of din and lawlessness in Edinburgh and Glasgow was the callous indifference or connivance of the Magistrates and town guard in the abuse of the Quakers and the violation of their property and legal rights. It was in striking contrast to what obtained in other places except Hamilton, especially to the peaceableness of Aberdeen and the attitude of its Magistrates. Indeed the authorities of the former cities not only failed to suppress the violence and intolerance of the populace which were contrary to both the policy and edicts of William.III, but too often were the clergy the open encouragers of the rabble in their cruel and destructive orgies. The times were still rude but no longer dangerous as in the Stuart dynasty, and the Quakers were justified in accusing authorities of acting too frequently "contrary to the true and good End of the Institution of Magistracy, as a Terror to Evil-doers; and not to abuse, but protect the Innocent."⁷³

72. "Life of John Fothergill", (1773) PP 32-3.
 73. Story's "Journal", (1747) P 96.

CHAPTER IV.

"THE CONDITION AND OUTLOOK OF QUAKERISM
ELSEWHERE IN SCOTLAND. c.1690-1701."

With the exception of the town of Hamilton in 1692 and one or two other places, the rest of Scotland showed a general behaviour of the populace, and in particular a treatment of the Quakers, in striking contrast to that evinced in Edinburgh and Glasgow during the last decade of the 17th century. It would appear that the latter was not wholly accounted for by "the fury and fiercenes of the presbyterian blind zeall or rage against Frinds ~~as~~ in the South and West"¹ at least. The Privy Council evidently had the Capital marked down as a plague-or storm centre from which It did not intend contagion to spread, for the Lords; "for the better keeping and securing the Peace of the Kingdom", forbade anyone to travel to any part of the Kingdom without a written authority from a Privy Councillor not dissimilar to our modern passport, and required of all magistrates and civil and military authorities strict attention to the terms of the Act.²

But although, in Barrow's words, "in all other parts, both the inhabitants and soldiers are quiet and moderate towards Friends"³ and they had the opportunity as never before of building up a strong Cause in Scotland, all was not well with the Society. The years immediately after the Revolution brought serious loss to it in the death of some of its foremost leaders in both front and second ranks. Dewsbury passed away at Warwick in June 1688;⁴ Parker in 1689;⁵ John Burnyeat in 1690, and also George Gray of Aquorthies, who had a unique influence in Northern Quakerism for his natural gifts and graciousness of soul.⁶ To these were added the infinitely heavier blows of the death of Robert Barclay and George Fox. Barclay died in his prime at Urie on 3rd October 1690 after his last tour with Dickenson.⁷ The "Testimonies" to this outstanding Quaker scholar, with whose name Scottish Quakerism is coterminous to the uninitiated, were rich and varied. Those by Fox, Penn, Livingstone and Jaffray are printed after the Preface to "Truth Triumphant", and a well known composite one by intimate contemporaries is found in Bevan's "Short

-
1. cf Letter from Aberdeen Friends to the London Correspondents, 6th June 1697 in JFHS VIll, P75.
 2. "Act of the Privy Council of Scotland discharging persons to travel from Edinburgh without passes". Edin, Dec.8.1696. (In National Library--Heirs and Successors of A.Anderson.)
 3. Letter to Crisp and Whitehead in "Collectitia"(1824) P365.
 4. Smith's "Life", (1836) P279.
 5. Sewell's "History", (1811) II, P472.
 6. cf John Barclay's Tribute. (Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd ed) PP337-8.)
 7. v ante, Bk.II. Ch.VII, P129.

Account" of his life.⁸ To these must be added an "Epitaph" in rhyme by Arthur Forbes of Brux, a non-Quaker,⁹ and a singularly courtly and beautiful letter to Christian Barclay from Anne, Countess of Errol written from Slains Castle, Aberdeenshire, acknowledging a volume of Barclay's and extolling his loyal friendship especially to her unfortunate brothers.¹⁰ In Fox's letter of sympathy to Christian Barclay, he commits her to the "great Ruler and Orderer of all" and enjoins her to "do thy Dilligence in thy family, in training up thy Children in the fear of the Lord and in his new Covenant of Life...and all thy Servants and Tennants in the wisdom of God. Thou must answer the Truth in them all."¹¹

Fox himself 'passed on' in January 1691, one Sunday evening after he had given his last message to a large meeting at Gracechurch Street.¹² Of the "Testimonies", those by Ellwood, the great editor of the "Journal", and Penn are the best known. Only about a fortnight before his death, Fox wrote an important last letter to the Friends in Aberdeen stating that he had nominated six Friends then resident in London to correspond with their brethren in Scotland, and urging the latter to correspond faithfully and systematically with them concerning all that was of interest and importance for "the Truth".¹³ The Aberdeen Correspondence Committee nominated by the Monthly Meeting from the Town and Country to carry out the Founder's injunctions, contains many already familiar names like Gellie, Jaffray, Andrew Galloway, Barclay, Burnet of Lethendy and Robertson of Kinmuck.¹⁴

There was more behind this and other arrangements doubtless than just Fox's desire to set his house fully in order before his death. There is every likelihood that Fox with his keen vision and marvellous foresight, had real anxiety for the future of the Movement in Scotland as elsewhere, not that it lacked an organisation which was as satisfactory a combination of settled authority and spiritual freedom as it could well be made, nor yet, because like Penn, he feared that the almost simultaneous dying of "so many bright stars" betokened a dreadful storm approaching,¹⁵ but because he foresaw in its release from persecution and the necessity to struggle, the danger of slow internal disintegration and 'ennui', and a weakening witness in an environment of toleration,

8. Bevan "A Short Account of the Life and Writings of Robert Barclay" (1802), PP75-8.

9. Immediately after the "Testimonies" in "Truth Triumphant", (1718) Vol I.

10. The letter is given by John Barclay in "Jaffray's Diary", Note B.B, PP445-6. The brothers referred to in the letter are James 4th Earl of Perth, and John 1st Earl of Melfort.

11. "Reliquiae Barclaianae", PP 71-2.

12. Braithwaite's list of references on his last illness and death is very full. ("Second Period", 1921. P 434, n2) v also Sewell's "History" (1811), II, PP 487-8. A Neave Brayshaw's "Personality of George Fox" gives the best and most comprehensive views of his character and powers.

13. v Minutes of the Aber. M. 12-12-1690/1 in JHHS VIII 64-5. Three of the six were Livingstone, Gilbert Mollieson, & Alexander Paterson.

Minutes of
Aber. Month-
ly Meeting,
1-1-1691 in
JHHS. VIII, p66.

Penn's
Testimony
to Barclay in
"Truth Trium-
phant", (1718)
Vol I.

apathy and compromise. It was imperative therefore to "be watchful and strengthen the things which remained." An evidence of this was the default of the London correspondents fifteen years after when Andrew Jaffray on behalf of the Aberdeen Quakers wrote them a "pungent Letter" threatening to change their correspondents.¹⁶

If decline was Fox's presage, it came steadily true in Scotland in the following half-century. In the decade after the Revolution the first signs were visible, and were accentuated and thrown into bolder relief by the seven years of famine, epidemics of sickness, and national disaster,—"King William's dear years"—, which overtook the unhappy Land, from 1694 to 1701. The seasons were generally cold and most unseasonable, with storms and little sun. Harvests were frequently as late as November and December, and not unknown even in January and February. The yield was poor, and much rotted in the fields. A sidelight on the total failure of the harvest of 1696 was Thomas Story's inability at Cupar-Fife to get grass, hay, or staw for the horses, "but only Thistles for which we paid ls.9d."¹⁷ When Christopher Story visited Aberdeen with his wife in October 1698, they found the people reaping their corn which for a month had been buried in snow, and fires lit in the fields; "it was so cold".¹⁸ Relief was brought to suffering Friends in the North of Scotland in 1697 from the London Correspondents by the hands of two of them, Daniel Munro and his wife, there being "deep sufferings of many in Scotland by reason of a great scarcity of corn,"¹⁹ and in 1698, Hertfordshire Friends subscribed £1 -17-6 to help in the relief of the Northerners whose crops had failed for the third successive year.²⁰ An unfortunate impression gained currency among the London Friends that the Scots Friends had been negligent and callous in the relief of their poor, and the former communicated this to Scotland. The Aberdeen Friends indignantly denied it, and in detailing the awful rigours of 1698 emphasised that no Friend had so far suffered extreme want owing to the kindness of other Friends.²¹ In the same year the Hamilton Friends sent £5 relief by Alexander Seaton to Kinmuck Friends which "came very seasonably to help them in their need."²² The mortality rate, from want of food and mysterious diseases that puzzled the physicians, was very heavy, and at times the deaths followed so closely on one another that many were buried without coffin or winding sheet.²³ According to Christopher Story

-
16. Minutes of Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting, 26-V-1705, in JFHS Vlll.P115
 17. "Journal", (1747) P91.
 18. "Life of Christopher Story", (1726) P80. v also Copy of Letter from Aber. Midmonth Meeting to London Correspondents, 17-9-1698. (Bundle 62 (1) of Aber MSS at Crown Street.)
 19. JFHS XII., PP 143-4.
 20. Hine, "A Mirror for the Society of Friends", (1929) P 36.
 21. "Copy of Letter from Aber. Midmonth Meeting" (as above)
 22. "Hamilton Meeting Book" 1695, (MS Vol. No 14), PP 6,7.
 23. "The Edinburgh Magazine and Literary Miscellany", (1820) Vol.Vll.
 PP 46-8. cf "Life of John Richardson", (3rd ed, 1774.) P 51.

some died even in the highways. To add to this national calamity came the disaster of Paterson's "Darien Scheme" in 1698 with the loss of thousands of lives and the life-long ruin of thousands of others at home; and in 1700 a great fire in Edinburgh. These sufferings ate into the very heart of the people, bringing them nearly to despair. So low did the spiritual condition of the country become that by ~~the~~ Acts of the General Assemblies of 1700 and 1701, a "Solemn Fast and Humiliation" for placating the wrath of the Lord, was ordered to be observed, the aforesaid troubles being 'proofs' of His displeasure.²⁴

The Quakers were insistent that "the Testimony of Truth ought to be weightily kept up against all hypocritical publick fasts"²⁵ and Fast days. After a recent Fast, Margaret Jaffray of Kingswells addressed the inhabitants of Aberdeen on the subject,²⁶ and the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting in 1700 protested against any interference with any of "our servants that Do not own the Truth as to these days"²⁷ Notwithstanding this, the national tribulation which led directly to the Church's Solemn Fast of 1700 must have had an indirect effect at least on the Scottish Quaker enterprise, both internally and externally.

Generally speaking, Quakerism made no headway during this decade. Any local advances or signs of encouragement were offset by other losses and tendencies to decline. Domestically the Friends seem to have been as a whole harmonious. Barrow found "things generally well in unity and good order"²⁸ There were "many precious meetings" up and down the country with "comfortable oportunites"; Friends were "generally well, fresh, and savoury in true Love and unity, and our Meetings fresh,"²⁹ and with few exceptions, meetings were at least "to our satisfaction". Thomas Thompson an English Friend was amply satisfied with the "Heavenly" and "very precious" meetings he had in Urie and Donside as also in Edinburgh.³⁰ John Barclay applied James Gough's eulogistic remarks on Quaker meetings in Ireland to those years in Scotland on the whole,³¹ while Samuel Watson who visited Scotland again in 1699 with his daughter Mercy Johnson³² wrote a general epistle to Friends in Scotland from Hamilton on his way

24. v ante, Ch. I, P 239, note 19.

25. Aberdeen Monthly Meeting Minutes of 6-VI-1691, in JFHS Vlll, P 66. of "Aber Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4.) P "19".

26. Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P 386.

27. "Minute Books of Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol.4.) P19.

28. "Collectitia", (1824) P 365.

29. Letter from Aberdeen to London Correspondents, Nov. 1693, in JFHS Vlll. P71.

31. Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P 363.

32. "Piety Promoted", (1854) Vol. I, P 252.

30. Thompson's "Life and Services", (1708) PP. 36-7, 29.

South, full of joyous satisfaction with the peace and internal health of Friends' meetings there, which he counsels them to guard. Frances Sonemans seems to have had an apprehension about 1693 that the virus of the Keithian separation would reach his home country, and work havoc. That there is no evidence that it did so directly is seen most clearly in 1700 when Sandilands and Keith failed to drive a wedge into the Society at Aberdeen. Sandilands, it will be recalled, was one of the four Marischal students who attested "Quakerism Confirmed", but about the time of the Revolution, he identified himself with Keith and actively opposed Quakerism. He appears to have returned to Aberdeen about the end of the century where he published in 1700 "Some Queries proposed to the Monthly Meeting of the Quakers at Aberdeen," to which Keith prefixed a letter "of very serious and Christian Expostulation with his old Friends". In an address to the Lord Provost and Council Sandilands boasted himself the champion against "the gross and vile Errors that lay couched under the mask of Divine Illumination" and the contradictions of Quakerism. After quarrelling with Andrew Jaffray over "some gross passages" in Penn's "Works", Sandilands went to the Monthly Meeting, read his "Queries" and got the replies which might have been expected.³⁵ But the Friends refused to prosecute the controversy any further.

Yet despite the general internal peace and concord in Scotland, there were significant premonitions of decline and eclipse. In 1696 not one of the five outlying Monthly Meetings sent representatives to the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting except Urie, from which only Robert Barclay came, and the latter Meeting sent to Kinmuck Monthly Meeting as being its chief member and the largest in Scotland, a "Lyne" of brotherly reproof "to quicken them to mynd Truth's concerns and affairs more diligently", and send delegates.³⁶ The next Summer the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting "thought fitt to stirr up and deall plainly and tenderly" with the Friends at Montrose for their remiss and apathetic treatment of English travelling Friends who had complained verbally and in writing that they could scarcely get a meeting there. The Aberdeen Meeting "are necessitat to signifie our great grieff" for this treatment of English Friends who were quite unused to such in their own country, which was conduct unworthy of the traditions of the Society. Apparently Montrose Friends were none too scrupulous either in remitting payments for books received.³⁷ Thomas Story found that the people at Montrose then "did not seem to be weary or heavy laden, or fit for the Cross of Christ, nor sensible of any want".³⁸

33. Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) PP 372-4.

34. JFHS II, P 29

35. "Some Queries proposed" PP 2, 3-4.

36. Aberdeen Q.M. Minutes 12-1X-1696, in JFHS Vlll, P 73.

37. Aberdeen Monthly Meeting Minutes, 3-1V-1697, in JFHS Vlll. PP 74-5. The letter bore fourteen signatures of prominent Quakers.

38. "Journal", (1747) P 92. But cf Letter from Aberdeen Friends to London in June 1697, in JFHS Vlll, P 75-6.

It is not surprising that a proposal in the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting in 1700 to provide a Meeting House at Montrose was deferred "till another tyme" ³⁹

Things were no more encouraging in Lanarkshire. Story and Henry Atkinson found the meeting at Hamilton in 1696 "very poor and low, for Things were then in a declining Condition at that Place".⁴⁰ This was further borne out in 1699 by the failure of the six Particular Meetings to establish at the request of Hamilton Monthly Meeting, each a Monthly Meeting of its own, and combine to form one Quarterly Meeting "in the West".⁴¹ These six Particular meetings included Glasgow, Douglas, Gartshore, and Hamilton itself. Some consisted of little more than one household. In the same year the Gartshore Meeting evidently required to be exhorted to attend the Hamilton Monthly Meeting more carefully, as their shortcomings became more noted from time to time.⁴² Gratton's counsel to the Quakers in Scotland was not without reason, "Let not your Monthly and Quarterly Meetings be neglected and take care of the whole church of God in your nation."⁴³ The best and most earnest of them saw a necessary solution to this trend of things in closing the gaps in organisation and tightening up oversight and discipline. The Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting in 1693 resolved to appoint two "weighty Friends" to have special care over members at home and be a sort of *patresfamilias* giving them advice and help as might appear needful.⁴⁴ Weekly family meetings at each others' houses in rotation were also resorted to in imitation of the early Christians. Samuel Watson in the aforementioned letter of 1699 went as far as to urge the appointment of male and female overseers "duly to inspect into the families of their particular meeting; to see that there be no neglect of the poor, no disorderly walking on the part of any person that professes the Truth, neither unfaithfulness in any degree."⁴⁵ Reports should be given in to the Monthly Meetings in which "a weighty course should be had in calling each meeting to examination how things are amongst them". All would then be ready and in order for the Quarterly Meeting. How far these or similar measures proved a solution of the situation or even an alleviation of it, is extremely doubtful.

During the last decade of the 17th century there was a great influx of "public" and travelling missionaries into

-
39. "Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book." (MS Vol No 4), P 17.
 40. "Journal", (1747) P 94. For the Atkinsons, v Ferguson's "Early Cumberland and Westmorland Friends" (1871), PP 104-6.
 41. "Hamilton Meeting Book 1695" (MS Vol No 14) P 10.
 42. Ibid, P9.
 43. Letter to Scots Friends in "Journal", (1720) P 130.
 44. Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) P 362.
 45. Watson seems to have been unaware that the Aber. Quarterly Meeting had already appointed overseers in 1698. (v "Testimony" issued from Aberdeen Q.M in July 1698. v "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol No 4) PP4-6.)

Scotland, chiefly from over the Border, comparable in zeal and numbers with the first stream in the Fifties. A certain slackness in presenting travelling credentials seemed however to prevail for the Aberdeen Friends- who were easily the strictest and most constitutional in these years-, in desiring Cumberland Friends to continue " the frequent sweet visits we have had from these parts" enjoin all according to usage to bring " a Certificat with them of the Unity of frinds with their travell and Service to be seen signed by the Quarterly or Monthly Meetings to whom they belong."⁴⁶ As Aberdeen got the bulk of these visitors, she naturally raised the matter. The records show an approximate number of a hundred and twelve Stranger Friends in the period 1690-1701, including those to Edinburgh and Glasgow, of whom seventeen were women.⁴⁷ Many of them are only names or of no real importance, but some notice must be given of the travels and fortunes of the more important visitors to other parts of Scotland,

Robert Barrow of Kendal toured the most of Quaker Scotland alone in January 1692, concentrating chiefly on Aberdeen and the North-East, where he found " a fine openness, many of late convinced and hopeful to continue, and many inclinable and willing to hear."⁴⁸ The chief value of his visit however is his long "Breviat"⁴⁹ or Synopsis of his messages and conversations while in Aberdeen, which is full of sage and piquant counsel and 'obiter dicta' ranging from the necessity of close attendance upon Men's Meetings in session, and desiderata in ladies' dress and deportment, to the relative value of preaching,—"the Suburbs of Religion"— and practice. He also stresses the obligation to give serious practical attention to the " wholsom advyce and Counsell" of the London Yearly Meeting Paper and not to read it over as a News Letter and then lay it aside—the fate of many referenda of Annual Assemblies!

The most part of the time that Thomas Rudd was in Scotland he was accompanied by Thomas Story and John Bowstead. His "Woe to the sandy foundation" sounded through every city and town he visited. After their stirring adventures in Edinburgh, culminating in their visits to Lady Kincairn and Lady Collington, they began their tour in the North, and on the whole had a favourable and peaceable reception with no serious violence offered to them. Crossing by ferry from Leith to Kinghorn, they passed through Cupar-Fife, where " the People came forth as Bees from a shaken Hive"⁵⁰ to Dundee and Broughty-Ferry without any " incivility" or incident. At Monifieth they ran into a party of

46. JFHS VIII, P 76.

47. These figures are based on W.F. Miller's lists (v JFHS XI, 140-5 : 172-3.) Several are mentioned in "Piety Promoted" also.

48. "Collectitia", (1824) P 365.

49. v " Miller MSS" Vol. II, 155-7.

50. Story's "Journal", (1747) P 59.

wedding revellers upon whom naturally "little was effected", as also upon the people of Arbroath who "being generally Episcopal" and with a "dull senseless Spirit reigning" among them "had little desire to know Truth".⁵¹ At the Market Place of Montrose the people were "indifferent sober" though some juveniles threw dirt at Rudd. Passing through Kirtonhill, the birthplace of Colonel Barclay and the latter house of David Falconer, they arrived at Urie which they made their centre for visiting the neighbouring villages of Dunnottar, Stonehaven, and Fetteresso where Bowstead preached in the Churchyard "to a People buried in Ignorance who seemed to have no sense of God at all". Aberdeen was not quite as tranquil, but after withstanding a file of musketeers who tried to bully them in the Market Place, they were unmolested.⁵²

At Aberdeen, Rudd separated from Story and Bowstead and went South again to Benholm where he quickly lived down the old charge of being a Jesuit in disguise, while they continued to Inverurie and Kinmuck. At the latter place Rudd rejoined them five days later, and all proceeded through Huntly, Keith and Fochabers to Elgin.⁵³

The dramatic three hours which the trio spent in Elgin cannot be adequately dealt with here. Seldom is Story more fascinating than in these pages, and his narrative is full of pith and drama as he tells of how, after their arrest and confinement in the Guard Room of the Tolbooth⁵⁴ at the instigation of the "Presbyterian Magistrates", they so won over the military as Paul did his Praetorian guards, that the Magistrates were more eager to thrust them out again into liberty than they had been to imprison them; also of how Story discomfited the minister, whose name was Tod,⁵⁵ regarding his "call" to the ministry, so that he had to escape from the crowd to the taunt of Bowstead's words "The Hireling runs because he is a Hireling".⁵⁶ From Elgin they continued through Forres, where they had an interesting interview with an 'outed' Episcopalian,⁵⁷ through Old Nairn where they received one of the now rare outbursts of abuse from the people, and Nairn itself, to Inverness.⁵⁸ There is nothing of any note on their return journey to record except the strange history of John Gellie, the Quaker fanatic of Kinmuck, the son of John Gellie.

51. Ibid, P 60.

52. Ibid, P 61.

53. Ibid, PP 61-2.

54. For a description of the Old Tolbooth, v Shaw's "History of the Province of Moray" Vol I, PP 370-2. cf also MacGibbon and Ross "Castellated and Domestic Architecture" (1892) Vol. V, PP 98-9.

55. Scott's "Fasti" (New ed.), Vol. VI., P 393.

56. Story's "Journal", (1747) PP 62-4.

57. One, William Falconer, a relative of David Falconer.

58. Their visit there will be referred to. post, Chapter VIII.

minister of Kinkell,⁵⁹ and nephew of Andrew Jaffray, who could lay his own mother under his spell. It is the only known case in Scottish Quakerism parallel in certain aspects to that of Nayler.⁶⁰

In 1694 John Gratton of Derbyshire and James Halliday had "many precious meetings up and down" the country. They went to the West, and most places of note between Edinburgh and Aberdeen, visiting Urie where they spent several days with Christian Barclay; John Forbes at Aquorthies; the Jaffrays at Kingswells and on their return home, the house of James Wood, gardener at Drumlanrig Castle.⁶¹

The next New Year came Peter Gardiner a notable Essex Friend, the man of "hind's feet", who insisted upon travelling on foot.⁶² He visited principally Aberdeen, Urie and Montrose with edifying results to Friends.⁶³ Since her husband's death, Christian Barclay, true to the spirit of Fox's injunction had maintained an active Quaker testimony in her locality as well as a worthy influence in her family.⁶⁴ She went to Fetteresso Church one Communion Sunday and from the gallery after service declaimed against their "Ceremonies and shadows" only to be ejected, amid the protest of John Mylne the minister, and his wife. In the Churchyard she continued her testimony. Andrew Jaffray, and young Robert Barclay also visited Fetteresso Church for the same purpose and fared similarly for their pains. These examples influenced another convert to Quakerism, Janet Burness of Carnton near Urie, to witness against the parish minister for which she was carried off roughly to prison.⁶⁵ Gardiner thus found "testimony" around Urie very alive, but he made it more living still, for while Christian Barclay wisely and consistently followed her own precepts to Friends⁶⁶ and gathered her children for worship and instruction every morning before breakfast as Gratton himself witnessed,⁶⁷ Gardiner enriched and emboldened to a remarkable degree the whole Barclay family to bear their witness to the Faith they held,⁶⁸ At these meetings in Aberdeen and the Mearns led by Gardiner, several local Friends were present. Later Gardiner wrote with characteristic Quaker exaggeration very soon before his death, that the Lord was "pouring out of his Spirit in a glorious manner in the West of Scotland."⁷⁰

59. Scott's "Fasti", (New ed.) Vol VI, P 164.

60. Story's "Journal", (1747) PP 70-2.

61. Gratton's "Journal" (1720), PP 124-5. James Wood, not a very exemplary Friend, was the son of Hew Wood (cf JFHS XLV, 9-11.)

62. cf "John Row MSS", Vol 17, (1779) PP 49-52.

63. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in JFHS VII, P 98.

64. For her character, v Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd ed) PP 381-2.

65. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in JFHS VII, PP 185, 186.

66. cf Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd ed) P 361. / 67 "Journal", (1720) P 125.

68. "Richardson MS", II, PP 41-2: Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd ed) P 352-4: Bridge's Paper on "The Barclays of Ury" in FQE XLV, PP 51-3. For the family, v further, Jaffray's "Diary" PP 382-3.

69. v "Reliquiae Barclaianae", PP 83, 84, 93.

70. Jaffray's "Diary", PP 356-7.

Following
is up with
letters after
quitted
ie. 69.

He died of smallpox at Carlisle on his way home.⁷¹

In August 1696 Thomas Story was again in Scotland this time with Henry Atkinson. It was an uneventful tour, consisting chiefly of attendance at "pretty comfortable" and "open" meetings of Friends, varied by an altercation on the Kinghorn ferry-boat with another "Episcopal Priest" and a "young Gentleman" who "had a mind to dispute with me on the Subject of Baptism", and who being quickly silenced became plausible. At Aberdeen where the Quakers stayed four days "several Persons of Note in the World... especially of the Female Sex, but incognito" attended the meeting at Andrew Jaffray's house and "behaved very solidly", but Gartshore Meeting was under "the Power of Darkness" through the disloyalty and dictatorial spirit of a self-appointed leader, Andrew Gray, and the two meetings held in Glasgow were "very hard and dry".⁷²

About 1695 Bowstead figured with Christopher Story during another visit of the latter to Scotland in a mêlée at Canonbie, Dumfriesshire. It seems that Story had got permission to hold a meeting at Broomholm from the landowner, who however was induced by Armstrong the "Priest" to cancel it at the last moment, so that the Quakers held it on the highway about a mile from Canonbie Kirk. When Elders of neighbouring parishes and officers of the law appeared on the scene, accompanied by a disorderly rabble of "rude shabby lads and youths void of understanding", the situation became menacing. The Quakers were beaten and abused, and Story was injured to the effusion of blood. But the passive resistance of the Quakers was as resolute as ever. "A brave Warfare it was, and Friends kept their Places old and young, and the Meeting continued near three Hours".⁷³ Nor had the Friends done with Canonbie.

William Edmundson's brief passage through Dumfries and Galloway in August 1697⁷⁴ is of no importance, and beyond Edinburgh and Glasgow, John Fothergill gives no details of his first visit,⁷⁵ and the same is true of his next visit in 1701.⁷⁶ Aberdeen was lively however about that time. 1698 was the peak year of travelling and missionary Friends in Scotland, when over a fifth of the total from 1690 to 1701 came, and all but Fothergill were known to visit Aberdeen.⁷⁷ That Quakerism was still not an entirely negligible quantity in and around the City,⁷⁸ was seen in the

71. cf "Reliquiae Barclaianae", P 101, (Letter from Seaton to Barclay.) and Letter from John Bowstead of Aglionby to Francis Stamper, in Jaffray's "Diary", PP 357-8.

72. Story's "Journal", (1747) PP 91-4.

73. "Life of Christopher Story", (1726) PP 77-8.

74. cf "Journal" (1774), P 197.

75. "Life", (2nd ed. 1773) P 24.

76. Ibid, P 31.

77. JFHS. XI, P 144 : Records of Aberdeen Yearly Meeting in Ibid, VIII, PP 76-7.

78. Thom's "History of Aberdeen", (1811) gives the number as 50 in 1700. (Vol II, P 17)

irregular election of Bailie John Johnston to the Provostship, which was engineered by his father-in-law Provost Cruikshank. When the case went before the Privy Council and the election was annulled, it was urged against Johnston that he was a "person of profest and manifest enmitie to the religion established, in so far as he was ...avowedly a maintainer and promoter of the detestable sect of the qwakers" and objected to oaths.⁷⁹

In 1699 Dickenson and the youthful Jonathan Burnyeat "who was very zealous against deceit and wickedness both in professor and profane" visited Douglas, Hamilton and the North before attending the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting.⁸⁰ The same year Obadiah Haig landed back from America, a well-off man, visited his uncle Anthony at Bemersyde, the Barclays of Urie, and the Skenes of Aberdeen. In 1701 he married the grand-daughter of Bailie Skene of Newtyle and sailed again for America. But he never reached home, dying at Barbadoes aged twenty-seven.⁸¹

In the same year, Christopher Story with Richard Latimer and four other Friends travelled through the South-West of Scotland distributing a supply of Quaker publications received from Gilbert Molleson and others in London. At Dumfries being refused accomodation for a meeting at their inn, they went to the Fish Cross and bore their testimony. The town guard showed considerable patiences and forbearance, and "no harshness appeared from any" of the populace who received the literature willingly and showed considerable curiosity in reading it. All along the Quakers' route to Portpatrick they had "frequent opportunities to disperse" their books" to great satisfaction, and people in receiving them showed us much kindness," and at Baldown near Wigtown, they found a local "agent" in a solitary member of the Society. The last book was given to the skipper of the Irish boat from Portpatrick.⁸²

On their return from Ireland the Parish of Canonbie was again the scene of a disturbance in 1701 which was more serious in aspect than the last although no one was actually injured. As the Quakers sat on the ground holding an open-air meeting at Woodhouse-Lees, a strong party, mounted and on foot, under Bailie Melvin, tried to break them up by force, and in the confusion some of both sides were knocked down a steep bank. The visiting Friends were dragged into a wood near at hand, followed by their congregation, and Henry Atkinson when he offered to pray,

-
79. "Registrum Secreti Concilii Decreta" of 25th November 1697, leaves 48ff, especially leaf 51a; and cf Thom's "History", (1811) Vol. II, P3.
80. "Some Account of Jonathan Burnyeat", (1857) PP5,6. cf also Ante, Ch. III. P270.
81. Russell "The Haigs of Bemersyde", (1881) PP 337-9. cf Ante, Bk. II, Ch. VI, P 115.
82. Letter to Gilbert Molleson from Lurgan, dated 21-III-1701 in Story's "Life", (1726) PP 100-105.

was dragged on horseback through a deep part of the Esk and held in a house on the other side. Story later wrote a vigorous letter of protest to Armstrong the minister, who did not seem to have been present but whom Story regarded as 'laying the guns' behind. In his letter Story incorporated a "Homily"—the substance of what he would have said to the audience had he got the opportunity.⁸³ With characteristic vigour Story denounces "thy Man the Clerk and Schoolmaster" as representative of "no good Government in thy Family" and appeals to Armstrong to be done with blind prejudice and bitter judgment. Armstrong made no reply," perhaps feeling himself unable to deal with such charges" as Ferguson humourously comments,⁸⁴ but he interfered no further with the Quakers, in Canonbie.

Later in the same year Dickenson, in company with Richard and Robert Latimer paid his fourth visit to Scotland on his way to Ireland through Dumfries and Galloway. This is by far the most vivid and detailed of all Dickenson's memorabilia. Probably some time on this journey he had his strange and thrilling escapade with Jane Fearon.⁸⁵ Somewhere on the Border they were joined by Samuel Bownas and his fellow-traveller Isaac Thompson, and the journey to Dumfries was whittled away between "profitable conversation of good service to us both",⁸⁶ exhortations on the road to several people in passing of whom "some took it kindly", and the confounding of an assailant with an effective Scriptural bomb.⁸⁷ Curiously enough Dickenson makes no reference to Bownas in his "Journal",⁸⁸ but both were at Dumfries together, and all five went into the street to hold their meeting. The inhabitants were amazed to see so many Quakers together and received Dickenson's uncompromising message for the most part "soberly", though some were "very rude".⁸⁹ Next morning Dickenson and Bownas went their several ways. On Dickenson's way through Galloway "the states of the people were clearly manifested" to him, but "several were reached."⁹⁰ On their first Sunday morning in Stranraer they sat down on the Mercat Cross opposite the door of the Church waiting for the congregation to come out. They "scaled", to find Dickenson interceding for them in their blindness, and when "the priest and people came crowding about" him, he seized the opportunity to declare the way of life

83. "Story's Life", (1726) PP 110-20.

84. "Early Cumberland and Westmorland Friends"; (1871) P98.

85. "The Annual Monitor"; (1816) PP 125-130.

86. "Life and Travels of Samuel Bownas", (2nd ed. reprinted 1895) P 37.

87. Dickenson's "Journal"; (1745) P 130.

88. There is a discrepancy in the dates. According to Bownas' "Life" he started on Oct. 11th. (P37) while Dickenson did not "take his journey" till the 15th. ("Journal", P129) The disparity may be accounted for by Bownas being longer in reaching the Border.

89. cf Dickenson's "Journal", PP130-1 with Bownas' "Life and Travels", (1895) PP 37-8.

90. "Journal", P 131.

and inward holiness, without which "all your Preaching, Praying and Singing is but vain and an Abomination in His Sight".⁹¹ Dickenson seems to have got a good hearing and held most of them to the finish. Things however were different in Port-Patrick, where the people were "very wicked" and "rude because they had no minister in the place nor none to instruct them". Dickenson saw his chance at a funeral and taking pity on the crowd that thronged him after the burial "as sheep having no shepherd", he "opened unto them how they might come to the true knowledge of God". Several were "reached" but when one poor woman offered to pay him for baptising her child, he told her that he "did not preach for hire but freely for the Lord's sake, and as for baptising her child, the Scriptures did not warrant me in it."⁹²

Meanwhile Bownas and Thompson having struck North by Glasgow, Linlithgow and Bo'ness got as far as Inverurie and Kinmuck returning to the Borders, but found meetings generally "very small". Even at Edinburgh they had only "one little Meeting". It was at Jedburgh that the most stirring incidents in their journey occurred. The friendly landlord told them "how indecently the minister had railed against the Quakers the day before,"⁹³ but begged them to confine their ministrations to his family and not go into the streets, in case the mob took reprisals on his inn. Still, after reassuring him, the Quakers went out only to find themselves subjected at the Mercat Cross, on which they were sitting quietly, to a modification of "Jeddart-Law" by being haled off to the Tolbooth before they had begun to preach. Robinson, their local guide, had gone willingly, thinking that they could all preach more easily to the crowd through the gaol gratings as two other Quakers had done the week before, but the Provost had the windows boarded up. Soon they were offered their liberty on condition of quitting the town in silence, but they refused it, and Bownas wrote to the Provost⁹⁴ protesting against the infringement of their Christian liberty and especially against being imprisoned uncondemned like Paul and Silas at Philippi,⁹⁵ and contrary to the law of the land.

Whether the Provost ever received this 'candid communication' is uncertain, but the next day an influential country gentleman intervened and compelled him to release Bownas and his friends. It was Market Day and Bownas was able to preach to a great audience of about 5000 that thronged the streets and crowded the balconies and casement windows of the houses around. At the end, as he prayed, town-sergeants dragged him to the Tolbooth door, but one of the sentries on guard who was an Englishman, if not a Westmorland man, overhearing Bownas' refusal to

91. Ibid, PP 131-2.

92. Ibid, PP 133-4

93. "Life and Travels", (1895) P 39.

94. Ibid, PP 41-2.

95. Acts XVI, 37,38.

enter the Tolbooth voluntarily except on a mittimus, reversed his musket and threatened the officers if they dared to thrust him in instead of taking him before the Provost for examination. This the sergeants refused or feared to do, and Bownas found himself at liberty on a natural platform facing another crowd of townspeople and soldiers. As Bownas retired to his inn, the populace were very respectful and made a lane for him crying encouragingly "You have dung them sir"; mine host was now quite convinced of the wisdom of Faith; and that evening several gentlemen assembled at the inn eager to discourse about religion, especially the question of the Scriptures and the authority of the Spirit, and the office and 'call' to the ministry. This led Bownas to a "concern" to outline the story of his life and how he came to be a preacher. "I could not give account how another man might receive his ministry but I have given you a faithful and candid account how I received mine." This terminated late in the night the only important missionary event of this decade in Scotland and one which gave Bownas and his companions the most natural and complete satisfaction.⁹⁶

But it cannot be denied that, on the whole, it was a sad and disappointing decade for the Society in Scotland for it yielded so little that was of any tangible or permanent value. The assets and results of this brave and resolute missionary enterprise were out of all ratio to the personnel and resources utilised. The travelling and "public" Friends were very sanguine. They clutched with a kind of pathetic gratitude at the least hope or possibility of advance. There would be a "tender People" at Cupar-Fife in time;⁹⁷ the fields of Dundee were "not yet full ripe, but in due Time" there might be a plentiful Harvest.⁹⁸ Grattan believed the Lord would have a "great people" (ie a great Quaker Church) in Scotland in the future when "zealous professing people" found this other channel for their zeal.⁹⁹ In 1697 the people, "except bigot presbyterians" were "exceeding Loving, serious and solid towards frinds, rypening fast towards the Harvest(as we Lyvingly hope)", so that eg. they lingered on in the cemeteries at Aberdeen after a committal to listen to Andrew Jaffray.¹⁰⁰ It did not seem to occur to Friends that the people might be waiting merely till the grave was filled in, as is the custom in Glasgow to this day, or remaining through pure bovine curiosity, or for the lack of something better to do. Unfortunately for the Quakers, the vast majority of their audiences were nominal Presbyterians at least, but by the closing years of the 17th century, clergy and laity alike could scarcely be called "bigoted." As the century of Deism drew near, they

⁹⁶ "Journal", (1720) P 126.

⁹⁹ "Journal", (1720) P 126.

¹⁰⁰ Letter from Aberdeen to London Friends, dated 6-1V 1697, in JFHS VIII, 75.

were settling down steadily into apathy or into an even tenor of "Moderatism" which is often accompanied by an easy-going tolerance and a spirit of kindly helpfulness. Consequently very few people had any inclination to be disloyal to the recent Toleration Acts, and except in Glasgow and Edinburgh, where the Magistrates were probably glad to give the rabble an outlet for their animus, and wink at things, cases of persecution or abuse were rare, -eg those at Hamilton, Elgin, Old Nairn and Canonbie already noted. One or two other Friends however were imprisoned in 1700, a Norwich man named Dipledey who was put in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh for having "som testimony in the oppen street",¹⁰¹ and a York woman named Mary Ellerton with other Friends at Hamilton "wpon the account [of her] declaring her mind to the peopell when they ware coming out of the stepelhouss in the greav yaird"¹⁰² Very few Quaker meetings were disturbed or Friends threatened in giving their public testimony, and attitudes varying from neutrality and unconcern to sympathetic interest and friendliness were shown to them throughout the country. Magistrates were mostly lenient like the Bailie who dismissed Rudd at Cupar,¹⁰³ the Magistrates at Elgin who so quickly saw the error of their policy,¹⁰⁴ and Bailie Scott at Forres who actually entertained the Friends "with friendly Respect" at his inn.¹⁰⁵ Exceptions were the Bailiff at Canonbie and the Frovost of Jedburgh. The ministers generally were content to hold a watching brief or instigate others behind the scenes to harass the Quakers. They showed a reluctance to come into the open, like Armstrong of Canonbie, the minister of Benholm,¹⁰⁶ the "Priest" of Fetteresso who watched from a window the Quaker wolves in sheep's clothing among his flock in the Churchyard,¹⁰⁷ or the minister of Jedburgh.¹⁰⁸ The clergy did not seem to fare too well as protagonists of the Quakers, as the minister of Elgin discovered.¹⁰⁹ The conduct of the Elgin soldiers in the guard room, the Corporal at Nairn,¹¹⁰ and the Jedburgh sentry, are typical of the friendly spirit shown by the military to the Friends who abjured their calling.

The civilian population was in the main quiet and peaceable if not always "sober" or "tender". This, more than anything else seems to have misled the travelling Friends and inflated their hopes. In addition, being mostly English, they did not understand the stolid and unemotional nature of the Scotch, which was never very "enthusiastick" at any time, and placed the

-
101. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol No 15) P 101.
 102. Ibid, P 100.
 103. Story's "Journal", (1747) P 59.
 104. Ibid, PP 62-3.
 105. Ibid, P 64.
 106. Ibid, P 61.
 107. Ibid.
 108. "Life and Travels of Samuel Bownas", (1895) P 39.
 109. Story's "Journal", (1747) PP 63-4.
 110. Ibid, P 65.

general absence of opposition and maltreatment to their own credit account. Nor could they diagnose the ecclesiastical situation. The Quakers largely mistook for the support or interest of the people what after all was only a good-natured curiosity, or a humane toleration, or a certain weary religious 'ennui' born of their terrible privations in the famine years and the subsidence of their spiritual life in the Church to a kind of conventional respectability and easy good nature. To interpret the watching by the Cupar crowd of the departure of Friends who went away "tendered.. and yearned towards them",¹¹¹ as potential "convincement", or the frequenting of their meetings at Montrose by church people who confessed themselves "shaken Loose of all their former religion and certainty theirot",¹¹² as an earnest soul-quest, proved to be a mirage. Quietness and peaceableness were not to be understood for receptivity, for while the aftermath of ruthless persecution and upheaval might seem to the Quaker missionaries to afford an unparalleled opportunity for presenting the Gospel of the Inner Light to Scotland, it proved in fact on various grounds, social and ecclesiastical, to be only an illusory hope.

111. Ibid, P 60.

112. Letter from Aberdeen to London Friends, dated 6.1V.1697, in JFHS Vlll. P 76.

CHAPTER V."TWO DECADES OF PATIENT ENDEAVOUR AND HOPE, 1701-1721"

The closing years of the 17th century witnessed many far-reaching and important social and religious changes over the country affecting all churches and religious bodies, not excepting the Society of Friends. Indeed these years inaugurated a new era which was too impatient to await the advent of the new century. The death of Fox and Barclay was the beginning of the end of the "Heroic" age of Quakerism in Scotland.¹ The basis of membership in the Society, especially on the credal side, had all along been nebulous with a certain mixture of incongruous elements, but what homogeneity there had been, was largely conserved by the winnowing fan of persecution. Now that the age of intolerance, of popular hatred and violence, and of official persecution was swiftly passing away, the Movement became increasingly heterogeneous, and thus weakened, was exposed to the inescapable pressure of the low social and religious life of the country in general. Many of the "ancient" leaders and foremost "public" Friends were being gathered to their fathers, and the Law of Reaction which operates in every intense religious revival, brought, with the passing of that generation of heroic and uncompromising pioneers, an abatement of fervent spirituality and selfless devotion to the Cause which their successors failed to reproduce or resuscitate.² The indefinable fear and foreboding of these radically changing years, especially in their effect on the uprising generation of Friends, found representation and more than average expression in the long letter written from Urie by Christian Barclay to the London Quakers in 1693, in which she exhorted all who survived to "stand up in faithfulness of heart" and "in the authority that God giveth" them. Let parents and teachers especially aim with entire consecration to Truth to "bring forth a sober and a serious conversation in it" among the young and to insist still on the "thorough difference between the needful and the needless or superfluous things either in meats, drinks, or apparel," as well as employment. Let youth shake itself free of all entanglements in the mind or in the service of God, and let all "have a weighty care to hold on "to their inward and mystic silence of worship."³

This important document of conservatism and tradition affords a good clue to, and interpretation of, the policy and tendencies of the Society for almost a century following.

-
1. The "heroic" function as F.S. Turner observes passed to Wesley and Whitefield. (v Scottish Sections of Wesley's "Journal", especially under the following dates; -Friday, 10th June, 1757 (Kelso): Sunday 27th May, 1764. (Edinburgh): Sunday 1st May, 1768. (Aberdeen): Saturday 18th April, 1772. (Glasgow). But Wesley had a very different reception in Scotland than the 17th century stranger Friends had, especially from the ministers.
 2. cf. Letter from Samuel Bownas to James Wilson, 1751, in "Robson MSS", (44) PP68-2 (Euston Library) cf Rufus Jones, "Later Periods", Vol I, P2.
 3. "Swarthmore MSS." Vol. VI, No 73, dated 29-VI mo. 1693. cf Letter from London Friends to Aber. Q.M. 15-6-1709 (Bundle 62(2) of Aber. MSS.)

While the Friends were alive enough to the gravity of the new situation and environment in which they found themselves, their diagnosis of it was inaccurate, and their measures and remedies to meet it, shortsighted and unwittingly obstructive of their own interests. This produced internally the age of "Quietism" and externally the age of "Legalism", the two complementary aspects of the same hermit policy of seclusion and self-sufficiency which lasted till almost the close of the 18th century.

With Bownas's experience at Jedburgh as the only outstanding missionary success of these years in Scotland, the Quakers were forced to the conviction that they could not hope to absorb the Church and that if they were still the true "Church" then the Church (i.e. the Society) could only be "a peculiar people" more "peculiar" than ever because of the apostasy that prevailed in the land. Thus they retreated within themselves to nourish a more exclusive spiritual existence than ever in the quiet of their meetings and the ambit of their own fellowship. The cultivation of the seed plot of their own soul seemed to be the one spiritual condition of survival. They developed most of the characteristic features of "Quietism", and "the plain Query of ancient times addressed by the Yearly Meeting to its subordinate churches 'How doth Truth prosper?' is changed to 'How do Friends prosper in the Truth?'"⁴ The impression seemed to gain ground that enough had been suffered already in the propagation of 'Truth', and the point of emphasis was shifted increasingly from the missionary enterprise to the rearing of a 'homegrown' religion; from the conversion and gathering-in of those outwith their borders to the watchful oversight and the assiduous cultivation of the offspring of their own members to fill the gaps made by death. The mistake was the old one, of losing one's life in seeking to save it and the oversight of the fact that missionary effort is the best test and the most healthy promoter of personal religion. The spiritual intensity of the Friends began to wane, largely, though not wholly through their own fault. They became a sect among sects, distinguishable from the general religious community by little save their exclusiveness.

On the practical side, in the affairs of the Society and its contact with the community, legalism and discipline were the order of the day. There is less to be found in contemporary Quaker records about preaching the Gospel to the World than about the duty of being "lights to our neighbours" in outward conduct. This made for a foolish stringency which landed them in barren formalism. Admittedly, no Church or religious society can maintain a healthy and intrinsic life without some system of constitutional law and regulations, and some disciplinary authority over its members. Barclay's thesis set forth in "The Anarchy of the Ranters" in opposition to the libertinism of the separatists was essentially sound. So was Keith in his opposition to the

4. Barclay's "Inner Life of the Religious Societies", (1879)
P 515. cf Rufus Jones, "Later Periods", Vol. I, pp 32-4, ff.

strong tendencies to religious Bohemianism in American Quakerism, and had he been different in his spirit and methods, the excesses of the cast-iron legalism of the 18th century Quakerism, whose motive was good but whose expression was unwise and short-sighted, might have been mitigated or avoided altogether. As it was, resistance to the prevailing worldliness of the 18th century by a legalism that tried to exact obedience to external rules—many of which were prohibitions of the most trifling nature—only issued in a steady departure from "the deeper way of inward discipline which the First Publishers of Truth had known."⁵ In attempting to exorcise the danger of licence, this legalism hardened too often into a negative tyranny, and the correction or "disowning" of members absorbed more energy than the winning of converts. That there were cases of offence where disciplinary measures were reasonable and necessary is not denied, but too little discrimination was made between these and peccadilloes and harmless breaches of traditional usage. This led not infrequently to impatience under restraint and even to open insubordination.

The scare of "worldliness" which arose in the closing years of the 17th century and gave birth to the above policy, produced two striking things;—

(1) A System of family overseers.

The Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting in furtherance of its resolution in 1693 and in anticipation of Samuel Watson's advice, as already noted,⁶ appointed male and female overseers who should "weightily take care to see" that all members conformed strictly to what was enjoined or forbidden, and report the recalcitrant who refused, to the next Monthly or Quarterly Meeting. ~~Ed.~~ George Swan as "of blameless conversation" was appointed an overseer of Glasgow Meeting in 1699;⁸ John Gleny Junr. and George Temple were appointed to Kinmuck Meeting and David Wallace and Robert Scott to Urie and Stonehaven Meetings,⁹ and they reported things peaceable and "not obstinat nor Refractory from good discipline". In 1733 three leading Edinburgh Friends were appointed by their Monthly Meeting to visit families "in order to inspect there conversation" and to give advice.¹⁰

A very good specimen of what such inspection and advice comprised is given in a Paper issued by Aberdeen Monthly Meeting in 1714 whose main heads may be summerised as follows;— (1) Concerning Tithes. (2) Concerning debauchery and frequenting taverns without absolute necessity. (3) Concerning vain recreations as "Gaming", "Carding", "Dycing" and Billiards. (4) That all differences and quarrels be speedily settled by reference to overseers or arbitrators among Friends of the parties' own choice. (5) That Weekly Meetings be kept up, "and all Drowsiness and sleeping in meetings Diligentlie watched against." (6) That speech and dress be plain, and Scripture names of days and months be

5. Braithwaite "Second Period of Quakerism", (1921) P 524.

6. v ante, Ch. IV. PP 275-6. (7) "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS. Vol. 4) PP "5-6". (8) JFHS XI, 24.

9. "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol. 4) P30.

10. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book" 1730, (MS Vol. 13) PP4-5.

adhered to. (7) That plain and simple Truth obtain in all business transactions. (8) That Wills and Testaments be "settled tymeouly" and Friends have their 'house in order'.¹¹ But it is quite evident from the Minutes and Records of these times that the Overseers met with mixed success and were unable to suppress the "high uppish unconcerned spirit" in many, especially the youth.

(2) Successive lists of orders and prohibitions on the details of dress, speech, domestic economy, and almost every imaginable social pursuit or religious habit.

Three such are important viz:- "A weighty paper containing severall heads of solid advyces and Counsells to frinds" from Ireland which was read at Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting in 1692;¹² the "Festimony" from the same meeting in 1698;¹³ and "Cautions and Counsells to Ministers" issued by the Yearly Meeting of Ministers in 1702.¹⁴ Every item of these interesting and sometimes amusing lists cannot be given now, but some of their main notanda may be instanced.

No single item gave more trouble or anxiety than dress and the toilet, in which a tendency to vanity became a problem to the Society. The Aberdeen "Festimony" of 1698 was almost exclusively a minute "Guide" on the orthodox Quaker dress for men and women, from which all colour and decorations were banned. In 1700 Thomas Hicks, an English Friend wrote what was in the estimation of the Aberdeen and Edinburgh Meetings "a good & savoury paper touching the Superfluity of young men and women's apparell",¹⁵ to which Hew Wood added a long postscript. The latter was also the author of the famous dissertation against "peariuigs" and the unlawfulness of making them of "women's hear". In the same year the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting testified against them,¹⁶ and in 1702 William Miller "the Patriarch" declared "his dislick with som men frinds in ther wearing ther Coats oppen in the breast, and of som women frinds that weareth ther bear breasts in resemblance of the great women that hath ther breasts and there necks every much neacked, which he is shure that truth ought not to admitt of".¹⁷ Four years later, the Quarterly Meeting had under "due consideration.. the disorderly walking of som young people with ther apparell and languadg", so that "those imoralitys" might be restrained, and heads of families were cautioned to see to any who were of "gaddy

11. "Minute Book of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting" (MS. Vol 3) PP 54-5.

12. Minutes III. 1692, in JFHS VIII, PP 68-9.

13. "Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4.) PP 4-6.

14. Given in Braithwaite's "Second Period" (1921) PP 541-2.

15. cf "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 106. v also Minutes of the Aber. M.M. 2-XI 1700, in JFHS VIII. 114. cf "Memorials of Hope Park", (1886) P 7.

16. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 106.

17. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 110. Miller's original letter is lost. cf Barrow's "Breviat". (v ante, Ch. IV, P 78.)

appereil and not speeking the singall languadg".¹⁸ But the ideals of severity and drabness which characterised the first yeomen and Puritan pioneers of the Society had gone. Even Christian Jaffray, Great grand-daughter of the Diarist, was rebuked by Aberdeen Friends in 1727 for "her Gaudie apparel,"¹⁹ but she unrepentently went "off to the publick worship of ye World".

All the accustomed games, pastimes and sports seem to have been frowned upon. In 1707 William Gellie, an Aberdeen Quaker was disowned for breaking his promise to abstain from "playing at Gowff and other such foolish practises",²⁰ while game shooting, hawking, archery, draughts, billiards, "or any other foolish Game so called", were proscribed to youth, none of whom should "need any Caution as to such things".²¹ Disciplinary measures were threatened in 1706 by the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting against all who "are Guilty of such disorderly practices" as drinking in taverns and gambling,²² and again in 1725 a "Testimony" was issued against excessive drinking and tippling "for the vindication of Truth and Friends"²³

The business-life and apprenticeships of Friends were carefully controlled. In 1703 Miller "the Patriarch" wrote "a savoury paper" showing "That the precious Truth neither allows stealing from customers on any pretence, nor dealing in goods prohibited by Act of Parliament, nor in any goods unsuitable to our blessed Testimony."²⁴ It appears that a certificate of good character had to be obtained by anyone who would "goe abroad to seek employment."²⁵ Idling was prohibited as also over-immersion in business "to the hindrance of service."²⁶ Legacies were left in the hands of trustees "for putting out apprentices", resolutions agreed to by the apprentice, and a formal agreement drawn up with his prospective employer. If the apprentice was a married man, his wife received an allowance ad interim.

Marriages and marriage customs were still closely hedged in the Society. "Marrying out" was strictly forbidden, and a Kinmuck Quaker called Barclay who had insisted on "using some form of marriage w^tout doors... unknown to us" was debarred from the Meeting.²⁷ Friends were prohibited from allowing any wedding or wedding déjeuner "of the World's people" to be held in their

18. Ibid, P 151.

19. "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 3) P 115.

20. Ibid, PP 13-14.

21. Aberdeen "Testimony", 1698. cf Minutes of Aberdeen M.M. 3-III-1694, in JFHS VIII. P 77.

22. "Minute Book of the Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4) P "40"

23. Ibid, P 105.

24. Quoted in "Memorials of Hope Park", P 2.

25. eg "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 3) P 71.

26. v "Cautions and Counsels to Ministers" (1702) in Braithwaite's "Second Period", P 541, No.8 : cf No.11.

27. "Minute Book of Kinmuck Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol.5.) P 162.

houses, and pipers at such or at any other time were 'taboo'.²⁸ The only permissible excuse for attending "Penny Weddings" was to bear Testimony "against the Excess of such Conventions", and to hold a "Penny Wedding" in one's own house was as illegitimate as "ane sprinkling feast".²⁹ And the Church had her own attitude to such 'mixed' marriages. In 1709 a resolution of the Presbytery of Aberdeen was read from the pulpit of Old Machar "Discharging all protestants to marry with papists or Quakers" and suspending from sealing ordinances all who have already contracted such marriages "ay and till such tyme they evidence ther repentance".³⁰

Conformity with the World in the conduct of funerals also was resolutely discouraged. The Aberdeen Men's Meeting in 1694 "unanimously discharg all such foolish customs" as young bachelors carrying their unmarried friends to burial, and "all unecessary superfluities such as handles and clasps upon Coffins." ³¹

On the religious side as well as the social and domestic, the Quaker legalism of the 18th century was as determined in the effort to enforce obedience. There were many instances of defection to "the steeplehouse" an old sin, for which the overseers were quickly commissioned to interview the offender and report to the Monthly Meeting.³² Reference is made in 1716 to some Kinmuck Quakers having "tampered in indirect ways with paying the small Tyths" and the matter was investigated and agreed upon by the erring with results satisfactory to the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting.³³ But the strangest and most significant surprises in this Quaker age of conservatism were introduced in the "Cautions and Counsels to Ministers" of 1702, especially "against hurting meetings by speaking at the close when the meeting was left well before"; (No6) "against men and women travelling together" (No13)—which Dickenson and Jane Fearon disregarded: "against laying too great stress on authority of message" (No 17); and "against presumptuous prophesying against a nation, town or person". (No 18) These and other items reveal an inner situation of difficulty and even revolt, which forces an admission that a static 'modus operandi' and hidebound policy were largely impossible to maintain any longer.

There can be little doubt that the 'laxities' of the times which impinged on the Quaker life and doctrine, seriously affected the old spirit of prophecy and its influence, as well as

28. Ibid, PP 164-5.

29. "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol.4.) P83.

30. "Session Records of Old Machar" of 28-8-1709, in Munro's "Records of Old Aberdeen" (1899), Vol. II, P 121.

31. Minutes of Aberdeen M.M. 4-VIII-1694 in JFHS VIII, P 71.

32. "Minute Book of Kinmuck Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol.5.) P168; and "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 3.) P 115.

33. "Minute Book of Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting", (MS. Vol. 4) PP 88,89.

the pristine aggressiveness and 'self-denying ordinances' of the first "Publishers of Truth" who gloried in tribulation. The policy of "Legalism" with its minutiae of prohibition, and stringency of norm, in itself an unconscious revolt from the ideal and authority of "Immediate Revelation" and was found to be no cure for the "evils" of the new age. If "Immediate Revelation" had produced many strange aberrations and anomalous situations, this "Legalism" only produced futility and stalemate. Legalism tended to call into prominence those who had administrative and executive talents rather than those who possessed gifts of grace and the missionary urge. The inquisitional and judicial rôle largely replaced the pastoral, and while no doubt the fire of purification was sometimes needed, it became too largely the fire of scorching, leaving a track behind in which little could grow, least of all new leaders from the new generation for the new age.³⁴

Cases of desertion from Quakerism to the Church were not uncommon at this time, not only of proselytes who were returning to the spiritual home of their early days, but even cases like that of Isabel Mercer of Old Machar in 1715, who had been reared from infancy in "Truth" and now craved absolution from the Church and admission to its sealing ordinances.³⁵

But it is not to be inferred that in this epoch of Quietism and Legalism, continuity of spiritual life, inwardly and outwardly, virtually ceased. It was "cast down, but not destroyed." Occasional controversy and spasmodic persecution continued. In 1699 Antoinette Bourignon's "A Treatise of Solid Virtue" was published in an English version at London by Dr. Keith, Dr. George Garden formerly minister of St. Nicholas, Aberdeen, and brother of the Professor at King's College. Garden had become imbued with Bourignonism, identified himself with its opposition to the Quaker principles and inveighed against them. He and his new-found Foster-Mother were answered by Robert Barclay Junr. in his "Modest and Serious Address to the well-meaning Followers of Antonia Bourignon" and by Andrew Jaffray in a letter appended to it, both of 1708. Garden had however been deposed from the ministry seven years before. The Quakers claimed the credit through Barclay's pamphlet of causing the speedy eclipse of Bourignonism,³⁶ but it is much more probable that the severe ban which the General Assembly put on it from 1701 onwards and its inclusion in the official list of heresies, which of course ordinands were required to abjure, brought this about.³⁷

34. cf Braithwaite's "Second Period", PP 538-9: cf PP 535-6. (on 'Education'.) Margaret Fox foresaw this in 1698.

35. "Extracts from the Session Records of Old Machar," 27-XI-1715 in Munro's "Records of Old Aberdeen" (1899) Vol. II, PP 127-8. The detailed procedure in such a case is well described. Not a single loophole was left for the applicant.

36. cf "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in JFHS VII, P 190.

37. cf A.R. MacEwan's "Antionette Bourignon, Quietist", (1910) PP 96-7, and Henderson's "Mystics of the North-East", (1934) PP 35-6, 38: also cf Jones, "Later Periods", Vol. I, P 58.

The spurts of persecution which still punctuated the life of Scottish Quakers were petty and usually very local, Edinburgh getting the chief share. In 1703 two English Friends, Holme and Balding "declared the Truth in the streets... at several Places" and on arriving in Glasgow from Gartshore one Sunday afternoon were shut up in prison all night by the Provost "as he said, for travelling on the First day".³⁸ The Edinburgh Meeting, that "poor distressed litle handfull" began again to receive the unwelcome attentions of the students and the rabble in 1705,³⁹ and in the following year, Rudd was again incarcerated in Edinburgh, Glasgow, Hamilton, and "the thives' hole" at Linlithgow for "declairing his mind, preaching repentance in the Strits".⁴⁰ In 1706 on the eve of the Union of the Parliaments, the Scottish Friends sought the help of the Meeting for Sufferings in securing a proper legal basis of Toleration and protection against persecution. The Meeting thought the time opportune and agreed to co-operate to this end.⁴¹ But it would appear that the attempt was unsuccessful for in 1708 the mob caused disturbance and damage: "som of them was wery rude in bricking up [smashing] of windoues" of the Edinburgh Meeting House in spite of the presence of officers and soldiers sent by the Magistrates,⁴² and even six years later when William Miller was having repairs carried out on it, he had to have the windows "Firlaced to hinder ye stones for coming upon friends when ye wyld Boys do Trou ym."⁴³

The significant thing about these little eruptions, trivial in themselves, lies in the changing attitude of Magistrates and other authorities in maintaining law and order where Quakers were concerned. In 1701 Hew Wood was "put to the horn" for non-payment of tithes, but he informed the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting that "the Dutches of Hamilton did not use any execution there upon."⁴⁴ In 1702 the Edinburgh Friends were "wery glead to record som beginnings of amendment" in the authorities who "sent ther searcers with ther officers and putteth away the rabble from amongst us" with "there disorderly miscariadges and ther unchristian behaviour,"⁴⁵ while Lord Fountainhall's judgment in the Barbara Hodge action, the year following, was distinctly encouraging to the Society. In 1705 when the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting was greatly disturbed, petitions were lodged with the Civil Authorities and the College Authorities which were "pretty weell accepted," the Chancellor being specially magnanimous and helpful in his advice.⁴⁶

-
38. "Life and Travels of Benjamin Holme", (1753) -(Prefaced to his "Collected Works") PP 3-4.
39. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol.12) P 94, and "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 152. also "Epistles to and from London Y.M. 1706-1749", (Aber MS Vol.18) P 1.
40. Ibid, PP 152, 153.
41. "Case of the People called Quakers" and Correspondence. (Bundle 60 (19) in Aber. MSS.
42. Ibid, P 163.
43. Ibid, P 199.
44. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 109.
45. Ibid, P 122. cf P 125.
46. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 146.

Hooliganism however did not cease for some years. In Glasgow also there was a distinct improvement in the conduct and bearing of the Magistrates to the Quakers, and in 1707 "the provost of Glasgow being applied unto upon some disturbance with some boys upon the Comptrol put the boys in prison"⁴⁷ As little encouragement apparently did the Civil Authorities give to the Church which was still snapping away at the Friends like an ill-natured terrier. The result of the Presbytery of Lanark's recommendation to the Magistrates at Douglas in 1705 to "repress the conventicles of Quakers" held there, is unrecorded,⁴⁸ but Kinmuck was a good test case. The ministers of Kinkell and Tarves—Skene and Anderson, in whose bounds the Quakers were still most numerous complained in vain to an impotent Synod. Robertson of Kinmuck, the Quaker schoolmaster, secure in the toleration of his Sovereign,⁴⁹ naturally defied all the Church's attempts to summon him; and so afraid was Skene of the Quakers, "these thorns in his sides" playing havoc at the church in his absence, that he declined to keep his appointment by the Presbytery to preach at Methlick. In March 1703 the Presbytery of Ellon asked an avizandum from the Sheriff "anent Robertson the Quaker schoolmaster and the remnant of that sect in Kinkell and Tarves." But the Sheriff calmly asked what Act of Parliament was to be his warrant for suppressing them as "otherways he would not move". Nor had he, two months later when the Presbytery 'found' "that the Sheriff doth nothing else but trifle in the matter of contumacious persons referred to him". The Civil Powers were unsympathetic to the Church and under cloak of pressure of business, ignored the Presbytery for nearly two years longer, so that the latter with commendable discretion, intimated that "upon weighty considerations it is thought fitt to [de]sist the process against the Quakers of Kinkell and Tarves for a tyme".⁵⁰ That "tyme" has been a long one! A more positive example of the growing favour shown to the Quakers was the admission by the Dean of Guild of Glasgow of "George Swan, hammerman in Gorbals" as a burghess, at the desire of the Duke of Montrose and the remission of his fines. This was in February 1708. In March also at the instance of the Duke, he was admitted "gild brother of the said burgh" with remission of his fines.⁵¹

From 1702 to 1721 there was no lack of travelling and "public" Friends, who in spite of the strained relations

47. Ibid, P 158.

48. "Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark", P 139; and Rogers "Social Life in Scotland", (1886) Vol. II, P 117. v also ante, Bk. I, Ch. IV, P 31. cf "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol. 15) P 147.

49. Robertson is mentioned by Besse as suffering persecution prior to 1679. cf "Sufferings" (1753), Vol. II, PP 505, 530.

50. Mairs "Narratives and Extracts from the Records of the Presbytery of Ellon. 1597- 1709", (1894) P 248. Robertson died in 1714, aged 77.

51. "Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Glasgow 1691-1717", (1908) PP 417, 422.

between Scotland and London Yearly Meeting about putting up candidates for Parliament,⁵² visited Scotland; a hundred and sixteen men and twelve women, an approximate total of a hundred and twenty-eight,⁵³ but Samuel Bownas' remarks on a return visit to Scotland in 1720 sum up and epitomise the situation—"I found Friends in that nation very much decreased in number, above one half, and sundry meetings quite dropped unless when a Friend came to visit them. I spent about six weeks in that nation, but nothing extraordinary happened."⁵⁴ There was however a great deal of quiet loyalty, generosity, and brotherly spirit, in spite of the difficulties and certain disruptive tendencies of the times. Friends still met "in love and unity" and it was still possible to gather together "many sober people" who at least were "attentive to the Truth". Quaker literature continued to be circulated,⁵⁵ and the importance of preserving Records and Trust documents was recognised.⁵⁶ Apparently adequate legacies were still left for the sustenance of the poor, and generous provision made for the travelling and hospitality of stranger Friends;⁵⁷ while a bequest is recorded as left for the school at Kinmuck in the hands of Sir William Forbes of Craigievar.⁵⁸

In 1703 Dickenson and "that tender plant Jonathan Burnyeat" had a long tour in Scotland with a record of thirty-two meetings. Burnyeat's account of it is purely topographical and statistical and he makes no comments on these meetings or on the general situation.⁵⁹ But some sidelights are given in a letter written by Dickenson from Edinburgh to his friend Rooke, They "had good service and in many places had many people at our meetings, some great ones out of curiosity to hear such a youth preach". The inhabitants of Aberdeen they found "very wicked as in many other places in this poor nation", but they "had service in promoting the discipline which is greatly wanting in Scotland."⁶⁰ Burnyeat was again in Scotland in 1708 at the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting.⁶¹

But it is from Thomas Story's third tour in Scotland in 1717 that the most interesting information is derived. Most of the time he was accompanied by Robert Barclay and his son. The attendances at meetings were very unequal: some were "large and open", and they had a good reception: others were small and low-spirited. Aberdeen, Kinmuck and Urie were still the most prosperous

52. "Epistles to and from London Y.M.," 1706-49, (Aber. MS Vol 18) PP 1ff.

53. Based on W.F Miller's lists in JFHS XII, PP 173-7.

54. "Life of Samuel Bownas," (2nd ed. reprinted 1895) PP 154-5.

55. "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4) P 4: and JFHS VII, P 115 n.

56. EG. "Minute Book of Kinmuck Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 5) P 169.

57. Sundry Extracts from Aberdeen Records in JFHS VII, P 119.

58. "Minute Book of Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4) P 91.

59. v "Some Account of the Gospel Labours of Jonathan Burnyeat", (1857) P 7.

60. "Swarthmore MSS." VI, No 80. (Letter dated 4-1Xmo-1703) (Original)

61. JFHS III, 83.

centres, but in Edinburgh, there were only "about Half a Dozen Friends still remaining" at the meeting held in William Miller's house, and Story laments that "tho' that City hath often been visited and warned from the Lord by his Servants, yet there appears not any Inclination in them towards Truth or the Way of it: but the contrary, so far as I can see, or learn from those Friends conversant among them."⁶² In Glasgow, things were not encouraging and in Gartshore and Hamilton, the meetings were dwindling to a "very small" number of Friends. But Story found a welcome modification and improvement in the bearing of Church people to the Friends. George Swan's wife was now "very loving and courteous" and "though the Presbyterians have the Government" in Glasgow, "the People seem more moderate than formerly, whether arising from the many Divisions now on foot among themselves, or Considerations of the Lenity of the Government in England, or.. a secret work of God towards their Redemption, or a general Reformation, I shall not determine."⁶³ In his note on Kelso, Story also observes that "the Presbyterian Church-government and the Management of their Priests or Ministers not sitting so easy on the shoulders of some of the People as they desired, they were (some of them) about this Time looking out some better Way".⁶⁴

Incidentally, he was clearly interested in several things that he saw on this tour, Queen Mary's prison on Loch Leven Island, the gardens of Hopetoun House, which were "very neat", the lead mines at Wanlochhead, the "very rich and pleasant Country" of the Carse of Gowrie, and the medicinal waters of Bridge of Earn, "good against the Rheumatism, Scurvy and some other Distempers," which Story and Barclay tasted.

Of the host of other travellers in Scotland about then, little or nothing is known.

In these two decades, 1701-1721, it only remains to notice two important constitutional matters affecting the Quakers' civil and religious liberty:-

(1) The year 1714, the last of Queen Anne's reign, was a landmark for the little band of Aberdeen Friends. In 1709 Robert Barclay and Roderick Forbes forwarded a memorial to the Meeting for Sufferings at London, craving its help to get the "Burgess Oath" and "Addition" to the oath rescinded, and specially pointing out that certain landowners, dispossessed of their burgess status, would lose their lands also in terms of the charters.⁶⁵ In October 1710 a Petition was presented to the Town Council of Aberdeen,

62. "Journal" (1747), P 586.

63. Ibid, P 588.

64. Ibid, P 585.

65. Memorial by Barclay and Forbes to the Meeting for Sufferings, 1709. (Bundle 62(3) of Aber. MSS.)

signed by Robert Barclay, Andrew Jaffray, John Somerville and Daniel Hamilton, showing that, whereas in the time of severe persecution of Friends in Aberdeen an addition had been made by the Council to the Burgess Oath,⁶⁶ depriving all who owned or professed Quakerism of the benefits and privileges "competent to them as burgesses" to the loss now of their constitutional and civic rights in virtue of the Royal toleration and successive Acts of Parliament, the time had come for the Council "to rescind the said Act as contrary to the Liberty and property of the subject", that they and their posterity might, "according to the Inclinations of the Queen and parliament enjoy their just right and privilege". The petitioners craved accordingly.⁶⁷ The Provost and Magistrates courteously and deftly replied that inasmuch as adherence to "the true reformed Protestant religion" with a denial of the heresies of Popery and Quakerism had been for many years before and since "the happy revolution", an integral part of the Burgess Oath, they were unable to rescind or alter the Burgess Oath, and added that the petitioners had no ground to complain against it, "seeing it's notourly known that all Quakers' children whose parents were burgers, are allowed liberty to trade as freely as any other burgers, though they be not actually admitted burgers because they will not take oaths" and that Andrew Jaffray was the only actual local landowner.⁶⁸ A similar petition was dismissed by the Magistrates in August 1711.

The Quakers laid the onus on the Church for instigating the Magistrates and connected the oath persecutions with the riots in Edinburgh and Glasgow.

In January 1711/12 the Aberdeen Friends learned that a Bill was to be brought into Parliament to prevent disturbance of the English Church Services, and wrote to the London Friends suggesting that the opportunity should be seized for getting a clause appended to this Bill in order to make the toleration enjoyed by English Quakers applicable to the Scottish in the same measure, and also as a possible weapon in the struggle against the Burgess Oath in their own city.⁶⁹ "We have used" wrote the Aberdeen to London Friends, "all friendly and respectfull methods with the magistrates of this town in behalf of our freedom, and have also had the concurrence of a considerable number of the Chiepell inhabitants and Citizens of the place. But all proves to no purpose by reason of the malice of our adversaries." Newcastle Friends, they added, were likely to win this right in their similar struggle and could not the Meeting for Sufferings get this just

66. In 1678.

67. v MS Copy of Petition, (Bundle 65 (2) of Aber. MSS.) and "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen, 1643-1747" (1872) PP 342-3. The Petition was not disposed of by the Council till 29th November. (A copy of this Act of Council is also in Bundle 65 of Aber. MSS.)

68. Ibid.

69. Letter to Friends in London, in Aberdeen Bundle of MSS. No 62(6).

issue settled universally in Scotland?⁷⁰ The London Friends agreed, and determined to petition Her Majesty.

The above reference to the concurrence of a considerable number of the non-Quaker citizens of Aberdeen was no empty boast, for a Petition was sent to the Magistrates the same year, signed by thirty-nine prominent men of the City, many of them lawyers and merchants, protesting against the infringement of the settled liberties and constitution enjoyed by the Burghers of Aberdeen, and the unwarrantable change in the Oath whereby the Quakers were excluded from their hereditary rights. The Petition further bore that the Quakers had always "in their lives and conversations behaved themselves as a Quiet, Industrious, well-disposed sett of people, whereby they have justly procured the Protection of the Civill Government and goodwill of their neighbours", and the signatories craved that for the sake of the trade of the City and especially for the sake of Christian charity to a people so notable for their loyalty to the Throne and the Civil Powers, the Magistrates rescind the Burgher Oath and relieve the Friends from their grievance.⁷¹ Attempts were made in 1712 to secure the intervention of the Lord Advocate, Sir James Stewart of Goodtrees, who was sympathetic to the Quakers and ruled the Oath as "without warrant of law", but it was not within his power to take direct action against the Magistrates without the Secretary of State.⁷² To the latter, - the Earl of Dartmouth, - Stewart expressed his "humble opinion" on the illegality of the Oath, so that "Her Matie either by yr Lordship or by any other she pleases may signify her mind to the Magistrats of Aberdeen"⁷³ Dartmouth referred the matter to the Lords Barons of the Exchequer in Scotland who advised both parties to the dispute and called for statements of their case. The Magistrates' case was, that if Quakerism had been in existence when the original Burgher Oath was passed denying Popery and upholding the Reformed Truth, Quakerism "would have been expressly renounced as weall as Popry", so that, especially with 34 years' precedence, they were well within their rights in classing the two heresies together, and in any case, Quakers whose fathers were burgesses had trade concessions granted them.⁷⁴

The Quakers in their reply to the Barons based their case on the uniqueness of the illegal and harsh treatment meted out to them in Aberdeen; on the repeated futility of petitioning the Magistrates for redress; and on the precarious

-
70. MS Letter to Friends in London, 26-2-1711. (Bundle No62(5) in Aber. MSS at Crown Street.)
71. Copy Petition of Aber. Burgesses to the Magistrates 1710. (Bundle 65 (4) of Aber. MSS) The signatories were Episcopalians.
72. Copy of Advocate Stewart's Letter to R. Barclay, 1712. (Bundle 65 (12) of Aber. MSS.)
73. Stewart's Letter to Lord Dartmouth, 1712. (Bundle 65 (13) of Aber. MSS. cf his Letter to Penn. (Ibid (17).)
74. Copy of Memorial to Lords Barons from Magistrates of Aberdeen 1712. (Bundle 65 (15) of Aber. MSS.)

nature of any trading concessions and loss of apprentices.⁷⁵

The Barons' verdict was entirely in favour of the Quakers getting the right of affirmation only without any oath whatsoever. Meanwhile in July 1714 the Meeting for Sufferings notified the Aberdeen Friends that it had thrice petitioned the Queen and Council and that the expenses due, including the fee of the Solicitor-General for Scotland for pleading their cause before the Council, amounted to over £26.⁷⁶ This cooperation immeasurably strengthened the Aberdeen Friends who themselves had sent a Petition to the Queen through the Earls of Mar and Findlater whom the Magistrates had offended. The Petition was referred to a Committee of the Privy Council along with a Report of the Barons of the Exchequer in Scotland concerning the alterations made to the Aberdeen Burgess Oath. The Lords of the Privy Council having considered the Report "and also heard Mr. Solicitor Generall" of Scotland, humbly submitted "that those additional words of which the said Quakers Complaine ought not to be inserted in the said Burgess Oath as not being warranted by law and that Her Majesty would be pleased to Direct the Magistrates there that the said Additional words of ye oath be left out as far as they concerne the Quakers". The Queen ordered accordingly. Barclay appeared triumphantly before the Aberdeen Council, read the Privy Council Act dated 21st June 1714 and required them to obey it.⁷⁷ The Magistrates and Council had no option and thus another step forward in Quaker freedom was taken, not only civilly but religiously, for Quakerism was implied to be no longer a heresy debarring from constitutional rights.⁷⁸

(2) The other constitutional issue of these years, relative to Friends, was a much more important and universal one. For nearly thirty years after the passing of the Toleration Act, various "Affirmation" Acts which were passed or projected, destined to relieve the consciences of Quakers from the necessity of taking oaths in a court of law or elsewhere, served to produce a serious cleavage of opinion in the Society which led to protracted sessions of the London Yearly Meeting and heated debates. It is unnecessary to enter into the details of the "Affirmation Controversy" which centred chiefly round the retention of the Name of God in forms of affirmation proposed, or the substitution for oaths of other forms of words which were alleged to have the "property" and intent of an oath. It was a struggle of compromise all along, as no Government would accept any plain affirmation with no reference whatever to the Sacred Name. Neither the Toleration Act nor any of the Affirmation Acts of 1695 and 1702 applied

-
75. Memorial to Lords & Barons from Quakers of Aber. (Bundle 65 (16) Printed in Aber. MSS.)
76. Letter from Gilbert Molleson etc to Aber. Q.M. 2-5-1714. (Bundle 65.(21) of Aber. MSS.)
77. "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen" (1643-1747), PP 347-8. cf "Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book" (MS Vol. 4) P"81". A copy of the Council Minute is in Bundle 65. Aber MSS (No. 20)
78. cf Munro's "Memorials of the Aldermen, Provosts, and Lord/Provosts of Aberdeen" (1897), P205.

to Scotland. In May 1703 a Petition to the Queen was drawn up by eighteen Friends at Edinburgh craving freedom from swearing before any tribunal. It is doubtful if this Petition was ever submitted as the Quarterly Meeting did not particularly favour it being sent up.⁷⁹ But in Scotland the 'Affirmation' question was a very live issue, and most of the Scottish Friends were in the "Dissatisfied" camp against Penn and Ellwood the English leaders of the pro-Affirmationists, particularly Robert Barclay and Roderick Forbes, eleventh laird of Brux,⁸⁰ who died in 1712 before the long dispute was settled. Barclay and John Forbes intimated to the Yearly Meeting of 1702 that Aberdeen Friends dissented "from that called the sollem affirmation in England, and give also their sense of it", which was that there was no essential difference between it and an oath.⁸¹ An Epistle from Aberdeen Yearly Meeting to the London Yearly Meeting in May 1713,⁸² made Whitehead complain of its severity. This was followed by a letter from London which sharply informs the Aberdeen Friends that they had been better employed attending to the prosperity of Truth in Scotland than in writing thus in ingratitude.⁸³ Two months later, Barclay sent a slashing personal reply, accusing the English Friend of having a bad conscience. Barclay took the opportunity of saying also that Aberdeen Friends had no intention of disquietening themselves further in this controversy, as they had been opposed all along to the Affirmation and as their correspondents in the Meeting for Sufferings had announced the discontinuance of correspondence from that time.⁸⁴ To this letter from the Aberdeen Friends, David Barclay and Falconer replied in one of the most classical and gripping of extant Quaker epistles. David Barclay told his correspondents that their letter was so inflammable that he had not shown it to anyone but Falconer, as they had good reason to believe that it "would have kindled a fire that would prove very detrimental to ye unity of ye Body". Barclay urged, indeed pleaded with the Aberdeen Friends not to force a schism, pointed out that their separatist tastes could only play into the hands of their enemies in the State and leave themselves exposed and unrelieved; and after a caustic reminder to the Aberdonians to practice their own many excellent advices and counsels to others about living in peace and keeping themselves unspotted from Governments of the World, he asked Robert Barclay and his friends if he might consign their letter to the flames so that its contents might die in silence.⁸⁵ Probably this was agreed to by Aberdeen Friends, but there is no record of it. The correspondence

79. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol.15) PP 131-2,139.

80. v "Reliquiae Barclaianae", PP 127-8: also "Piety Promoted", Vol.II, PP 76-8; and Macfarlane's "Genealogical Collection of Scots Families", Vol.II, P239.

81. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol.15) P 119.

82. "Book of Epistles to and from London Yearly Meeting", (Aber. MS Vol.18) PP 30-2.

83. Ibid, P 34.

84. "Reliquiae Barclaianae", PP 141-9. (Letter wrongly dated 'November 1713' should be July.)

85. Letter to Aberdeen Friends from David Barclay of London, 9-5-1713. (Bundle 62(13) of Aber.MSS.)

of these years reveals a real bitterness on the part of the Aberdeen Friends so that the Edinburgh Friends counselled them "to keep as much as possible from giving them any offence through any tart expression or otherwise."⁸⁶

In May 1712 the Provost of Aberdeen brought before the Town Council a letter he had received from the Lord Advocate "desyreing them to take the Quakers' solemne affirmat-ione in place of ane oath in any bussines they might have before the towne courts" and also to record the terms of the letter in their Records. The Council however refused to record the letter "in the said counsell books", it being "the unanimous opinion of the counsell that it wes not proper to registrat the said letter in ther books, because they knew no law in Scotland appoynting the Quakers' affirmation to be taken in place of judiciaall oaths".⁸⁷ What prompted the Lord Advocate to take this action is unknown, unless his sympathy with the Friends and possibly the precedent of the Scottish Judges in 1680 in deciding in the case of Robert Burnett of Leys "that a Quaker should not be holden as confessed for refusing to swear, but allowed to declare the truth in their own terms, viz as in the presence of God".⁸⁸

It was not till 1714 that an Act was passed in George I's first Parliament⁸⁹ making the old "Affirmation Act" of 1696⁹⁰ perpetual and extending it to Scotland, that any such measure came to the Northern Kingdom. This Act, while not received with enthusiasm by Scottish Quakers any more than its predecessors had been among the "Dissatisfied" in England, paved the way for the last "Affirmation Act" of 1722⁹¹ which paid worthy and deserved tribute to the loyalty and good citizenship of the Friends and contained at last a form of affirmation which was considered satisfactory by all.⁹² So ended the long struggle.

86. Epistle from Edin. Q.M. to Aber. Y.M. 11-2-1714. (Bundle 62 (17) of Aber. MSS.)

87. "Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen" 1643-1747, (1872) P 347.

88. Brown's "Supplement to the Dictionary of the Decisions of the Court of Session", Vol. III, P 349.

89. For text v "A Collection of Acts of Parliament and Clauses of Acts of Parliament, Relative to.. Quakers", (1757) P 22, Number XI.

90. Ibid, P 17, Number VI.

91. Ibid, P 32, Number XVII.

92. This Act omits all reference to God as Witness.

CHAPTER VI.

"EBB AND FLOW OF THE SOCIETY IN SCOTLAND, c1721-1740."

The settlement of the "Affirmation" question marked the last stage of the conflict of the Quakers with the authorities. Safe from the effects of persecution and outlawry, they had nothing now to face but occasional outbursts of bad temper, and as acknowledged keepers of the peace they were allowed to enjoy the privileged security which they had so resolutely won. No school of fiery prophets remained to incite them, nor was any on the horizon. Eccentricity and mad extravagance were all but dead. The State had at least learned by wise concessions how to invalidate their stubborn witness and disarm the sympathies of many citizens toward their just grievances. The result was that the Quakers in their new sheltered life steadily became a rather "proper" sect, and took on a good deal of the environment of ecclesiastical "respectability" and "moderatism" in which they found themselves. The danger of reaction in their new security, was fully recognised by the London Yearly Meeting which sent a special circular Letter to all the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings cautioning the members to be very vigilant of their conduct, of the spiritual qualifications of their preachers, and of the tried fitness of those whom they allowed to travel abroad in public ministry.¹

How far this new security was responsible for the external decline of the Movement in Scotland, it is difficult to gauge, but serious decline and loss there were. Four deaths practically denuded the rank of the leaders, those of Alexander Seaton and Christian Barclay in 1723,² of Andrew Jaffray of Kingswells in 1726,³ and of George Swan of Glasgow in 1731. These of course were incidental, but what of the events which follow? In 1722 Hamilton Monthly Meeting, which at the beginning of the century was comfortably-off,⁴ had so weakened that it was merged in the Glasgow Meeting,⁵ and this had been preceded by the extinction of Douglas Particular Meeting in 1708 after the removal of the Millers the last Quaker family,⁶ and of Cumberhead Particular Meeting in 1710 after the disownment of a Friend. When Thomas Story on his fourth Scottish tour visited Linlithgow Meeting in 1728 with Thomas Erskine,⁷ he found it at a very low ebb,⁸ though the Edinburgh

-
1. MS. Minute of the London Yearly Meeting 1728, sent to Robert Barclay of Urie. (Aberdeen Bundle of MSS. No 66 (5).)
 2. Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd ed) P 375.
 3. For John Barclay's Testimony to him, v Ibid, PP 384-6, 390.
 4. v Art. by W.F. Miller in JFHS Xll, PP 1-2.
 5. "Hamilton Meeting Book 1695", (MS Vol. 14) P 45. (The page is half torn away, but the transition is clear.) cf JFHS. I. P 117.
 6. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 162.
 7. v infra, PP 306-7.
 8. Story's "Journal", (1747) P 664.

Quarterly Meeting continued to pay the rental of their Meeting House for some years later. Story found the Edinburgh contingent of Friends reduced to virtually Miller 'the Patriarch', "who had stood his Ground faithfully from the Beginning", and his family connection, and although many citizens came to the West Port Meeting House "much more quiet and attentive than heretofore", and departed much impressed "beyond whatever I had observed in that City at any Time before",⁹ Story was not sanguine. For to enjoy "a good Season" from the Lord or feel "Truth over all in Authority and Brightness" was not conditional upon numbers or increase. And the "Christian experience" in Scotland of George Bewley, an Irish Friend ten years later, was only a very brief and dry itinerary of places visited, without setiment or comment.¹⁰

Between 1721 and the death of Swan in 1731, there seems to have been a considerable amount of dissension among Quakers in the West. In April 1721 the Hamilton Monthly Meeting sent him a letter "disering him to do gustic to John nisbet" ¹¹ and in November the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting was notified of some discord between Swan and John Purdon.¹² This was settled, but further trouble in the Glasgow Meeting was only allayed by a committee of the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting "labouring with them for a reconciliation".¹³ Things quietened down, and for the remainder of his life Swan seems to have been actively engaged in the business of Friends in Glasgow, in the relief of the poor, in taking charge of the collections for various objects, and, in his calling as an innkeeper, looking after the stabling and care of the horses of "public" Friends.¹⁴ From 1733 until about 1790 there are very few traces of regular meetings in the West and the Glasgow Meeting seems to have fallen into abeyance till 1791.

Parallel to this slow disintegration, there was an increase of toleration and leniency towards the Quakers by the Civil Authorities, as well as of civility and fair hearing by the general public—with the exception of college students and the purely ruffian element of the city, always bent on an orgy. In May 1728 when Thomas Story and Erskine held a meeting at Swan's house, the number of people that attended was so great that the two rooms, the stair, and the yard outside were crowded,¹⁵ and that "not with a rude Rabble as in Times past, but an intelligent People" who received the Truth "with Sobriety and Attention" so that "I perceived the State of that People was much altered for

9. Story's "Journal", (1747) PP 664,665.

10. "A Narrative of the Christian Experiences of George Bewley", (1750) PP 38-9.

11. "Hamilton Meeting Book 1695", (MS Vol 14) P 43.

12. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) PP 234-5,237.

13. Ibid, P 237.

14. George Swan Junr, one of the few members of the innkeeper's large family that survived, settled in Perth and married into the Miller family in 1752.

15. cf Story's "Journal", (1747) PP667-8.

the better since I first knew that Place, and the old Prejudices much worn away in many of them" To a subsequent meeting a Magistrate came.¹⁶ The worst disturbers of their meetings in the new Glasgow Meeting House in 1730 were "a great Company of the Collegians.. much ruder than any other of the baser sort" Story had "heavy Reflections that these Seminaries of the Members both of the National Church and State should be more peculiarly depraved than the worst of the other Rabble", and sympathised with the parents of the students for the poor return they got for their outlay! "For alas! what but bitter and poisonous Waters can be expected from such depraved and envenom'd Fountains."¹⁷ But Story did not omit to pay tribute to the "Care of the Magistrates in sending Civil officers to keep out the baser sort: which we were favoured with, every Meeting." In Edinburgh however, the Quakers did not appear to have been so fortunate, for there is an entry in the cash accounts of Edinburgh Meeting that in 1720, 48 shillings Scots were paid "to the soldiers that guarded the Meeting house door", and in 1724 that 24 shillings sterling were "paid to the Town Officers and Soldiers for attending the Meeting house door." ¹⁸

In public places outwith the Meetings the authorities were learning more generally to turn the 'Nelson eye' and the deaf ear to Friends' activities, so long at least as there was no obstruction or fear of disturbance. True, some of the City Guard whipped off four Quakers to detention from the Market Cross of Edinburgh in 1722, but probably more on account of the "violent agitations" of the woman preacher than because of the woes she pronounced on the inhabitants.¹⁹ But no one seems to have interfered in the least with Thomas Erskine when he "made a religious peregrination through this city" in March 1736, uttering his gloomy prophecies on "the inhabitants of the Good Town" at the head of the West Bow, and preaching at the Cross, giving his audience "forty days to think on't"²⁰ He was likewise immune when, he warned Musselburgh that the Spirit had appointed him to hold forth to them in the Market Place at 5 PM. He mounted the Cross, and also in Edinburgh on 28th June he "evangelised from the Castle hill down the High Street to the Netherbow uncovered, enforcing with a deal of warmth that the dreadful day of the Lord was at band."²¹

Thomas Areskine, or Erskine, the friend of Story by whom he is first mentioned,²² was a brewer in the

16. Ibid, P 665.

17. Ibid, P668. It is interesting however to note that John Fothergill Junr. was a student at Edinburgh University from 1734 to 1736.(v JFHS Vlll. P 123n.)

18. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book"; (MS Vol 12) PP 110, 112.

19. Chambers's "Domestic Annals of Scotland", (2nd.ed) Vol. III, P467.

20. "Caledonian Mercury", 19-1-1736, in Chambers's, "Traditions of Edinburgh", Vol. II, (1825) P 50.

21. Ibid, (28-6-1736.)

22. Story's "Journal", (1747) PP 590-1.

Pleasance and the acknowledged leader and preacher among the Edinburgh Friends after Miller 'the Patriarch'. He belonged to Allendale, Northumberland, was 'a son of the Manse' and had been "a Baptist Teacher". In 1721 he paid "a comfortable visit" to Friends in Aberdeen, not exclusively religious, since in February 1722 "certificates of clearness" were passed by Aberdeen and Allendale Monthly Meetings for his marriage to Mary Jaffray, widow of James Jaffray of Kingswells.²³ In 1728 the Areskines removed to Edinburgh. Areskine's second wife, whom he married in 1734 was Margaret Miller,²⁴ grand-daughter of 'the Patriarch' and daughter of George Midler who gave up the family profession of gardening and established a linen manufactory near Bristo Port about 1725.²⁵ After his "peregrinations", Areskine published in 1736 an Address "To all the people of the Kingdom of Scotland in general, and to the Inhabitants of Edinburgh in particular", a Broadside of the usual warning and hortatory type which produced no criticism and no results. Ray the historian, who knew Areskine tells of how the Jacobite rebels in 1745 ransacked his house of money and valuables. On making representation of his loss to Prince Charles Edward and complaining that the reigning monarch was content with taxation, not pillage, the Prince peremptorily replied that "he [Areskine] was many years in Debt to the Revenue of his Father's Excise, and it was but the proper Dues to his Government."²⁶

No figure however is more important in the Annals of Scottish Quakerism during the first generation of the 18th century than Thomas Story of Justicetown. His third and fourth visits in 1717 and 1728 coincided with the famous and protracted heresy trial of Professor John Simson of Glasgow College with whom he and Areskine came into personal contact during the former's last tour in 1730. The first process against Simson for alleged Arminianism lasted in Glasgow Presbytery and the Assembly from Webster's libel in 1714 till 1717 when the Assembly terminated the case by an unusually mild reprimand and interdict and allowed him to retain his chair. In 1726 the storm blew up again on charges against the Professor of having ignored the injunctions of the Assembly of 1717 and of additional heterodox teaching on the Trinity. After a long process of almost interminable argument and high theological sword-play, during which Simson was suspended from Assembly to Assembly, this second arraignment for Arianism ended in stalemate in 1729 with suspension 'sine die' from all his ecclesiastical and teaching functions. Story's comment in 1730 on the "affair" is interesting, viz, that Simson "being a Man of good Temper, religious in his Way, and of Learning superior to most, if not all of them, they could not

23. cf "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 3) P 94.

24. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book" 1730, (MS Vol. 13) PP 10-12.

25. "Memorials of Hope Park", PP 7, 8.

26. "History of the Rebellion", (1755) PP 54-5. cf "The Woodhouselee MS", ed. A.F Stewart, P 82.

make good their Charges against him nor so far convict him as to proceed to Excommunication."²⁷ Story and Areskine were favourably impressed with their two hours' interview with Simson although they agreed to differ on Baptism, and they parted on the friendliest terms.²⁸

No suggestion has ever been offered as to what drew the Quakers to Simson, but certain affinities are not far to seek. It was more than merely the occupation of a common ground as heretics, for even then they might have differed on doctrinal issues and doubtless did, as Story felt. More probably it was because the depositions of the students taken by the Assembly's Committee were calculated to favour, if anything, the Prosecution rather than the Defence, and Story had no reason to love theological students: also the fact of Simson's unsoundness upon a major doctrine which the Quakers themselves did not accept, may have been a bond between them. Most likely of all however such community as existed between Story and Simson was based on opinions regarding the salvation of the heathen, and original goodness which Simson uttered in 1717 and which Story must have heard, viz "that if the heathen would, in sincerity and truth and in the diligent use of means that providence lays to their hand, seek from God the knowledge of the way of reconciliation necessary for their acceptable serving of him, and being saved by him, he would discover it to them": "that there are means appointed of God for obtaining saving grace, which means, when diligently used with seriousness, sincerity, and faith of being heard, God has promised to bless with success"; and "that it is inconsistent with the justice and goodness of God to create a soul without any original righteousness or any disposition to good", or to postulate in infants any original sin.²⁹ In these sentiments there is much that is implicit and explicit in the doctrine of the "Inner Light",

On his last tour in Scotland, Story journeyed North by Kelso where he was entertained and held a meeting at Charles Ormiston's house. On his return route to Kelso, accompanied by Joseph Miller, a son of "the Patriarch" (and Ormiston's son-in-law,³⁰) they met the Marquis of Lothian and Sir John Rutherford of Egerton at the inn at Channelkirk. Story found them "very familiar and courteous, though Strangers to us", and as the distinguished visitors and their equipage overtaxed the resources of the inn, the Marquis "coureously sent us some of his own Provisions his Servants had brought for them."³¹

27. "Journal", (1747) P 668. cf also Mc.Kerrow's "History of the Secession Church" (1848) PP 20-7: and Dr. James Fraser's Letter to Wodrow, dated 7-7-1726, in "Analecta Scotia" (1834) Vol. I, P 315. For a concise and lucid résumé of the whole case, v. H. F. Henderson's "The Religious Controversies of Scotland" (1905) Ch. I, or R. H. Story, "The Church of Scotland", III, PP 617-8, 632, 639 etc.

28. Story's "Journal", PP 668-9.

29. Answers to Webster's Libel quoted in Mc.Kerrow's "History of the Secession Church", PP 8-9.

30. "Memorials of Hope Park", P 6.

31. "Journal", (1747) P 669.

But the most notable outcome of this last visit of the Laird of Justice Town was the 'convincement' of May Drummond, sister of Sir George Drummond, Provost of Edinburgh,³² perhaps the best known, as certainly the most scintillating woman in Scottish Quakerism; although it is quite absurd to claim, as Chambers does, that "in many respects she was perhaps the most remarkable woman that Scotland ever produced except the Duchess of Lauderdale".³³ According to Kelsall, May Drummond was born about 1710,³⁴ and her convincement was about 1732, but Story dates it 1731. At the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting in 1731 May Drummond came with a large party of her friends, the 'smart set' of that day, and was captured by Story's address, and after further attendances at Friends' Meetings became convinced and owned the "Truth" publicly to the amazement of her social circle and the chagrin of her relations.³⁵ In a page of autobiography she tells that when she severed her membership of the Church of Scotland, not a single minister came to ask her the reason why, and in 1736 she had outgrown any expectation or desire of any pastoral visit, although she was prepared to attend "their Assembly, Synod or Presbytery if called there to answer."³⁶ All her friends were against her joining the despised sect of Quakers except the Provost and a younger brother. The former could hardly be antagonistic when one of the first-fruits of his sister's Quakerism was her active collection of a large sum for those days, £372, from Quarterly Meetings in England, Edinburgh, and Dublin in aid of the Infirmary, the individual sums being detailed in the entrance hall to the old institution under the title "Fraternity of Quakers 1739".

May Drummond in the teeth of ostracism and unpopularity maintained her ground and her new principles firmly, and within three years was called to the ministry, encouraged no doubt by Story himself who was advanced in his view of women preachers and realised the high gifts of popular speech which she possessed and the attraction of her romantic circumstances and conversion.³⁷ Before she entered fully on her career of public witnessing however, she entered the lists of controversy on behalf of her new friends by an attack on John Shaw, the minister of South Leith, though why he should have been singled out for special attention is not clear. In 1733 she wrote, apparently together

32. One of the most enterprising of the Provosts of Edinburgh, a principal founder of the Royal Infirmary, the "Father" of the New Town, and builder of the North Bridge in 1769. George Drummond who was six times Provost was Allan Ramsay's "Dear Drummond" ("Works" Vol. I. P. 186.) cf Malcolm's "Genealogical Memoir of the House of Drummond" (1808), pp. 52, 53, 54; and Fountainhall's "Chronological Notes" (1822), p. 93.

33. "Traditions of Edinburgh", (1825) Vol. II, p. 51. But cf Pope's lines in his "Epilogue to the Satires", and note (1881 ed.) Vol. III, pp. 469-70.

34. "Diarys of John Kelsall", Vol. VII, 8-4mo-1735. (Euston Library)

35. Story's "Journal" (1747) p. 714.

36. "Internal Revelation", (1736) p. 15.

37. Story's "Journal" (1747), pp. 714, 719.

a "Paper" and a letter to Shaw couched in the traditional terms of primitive invective, castigating him for preaching against the light of the inner Kingdom of God and the iniquitous anomaly of a paid priesthood who had turned the proclamation of a free Gospel into a lucrative vested interest.³⁸ A new factor had however come into existence since the fiery polemics of the early pamphleteers, which governed all publications in the name of the Society and with which May Drummond had now to reckon—Censorship. Under the authority of the London Yearly Meeting of 1672 what is known as "The Second Day Morning Meeting" assumed the censorship of all MSS, translations, and new editions of works published under the name of the Society, and the Yearly Meeting appointed ten Friends to check "unwise printing" and "to see that books were carefully corrected" and duly authorised before being released.³⁹ The "Paper" and the proposed letter in part were therefore ordered by the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting to be sent by Charles Ormiston Junr. with covering letter to the Morning Meeting to "soften & rectify Any expressions either in the paper or Letter".⁴⁰ Three months later, in May 1734, the verdict of the Morning Meeting came to hand, approving the "Paper" but rejecting the writer's strictures on Mr Shaw, and requiring Friends in Scotland to "doe therewith as they shall think fitt". No further action is recorded, but May Drummond, nothing daunted, submitted the letter again in 1735 to the Morning Meeting under the title "A Letter to a Preacher, dated Edinburgh the 25th, 7 mo, 1733", and two other "Epistles", one of which she withdrew, the other of which was addressed "to ye People of Scotland", dated January 1733. There is no record of the ultimate fate of the letter to John Shaw, nor any record of whether it was ever sent.

In 1734 May Drummond travelled in Scotland, and with Story and others in England in 1735,⁴¹ during which time she was received in audience by the Queen, Caroline of Anspach only two years before her death, and the gracious reception that this able woman gave the Quaker,⁴² made May the platform sensation of the year in London and the Provinces alike. She was a woman of brilliant gifts, versatility, and courageous speech, as Story testified, but while she dazzled her crowded audiences, she seemed to fail to move them or make converts to the Quaker faith. Into this problem it is not necessary to enter minutely here, and in any case the annals of her life are too fragmentary with many gaps

38. "Robson MSS(67), PP28-30. (In Euston Lib.) v also "Internal Revelation", PP17-20.

39. cf L.M.Wright's "The Literary Life of the Early Friends"(1932) P 98. Even the 1st edition of Fox's "Journal"(1694) was at one point closely scrutinised and argued.(v Smith's "Catalogue", Vol.I, P 691.)

40. "Edin.Quarterly Meeting Book"1669,(MS Vol.15) PP292-3. Apparently, part of the letter was too questionable even to send up to the Morning Meeting. 41.Story's "Journal"(1747),PP714,19,20.

42."Robson MSS(44), P74.(Eus.Lib) for her letter to Wm.Miller the second; also Thos.Chalkley's "Journal"(1751) P279.
(Reprinted in Smith's "Catalogue", Vol.I, P544.)

to ensure a balanced judgment. All the clues extant centre on the fact that from about 1753 May Drummond was falling more and more into disfavour with Friends and latterly into definite aversion. In two letters to her friend James Wilson, one dated June 1758 from Edinburgh,⁴³ the other dated April 1759,⁴⁴ she spoke of "the tyed of Malice" which "ran high against her, and the Lyeing tung" which "was permitted for her probacion to do itt's worst", and suggested that "the floods of inveterat Malace and Crowal invey" were occasioned by Friend's mistrust of her motives in ministering, and grave suspicion that she sought men's flattery and praise more than the inward seal of God's favour. By 1765 when her "case" was brought before the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting by the arbitrary William Miller 'The King of the Quakers' there were other indictments and allegations, and she was enjoined on two important criteria of the ministry to be silent in meetings.⁴⁵ After a brief defiance of authority she yielded for a year, when her resumption in London entailed an exchange of letters between the Second Day Morning Meeting and the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting, the latter of which pronounced her on grounds of conduct and the burdensomeness of her "dead formal" preaching and praying, to be "not at all fitt to preach" or to be received as a minister.⁴⁶ From the time of this sentence which only fell short of "disownment", May Drummond faded out of Quaker records and activities and died at Edinburgh in 1772.⁴⁷

During 1721 and 1740 a large number of travelling and "public" Friends visited Scotland. W.F. Miller listed sixty-six men and four women,⁴⁸ but it is impossible to reach any approximate figure, as many probable visitors mentioned in "Piety Promoted" are undated.⁴⁹ Probably one or two of these were Americans—the first appearance of American Friends in Scotland. Of the list the most notable next to Story was Benjamin Holme, who was three times in Scotland, in 1728, 1735, and 1737.⁵⁰ In 1728 he penetrated as far North as Elgin "in the Murrah", and in 1730 as far as Fraserburgh. He visited Lord Pitsligo and Lord Salton and was well received, especially by Lady Salton, who

-
43. Gibson MSS, Vol. I, P 89. (Euston Lib.) Wilson travelled in Scotland also. cf "Memoirs of S. Fothergill" (1843), P 280.
44. JFHS Vol. IV, PP 105-6.
45. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book" 1730, (MS Vol. 13) PP 63-4.
46. Ibid, PP 64, 65, 67-8. cf the Case of Andrew Gray. (Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol. 15.) P 70.
47. Other supplementary references to her life and character will be found in "Quakeriana", Vol. I, (1894) P 106. : Story's "Journal", (1747) P 720; Copy of MS Letter in JFHS IV, P 110; References in Ibid, PP 112-3: Her other publications detailed in Smith's "Catalogue" I, PP 544-5; also Ibid, P 60. "Life of S. Fothergill", (1843) PP 106-7.
48. v JFHS XII, PP 177-9.
49. Also of Ibid, PP 180-1.
50. He was also in Glasgow in 1703. (v ante, Ch. V, P 295.)

was "a pious tender Woman". He was also in Aberdeen and Dundee, and from the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting went to Falkirk and Dalkeith "where no meeting had been before". The last tour he made was the most comprehensive of all, the places visited ranging from Inverary to Girvan through the centre of Scotland to Ormiston in East Lothian and Aberdeen and Old Meldrum in the North. It is an interesting itinerary in that Quakerism penetrated to some places then for the first time on record, but Holme's tours appear to have had no missionary value for all the meetings he held.⁵¹ A nominal interest in religion still survived, but in the mid-eighteenth century faith was decadent and from the spiritual cold-storage Quakerism was not free. "I do see" wrote Areskine to West of England Friends, "it's a day of Searching amongst us as with Candles and finding out such as are settled on the Dead Lees of Opinion and profession and at Ease without the Lord".⁵²

51. v "Life and Travels of Benjamin Holme" by Himself. (1753)
(Prefaced to his "Collected Works") PP 67, 75, 77-8.
52. Postscript to Letter from Edinburgh, dated 12-12mo-1736/7.
("Swarthmore MSS." Vol. VI, No 99. original.)

CHAPTER VII."THE DECLINE BECOMES GRAVE. c1740-1786."

In the middle decades of the century the Society of Friends became more hermit-like than ever before. The serious situation and outlook deteriorated into one of the utmost gravity, and no chapter of the Scottish fortunes of Quakerism is more depressing. At no time since the Reformation had the church, through the apathy and spiritual starvation of Deism and Moderatism, sunk so low. With Ebenezer Erskine's famous sermon in 1736 in which he bewails "the carcass of worship instead of the soul of it presented unto the living God" and "nothing but dead ministers and dead people, dead preaching, hearing, praying, and praising"¹; with Whitefield's great oration delivered in Glasgow Cathedral Churchyard on the essential anointing and business of a Gospel minister not "to entertain our People as Cicero, Seneca and other Heathen Moralists did" but "to preach Christ";² and with the strong invective against most of the ministers levelled by men like Hamilton of Strathblane, the Quakers of an earlier age of pugnacity and polemics would have been in fervent agreement and aggressive support. Their successors of these years it is true, were sympathetically inclined to Whitefield. When Whitefield preached to a great audience in the Orphan House Park, Edinburgh, "a portly well-looking Quaker nephew" of the Erskines accosted him saying "Friend George, I am as thou art.. and therefore if thou wilt not quarrel with me about my hat, I will not quarrel with thee about thy gown". Great numbers of Quakers also came as spectators to the Communion in Edinburgh in 1742 in which Whitefield took part.³ But on contemporary Scottish Quakerism as a whole, Whitefield made no deep impression.

Nor is there any evidence in contemporary or later Quaker literature that the Friends reacted any more to, or were affected in the slightest by, the Seceders' bid for spiritual freedom, by the influence of the numerous "praying societies", or by the remarkable Revivals of Cambuslang⁴ and Kilsyth in 1742. Perhaps nothing is more significant of the Quakers' consciousness that their Cause, in Scotland at least, was an exploded magazine, than their silence on these things. Perhaps nothing is more indicative also of their own deterioration. Here was ample material both declamatory and inspirational to recharge their waning fires. They did not even attempt to make any capital out of Kilsyth and Cambuslang, as they did out of Stewarton and the Kirk of Shotts in Keith's day. They paid no tribute to the working of the Spirit in the Church and the only comment issuing from the Society

1. "Whole Works of Ebenezer Erskine", New ed., (1871) Vol. II, P347.

2. Whitefield's Sermon on "The Duty of a Gospel Minister," P 7. (In "Eight Sermons")

3. Gledstone's "Life of Whitefield", PP 258, 290.

4. v Sinclair's "Statistical Account of Scotland", Vol. V, PP268-74; and various Church Histories.

upon the religious situation of these decades, was the sardonic hope of Samuel Fothergill that the great division among the Presbyterians, "Seceders and Seceders, and Seceders from them.. almost daily making their appearance" might be "a previous step to better times, and that the commotions and overturnings may be a means to raise a sense of danger, and a secret cry for relief to Him who is alone able to afford it,"⁵ i.e. that the Church's disruptions might lead to revival of Quakerism. It was not a worthy attitude, and this reference to the Erskines and Gillespie, to the Burgher and Antiburgher split, and to the Patronage disputes, was futile and helped nobody. But while these sentiments were Fothergill's individually, they doubtless expressed the mind of the Scottish Friends pretty generally.

Miller "the Patriarch" died in 1743, leaving in his Will for the maintenance of the Edinburgh Meeting House and Burial Ground the sum of 400 marks.⁶ His son William, who was a successful nurseryman and seedsman, succeeded his father as Clerk and Treasurer to the Edinburgh Meeting and became the administrative head of Quakerism in the Capital. Like Areskine he was plundered by the Jacobite Army in 1745, but escaped more lightly than the brewer.⁷ Another echo of the Rebellion was the occupation of the Meeting House at Aberdeen by Government troops in 1745 and 1746 so that certain of the Monthly Meetings were not held.⁸

The extinction or reduction to vanishing point of meeting after meeting at this time makes a dreary chronicle. In the second half of the century Minutes frequently consisted of nothing but financial reports, repairs to properties, legacies, and charity doles. Often the business was simply nil under the derelict formula "Friends being assembled for affairs". Urie and Stonehaven Monthly Meeting had ceased in 1733. About 1750 meetings at Gartshore died out and the use of the Meeting House was discontinued⁹ as also meetings at Heads in Glasford. When Catherine Phillips of Dudley visited Linlithgow in 1752, the Friends Meeting had vanished, although she managed to collect "a small meeting in an inn with the town's people which was low though not quite dead."¹⁰ Glasgow Monthly Meeting had sunk so far that for over fifty years no attempt seemed to be made to keep systematic minutes and internal

-
5. Letter to his brother Dr. John Fothergill, dated from Old Meldrum 8-9mo-1764. ("Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill", ed. Crosfield, (1843) P 450.)
 6. v "Com. Edinburgh Testaments", Vol. III, Part. 1, (William Miller's Testament, 16th March 1747.) and Vol. 112, Part 2. (Testamentar, William Miller). According to "The Gentleman's Magazine" this brewer of "Quaker's Ale" died worth a fortune of £5000. (v Vol. for 1743, P 553.)
 7. "Memorials of Hope Park", PP 11-12.
 8. "Minute Book of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol. 3) P 181.
 9. "Transactions of the Glasgow Archeol. Society", Vol. V, Part. 1, Pl 06.
 10. "Memoirs of Catherine Phillips", (Payton) (1797) P 39.

information was very fragmentary. A letter from Glasgow Friends was read at the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting in 1737 reporting the attendance at First Day Meetings of "sober people who behaved decently", and expressing their own hope "to be mor in the way of their Duty than heretofore".¹¹ The cash accounts of the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting show that the Glasgow Meeting House was sold in July 1751,¹² but there is no record of the purchasing or building of a new one. From then till about 1788 there is next to no information about Glasgow, except from other sources. There is considerable evidence in the Journals of travelling Friends that the religious condition of Glasgow and the reasonable and almost eager attitude of the public towards Friends contrasted very favourably with the lifeless and apathetic spirit of their own remnant. John Churchman of Pennsylvania, a Quaker minister, held two meetings one Sunday in 1751 "which were large open and satisfactory to which many tender inquiring people came who behaved well".¹³ In 1764 his friend and correspondent, Samuel Fothergill was surprised to meet with much civility from the populace and very respectful treatment from the Magistrates. To his "large open meeting" came "many principal people of the city", several of whom were anxious to prolong his visit, "as they alleged they knew nothing of Quakerism but through the medium of misrepresentation, and were astonished to find our principles so different from those which their ministers generally ascribed to us".¹⁴ Two years later Joseph Oxley of Norwich had a "good meeting" one Sunday, when the conduct of the audience was "sober", but what impressed him most was "the order and becoming behaviour" of the throngs of people in the streets making their way to their own "places of religious worship" both morning and afternoon, a witness and example which he would fain hold high to "our people in England".¹⁵ But significantly enough, Churchman had "a concern" to take "those called friends" privately to task about "the need they had to look to their ways and conversation that they might be as lights and good examples among the people in that place who were seekers after the truth".¹⁶ Probably it had no effect. Fothergill never mentioned local Friends, and Oxley and his companion "lodged at Provost Ayton's, no Friend of account living here".¹⁷ Nor does there seem to have been for over twenty years longer, for there were no names of Glasgow or Western Friends in the Membership list

11. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol. 15) P 312.

12. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol. 12) P 137.

13. v "An Account of the Gospel Labours of John Churchman" (1781), P 141. For Churchman's character, v Hodgson's "Select Historical Memoirs" (1844), PP 368-74.

14. Letter to his sister in Crosfield's "Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill", (1843) P 452.: cf Letchworth's "A Brief Account of the late Samuel Fothergill", (1774) P 7.

15. "Journal of Joseph Oxley" (1837), P 282. Note the respectful substitute for "steeplehouses".

16. "An Account of John Churchman", (1781) PP 141-2.

17. "Journal of Joseph Oxley", (1837) P 281.

compiled by Edinburgh Monthly Meeting in 1787.¹⁸ Gibson made no allusion to Quakers or any Meeting House in his list of Glasgow dissenters in 1775.¹⁹

A small meeting at Beldivy (Baldovan), a hamlet near Dundee is recorded in 1735 as sending representatives to Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting, but its life was short-lived, and it does not seem to have survived beyond 1765.²⁰ In 1766 Oxley found "no meeting nor Friends of our Society" in Dundee.

After 1750, Kinmuck Meeting was very much reduced and did not show any sign of revival till the Wighams settled there about 1784.²¹ All was not well nor had been for a number of years before, especially on the educational side. Since the death of John Robertson in 1714 there had been frequent changes of the schoolmasters and apparently Friends thought that certain of them required careful surveillance, one James Bean "from England" being informed that absence from Quarterly and Yearly Meetings without reasons would "Incur the Censure of the Quarterly Meeting", and the continuance of another "being to be according as he behaves regularly." In 1781 Kinmuck Quakers subscribed £10-19-0 for Ackworth School where there were already six children from Scotland,²² a foreshadowing of the abolition of the school in 1807.

Urie however showed a more disappointing decline still. In 1747 Robert Barclay Junr. died, followed by his brother John in 1751, and when Churchman visited Urie in the latter year, there was no meeting at all.²³ In 1756 Samuel Neale, an Irish Quaker felt impelled to "deliver" himself, "which was very close and sharp, for the apostasy is glaring in this part of the World... both in speech and apparel."²⁴ A few years later, Fothergill and Isaac Wilson had "a small meeting with a few of our Society"²⁵, but Oxley in 1766 judged "the pure life was kept under and oppressed and in great bondage" at Urie.²⁶ By 1787 when Wilkinson and Pemberton on their return from their Highland tour²⁷ visited "the poor remains of our Society" at Stonehaven, "these only numbered seven" and all of them above eighty without any descendants among Friends, so that a few years in all probability will put an end to our Society in those parts."²⁸

-
18. "Edin Monthly Meeting Book", 1730 (MS Vol 13) P 99.
 19. "History of Glasgow", (1777) P 127.
 20. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P302: cf P303.
 21. post, Ch. IX, P 330.
 22. cf Art by W.F. Miller on "Early Schools in Scotland", in JFHS. Vol. I, PP 108-110. cf Miller MSS, Vol. I, P 73.
 23. "An Account of John Churchman", (1781) P 140.
 24. "Life and Religious Labours of Samuel Neale", (1845) P 48.
 25. "Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill", (1843) P 451.
 26. Oxley's "Journal", (1837) P 281.
 27. cf post, Ch. VIII. PP 324-7.
 28. "Journey of John Pemberton to the Highlands", (1810) P56: FQE. Vol. XXVII, (1893) PP 283-4.

Turning South, we find Kelso Meeting reported as demoralised and very weak. In the Records there is nothing but marriages, poor fund grants, and outlays for travelling Friends. In 1749 the Monthly Meeting was held irregularly and finances dropped "because of the bad Attendance given by several of our younger Men".²⁹ Churchman and his companions visiting it on a Sunday in 1751 found "Truth" at a low ebb and the atmosphere impossible for fellowship, so that they made "an opportunity of clearing ourselves of friends there who had much fallen from the simplicity of the pure truth into the modes, fashions, and customs of the World"³⁰ The following year Catherine Phillips confirmed this, as she felt her "spirit sorely distressed on account of truth's being almost forsaken by its professors who were but few in that town"³¹ while Fothergill ministered in 1764 to "a few worthless people under our name, accompanied by a few of other Societies who seemed nearer the Kingdom."³² In 1786 Kelso Monthly Meeting was discontinued and merged in that of Edinburgh.

Edinburgh itself however was little better. Between 1740 and 1786 records are very fragmentary. Catherine Phillips was depressed by "the professors of truth..whose states were mostly distressing, a libertine spirit having carried away the youth and an easy indifferent one prevailing among those further advanced in years"³³ In their meeting, Churchman "had a sense that silence was best"³⁴ after a surfeit of words, and in 1756 Neale was not discontented with his audience, the more that "the wide and distant walking of some from the principle they profess"³⁵ was no advertisement of 'Truth'. These visitors may have resented a certain growth of "popularity" in their open meetings for in 1748 the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting was "crowded with Numbers of the Inhabitants of this place, many of whom were people of Account," as were also their Sunday meetings.³⁶

A surprising and reactionary step in the light of practical immunity from molestation and the attendance of numbers of "sober" if curious listeners at the meetings was taken about 1759, viz to keep the doors of the Meeting House or Miller's 'Chapel of Ease' at Meadowflats "bared" or Locked in the tem of worsherp", a practice which May Drummond strongly deprecated.³⁷ It is not surprising that Fothergill in his letters to his brother and sister already referred to, found the number of Friends at

29. "Kelso Meeting Book", (MS Vol 17) PP3,5.

30. "An Account of John Churchman"(1781), P 138: and "Kelso Meeting Book 1748", (MS Vol 17.) P 201.

31. "Memoirs of Catherine Phillips"(1797) P 38.

32. "Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill",(1843) P 452.

33. "Memoirs of Catherine Phillips", (1797) P 39.

34. "Account of John Churchman",(1781) P138.

35. "Life and Religious Labours of Samuel Neale" (1845) P 48.

36. MS Letter from E.Y.M to the London Y.M.1748. (Port.30, Nos 3 & 4)

37. JFHS Vol VII, P 105.

Edinburgh "very few" and "very few of these worthy of the name". He put the number at a maximum of thirty, but "there is scarcely one bound in heart to the testimony", and although he did not feel his visit fruitless, he was "afflicted to see and feel the extremely low state of things amongst them", and the shadow of death seeming to brood over the City.³⁸ Matters were only made worse in the Seventies by the schismatic policy of Wm. Miller of Craigentiny "the King of the Quakers" and a very absolute monarch, who ultimately shared the fate of his regal prototypes by being disowned. He rarely attended the regular Meeting House in, Peebles Wynd, but built 'a chapel of ease'—doubtless a room of his new business premises—opposite his residence in Meadowflats at the back of the Canongate, in which he presided on Sunday afternoons at irregular meetings of his own which were called in scorn "bread and cheese meetings" from the attenders being regaled with refreshments.³⁹ In such circumstances it was little wonder that according to his own admission "things in every respect are not altogether as we do wish",⁴⁰ and that visiting Friends had "a painfully exercising time".⁴¹ "But I need not particularise that place", wrote Fothergill; "the state of the Society in general is so."⁴²

These middle decades of the century show a steady disintegration of discipline and internal loyalties, as well as⁴³ different kinds of perversion, but this was not confined to Scotland. Apostasy was growing: Churchman sensed "the prevalence of a dark deistical spirit over many of the professors of truth", and records an example of it in the rejection and refusal of a former Friend near Montrose to allow him to hold a meeting, "alleging that it would do his people or servants no good, and as for himself, he thought he knew as much of the truth as we could inform him."⁴⁴ Breach of confidence seemed to strike a new note in domestic affairs, and in 1743, the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting gave its "Sense" that any member guilty of divulging to strangers or in public the smallest item of proceedings should be censured and suspended from "sitting in our Meetings Henceforth".⁴⁵ Another curious item in the Aberdeen Records implies abuse of privilege in respect of guides to Inverness by travelling Quakers who were suspected of making a sort of Cook's tour thither under the aspect of a missionary itinerary! "It is heer by Recommended; the quaint Minute runs, "that all frinds for the fouttr Dooe nearly Inquer Counsering the Charetor of Traveling frinds who askes for Guids for Inverness whether it be on the accompt of Curiosity or for the Publick Servies of truth and if one any other accompt then for the Servies of truth, then no Guids ar for the futter to be allowed to them."⁴⁶ Possibly some

38. Crosfield's "Memoirs", (1843) PP449, 452.

39. "Memorials of Hope Park", PP14-15: v also "The London Chronicle", Sept. 3-5, 1778 P 229.

40. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book" 1730, (MS Vol 13), P 71.

41. JFHS. XlII, Pl2. 42. Crosfield's "Memoirs", (1843) P449.

43. MS. Letters of London. Y.M. 1750, 1775, (Bundle 66⁽⁶⁾ of Aber. MSS)

44. "An Account of John Churchman", (1781) PP143, 140.

45. "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4.) P189. cf PP201-2.

46. "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4.) P243 unnumbered.

unfortunate incidents and experiences may lie behind such excursions, as complaint is general at this time about "a torrent of libertinism", intemperance and other proscribed habits common among the Quaker youth. Even William Miller's example and conduct as a leader of Friends cannot be sactioned as a healthy one, for he delegated parts of his official duties to his secretary Notman in a quite unconstitutional way, and ran counter to an honoured tradition of the Society by boasting to an American Friend that he had a sermon ready written for every Sunday in the year.⁴⁷

All these facts and tendencies were symptoms and signs of a grave decline in the Quaker enterprise in Scotland. They contrast strangely with the information received by the London Yearly Meeting through "Epistles from Wales, North Britain, Ireland etc" circ. 1760-1780⁴⁸ in which "love and unity" are stated to be "generally preserved", truth to prosper in the minds of many, a considerable number of convincements to be taking place, and "a considerable number of well disposed youth to be appearing in various parts". These excerpts must be taken to apply chiefly to Wales and Ireland. Admittedly, one or two bright patches still existed in Scotland, especially in Aberdeenshire, as will be mentioned presently, but these exceptions could hardly be held to justify such satisfactory accounts as regards the Scottish situation generally. It was not till about 1785 that the tide began to turn a little. If further evidence is needed of the serious reduction in numbers and the low ebb of the Society as a whole in Scotland, it is furnished in Catherine Phillip's thankfulness for the few who still "stand as monuments of the divine power in this barren and almost desolate land",⁴⁹ and Oxley's lament over "this poor nation" in which the Society has fallen away from the old paths and the ancient purity and zeal of the fathers.⁵⁰ The situation, especially in the Midland counties was "very mournful". About 1750 only "a faithful remnant" could be said to be left. Attendances at worship were very poor even on Sundays, and most week-day meetings as well as several Monthly Meetings almost ceased to be held. Women's Meetings were irregular or suspended altogether. Offices remained unfilled and Scotland had no representative for a time to the London Yearly Meeting. There was great slackness in administering the rules and enforcing the discipline upon which great hopes had been built a century before, and trifling things were confused with, or substituted for, matters

47. "Memorials of Hope Park", PP 14, 15.

48. v "Extracts from Epistles from the Yearly Meeting in London to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings of Friends in Great Britain, Ireland and elsewhere", 1762, 1778, 1779, 1780.

49. "Memoirs of Catherine Phillips", (1797) P40. cf also, P 200.

50. Oxley's "Journal", (1837) P 283.

of first importance.⁵¹ It also became increasingly difficult to determine who were entitled to be considered members and who were not. About 1760 the London Yearly Meeting began to face the situation seriously, and a system of special visits by Ministers through the country was organised and 'findings' reported. Fothergill's visit in 1764 was not an official one, by authority of the Yearly Meeting, but its purpose was the same, to take stock of every meeting of the Society in Scotland, to visit even "odd stragglers under our name", and to endeavour to improve and restore their discipline.⁵² But the lamentable situation was to show no sign of improvement for another twenty years.

The only bright spots during these years, comparatively speaking, were Aberdeen, Kingswells, Old Meldrum, Ormiston in East Lothian, and, strange to relate, Stirling. Churchman, Neale and Fothergill all noted the largeness of their meetings in Aberdeen to their great "satisfaction", Fothergill's audience being due to the energy and alacrity of David Barclay.⁵³ At Kingswells, Churchman's meeting was attended by "many friends and others, truth owning the service which was cause of humble rejoicing", and at Old Meldrum "many people came" and he found several Friends "here tender and valuable".⁵⁴ In 1756 Neale claimed to have found the largest body of Friends in Scotland at Inverurie, and at Old Meldrum "a sensible body.. concerned at heart for the growth and increase of the Truth", the meetings being "open and comfortable".⁵⁵ By Fothergill and Oxley's time, Old Meldrum had the largest number of members of any surviving meeting with whose fellowship he was amply satisfied.⁵⁶ The leaders of it were the venerable Robert Harvey, a great traveller, who had visited most of the meetings in England, Wales and Ireland⁵⁷ and died in 1788,⁵⁸ and John Elmslie. In 1748 the latter signed a letter from the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting intimating "a concern in many to enquire after our Doctrine in these parts", which Friends were fostering.⁵⁹

For a number of years Ormiston was a considerable centre of Quakerism. Two daughters of William Miller the

-
51. cf "London Yearly Meeting during 250 years" (1919), PP 38ff.
 52. Crosfield's "Memoirs" (1843) PP 447-8. Further reference to this visit will be found in the Supplementary Chapter on Discipline.
 53. Crosfield's "Memoirs" (1843) P 452.
 54. "Account of John Churchman", (1781) P 141.
 55. "Life and Religious Labours of Samuel Neale" (1845) PP 48-9.
 56. Crosfield's "Memoirs" (1843), P45, and Oxley's "Journal", (1837) P280. In and around Old Meldrum there were 20 families in 1780. (v "Memoirs of Sarah Stephenson" (1807) P53.)
 57. v "Piety Promoted" (1854) Vol. III, P 163: cf Neale's "Life" (1845) P96; and "Life and Travels of John Pemberton" (1844) P263.
 58. "Aber. Register of Burials" (MS Vol. 9. Euston) P 9.
 59. Port. 30. No. 1. Letter of 28-2mo-1748.

second settled into married life there. The elder, Marie, married John Christy an Ulster Friend⁶⁰, who with his two brothers is credited with the introduction of bleaching and potato cultivation into Scotland.⁶¹ The Christy family, which became prolific, was the main support of Quakerism in East Lothian, and John Christy's residence was the place of meeting. There was also a considerable family of Wight in Ormiston and Edinburgh during the latter half of the century.⁶² About the same time there were also Christys in Tranent,⁶³ and there may have been a few friends in Saltoun Parish.⁶⁴ John Churchman and Catherine Phillips both had good and large gatherings at Ormiston, and with John Christy as guide, Mrs Phillips paid a missionary visit to North Berwick where she knew not of any meeting held before, and although they encountered "a dark spirit" in getting any place to meet, they at length secured a large granery where they had a good meeting with "solid" people.⁶⁵

Although her "spirit was exercised" about holding a meeting in Stirling as it appeared "to be a high professing place"⁶⁶ and she did not do so in the end, Fothergill was freely granted the use of the Court House in the Town Hall by the Magistrates, most of whom attended his meeting which was "to good satisfaction, being favoured with the extension of heavenly humbling virtue",⁶⁷ though no convincements are recorded. About this time Bannockburn was divided into four districts or "fields" in one of which, Quakerfield, many of the residents, according to local tradition, were Quakers, but there was no meeting.⁶⁸ They would naturally worship at Stirling.

In these forty-five years there was the usual influx of travelling and missionary Quakers into Scotland, but a new note appears in the Records, viz, that a good number of them, individually designated, were "not publick". They totalled nearly two hundred approximately of whom 40% were women, an unusual proportion.⁶⁹ There is little outstanding in their travels to record. The marvel was that so many came when Fothergill only

60. "Edin Monthly Meeting Book" 1730, (MS Vol.13) PP 8-9.

61. "Memorials of Hope Park", P 12. One of these, Alexander, seems to have carried on George Swan's business for some years and then settled as a bleacher at Luncarty, Perthshire.

62. W.F. Miller's MSS Album, "Some Records of Births etc", (Euston Lib.1918) P 58.

63. v W.F. Miller's MSS Album, "Some Records of Births etc", P 12.

64. Two are noted as surviving about 1795 in Sinclair's "Statistical Account of Scotland", Vol.X, P 255.

65. "Memoirs of Catherine Phillips"; (1797) P 38.

66. Ibid, P 40.

67. Crosfield's "Memoirs" (1843). cf. PP 449 and 451.

68. Winchester's MS. Notes P2. "Taylor's Building", Quakerfield, has no Quaker significance at all. Bannockburn is mentioned in "The British Friend"; (1847) P 238.

69.69. Based on W.F. Miller's lists in JFHS X11, PP179-80. (not including again those mentioned on PP180-1) and X111. PP 5-13.

visited "a few scattered poor individuals, where we could find them" between Perth and Dundee and Urie,⁷⁰ unless it was that despite everything, they still had something left of their incurable hope of finding an open door "to those not professing with us"⁷¹ In 1780 Sarah Stephenson, a Wiltshire Friend with five others visited Old Meldrum and Urie where they were treated "with much respect" by Robert Barclay, Great-grandson of the Apologist, though he was not a Quaker. In Edinburgh they had "close painful labour"⁷², and a very similar experience awaited Sarah Grubb and Mary Proud in 1782, at Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Old Meldrum.⁷³

No foreign Friend certainly knew Scotland better than John Pemberton of Philadelphia, and his travels in the Lowlands and Highlands are most interesting. With his friends he entered Scotland by the East in 1785 and after a meeting in a horse-school at Haddington he travelled to Edinburgh and thence to Inverness by the East coast, Donside, and the Moray coast. At Fochabers, the Duke and Duchess of Gordon attended the Quaker's meeting.⁷⁴ The next year Pemberton was back in the North and spent some time in the Borders, visiting Hawick, Selkirk, and Jedburgh, where the Friends "had very different treatment from what dear Samuel Bownas met with". At Dumbarton they received an unusually good reception and were offered by the Magistrates the Freedom of the Burgh.⁷⁵

Pemberton was twice in Scotland in 1787, in April when he travelled through Galloway to Port-Patrick and later had an informal meeting with the Presbytery of Irvine; and in August with Thomas Wilkinson, his companion also in the Highlands. Dumfries and Ayrshire, especially the Cumnocks and Kilmaurs, proved themselves inhospitable, but St. Andrew's where a haughty ecclesiastical and scholastic tradition seemed to the Friends to promise little, proved a welcome surprise. Pemberton however could not resist a characteristic reflection on its ruined Cathedral. During their tour in Fife, the Quakers also visited Anstruther where Chalmers was only a child of seven.⁷⁶

-
70. Crosfield's "Memoirs", (1843) P449.
 71. cf "Memoirs of Catherine Phillips" (1797) P40. For another instance of their incurable optimism, v Letter from Herts Friends, 1790 in "Kelso- Meeting Book" 1748, P 52.
 72. "Memoirs of Sarah Stephenson" (1807), PP52-6: 122-4.
 73. "Life of Sarah Grubb", (1794) PP 50-2, 55.
 74. "Life of John Pemberton", (in "Friends Library" Vol. VI) P 329.
 75. Ibid, PP 339-341.
 76. Ibid, PP 341-2, 346, 353. cf Wilkinson "The Last Journey of John Pemberton", PP 3-10.

Pemberton seemed well satisfied generally with the reception he and his message got in Scotland, and there is a welcome relief in his pages from the Jeremiads of most other travellers of those years.

During this period, the two great centres of hospitality for 'public' and other travelling Friends were the Ormiston's house at Kelso and the Miller's residence at Craigentenny. Three generations of the Ormiston--all Charles--kept the meeting going at Kelso for well over a century, and even in its lowest days, they continued to entertain generously every Friend from over the Border and beyond who made Kelso his first halting-place in Scotland. Most of the two hundred or so Friends that Miller computes between 1741 and 1785 visited Kelso. The Ormiston's were related by marriage to the Miller's,⁷⁷ and whatever may be levelled against the autocratic 'King of the Quakers' it cannot be denied that he had a large benevolent heart. Craigentenny was a well-known social centre, many of whose guests "were the elite of the Society in this country and America"⁷⁸ and not content with entertaining poor travellers, William Miller furnished them with guides for many days together at his own expense, both of which were uncommon practices among resident Quakers in Scotland.⁷⁹

77. "Memorials of Hope Park", P 13.

78. Ibid, P 25; and also P 26 etc.

79. "Journal of Joseph Oxley", (1837) P 283.

224

CHAPTER VIII.

"QUAKERS IN THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS, AND
THEIR CONTACTS WITH JACOBITISM"

§1.

For full twenty years, from 1658 to 1678 there are no records of any Quaker's presence or activity in the Highlands. According to Thomas Story there was an anonymous travelling Friend in these parts, fourteen years prior to his first visit,¹ i.e. about 1678, but it was not till after the Revolution that Friends gave any serious attention to the Highland area, and for the next century there was a series of Quaker visits and tours with a large gap of nearly eighty years in the 18th century.

In 1692 Story, with Rudd and Bowstead, reached Inverness from Nairn. They had a very courteous reception and reverent attention from the populace all through, and even the civil guardsman who refused ^{Rudd} entrance to the Episcopal church "gave us no hard words, nor shewed any Passion in his Gesture"² On the Saturday, Story refused to discuss Predestination to eternal damnation with an interlocuter, but insisted on pressing his views upon the latter. On the Sunday, Rudd and Bowstead intercepted the church people at strategic points on their way to and from worship, and were listened to with obvious interest which the priest-in-charge wisely decided not to interrupt. In the evening a number of officers of the local garrison visited the Quakers at their inn after dinner, followed by a large number of townspeople who filled the apartment to capacity, and so friendly and reverent was the meeting which followed, led by Rudd and Bowstead, that it might have been an ordinary Quaker meeting. The following morning the officers returned, and after conference with them, the Friends crossed to the Black Isle "but found no farther Concern on that Side", upon which they returned again to Inverness.³

Passing over the unimportant visit of Thomas Wilson and Dickenson to the Highlands where they landed from their visit to America in 1694 and "travelled from thence by land into Cumberland",⁴ the next visit of any moment was the tour of Andrew Jaffray, Barclay and others in 1697 into the West Highlands, "where no Friends had ever been before".⁵ During their three days' itinerary from Aberdeen to Inverness, they exercised various

1. "Journal" (1747), P 62.

2. Ibid, P 66.

3. Ibid, PP 66-7.

4. "A Brief Journal of .. Thomas Wilson," (1784) P 42

5. "The Record Book of Friends of the Monthly Meeting at Urie" in JFHS VII, P 189.

public and private ministrations at Fochabers, Elgin, Forres, and elsewhere. Passing down the lochs of the Caledonian Canal, they were entertained at Lochiel's seat near Loch Arkaig. From Auchnacarry, Jaffray made an excursion to the garrison at Inverlochy, treated the Commanding Officer to a discourse on the Heavenly warrior, which was well received, and "had a notable opportunity" with the chaplain before a gathering of soldiers.⁶ When he returned to Lochiel's, the four Quakers had a "very good meeting" with Barclay's Highland relations and "several people that understood English" were "evidently reached".⁷ The younger Cameron convoyed them for several miles on their way back to Inverness. A very satisfying conference between three representative townsmen and Barclay and Jaffray on the other side, was followed by an intensive Sunday's propaganda in the streets after Church services, and in the Friends' quarters, on both of which occasions large and peaceable audiences of people were "exceedingly attentive and sober". Jaffray finished the day by visiting Hay the old Bishop of Moray who was ill, and on the Monday they set out for Aberdeen again.⁸ Three years later, in 1700, he was back in Inverness with his daughter Margaret and other Friends.⁹

A long hiatus in Quaker visitation of the Highlands from 1700 to 1779 was all the more remarkable owing to the state of confusion and disintegration in the Church both on the Presbyterian and Episcopal sides, and the strife caused by the Patronage Act of 1712. But the time was past when such lack of solidarity and spiritual cohesion promised a hopeful seed-bed for the "Truth". In 1779 Isaac Ritson of Cumberland, a youthful Quaker Goldsmith, schoolmaster, medical student, erratic litterateur, and intimate of Dr. John Brown, toured the Highlands "with only a few shillings in his pocket; but such was the kindness he experienced in Caledonia, that on his return in about twelve months, he made a pretty respectable appearance, being well clothed, and no longer the humble pedestrian, but mounted on a pony."¹⁰

No Friend was more widely travelled in the Highlands and the Orkneys than John Pemberton. He was also in the Lowlands in three consecutive years, 1785, 1786 and 1787 with different companions, and enjoyed a great deal of kind hospitality both religious and social from ministers and people alike.

6. Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd ed) PP 365-6.

7. Ibid, P 366

8. Ibid, P 367.

9. "Memorials of Hope Park", (1886) P 5.

10. "Jollie's Cumberland Guide and Directory", (1811) PP 53-4.

In 1785 during a tour of Ross, Sutherland and Caithness, three ministers with Lord Ankerville and Sir Hector Monroe attended their meeting at Tain: in Orkney, churches were thrown open to the Friends for many of their meetings, and Provost Lindsay of Kirkwall placed his house at their disposal as their base of operations; while at Thurso, an audience of 700 assembled in the Church to hear the Quaker message.¹¹

The next year Pemberton was back in the Orkneys when no less kindness was shown to him and his friends, and they were actually permitted to hold a crowded meeting in St. Magnus' Cathedral, the first Quaker meeting ever held in any Scottish Cathedral and probably in any cathedral. The Orcadians, Pemberton found a well-conducted and well-read people, able to digest even books of the calibre of Mosheim's "Institutes". The Friends returned South by Dunkeld—where no Quaker meeting had ever been held previously—and Perth.¹²

In 1787, Thomas Wilkinson, the friend of Wordsworth who dedicated to him the poem "To the Spade of a Friend",¹³ travelled through Kintyre and the Highlands with John Pemberton. Wilkinson was greatly impressed with the scenery, and himself no mean Lake-land poet, wrote an "Address to the Highlands of Scotland", in praise of their natural glories and inhabitants.¹⁴ He has been not inaptly called "the St. Francis of Quakerism". At Southend, Rev. David Campbell, the blind parish minister with his daughter Margaret, entertained them most liberally while they held meetings round about, and even opened his church to them.¹⁵ From Argyll where they had intercourse with the Duke and his family, they passed through Dalmally and Glenorchy to Fort-William. From Fort-William, where they had encouraging meetings among the military and townspeople, they proceeded through the territories of the Macdonalds, Camerons and Frasers to Fort-Augustus and had some large meetings there. The Governor, Trapaud whose wife was a descendant of Jean Barclay and Lochiel, ordered the military Chapel to be used and the soldiers marched up in rank to the concluding meeting.¹⁶ Thence the travellers went to Inverness.

During their tour, Wilkinson found some time for mountaineering, working in the fields with peasants¹⁷ and visiting Culloden Moor. He characterised the Highlanders as "an amiable intelligent polished and hospitable people", whose ministers,

-
11. "Life of Pemberton", (Friend's Library) Vol. VI, PP 330-1.
 12. Ibid, PP 338-9.
 13. "Poetical Works", (1884) P 191. (§ of "Poems Proceeding from Sentiment and Reflection".)
 14. "The British Friend", 1848, PP 5-6.
 15. cf "Life of Pemberton", (Friends' Library Vol. VI.) PP 348-9.
 16. Wilkinson "The Last Journey of John Pemberton", PP 43-6.
cf "Life of John Pemberton", (Friends Library Vol VI.) PP 347-51.
 17. Probably from Wilkinson. Wordsworth got his inspiration for "The Solitary Reaper".

"numbers of whom I visited in giving notice of the meetings, seem many of them enlightened men". "There is something solemn", he added, "in a Highland congregation".¹⁸

Pemberton wrote from Carlisle to George Miller, son of George Miller the brewer, soon after the former had returned from Scotland,¹⁹ and in 1797 Miller himself, accompanied by Henry Tuke, visited Luss, Tyndrum and Inverary, at the last of which they held two meetings, one at the inn and the other on an early October evening in the Duke of Argyll's policies, which was largely attended "considering the smallness of this place".²⁰ Thence they continued to Oban. In 1799 George Miller travelled to Orkney by Perth, Inverness and Wick, but this tour was quite uneventful.²¹ Stephen Grellet visited Inverness from Kinmuck in 1811 holding meetings on the way in most of the Morayshire fishing towns, but his tour in the Highland area does not seem to have been very fruitful.²²

§ 2.

The Quakers in England suffered severely from the Jacobite army on the march to Derby and the retreat in 1745, but as we are concerned chiefly with their contacts in Scotland, and as some attention has been given to this in connection with Robert Barclay²³ and the question of Jesuitico-Quakerism, a few additional observations only remain to be made. As a general principle the Society of Friends could have no commerce with Jacobitism either religiously or politically, and in actual practice had no sympathy with their insurrectionist policy or methods. Their loyalty to the Stuarts as a dynasty ceased with the reigning monarchs. The loyal Addresses to the Throne after both the Jacobite Rebellions have already been adduced,²⁴ and were practically unanimous; and further evidence of their loyalty to the Hanoverians is afforded by the material aid they gave to the Duke of Cumberland's forces in the pursuit of the young Pretender's army North to Carlisle.²⁵ To this general attitude however, there were occasional exceptions like Jane Stuart the natural daughter of James II. who lived as a recluse at Wisbech in the Fen Country but travelled once to Scotland to see her brother,

18. FQE, Vol XXVII, (1893) P 283.

19. Letter dated 7-1mo-1788 in "Memorials of Hope Park", P 30.

20. Letter to his wife in "Memorials of Hope Park", P39.
cf JFHS XIII, P 15.

21. "Memorials of Hope Park", PP 42-3.

22. "Memoirs of Grellet", (1860) Vol I, PP 178-9.

23. Braithwaite however is not entitled on the available evidence to call Barclay a Jacobite. ("The Second Period of Quakerism", 1921. P 179)

24. v ante, Book II, Ch. XVlll, P 231.

25. cf however Braithwaite's "Second Period", P 199.

26. cf JFHS XXI, PP 18-19.

'the old Pretender'.²⁷ May Drummond was also an ardent Jacobite and irritated many of her friends by boasting of "my worthy cousin Perth".²⁸ Jonathan Forbes of Brux near Alford joined the young Pretender's forces, and was present at Culloden. There ^{were} cases too in which Friends, if not actually Jacobites, coquetted in a very compromising and suspicious fashion with Jacobitism. Robert Barclay— 'Robert the Strong',—grandson of the Apologist, and his wife, Una Cameron of Lochiel²⁹, are alleged to have had a full length portrait of Prince Charles Edward "before which they taught their children to bow every day, especially since the Cause of the Stuarts, whose blood mingled with their own, had been unfortunate!"³⁰ In the accounts kept by Laurence Oliphant of Gask ("the Auld Laird") one of the governors of Perth for the Prince in 1745-6, there is an item concerning Alexander Christy, the Luncarty bleacher, curious for its inconsistency. It was planned that the force mobilised under the Drummonds at Perth should join with that of Charles Edward on their return from Derby and besiege Stirling Castle. French cannon had been landed at Montrose and it was in connection with their transport from Perth that the entry in the Gask accounts was made— "To Mr. Christie, Quaker, for carrying up six Cannon to Down, £9-13-11½".³¹ There is little doubt that Christy was thus an unwitting contributor to the dénouement of Culloden, for these cannon tempted the Jacobites to besiege Stirling instead of pursuing the defeated troops of Hawley after Falkirk.

There was no bitterness between the Quakers and the Jacobites however, even when they were furthest apart. The incidents on the march to Derby, the plundering of an Aberdeen Friend, John Messer's chattels by the soldiers in 1716,³² and the similar raids on Areskine's and Miller's houses in 1745 were only the irresponsible looting which is a traditional adjunct of most campaigns. In face of the courteous and hospitable reception that Ritson, Wilkinson and Pemberton were all accorded in the Highlands after the "Forty-five" it is evident that between the two parties, quæparties, there was no gulf of animosity fixed, but neither was there any community of sympathy.

27. "The Friend", Vol. VI, (1848) P 70.

28. ie the titular Duke of Perth.

29. v ante, Book II, Ch. VII, P/30.

30. Miller MSS Vol. I, P 42.

31. TLK. Oliphant's "The Jacobite Lairds of Gask"; (1870) P 168.
cf also PP 160, 161.

32. "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol. 3.) P 69.

CHAPTER IX.

"HOPE OF REVIVAL AND FAMOUS VISITORS TO SCOTLAND
c 1785 - 1820."

Throughout the 18th century things had been steadily drifting from bad to worse, and about 1785 it seemed to be felt in the Society that the time was ripe for a fresh start to be attempted, and laxity and irregularities of various kinds to be checked. With indomitable pertinacity therefore, new Record books were procured¹, Meetings for Discipline were resumed regularly,² and their minutes kept; and vital statistics of Friends were registered with greater care and accuracy than they had been for years. Greater unification of the scattered Quaker forces in Scotland was also a desideratum. In 1786, one step of consolidation was taken. In 1764 there were still two Yearly Meetings in Scotland - Aberdeen and Edinburgh, each with their subordinate Quarterly and Monthly Meetings. Fothergill during his visit to Scotland that year was anxious to unite them, but for the sake of peace did not urge the matter "too vehemently" as he found William Miller 'the King' and Robert Barclay "inflexibly bent against uniting the Meetings".³ In 1786, however, it was decided to amalgamate them, and a special Epistle was received from the London Yearly Meeting confirming their union under the appellation of the "Half Year's Meeting of North Britain," from the meetings being held biennially, at Edinburgh in the Spring, and at Aberdeen in the Autumn. The first of these Assemblies, later called "The General Meeting for Scotland" was held at Aberdeen in December 1786, and ranked as a Quarterly Meeting in England⁴. Owing to the dwindling condition of the Society, Aberdeen, Kinmuck, and Old Meldrum amalgamated as the one monthly meeting for all Friends North of the Tay, as also did Edinburgh and Kelso for all South of the Tay.⁵

By this time the Scots Quakers were becoming heartily tired of the tyranny and domestic anarchy of their 'King,' William Miller, and determined to make a disciplinary example of him. About the end of 1787 the Laird of Craigentenny, a widower of thirty years' standing, decided to add to his other irregularities a second marriage to a lady outside the Society. His defiance of the Monthly Meeting in being married by a "priest"⁶ would probably have been forgiven,

- Edin. Monthly Meeting Book, 1730" 3 Vol. P.P. 103.
1. cf. "Edinburgh Preparative Meeting Minutes 1787," (Fragment, in Register of Burials - MS Vol 11) P.1.
 2. cf. "Select Half Years' Meeting Book for North Britain 1787-1841", (Aber. MS Vol. 34) P.5.
 3. The list is given in Crosfield's "Memories of Samuel Fothergill", (1843) PP 448, 450.
 4. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book" 1730, (MS Vol.13) P.92; and "General Meeting Book 1786", (MS Vol. 46) P.1. Sometimes One 'Half Year's' Meeting was held at Kinmuck or Old Meldrum.
 5. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book" 1730, (MS Vol.13) P.88; "Kelso Meeting Book" 1748, (MS Vol. 17) PP 33-34.

as he acknowledged and repented of his offence, and as his offices in securing a new Meeting House in lieu of the condemned Peebles Wynd one were invaluable, had he not refused to discontinue his "Seperate" "bread and cheese Meetings".⁷ In this he would not yield, and the Half Year's Meeting disowned him in 1788,⁸ though he continued to administer the Meeting funds, for several years longer, and always appeared as a Friend.⁹

The Epistles of the London Yearly Meeting to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings throughout the country for 1787, 1789 and 1790 were even more sanguine and hopeful than their immediate predecessors of the imminence of a new season of revival.¹⁰ But in these Epistles there is no mention of Scotland, yet signs were not entirely lacking there. In 1784 a Northumberland couple, John and Elizabeth Wigham, only "under a strong sense of religious duty"—probably to encourage other English Friends similarly to strengthen the derelict Scottish ranks—settled near Edinburgh, whence they removed later to Aberdeenshire.¹¹ Both were ministers and did much to promote revival in Scotland. Thus in "this nearly desolate part of the heritage" was discipline "in good measure restored, and a few solid Friends were raised up to conduct the affairs of the Society".¹²

When the Glasgow Quaker body showed signs of returning life in 1788 they were in possession of their Meeting House at Stirling Square. George Dillwyn, an American Friend who visited Scotland in 1788 communicated to the Meeting for Sufferings "the pleasing account of the little Meeting at Glasgow". "I have several times thot", he added, "and even before I saw the place, that there was a seed in it which would be raised".¹³ Although the Stirling Square Meeting

7. Ibid, PP 106, 107.

8. Ibid, PP 109, 110 - cf. "General Meeting Book" 1786, (MS Vol 46) PP 22, 25.

9. cf. Ibid, P. 119, 121 etc. and "Memorials of Hope Park", (1886) PP 15-16.

10. "Extracts from Epistles from the Yearly Meeting to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings of Friends in Great Britain, Ireland and elsewhere."

11. cf. Wighams' Letter to Ann Reed in "Memorials of Hope Park", P 29: "General Meeting Minutes" 1834, (MS Vol 47) May 1840: "Memories of John Wigham" PP 11-13. For an estimate of the character and ministry of Eliz. Wigham, v. Letter from Edin. M.M. to Aberdeen M.M., paginated with "MS Register of Sufferings" P 39.

12. Crosfield's "Memoirs of Fothergill", (1843) P. 448 and "Memorials of Hope Park", P 26.

13. Letter from John Pemberton at Carlisle to George Miller, dated March 1788. (v. "Memorials of Hope Park", P 30.)

House which was sold in 1791 had by 1795 become a weaver's shop,¹⁴ and the Friends were worshipping again in a rented house, they had three good leaders round whom gathered the nucleus of the present meeting in Glasgow. These were Anthony Wigham, son of John Wigham¹⁵ from Edinburgh; William Smeal from Kirkliston; and John Robertson.¹⁶ About this time there were four Quakers in the Barony Parish,¹⁷ and Friends had begun to attract public notice again as was proved by Sarah Stephenson and her companion when "the rude rabble followed our chaise as we rode along the streets, behaving very unhandsomely, of which our singular appearance might be the occasion".¹⁸ In 1792 Mary Dudley a travelling Friend reached Glasgow from Perth and Dunblane "over some of the roughest road I ever encountered" and then passed on to Ayrshire, but her visit was not important:¹⁹ neither was that of Mary Alexander of Needham Market in 1805.²⁰

But no such hopeful signs were evident in the Borders. Mary Dudley found more to thrill her in the scenery of Teviotdale as she travelled by Hawick and Ancrum than she found in the Quaker remnant left in Kelso, where, far from there being any increase, there were "but few in membership, and perhaps not all of these really initiated into the fold by spiritual baptism". She mentions one or two choice souls still left with whom she had fellowship, but both in Kelso and Roxburgh, the general populace showed nothing more than a placid curiosity in the open meetings.²¹ By 1795 the Kelso Meeting had died out, and the year 1796 marks the last entries of visiting Friends in the Records.²² Sinclair alludes to Quakers about this time in Kelso²³ and Ednam,²⁴ but no number is mentioned, and he lumps together in Roxburgh nine "Cameronians and Quakers."²⁵ By 1804 there were but two families of Quakers in Hawick.²⁶

Edinburgh showed a dearth of leadership, but the situation was slightly better than the Borders, and while considerable numbers attended the public meetings of Friends, few applied for membership or showed any deep interest, except several College students.²⁷ The visiting Friends left the Capital with

-
14. Brown's "History of Glasgow, Paisley, and Port Glasgow" (1795), Book. I, P 107.
 15. cf "Memorials of Hope Park", P 26.
 16. Jas Brown "The Religious Denominations of Glasgow" (1850) Vol. I, 275.
 17. Sinclair's "Statistical Account of Scotland", Vol. XII, P 121.
 18. "Memoirs of Sarah Stephenson" (1807), PP 123-4.
 19. "Life of Mary Dudley", (1825) PP 151-2. cf JFHS XI, P 6.
 20. cf "Some Account of Mary Alexander", (1811) P 159.
 21. "Life of Mary Dudley", (1825) PP 145-8
 22. "Kelso Meeting Book" 1748, (MS Vol 17) P 213.
 23. "Statistical Account of Scotland", Vol. X, P 585.
 24. Ibid, Vol XI, P 306.
 25. Ibid, Vol XIX, P 119.
 26. "Some Account of Mary Alexander", (1811) P 152.
 27. "Life of Mary Dudley", (1825), PP 148-50.

heavy hearts or 'peculiar exercise', for its day seemed past,²⁸ and Friends like George Miller the gingham mercer and Classical scholar of Nicholson Street were only beautiful relics.²⁹

A small handful of Quakers remained in Perth and Kinnoull,³⁰ but several were of very doubtful quality as Mary Dudley and Mary Alexander both found³¹ to their "exercising labour"; while in Dundee the latter had a "satisfactory meeting" in an 'unevangelised' part of the town.³² Apparently there were still left a few "Quakers who began to mingle amongst us and to groan in spirit."³³

But Aberdeenshire still held more Friends than all the rest of Scotland together, although the number of defections to the Church was greatest in the North, and the Women's Preparative Meetings of Aberdeen and Old Meldrum were both dissolved about 1800. Sinclair gives figures and unspecified numbers which cannot total less than 60-70, covering the Parishes of Keith-hall and Kinkell which heads the list with 38; Tarves: Inverurie: Bourtie: Chapel of Garioch, and Old Meldrum. The one Quaker family noted as being in Chapel of Garioch³⁴ was the well-known Donside family of the Cruikshanks of Balhaggardy, a township near to the Field of Harlaw. Mary Alexander made it her centre when she visited the Kinmuck and Old Meldrum groups, but she was not enthused with the condition of Quakerism in these parts; at Aberdeen itself things were not better, and the last survivor of the Ury Meeting was "a very ancient woman"³⁵ waiting for the consolation of Israel'. At Montrose the Friends' distinctive witness had virtually ceased, for about 1795 there was only four noted, and "the religious sects in Montrose....live in general in great harmony."³⁶ The Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders at London took a serious view of the general condition of Scotland in 1797 and sent to the Scottish Quarterly Meeting of Ministers and Elders a rather stiff epistle, which, while sympathising with their weakness in Scotland, complains of negligence in the Scots ranks through "too great an attachment to the concerns of this Life".³⁷

A considerable quota of travelling Friends in

-
28. Ibid; cf "Some Account of Mary Alexander" (1811), PP 152-4, 159-60.
 29. "Memorials of Hope Park", PP 21-23.
 30. cf Sinclair's "Statistical Account of Scotland", Vol. XVlll, P550.
 31. "Life of Mary Dudley", PP 150-1: "Some Account of Mary Alexander" PP 158-9.
 32. Ibid, P 158.
 33. "Dundee Past and Present" (2nd ed. 1910) P 54.
 34. "Sinclair's Statistical Account of Scotland", Vol. XI, P 502.
 35. "Some Account of Mary Alexander", (1811) PP 155-7.
 36. Sinclair's "Statistical Account of Scotland", Vol. V, P47.
 37. "Select Half Year's Meeting Book for North Britain" 1787-1841, (Aber. MS. Vol. 34) PP 16, 18.

addition to those mentioned visited Scotland between 1787 and 1797 when the long and steady stream of missionaries seem to have ceased. In this last decade there were approximately twenty-four men, and thirty-two women, a total of fifty-six, with an unusual preponderance of women.³⁸ The only activity of any interest was the extensive visit which George Miller and Henry Tuke paid to the West of Scotland in 1797 embracing Greenock, Dumbarton and Luss and finishing at Inverness, during which they experienced "a deal of rudeness" in some of the towns near Glasgow. This may be called the last official missionary tour in Scotland, and subsequent Friends who visited Scotland did so privately. The hopes of revival which ran high about 1783 were doomed to failure. The time for any possible resurrection was past. Only the Quaker's new emphasis on social and humanitarian activities in the early 19th century perpetuated their life a little longer.³⁹ In 1807 the Kinmuck School was wound up on account of the paucity of the scholars, and the schoolmaster dismissed. Thereafter the accumulated dividends of the salary were devoted to sending more needy children to Wigton or Ackworth.⁴⁰

In 1811, Stephen Grellet the French Quaker and the most famous international missionary of the Society since Penn, visited Scotland, where he found the strength of the Friends sadly waned. In most places however that he visited, including Jedburgh, Lockerbie, Edinburgh, Kirkcaldy, Dundee, Arbroath, Stonehaven and Glasgow, the people flocked to hear him or see him sit in silence and often he felt "a holy solemnity over all". At Kirkcaldy the minister magnanimously broke off the service he was conducting to allow the waiting crowd to flock into the Church to hear Grellet. At most of these gatherings there seems to have been remarkable scenes. Aberdeen however gave a chilling reception "I feel myself" he says "in this place of high religious profession as in a prison house encircled with darkness; my way is entirely closed up from having a meeting among the inhabitants, over whom I mourn silently; and I find no place for the rest and relief of my exercised spirit."⁴¹ A subsequent visit in 1833⁴² was unimportant.

The next distinguished visitors came in 1818 in the persons of Elizabeth Fry of Norwich, accompanied by her brother Joseph J. Gurney and his wife. It was, not unnaturally, with the greatest reluctance that Mrs Fry contemplated the tour, but a strong sense of duty, "a real putting forth" at length

38. These figures are taken from W.F. Miller's list in JFHS. XI.11, 13-15

39. v post, Ch. XI.

40. "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting 1786-1832" (Aber. MS. Vol. 24) P125.

41. "Memoirs of Stephen Grellet", (1850) Vol. I, PP 175-9.

42. Ibid, Vol. II, P 418.

impelled her.⁴³ The important and invaluable contribution which they made to the enterprise of prison and criminal reform was only, in their intention, a subordinate end, but one beside which the real object of their tour—the concerns of the Friends in Scotland—paled into significance.⁴⁴ At Aberdeen, Mrs Fry found little but depression and several other Friends bent on the same futile mission, for about this time there was dissension in the Two Month's Meetings.⁴⁵ The "General Meeting" then in session which they attended "was ended under a feeling of quiet peace", and the Gurneys enjoyed the fellowship especially of their old friends the Wighams and their family; but there was no inspiration for Mrs Fry. At Kinmuck the same depression settled down even more oppressively on both her and Joseph Gurney, who "spoke as if he felt it necessary to warn some to flee from their evil ways and from the bondage of Satan".—an instinct not without foundation as afterwards was known,—although the meeting concluded in a happier frame of mind.⁴⁶ Ury was now only a pensive memory.⁴⁷

At Edinburgh the Quaker party attracted considerable public notice both in the Press and from the populace who flocked to their meeting, and the morning before they left, a notable company of citizens met with them for breakfast and fellowship. In Glasgow much of their time, as in Edinburgh, was occupied in prison exploration, and such meetings as they held were obviously uncongenial to Mrs Fry. Apparently she also visited Hawick, but of this there is no record.⁴⁸

A less well-known but no less honourable Quaker lady who visited Scotland about the beginning of the 19th century was Deborah Darby of Salop, one of the formative influences in the life of Elizabeth Fry,⁴⁹ but more famous still as a real spiritual mother to Dr. Henry Duncan of Ruthwell, the founder of Savings Banks in Scotland, when he was a young minister of thirty. Mrs Darby must have been at least four times in Scotland. She was up in 1786.⁵⁰ Miller notes her in his list for 1797.⁵¹ She met Duncan in 1804, and she was back in Edinburgh in 1807. Few more spiritual romances in the ranks of the Scottish clergy have been written than the life story of Henry Duncan by his son and biographer. In his time the overwhelming majority of the

-
43. "Memoir of Elizabeth Fry" by her Daughters, (1847) Vol. I, P328.
 44. Ibid, 335. (The great social work of the Gurneys will be dealt with in the next chapter)
 45. "Select Half-Years Meeting Book for North Britain" 1787-1841, (Aber. MS. Vol 134) P 58.
 46. Ibid, PP 329-331. 47. Ibid, P 329.
 48. "Memoir of Elizabeth Fry" (1747), Vol. I, PP 331-2.
 49. "Memoir of Elizabeth Fry" by her daughters, (1847) Vol. I, PP 59-60.
 50. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book" 1730, (MS Vol. 13) P 86.
 51. JFHS. Xl11, 15.

Scottish ministry and laity were 'Moderates', and Dumfries and the South generally was the most unmixed of all. Duncan was no exception, and his pioneer organisation and captaincy of the "Ruthwell Volunteers"⁵² and light social gaieties occupied, it is to be feared, as much of his time and enthusiasm as the duties of his sacred calling.⁵³ Before 1804 there was "nothing to indicate that the marvellous change expressed by the word 'conversion' had yet taken place in his soul", and "as yet his mind was comparatively dark",⁵⁴ until on that fateful Presbytery Meeting day at Annan he learned that three Quakers were to hold a meeting in the town the same evening. He waited to attend it, despite clerical remonstrances, and so deeply moved was he by that meeting that he invited them to dine at Ruthwell Manse next day on their way to Dumfries. Mrs Phillips, Duncan's then unmarried sister, has left an account of the epoch-making address of Mrs Darby to her brother which melted the minister to tears and brought the whole household with the Quakers to their knees. Not content with this transferring experience, Duncan even followed the preachers to their next meeting at Dumfries.⁵⁵ If there is any doubt as to whether the Quaker's visit led him immediately to entire consecration to Christ, there is no doubt that it was the turning point of his life and of his ministry from a lifeless 'Moderatism' to earnest evangelical religion and ardent philanthropy. In the manuscript which was found in Dr. Duncan's pocket book, dated 1804, there is the frankest review of his past life followed by the three famous resolutions on renewed Christian faith and self discipline,⁵⁶ part of which was "regular self examination and attention to the operations of his own heart". "I will in this respect", added Duncan, "endeavour to follow the example of the very respectable sect of Christians known by the name of Quakers, whose principles and conduct in many particulars I think worthy of being adopted"⁵⁷ and these self-imposed rules he resolved to read daily till he knew them by heart.

It was always with manifest pleasure that Dr. Henry Duncan referred in after years to the visit of Mrs Darby and her good companions, and nowhere is it stated that he ever again appeared at the head of the "Ruthwell Volunteers" or any other volunteers save those who enlisted to be 'good soldiers of Jesus Christ' in Ruthwell Parish and beyond.

52. cf Hall's "Dr. Duncan of Ruthwell", PP 34-5. For a classical picture of Volunteering in the days of the French Revolution invasion scare, v D.M. Moir's "Life of Mansie Waugh" (1911), Ch XII, P 108. Chalmers held a similar position in St. Andrews' Volunteers (v Hanna's "Memoirs" (1854), Vol. I. P 68.)

53. cf "The British Friend", 1848. P 327.

54. GJC. Duncan "Memoir of Rev. Henry Duncan DD," P 51.

55. Ibid, PP 52-3.

56. Ibid, PP 55-6.

57. Ibid, P 56. cf Hall's account of events in her "Dr Duncan of Ruthwell", PP 42-4.

CHAPTER X."THE QUAKER CONTRIBUTION TO SOCIAL AND
HUMANITARIAN ACTIVITIES IN
SCOTLAND."

By the year 1820 the full effects of the Industrial Revolution on the masses of the people of Britain, aggravated by the deep depression and reaction consequent upon the long struggle of the Napoleonic War, were beginning to be definitely experienced and appraised. The long night of apathy to social and moral betterment which had lasted nearly four centuries began to break into a dawn pregnant with hope and revolt. A new era was being sensed not afar off, and the Quakers were among the foremost as always, who were prepared to hail any advance toward better and juster conditions. While none of their social and humanitarian contributions to be considered here, struck directly at the social and economic evils of the Industrial Revolution as such, the Friends were fully alive to the fact that the progress of civilisation, the increase and new distribution of population, and the changed face of society and commerce, automatically condemned institutions and traditions of a former day as inapplicable and obstructive to theirs. And as the religious consciousness began also to awaken to the new era and slowly to identify itself with the age of reform in the middle decades of the 19th century, so too the Quaker mind and attitude began to broaden remarkably and find points of appreciation and affinity in Scotland with such men as Norman McLeod (except in his views on war and peace); Erskine of Linlathen; McLeod Campbell; Henry Drummond; to a lesser degree; Livingstone; John G Paton; Mackay of Uganda; and most of all, Chalmers.

The social activities of the Friends in the first half of the 19th century may be grouped as follows;— Prison and Criminal Reform; Slavery; Famine Relief; Temperance.

(1.)

By far the most important outcome of the first visit of Mrs Fry and J.J. Gurney to Scotland in 1818, was the publication the following year of the latter's "Notes on a Visit made to Some of the Prisons in Scotland,..." an account of their investigations and observations which McGeorge termed "almost incredible." ¹ These revelations came as an unwelcome shock to all thoughtful and benevolent people— though they gladly realised the necessity of dragging the facts into the public light,—

1. "Old Glasgow", (3rd ed. 1888) P 133.

while some from selfish motives and interests gave the "Notes" a hostile reception² and tried in vain to contradict their assertions. Most of the numerous letters which Gurney and Mrs Fry received however encouraged them to persevere in their researches and enterprise.

These illuminating pages show that the prisons visited in Scotland may be grouped under three categories—the very bad; the comparatively good, ranging from the satisfactory to the meritorious, according to contemporary standards; and the moderately tolerable, free from the worst features common to most. In the first class were the gaols of Dunbar, Haddington, Montrose and Aberdeen, in all of which conditions were shockingly bad.³ In the "tolerable" class, the new gaol at Cupar-Fife may be with difficulty be included as the best of the small urban prisons and many others too numerous to detail.⁴ The remainder may be termed the "good". The new Bridewell of Aberdeen in contrast to the old Prison which badly needed to be razed and rebuilt, showed many welcome features of improvement.⁵ Edinburgh as a city was outstanding for enlightenment and progress in all its prison polity.⁶ Even the old Canongate Tolbooth was far in advance of its contemporaries elsewhere. The Calton Gaol then about six years old had many amenities including not only an infirmary but an isolation ward, and good religious ordinances, but the palm fell to the Edinburgh and Glasgow Bridewells, the latter of which was almost self supporting,⁷ though its situation and planning left something to be desired.⁸ Even the best of these however were far from perfect, overcrowding, lack of classification, and, in the case of the gaols, lack of employment, and injurious social intercourse, neutralising to a considerable extent the worthier features.

In contradistinction to Aberdeen and Glasgow, whose large numbers of criminals were largely attributable to the rise of big factories, the prisons of Forfarshire were practically untenanted, and the latter is explained largely by the religious and Scriptural education of the masses, then almost universal in the county; and partly by the fact that any rare prisoners in its gaols found themselves usually in solitary confinement not subject to the contamination of "large and lawless and dissolute companies"⁹

-
2. For the main reasons of "Encyclop. Britannica", 11th ed., Vol 22, P 363. (Art on "Prisons".)
 3. Gurney's "Notes", PP 18-22, 27, 28-30, 50-53.
 4. Ibid, PP 22-41 partim.
 5. Ibid, PP 30-3.
 6. Ibid, PP 41-9.
 7. cf Ibid, P 131.
 8. Ibid, PP 54-6.
 9. Ibid, P III.

This latter was one of the two great demoralising evils which did so much to retard the reformation of the criminal and multiply Crime, and was most pronounced in Glasgow prison. The other evils were physical and material, ranging from the closest confinement and most loathsome and insanitary conditions in the cells to positive torture of unhappy inmates at Haddington and Aberdeen.¹⁰ These evils were accentuated where gaolers 'lived out' or there was no visiting chaplain and they were unfortunately prevalent in Scotland.¹¹ But what roused the righteous anger of the Gurneys most was the cruel and dastardly treatment meted out to debtors¹² and even more to lunatics. Asylums were then very scarce in Scotland, and lunatics and mentally-deranged persons were either allowed to roam freely, a danger to the community, or immured in the Gaols in solitary confinement in the most bestial and putrid conditions. To the horrible instances of such confinement at Haddington,¹³ Kinghorn,¹⁴ and Perth old Jail,¹⁵ which came under his own observation, Gurney added another, reported from the prison of Inverness, which was even worse.¹⁶

The happiest concomitant of this tour of the prisons for the Gurneys was the kind reception and facilities that the Magistrates of the various cities and towns gave them, and the manifest interest and sympathy which they showed in their investigations. At the Calton, Edinburgh, Montrose, and Glasgow, either the Provost or some of the Council accompanied the Friends to the prisons in person, and they found these civic leaders' views in most cases very similar to their own, and their policy fully in line with the needs of the hour. But the general impression left on the minds of the Quakers was "that a degree of misery, quite unfair and quite unnecessary, was endured by prisoners of all descriptions, in many, perhaps a majority, of the prisons in Scotland."¹⁷

The main object and achievement of the Friends' visit to these Prisons and Bridewells was the systematic collection of data; they hardly expected more. But immediate and tangible results were not wanting, for it is practically certain that it was Gurney's revelation of the Haddington lunatic's case that impelled Sheriff Horne to have him humanely cared for,¹⁸

10. Ibid, PP 19, 29.

11. Ibid, P 105.

12. Ibid, PP 107-8

13. Ibid, PP 19-20.

14. Ibid, PP 22-3.

15. Ibid, PP 39-40

16. Ibid, PP 108-9

17. Gurney's "Notes", (1819) P110.

18. Ibid, P 20n.

while the Quakers were permitted, through the instrumentality of the Magistrates of Glasgow, to establish a Committee of Ladies to visit and elevate the women in Duke Street Prison and the Bridewell.¹⁹ This was a branch of the "British Ladies' Society for visiting Prisons", a scheme so dear to the heart of Mrs Fry that it became identified with her name as her distinctive life work. In 1827 she yielded at last to numerous requests for an explanation of the principles and methods of the Society and published her "Observations on the Visiting, Superintendence and Government of Female Prisoners", a slender volume packed with sage counsel and insight for all concerned, and dealing in her own way with the same topics as her brother did in his "General Observations".²⁰

Mrs Fry was twice again in Scotland, in 1834 and 1838. The 1834 visit was a happy blend of holiday amid the glories of Loch Tay, the Trossachs and Argyllshire, and of service of the Kingdom of God.²¹ On this occasion she was much more buoyant in heart than in 1818, in spite of "the weeping climate", and whether in her religious intercourse with servants and visitors at Highland inns, the inmates of the Edinburgh Prisons and Refuges, or former friends who welcomed her back to the Capital, "her's was a constant endeavour to leave some savours of good on all with whom she had any communication."²² She still kept a vigilant eye on the condition of the State prisons, and on her return home, sent to the authorities the results of her observations, and her recommendations for the hygienic, moral, intellectual and spiritual improvement of the prisoners, upon which the Home Office put its imprimatur.²³ She was materially helped in her crusade at that time by the founding of a "Prison Discipline Society" in Edinburgh whose progressive Christian policy created more public interest and knowledge.

In 1838 Mrs Fry paid her last and most important visit to Scotland, with her sister-in-law and two male Friends, travelling via Hawick, Edinburgh, Perth and Stonehaven to Aberdeen. There they resumed their fellowship with the Wigham family and had an excellent reception from some of the "serious inhabitants" including Principal Jack of King's College with whose family they breakfasted and the Provost, Sheriff, Town Clerk, and Bailie Blackie, in whose company they visited the prison to find it vastly improved through Blackie's activities, "in fact in excellent order".²⁴ To the practical interest and sympathy of the authorities with Mrs Fry's mission was added that of the local ladies who met the Quaker visitors at the Royal Hotel and planned the formation of a regular visiting Association or Committee. After a quick visit to Kinmuck where they found the Friends "a kind, serious, simple-hearted people," they were back in Aberdeen in consultation with

19. Ibid, PP 56-7.

20. Ibid, PP 112-139, & PP 145-170.

21. "Memoir" by her Daughters (1847), Vol. II, PP 193-8.

22. Ibid, P 197.

23. Ibid, P 200.

24. Ibid, P 280.

the principal officers of the Gaol, and so many ladies flocked to the hotel for the important conference that they had to meet in the large assembly room. Mrs Fry was the presiding genius of the meeting and an influential Ladies' Committee was formed for Aberdeen and district, with the Countess of Errol as Patroness, and the Provost's wife as President. The Provost, Sheriff, and many other gentlemen who attended "were most politely dismissed by our dear friend!"²⁵ After the meeting, a large mixed company, including magistrates, visited and inspected the Bridewell, and Mrs Fry's after address to the company on the institution was embodied in a letter to the Provost and chief civic heads of Aberdeen. In it she expressed her great satisfaction with many improvements in the Bridewell during the previous twenty years and enlarged chiefly upon the immediate desirability of female officers for the women prisoners and the certain benefit of the newly-appointed Committee.²⁶ On the Friends' return from the Bridewell, the Sheriff and Dr. Dewar, Principal of Marischal College came to the Hotel for a private discussion, especially of the new Prison Bill for Scotland.²⁷

From Aberdeen, Mrs Fry and her companions proceeded to Rennie Hill, where, one Saturday, "a large party of Magistrates, lairds and their ladies" met them to discuss prison reform. Sunday brought the remarkable meeting with the fishermen of Anstruther where the numbers were so large that they flocked to a neighbouring chapel and the service was cancelled to allow a Public Meeting of Friends, which the Friends used to the fullest advantage.²⁸

In Edinburgh the Quaker party along with their host, Alexander Cruikshank and their friends the Mackenzies of Seaforth had a very full and fruitful programme. The Executive of the Scottish Ladies Committee which had been active and self-sacrificing in the cause, organised a large meeting for ladies at the Royal Hotel "and the leading object of this meeting in extending the sphere of interest on behalf of poor prisoners... among the ladies of Edinburgh seemed to be fully obtained."²⁹ Later the same day Mrs Fry visited the Refuge with the Mackenzies and discussed the establishment of a Penitentiary, and all dined with Lord Mackenzie of Belmont and followed up the great subject of Mrs Fry's mission in their table-talk. The morning following, a breakfast party was held at Miss Mackenzie's with the same object, with Mrs Fry as the chief speaker: thereafter she and her hostesses visited the solitary wards of the Prison, and in the evening the Friends entertained at the Royal Hotel an influential company of fifty Magistrates and leading citizens for a round-table discussion on the new Scotch Prison Bill, and Prison Discipline in Scotland,

25. Ibid, P 281

26. Ibid, PP 281-3.

27. Ibid, P283.

28. Ibid, P284.

29. Ibid, P285.

with special reference to solitary confinement, which was giving Mrs Fry deep concern. She expounded fully her reasoned and conscientious objections to it, and the measures that accorded with her ideal.³⁰ After large Public Meetings for worship in Edinburgh and Leith, the Quaker party left for Glasgow.

They stayed at the George Hotel and the Lord Provost and other gentlemen called on Mrs Fry. She visited the Bridewell, and in the evening a large number of Glasgow ladies met at her hotel. The following day they went to Greenock accompanied by the Misses Mackenzie and had a large and important meeting with a hundred ladies which was "highly satisfactory". Mrs Fry visited the Gaol- a good one- and addressed the female prisoners. In the evening she conducted a crowded Public Meeting for worship in the Seamen's Chapel, and the next day held another large meeting of Greenock ladies and addressed the workpeople in a big factory.³¹

In Glasgow an Association was formed at a large meeting of ladies in the Friends' Meeting House and public interest was extended.

The last place in Scotland recorded as visited by Mrs Fry was Paisley, where the Magistrates not only gave the Friends every courtesy and facility but asked Mrs Fry to leave her recommendations in writing. The practical outcome some months later was the appointment by the Commissioners of the first Matron of Paisley Gaol and Bridewell, and Mrs Fry was given full credit for inspiring the new policy of female custody and other advances in prison polity.³² The question of juvenile criminals and offenders was as yet untouched. Even in 1819 when there was a large number, no attempt had been made to separate them from mature and hardened criminals.³³ It was not till 1850 or so that the need of drastic action was felt, and in this advance Sheriff Watson of Aberdeen was a pioneer.³⁴

(2).

To the Quakers falls the honour of being the first to raise a voice in England against slavery. As early as 1671 Fox showed himself opposed to it, and by 1761 the Society had got so far as to exclude from membership all who were found implicated in it, and issued appeals against the system. In 1783 they founded the first anti-slavery Society in England. Eleven years previously however Granville Sharp, the pioneer champion of the slaves in the legal arena had secured Lord Justice Mansfield's

30. Ibid, PP 286-7.

31. Ibid, PP 288-9.

32. Ibid, PP 289-90.

33. Gurney's "Notes", (1819) P43.

34. FQE. Vol.I, P80.

famous decree, and in-1787 several Friends joined Sharp, Clarkson and Wilberforce's Committee for the Abolition of the Slave Trade. Scotland was late in coming into line with enlightened Christian opinion and protest elsewhere, except for the courageous Manifesto of the Associate Synod of 1788;³⁵ and although in 1833 the emancipation of all slaves in the British colonies had become the law of the land, one branch of the Scottish Church had a long spoon in the cauldron of the slave trade till nearly the middle of the century.

One of the best-known advocates of the abolition of slavery in the British colonies was George Thompson, (1804-1878),- who although not a Friend, was actually allied with Friends in Scotland in the emancipation cause. In 1833 he delivered in Edinburgh a series of lectures which resulted in the formation of the "Edinburgh Society for the Abolition of Slavery throughout the World" and also lectured and took part in public discussions in Glasgow.³⁶ After an absence in America where he was a colleague of Lloyd Garrison and Whittier, he was back in Scotland, and in 1838 joined forces with Joseph Pease Senr.³⁷ (1772-1846) in his campaign against the deportation of the hill coolies of India to Mauritius and Guiana and in exposing their terrible conditions in India itself under the East India Company, especially after the Bengal famine of 1838. No two men were greater authorities on the Indian question than Pease and Thompson, for both had studied it at first hand in India. They linked up with the Aborigines' Protection Society and then commenced their Scottish tour, with their headquarters at Bridge-of-Allan. At Edinburgh at a meeting in the Waterloo Rooms, presided over by the Lord Provost, Pease spoke of the slave conditions of oppression and robbery under the East India Company and of the horrors of the Famine, and substantiated every statement. In Glasgow several important meetings were organised, one at Dr. Ralph Wardlaw's chapel, and one presided over by the Lord Provost which appointed a special committee to urge on Parliament the most pressing reforms and the redress of the worst injustices in India. In this enterprise Lord William Bentinck, Member for Glasgow, late Governor-General of Bengal, and many influential citizens cooperated heartily, and in 1839 the British India Society was formed.³⁸

In 1843 Thompson was back in Scotland, this time with Garrison for a crusade against American slavery, the great moral and religious issue which reveals the only sad and perhaps the solitary unchristian aspect of the great epic of the Disruption

35. M'Kerrow's "History of the Secession Church" (1848) PP 343-4. This Manifesto was the first and for long the only official expression of Church opinion on the Slavery Question, in Scotland.

36. v DNB. Vol. LVI, (1898) P 211.

37. His daughter, Elizabeth Pease Nichol, was expelled from the Society on her marriage to Prof. John Pringle Nichol of the chair of Astronomy, Glasgow University. Their son was Prof. John Nichol, of the chair of English at Glasgow.

38. v Stoddart "The Life of Elizabeth Pease Nichol" (1899) Ch. V. pp 72-81, 89; and Bell's "British Folks and British India Fifty Years Ago" (1892) PP 31-34: 30, 35 etc.

The mighty wave of religious feeling which produced the Disruption had quickened the national conscience even in ways which the Disruption leaders did not realise, and had predisposed "the better part of the population of such towns as Glasgow, Greenock and Edinburgh to a less lukewarm interest in matters affecting the larger humanity outside Great Britain,"³⁹ an observation which was true not only of the quickening of Foreign Mission enterprise but of the Anti-Slavery Cause. The Presbyterian Church in Ireland gave its magnificent help immediately and spontaneously to its dispossessed brethren in Scotland, but the Free Church did not even wait for corresponding aid from America but sent out Dr. Cunningham's deputation of appeal to the Presbyterian Body in the States at the end of 1843. Throughout Brown's pages there is not a single word of any bearing of the slave trade upon the financial help given by American churchmen to the Sustentation Fund of the Free Church,⁴⁰ and in most "lives" of Chalmers and other contemporary records, the policy and attitude of the Free Church on this question is passed over in silence. But any history of the Disruption which omits it is incomplete, for in Scotland it aroused a wave of righteous indignation. Into the fray the Quakers went heart and soul, and alongside of them were marshalled not only Garrison and Thompson, but Dr. Wardlaw, the great majority of the Established, Secession, and Relief Churches, and a large floating body of public opinion generally.⁴¹ These all coalesced in the Glasgow Emancipation Society which throughout 1845 kept the public attention directed to the grave impropriety of the Free Church's acceptance of financial aid from American churches that admitted slaveholders to their communion. Secession and Relief pulpits were opened to the men who led the anti-slavery crusade in America, and the lectures and speeches of Douglas, the escaped American slave, of Buffum, and of Wright, roused a very considerable popular animus against the policy of the Free Church, and the widespread slogan "Send back the money" was loud and clamant, in declamation, cartoon and scribble on every blank wall in Edinburgh.⁴² Chalmers's attitude to the problem, his entertainment of many American guests at Morningside during 1845, and his intercourse with Americans in which he went so far as to say that he hoped "this obtrusive spirit" of the abolitionists in trying to extort from the American Missionary Board a declaration in favour of emancipation, would "have an effective check put upon it"⁴³— all these added fuel to the flame.

39. Stoddart's "Life of Elizabeth Pease Nichol", (1899) Pl15.

40. cf "Annals of the Disruption" (1884), PP 544-550. The Quakers believed that the Free Church lost much potential assistance through its attitude to Slaveholders. (v "British Friend", 1848, P239)

41. cf "Memorials of Hope Park" (1886), Pl70.

42. "The British Friend" 1846. (PP 97-8): "Memorials of Hope Park", (1886) P 170.

43. Hanna's "Memoirs" (1854), Vol. II, P 725.

A great public Demonstration organised by the Glasgow Emancipation Society and presided over by Dr. Wardlaw was held in Glasgow on 21st April 1846. Garrison harangued the packed audience for over an hour and a half, and the proceedings were of the liveliest character. A Memorial was sent to the Free Church General Assembly "imploing it to renounce fellowship with Slaveholders and return the money some time ago obtained from them"⁴⁴ Similar meetings were held in Paisley and Edinburgh in the hope that "the efforts used will induce the leaders of the Free Church to take right ground on this important question", for "with them lies the responsibility, the people being decidedly hostile to participation in the gains of slavery".⁴⁵ One evidence of this was the conferring of the Freedom of Edinburgh on George Thompson, the popular crusader and orator.⁴⁶ And "The Witness" during May 1846 was full of heated correspondence to the editor.

Alas, when the Assembly met next month, the Free Church failed to rise to this Christian challenge. Consistent with its pioneer Manifesto of 1788 and its Petition to Parliament in 1822 "for the immediate mitigation and ultimate abolition of slavery throughout the British dominions," the United Associate Synod of the Secession Church now in session in May 1846, passed unanimously after much discussion a resolution condemning slaveholding as a most heinous sin, and in view of vain remonstrances with American Churches refusing "Christian fellowship with any Church which was sanctioning that system of iniquity".⁴⁷ A week later the Relief Synod heard two overtures to the same effect but no Resolution was adopted.⁴⁸ But on the 30th, the General Assembly of the Free Church, after a lengthy discussion, led chiefly by Candlish, Duncan, and Cunningham, and despite Memorials from ^{and} overtures from members "resolved to receive the report of Dr. Candlish's Committee on the matter of fellowship with American Slaveholding Churches which recommended that the former deliverance of the Assembly thereanent should be adhered to".⁴⁹ Thus ended this discreditable and regrettable episode of the Disruption fathers. There can be no argument that their policy was either morally sound or spiritually consistent. Their Quaker and ecclesiastical opponents had no need to wield any other weapon than the basic principles, that the Church which had fought so nobly against an overweening power which threatened its religious liberty, should have been the first to scorn any entanglement with a System that fettered men in a far crueller bondage;

44. "The British Friend" (1846), P98.

45. Ibid.

46. "Memorials of Hope Park", (1886) Pl76.

47. "The Witness", May.9.1846, P3, col.7

48. Ibid, May16.1846, P3, Col.4. The "British Friend"(1846), P 124 is in error here.

49. "The British Friend", (1846) Pl24. cf "Memorials of Hope Park", PP 170, 176. For the full case from the Church side v "Proceedings of the Gen. Assembly of the Free Church" 1846, Appendix III, PP 3-49. v also "The Witness", June.2.1846, PP3-4. and "The Scotsman", Wed. June 3.1846, P3 for account of Proceedings.

and that the Church whose cardinal principle was the Headship of Christ in His own Body, should have remembered that the tortured bodies of Negro slaves were as sacred temples of His Holy Spirit as any outward or visible church.

The annual Anti-Slavery Bazaar held in Boston in 1847 was more than usually supported by Friends and sympathisers in Britain, following upon recent events. Glasgow, Edinburgh, Perth and Kirkcaldy sent valuable and beautiful donations of goods. The ladies of Edinburgh sent a silver tea service as a testimonial to William Lloyd Garrison and ten thousand women of Edinburgh sent an impressive Address to the women of the United States.⁵⁰ In 1848, the Edinburgh Female Emancipation Society sent a letter of felicitation and encouragement to the women of Paris through whose exertions and appeal to the Chamber, slavery had been abolished in the French colonies.⁵¹ In 1853 Harriet Beecher Stowe visited Scotland and had a very enthusiastic and eager reception from the people.⁵²

(3)

The Friends bore an honourable part in Famine relief work in Scotland. During the 'Hungry Forties', no part of the land was more tragically hit than the Highlands and Islands after the almost total failure of the potato crop in 1846. 300,000 people in these parts were left with only a few weeks' food in store, and this time, the Free Church led promptly and indefatigably by Chalmers, worked side by side with the Quakers for the sustenance of the destitute and perishing.⁵³ In 1855, destitution again stalked through the West Highlands and Islands and the Friends again gave timely relief. The islands of Skye, Harris, North and South Uist, Barra and Mull were specially hard hit owing to the complete failure of crops and fisheries in 1854. Ministers, schoolmasters, and public officials testified to the grave privation of the people for whom no parochial aid under the Poor Law of Scotland was obtainable, and the inhabitants were very grateful to the Friends for their invaluable help.⁵⁴ Most of the Islanders were starving and many practically naked.

(4)

It was not until the middle of the 19th century that the Temperance Question, ie abstention from alcoholic drink or any concern in its manufacture, sale, or profit, became a moral issue in the Society of Friends as a body. Even as recently as

50. "The British Friend" 1847, PP 47-8.

51. Ibid, 1848, PP 173-4.

52. v "The Friend", Vol XI, (1853) PP47-8: 115.

53. cf "The British Friend", 1847, P 14.

54. cf "The Friend", Vol XIII, 1855, PP 48-9, 73-76.

the days of Areskine, Joel Parkinson⁵⁵ and George Miller,—the latter of whom gained, only about a century previously, "many prizes of plate, awarded to him by the Brewers' Association of Auld Reekie for the excellence of his... true Quaker ale with the hat on",⁵⁶—the Friends seem to have had no conscientious scruples about the moral and social evils of the liquor traffic, and it is only fair to read the eminently pious letters of Areskine⁵⁷ and to estimate the repute in which Friends held their brewer brethren, in the light of this unawakened condition. In their day and for decades afterwards "Temperance" among Quakers generally was simply "ἐγκράτεια", involving 'moderate' and controlled consumption of alcoholic beverages even in public houses, and in many of the Gurney MSS, wine was considered as quite normal.⁵⁸ The Quakers however were very particular about the revenue side of the Liquor Problem, for in 1782 Kinmuck Meeting, deprecating the practice of illicit stills in the country generally, ordered intimation to be made to all its members that none must have any traffic in the distilling or selling of spirits, nor sell malt, without paying the duties thereon honourably. This rule was not a local but a universal one among Friends and Kinmuck intimated that any breach thereof would be "Dealt with according to the Rules of our Society."⁵⁹

The next century brought a great change of view in the Society. The London Yearly Meeting of 1835 adopted a strong resolution on the benefits of personal abstinence from spirits and the inconsistency of any Friend being engaged in 'Dram Shops'.⁶⁰ Whether the interruption of Mrs Fry's meeting in Greenock in 1838 by "an advocate of the temperance movement who embraced the occasion for speaking in favour of that cause and was applauded by the throng"⁶¹ indicated any growing expectation of the public that this necessary social reform should be added to the Quakers' list, is uncertain, but certainly by then many Friends were realising the dire consequences of the sale and consumption of alcohol,⁶² and after Gurney's conversion to total abstinence in 1842 the Society steadily became a Temperance force in England and Scotland alike, and over the world.

(5)

Just a century ago there happened a strange and unique episode of Quaker humanitarian activity when an Irish

55. JFHS VIII, PP 123 ff.

56. "Memorials of Hope Park", (1886) P 19.

57. eg his Letter to Cornish and West Country Friends in "Swarthmore MSS" (original) Vol VI, No 99. cf "The Westonian", Vol. XVII, PP 139ff.

58. cf JFHS XXIX, P 37.

59. "Kinmuck Book" (MS. Vol 21.), P. 3.

60. "Minutes of the L.Y.M 1835" (Minute on Temperance), PP 540-2 Folio.

61. "Mémoir" by her daughters, Vol. II, P 288.

62. eg. v JFHS XXIX, PP 37 ff.

Friend named George Pilkington, late Captain in the Royal Engineers went to Shetland unarmed and alone, determined to procure the release of the Hon. Edwin Lindsay, younger son of the sixth Earl of Balcarres who through his father's treachery had been illegally detained on the lonely island of Papa Stour in the Shetlands for twenty-five years on a false charge of insanity. The story of how Pilkington procured Lindsay's emancipation and their adventures in Shetland and Orkney, reads almost like one of G.A. Henty's books, and the curious narrative is rendered more amazing than ever by the fact that it was a triumph of faith and moral power all through, without the slightest recourse to physical force.⁶³

63. "Travels through the United Kingdom", PP 89-226.

CHAPTER XI.

"PERSONALITIES AND THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND IN
THE MID-NINETEENTH CENTURY."

The Society of Friends in Scotland as an entity had become too fragmentary and evanescent by this time to be amenable to the intellectual and spiritual revival which swept the land from about 1830 to 1845. It is not competent here to discuss the effects on Quakerism in England and elsewhere of the new democratic and intellectual era which sprang up with the second French Revolution in 1830, and gripped political and religious England in the Reform Bill, the Chartist Movement and Puseyism; but in Scotland the effects of this new Renaissance within the ambit of Quakerism, while not far-reaching, were not entirely negligible. The most notable of these on the social side were detailed in the previous chapter: here one or two echoes may be heard in the relations of the Quakers with Thomas Chalmers, in the "Beacon" controversy within the Society in which Dr. Ralph Wardlaw figured, and in changing customs among Friends. While convincements were "rare" and wholly disproportionate to "the abundant labours bestowed at different times on our land", there was "at the present time however considerable excitement on religious topics and church matters which may be overruled for good in the promotion of vital Godliness." ¹

About a year before he left St. John's, Dr. Chalmers first met the Gurneys and the Frys at Upton, "and much congeniality both of feeling and of sentiment I enjoyed with them".² In "Chalmeriana" which was published posthumously in 1853, Gurney, who bore a close resemblance to Chalmers in his earlier days, has left a valuable and illuminating collection of memorabilia and 'obiter dicta' of the great Ecclesiastic, covering the almost daily visits of Chalmers to Gurney during his visit to Edinburgh in 1830, and Chalmers's sojourn at Earlham, the Gurneys' seat in Norfolk in 1833.

In these reminiscences, Gurney's own breadth of mind and liberality of sympathies no less than Chalmers's are revealed in pages of culture and spiritual acumen. While Chalmers and Gurney are naturally the 'personae egregiae', the rich canvas is full of other famous figures and 'shades', including Wilberforce; Joanna Baillie; Dr. Bathurst, Bishop of Norwich; Isaac Milner, Dean of Carlisle; Edward Irving; Dr. John Brown of Broughton Place; Robert Hall of Leicester; the Erskines of Mar; and John Forster of "Popular Ignorance" fame. Chalmers met Mrs Opie at Earlham,³ but curiously enough there is no mention of her in Gurney's work. For Chalmers's acquisitive, massive mind, and humble childlike spirit,

-
1. "Richardson MSS," Vol IV, No 72. (Letter from John Wigham, at Aberdeen to George Richardson, dated 8th Dec. 1840)
 2. Hanna's "Memoirs" (1854), Vol. I, PP 619-20.
 3. Ibid, Vol. II, PP 311-2.

Gurney had unbounded admiration, and "in the broad fields of Dr. C's heart and intellect" he loved to "expatiate".⁴ Of narrowness and bigotry both were equally free. While each honoured the other's distinctive principles and differences, they had still much in common, and Gurney found Chalmers's visits to his quarters in Edinburgh as welcome as "a tonic for the faint and a crutch for the lame".⁵ In their many conversations on both sides of the Border, as also frequently at family devotions when Chalmers gave a brief exposition or commentary on the passage, his affinities of thought and belief with the Friends usually received striking expression, and doubtless Gurney selected for inclusion those passages which were most akin to his own Faith, eg Chalmers's observations on Matt VII. 11⁶ and Romans VII.⁷ Most of their discussions were on deep theological problems or important ecclesiastical issues, — "much more frequently about things than persons";⁸ on Christian evidences;⁹ Divine Providence, with particular reference to "special Providences"; Justice and Atonement: the basis of Ethics; the cure of pauperism in Scotland and England; and the New Revolution; and with fine Christian insight and interpretation they assimilated each other's views and were in substantial agreement.

Almost the only topic on which they differed was the necessity of organised religion and some kind of systematic territorial plan of evangelism, "docks of irrigation through which the predominant religion, whatever it is, may diffuse its streams of Christian instruction." Chalmers set no store by a civil or ecclesiastical Establishment quae Establishment any more than he did by a Free Church quae Free Church.¹⁰ But he insisted on the paramount importance of a religious Establishment organised on a national scale and recognised and approved by the law of the land, though in no way subject to it in things spiritual. If the State failed to provide Churches and adequate administration of Gospel ordinances in every part of the land, the natural disinclination of the populace to religion would certainly not make good the deficiency by any "voluntary principle". How satisfying to Chalmers was the panorama of the thick-set spires of Norwich compared with the paucity of churches in West London visible from the top of St. Paul's! Both he and Gurney were fully agreed that without the inner religious principle of divine grace or the dynamic of vital Christianity, machinery was useless, but, that given, while Chalmers postulated it for spiritually energising the land, Gurney strongly suspected the tendency of machinery by its

4. "Chalmeriana", (1853) P 31.

5. Ibid, P 22.

6. Ibid, PP 108-9.

7. Ibid, PP 125-9.

8. Ibid, P 59.

9. On which they had both written. (cf Smith's "Catalogue of Friends Books", (1867) Vol. I, P 884.)

10. cf "Annals of the Disruption", (1884) PP 623 ff.

very nature to reduce the power, and maintained that the Head of the Church needed none such. With the immanence of Christ in His Church, His free and irresistible Gospel through His commissioned servants would more abundantly and effectively overtake and capture the populace than the parochial and endowed mechanism of any Establishment however religious, for "the wind bloweth where it listeth". Here Chalmers and Gurney parted company, and most charitably and with mutual esteem agreed to differ.¹¹

Gurney, who was in reality a product of the Evangelical Revival of England, was a rather advanced thinker among the Friends, so advanced that for a time he was "suspect" and barely escaped discipline. He occupied a theological position roughly mid-way between the old conservatism of the 17th and 18th centuries and the tenets of the new left-wing party,¹² or "Beaconites", who caused some disturbance about this time. The Beaconite Controversy which sprang up in 1835 was a counterblast to the serious 'Hicksite' Secession in America in 1827-8, and took its name from a pamphlet by Isaac Crewdson of Manchester, entitled "A Beacon to the Society of Friends". Crewdson promulgated views of a distinctly 'evangelical' type in which the vague nebulosity of Hicks's teaching on Jesus Christ, the Atonement, and the Scriptures, was counteracted, and these cardinals of Truth made more literal and concrete than ever before in Quaker doctrine. A special committee under Gurney tried in vain to heal the breach, but the Beaconites ultimately broke away from the Society¹³ and left Gurney and an influential section alive to the need of giving a more 'evangelical' bent to their theology, and paying to the Scriptures as the authoritative standard of orthodoxy, a greater deference.¹⁴

Into the lists of the Beaconite controversy came two famous clerical protagonists, one in England and the other in Scotland, and both naturally on the side of the Beaconites, — Frederick Denison Maurice, and Dr Ralph Wardlaw, minister of West George Street Chapel, Glasgow,¹⁵ of whom mention has been made in another connection. In 1838 Maurice wrote a series of Letters to a member of the Society of Friends enquiring whether the spiritual principles as professed by them, did not necessarily imply the observance of Christian ordinances. Did not such a spiritual Kingdom in the World such as the Quakers sought to establish exist already, and were not the Sacraments and other ordinances

-
11. Many of the Gurney details are also found in Hanna's "Memoirs", (1854) Vol. II, PP 210-2.
 12. v his "Distinguishing Views and Practices of the Society of Friends", (7th ed. 1834) partim.
 13. They no longer exist as a separate body, having joined evangelical Churches, or sects like the Plymouth Brethren.
 14. Cunningham gives a good and succinct summary of the Hicksite position in "The Quakers", (1868) PP 286-294.
 15. The predecessor of Elgin Place Church.

of the Church the expression of it? These letters were shortly afterwards published as "The Kingdom of Christ".

Through his intimacy with several Quaker families, many of whom supported Crewdson, Dr. Wardlaw was drawn into the contest. As a result of the consultations which he gave to his Beaconite friends, he found himself sharing their views and soon they solicited the aid of his pen in their support. This led to the publication of his "Friendly Letters to the Society of Friends" in 1836. The style is elegant and the spirit and tone all through is good, even courteous, though rather less so in the last two or three of the eight letters which compose the book. An anonymous correspondent in the "Evangelical Magazine" noted the striking contrast between Dr. Wardlaw's controversial, and the attack on the Friends launched by Dr. S.H. Cox in America.¹⁶

Any critique of Wardlaw's Work here would be beside our present purpose. He confined himself to the citadel of the Quaker Faith, leaving the ramparts untouched.¹⁷ He wrote from the twofold motive of being impelled to chasten and correct the Friends out of the very love and respect he bore them; and in order to modify or check a tendency to Socinianism which he saw developing in them. He was most cogent in his vigorous challenge of the Quakers' relegation of the Scriptures to the level of the secondary rule of faith, especially that doctrine was maintained by Robert Barclay's "Apology", while he welcomed signs of a growing deference to the authority of the Scriptures in modern Quakerism. The indwelling of the Spirit whether as Teacher or as Guide could never be 'in vacuo' and utterly independent of any written and historic word. To imagine the former as possible was to let the soul swoon away in vague nebulous mysticism, ignorant of the very stuff of the Christian religion, while to imagine the latter was to render one self prey to all manner of delusions and insidious imaginations in mistake for the dictates of the Spirit. God had chosen to reveal His truth and bestow his guidance chiefly through the Scriptures, at least since the Scriptures were, for the Spirit could never properly be called a Rule.¹⁸

Wardlaw found himself in a large measure of agreement with Gurney on Justification and contrasted Gurney's interpretation of the basis of salvation as infinitely more Scriptural than Barclay's "most extraordinary confusion of ideas" ... subversive, materially if not utterly, of the apostolic gospel.

-
16. MSS "A Few Queries and Remarks", (1836 Euston) PP3-4.
 of "Friends and Independents", (1836) P 25.
17. P 379.
18. Chs II, III, VIII.

But which was essential Quakerism? For by the same indivisible Spirit, both clearly could not be right.¹⁹ The weakest parts of the Letters are the sections on the validity of the Inner Light, especially in its relation to salvation, though Wardlaw's exegesis of the two master-texts of the Quaker 'system'- St John I,9, and I Cor. XII.7, is skilfully done.

Wardlaw was certain that there must be a split between the Beaconites and the orthodox Friends, of whom Gurney could only with difficulty be reckoned one. He waited to see what effect his controversial "Letters" would have on the "most interesting condition" of the Society.²⁰ In sober fact, they had very little. Gurney told Wardlaw that he was agitating himself out of all proportion to the importance of the Beacon controversy which was only the extreme reaction from Hicksism,²¹ and thus the "Letters" while read and replied to, cut very little ice, and produced no sensation. Gurney of course replied to them with another series of "Letters", supplementary to his "Observations" which Wardlaw had used in framing his case. In the same year, 1836, in which Wardlaw's "Friendly Letters" appeared, an anonymous reply was issued entitled "Friends and Independents" a lengthy tract of forty-four pages. It was a venomous production on the whole, but clever, and in parts bitingly sarcastic. It did not pretend to give an analysis of, or reasoned reply to, Wardlaw's "Letters," but while some of it was beside the mark and sidetracked into matters not germane to the doctrines at issue,²² the first half contained one of the ablest presentations of the Quaker case from the Scriptures themselves²³ of the Spirit as the primary Rule of Revelation and Faith, because pre-existent to a single letter of the written Word of God, or even (the O.T.) the Incarnate Word. The Scriptures were certainly true, the writer argued, but only because they happened to coincide with, and confirm the direct witness of the Spirit already present in man's consciousness. Man's consciousness of God did not spring from the Scriptures, but fitted the written revelation. While the Scriptures were useless without the Spirit, the Spirit was not impotent without the Scriptures.²⁴

Wardlaw did not give the Quakers sufficient credit for their undoubted knowledge of the Scriptures. His knowledge of Quaker doctrine as set forth by writers of different periods seems to have been representative enough, but it was by no means wide, much less exhaustive. He strove however to be fair. Whether

19. "Friendly Letters", V, VI.

20. In a letter to his son, quoted by Alexander in "Life and Writings of Ralph Wardlaw D.D.", (1856) P 355.

21. Ibid, P 356n.

22. eg PP 27-8, 29.

23. But why prove the primacy of the Spirit from the Scriptures themselves? This really surrenders the case.

24. cf also "Memoirs of Stephen Grellet", (1860) Vol.I, P 180.

he really understood mysticism, especially the essence of Quaker mysticism need not be discussed here. Lindsay Alexander thought that he did not; likewise the anonymous correspondent in the "Evangelical Magazine",²⁵ and there is a good deal of empiricism in the "Friendly Letters" to support the view.

Alexander was of opinion that Wardlaw had "hardly grappled" with the real import of the heart of Quakerism, viz the "Inner Light," which was neither the natural reason, nor the 'pure' and immediate illumination of the Holy Spirit revealing truth, "but a faculty implanted in the soul by God, and bearing some analogy to the moral sense of certain ethical philosophers, but more closely allied to the Christian consciousness of Schliermacher and his school". A belief in some such faculty as the 'sine qua non' to any effectual examination of the Quaker Faith, Wardlaw did not seem to have possessed with all his dialectic brilliance, and thus he missed the mark.²⁶ There we must leave the question.

Quakerism in Scotland suffered little from the Beacon controversy,²⁷ but to its recent new social and humanitarian orientation was probably due a minor revival of its fortunes in the middle of the century. About the time of the Disruption the Edinburgh Meeting enjoyed the most flourishing period of its very chequered history, and numbered probably about a hundred and ten.²⁸ They lived mostly in the area round Newington and the Meadows²⁹ in convenient proximity to the Pleasance Meeting House. The old families of the Cruikshanks, Wighams and Millers were still represented in the Friends' life and councils, while Professor John Barlow of the Veterinary College,³⁰ Dr Barry the conqueror of Mont Blanc, and later on, Lord Lister, gave the Society a place in Academic circles, although the famous surgeon attended meetings less frequently after his student days and eventually "married out".³¹

W.F. Miller has collected a number of quaint and interesting customs of these days. In 1850 plain gravestones with the minimum of particulars were reluctantly sanctioned; churches were usually designated by the names of their ministers; and though wall pictures, charades, recitations, and some games of skill and innocent diversion were allowed or encouraged, music, the drama, and cards, were not as much as named. A weird phenomenon, for which the Edinburgh Society was famed most of all, was the iron coffin cage kept as a deterrent to the body-snatchers' depredations.³²

-
25. MSS "A Few Queries and Remarks", P 4.
 26. "Life and Writings of Ralph Wardlaw D.D." (1856), P 356. cf. "Friends and Independents", PP 3,8.
 27. of however the reaction that set in to silent worship in Orkney in 1835. (v "The Friend", Vol VII, 1849, P 203)
 28. Gordon in "The New Statistical Account of Scotland" (Vol I P667) gives the returns as "80 members, and from 20-30 who are not joined to the Society."
 29. "Drummond St" perpetuates the name of May Drummond and her brother the Provost.
 30. v "A Memoir of John Barlow", (1858) PP 2-4.
 31. For many other Edinburgh Quaker worthies v Art by W.F. Miller in J.F.H.S., X, PP 1-11. 32. J.F.H.S. X, PP. 45-50: XVII, 48.

In 1821 a Meeting House was acquired in Hawick and a Monthly Meeting established till 1844. But it was very small, and in that year the Quakers ceased to exist as a body.³³

About the same period the leading figures in the now resuscitated Glasgow Meeting were John Robertson, Anthony Wigham and the Smeal family,³⁴ the first two of whom were in business partnership also. In 1824 they were joined by John Henderson, a great friend of Bright and Cobden, and later Treasurer and Provost of Paisley. Henderson having been captivated with Joshua Geddes and his sister, the Quaker characters in "Redgauntlet", enquired if there were any Friends still left in Scotland, and on discovering the existence of the Glasgow group, he attended the meetings every Sunday and ultimately joined the Society in May 1837.³⁵ In January 1843 Smeal's sons William and Robert founded, and edited conjointly "The British Friend", and in 1860 a circulation of 2000 copies was reached.

In 1860 the Glasgow Meeting was the largest in Scotland, but as it numbered only 50-60,³⁶ it is evident that the tide had again turned in Edinburgh; and probably elsewhere. Since Grellet's visit at least, Kinmuck was the most Northerly Meeting in Scotland.³⁷ Including it there were only four Meetings for worship in Scotland in 1851, with a total attendance at both 'diets' each Sunday of 211.³⁸

The bitterness and mutual insults between the Quakers and the Churches had passed away, but the Society remained the candid, though now polite, critic of Church policy and activities. Friends heartily supported the popular clamour and boycott against the rousing of Dissenters' goods in Edinburgh for arrears of ministers' stipends,³⁹ and altogether disapproved on principle of the Free Church's exertions to have unsympathetic landowners compelled by Act of Parliament to sell land required for the erection of new churches and manses. The Quakers regarded the Disruption as an "important secession from the Scottish Establishment", with which they fain would have been in fuller concord, but which was marred by the Free Church's methods of obtaining the money and sites they needed.⁴⁰

-
33. "General Meeting Minutes 1834", (MS. Vol. 47) May 1844. (No Pages), and "History of Hawick from 1832" (1902), P 143. v also Pease's "Travelling Map of Great Britain and Ireland". (1825)
34. Wm Smeal Sen^r was admitted a Friend in Edinburgh in 1801 but removed to Glasgow in 1802. (v. Notice in "The Annual Monitor" No. 26 for 1838, PP 137-8)
35. "Edin. Two Month's Minute Book", (MS Vol. 31) P 100.
36. Brown's "Religious Denominations of Glasgow", (1860) Vol I, P 74.
37. "Memoirs of Grellet", (1860) Vol I, P 178.
38. "The Friend", Vol IX, (1851) P 125.
39. "The British Friend", (1848) P 145.
40. Ibid, P 239. cf Hanna's "Memoirs of Chalmers", (1854) Vol II, PP 761-2.

CHAPTER XII."A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE LAST PERIOD WITH
OBSERVATIONS."

The decline and disintegration of a fine movement or institution is always a regrettable thing, and the task of epitomising such, is as difficult as it is unedifying. In the first period of Quakerism in Scotland, it was, as elsewhere a Movement: in the Middle period, a System; and in the last period, for the most part, a Capitulation.

During the period of its decline Quakerism was very little affected by purely Quaker influences outside the country like the Keithian schism and hostile propaganda, or the Beaconite controversy, but it suffered severely from the spirit of the times during the 18th century; from the general religious indifference; the dead hand of Rationalism and Moderatism; the moral laissez-faire and social laxity prevalent; the people's quest for a happier material lot and a fuller life; but especially from the cessation of persecution and ostracism, with its loss of internal heroism and external admiration. The early decades of the century witnessed a weakening hectorism on the part of the Church, and a definite improvement of attitude and policy in most Magistrates towards the Quakers and the rabble that still molested them suddenly. The important civil liberties which they won in measures like the rescission of the Addition to the Aberdeen Burgess Act, and the final amendment of the Affirmation Act in 1722, brought them still more into line with their neighbours. But those who had patiently toiled and endured to secure "tolerations" and "privileges" for Friends were unconsciously "preparing a different type of person and were passing over from a movement charged with potential energy to a stage of arrested development and cooling enthusiasm".¹ They became more and more self-centred and "proper", and were practically ignored by the authorities in the normal even tenor of their life. Even the 'ethos' of their worship became different, as also the spirit and attendance at their meetings for discipline.

The Quakers, while to some extent alive to these dangers, chose the wrong methods to avert them. By wrapping themselves in the spiritual shroud of "Quietism", they all but killed the faith of their souls and the reality of worship. Their reaction to the environment and new conditions of the age, which produced the policy of Legalism and the revival of outworn ideas of discipline, with its overseers and its lists of things 'taboo',

1. Braithwaite "Second Period of Quakerism" - Intro by R.M. Jones, P XLVI.

only served to encourage a double standard in the lives of many of the members and created largely the very formalism which they despised in the Church. Matters were made worse by the introduction early in the 18th century of the disowning of members for "marrying out" of the Society which drove from its ranks many who might have been a strength to it.² By the middle decades, Quakerism in Scotland was distinctly moribund except in the North-East, and in spite of the uniting and centralisation of meetings, and of the pathetic influx of English and other travelling Friends which showed no abatement to the end of the century, it only managed to hang on to life till the earlier 19th century when the new social and humanitarian enthusiasms of the Society revived its drooping spirits through service of the unfortunate prisoner and oppressed slave. Then its mysticism became practical again, and it recollected that no Church or Religious Body can live upon its past, or by simply determining to feed and garrison its own spiritual life. The spiritual life is like the muscles of our bodies; it must get plenty exercise and test out its fitness in a practical world if it is to survive and be in health.

-
2. This practice I understand, only ceased about 1870. cf also Jones, "Later Periods of Quakerism", Vol II, P 949.

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER I"PERSECUTION IN SCOTLAND".

It is no less true of Scotland than of England that the Quakers obtained through the doggedness of their passive resistance a legal recognition of their worship and customs and an indulgence of their scruples from both civil and ecclesiastical courts and legislature. But it was through a long and wearisome struggle that this consummation was reached. From first to last Persecution continued for sixty-eight years, dating from the mobbing of Halhead and Lancaster in Dumfries in 1654 to the last 'Affirmation Act' of 1722. The accession of successive rulers brought the Friends grievous disappointments or hopes deferred or pledges betrayed. Cromwell indeed avowed liberty of conscience to be a "Fundamental" and a "natural right". "All the money in the Nation" he wrote, "would not have tempted men to fight upon such an account as they have here been engaged, if they had not had hopes of Liberty 'of Conscience' better than Episcopacy granted them or than would have been afforded by a Scots Presbytery, or an English either".¹ But although the Protector in no direct way harried the Friends or instigated any persecuting measures against them, there can be no question that, through pre-occupation with intricate State affairs or division of counsel, he often permitted those acting under his suzerainty if not by his command, to persecute or penalise the Quakers, and put little or no check to it. Thus the latter derived small practical immunity or security from Cromwell's worship at the shrine of Freedom.² The most persistent gnat that stung him was Burrough, who addressed several plain-spoken epistles to the Protector, and accused him of setting himself up to be worshipped and of falsifying promises in the day of his power that he had given in the day of his need, eg. that he would relieve the country of the oppression of Tithes, if he won Dunbar.³ In one sweeping generalisation Fox lumps together "some parts of Scotland" with Cumberland, Yorkshire and other English counties as experiencing the same "exceeding sufferings and cruel dealings from men of all sorts", the same malice from the clergy and the same oppression from Justices.⁴

From Richard Cromwell the Quakers like everyone else expected nothing and got nothing. In that sense they were not disappointed. The Declaration of Breda had buoyed up their hopes, but the "happy Restoration" was quickly followed by the perfidy of the King and the persecution, largely brutish and pettifogging, of a people

-
1. Carlyle's "Cromwell's Letters and Speeches", (1888) Vol III, Speech III, PP 54 - 5.
 2. cf Nayler "Some Considerations Needful". (In "A Collection of Sunday Books, Epistles and Papers" (1716.) P 756.)
 3. Evan's "Memoir of Edward Burrough": (Friends' Library" Vol 14, PP 430-1.)
 4. "The Great Mystery", (1659 ed)-("Epistle to the Reader", P 14.)

which even at their worst could not seriously be held to have "disturbed the peace of the Kingdom". The most drastic and sweeping of all the Acts against them was that of the Privy Council of July 1667 which was apparently meant to wipe them out once for all. By this Act all officials within whose jurisdiction Quakers were found, especially the Sheriffs of Teviotdale, Lanark, and Aberdeen, were required to have all male Quakers holding or attending meetings arrested and sent to the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, the Magistrates meanwhile to retain them there: also that heritors, ministers and Bishops co-operate to the full with the civil authorities in making these provisions effective, and that proclamation be made at every Market Cross and Parish Church.⁵ The only real mitigations of persecution during Charles' reign were the abolition by the Scots Justiciary Bench in 1671 of the oath for Quaker defendants in suits for debt in favour of a solemn declaration; and the cessation of the civil persecution in Aberdeen in 1679. But in Linlithgow, the Magistrates in 1683 were ordered by the Privy Council to sell up all imprisoned Quakers who were too poor to be distressed, and all holding meetings were to be fined and imprisoned. Six were confined in 1684.⁶

James VII was too immersed in the affairs of State, the intensified persecution of the Covenanters, and his machinations to establish the supremacy of Roman Catholicism in the Nation, to trouble about any constitutional relief for the Friends until they found themselves caught up in the favourable tide of the Declaration of Indulgence.^{6A} They knew they were sailing in Romanist waters, but the wind was so propitious that for the time being they were thankful.

The attitude of the Quakers to civil and ecclesiastical persecution has already been defined and exemplified, and little remains to be added here. The Quaker principle of non-resistance, often under the cruellest provocation, was undoubtedly their greatest asset in the end, but their non-resistance was not absolutely unqualified in its pacifism. They suffered with inflexible determination but not in silence. They proclaimed their grievances and sufferings from the house-tops and seldom lost a chance to castigate the hypocrisy of those who made long prayers and revelled in torrents of pulpit eloquence while persecuting God's people. They deemed it their duty to acquaint magistrates, judges and councils of all illegal proceedings and plots and to use every legitimate and Christian means to obtain redress, not for their own Cause only, but for the good of their persecutors' souls. But their efforts to have persecuting statutes amended or revoked, though abortive, promoted essentially the cause of religious liberty. It was indeed this

5. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol II, PP 312-3.

6. Ibid Vol VIII, P 7; and Vol X, P 380.

6A. cf. Shields, "Faithful Contendings Displayed," (1780) PP. 286, 307, 355.

conscious obligation to bear witness to their wrongs and the "spiritual wickedness in high places" that called into being in 1675 the "Meeting for Sufferings" which at first "was designed as a vigilance committee on sufferings, to receive regular reports of all cases that arose". It was authorised in 1679 by the Yearly Meeting to meet out of the General Fund the expenses incurred by Friends in approaching the Government and in propaganda and literature. Until 1750 "Cases of Suffering" headed the pages of the Minute Book,⁷ and for many years, constant reminders were being given to Scottish Meetings to make their returns carefully and regularly.⁸

The Quakers did not abjure litigation and law courts although they had no love of them. By the side of the case of Barbara Hodge must be set that of Seaton v Muirhead in 1695. George Muirhead who was a Bailie in the Gorbals, aided and abetted by others, was sued by Alexander Seaton, Keith's convert, "for ye Riot & oppression committed by ye said Baylie etc in breaking open Alex^r Seaton's door & keeping him out of his possession".⁹ The plaintiff evidently won his case for Muirhead had £36 damages to meet. The Burgh Treasurer of Glasgow was instructed by the Council to pay him £44 Scots to cover his expenses in the plea,¹⁰ and Hew Wood the Friends' Treasurer similarly paid over £12 to Seaton.

Two other cases may be conveniently mentioned here also, where the Quakers were the aggressors. In 1727 cash was authorised to be paid by the Edinburgh Meeting "for a warrant to throw out a Tennent's Furniture in the Floor above the Meeting House".¹¹ A century later, Aberdeen Monthly Meeting had troubles with Stewart M^c Leod, the leaseholder of the Gallowgate property, and took him to the Sheriff Court.¹²

Fox's letter to Cromwell's Council in Edinburgh, Barclay's letter to Sharpe, and innumerable Petitions and Addresses to Authorities furnish only a fraction of the evidence of the Quakers' boldness in denouncing their enemies direct, -although, as Sewell points out, his people have had many predecessors "who have told their persecutors very boldly of their wicked deportment".¹³ On one occasion, about 1691 a Quaker preacher at Glasgow Cross informed his audience which had behaved very badly that he had

7 "Church Government", (Christian Discipline", Part III, 1931) PP 60-1. 8. v next Chapter.

9. "Hamilton Meeting Book" 1695, (MS Vol 14) P 1.

10. "Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Glasgow", 1691-1717, * (1908) P 168.

11. J.F.H.S. Vol XXIX, P 41.

12. "Aber. Monthly Meeting Book 1832-1868", (Aber. MSS. Vol 25) PP 21, 57; cf P 31.

13. "History", (1811) Vol I, Preface, PP XI-XII.

received better treatment from Red Indians, "people whom you call savages".¹⁴ In 1674 a number of Friends pushed into the hands of Bishop Scougal, "one of the most sober and moderate among them", a series of eleven "Queries touching Excommunication", questioning its authority, nature, grounds and language; with the unexpected issue that the Bishop abrogated the supreme censure of the Church for the remainder of his lifetime. But with a complete reversal of this policy under Haliburton his successor, the Quakers published this Testimony in 1682 "for clearing the Truth and out of Compassion to them; lest they be found fighters against God & his people".¹⁵

The Quaker excesses in habit, speech and action often provided a ground of persecution as in the early Cromwellian days in Edinburgh or Andrew Jaffray's unsavoury acted parable at Aberdeen in 1677, but despite Fox's generalisation just mentioned, persecution was never so severe as in England. Not a single Quaker is recorded as having been put to death, nor in Besse's list of those who died under Sufferings for their Faith is a Scots Quaker mentioned.¹⁶ Except in Aberdeen subsequent to 1679, the usual attitude and conduct of magistrates and other civil authorities to the Friends was hostile and they often encouraged the rabble to do its worst or allowed it to violate and maltreat the Quakers with impunity. Notable instances of this were Provost Petrie and Bailie Burnett of Aberdeen, Bailie Haliburton in Edinburgh and Bailie Aird of Glasgow. But there were many exceptions like Bailie Brook of Glasgow, and the Circuit Judges at Aberdeen in the severe snub they administered to Meldrum and Menzies.

In 1709 Charles Ormiston of Kelso reported to the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting that the Justices of the Peace for Roxburghshire had interdicted the Magistrates of Jedburgh from expelling two Quaker women named Stage from the town for keeping a school, and allowed them to remain,¹⁷—an uncommon instance of the conflict of two civic authorities.

As late as 1737 a remarkable marriage 'case' occurred in Aberdeen when both ministers of St Machar refused to call the Banns of a couple because the prospective husband was a Quaker, even when required to do so by Patrick Milne, Writer in Aberdeen. Milne threatened to proclaim them himself in the Cathedral before a Notary Public, and carried out his intention on three successive Sundays. When he again interviewed the ministers demanding that the parties be married, they refused. The result was that the bride and bridegroom went before Sheriff—Depute Forbes, who on finding all the legal requirements duly complied with, "considers

14. "Transactions of the Glasgow Archeol. Soc.", Vol V, Part I, P 103.

15. "Some Queries touching Excommunication", (1682) P10.

16. "Sufferings" (1753), Vol II, PP 634-6.

17. J.F.H.S. VII, P 113.

them... to be married persons and Recommends to all whom it may concern to consider and look upon them as such hereafter".¹⁸

A noticeable feature of the persecution in Scotland throughout was that the civil authorities had never any reason to doubt the good faith of the Quaker community and the most striking evidence of this appeared in Linlithgow in 1673. A number of Friends including Patrick Livingstone and Alexander Hamilton were apprehended at a meeting in a private house and imprisoned. On their second summons before the Burgh Council, the Magistrates required them to go to Edinburgh with or without escort and appear before the Privy Council. Upon the Friends' agreement to go voluntarily, they were dismissed. They kept their pledge and although they attended the "secreet counsell" the whole time, they were never cited, and returned to Linlithgow, where the Provost was so satisfied, that they were all set at liberty.¹⁹

It is interesting and significant to recall the view taken of the Quakers by Sir George Mackenzie, the Lord Advocate in some of his last written words, as expressive of the official and judicial mind. He most cordially commended the Quakers' ideal and policy as a really effective means of gaining their ends which "does not only give them much tranquillity and enable them to help all those of their persuasion to a degree that is to be admired and commended, but.. makes them acceptable in the neighbourhood". He tilted at Wodrow for his "growling" at the Bishops' slackness in administering the anti-Quaker Act of Council in 1663, and at James II for indulging them. He professed to have little faith in the "laudable way" of persecution, strangely enough. But Mackenzie's own inconsistency in this cannot dull the edge of his satirical thrust at the Covenanters, viz that from the Presbyterian point of view it was not religious persecution that was wrong, but persecution of Presbyterians, whereby they proved themselves the friends of religious and civil liberty even up to 1720!²⁰

Mackenzie's love of the Covenanters, as is well known, was in inverse ratio to his admiration of the Quakers, and the persecution of the one differed materially from that of the other in certain respects. There is no need of course for any writer to betray his lack of historic sense and fairness by saying, as one did in the middle of last century,²¹ that the Quaker's sufferings were so trifling as "hardly to deserve the name of persecution" or of "being named in the same day" with the outrages upon the Covenanters. He is also in error in his view that it was

18. "Scottish Historical Review," (1908) Vol V, PP 131-3.

19. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16) P 18.

20. Lang's "Sir George Mackenzie, King's Advocate", (1909) PP 6,317.

21. v"Low's Edinburgh Magazine", (New Series) Vol I, (1847) P 247.—
Art. on "Fanaticism in Scotland".

only under Prelacy and not under Presbytery that the Friends in Scotland suffered. Let it be granted at once that there was never the systematic, ceaseless, or outrageous cruelty in the persecution of the Quakers that darkened the lives of the Covenanters for a whole generation, but this does not write down the sufferings of the former as negligible. It is true, for various reasons, that a measure of indulgence was shown to them not infrequently, which the Covenanters did not enjoy. Mair affirms not unreasonably that if some zealous Covenanter had behaved in an Erastian Church like Foveran as John Skene did, he would have been immediately riddled with bullets from a dozen muskets on the kirkyard grass.²² The Quakers were not tortured with thumbkins, firematches, or the 'Boot'; they were not shot without trial, nor were they hanged, drawn and quartered. There is no comparison between the Quaker casualty list as given in "A Cloud of Witnesses" or John Howie's computation of 18,000 Covenanters who endured either death or "the utmost hardship and privation". But they were subjected to sixteen years of almost unbroken persecution in Aberdeen and the North-East as well as much in Edinburgh and Lanarkshire for varying periods, and like the Covenanters they were imprisoned in durance vile, exorbitantly fined and 'distressed', oppressed and outraged by the military, and even were not strangers to banishment. Nor had they any desire to escape the full effects of the persecution meted out to them or to exchange principle and self-renunciation for ease and expediency. As soon as they were released from prison, they returned to their meetings and public testimony. In 1709 it was reported to the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting that a City magistrate, Bailie Falconer, had paid Bartholemew Gibson's dues to Wilkie the Parish Minister of the Canongate, ^{and} intended to continue, whether he was re-imbursed or not. But the Meeting instructed the farrier to charge the Bailie personally to discontinue such dues and to acquaint the Minister that the Bailie had paid these contrary to the knowledge or will of the Meeting.²³

Most of the dozen "crimes" for which the Quakers suffered persecution in Scotland, with their penalties, having been detailed in the preceding pages, require only a brief recapitulation here, and one or two others noted more fully. The former include the interruption of services - in the very early days of Scots Quakerism, and not universally either; preaching in "Steeple houses" after service; maligning the "Priests" publicly or bearing testimony against them; sheltering Quakers and harbouring Quaker meetings; praying in Market Squares or other public places; refusing to take any oath; marrying in Quaker fashion; and burying the dead in Quaker fashion and in Quaker ground. To these may be added the following:-

-
22. "Narratives and Extracts from the Records of the Presbytery of Ellon, 1597-1709", (1894) P 181.
 23. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15.) P 167.

(1) Non-observance of "Fast-days".

As already noted, Fasts were not uncommon in the post-Revolution years for about two decades. In 1693 the Church enlisted the help of the Scots Parliament when upon a petition from the Ministers of Edinburgh Presbytery, and others, it passed an "Act for a Monethly Fast" ordering that the third Thursday of every month be "religious and strictly observed by all persons within this Kingdom both in Churches and Meeting Houses" as "a solemn day of fasting and humiliation".²⁴ The Quakers naturally refused to conform to these 'man-made' rites. Some in Lesmahagow Parish who carted manure on a "Fast-day" in 1701 were "referred to the magistrate", and the names of the witnesses "who can prove the same" were given.²⁵ For bearing their testimony against "these fasts", two Linlithgow Friends were imprisoned in the same year, and one had her shop padlocked, debarring her entrance.²⁶ In 1702 the same Magistrates put Patrick Robinson in gaol for ignoring "Fast-days".²⁷ Even in the early years of last century Friends who refused to observe public and sacramental Fast-days had their shops closed by the police, or suffered imprisonment.²⁸ In 1849 a Manifesto appeared entitled "Reasons why members of the Society of Friends do not close their shops on Fast-Days and other occasions appointed by the Government for religious observance", setting forth that true fasting is an inward thing, a homage of the soul to God every day, and that no specific days or acts of worship can legitimately be dictated by any man.

(2) Neglect of Sacraments and Ordinances.

The Quakers had a great contempt for "water sprinkling" since the only valid baptism was the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. In 1666 a tailor in Lanark named Hastie was summoned before the Presbytery "for contemning of ordinances and keeping his child from baptisme", but he did not appear, and was ordered to be proceeded against by Barnie, the minister of Lanark.²⁹ Application for baptism was made to the Kirk Session of Glassford in 1700 by three children whose father was a Quaker, but the minister found them so "utterly ignorant and incapable as yet of admission" that the Session directed that they be first instructed in the principles of the Christian Faith and put to school till they were ready for baptism on profession of faith "to the edification of the congregation".³⁰

About 1710 a Linlithgow Friend named Macrae had

-
24. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", (1820) Vol IX, P 252.
 25. Greenshield's "Annals of Lesmahagow", (1864) P 141.
 26. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 109.
 27. Ibid, P 123.
 28. "An Account of the Distraints on Friends", (MS Vol 73) P 1.
 29. "Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark", P 106.
 30. Minutes of Glassford Kirk Session, (7th January 1700)

his child carried from the house by his wife's father and mother in whose temporary charge it had been left, and who took it to "the priest of the town and caused him sprinkle it". Macrae "gave out a paper" against Dalgleish the minister "and those that were actors therein, showing his dissatisfaction thereof"³¹

(3) Refusing to finance, or serve in, the Militia.

In December 1688, the Scots Privy Council passed an "Act anent the punishment of those who refuse to serve in the foot Militia", empowering Justices of the Peace or Commissioners of Assessment to arrest any person refusing to serve in the Militia when "pitched upon" and to imprison him "in the next convenient prisone", with a fine of £20 Scots and such corporal punishment as the Justices "shall think fitt by whipping or other-ways", in addition.³² No early cases of Quakers are recorded under this Act, or under the Militia Act of the Scots Parliament of 1669, but in 1694, a certain John Macrae, who had been press-ganged as a soldier, successfully petitioned the Council for release as a conscientious objector.³³ The earliest recorded instance of declining the Militia was during the Napoleonic "scare" in 1798 when several Edinburgh Quakers who refused to enlist were mulcted of nearly £6.³⁴ In 1802 an Act to establish a Militia Force in Scotland was passed. Quakers called up had to present a certificate witnessed by two Quaker householders within seven days to a Schoolmaster or constable. If the Chief Constable or any constable in a Division were a Quaker, he might be released from duty under the Act by the appointment of a deputy. Any Quaker refusing to appear or serve when chosen by ballot, or to provide a substitute from the same neighbourhood who should fulfil all the requirements of the Act, might find such substitute provided by two Deputy-Lieutenants and himself distressed in goods or money to meet the expense, with the alternative of three months' imprisonment or until the required amount was paid. Right of complaint was given.³⁵ Amos Wigham, the Kinmuck farmer, would neither serve nor secure a substitute, for which he was distressed of two young cattle and nearly £16 in cash in 1803.³⁶ In 1803 also Alexander Cruikshank of Kinmuck was, by a warrant issued by Elphinstone of Logie and Mackenzie of Glack, distressed of "most of his wearing apparel, his watch etc." and fined over £11 for refusing to serve in the Militia.³⁷

31. "Minute of Edin. Q.M. anent Insults in the South" in Aberdeen, Bundle of MSS. No 66. (2); and "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS. Vol 15.) P 180.

32. RPCS 3rd Series, Vol. XI, P 334.

33. Chambers' "Domestic Annals of Scotland", Vol. III, P 59.

34. "An Account of the Distraints on Friends", (MS Vol 73) P. 1.

35. Tomlins' "Statutes", 42 Geo. III. Cap. 91. PP 488, 488-9, 491.

36. "Sufferings of Amos Wigham" (Bundle 63. (9) of Aberdeen MSS.)

37. "Aber. Monthly Minute Book", (MS Vol. No 24 in Aber MSS) P 97.

A Friend was assessed at £10 in the same year for the cost of the Militia, which on his refusal to pay was taken from his till.³⁸ William Smeal of Glasgow was distressed in the same way in 1806 for contravention of the Militia Act, by the Commissioners of Taxes.³⁹ In Hawick, Walter Wilson at the instance of the Deputy-Lieutenant had hosiery seized to the value of 7 guineas in 1822, and this amount was probably repeated in cash two years later.⁴⁰

(4) Refusal to pay Tithes or Annuity Taxes for Ministers' Stipends.

This refusal was based on the 'freeness' of the Gospel and on the abrogation by Christ of the Levitical and ceremonial Law for tithes and priesthood (St. Matt. X. 8-9 and Hebrews VII.) Strangely enough, little is heard about such exactions or penalties in Quaker Scotland until the 18th century, but whether the assessments were served on Friends before that time and then waived, is uncertain. From 1702 to 1851 the cases are numerous. An exhaustive list would only be wearisome, and a few of the most interesting examples will suffice. Often the amounts seized were far in excess of the demand notices, and 'distresses' varied, being in cash, in goods, or by arrest of tenants' rents, or money in the Bank. The first on record were in 1679 when two Friends in a parish unnamed had their cows distrained for Tithes,⁴¹ and in 1705 Robert Hamilton of Shawtonhill was sued by Borland, the minister of Glassford.⁴² In 1709 Bartholemew Gibson was "poynded" for £8 Scots by Thomas Wilkie, of the Canongate Parish and brass to the value of £1-10-0 taken for his dues.⁴³ This was the same case in which Bailie Falconer intervened. Hawick had an intensive spell of distraint in 1823-4 when Charters, the minister of Wilton Parish extracted exorbitant amounts from William Wilson and William Watson in hosiery and yarn and two other Friends unnamed were relieved of £27⁴⁴. In 1834 Alexander Cruikshank was sued by the law-agent of the Edinburgh Ministers for nearly £90 arrears of Annuity Tax covering a period of about six years and his tenants' rents were arrested. The process was repeated two years later.⁴⁵

David Doull, a leading Edinburgh Quaker, along with others, suffered considerable loss. For an assessment of

-
38. Ibid, and "Edin. Monthly Meeting Minutes" 1794, (MS Vol. 29) P. 147.
 39. "An Account of the Distraints on Friends", (MS Vol 73) P. 1.
 40. Ibid and "Edin. Two Months' Meeting Book", (MS Vol. 30) P 50.
 41. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) P 39.
 42. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 145.
 43. Ibid, P 165. cf P 149. Wilkie was an ex-Moderator of Assembly. (Warrick, P. 132)
 44. "An Account of the Distraints on Friends", (MS Vol 73) P 2.
 and "Edin. Two Months' Meeting Book", (MS Vol 30) P 50.
 v also "Gen. Meeting Book" 1786, (MS Vol 46) P 183.
 45. "Edin. Two Months' Meeting Book", (MS Vol 31) P 64, and
 "An Account of the Distraints on Friends", (MS Vol 73) PP 3-4.

£8 stipend dues he was relieved by the Magistrates in 1827 of "a box of tea, two tables and a sofa" to the value of about £17 and again in 1835 by the City Chamberlain of £11, the amount being recovered by the arrest of an account due to his firm by the Royal Infirmary.⁴⁶

No Friend however was "distressed" so incessantly over a long period of years as Charles Ormiston, the third, of Kelso. He paid no Tithe for stipend specifically, - although his father and grandfather had paid both Tithe and Feu to the Duke of Roxburgh, - but only Feu, and Tithe as "Quit Rent". He had a considerable correspondence with the Meeting for Sufferings over the legitimacy of continuing the latter in which he sought to persuade that Body that this Tithe had no relationship to the stipend.^{46A} But the Meeting was not satisfied, as Tithe in England was exclusively for the "Priests' pay", and apparently Ormiston yielded,⁴⁷ for the Minutes of the Edinburgh Quarterly and Yearly Meetings contain very frequent entries between 1704 and 1720, and even later, that he was "still pursued" by the Duke's Chamberlain or others and had his tenants' rents arrested, for non-payment of Tithes.⁴⁸

The commonest and most dramatic phenomenon of the history of the Quakers' sufferings in Scotland, which they shared with many of the Covenanters, was their implicit belief in divine nemesis and retribution overtaking their persecutors,⁴⁹ and certainly many sequels happened to the latter which the Friends claimed as proofs of their belief. The instances are legion and it is doubtful if ever a complete list could be compiled. But a few may be mentioned here. The most famous was probably the sudden death of Forbes, minister of Inverurie in 1666, but others were Bailie Burnett and "Black" James Skene of Aberdeen who were both carried away by painful illnesses; Arbuthnot, minister of Arbuthnott Parish who was deposed;⁵⁰ Horne, the bell-ringer who struck Keith and was soon after instantly killed; Patrick Hay, the Advocate-depute who was drowned at night in the Don;⁵¹ the similar fate which befel twenty-eight parishioners of Canonbie one Sunday, while crossing the Esk;⁵² and of course the miserable end of George Keith in Sussex, "unwept, unhonoured and unsung".

-
46. Ibid, PP 2, 3. 46A. cf "Faithful Contendings Displayed" (1780), P 61.
 47. Letters from Charles Ormiston to the Meeting for Sufferings in London. (Portfolio 30, Nos 5, 4, 7 in Euston Library.)
 48. eg "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book"; (MS Vol. No 15) PP 137, 143, 148, 207, 225.
 50. JFHS VII, P 96.
 51. Skene "A Brief Historical Account", P 18. (v also PP 14 and 18 for other instances.)
 49. cf "A Cloud of Witnesses", (1871) P 345, footnote.
 52. "Life of Christopher Story", (1726) PP 78-9.

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER II.

"ORGANISATION AND ADMINISTRATION IN SCOTLAND."

The term "Discipline" is used in two senses, in the Quaker sense, and in the usual ecclesiastical sense. By the former is understood "all those arrangements and regulations which are instituted for the civil and religious benefit of a Christian Church",¹ which cover all the matter of this chapter as well as the administration of 'discipline' among Friends in the customary interpretation of the word. The latter will be dealt with in the following chapter. The Quaker theory and practice of the Church, as also its system of meetings was much the same in Scotland as elsewhere.

Early Quakerism in Scotland was organised under two Quarterly Meetings, the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting, which originated in 1669 and the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting which originated in 1680. The former embraced three Monthly Meetings, Edinburgh, Glassford (later Hamilton and Glasgow): and Lessuden (later Kelso.) In 1691 Linnlithgow was added. The latter included four Monthly Meetings, -Aberdeen; Kinmuck and Old Meldrum; Urie and Stonehaven; and Montrose. The "General Meeting" for South Scotland was the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting in June each year, and the first was held in June 1669. In 1691 the name was changed to the "Yearly Meeting". In 1697 Aberdeen established a Yearly Meeting of its own, as the long distance from the Capital made attendance very inconvenient for North-Country Friends, but mutual correspondence was arranged. From 1786 to 1807 the two met as one biennially, in Aberdeen and Edinburgh alternately and was known as the "Half Years' Meeting". In 1807 the annual assembly was called "The General Meeting for Scotland" and is still so denominated. A curious innovation was made in 1704 when Aberdeen Yearly Meeting unanimously granted permission to Roderick Forbes of Brux to hold a Yearly Meeting at Brux, but on what ground is not known.²

From about the beginning of the 18th century the history of Scots Monthly and Particular Meetings is for the most part the dismal tale of annihilation or attenuation, followed by enforced amalgamation, several instances of which have already been detailed. A few late developments are recorded, but they are only like faces in the mist, whose continuance was brief. The meeting at Baldovan formed about 1735 lasted only some thirty-five years. In 1802 a Meeting for Worship was instituted in Dundee and a house rented for Friends by the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting

-
1. "Church Government"; ("Christian Discipline", Part III.) 1931, Intro.; P XlIII.
 2. "Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4.) P "34".

but by 1808 it had to be discontinued.³ A Particular Meeting at Hawick was inaugurated in 1823 under Edinburgh Two Months' Meeting,⁴ but its lifetime was only about twenty one years. A spirit of conservatism too, balked incorporating unions as long as possible. Samuel Fothergill in 1764 saw several very weak Monthly Meetings, which, "each having separate bequests, are determined against any junction", and William Miller and Robert Barclay held up the fusion of the two Yearly Meetings⁵ for over twenty years, till 1786.

About that time when the stricter tradition was revived, the new Half Yearly Meeting resolved to recommend each of its Monthly Meetings to (a) Compile a list of "those that are fit to be deemed members of our Society"; (b) "Examine into the Securities of their respective Legacies, Meeting Houses, and Burying Grounds"; and (c) "Consider what friends among them are Suitable to be nominated to the Status of Elders, and to be recorded as Ministers in Unity". For each of these a small Committee was appointed to see the terms were carried out, but it is significant that they proved "rather dillatory" so that they were recommended "to unite with John Wigham" whose arrival was in prospect.⁶

At the Half Year's Meeting at Edinburgh in 1798, it was decided at the instance of the Aberdeen Friends to extend the limits of the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting from the Tay Northwardstto the South Esk at Montrose, "and keeping the line of the River, Westwards to Brichen (which is not included) and from it in a South West direction, include Forfar and other places on the principal Road to Perth."⁷

The intercourse of these various meetings served important business and administrative purposes in addition to their spiritual significance. The ideal of regular and constitutional representation from a lower to a higher meeting was always kept in view and honoured in theory, though not always in practice. The Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting's recommendation to each Monthly Meeting in 1673 to send "two sound and weightie Friends" as delegates, and that none others attend the Quarterly Meeting unless they have "business" or a "call" to come,⁸ indicates that these meetings were early troubled at times with the presence

-
3. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Minutes" 1794, (MS Vol 29) PP 129, 221. There is however a Meeting for Worship in Dundee today.
 4. "General Meeting Book" 1786, (MS Vol. 46) P 164. The 'Edinburgh Monthly Meeting' became the 'Two Months' Meeting in 1809.
 5. Crosfield's "Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill" (1843), PP 449-450.
 6. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 13) PP 96-98. cf Draft Minute of Aberdeen Half Yearly Meeting, 18th 10mo. 1786. (In Bundle No. 61 of Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House) Also cf "Memoirs of John Wigham", PP 12- 13.
 7. "Gen. Meeting Book" 1786, (MS Vol 46) P 60. and "Edin. Monthly Meeting Minutes", (MS Vol 29) PP 59-60.
 8. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", 1669, (MS Vol 15) P 34.

of unauthorised persons. On the other hand, lower meetings were sometimes very negligent. Glasgow Meeting as already noted, sent no representatives for several years to Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting during the dispute about their Meeting House, and Kinmuck Meeting was reprimanded by Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting in 1696 for a similar offence.⁹ Attendances at meetings naturally fluctuated with the general prosperity or depression in the Society, and indeed in the 18th century, so small and monotonous was the business transacted at many meetings that delegates had small encouragement to attend. This was probably part of the reason why the system of correspondence with Scotland which Fox instituted just before his death seems to have broken down within a quarter of a century. Apparently thinking that they were inadequately served by the London correspondents, the Scots Friends complained of neglect. This the former repudiated and the relations between them were obviously strained.¹⁰ In the end Gilbert Molleson and Alexander Paterson refused to act longer as correspondents with Scotland, as they took serious exception to the attitude and spirit shown by the Aberdeen Friends over the Affirmation Question and refused to be parties to a line of action which was a grave menace to the peace and unity of the Society.¹¹ When the Second Day Meeting in London asked the Scots Friends to choose new correspondents in 1713, the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting replied that "it is ye minde of Friends here that ane answer be written to ym to know their Reasons more particularly for Refusing to Correspond with us".¹²

Some interesting advice and practical counsel was sought at Meetings from time to time. The wife of a seaman called Somerville consulted the Aberdeen Mid-Month Meeting in 1672 as to whether "it was safe or suitable for him to flee from the press to the war that is now denounced against the States of Holland by the King. The Meeting advised that he remain in Aberdeen, but left him "to his own freedom". He did stay, and when the Magistrates imprisoned him and required him to give a pledge of military service as a condition of his release, "Friends thought fit to advise him not to give any engagement.. lest otherwise it might mar his peace and reflect on Truth".¹³ In 1680 some Aberdeen Quakers sought counsel of the Monthly Meeting as to the propriety of giving a gratuity to the prison warders for their consideration to Friends during their periods of incarceration, now happily ceased, and it was agreed that voluntary contributions should be welcomed not only from Aberdeen but

9. JFHS VIII, P 73.

10. "Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4) P "39"; and MS Letter from London Correspondents to Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting, 22-6mo-1709. (In Bundle 62 (2) of Aber. MSS.)

11. Letter from Gilbert Molleson and Alex. Paterson to the Aber. Q.M. 3-10-1713. (Bundle 62 (19) of Aber. MSS.)

12. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) PP 195, 196. cf Copy of Letter from Aber. Y.M to London Correspondents, 25-7 of 2mo 1716. (Bundle 62 (9) of Aber. MSS.)

13. JFHS VIII. PP 42, 43.

also from Kinmuck.¹⁴

When any adherent applied for membership in the Society two or more members of the Monthly Meeting were appointed to "have an opportunity" with him and report to the ensuing Meeting. Often the application was delayed until the members' judgment was more fully matured and sometimes the application was refused.

Certificates of transfer or certificates for travelling Friends were generally issued or received in Scotland with the same meticulous care as elsewhere. No Quaker was supposed to venture afield without this passport from his last Monthly Meeting, as to his "orderly walk and conversation" among them or signifying Friends "unity" with him in the object of his mission.¹⁵ It seems that a son of Quakers, not himself a Friend was usually granted a certificate, for when one named Robert Keith asked the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting in 1716 for the same for his son to seek employment abroad, young Keith received a certificate "declaring him a Child of honest parents and that they have nothing to lay to his Charge".¹⁶ George Cruikshank of Balhagardy was granted a similar one from Kinmuck for his son in 1785.

Sometimes the Yearly, sometimes the Monthly Meeting was the medium of the distribution of both Quaker and anti-Quaker literature; up to about the Revolution the commonest form of literature was crusading tracts, after 1688 "Journals" began to be common also. In 1675 Aberdeen Mid-Monthly Meeting decided that John Swinton should send from London six copies of every Quaker publication and that one copy should be allocated to two Friends named who should "pay for them how soon they receive them".¹⁷ In 1694 Edinburgh Yearly Meeting determined that three hundred copies of Hew Wood and Patrick Livingstone's pamphlet, 'Some things Writ Concerning Forms', "shall be sent to the West, and on hundred to the north, and on for this meeting and Kelso."¹⁸ A certain Andrew C- was instructed by Edinburgh Monthly Meeting in 1698 to "gett the money for these books called the sneak in the grease and to give it in against the next meeting",¹⁹ while Aberdeen Yearly Meeting agreed in 1708 to contribute £5 towards reprinting William Dell's "Works", the Aberdeen, Kinmuck and Urie Monthly Meetings each contributing one third.²⁰ Later on in the century there is little evidence of such activity.²¹

14. Ibid, P 55.

15. eg. Ibid, PP 71-2, 72-3, 76.

16. "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 3) P 71.

17. JFHS. Vlll, P53.

18. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 72.

19. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) P 74.

20. "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4) P 48: v also JFHS Vlll, P 115n: and cf "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 3) P 35.

21. cf however, Letter from London Friends to Aber. Q.M. 18-6-1710 Bundle 62 (14) of Aber. MSS.

The Records of the Society of Friends in Scotland are irritating in their inequality. During the last years of the 18th century and the first half of the 19th, they are full of dry formality and a wearisome conscientiousness, but the earlier ones, the most valuable for the historian, are not too well kept, with many unexplained gaps, and birth, marriage and death notices mixed up with Minutes in a haphazard way. A few of the gaps of course may be due to such causes as intensive persecution. There is eg. a great paucity of Glasgow Records in the last decade of the 17th century, most of our information about the fortunes of Friends there coming from private Journals and the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting Minutes; and during the fiercest persecution in Aberdeen, from 1676 to 1679 there is a long interruption in the Records of Monthly Meetings. Like several others, a valuable early Record of Quakerism in the West known as "Hew Wood's register" is lost although it and other contemporary papers were supposed to be collected by the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting in 1708 and sent to London to be ingrossed in the generall historie according to the memorial sent from frinds ther".²²

The earliest mention of any Record of persecution, apart from private sources like Halhead and Caton, was an instruction from the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting to the Monthly Meeting in 1670 to be "diligent to gather up the sufferings of Friends as—as may be remembered, with thes circumstances, time when, place where, names of persons inflicting, name of persons upon whom it was inflicted and why, with the examples come upon persecuters (if there be any)".²³ Lessudine Monthly Meeting was also advised "that a book be boewght to registrat sufferings in & brought to the nixt qterly meeting by Richard Rae & patrick Livingstone" in August 1670.²⁴ This resulted in the commencement of the "MS Register of Sufferings". In November 1671 Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting strongly urged all Preparative Meetings to give in their list of sufferings to James Brown of the Westport who was to pass them on to Walter Scott, "to whom the caire of that matter is left for puting them in swch methods as they may be recorded from time to time".²⁵ But apparently, through some unaccountable slackness, much was left to be desired, for in 1682 the Quarterly Meeting recommended to its Monthly Meetings to make two members in each responsible for making careful and detailed returns of sufferings to the former each time it met.²⁶ Again in 1691 the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting urged "that Friends thro' the Nation take care to record ane exact account of all their suferings on truth's account in their Monthly and Quarterly

22. JFHS Vol. XLV, P 9.

23. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) P 21.

24. Ibid, P 22.

25. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 25.

26. Ibid, P 46.

Meeting Books, mentioning ye year and if possibl ye day & month, and yt a perfect acot of them be brought to each Yearly Meeting, yt any part or portion of them may be laid before those in authority as truth requires for the Redressing of Greavanices".²⁷

The Birth, Burial, and Marriage Registers however were quite well kept in the later years of our period probably owing to an instruction of the Half Year's Meeting in 1795 that Monthly Meetings make their returns at least once in the year. Aberdeen and Edinburgh each had its own registrar.²⁸

In 1829 the General Meeting appointed a special committee to make an inventory of all extant Registers, Minute Books and other documents and to compile a list of all missing Records of Meetings formerly in existence in Scotland. The results of the investigation are set out in careful detail and occupy twenty-one pages of the Minute Book.²⁹

The Quakers laid great stress on their Social Services and Philanthropy. It was a principle of the Society from the beginning that all poor or indigent Friends should receive what assistance they required within itself, and none should be chargeable to outside charity or public funds. The very first General Meeting in Edinburgh in 1669 recommended Quarterly and Monthly Meetings to institute a fund "for swplyeing the poore among freinds," and from 1674 frequent mention is made in Minutes of "the box" which may however have been the same "chist that keeps the wrytes" of the Edinburgh Meetings.

During the height of the persecution in Aberdeen, the prisoner Friends were a special care on Quaker charity. In December 1676, Edinburgh Monthly Meeting collected and sent to Aberdeen for the relief of the prisoners £150 Scots "by ane bill drawn wpon Alexr. patton collector of the pwblick dwttes of the shire of Abd the money being payed in be David falconer to Rojunes clerk to the Lyones office go is the sd Alexr pattones correspondent here".³⁰ Six months later, Edinburgh Friends gave James Brown another £88 Scots and from Lessuden and Kelso came a contribution of £48 Scots. Linlithgow sent £5,³¹ which is the first mention of Quakers there although they were not formed into a meeting for another fourteen years. All these amounts were forwarded by Brown to David Barclay of Urie, and others were sent later in the year. The Women's Meeting

27. Ibid, P 59.

28. "Gen. Meeting Book" 1786, (MS Vol 46) P 51.

29. Ibid, PP 221-242. cf also "Richardson MSS" Vol V, No 48, (Euston Library) and "Note on the Sources" in Bibliography.

30. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) P 36.

31. Ibid, P 37, and "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol 16) P 23.

at Hamilton collected £10 Scots, and Friends at Gartshore and neighbourhood £22 Scots.³²

A case of banishment was relieved in September 1682 by the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting, - one Thomas Dunlop, a poor weaver in Musselburgh who, after only ten weeks' residence was expelled in June for his Faith by the Magistrates and afterwards imprisoned. He and his family became outcasts for a time and were forced to live in the fields as no one would give them shelter. After thirteen days' vain effort to move the Magistrates, Dunlop appealed to the Privy Council for restitution to his home. The Council, while approving the statutory action of the Magistrates, added the rider that if Dunlop was not removed from the town "in an orderly manner" he had the right to appeal before an ordinary Justice against the mode of his ejection.³³ In 1699 Hew Crawford, a Lanarkshire Friend lost his employment and the Hamilton Meeting gave him "a boll of meall" costing twenty Scots marks for the relief of his family.³⁴ The same year the London Meeting for Sufferings sent £108 for the relief of the poor in Scotland.³⁵ Other examples in the 18th century were John Brown, man-servant in Hallhill who was voted help "because of charg of famelie";³⁶ John Cook of Linlithgow, of similar occupation, who for his beliefs lost his father's favour, and financial help apparently, and was in need of clothes;³⁷ John Corstorphine, the most frequent recipient of charity from the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting circ. 1730 to 1740. In 1741 a grant of a shilling was made to an indigent Friend "to help to Buy her a wheel to spinn on",³⁸ and in 1816 one Barbara Hunter was voted a s sum by the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting "to enabel her to buy a Cow".³⁹

But while Quaker philanthropy began at home, it did not end there. In 1685 the Aberdeen Friends collected £15 for the relief of "Friends prisoners under the Turks", and an Edinburgh Friend was to be asked to try to collect the same amount "amongst Friends in the South".⁴⁰ When ex-Provost Drummond appealed to the Society at Edinburgh in 1738 for a contribution towards building a hospital of sixty beds which the Managers of the Royal Infirmary had undertaken, the Friends were "Inclinable to countenance so good a work here", and Areskine and Charles Ormiston Junr. were commissioned to enlist the

32. Ibid.

33. RPCS.3rd Series, Vol VII, PP 486-7: cf "The British Friend", (1861) P 71.

34. "Hamilton Meeting Book", (MS Vol 14) P 9.

35. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 95.

36. "Hamilton Meeting Book", (MS Vol 14) P 24.

37. JFHS Vol XXVI, P 10.

38. "Edin Monthly Meeting Book", 1730, (MS Vol 13) P 29.

39. "Cash Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting 1816-36," (Aber MS. Vol 26). P 2.

40. JFHS Vlll, 62.

cooperation of others in Aberdeen, Kelso and Glasgow Meetings.⁴¹

In 1835 the General Meeting for Scotland appointed four leading Friends in Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Hawick as a committee to receive subscriptions in aid of the proposed fund "for promoting the Universal Abolition of Slavery and the Slave Trade". The Meeting in 1836 realised nearly £5 for this object, and in 1838 authorised and raised over £8 "for the improvement of the African Race" and the other object as well.⁴² In this same year a resolution moved in the House of Commons "That negro apprenticeship in the British Colonies should immediately cease" was carried by three votes.

The Quaker attitude to Education has already been defined. After the first few years, things did not go too smoothly at Kinmuck. In 1708 Aberdeen Yearly Meeting found it necessary to bind Robertson to "give due and constant attendance" to his duties as a schoolmaster and to the diet and cleanliness of the poor children boarded with him. For the next seventy years or so the records show a period of great unsettlement with frequent changes of masters and ushers, and it is not easy to determine which side was to blame for many controversies.⁴³ Probably on this account some Scots children went early to Ackworth School, and after considerable negotiations the children of Scots Friends were admitted in 1819 to the new Wigton School in Cumberland.⁴⁴ Scottish Quakers contributed liberally to Wigton School, and the General Meeting was represented on its Board. The will of John Robertson of Kinmuck which came into effect in 1833 provided at the discretion of the trustees, for the interest of the residue being devoted to the education of the children of poor Scottish Friends, at Ackworth or any other similar seminary.⁴⁵ Occasionally a poor boy was materially helped in his education as George Moore, an orphan who was boarded by the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting with Patrick Robinson at Linlithgow "to be kept at school to learn to read and write". £10 Scots per quarter was paid for "George Moor his bed and burding".⁴⁶ But particular attention was given to making provision for "putting out apprentices". Funds were provided in necessitous cases, not only for board but for clothing. In 1675 mention was made in the Hamilton Meeting "concerning the benefit and necessities of putting the children of poor friends to trades",⁴⁷ and legacies were left for the purpose. Of these

-
41. "Edin Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 314.
 42. "Edin. Two Months' Meeting Minute Book", (MS Vol 32) No pages num^{ber}.
 43. Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book, (MS Vol 4) PP 50, "54", 69-70, "84", 141. v also ante Bk III, Ch. VII.
 44. "General Meeting Book", (MS Vol 46) PP 147, 183.
 45. "Minute Book of General Meeting for Scotland" 1832- 1871, (Aber. MSS. Vol 20) P 10.
 46. JFHS. Vol XXVI, P 10. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 140.
 47. "General Record of Friends in the West", (MS Vol.16) P 20.

the two best known are those of James Brown of the West Port and Elizabeth Dickson of London.⁴⁸ James Brown left in his Will 500 marks, the interest of which was to be applied every third year for the use of "ane apprentice", who had to be an orphan lad or girl, or the child of parents too poor to help them. Preference was given to the children of Friends, failing which, the recipient must be "of the soberest and honest parents of the people of the World that Friends can be informed of".⁴⁹

A quaint and interesting deed of contract is extant between a hookmaker named Muir and a married Friend, Robert Gordon whom the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting of 1674 "put out" as an apprentice. Gordon was to "live in" and Friends were "satisfied to concur to entertaine his wife and children". An inducement to the apprentice to "prove diligent and painfull at his work" was to be some instruction from Muir "in his trade of Cardmaking about the end of the year".⁵⁰

Other items and aspects of Quaker finance in Scotland besides charity are not without interest or importance. Most of the money transactions in Meeting Records were in Scots Pounds up to about 1730, but in the West of Scotland this currency lasted as late as 1750. Usually Pounds 'sterling' or 'Scots' are clearly marked as such. With few exceptions there was all along as already observed, a generous and mutual spirit of help shown by one Meeting to another, and a willingness to have "all things common" financially as well as religiously. At Edinburgh Yearly Meeting in 1680, Andrew Jaffray presented Aberdeen Friends' need of assistance to complete their Meeting House and "diverse freinds have mentioned what they will give and some have given already".⁵¹ The stronger bodies often helped the weaker in paying the rent of their Meeting Houses, as Edinburgh Monthly Meeting helped Linlithgow in 1699 and the Dundee group were subsidised in 1802. Certificates of the distraint of goods or money suffered by Friends for any offence, were forwarded to the ensuing Yearly Meeting, as eg. in 1798, when Edinburgh members were "distrained" to the amount of nearly £6 for refusing to pay their military assessment;⁵² and in certain cases Friends were reimbursed for their loss by their Monthly Meeting. Occasionally loans to poor Friends were made by Meetings or by individuals, usually the former. Kinmuck Meeting eg. lent a member John Milne £12 in 1721, repayable in two years' time.⁵³ But it is to be feared these loans were not in all cases repaid.⁵⁴

48. "Aber Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4) P "91".

49. v Copy of Brown's Will in "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4) PP 10-11. cf "Edin Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 68 etc. For the Aberdeen administrators of Brown and Elizabeth Dickson's Wills, v "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4). P 91.

50. JFHS VII, P 53.

51. "Edin Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 42.

52. "General Meeting Book" (MS Vol 46), P 60.

53. "The Kinmuck Book", (MS Vol 5) P "185".

54. cf JFHS VII, P 9.

The contributions of the Quakers "for the service of Truth" in their various meetings were generally conscientious in proportion to their means, although some recorded are candidly qualified by the word "oullie". An interesting adumbration of the Free Will Offering Scheme of today is given in a budget of the Kinmuck Meeting for 1679, with sums varying from £2-10-0 stg. to a shilling, promised at Whitsunday and Martinmas.⁵⁵ Part of the Quaker income accrued from property built or purchased as a speculation and rented to tenants, as eg. a backland tenement in Guest Row, Aberdeen which was purchased, partly by contributions, about 1700;⁵⁶ the house and stables at the Gallowgate Burying Ground;⁵⁷ and the block of tenements in the Pleasance Edinburgh in front of the Burial Ground, the building of which was completed in 1805 at a cost of £1037.⁵⁸ Twenty years later it was insured against fire at £800, and at the same time two other Meeting Houses were insured also, Glasgow for £600, and Hawick for £300.⁵⁹

Legacies or annuities were left by Friends for various purposes, for "putting out apprentices"; for schools or the education of poor children; for Friends in needy circumstances; for the renovation or upkeep of Meeting House property and for travelling ministers.⁶⁰ The last is the most frequent stipulation. Elizabeth Dickson left two bequests, in 1701 and in 1711, which are typical examples. The former was £100 whereof half of "the annual rents, issues and profits shall be given to such faithful friends who are low in the world, and may be drawn from their outward business and habitation to visit the people of God called Quakers in Aberdeen or elsewhere in the northern or western parts of Scotland."⁶¹ The other half was for Friends visiting Edinburgh. The interest of the 1711 legacy, also of £100, was to convey "English Public Friends from Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting to Montrose Meeting or to help them hither."⁶² The Kinmuck Monthly Meeting passed a wise resolution in 1714 "that the mortification donations, legacies, and purchases belonging properly to this meeting should be entred among the records.. that so succeeding ages may both see their ancestors care of the publique and also may be more capable to distribute them according to the true intent of the donors."⁶³ But the Quaker finances in

55. Ibid, Vol VIII, P 54.

56. Ibid, P119.

57. cf "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting" (MS Vol 3) PP 137-9.

58. "Edin Monthly Meeting Minutes" 1794, (MS Vol 29) P175, and "Edin. Two Months' Meeting Accounts" (MS Vol 50) PP 5ff.

59. "Edin Two Months' Meeting Minute Book" 1832, (MS Vol 30) P91.

60. eg "General Meeting Minutes" 1834, (MS Vol 47) PP 495; "Edin. Monthly Meeting Minutes" 1794, (MS Vol 29) PP 228-9; "The Kinmuck Book" (MS Vol 5), P "189".

61. cf JFHS. Vol VIII, P119: and "Exhibit of the Several Properties" (MS Vol.—), PP 15-16.

62. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) P 104.

63. "Minute Book of Kinmuck Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 5) P 169.

Scotland while usually sufficient were not always well administered, especially as the Society declined. In 1737 Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting became alarmed at the confusion of their funds, and appointed Robert Barclay Junr. "to make out and compleat their severall Rights in manner hereafter expressed" and to overhaul the whole affairs of the Society.⁶⁴

The travelling and incidental expenses of Stranger and Ministering Friends were always somewhat of a problem, especially when those who had "a concern" to visit Scotland became too abundant. In the very early missionary days English Friends usually travelled at their own expense, or, if they could not afford to do so entirely, with a grant from the Swarthmore funds. It is not certain when this practice ceased but probably soon after the Cromwellian period. During the middle period the responsibility for Stranger Friends was usually vested in the Scots Monthly Meetings, but sometimes in the Quarterly Meeting,⁶⁵ though gratuitous service or hospitality by individual Scots Friends was not forbidden. Most of the visitors were very much "foreigners" in Scotland and conditions of travel were difficult. This made the burdens on the meetings for guides, accomodation of the visitors, bleeding and grazing their horses, sometimes even hiring horses, and renting rooms for meetings, both uncertain in their incidence, and unequal. It is not surprising that there are indications of discontent or indifference in the 18th century to these crowds of visiting Friends, English, Irish and American, especially as some had clearly come on a holiday jaunt! Montrose had to be reprimanded by Aberdeen in 1697 for its negligence and inhospitality,⁶⁶ but one may sympathise with the isolated Friends at Montrose in the light of a Minute of the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting of January 1700 which reads:—"Friends at Stonhyve and Urie represent ther great concern that travelling frinds are not sufficiently attended with conveys South and North, which this meeting acknowledges the great need of Looking to Especially at Montross where the greatest Gap betwixt Meetings is from thence to Edinburgh..."⁶⁷ In 1705 the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting came to an agreement with Montrose Friends to convey "public" Friends thence to Edinburgh at the expense of the Quarterly Meeting.⁶⁸ Bartholemew Gibson the Canongate blacksmith, leading Edinburgh Friend though he was, had to lie out of his money for attending "Publick Friends" horses for a considerable time, and was seemingly paid by reluctant instalments till at last in 1699 the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting cleared its conscience by "clearing of that

64. "Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4) P 164.

65. eg v "Hamilton Meeting Book" (MS Vol 14), P 11, where Edinburgh Q.M. assists Cumberhead Meeting in conveying travelling Friends back to England, "because it is a long journey, and in any other thing, wherein they are burdened beyond their ability"

66. "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting", (MS Vol 4) P 12.

67. Ibid, P 16 (2).

68. Ibid, P "39". A modified concession of a similar kind was made to Kinmuck, (v "The Kinmuck Book", MS Vol 5. P "167".)

money that is dew to bartholemew gibson".⁶⁹ This state of affairs does not seem to have improved within the next generation, for in 1734 the Glasgow Friends demanded a part of Elizabeth Dickson's legacy for defraying the charge of "public" Friends visiting them, which was rather unwillingly conceded to them by the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting for the one year only but not as a precedent.⁷⁰ This led to the latter passing a new regulation that each Monthly Meeting defray the charge of Public Friends out of their own funds as far as possible, and that Friends take their turn of "conveying" the visitors personally or provide a substitute "and consider [recompense] that person for their time": also that the Monthly Meeting be responsible for all travelling expenditure of the strangers.⁷¹ Sometimes the expenses for travelling Friends were very heavy. Samuel and Mary Alexander's journey North from Glasgow in 1804 cost £19; Deborah Darby and her friend travelling from Glasgow to Aberdeen and Orkney and back to Carlisle in 1807 cost £99;⁷² while the expenses of Stephen Grellet's visit to Scotland in 1811 amounted to nearly double that sum.⁷³ In the thirties and forties frequent application was made to the John and Martha Robertson Trust for assistance in defraying travelling Friends expenses, by Meetings whose funds were low or exhausted.

The Quaker Records in Scotland are full of marriage notices and certificates, the latter of which are also rather stereotyped descriptions of what took place. The earliest marriages seem to have been very simple and direct transactions, free from many later formalities, the parties, presumably with their parents' consent, coming before a Monthly Meeting and being married there and then. But soon regulation upon regulation was added until there was a definite system of procedure by the 18th century. In 1673 Aberdeen Monthly Meeting decided ("to shun all Inconveniences in tyme coming") that contracting parties must give previous notice to their Meeting or "Their marriag shall be stopped untill frinds be satisfied that it may be accomplished".⁷⁴ In 1686, Aberdeen Meeting banned marriages in private houses and directed that "without some speciall reason" they take place in a public meeting of Friends.⁷⁵ In 1697 the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting made the procedure more standardised and uniform by bringing it into line with the English Friends' methods in three particulars,⁷⁶ and later came the appointment by the Monthly Meeting of some of its members to make strict enquiry into the "clearness" of both parties and their freedom from any other engagement. It would seem however that engagements were still too frequently clandestine

69. JFHS Vol XXVI, PP 9-10.

70. "Edin Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) PP 295, 296.

71. Ibid, P 297.

72. "Edin Two Months' Meeting Accounts", (MS Vol 50) under dates.
(No pages numbered)

73. "Edin Monthly Meeting Minutes" 1794, (MS Vol 29) PP 284, 286. cf. Jones,

74. JFHS Vol VIII, P 46.

"Later Periods", Vol. I, P 215

75. Ibid, P 62.

76. Ibid, P 74.

for in 1699 Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting reached a unanimous "sense" — for there is no voting in Friends' gatherings—that before any Friends give notice of their intention to marry to their Monthly Meeting, they must first obtain their parents' consent, if alive, as well as of relations or good friends, "and likewise.. have acquainted some faithfull friends" in their meeting or meetings and to have their consent also;⁷⁷ altogether a pretty stiff order.

Sometimes the Meeting declined to accept an intimation of marriage, as Kinmuck did in 1685 when it rejected James Porter and Elizabeth Blackhall on the ground that Porter's first wife was too recently deceased, and Elizabeth "had not given such prooffe of her being settled in the truth as to satisfie the mynd of freinds."⁷⁸

There is nothing more of interest about marriages for over a century. In 1824 the General Meeting for Scotland proposed to the London Yearly Meeting a wise and welcome innovation, viz that to obviate the necessity of parties having to wait two months after their intimation of marriage to be declared "clear", the Edinburgh Two Months' Meeting should be allowed "to liberate parties.. at an adjournment of the meeting at which their intentions are declared... provided such an adjournment be not held till after a suitable time has elapsed for making proper enquiry into the clearness of the Parties".⁷⁹

About Burials, little remains to be added. There was no such thing as a "service", and often the whole proceedings would be carried through in reverent silence. The funeral had to be of the simplest and plainest, and "all unnecessary superfluties such as handles and clasps upon Coffins" were forbidden.⁸⁰ Stranger Friends who died while travelling in Scotland were interred in the nearest Burial Ground.

Title Deeds were not safeguarded always as they should have been, and there was no central repository for them. They remained in local Friends' hands and sometimes went amissing. Lindley Murray Hoag has left on record a strange experience he had when staying a night at Urie in 1849, of how the ghost of David Barclay revealed to him the hidden safe in his bedroom wall in which were found next morning the valuable lost Title Deeds of the Urie Estate.⁸¹ There is pretty frequent mention in Monthly Meeting Records of the need of care of Deeds.

77. "Hamilton Meeting Book" 1695, (MS Vol 14) P 11.

78. JFHS Vol Vlll, P 61.

79. "Edin. Two Months' Meeting Minute Book" 1822, (MS Vol 30) PP54-5

80. JFHS Vlll, P 71.

81. "Memoirs of John Wigham Richardson, 1837-1908," PP 37-8.

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER III."DISCIPLINE IN SCOTLAND."

The fact that not till 1737 was there any proper or constituted membership in the Society of Friends, particularly in the very early years before Fox established Meetings for Discipline in 1668, accounts for a considerable amount of the trouble among the Quaker community, both internal and external. Attendance at meetings was claimed to give the right of membership and consequently it was all too easy, as Caton discovered in Edinburgh, for the young edifice in course of building to be "daubed with untempered mortar"¹ by "unwise builders" who were really turbulent or ignorant spirits causing vexation and dispeace. Unfortunately, but naturally, the outside community classed them all together, and the real Friends had sometimes to suffer for the policy and behaviour of those whom they repudiated and would have disowned. It was these conditions which largely led to the growth of discipline in the ordinary ecclesiastical sense and to the classic work on the subject, Barclays "Anarchy of the Ranters" which was published in 1674.

The Quaker discipline if not always enlightened was quite uniformly strict and more regular in its system than the Quaker organisation. Individuals and sections alike came under the lash, and there was generally no respect of either. It covered every part and relationship of Friends' lives. Dress and personal habits have been alluded to previously. Aberdeen Yearly Meeting in 1701 resolved "that hereafter Non shall sitt in or be owned as members" of any of the men's meetings "Unless they be subject to the order and Government of Truth in the Meetings, in Conversation and apparell etc".² The Monthly Meeting divested itself of any further responsibility for an apprentice who refused to commence under the employer contracted with, or to serve out his time until he qualified. In one case in 1703 where the instigation of a youth came from his mother, the Meeting threatened to withdraw all assistance from her.³ Even after a marriage had been fully sanctioned, it had to be supervised, and one or two representatives were usually sent from the Monthly Meeting to see that "good order is kept", and report back to the Meeting and be discharged.⁴ The Monthly Meeting always appointed two or more members as the executors of deceased Friends' Wills, and where non-members of the Society were heirs to the whole estate or residuary legatees, the executors insisted that all funeral expenses and outstanding debts of the deceased should be met before the effects could be touched by such persons.⁵

1. A quotation from Ezekiel XlII. 10.

2. Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4) P "22".

3. Ibid, P 30.

4. eg "Minute Book of Kinmuck and Old Meldrum Meetings", (MS Vol 21) PP 18-19.

5. eg Ibid, P 16.

In 1764 Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting resolved that no member should lend out any of its public funds without its instructions, or borrow any sum without finding caution agreeable to the Meeting.⁶ Officials were usually trustworthy, as they were chosen with care and with the full "sense" of a meeting, but the experience of a weak or dishonest treasurer may lie behind this regulation. Even important officials, if in default, or "bringing reproach on Truth", were disciplined with impartiality, as William Miller the Third who was disowned, and Andrew Reid, clerk to the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting, who was cashiered from all his offices and censured in 1802 for defiance of the Meeting's authority, and contumacy.⁷ Kelso, Montrose, Gartshore and Kinmuck Meetings also were severely reprimanded at various times for slackness in sending representatives to the higher Meeting and other delinquencies, while arising out of the "great neglect" of Kelso Women Friends to maintain their Monthly Meeting, the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting of 1717 had to urge Friends "in their severall monethlie meetings.. to exhort ye women friends to take care to hold up right Discipline in ye Church".⁸ For fully a decade in the early 19th century, to about 1816, there was serious dissension in the Scottish Meeting of Ministers and Elders. The cause (or causes) is not clear, but the disharmony must have accounted partly for the low condition which travelling Friends experienced. The London Yearly Meeting had the matter in hand with the General Meeting for Scotland and the Edinburgh Two Months' Meeting, and in 1814 London suggested to the Scots General Meeting to consider whether "the time is not come for the removal of such as may be the cause of the offence from these stations." It is very probable that Reid the ex-clerk was largely involved in the dispute, if not the cause of it, and when he appealed finally to the London Yearly Meeting against the Scots General Meeting in 1816, London dismissed his appeal.⁹

The procedure in dealing with defaulters and renegades varied little. The beginning of the process was usually one of two kinds. It might be a simple domestic "Fama" that the outside world cared nothing about, or only ridiculed. Even in the earliest years in Edinburgh and South Scotland, about 1669 and 1670, eg. there was a considerable number of processes,¹⁰ for "turning aside from the Truth", not attending meetings, and other charges, while at various later dates, processes for attending the 'Steeplehouse'; 'marrying out'; compromising or 'tampering' with Tithes; participating in forbidden pastimes; or joining some branch of the King's "services", were very common

-
- 6.. "Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4) under 7th month 1764...
(Page unnumbered.)
7. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Minutes"; (MS Vol 29) PP129-130.
8. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 212.
9. "The General Meeting Book" 1786, (MS Vol 46) PP 124-5, 133, 134-5.
10. cf "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) PP 19, 21, 22.

But sometimes the "Fama" was of a more serious nature, rising to a "Fama Clamosa" and affecting closely the general community as well as the Society. In any case, as soon as a report or rumour concerning any member came to a Friend's ears, it was reported at the ensuing Monthly Meeting,¹¹ and apparently whether the alleged offender was present or not, a small deputation of two to four members was appointed to interview him. If the "suspect" was a woman, a woman Friend was usually added to the visitors. Sometimes Friends had "a concern" or "were moved of the Lord" to volunteer for this duty as Patrick Livingstone and Hector Allen were to visit Andrew Haig when he "fell away";¹² otherwise deputies were instructed to proceed. Sometimes members of another meeting, if they could be secured, were commissioned.

The results of these deputations' visits naturally varied. Sometimes all efforts were futile, especially in marriage cases like William Gellie's in 1712, when Friends from the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting "got but small satisfaction,"¹³ and Robert Burnett, tutor of Leys'. Sometimes the deputies got a heated and rebellious reception from the delinquents, but more generally an attitude of real regret or contrition was evinced, and a willingness to own and acknowledge shortcoming or guilt. In the latter contingency, the culprits were afforded an opportunity to "give in a paper" voluntarily to the next Monthly Meeting confessing and condemning their actions or words and promising to reform and amend. A typical example is that of James, son of Hew Wood whose "scandallous walking" in being 'married out' by a "priest" in 1696 brought deputies from Hamilton Meeting who "weightily told him that they cannot have fellowship with him in ye Truth unless.. he bring forth fruit meet for repentance."¹⁴ He submitted the necessary "paper" which was read at Edinburgh Monthly Meeting in July 1697—why so long after is not known—and recorded, and a copy sent to Fetteresso whither he had removed.¹⁵ A touching instance of such self-condemnation was that of Christian Mercer for the same 'sin' and "bringing a reproach upon the Truth".¹⁶ All such "papers" or "few lynes" were recorded in the Minutes, but in some cases the delinquent was not freed from discipline for a time till it was seen if he made good. No evasion was allowed. If the delinquent failed to implement his acknowledgment and promise, his "paper" became null and void and the process recommenced; or if, like one, William Jolly, who was "under dealing" for gaming and other censurable practices, he failed to submit his "paper" as promised,

11 By a Minute of T.V.M in 1794. the Preparative Meeting might be (Aber. Bundle of MSS. No 66. (8).)

12. "Edin Quarterly Meeting Minutes", (MS Vol 15) P 46.

13. "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 3) PP 43, and 45

14. "Hamilton Meeting Book" 1695, (MS Vol 14) P 2.

14. "Hamilton Meeting Book" 1695, (MS Vol 14) P 2.

15. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) P 72. cf Testimony of William Glennie Junr. 1713 (Bundle 60 (4) of Aber. MSS.)

16. "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 3) P 129.

the Monthly Meeting ordered him to do so at its next sederunt.¹⁷

If after being interviewed, the culprit showed no signs of "giving in" a voluntary confession, he was summoned to submit it to the next Meeting. If no reply was received, a second deputation was often appointed, or a "Testimony" given out against him among Friends. In extreme cases of moral collapse which were unrepentent or contumacious, or in other cases where the "paper" submitted was unsatisfactory and every lesser means had failed, the Monthly or Quarterly Meeting "to clear Truth" issued a public "Testimony" or Manifesto, disowning him and certifying that he was no longer counted a member of the Society. In certain cases a caution was added to have no dealings with the disowned culprit.¹⁸ As a rule, every case of delinquency was tried upon its merits with commendable fairness according to the standards of the Quaker people, and even with great patience at times. Occasionally however unreasonable harshness was shown, as in the case of Elizabeth, wife of John Leslie of Old Aberdeen in 1722. Mrs Leslie had been charged before the Magistrates with theft but was acquitted owing to her "distraction of mind". At the subsequent Monthly Meeting, although her husband gave in a resumé of the court proceedings and she a "paper" against herself, the Meeting sent a "Testimony" to the Magistrates condemning her, and she was disowned.¹⁹

The most important or striking categories of offences in addition to those already specified, may be briefly tabulated here, and a few representative examples given.

(1) Debts, Business Dishonesty, and Bankruptcy.

Debts might be "bad" because of their magnitude, their long standing, or their culpability and wilfulness. There was quite a spate of them about the beginning of the 18th century, in contrast with the Friends' earlier reputation for business integrity. In 1696 two members of Hamilton Meeting were appointed to interview George Weir—whether the part-writer of the "Scotch Priests Principles" or his son, is uncertain,— "about the scandall that is brought upon Truth and friends" by his heavy debt and defrauding of his creditors, while steps were taken to remove the Meeting from his house.²⁰ In January 1703 after other expedients had failed, Edinburgh Monthly Meeting publicly disowned Duncan Morison and his sons, tobacco merchants, for contracting unpayable debts at Hamilton, and, instead of giving themselves up with their remaining stock to their creditors, fleeing to the sanctuary of Holyrood Abbey to escape arrest and "to frustrate their sd creditors".²¹ This may partly have

17. Ibid, P4.

18. eg Robt Watson, ("Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4) P30) and John Mackenzie (v infra P 392)

19. "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 3) P 97. and "Testimony" at the end of the volume.

20. "Hamilton Meeting Book", (MS Vol 14) P 2.

21. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol.12) P 89.

prompted the "savory paper" by William Miller the Edinburgh clerk, which was read and approved by the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting in 1703 bearing, inter alia, "that the precious Truth neither allows stealing from customers on any pretence, nor dealing in goods prohibited by Act of Parliament."²² But such defections continued. The same year a cooper's wife in the Gorbals squandered all her husband's money and ran into debt "above what they both are able to pay", so that the husband had to crave Friends' advice. The Edinburgh Yearly Meeting, "judged it saif for the man to Inhibit his said wife at Law, that she contract no more" and a Manifesto was issued against her.²³ In the case of Charles May in 1708, his "small paper" was judged unsatisfactory by the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting and he was disowned by Friends, "yet earnestly willing that it may please the Lord to give him a sense of his miscarriages, and that he may recover his loss for the Good of his immortal soul."²⁴ Even distance was no barrier to discipline, for a 'fama' of business dishonesty being raised against a Friend, John Scott who had gone to London, in 1677, the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting "thought meet that if he comes to Scotland shortly, he be spoke to thereanent, and if he remains at London, that he be write to."²⁵ Bankruptcy also was generally considered an indictable offence. In 1733 Edinburgh Friends signed a paper of Testimony against Joseph Miller of Craigentenny, son of the "Patriarch", probably for bankruptcy,²⁶ while nearly a century later, another Joseph Miller was disowned as a culpable bankrupt,²⁷ as was also a Quaker named John Sinclair in 1848.²⁸ A particularly distressing case was that of George Brantingham for culpable bankruptcy through years of neglect. He was treasurer to the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting which found that he "acted unfaithfully to the Trust reposed in him as Treasurer to this Meeting", and disowned him.²⁹ But judgment was sometimes mixed with mercy, for in the case of the former Miller, though his subscription to the new Meeting House was not refunded, some of his relations raised a fund to help to liquidate his debts,³⁰ and another bankrupt, William Gibb was not in the end disowned on account of his business partner's share of the guilt.³¹

-
22. JFHS II, P 125. This Abbey sanctuary only ceased within the last century.
23. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) PP 131, 134, 138-9.
24. "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting" (MS Vol 3), PP 17-20 partim.
25. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) P 37. cf "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 39.
26. Ibid, P 290.
27. "Edin. Two Months' Meeting Minute Book" 1822, (MS Vol 30) PP 148-9.
28. "Edin Two Months' Meeting Minute Book" 1848, (MS Vol 32) PP 15, 20.
29. "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting 1832-1868", (MS Vol 25) PP 176-7.
30. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 299, and "Memorials of Hope Park", P 6.
31. "Edin Two Months' Meeting Minute Book" 1831, (MS Vol 31.) PP 78, 82, 88.

(2) Cases of adultery and fornication were not common, except during the boundary years of the 18th and 19th centuries. Even then they were considerably below the proportion of Kirk Session cases. Probably within this category falls a "sham marradg" between two Friends in Gartshore Meeting, reported in 1709. About the end of the 18th century a case of antenuptial fornication occurred in Kinmuck Meeting, when the culprit Barbara Glenney was disowned.³² In 1804 a Quaker named Mercer was disowned for drunkenness and immorality in Dundee.³³ But no case was more flagrant than that of one, James Stoddart who was disowned in 1841 for absconding abroad with his mistress leaving behind in Edinburgh his three children, all illegitimate, and chargeable to the public relief.³⁴

(3) "Scandalous carriage" however is a common charge in these records and embraces a variety of offences apart from the sexual, especially drunkenness and wife beating. Sometimes the charge is framed very vaguely as in the case of Duncan, a Hamilton adherent who was "discharged to come" to the Meetings, and two years later in 1698 publicly "denied" for his "scandulus Carriage and his wicked words and actions".³⁵ But usually the charge is clear enough.

The earliest case of drunkenness recorded is that of James Weir, a Corstorphine weaver, who with his wife, was indicted by the Edinburgh Meeting in 1673 for "their scandalous life and conversation", particularly his, in being "Beastly drunk", so that even the minister had to summon him before the Kirk Session and reprove him, and his wife refused to live with him as a wife. Both were 'testified against' and publicly disowned.³⁶ In 1702 the same Meeting had to deal with James Halliday Junr. "ane coatch driver", who was supposed to be "drunk in driving so furiously in the publick stritt" so that people were in danger of being "greatly hurt" and "lickwise himself in haizerd of his own Life." He was imprisoned, and the Meeting sent William Miller to see him later and report.³⁷ Fifteen years later Hugh Spiers, a gardener in Old Aberdeen was disowned for drinking and profanity,³⁸ and in 1725 the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting gave out its testimony against tipling and excessive drinking.³⁹ In 1788, a woman was interviewed for her excessive drinking of spirits, but the deputies had "no great satisfaction" and nothing

32. "The Kinmuck Book", (MS Vol 5) PP "303-4".

33. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Minutes" 1794, (MS Vol. 29) P 167.

34. "Edin Two Months' Meeting Minute Book" 1831, (MS Vol 31) P 187.

35. "Hamilton Meeting Book", (MS Vol 14) P 7.

36. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) P 32.

37. Ibid, P 85.

38. "Minute Book of Aber. Monthly Meeting", (MS. Vol. 3) P 75, and "Testimony" at end of Vol.

39. Ibid, P 105, and "Testimony" at end of Vol.

further is known of the case.⁴⁰ Wife assault was sometimes the concomitant of drinking, though not invariably. In January 1715 a baker in Old Aberdeen named Strachan was disowned for "disorderly conversation", drunkenness and wife beating.⁴¹

(4) Any traffic with the "Services" was banned, in conformity with the traditional Quaker opposition to war from an early date in their history. In 1736 an Edinburgh tanner named Robertson was visited by two of the Millers on the report that "he had carryed arms and went to the Generall Muster upon the King's birthday."⁴² Andrew Lee Junr. had to be "closely dealt with" more than once for joining the Volunteer cavalry in 1799 before he would withdraw and deliver "up his arms under an Intention never to resume them,"⁴³ and in 1813 two other Friends were disowned for violating "our Christian testimony" by enlisting in the Navy.⁴⁴

The most interesting case however is that of William Gibb Junr. in 1838, who went from Edinburgh to London and presented his credentials to Southwark Monthly Meeting. The latter returned them because he had got a post in the Contract department of the Admiralty at Somerset House. Proceedings were begun, and the case dragged on for five years with numerous conferences and interviews. But while Gibb's attitude to Friends was always respectful, he would not surrender his situation, because it was permanent and secure, and his health was not equal to any kind of work. He was in a dilemma, as he did not wish to leave the Society, and so were the Friends; but in 1843 he said he would prefer disownment to resignation, and in December the Edinburgh Two Months' Meeting was compelled very reluctantly and with real sympathy to disown him, "desiring at the same time his best welfare" and hoping for his reinstatement.⁴⁵ The Gibb affair is referred to in the answer of the Scots General Meeting to Query 9 in 1842- "With the exception of Two Cases of Friends having entered into Contracts to supply Clothing for the Navy and one Case of a Friend having undertaken a situation in the Admiralty Office... Friends are faithful in our Testimony against bearing arms etc."⁴⁶

(5). The imposition of Tithes and Parish dues does not seem to have been so intense on the Quakers in Scotland, or so universal as in England, but they were sufficiently stringent in some places and times to tempt the Friends to compromise or

40. Ibid, P 278.

41. Ibid, PP 58-9.

42. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P308.

43. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Minutes" 1794, (MS Vol 29) PP 72.75.

44. Ibid, PP 322, 324.

45. "Edin. Two Months' Meeting Minute Book" 1831, (MS Vol 31) PP 130, 224, 229.

46. "General Meeting Minutes" 1834, (MS Vol 47) under May 1842. (page unnumbered.)

"tamper" with them, eg. in differentiating between what went to the support of the schoolmaster and what was an emolument of the minister. As long as they could avoid the latter, they appeared to care less about other dues, as is seen in Charles Ormiston's discussions with the Meeting for Sufferings. But this distinction was often obscure in theory and difficult if not impossible in practice. Friends for instance held shares in a Fire Insurance Company whose offices were assessed for the maintenance of the clergy. How far was this lawful? The matter was submitted to the Yearly Meeting in 1814.⁴⁷ Reminders and warnings were frequently renewed to overseers of Preparative Meetings and even to Monthly Meetings by the Quarterly Meeting to keep up the testimony against Tithes for the support of "hireling priests", and to ensure that no members paid such on pain of disciplinary dealing.⁴⁸ Sometimes Friends gave in voluntary Testimonies against themselves for payment of small tithes as the Johnstons of Newhills, father and son, in 1715.⁴⁹ The report given by Edinburgh Preparative Meeting in 1791 to the Monthly Meeting is typical of most, viz that the Friends appointed to enquire "into the Clearness of the Members of this Meeting in our testimony against the support of a hireling ministry report that they have performed that service and that it appears that none have complied with any demands made against them for that purpose since last year."⁵⁰ The practical difficulties of the problem might sometimes be side-tracked, but they were always present, as the Half Year's Meeting held at Kinmuck in 1797 realised, though the results of their discussion were not particularly helpful to perplexed Friends. After "solid consideration" of the "difficulty in which divers of its members are involved by being bound in their Leases to uphold in some degree a Hireling Ministry", the Meeting recommended them to "exert themselves in using their endeavours to get extricated from such entanglements, and that others may be careful not to get into similar engagements in future."⁵¹

But there were more practical helps than this given to diminish "shortness with respect to bearing our testimony".⁵² The Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting in 1716 succeeded in stiffening up some Kinmuck casuists to suffer rather for conscience' sake,⁵³ while ten years earlier it gave plain and sensible advice to Friends about declaring their possessions.

-
47. "Minute Book of Aber. Quarterly Meeting and General Meeting for Scotland", (MS Vol 19 in Aber. MSS P 146.)
 48. eg "Minute Book of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting", (MS Vol 3) P 61 etc
 49. (Bundle 60 (8) of Aber. MSS.)
 50. v Minute bound up in "Register of Births and Burials" 1681, (MS Vol 11) P 12. This Preparative Meeting was discontinued in 1792.
 51. "General Meeting Book" 1786, (MS Vol 46) P 57.
 52. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 245.
 53. "Aber. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4) PP 88, 89, and JFHS Vlll, PP 117-8.

In view of the exorbitant assessments or "Lybelling" of some "priests" for "their smal tyth or viccarage", the Meeting advised that, after Friends had refused on conscientious grounds to pay tithes, they should make a simple and voluntary statement to the Judge as to the number of cattle they have, in case the bailiff should distrain in ignorance more than he ought to take, or letters of horning were issued.⁵⁴

(6) Unauthorised Proceedings.

In the last years of the 17th century the Society seems to have had trouble with members travelling 'publicly' and incurring without leave, expense, for Hamilton Meeting in 1697 resolved that "no particullar person belonging to this meeting shall ingage in any thing of a publick concern without the consent of the body of ffriends" or "beare, if ffriends see meet, the burden themself"⁵⁵ From the beginning of the 18th century, there was a considerable number of defections to the Church, and these increased in the 19th century. Nothing need be added to what has already been written on this feature except one or two additional matters of interest. Two Kinmuck Friends, a man, and a married woman were disowned near the end of the 18th century for going to "those called presbetariens" and refusing to return to the Meeting.⁵⁶ In 1717 the wife of William Gray of Inverurie was cited for "her Error in medling at the Election of the Parish Priest."⁵⁷

Gray himself on threatening to go to law with his sister in 1709 was summoned before the Kinmuck Meeting, and as he resented the advice proffered him, he was warned that if he had recourse to law, he would be "denyed and a paper given forth against him."⁵⁸ Assuming that the sister was a Quaker, it is evident that although law-suits against outside parties were not banned, it was forbidden for any Friend to go to law against another.⁵⁹ The next year the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting ordered both plaintiff and defendant in another suit to give in written condemnations of themselves, the one for summoning his brother Friend, the other for putting his hand "to the form of ane oath befor the Sherief"⁶⁰

During the Twenties there was much slackness in the administration of Friends' financial affairs. Balance-sheets were not being properly kept, and money from rents and

54. "Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4) P 41.

55. "Hamilton Meeting Book", (MS Vol 14.) P 5.

56. "The Kinmuck Book", (MS Vol 5) PP "298", "300-1".

57. Ibid, P "175".

58. Ibid, P "158".

59. cf ante, Supp. Ch.I, P 359.

60. "Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4) PP 56, 57.

property was being disbursed without any consultation of the Meeting or of the trustees. By 1731 the situation was so unsatisfactory that Alexander Jaffray overtured the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting to clear up and regularise their affairs.⁶¹

But no unauthorised proceeding was more common or was punished more consistently with disownment than:-

(7) "Marrying out", a principle considered fatal to the purity of the Society's life and witness in keeping itself "unspotted from the World". It was a foolish and unequal law and wrought untold loss and havoc to the Cause till it was abrogated last century. A person was not denied admission to the Society by "convincement", even if his or her partner in life did not share the new convert's faith, ie. he was allowed to go on living with this "worldling", but whenever a Friend married "out", he was cast out of the vineyard. Usually, as might be expected, the "culprit" was unrepentant, but even in the case of an exception like Charles Ormiston's daughter, restitution seemed deferred indefinitely. When her father gave in a 'paper' signed by her, acknowledging her offence and craving restoration of fellowship with Friends, the Kelso Meeting in 1748 only decided that the "said Paper... lye in the Box amongst the rest of Friends' Papers"⁶², with what ultimate issue is not known.

Loyalty to the principles and witness of the Society took precedence of home loyalties, and even the sphere of domestic affairs and relationships was not private or immune from the interference and control of Meetings, or of individual Quaker members or overseers. Members of the same family would go so far as to inform against one another. Thomas Dunlop lodged a complaint against his son and apprentice at Edinburgh in 1694, and the Monthly Meeting appointed "the said thomas to bring him before the next Monthly Meeting".⁶³ Sixty years later, one Deborah Galloway accused her son-in-law Glenny to the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting of having broken his promise to give her half a peck of meal weekly. Two members were appointed to inform Glenny that, failing the implementing of his promise or a sufficient reason for not honouring it, given in to next Quarterly Meeting, disciplinary proceedings would be taken.⁶⁴ The result is not known.

More often the Meeting was the first to move. The Kennedy family of Cumberhead came in for direct interference

61. v Memorial by A Jaffray to Aberdeen Q.M anent Funds 1731. (Bundle No 63(2) in Aberdeen MSS.)

62. "Kelso Meeting Book" (1748), (MS Vol 17) P3.

63. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 12) P 68.

64. "Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 4) P 214.

in the opening decade of the 18th century. The Hamilton Meeting reported to the Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting that John Kennedy Junr. "doth not behave suitably towards his parents and frinds", and the latter summoned him "to attend the next quarterly meeting in order to vindicat himself and to satisfie frinds."⁶⁵ Within the next six years his mother apparently died, for when in 1710 his father, John Kennedy of Cumberhead proposed to take his servant as his wife, strong exception was taken to the projected union because she was neither a Friend nor 'a suitable person', and the Yearly Meeting published a manifesto against him.⁶⁶ Kennedy left Cumberhead and Quakerism ended there.

Even in the relations of husband and wife the Quaker Meeting showed a promptitude to take action. In 1715 an Edinburgh Friend, Jane Shaw had left her husband and gone to reside in Kelso. On hearing this, the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting "in a weighty sense having weighed ye affair" commissioned two Kelso women Friends to "discourse her concerning ye occasion of her Leaving her husband and deall with her to Return to him as soon as possible her health will permitt", and report.⁶⁷ In 1787 the overseers of Old Meldrum Preparative Meeting reported in session that in consequence of disagreeable things they had learned of differences between Robert Harvey and his wife in Inverurie, they had visited them, but to no satisfaction, and asked the Meeting "to take this matter under their care". The Meeting appointed six members "to visit them in love" and persuade them to reconcile their differences, with certification that "otherwise Friends will clear themselves and our Holy profession from lying under such reproachful conduct". But the visit of the deputation was fruitless, and the Preparative Meeting decided to carry the matter before the next Monthly Meeting.⁶⁸

The Quaker attitude to certain aspects and activities of social life was, as already indicated, very strict and uncompromising. Popular recreations and pastimes were practically 'taboo.' In February 1673, George Keith reported to the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting that two members, William Steven, weaver, and his wife had "countenanced the debauched tyme called yule" and spent all christmas day at her mother's in idleness and feasting also that they had resented reproof from their own immediate brethren and were unrepentant. In accordance with instructions from Aberdeen, Keith, with several other Friends, called on the Stevens and reprimanded them. They found the "man sensible and Jngenuous in acknowledging his fault: But his wife was not so at first: Yet afterwards being convinced by what was spoken to her,

65. "Edin. Quarterly Meeting Book", (MS Vol 15) P 142.

66. Ibid, PP 173, 174.

67. Ibid, P 204.

68. "Old Meldrum Preparative Meeting Minutes", PP 2,3. (Bound in "Kinmuck and Old Meldrum Monthly Meeting Book")— (MS Vol 21).

did weep and professed her grief for her offence."⁶⁹ A few years later, an Edinburgh Quakeress, Rebecca Lee Junr, was disowned by the Monthly Meeting for attendance at horse races and "other things in dress and address inconsistent with Truth".⁷⁰ The Quakers' hospitality at home was usually very kindly and generous, but extremely 'proper' though not altogether devoid of mirth and innocent 'abandon'. Certain 'writing' games, "Blind Mans Buff", "Hunt the Slipper", and—in the garden— "Hide and Seek" varieties were often permitted, after 1800. Henry Glassford Bell has left a record of his first visit to the Millers at Hope Park which is full of witty and clever caricature, and affords a fair picture of contemporary Quaker Society. Even in the genial irony of his closing sentence there is a suggestion that with all its defects he found something attractive in it— "I shall probably soon assume a snuff-brown suit myself, for verily I am half converted already"⁷¹

The Quakers' severe and plain manner of life and their dread of contamination by the World determined their attitude to all the Arts until the advent of the 19th century when they began to relax in certain things. The almost universal 'decoration' of walls of houses and Meeting Houses was a dull drab paint, if it was not whitewash. Paintings were hardly ever seen except a very occasional portrait in oils, but curiously enough, engravings were more in favour, "Penn's Treaty with the Indians" and the likeness of Elizabeth Fry or Fox ^{being} not uncommon. William Miller (1822-1866) one of the Hope Park family was a fine engraver by profession and a man of wide culture and sympathies, numbering among his correspondents several men of literary fame like Thomas Campbell, Samuel Rogers, and Dr. John Brown.⁷² A quaint touch is extant of the engraver's mother Ann Miller, that she indulged herself in Christopher North's opening lecture as Professor of Moral Philosophy and found it "brilliant and beautiful".⁷³ And two of the family of Alexander Cruikshank of Edinburgh developed a real love of the Arts and had a good collection of engravings. Singing and music were 'out of court' although they had been practised surreptitiously by the younger generation of the 19th century on a Jewish harp! The supreme horrors of dancing and theatre⁷⁴ or opera-going were of course shared by most contemporary Church people, and died very hard. In 1829 a solitary Friend at New Lanark who was the managing partner of the Cotton Mills was summoned for promoting a system of education among the workers in which the teaching of singing and dancing formed a part, but for some unknown reason he was not disowned, only counselled and cautioned.⁷⁵ But with a strange

69. JFHS. VLLL, PP 44-5.

70. "Edin. Monthly Meeting Minutes" 1794, (MS Vol 29) P82.

71. "Memorials of Hope Park", PP 68-9.

72. Ibid, PP 113 ff. Miller was noted for his engravings of Turner's landscapes

73. Ibid, P 100.

74. cf however JFHS. XVlll, PP 19-20. (Art on "The Theatre and Barclay's 'Apology,'" for the story of the singular conversion of Dr. Southam to Quakerism through attending the theatre.

75. "Edin. Two Months' Meeting Minute Book" 1822, (MS Vol 30) P223.

inconsistency, charades were allowed to become a favourite outlet of the artistic instinct in not a few households considered orthodox, and tableaux of Quaker history and even recitations from Shakespeare were latterly encouraged.

On a broad survey of the whole two hundred years, 1650-1850, there was never a time when the need of discipline was practically absent, and no black sheep troubled the fold, but during the decades of persecution in the 17th century it was certainly at a minimum. With the practical cessation of persecution in 1722 and the reign of legalism and jealous denominational exclusiveness, laxity and rebellion increased, especially among the younger members of the Society. But as far as it is possible to estimate from a comparison of the full and orderly 19th century records with the careless and often fragmentary records of the 18th and 17th, the 19th century was the worst of any. There were far more cases of moral decadence and immorality within the decades circ. 1790-1850 than there were before, and resignations from the Society and disownments were quite frequent. One feature however of Quaker discipline all through is noticeable, viz that a bitter spirit of vindictiveness and of revenge in those "denied" or expelled from the Society is very rare. The nearest parallel to Keith's apostacy was probably that of John MacKenzie, who, after a contumacious rebellion against the order and principles of Friends' Meetings was finally disowned in 1673. The case lasted for three years, and Aberdeen Friends had evidently grounds for stating that he was "ready to hurt frinds of Truth, especially young frinds", for none other than Keith himself included it in his warning to their Monthly Meeting.76

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER IV."CONCLUSION."

Quakerism in Scotland was always weak numerically, a fact which struck Miller on looking through his completed "Dictionary of Scotch Friends". Any accurate count of members or travelling Friends during the two centuries under our review is impossible, owing to gaps in records and the frequent carelessness in keeping registers, especially the earlier ones. In addition, some valuable MSS sources are lost, perhaps irretrievably. Miller estimates the number of members in Edinburgh Yearly Meeting, by convincement or birth, from 1656 to 1790, to have been only about 770. Allowing on his computation about 450 for Aberdeen Yearly Meeting, these years show a total of 1,220.¹ There were very few accessions after the opening of the 19th Century, so that for the entire period 1650-1850, a grand total of 1,400, or 1,500 at the most, cannot be far wide of the mark.

The year 1695 may be taken as the numerical watershed over Quaker Scotland as a whole. After that date the losses exceeded the gains by what might almost be called 'geometric retrogression'. Miller gives an instance in the two censuses within the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting area — in 1669, when the men alone numbered sixty-four; and in 1787, when the remnant of both sexes belonging to Edinburgh and Kelso Meetings, the only two surviving in the South, amounted to twenty-three!²

The decline of the Society of Friends however was general throughout the United Kingdom. About the middle of the Nineteenth Century the problem began to exercise seriously the mind of the Society. In 1858 an anonymous "Gentleman" offered a prize of 100 guineas for the best essay on the causes of the decline, and "Decline" literature multiplied. J.S. Rowntree's "Quakerism Past and Present" won the first prize. Many of the essays were written under a 'nom de plume', but probably the only purely native competitor was Robert Macnair, formerly a minister of the Church of Scotland, who became a Baptist owing to a change of belief concerning Baptism, but was never a Quaker. His "The Decline of Quakerism" was published in 1860.³ Macnair in common with the others confines himself of course to general principles and reasons obtaining all round, but here all that is necessary is to review briefly the main reasons for the failure of Quakerism to consolodate itself in Scotland.

The general estimate of the Friends in Scotland changed gradually with the widening scope of Toleration from the

-
1. cf J.F.H.S. Vol I, P 69.
 2. Ibid, P 70.
 3. Ibid, Vol II, PP 71-2.

early decades of blind prejudice and bitter hatred in the 17th Century through the stolid indifference and blank curiosity of the major part of the 18th, to something approaching admiration and esteem for the last seventy years of our period. For almost the whole period they were respected by the people and even by the clergy for their costly sincerity and comparatively pure and upright living, and even when the worst epithets were applied to them and they were classed with devils and other undesirables, it was not on account of their character, but rather of their doctrine and suspected alliance with Romanism and Catholic rulers. Even from people not usually credited with soundness of religious judgment, did expressions of esteem come, of whom Francis Jeffrey and David Hume may be instanced. Jeffrey while describing the Quakers as "cold in their affections", believed them to be "a tolerably honest, painstaking, and inoffensive set of Christians", who, despite their dullness and obstinacy, were "exemplary above all other sects for the decency of their lives, for their charitable indulgence to all other persuasions, [by Jeffrey's time] for their care of the poor, and for the liberal participation they have afforded to their women in all the duties and honours of the Society".⁴ Hume's view of the Quakers theologically may be passed over now as only what might naturally be expected from his religious preconceptions: what matters is that he has "indeed a great Regard for that Body of Men, especially for the present Members: and I acknowledge that even in the last Century, when all the different Sects were worrying one another, and throwing the State into Convulsions, they were always peaceable, charitable, and exemplary, and have in every Shape deserved well of the Public";⁵ - a rather excessive estimate no doubt, but in the main true.

It was not on ethical grounds that Quakerism failed to grip Scotland, but on psychological, theological, and ecclesiastical. Presbyterianism and Quakerism simply could not mix, and Bacon's dictum about the necessity for a new sect to possess the popular feature of supplanting or opposing established authority,⁶ does not apply here. That the Friends meant to be subversive all along the line except in the political sphere cannot be denied, though their methods of trying to achieve their objectives were modified with the years. But the hopelessness of any mutual understanding or even charity between the Scots Presbyterians and the Quakers until more recent decades, is exemplified by such controversials as Richard Crane's "A Short but a Strict Account taken of Babylon's Merchants", published in 1660; Crisp's "A Description of the Church of Scotland", published in the same year, and "A Sober Dialogue between A Scotch Presbyterian, a London Churchman, and a Real Quaker", published in 1699. What then were the main reasons for this ancient antipathy and these cross purposes? Why did Quakerism fail in spite of the

4. "Edinburgh Review", (1807) Vol X, P 102.

5. Letter to Elizabeth Shackleton, 1770. (In J.F.H.S. Vol XXVII, PP 39-40.

6. "Essays", ("Of Vicissitude") ed. Buchan, (1894) P 167.

incessant labours and other magnificent self-sacrifice and suffering to make any lasting impression on Scotland and its people? Only a brief recapitulation and summary of the chief reasons need be given in conclusion.

(1) The Scots were a strange blend of a passionate love of freedom and an almost crippling conservatism and reverence for tradition; but in religion they leaned heavily to the latter, and to them the Quaker or 'Independent' liberty was only spiritual Bohemianism, and the so-called "Inner Light" only darkness. Ecclesiastical and spiritual pride was strong in Scotland, as in England, but whereas in England it was chiefly the pride of outward pomp and ceremony, of political prestige, and of denominational "superiority", in Scotland it was the pride of a great achievement of Reformation and of the inherited sense of self-sufficiency that came from sweeping the boards of a corrupt and powerful tyranny. That Quaker preachers were sometimes met as Thomas Rudd was in Edinburgh by the young minister need cause no surprise, - "We have Ministers here already, sufficient to instruct the People, and need not you to make such Disturbance in the City".⁷ Such a typical attitude might have been shown to any exotic faith of the day that dared to rear its head in Scotland, but when the exponents of this Quakerism synchronised their advent to that "dark carnal nation" with the rising of the Sun of Righteousness after the long night of apostasy and thick Egyptian darkness,⁸ it was hardly to be expected that they would increase their welcome thereby. For whether this or other similar metaphor were used, the Quakers made it only too clear that by the 'long night of apostasy' they did not mean pre-Reformation times merely, but the whole period from the 'great apostasy' of the sub-Apostolic days up to that very hour. The Scottish clergy and laity naturally resented the implications of such an approach - "invasion" might be a fitter word, - quite apart from the fact that the whole economy and genius of Presbyterianism were fitted to keep out the excesses of fanaticism and the ravages of sectarianism.

And finally the whole rationale of an educated ministry, which was one of the cherished traditions of the Church of Scotland, was utterly opposed to the Quaker conception of the ministry, free of all things systematic, and common to all, without any training or learning in the vain philosophy of human seminaries, and dependent on the immediate and sufficient inspiration of the Spirit alone.⁹ The words of the mystic St

-
7. Story's "Journal", (1747) P 59.
 8. cf Keith's "A Salutation of Dear and Tender Love", P 1; "Swarthmore MSS." Vol IV, P 733. (Fox's Letter to the Army in Scotland.) etc.
 9. eg Barclay's Epistle "unto the Friendly Reader" - "Apology", (1886) P IX, etc.

Theresa which Alexander Whyte makes his own, are a perfect antithesis to the numerous Quaker denunciations of "letter learned men". "I always had a great respect and affection for intellectual and learned men... The more intellect and the more learning our preachers and pastors have, the better. The devil is exceedingly afraid of learning, especially when it is accompanied with great humility and great virtue... Commend me to people with good heads. From all silly devotees, may God deliver me!"¹⁰ But the Quakers scorned all academic titles and degrees as marks of Popery or of wordly vanity and praise, unknown to the Apostles.¹¹ No less did they loath what to them was the unspiritual security and unscriptural profession of a salaried ministry, — "preaching for hire",¹² whether it was an incumbency or a private chaplaincy, some of their favourite shafts being I Samuel II 36; Judges XVII 10, 11; Jeremiah XXIII 9ff, and Ezekiel XIII.¹³ This was a point of view with which the Scottish people had no sympathy at any time during the two centuries under review.

II. During all the fluctuations of Calvinism in the Deism of the 18th century and the "Moderatism" of the early 19th, the Church in Scotland never ceased to pay homage at Calvin's shrine, nor to be at heart jealous for herself as a Calvinistic Body. No doctrinal system could have been more antagonistic to the "Inner Light", and the Quakers were at times more than usually conscious of the hopelessness of dislodging the Scottish Church and people from their Calvinism. "I'll answer for it", wrote an anonymous pamphleteer who launched an attack on the Erskines and Wilson of Perth in 1747, "ninety nine out of a hundred of Mr Wilson's Flock will hold fast their Faith without wavering, will continue stedfast Retainers of that Original Nonsense which they sucked in with their Mother's milk, maugre all the popular or most cogent Arguments that can be advanced to the contrary".¹⁴ With refined irony the writer pays the Scottish Church the compliment of being "more consistent with itself than the Church of England in the Article of Election".¹⁵

But it was not the attack of the Quakers on Election, Predestination or a legalistic Atonement that irritated, indeed infuriated the Scottish church the most. It was the Quakers' constant suggestion that Calvinism had an inherent tendency to slide down into Antinomianism, and their identification of the Church's refusal to subscribe to Perfectionism, with its "Preaching up sin" for the duration of life. Such a denial of the

-
10. "Thirteen Appreciations", PP 151-2.
 11. Frequent allusion to this occurs in Keith and others. cf Macmillan's "The Aberdeen Doctors", P 44.
 12. eg. Howgill's "To all you commanders in Scotland", (1657) P 3, and Taylor's "A Trumpet sounded from under the Altar", P 3 etc.
 13. cf Parker "A Testimony of the Appearance of God", PP 4, 6, 7.
 14. "The Presbyterian Dream", (1747) P 25.
 15. Ibid, P 4.

regenerated life as equivalent to complete identification with the Divine, so that sin was no longer possible, was, they held, a thralldom to men, but a profitable thralldom for the clergy.

III. A cherished institution which the Quakers assailed was the Scottish Sabbath. They deprecated its sacrosanct observance in Scotland. Why should it be kept as holy any more than other days or New Moons and feasts of the Jews? Barclay argued that the Fourth Commandment did not bind Christians to the external observance of that day, else why did they not observe it strictly and consistently?, while to transfer all the religious habiliments of the Sabbath to the First Day of the week had no warrant in Scripture. Why should the Resurrection day be observed any more than the Annunciation, the Conception, Christmas, Good Friday and all the galaxy of the Roman Calendar? Was not the split of Christendom over the observance of Easter evidence that "Superstitious Observing of Days" was only the "Inventions of Men"? Barclay asserted that it was only in Britain that Sabbath-observance was made a fetish, not among Continental Protestants generally, and he claimed Calvin's authority for his view of holding the Lord's day as a time of convenience and utility.¹⁶ He protested against the traditional Sabbatarianism, because to the Christian every day was a true Sabbath or 'Lord's Day,' and a symbol of 'rest' in Christ. Every day was 'holy unto the Lord', a "Sabbath" wherein we might worship God, and wherein we ought to serve our brethren and "undo every Burden and let the Oppressed go free". But this external "Sabbath" as observed in Scotland and elsewhere was only "the Priests' Market day" wherein they sold and vended their "Babylonish Commodities", and if people did refuse to come and buy them, they tried to have them punished by the civil power.¹⁷

Such contempt for the Sabbath throws light on the case of John Scott of Leith in 1676. When he was remitted to the Magistrates by the Session of South Leith Church for brewing on the Sabbath and "venting many blasphemous speeches against ye sacraments and ministers of ye gospell", his defence was that "he might as weel brew on the Sunday as Mr H[amilton, minister of South Leith] might take money for going up to a desk, and talking, and throwing water upon a bairn's face".¹⁸ In August, Bailie Carmichael sentenced him to a heavy fine and removal of his family from Leith. Scott appealed against the

16. cf "Institutes" (1879), Book II, Chapter VIII, PP 343-4.

17. "Truth Cleared of Calumnies", PP 70-75; and "William Mitchell Unmask'd", PP 169-173. (Both in "Truth Triumphant", (1718) Vol I.)

18. Robertson "South Leith Records", P 134.

sentence, pleading extenuating circumstances for his brewing, and protesting against the severity of the sentence for his opinions, but when the appeal went before the Privy Council, it upheld the sentence, and charged the Court of Session to suspend no part of it.¹⁹

IV. From the Quakers' attitude to the Sabbath ^{sprang} naturally their attitude to the Church and its worship during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, though it became more respectful in the Nineteenth. The Seventeenth, represented most fully by Keith and Stephen Crisp has been already noticed. But it is easy to miss the rationale of the Quaker view in the heat of mere polemic. The Friends had a certain affinity with the Glassites in holding the Church to be a purely spiritual and heavenly fellowship of the illumined in this World, entirely independent of all kinds of earthly status and external endowments or defences. State Churches were unscriptural in their constitution and a contradiction in terms, inimical to true religious liberty. Religion as a living inward reality, experienced through immediate contact with God, could be trusted to take care of itself in the World and be contagious. Christ the eternal Light and Word shining directly in the soul would create, guide, and progressively construct His own Church — His one Body, spontaneous, unfettered, and victorious, — if only men would let Him work untrammelled by any essential forms, rites, organisation, orders, or even organisation.

Unfortunately the Friends were not able to live out this calm lofty faith or even to hold it without recrimination or reviling, when they themselves were reviled or abused. Their quiver was full of arrows of strong epithet and provocative analogy, and they scorned the Church's services, her prayers and her praise; they denounced her fasts and Fast-days; they refused her Sacraments as unwarranted survivals of primitive error or superstition; and in the early days before Barclay especially, ridiculed her subordinate standard "The Confession of Faith", observing that the Church had taken a long time to frame her faith. "Have you taught people all this while, and yet have your Faith to frame? How do you look at Christ the author of faith when you are making Faith? Can you make the gift of God?.... If men had asked a question of your Faith before, it was not made, which is contrary to the Apostles, for they said their faith was in them".²⁰ But of nothing were the Quakers more denunciatory than of the clergy. Even though we may not entirely agree with Buckle's famous tirade on the tyranny and bigotry of the Scottish clergy and Sessions in the Seventeenth Century,²¹

19. R.P.C.S. 3rd Series, Vol V, PP 39-40.

20. "Something in Answer to that Book... Intituled 'The Confession of Faith' etc", (1660) P 3.

21. "History of Civilisation", Vol II, Ch. V.

it should be remembered that the Friends witnessed and experienced themselves a situation sufficiently unideal and censurable as to explain if not excuse their feelings and anathemas on the Scottish Church.

V. The general Quaker theory of the Scriptures as expounded by Keith, Barclay, Farnworth, Gurney, and others, has already been referred to more than once, but a few final observations may make clearer still the antipathy of the Scottish Church to the Friends. To the dualism of the Seventeenth Century, the Quakers were prone no less than others, and especially in their conception of the Spirit's primacy of authority over the Scriptures, which stood in subordination to it as the stream to the fountain. Nothing on the Scriptures in Quaker literature can excel Proposition III of the "Apology", yet even Barclay cannot disentangle himself. To the question as to how the "primary rule" is to be applied to solve particular questions as they arise, the only consistent Quaker answer would be 'By our own inward and therefore personal and private illumination, which makes each one, so far as he responds to the Spirit's Light, an infallible oracle of divine truth'. If then two or more Christians of equal piety, education and sincerity, claiming alike to be infallibly guided, find themselves entirely at variance, what is to decide the issue? Obviously it can no longer be anything subjective: it must be objective. And Barclay is forced to admit not only that "the only fit outward judge of controversies among Christians" is the Scriptures in the last resort, but that "whatsoever any do pretending to the Spirit, which is contrary to the scriptures, [is to] be accounted and reckoned a delusion of the devil".²² Here then was the strange dilemma that the Spirit was the Witness to Scripture, and in His operations was a priori independent of Scripture, yet Scripture was in the last resort "the judge between differing findings of the Spirit" as Grubb so well expresses it.²³ The Church and people of Scotland would have been angry enough with the Quakers if they had denied the authority of the Bible altogether and had no secondary "rule", which of course the Friends were far from doing. But the Church and people were no less antagonistic to them for their confused teaching. For at no period during these two centuries, 1650-1850, did the Scottish nation waver in its loyalty to the Calvinistic doctrine of Scripture. It clung with a sure instinct to that certainty which the written Word of God gave, believing that the free and unfettered illumination of the Spirit was too subjective to be accepted as final, and that if every person were at liberty to

22. "Apology", (14th ed) Prop III, Sect VI, P 59.

23. "Evangelical Christianity", ed. Selbie, (1911) P 200.

fashion his dogma out of his own inner consciousness, however 'illuminated', all certainly of faith and duty would be gone. Thus the Scottish cleric and layman alike only too readily found the Quakers among such "fanatics who substitute revelations for Scripture" as Calvin had warned Protestants against a century before the Quakers' invasion of Caledonia.²⁴

VI. Finally, for their attitude to the Sacraments, the Quakers rendered themselves obnoxious to Scottish religion. The Orcadians of Firth and Stenness Parish were "greatly amazed" at the Quakers' non-observance of the Sacraments, and "anxious to know if they were Christian".²⁵ For water Baptism, or "ane sprinkling", they had nothing but contempt, and Alexander Jaffray, even in his pre-Quaker days; Anthony Haig; and Charles Ormiston, were all unable on conscientious grounds to present their children for baptism by the ministers, and others had to take their place.²⁶ The Friends maintained rightly that the baptism of infants was never mentioned in the New Testament, and that no Scriptural warrant for the baptism of adults with water could be substantiated. The only true baptism of Christ was a baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire, and the spiritual washing of regeneration was accompanied by a renewal of the Holy Ghost. A typical Quaker controversial on water baptism including infants' is an Eighteenth Century pamphlet, "An Answer to A Pamphlet lately printed at Edinburgh intituled 'Baptism with Water and Infant Baptism Asserted'", published in 1733. From the Church side came "A Dissertation on Baptism" in 1819, written by Alexander Pirie, minister of Newburgh-on-Tay, in which he designs to point out the errors of Quakers and Baptists on the subject, and refute their objections.

But the Quakers were more conscious of difficulty in controverting the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, for it commanded their greater respect. They did not deny Christ's institution of the Supper for the disciples, but argued that He no more intended it to be a binding ordinance upon His Church in perpetuity than circumcision and other Jewish rites, or even His own washing of the feet. No doubt He had good and sufficient reason for making the Supper a temporary institution then, but the Church's misunderstanding of Christ's command had brought about a substitution of the visible sign for the thing signified, or of the symbol for the inner reality symbolised, to the engendering of superstition and the grave injury of spiritual religion. The flesh and blood of Christ were to be taken in a purely spiritual,

24. "Institutes", (1879) Book I, Ch. IX, P 84.

25. Sinclair's "Statistical Account", Vol XIV, P 130.

26. v respectively Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) PP 98-99; Russell, "The Haigs of Bemersyde", (1881) P 263n : J.F.H.S. Vol IX, P 124.

not in a ritualist or external sense, for all life should be a sacrament, and the true communion of believers was in their inward intercourse with Him and with one another, whereby their souls were made partakers of that spiritual bread which endured unto everlasting life. The Quakers do not seem to have used the many disgraceful sacramental scenes of the Eighteenth Century, pilloried by Burns in "The Holy Fair", as evidence of their contention. They probably knew better than to generalise from these, but that such things could happen at Sacrament "seasons" doubtless confirmed them in their attitude. A century earlier, Keith had contended that the outpouring of the Spirit at the Kirk of Shotts in 1630 was no necessary vindication and seal of the Sacrament or its validity. It was no proof that God owned such ordinances; it was merely His condescension to the sincerity and earnest desire of the parishioners' souls at Shotts, though they were in error.²⁷ The Quakers would have nothing to do with the prevalent Calvinistic teaching of Sacraments as sealing ordinances of the Divine Word or Promises.²⁸ To them all outward forms were at best a needless encumbrance, and at the worst, soul-destroying.

These then are the principal reasons why Quakerism antagonised, or failed to grip, Scotland. Politically, the early Quakers were at a great disadvantage, but the deepest reason for the Quakers' failure all along was that they were at variance with the Scottish people in the very citadel of their national life — their Presbyterian Faith and Institutions. In the light of all the happenings of these two hundred years, Dr J.R. Fleming's suggestion must be considered extremely doubtful, "If the principles of the Society of Friends had taken root more deeply north of the Tweed, they might have done something to modify the hard dogmatism and prickly patriotism that have at times brought reproach on the national character".²⁹

The Quaker Movement in Scotland was a great epic for the most part, and threw up much that was noble, courageous, earnest, and self-sacrificing. But it was not only ill-timed in the century which gave it birth, but was destined to be so in all the succeeding decades, for neither the psychological nor spiritual climate of Scotland suited it. Strangely enough however, Quakerism seems to have learned something from the Presbyterian system in the evolution of its order of "Elders" and its hierarchy of Meetings. How far the Scottish Church may have learned from Quakerism is uncertain. But in the economy of Heaven it is certain that no real testimony is wasted, and if Rufus Jones is right

27. cf "The Way Cast Up", PP 193-4.

28. cf Calvin's "Institutes", (1879) Book IV, Ch. XIV, P 494.

29. "A History of the Church in Scotland, 1843-1874". (1927)
P 250.

when he says that the great days and the best 'dispensation' of Quakerism are to be in the Twentieth Century, it may be that the Quakerism of our own or of our children's day may yet get a chance in Scotland which the "Inner Light" of the past never enjoyed.

THE END.

APPENDIX A.

Specimen Copy of "Clearness" Certificate for Marriage.

To ye Men's Meeting at Aberdeen.

Dear Friends, With the Salutation of dear Love in the blessed truth in wch our Unity Stands, I hereby now signify to you that the Bearer, John White, having desired a Certificate from our Meeting with respect to his clearnes from all women here on account of marriage, And our Meeting having made Inquiry accordingly doth herby Certify to you that we do not find any thing to the Contrary.

We Remain with Dear Love,

Your Loving Friends,

Barclay.

- Spark.

David Wallace.

Robert Scott.

John Scott Sen^r.

William Melvin.

Signed by our
Monthly Meeting
at Ury the 30
of 1st mo. 1707.

James Bean.
John Scott Jun^r.
John Smith.
George Troup.

APPENDIX B.

Act of the Scots Parliament in favour of Lord Forrester against
William Osborne.

Apart from his co-operation with Fox in 1657, nothing further is known of William Osborne except a case in which he figured in 1661. At the Battle of Preston, where Cromwell cut up the Duke of Hamilton's forces, and ended 'The Engagement' "for releiff of his Maiestie then prisoner in the yle of Wight", Lieut-General William Baillie and his son Lord Forrester had been taken prisoner, apparently by Osborne. When after more than a year's imprisonment in Newcastle, they were likely to gain their freedom, Osborne "purchased a restraint" to be put on them till they paid him a sum of £300 with interest. They refused, but in the end had to make payment in gold for their delay. The sequel was that in 1661, Baillie being now deceased, Forrester as his executor petitioned the Council in Edinburgh that Osborne be compelled to refund the aforementioned sum with the interest since September 1649, in addition to a claim in Baillie's Will against him for libel, of £118. The Petition was granted by "His Majesty with advice and consent of the said Estates of Parliament", and by an "act and decreit" thereof in favour of Lord Forrester, William Osborne was ordered to find both sums.¹

1. "Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland", (1820) Vol VII, PP 238-9, col 2.

APPENDIX C.

LIST OF QUAKER WRITINGS

CITED, OR REFERRED TO, IN THIS THESIS.

Alexander, Mary.

"Some Account of the Life and Religious Experience of Mary Alexander, Late of Needham Market". York: W. Alexander. (1811)

Anonymous.

"Reasons why Members of the Society of Friends do not close their shops on Fast Days and other occasions appointed by the Government for religious observance". Broadside. (Vol. of Tracts D No 44 in Euston Library.) (c 1849) (No Publisher's Name or Place.)

Anonymous. (Aberdeen Friends)

"Some Queries touching Excommunication, Published by the People of God (termed in derision Quakers) to be considered by all the Bishops and Synods of the Nation... But most especially by the present Bishop and Synod of Aberdeen". (1682) No Publisher's Name. (Euston Library) A very rare Tract.

Anonymous.

"Something in answer to that Book called the Church Faith... and also To That Book Entitled 'The Confession of Faith, approved by the Church of Scotland'." London: Printed for Robert Wilson.. in Martins Le Grand. (1660.)

Anonymous.

"The Presbyterian Dream: or the Divinity of the Scotch Kirk Epitomised". London: Printed for M. Cooper at the Globe in Pater-Noster Row. (1747)

"Answer to the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy from the People called Quakers, a Copy which was given to the King by them upon the 4th day of the 5th month 1660, An".
(Broadside in Euston Library).

Areskine (or Erskine) Thomas.

"To all the People of the Kingdom of Scotland in General and to the Inhabitants of Edinburgh in Particular". Broadside. (1736) No Publisher's Name or Place.

Banks, John.

"A Journal of the Life, Labours, Travels and Sufferings.. of John Banks.. with Epistles and Papers.."
London: J Sowle, White-Hart Court. (1712)

"A Gentle Correction for Singers, such as Pretend to Sing David's Psalms". London: Printed and Sold by J. Sowle in White-Hart Court. (1709) ("Works", P 229.)

Barclay, Lydia Ann.

"Selections from the Writings of Patrick Livingstone", with a Brief Memoir. London: Chas. Gilpin, Bishopgate Without. (1847)

Barclay, Robert of Urie.

Letter to Christian Molleson, 28th March 1669. In M. Christabel Dadbury's "Robert Barclay: His Life and Work", (London; Headley Bros. 1912) PP 33-34. Also in "Jaffray's Diary", (1856) PP 241-2.

Dedication of the "Apology" "To CharlesII, King of Great Britain and the Dominions thereunto Belonging". (Prefaced to all editions of the "Apology", and written from Ury, November 1675).

"R.B. Unto the Friendly Reader Wisheth Salvation". (Referred to as "Epistle to the Friendly Reader".) Prefaced to "The Apology" (1886) and other editions.

Letter to Princess Elizabeth, Countess Palatine of the Rhine, from Edinburgh, 6th September 1676. (In M.C. Cadbury's "Robert Barclay: His Life and Work": (1912) PP 48-50. Also in "Reliquiae Barclaianae", (1870) P 5.)

Letter (Part) to Stephen Crisp from the Colchester MSS Dated 3rd July 1676, and given in Jaffray's "Diary", (3rd edition) P 272.

Letter to Princess Elizabeth, Countess Palatine of the Rhine, from Theobald's, 12th of 7th Month 1677. (In J G Bevan "A Short Account of the Life etc of Robert Barclay", (1802) PP 53-54.)

Letter to Sarah Fell 1689. (In "Letters etc of Early Friends" edited by A.R.Barclay, (1841) P 256.)

Letter to Sir David Carnegie, 1690. (In "Seventh Report of the Royal Commission on Historical MSS", Part I, Appendix P 724, 1879.)

"Truth Triumphant through the Spiritual Warfare, Christian Labours and Writings of.. Robert Barclay". ("Works".) 3 Vols. London: J Sowle, (1718.) (Barclay's principal writings are listed under individual headings.)

"Truth Cleared of Calumnies". A Reply to "A Dialogue between a Quaker and Stable Christian". ("Truth Triumphant", Vol I.) London: J Sowle. (1717-8.)

"William Mitchell Unmask'd or The Staggering Instability of the Pretended Stable Christian Discovered..". (In "Truth Triumphant", Vol I. (1717))

"A seasonable Warning, and Serious Exhortation to, and Expostulation with, the Inhabitants of Aberdeen..." Written at Urie, 12th of the 5th month 1672. (In "Truth Triumphant". Vol I PP. 193-7.) (1717.)

"A Catechism and Confession of Faith, Approved of and Agreed unto by the General Assembly of the Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles". (In "Truth Triumphant", Vol I. 1717.)

"Theses Theologicae". Prefaced to "An Apology for the True Christian Divinity". 14th edition. (1886)

and George Keith.

"Quakerism Confirmed, or a Vindication of the Chief Doctrines and Principles of the People called Quakers from the Arguments and Objections of the Students of Divinity (so called) of Aberdeen, in their Book Entitled 'Quakerism Canvased'". London: Printed by the Assigns of J Sowle in the year 1717. (In "Truth Triumphant". (1718.) Vol III.) (Part II)

"The Anarchy of the Ranters, and other Libertines, The Hierarchy of the Romanists and other Pretended Churches, equally Refused and Refuted". (In "Truth Triumphant", Vol I.) London: Printed by the Assigns of J Sowle. (1717.)

"An Apology for the True Christian Divinity". 14th edition. Glasgow: R. Barclay Murdoch. (1886)

("A Lover of the Souls of All Men".)

"Universal Love Considered, and established upon its Right Foundation." (In "Truth Triumphant", Vol III.) London: Printed by the assigns of J Sowle. (1717)

"An Epistle of Love and Friendly Advice to the Ambassadors of the several Princes of Europe, met at Nimeguen to Consult the Peace of Christendom, so far as they are concerned". (In "Truth Triumphant", Vol III (1718.))

"Some things of Weighty Concernment proposed in Meekness and Love by Way of Queries to the Serious Consideration of the Inhabitants of Aberdeen" in 1670. (Referred to as "Queries to the Inhabitants of Aberdeen.") (In "Truth Triumphant" (1718) Volume I, PP 90-96. (Appendix to "Truth Cleared of Calumnies".))

"Epistle to the Reader" of "Quakerism No Popery". (1675.)

Postscript to "Quakerism No Popery". (1675) (Section XIII thereof.)

"R B's Apology For The True Christian Divinity Vindicated From John Brown's Examination and pretended Confutation thereof.." (In "Truth Triumphant", Vol III (1717))

"R B's Testimony Concerning his Father". (In "Truth Triumphant", Volume III 1718.)

Barclay, Robert, Jun^r.

"A Modest and Serious Address to the well-meaning Followers of Antonia Bourignon etc". No Publisher or Place. Printed in the Year 1708.

"A Genealogical Account of the Barclays of Urie, Formerly of Mathers, Extracted from ancient Registers and authentick Documents, Together with Memoirs of.. Colonel David Barclay of Urie and... Robert Barclay of Urie..." Aber: Printed by James Chalmers. (1740)

Barrow, Robert.

"Breviat". (In "Miller MSS" Volume II, Friends' House Library, Euston".)

Letter to Crisp and Whitehead in "Collectitia". (1824)
P 365.

Besse, Joseph.

"A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers" (from 1650 - 1689) Vol II. London: Luke Hinde, George Yard. (1753.)

Bevan, Joseph Gurney.

"A Short Account of the Life and Writings of Robert Barclay". London: W Phillips, George Yard. (1802).

Bownas, Samuel.

Letter to George Keith, dated "the 1st Sunday in August 1702". (In "Life and Travels of Samuel Bownas", (1895) P 64.)

"An Account of the Life, Travels, and Christian Experiences of Samuel Bownas", with Preface by Besse. 2nd edition, 1761, reprinted 1895. Edited by J.B. Braithwaite Junr. London: Edward Hicks Junr. (1895)

Burnyeat, John.

"Journal of Life and Gospel Labours of John Burnyeat". Edited by A.R. Barclay. London: Harvey and Darton, Grace-church Street. (1839) (First printed in 1691 as "The Truth Exalted etc". qv. infra.)

Letter to American Friends from Hartford, dated 19-4-1682.

Letter to his "Brother T.A. of London, dated 6-8-1684.
(Both the above are found in "The Truth Exalted in the
Writings of... John Burnyeat", 1691.)

Burnyeat, Jonathan.

"Some account of the Gospel Labours of Joanthan
Burnyeat". Edited by Thos Chalk. 2nd Edition. London:
W & F.G. Cash. (1857.) (Diary.)

Burrough, Edward.

"The Case of Free Liberty of Conscience in the
Exercise of Faith and Religion, Presented unto the King
and both Houses of Parliament". London: Thomas Simmons.
(1661)

Cater, Samuel.

"A Salvation in the Love of God... unto all the
Faithful Brethern and Sisters in Christ Jesus our
Lord..". (Written in Montrose Prison) No Publisher or
Place. Printed in the Year 1672.

Caton, William.

"An Abridgement or a Compendious Commemoration of the
Remarkablest Chronologies which are contained in
that Famous Ecclesiastical History of Ensebius
Pamphilus: with a useful Index to the same..."
Printed for the Author [In Rotterdam.] in the Year 1661.

"The Journal of the Life of that Eminent, Faithful
Servant, and Minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ,
William Caton". Edited by A.R.Barclay. 2nd Edition.
London, Harvey and Darton, Gracechurch Street. (1839)
(The earliest - printed Quaker "Journal".)

"An Epistle to King Charles the II sent from
Amsterdam in Holland the 28th of the 10th Month 1660".
London: Thomas Simmons, Bull and Mouth, (1660).

Chalk, Thomas.

"Journals of the Life, Travels and Gospel Labours of
Thomas Wilson and James Dickenson". Edited by Chalk.
London: C.Gilpin, Bishopgate Without. (1847)

Cautions and Counsels to Ministers".

"Issued by the Yearly Meeting of Ministers in 1702.
(In Braithwaite's "Second Period of Quakerism". PP
541-542.)

Chalkley, Thomas.

"A Journal or Historical Account of the Life, Travels,
and Christian Experiences of Thomas Chalkley".
Written by Himself. 2nd edition. London: Luke Hinde,
George Yard. (1751)

"Christian Discipline of the Religious Society of Friends in
Great Britain". Part III ("Church Government")
London: Friends' Book Centre (1931).

Churchman, John.

"An Account of the Gospel Labours and Christian
Experiences of.. John Churchman, Late of Nottingham
in Pennsylvania". London: Jas. Phillips, George Yard.
(1781)

Claridge, Richard.

"A Plea for Mechanick Preachers... with a Necessary
Distinction between the Art and the Gift of Preaching".
London: Assigns of J Sowle. (1727)

"Collections of Testimonies concerning Several Ministers of the
Gospel Amongst the People called Quakers Deceased, A".
London: Printed by Luke Hinde. (1760)

Crisp, Stephen.

"Memoirs of the Life of Stephen Crisp", by Samuel Tuke.
York: Wm Alexander and Son (1824)

"A Memorable Account of the Christian Experiences of....
Stephen Crisp". London: T Sowle, White-Hart Court. (1694)

"An Epistle of Tender Counsel and Advice". (In "A
Memorable Account of... Stephen Crisp".) (1694)

"A Description of the Church of Scotland, with a Word of Reproof to the Priests and Teachers, and officers therein..". (In "A Memorable Account of the Christian Experiences of... Stephen Crisp.." London: T Sowle, White-Hart Court. 1694) (The "Description" was written in 1660, but not published till 1694.)

Crook, John. - "A Lover of Peace and Truth".

"Truth's Progress: or A Short Relation of its First Appearance and Publication After the Apostacy". Printed in the year 1667. (No Place or Publisher.)

Crosfield, George.

"Memoirs of the Life and Gospel Labours of Samuel Fothergill". Liverpool: D Marples. London: C Gilpin: (1843)

"Declaration from the People of God called Quakers, against All Seditious Conventicles and dangerous Practices of any who under colour or pretence of tender Conscience have, or may contrive Insurrections; the said People being clear from all such things in the sight of God, Angels and Men,A". Broadside. No Publisher, place or Date. (In Volume "N", Euston Library.- No 5.)

Dewsbury, William.

Letter to the Friends in Scotland from Warwick, dated 29th of 8th month 1672. (In Jaffray's "Diary", (1856) PP 251-2.)

Dickenson, James.

"A Journal of the Life, Travels and Labour of Love in the Work of the Ministry of... James Dickenson". London: T Sowle, Raylton, and Hinde.(1745)

Drummond, May.

"Internal Revelation the Source of Saving Knowledge: candidly recommended in several Epistles". London: Printed for Jonathan Nelson in Reading. (1736.)

Letter from Steokton - on - Tees, dated 5th of 8th month 1769. (In J.F.H.S. Volume IV (1907) P 110.)

"To the Meeting assembled in the Chamber at Gracechurch Street on a second Day Morning, the 11th of the 5th Month 1766. With, - M.D.'s answer to their last advice the 19th of 6th month, 1766". Folio. (1766.) (No Printer's Name of Place.)

Dudley, Mary.

"The Life of Mary Dudley, including an Account of her Religious Engagements and Extracts from Letters". London: Printed for the Editor, and sold by J and A Arch, Cornhill etc. (1825)

Edmunson, Willian.

"A Journal of the Life, Travels, Sufferings and Labour of Love in the Work of the Ministry of.. William Edmunson..." 2nd edition. London: Mary Hinde, George Yard. (1774)

Emerson, William.

"Questions for John Bewick, called Minister of Stanhope". (No Publisher or Date, but probably about 1650.) Pamphlet in Euston Library.

Evans, William and Thomas.

"Edward Burrough: A Memoir of a Faithful Servant of Christ and Minister of the Gospel who died in Newgate, 14th, 12th Month 1662" London: Chas. Gilpin. (1851)

Farnworth, Richard.

"Light Risen out of Darkness now in these Latter Days". London: Giles Calvert. (1654.)

Fell, Margaret.

"A Declaration and an Information from us the People of God called Quakers to the present Governors, the King and both Houses of Parliament and all Whom it may concern". (In "Works". London: J Sowle. 1710.)

"F8" the King and both Houses of Parliament,

being a Short Relation of the Sad Estate and Sufferings of the Innocent People of God called Quakers for Worshipping God and Exercising a Good Conscience towards God and Man". Folio. London: Printed in the Year 1661.

Fothergill, John.

"An Account of the Life and Travels in the Work of the Ministry of John Fothergill". 2nd edition. London: Mary Hinde, George Yard. (1773)

Fothergill, Samuel.

Letter to his Brother Dr John Fothergill, from Old Meldrum, dated 8-9 month - 1764. (In Crosfield's "Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill". (1843) P 450.)

Letter to his sister. (In Ibid, P 452.)

Fox, George.

"A Warning from the Lord to the Pope, and to all his train of Idolatries... and also some Queries given forth to be answered by the Pope, his Priests or Jesuits, or them who are Popishly affected". London: Printed by Giles Calvert at the Black-spread Eagle. (1656)

"A Declaration of the difference of the Ministers of the Word from the Ministers of the World who calls the Writings the Word". London: Giles Calvert. (1656)
("Doctrinal Works" P 65.)

"The Great Mystery of the Great Whore unfolded". London: Thos. Simmons, Bull and Mouth. Folio. (1659.)

"The Journal of George Fox". Edited from the MSS by Norman Penny, L.L.D. with an Introduction by T. Edmund Harvey, Vol I. Cambridge University Press. (1911)

Letter to the Army in Scotland. (No Date.) In "Swarthmore MSS.", Volume IV, P 733.

"The Short Journal and Itinerary Journals of George Fox". (Tercentenary Supplement to Cambridge Edition. (1911.)

Testimony to Robert Widders. (In "The Life & Death... of Robert Widders". London: Printed in the Year 1688. (No Printer's Name.) P27.)

"A Collection of Many Select and Christian Epistles, Letters and Testimonies, written on sundry occasions by.. George Fox". Second Vol. London: T Sowle. (1698.)

Fry, Elizabeth.

"Memoir of the Life of Elizabeth Fry, with extracts from her Journal and Letters", edited by Two of her daughters. Vols I, II. London: Chas. Gilpin. Bishopgate Without. (1847).

"Observations on the visiting, superintendence and Government of Female Prisoners". London: John and Arthur Arch, Cornhill. (1827)

Gough, James.

"Memoirs of the Life, Religious experiences and Labours in the Gospel of James Gough". New Edition, edited by John Gough. High Wycombe: Printed by T Orger. (1802)

Gough, John.

"A History of the People called Quakers from their first Rise to the present Time". Vols I, II, and IV. Dublin: Robert Jackson. (1789 - 1790)

Gratton, John.

"A Journal of the Life of that Ancient Servant of Christ, John Gratton". London: J Sowle. (1720)

Gray, George. of Aquorthies.

"A Short Account of that Faithful Servant of the Lord, and Diligent Labourer in His Vineyard, George Gray etc". With Two Epistles. London: T Sowle, Shoreditch. (1692)

"A Warning to the Priests of Aberdeen". 1676. (In "A Short Account of George Gray etc". (1692), PP 21-26.)

Grellet, Stephen.

"Memoirs of the Life and Gospel Labours of Stephen Grellet", edited by Benjamin Seebohm. 2 Vols. London: A.W. Bennett, Bishopgate Without. (1860)

Grubb, Sarah.

"Some Account of the Life and Religious Labours of Sarah Grubb". 2nd edition. London: Jas Phillips, George Yard. (1794)

Gurney, Joseph John.

"Chalmeriana: or Colloquies with Dr Chalmers..". London: Richard Bentley. (1853) (There is also a reprint of the "Chalmeriana" not quite full, in Dr Adam Philip's "Thomas Chalmers" Part IV. Jas. Clarke & Co, 1929.)

"Observations on the Distinguishing Views and Practices of the Society of Friends". 7th edition. London: J & A Arch, Cornhill. (1834)

"Friendly Letters to Dr Wardlaw". Norwich: Printed by Josiah Fletcher. (For Private Circulation.) (1836.)

"Notes on a Visit made to some of the Prisons in Scotland.. in company with Elizabeth Fry: with some general observations on the subject of discipline". London: Printed for Archibald Constable & Co, Edin. (1819)

Halhead, Miles.

"A Book of some of the Sufferings and Passages of Miles Halhead". Quarto. London: A Sowle, Shoreditch. (1690)

Hebden, Roger, of Malton.

"A Plain Account of Certain Christian Experiences.. of.. Roger Hebden..". London. T Sowle, White-Hart Court. (1700)

Holme, Benjamin.

"AN Account of the Life and Travels of Benjamin Holme" by Himself. (Prefaced to "A Collection of the Epistles and Works".) London: Luke Hinde, George Yard. (1754)

Howgill, Francis.

"To all you Commanders and Officers of the Army in Scotland, especially: and to all elsewhere". Published in Leith 14th July 1657. (No Publisher's Name.) (Volume of Tracts No 16, Euston Library.)

_____ and others.

"A Testimony concerning the Life, Death, Trials, Travels and Labours of Edward Burrough". London. (1664) No Publisher.

Hubberthorn, Richard.

"Something that lately passed in discourse between the King and R.H." (In "A Collection of the Several Books and Writings of that Faithful Servant of God, Richard Hubberthorn". - "Works".) London: Printed by William Warwick. (1663.)

Jaffray, Alexander.

"Diary of Alexander Jaffray. Provost of Aberdeen, One of the Scottish Commissioners to King Charles II and a Member of Cromwell's Parliament". 3rd Edition. Aberdeen: George and Robert King, St Nicholas Street. (1856)

Jaffray, Andrew.

"A Serious and earnest Exhortation and seasonable Warning given forth in two Epistles to the People and Inhabitants of Aberdeen...". Written from Aberdeen Prison. (1677.) (No Publisher's Name.)

_____ "Letter from A.I. to Dr G.G." (George Garden.) Appended to Robert Barclay Junr's "A Modest and Serious Address to the Well-meaning Followers of Antonia Bourignon". No Publisher of Place. Printed in the year 1708.

Keith, George.

Letter to Robert Barclay, dated 12-3-1676, in "Reliquiae Barclaianae". (1870) PP IX - X.

"A Letter... sent to the Quakers in Aberdeen, containing a very serious and Christian exhortation with his Old Friends etc". (1700) (In Sandiland's "Some Queries proposed to the Monthly Meeting.. at Aberdeen". (1700))

"A Salutation of Dear and tender Love to The Seed of God Arising in Aberdeen, in Two Epistles". Printed in the Year 1665. (No Publisher or Place.)

"Help in time of Need from the God of Help". "To the People of the (so Called) Church of Scotland". Printed in the Year 1665. (No Publisher or Place.)

"Immediate Revelation.. Not Ceased, But remaining a standing and perpetual Ordinance in the Church of Christ". Printed in the Year 1668. (No Publisher of Place.)

"The Benefit, Advantage, and Glory, of Silent Meetings". London: Printed in the Year 1670. (No Publisher's Name.)

"The Woman Preacher of Samaria". Printed in the Year 1674. (No Publisher or Place.)

"Quakerism No Popery", or "A Particular Answer to that Part of John Menzeis, Professor of Divinity in Aberdeen.. his Book, Intituled Roma Mendax;..Wherein the People called Quakers are concerned..." Printed in the Year 1675. (No Publisher or Place.)

"The Way Cast Up, and the Stumbling Blockes removed". Printed [in Holland] 1677. (No Publisher.)

"The Way to the City of God, described..." Printed in the Year 1678. (No Publisher or Place.)

"The Way to discern the Convictions, Motions etc of the Spirit of God, and Divine Principle in us etc". Appended to "The Way to the City of God". No Publisher of Place. Printed in the Year 1678.

"Some short observations upon H.M. [Henry More.] his remarks upon my Book of Immediate Revelation". (It is doubtful if this pamphlet was ever printed. There is no trace of the original, but some parts are incorporated in "An Account of how George Keith became a Quaker etc", Published by John Whiting, circ. 1709.)

"Truth's Defence: or the Pretended 'Examination' by John Alexander of Leith.. Re-Examined and Confuted.." London: Benjamin Clark, George Yard. (1682.)

"The Presbyterian and Independent Visible Churches in New-England and elsewhere Brought to the Test..". London: Thomas Northcott. (1691.)

"An Appendix to Croese's History containing The True Copy of a Latine Letter Writ by George Keith, and sent by him to Gerard Croes, Translated out of his Latine Manuscript into English". London: John Dunton. (1696.)

"The Arguments of the Quakers, more particularly of George Whitehead,... Robert Barclay.. and my own against Baptism and the Supper, Examined and Refuted.." London: C Brome, at the Gun, St Paul's Churchyard. (1698.)

"The Deism of William Penn and his Brethern Destructive to the Christian Religion, Exposed..". London: B. Aylmer. (1699.)

"A Serious Call to the Quakers, Inviting them to Return to Christianity". Folio. Printed for W Haws in Ludgate Street. (1706) (British Museum.)

Postscript to Above. (Same sheet.)

"Mr George Keith's Reasons for Renouncing Quakerism and Entering into Communion with the Church of England". London: Booksellers of London and Westminster. (1700.)

"The Standard of the Quakers Examined or An Answer To the Apology of Robert Barclay". London: B Aylmer etc. (1702.)

and Barclay, Robert.)

"A True and Faithful Account of the Most Material Passages of a Dispute between some Students of Divinity (so called) of the University of Aberdeen, and the people called Quakers, held in Aberdeen in Scotland". London: Printed in the Year 1675.

Letchworth, Thomas. v infra.

"Letters etc. of Early Friends illustrative of the History of the Society", edited by A.R. Barclay. London: Harvey and Darton. (1841)

Letter from Edinburgh Monthly Meeting to Aberdeen Monthly Meeting, concerning Elizabeth Wigham, paginated with "MS Register of Sufferings". P 39.

Letters to King Charles II.

By Fox, Nayler, Parker, Caton, and Henry Fell. (In Volume of Tracts No 96, Euston Library.)

Livingstone, Patrick.

Letter to Bailie Alexander Burnett of Aberdeen, 1678. (In L.A. Barclay's "Selections from the Writings of Patrick Livingstone" (1847), PP 200-202.)

"Goodwill to the People in and about Aberdeen". (In L.A. Barclay's "Selections from the Writings of Patrick Livingstone". (1847) PP 135ff.)

Letchworth, Thomas.

"A Brief Account of the Late Samuel Fothergill, an eminent Minister of the Gospel". Taken from the "Monthly Ledger". 2nd Edition. London: Printed in the Year 1774.

Nayler, James.

"Some Considerations needful to be taken into mind by such as are in Place, to Ease the oppressed..." (In "A Collection of Sundry Books Epistles and Papers written by James Nayler" with his 'Life'.) London: J Sowle, White- Hart Court. (1716.)

Neale, Samuel.

"Some Account of the Life and Religious Labours of Samuel Neale". London: C Gilpin, Bishopgate Without. (1845.)

Oxley, Joseph, of Norwich.

"A Journal of the Life and Gospel Labours of Joseph Oxley of Norwich". London: Harvey and Darton. (1837)

Parker, Alexander.

"A Discovery of Satan's Wiles and his Subtile Devices". London: Thomas Simmons, Bull and Mouth. (1657.)
(Written at Leith, November 1657.)

Letter to George Fox from Leith, 13th February 1658.
(In "Swarthmore MSS." Vol III, P 39.)

"A Testimony of the Appearance of God in the Spirit of Power, and the true Light, Making manifest the deceipts of the Serpent. With some Reasons why Margaret Hambleton doth deny the Presbyterians of Scotland..."
(No Publisher or Date. Probably circ. 1658.)

Pemberton, John.

Letter to George Miller from Carlisle, dated 7-lmo. 1788.
(In "Memorials of Hope Park", P 30.)

Letter to his Wife. 1797. (In Ibid p 39.)

Penn, William.

"A Testimony to the Memory of Robert Barclay: by his Faithful Friend, William Penn". (Prefaced to "Truth Triumphant". Vol I. London: J Sowle. 1718.)

"An Account of W Penn's Travels in Holland and Germany Anno MDCLXXVII". London: T Sowle. White-Hart Court. (1694)

[Penn, William.] "A Friend to Truth and Peace."

"Some Seasonable and Serious Queries upon the late Act against Conventicles". (1670.) (No Publisher's name or Place.)

Penn, William.

"The Select Works of William Penn", 3rd edition, Vols. IV and V. London: James Phillips, George Yard. (1782.)

Penington, Isaac.

"Letters of Isaac Penington".. "The Greater Part not before Published". Edited by John Barclay. London: John and Arthur Arch. (1828.)

Phillips (or Peyton) Catherine.

"Memoirs of the Life of Catherine Phillips". London: Jas Phillips and Son. George Yard. (1797.)

"Piety Promoted, in a Collection of Dying Sayings of many of the People called Quakers". New and complete edition. Edited by Wm and Thomas Evans, Vols I-IV. Philadelphia: Friend's Book Store (1854) (The predecessor of "The Annual Monitor" of to-day.)

Pilkington, George,

"Travels through the United Kingdom in Promoting the cause of Peace on Earth and Good-will toward Men". London: Edmund Fry and Son. (1839.)

"Reliquiae Barclaianae".

"Correspondence of Colonel David Barclay and Robert Barclay of Urie, and his Son Robert etc". (Copy of British Museum Lithograph, Euston Library.) (1870)

Richardson, John.

"An Account of the Life of that Ancient Servant of Jesus Christ, John Richardson.." 3rd edition. London; Mary Hinde, George Yard. (1774)

Richardson, John Wigham.

"Memoirs of John Wigham Richardson, 1837-1908". Privately Printed. Glasgow: Hugh Hopkins. (1911)

Robertson, John, of Kinmuck.

"Rusticus ad Clericum, or the **P**low-Man rebuking the Priest". In Answer to "**V**erus Patroclus". (No publisher or Place. Printed in the Year 1694.)

"Some Manacles for a Mad Priest". In Answer to the Preface of "**N**azianzeni Querela". (No Publisher or Place. Printed in the Year 1700.)

Robeson, Andrew, of the 'West of Scotland.'

"A Word of Pitty to the Prophane and to the Unruly Rulers in this Generation". Folio Sheet. (1662.)

"Rules of Discipline of the Religious Society of Friends, with Advices". 3rd edition. London: Darton and Harvey. (1834)

Sandilands, Robert; Alexander, James; Seaton, Alexander; Paterson, Alexander.

Declarations of the Grounds on which they became "convinced" of Quakerism after the Debate at Harper's Close Aberdeen 1675. (In "Truth Triumphant", Vol III 1718) PP 181-182. (Appendix to "Quakerism Confirmed".)

Sandilands, Robert.

"Some Queries Proposed to the Monthly Meetings of the Quakers at Aberdeen, the sixth day of June 1700.... with their Answers thereto: together with some Remarks thereupon". Aber: Printed by John Forbes. (1700.)

Seaton, Alexander.

Letter to Robert Barclay from Glasgow, dated 29th of 2nd month 1695. (In "Reliquiae Barclayanae", 1870, PP100-1.)

Sewell, William.

"The History of the Rise, Increase, and Progress of the Christian People called Quakers". 5th edition. Vols I, II. London: Wm Phillips, George Yard. (1811)

Skene, Alexander and John; Mercer Thomas; Cowie, John.

"Quakerism Confirmed in answer to 'Quakerism Canvassed', wherein the account of the Students of Divinity of Aberdeen gives of the dispute they had with the Quakers is examined, and from their own words they are proved guilty of many gross lyes, contradictions and prevarications: which also is attested by the subscription of several students present at the dispute and since come to own and walk with the people called Quakers". Printed in the Year 1676. (No Publisher or Place.) [Part I.]

Preface to "The Way Cast Up and the Stumbling Blockes removed". (1677.)

Postscript to "The Way Cast Up and the Stumbling Blockes removed". (1677.)

"Plain and Peaceable Advice to those called Presbyterians in Scotland". London: Printed for Benjamin Clark. (1681.)

Skene, Lillias.

"A Warning to the Magistrates and Inhabitants of Aberdeen, writ the 31st day of the 1st month 1677." (In "Most Materiall Passages", PP 45-49.)

"An Expostulatory Letter Directed to Robert Macquarie". (Newtyle, 1678) In "Truth Triumphant", Vol III. (1717-8)

Smith, Edward.

"The Life of William Dewsbury". Preface by John Barclay. London: Darton and Harvey, Gracechurch Street. (1836) (Volume II of Barclay's "Select Series".)

Smith, Joseph.

"A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books, or Books written by Members of the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, from their First Rise to the Present Time, interspersed with Critical Remarks. and Occasional Biographical Notices, and including all writings by Authors before joining and by those after having left the Society, whether adverse or not, as far as known". Vols. I and II. London: Joseph Smith, 2 Oxford Street, Whitechapel E. (1867)

"Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana", or "A Catalogue of Books Adverse to the Society of Friends, Alphabetically Arranged". London: Joseph Smith, 6 Oxford Street. (1873)

"Supplement" to "A Descriptive Catalogue etc. (as above) London, Edward Hicks jun^r, 14 Bishopgate Street, Without E.C. (1893)

Stephenson, Sarah.

"Memoirs of the Life and Travels... of Sarah Stephenson". [edited by J.G. Bevan.] London: William Phillips, George Yard. (1807)

Story, Christopher, and Blair, Thomas.

"A Looking - Glass for the Inhabitants of the Town of Glasgow". (1691) (Probably first printed in the "Life of Christopher Story". (1726). The original MS. is not extant.)

Story, Christopher.

"A Brief Account of the Life, Convincement, Sufferings, Labours and Travels of.. Christopher Story.." London: J Sowle, George Yard. (1726)

Letter to Gilbert Molleson from Lurgan, dated 21-3-1701. (In Story's "Life", 1726, PP 100-105.)

Story. Thomas. of Justicetown.

"A Journal of the Life of Thomas Story.." Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Isaac Thompson and Co. Folio. (1747)

Stubbs, John.

"A True Declaration of our Innocency who in scorn are called Quakers, and how we are clear (if we have justice) from the Penalties of the late Act made against Seditious Meetings..." Printed in the Year 1670. (No Publisher's name or Place.)

Testimony given forth by the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting on 28-V-1698. (In J.F.H.S. Volume VIII, PP 77-80.)

Thompson, Thomas.

"An Encouragement early to seek the Lord and be faithful to him in an Account of the Life and Services of that Ancient Servant of God, Thomas Thompson". London: J Sowle, Whitehart Court. (1708)

"Truth Exalted in the Writings of that Eminent and Faithful Servant of Christ, John Burnyeat, The." (In Collected "Works".)

Tuke, Henry.

"Biographical Notices of Members of the Society of Friends". Vols I and II. York: W Alexander & Son. (1815)

[Weare, George and others.]

"The Doctrines and Principles of the Priests of Scotland contrary to the Doctrine of Christ and the Apostles.." (Appendix to Fox's "Great Mystery". (1659.)

W.H. Junr.

"The Life and Travels of John Pemberton, a Minister of the Gospel of Christ". Compiled for the American Friends' Library by W.H. Junr. Volume VI. Philadelphia: Printed by Joseph Rakestraw. (1842)

Whitehead, George.

"The Principal Controversies between The Litteral Presbyters of the Kirk of Scotland and the Illuminated Members of the Church of Christ, called Quakers". Printed in the Year 1672. (No Publisher's Name or Place.)

"The Christian Progress of.. George Whitehead... in Defence of the Truth and God's Persecuted People, commonly called Quakers". In Four Parts. London: Printed by Assigns of J Sowle at the Bible, George Yard. (1725)

Whiting, John.

"A Catalogue of Friends' Books, Written by many of the People called Quakers". 3 Vols. London: J Sowle, White-Hart Court. (1708.)
(Joseph Smith's "Catalogue" is based on 'Whiting'.)

Widders, Robert.

"The Life, and Death, Travels and Sufferings of Robert Widders..". London: Printed in the Year 1688.
(No Publisher's Name.)

Wigham, John.

"Memoirs of the Life, Gospel Labours, and Religious Experience of John Wigham, Chiefly written by Himself". London: Harvey and Darton, Gracechursh Street. (1842)

Letter to Ann Reid, 1784. (In "Memorials of Hope Park", P 29.)

Letter to George Richardson, dated 8th December 1840.
(In "Richardson MSS", Vol IV, No 72.)

Wilkinson, Thomas.

"Some Account of the last Journey of John Pemberton to the Highlands and other parts of Scotland". London: Wm Phillips, George Yard. (1810)

Wilson, Thomas.

"A Brief Journal of the Life, Travels, and Labours of Love.. of Thomas Wilson". New edition. London: Jas. Phillips, George Yard. (1784)

Wood, Hew.

"A Brief Treatise of Religious Women's Meetings, Services and Testimonies, according to the Truth". London: Printed and Sold by Andrew Sowle. (1684.)

and Livingstone, Patrick.

"Some things writ concerning Forms, that it may be
seen what is of God's own Forming: as also what is
of Man's". (No Publisher.) (1694) (Tract in Euston
Library.)

APPENDIX D.

A Note on the Sources.

There are certain regrettable blanks in the Sources. The following references in the Text and Footnotes will not be found either in Appendix C. or the Bibliography:-

A. Certain MSS which may never have been printed and which are now presumably lost, as no trace can be found of them even in the British Museum or Friends' House Library, Euston; eg. May Drummond's "Paper" (1734); Title Deed of Gartshore Meeting; Or Keith's Answer to the Bishop of Aberdeen's Thirty Queries.

B. Certain printed pamphlets which cannot be found; eg. William Mitchell's "A Dialogue betwixt a Quaker and a stable Christian", and "Animadversions"; Jonathan Burnyeat's "Warning to the Inhabitants of Edinburgh". (1699) etc.

Long lists of works like Barclays' and Keith's are listed in Appendix C. as nearly chronologically as possible.

In Division B.1A of the Bibliography I have adopted the following arrangement of the MSS:-

- (1) All that may be termed "Private" or "Semi-Private, alphabetically.
- (2) The Aberdeen volumes and papers, chiefly by numbers.
- (3) The Edinburgh and South of Scotland volumes, chiefly by numbers.
- (4) All the remainder, not amenable to the above categories, alphabetically.

Square brackets around persons' names denote works which are anonymous on the title page etc, but whose author or editor is thought to be known.

Many valuable early Records are doubtless irretrievably lost: eg. Montrose and Linlithgow MM. Minutes;

~~minutes~~; Kelso MM. Minutes, prior to 1748; and Edinburgh Y. M. Minutes, 1737-1786 etc. I have supplied the Friends' House Library, Euston with as complete a list of these as I can.

Some volumes of the early Aberdeen and Kinmuck Records, deposited too late at Friends' House, Euston, are in a deplorable condition from damp or otherwise, and in one or two instances the Librarian could not agree to let me touch them. I have had to ^{have} recourse to their contents from other sources, chiefly the J.F.H.S. W.F. Miller seems to have made his extracts there (Vol VIII) just in time, ^{circ} twenty-five years ago. In several of these MSS volumes, pages are missing or the numbers torn off the corners, and in some instances I have had to enter the number in commas, eg. "62", ie. the page I have counted as "62" among those extant.

The oldest and most important authorities in Division R/A are asterisked (*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

WITH OCCASIONAL OBSERVATIONS.

- B. 1. - Source Works.
- B. 2. = Best Secondary Authorities.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- D.N.B. "Dictionary of National Biography".
- D.P.P.S. "The Doctrines and Principles of the Priests of Scotland". ("The Scotch Priest's Principles" 1659.)
- F.P.T. "The First Publishers of Truth".
- F.Q.E. "The Friends' Quarterly Examiner".
- J.F.H.S. "The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society".
- R.P.C.S. "The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland".
-

DIVISION B 1. SOURCE WORKS.

A. M.S.S. PUBLISHED or UNPUBLISHED.

* "A Breiffe Account of the Most Materiall Passages and occurrences That happened to frinds of Truth During that great and Long Tryall of Sufferings and Persecution at Aberdene". (1676-1679) MS in Euston Library. (Referred to as "Most Material Passages" and bound with "A Breiff Historicall Account")
(This is largely the basis of "Besse's Sufferings",—Sect on Scotland.)

"A.R. B[arclay.] MSS" 1-125.

Original Letters of early Friends, mostly addressed to Fox. (Euston Library)

Areskine, Thomas.

Letter "to Friends in Cornwall, and in the West of England in general".+Postscript. Edinburgh, dated 12-12 mo. 173⁸₇. (Swarthmore MSS Vol VI. No 99. original.)

Backhouse and Mounsey.

"Biographical Memoirs". Vol III. (Memoir of George Gray of Aquorthies.) MS Volume in Euston Library.

British Museum Additional MSS. 23138, folio 61 . . . — Letter from James, Duke of York, to Lauderdale. (1677)

Brown James.

The Will and Disposition of James Brown, Tanner in the West Port. Witnessed by William Miller, John Molleson, and George Forbes, and dated 31-11-1680.
(MS No 68 in Aberdeen Friends' Meeting House.)

Bownas, Samuel.

Letter from Samuel Bownas to James Wilson, 1751.
(In "The Robson MSS", Volume 44, Euston Library.)

"Crosfield MSS, THE."

(of John Dymond Crosfield of Liverpool) One Volume. (In Euston Library.)

Drummond, May.

Copy of Letter to Rev John Shaw of South Leith, dated 25-7 month-1733. (In "Robson MSS" No 67, Euston Library.)

Copy of Letter to William Miller, the Second, 1734.
(In "Robson MSS", No 44, P 74, Euston Library.)

Fox, George.

"For the satisfying of all ignorant People that they may know ye true ministry. Some Queries to you to Answer who are called Ministers". Swarthmore MSS. Vol VII. (No 62.) original.

Letter to Robert Barclay, dated 2nd of 9th month 1680.
(Original Letter last heard of in the possession of R. Littleboy of Newport Pagnell, Bucks.)

"Gibson Bequest MSS. The."

Volume I. (In Euston Library.)

Kelsall, John. Diary. Vol VII. (commencing 1-6-1734) Typescript. (Euston Library)

Lauderdale Papers: Miscellaneous Correspondence, Vol XI-April to December 1665. (British Museum Add. Manuscripts 23, 123 f 168) (Royal Warrant for Arrest of Colonel Barclay, Sir James Stewart, and Lieut-Colonel Wallace, issued from Salisbury 23rd August 1665.)

"Letters and Documents of the Early Friends" : otherwise "The Swarthmore MSS". Vols I - IV, VI, VII. Transcribed Copies used unless otherwise stated. (Preserved at Swarthmore Hall till 1759: now in Euston Library.) Vols VI and VII are not transcribed.

"Miller MSS. The."

Vols I and II. (Wm. F. Miller of Winscombe, Somerset.)
In Euston Library.

Ormiston, Charles, the Third, of Kelso.

* Letters from Charles Ormiston, the Third to the Meeting for Sufferings in London. (Portfolio 30, Nos 5,4,7 in Euston Library.)

Portfolio of Miscellaneous MSS, Letters, etc No 30. Euston Library.

"Richardson, MSS. The."

Vols II, IV, V. Euston Library.

"Robson MSS. The" Volumes 44 and 67. (Euston Library)

"John Row MSS, The" Volume 17 (Euston Library)

Skene, Alexander, and others (Alex. Jaffray etc)

* "A Breiff Historicall Account and Record of the first Rise and Progress of the Blessed Truth, Called in Dirision Quakerism, in and about Aberdeen, of the oppositions and persecutions attending the same etc". (MS Vol 16 in Euston Library. The Basis of John Barclay's "Memoirs".)

"Spence MSS, The", in Euston Library. Folio, Volume III.

Stowe Manuscripts No 186 (4) - "The Present State of the Nonconformists". (British Museum.)

Winchester, Rev James, B.D.

MSS Notes on Quakerism in Bannockburn sent to the Writer. (1935)

Woodhouselee MS, The

A Narrative of Events in Edinburgh and District during the Jacobite Occupation, September to November 1745". Printed from Original Papers. Edited by A Francis Stewart. Edin: W & R Chambers (1907)

Wood, Hew.

"A peaper give out Concerning pearueags". Oldest authentic copy in the "Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting Book", 1669. (MS Volume No 15) at 207 Bath Street Glasgow, P 107. The original is lost.

"Digest of Births, Marriages and Burials for Scotland to 1872, with List of Record Books from which it was prepared, and a brief Introductory Sketch and Summary of the Contents thereof". (Copies in both Glasgow and Aberdeen Meeting House Safes, 207 Bath Street, and 98 Crown Street respectively.)

["Minute Book of Aberdeen Monthly and Quarterly Meetings". 1672-1692 in J.F.H.S. Volume VIII. (The original MS VOL I in Euston Library is too decomposed to be consulted.)]

["Minute Book of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting" 1690-1706. The original MS VOL No 2 in Euston Library is in too frail a condition to be consulted, but material is referred to in authoritative secondary sources, chiefly J.F.H.S.]

"Minute Book of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting" 1706-1786.

* In Friends' House Library, Euston Road, London. MS
Volume No 3.

"Minute Book of Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting" 1697-1773.

* (Contains also the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting Minutes.)
In Friends' House Library, Euston Road, London. MS
Volume No 4.

Note:- Drafts of Several of these Minutes are contained
in Bundle No 61 of Aberdeen MSS. at Crown Street Meeting
House.

"Minute Book of Kinmuck Monthly Meeting" circ. 1701-1782.

* In Friends' House Library, Euston Road, London. MS
Volume No 5.

"Aberdeen Monthly Meeting Register." MS Volume No 7 in custody of
Friends' House Library at Euston.

"Aberdeen Register of Burials" MS Volume No 9 in custody of
Friends' House Library at Euston.

"Book of Epistles to and from London Yearly Meeting 1706-1749." (Copy)
(Aberdeen MSS Volume No 18, at 98 Crown Street.)

"Book of Minutes of the London Yearly Meeting and other documents
from 1789 to 1828 and Minutes of Aberdeen Quarterly
Meeting and General Meeting for Scotland 1773-1832."
(MS Volume No 19 in Aberdeen MSS at 98 Crown Street,
Aberdeen.)

"Minutes of the General Meeting for Scotland, 1832-1871." Aberdeen MSS
Volume No 20 at Crown Street Meeting House.)

"Minute Book of Kinmuck and Old Meldrum Monthly Meeting". 1782-1786.
* In Friends' House Library, Euston Road, London. MS Volume
No 21.

"Old Meldrum Preparative Meeting Minutes". Bound up with "Kinmuck
and Old Meldrum Monthly Meeting Book". (MS Vol No 21) in
Euston Library.

"Minute Book of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting, 1786-1832." (MS. Volume No 24 in Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)

"Minute Book of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting, 1832-1868." MS. Volume No 25 in safe at 98 Crown Street, Aberdeen.

"Cash Book containing transactions of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting 1816-1836." (Aberdeen MSS Volume No 26 at Crown Street Meeting House.)

"Select Half Year's Meeting Book for North Britain," or "Minute Book of the Aberdeen Monthly Meeting of Ministers, and Elders. 1787-1841." (Aberdeen MSS Volume No 34 at Crown Street Meeting House.)

"Cash Book containing the Treasurer's intromissions from 1691 to 1780 etc". (Aberdeen MSS Volume No 43 at Crown Street Meeting House. ("Aberdeen Cash Book 1691".)

"Testimony of William Glennie Jun^r of Aberdeen against himself for his marriage with a professor, dated 20th December 1713." (Bundle No 60 (4) in Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)

Testimony of Alex Johnston of Newhills, Elder and Younger against themselves, dated 7-5-1715. (Bundle No 60 (8) of Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)

Testimony of Aberdeen Monthly Meeting against Siding with parties, dated 1st December 1715 signed by Andrew Jaffray and six others. (Bundle No 60 (9) in Aberdeen MSS. at Crown Street Meeting House.)

"The Case of the People called Quakers in Scotland Relating to there Christian and Civill Libertys" and Correspondence thereupon, 1706. (Bundle No 60 (19) of Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)

Letter from William Napier, Robert Beattie, and others to the Yearly Meeting at Aberdeen, dated 23-2-1710. (Bundle No 60 (25) of Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)

- "Draft Minute of Aberdeen Half Yearly Meeting," dated 18th of 10th Month 1786. (In Bundle No 61 of Aberdeen MSS in the Meeting House Safe, Crown Street, Aberdeen.)
- "Copy of Letter from the Midmonth Meeting at Aberdeen about the Famine of 1698," dated 17-9-1698, to the London Correspondents. (Bundle No 62 (1) in Aberdeen MSS. at Crown Street Meeting House.)
- "Copy of Letter from London Correspondents to Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting," dated 22nd of 6th month 1709 and signed by Alex Paterson and others. (In Bundle No 62 (2) of Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)
- "Memorial to the Meeting for Sufferings at London, anent the Aberdeen Burgess Oath, presented by Robert Barclay of Urie and Roderick Forbes of Brux." (1709) (Bundle No 62 (3) of Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)
- "Copy of Letter to Friends in London from Aberdeen Friends, about the Burgess Oath Petition," dated 26th of 2nd month 1711. (Bundle No 62 (5) of Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)
- "Copy of Letter to Friends in London," January 17¹¹₁₂. (Aberdeen Bundle of MSS. No 62 (6).)
- "Copy of Letter to London Correspondents from Aberdeen Yearly Meeting," 25-27 days of 2nd month 1716. (Bundle No 62 (9) of Aberdeen MSS. at Crown Street Meeting House.)
- "Letter from David Barclay and John Falconar of London to Robert Barclay and the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting," dated 9th of 5th month 1713. (Bundle No 62 (13) in Aberdeen MSS. at Crown Street Meeting House.)
- "Letter from Friends in London to Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting," dated 18th of 6th month 1710. (Bundle No 62 (14) of Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)
- "Epistle from Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting to Aberdeen Yearly Meeting," dated 11th of 2nd mo. 1714. (Bundle No 62 (17) of Aberdeen MSS. at Crown Street Meeting House.)

- "Letter from Gilbert Molleson and Alexander Paterson to the Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting," dated 3rd of 10th month 1713. (Bundle No 62 (19) of Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)
- "Memorial by Alexander Jaffray to the Quarterly Meeting held at Aberdeen, 29-5-1731"- Anent Funds. (Bundle No 63 (2) of Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)
- "Minute regarding Sufferings of Amos Wigham," penalised for Militia, dated 19-4-1804. (Bundle No 63 (9) in Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House.)
- N.B. The following Numbers are connected with the Aberdeen Burgess Oath Controversy and are all in Bundle No 65 of the Aberdeen MSS at Crown Street Meeting House:-
- "Extract Complaint the Dean of Guild, Aberdeen, against Alexander Galloway 1699" (65 (1))
- "Copy of the Friend's First Petition to the Provost, Magistrates and Council of Aberdeen," dated 4th October 1710. (65 (2))
- "Copy of Petition of the Burgesses of Aberdeen to the Lord Provost and Magistrates, on the Quaker's behalf," dated 1710. (65 (4))
- "Copy of the State of Friend's Sufferings at Aberdeen, 1711."(65 (5))
- "Copy of Sir James Stewart's Letter to Robert Barclay," dated 14th March 1712. (65 (12))
- "Copy of Sir James Stewarts Letter to the Earl of Dartmouth," dated 2nd May 1712. (65 (13))
- "Letter from the Earl of Dartmouth to the Lord Chief Baron of Exchequer in Scotland," dated, Whitehall, 25th June 1712. (65 (14))
- "Copy of Memorial to the Lord Chief Baron and Remanent Barons from the Magistrates of Aberdeen," anent the Quakers, 1712. (65 (15))

- "Memorial to the Lord Chief Baron and the other Barons of Her Majesty's Exchequer in North Britain" from the Quakers, Sons of Burgesses and Inhabitants of Aberdeen. (Printed) (65 (16))
- "Copy of Sir James Stewart's Letter to William Penn" (1712?) (65 (17))
- "Copy of the Minute of Her Majesty's "Counsell" - The Magistrates of Aberdeen and the Quakers," June 21st 1714. (65 (20))
- "Letter from Gilbert Molleson, Alexander Paterson and John Pirie to Aberdeen Quarterly Meeting," dated 2-5-1714 on behalf of Meeting for Sufferings. (65 (21))
- "Order from Her Majesty's Privy Council at the Court at Kensington to the Magistrates of Aberdeen," signed Christopher Musgrave and dated 21st June 1714. (65 (22))
- "Act of Aberdeen City Council anent the Second Petition of Robert Barclay and other Friends," dated 4th August 1711. (65 (31))
- "Decision of the Barons of Her Majesty's Exchequer in favour of the Quakers," dated 26th November 1712. (Not numbered.)
- "Minute of Edinburgh Quarterly Meeting anent Diverse Insults in the South, 1711". (Aberdeen Bundle of MSS No 66 (2))
- MS Minute of the London Yearly Meeting 1728, to the Several Quarterly Meetings in Gt Britain, sent to Robert Barclay of Urie. (Aberdeen Bundle of MSS.- No 66 (5) in Crown Street Meeting House Safe.)
- MS Minute of the London Yearly Meeting 1794. (Aberdeen Bundle of MSS. No 66 (8) in Crown Street Meeting House Safe.)
- "MS. Copy of Letter of the London Yearly Meeting to the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings in Great Britain, Ireland and elsewhere," 8th day of 4th month. 1750. (Bundle No 66 (16) of Aberdeen MSS at Meeting House, Crown Street.)
- "MS. Copy of Letter from the London Yearly Meeting to the Aberdeen Yearly Meeting," of 10th 6month 1775. (Bundle No 66 (16) of Aberdeen MSS at Meeting House, Crown Street.)

"MS. Inventory of the Writs of the Two Crofts of Kinmuck," from 1680 to 1714. By Alexander Jaffray. 1735. (Bundle No 66 (19) of Aberdeen MSS. at Meeting House, Crown Street.)

"The Deed of Donation of Elizabeth Dickson of London," dated 3rd of September 1701. Large Broadside on Vellum folded. In the Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street Glasgow. (No 1)

"The Explanatory Deed of Donation of Elizabeth Dickson to the Meeting in Edinburgh". dated 3rd of 7th month 1701. Large Broadside on Vellum folded. Location - as above. (No 2)

"Disposition of Alexander Hamilton to Robert Gray as Manager therein mentioned of His Lands of Shattonhill.. in Security of Robert Hamilton Bequest to Friends" Dated 21st August 1745. (At 207 Bath Street, Glasgow)

"Exhibit of the Several Properties belonging to the Society of Friends in Edinburgh, with a Schedule of the Title Deeds relative to Each Property". MS Volume in Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath St, Glasgow. (No number)

"Seasine In Favours of John Woddrow And Others Within Mentioned 1733". The Title Deed of Partick Burial Ground on Vellum. In Safe of Friends' Library, 207 Bath Street Glasgow. Restored to Scotland 1847. (v.Mem.within)

"Glimpses of the Early Quakers in Scotland". Typed Folio in possession of the Friends' Library at 207 Bath Street Glasgow. By "R.H.F." (1926)

"Register of Births and Burials" 1681. In the Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street, Glasgow. MS Volume No 11.

"Edinburgh Preparative Meeting Minutes" 1787-1792. Bound with "Register of Births and Burials" 1681. (MS Volume No 11 in Bath Street, Glasgow.)

"A Book for the monthly meeting of Edinburgh" 1669. In the Friends' Meeting House Safe 207 Bath Street Glasgow. MS Volume No 12. Referred to as "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book".

*

"Edinburgh Monthly Meeting Book" 1730 In the Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street, Glasgow. MS Volume No 13. Referred to as "Edin. Monthly Meeting Book 1730".

"Hamilton Meeting Book" 1695. In the Friends' Meeting House Safe,
* 207 Bath Street, Glasgow. MS Volume No 14 or 'V'

"A Record of the quarterly meeting held at Edinburow wherein is
* contained the names of those meetings etc". 1669.
In the Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street,
Glasgow. MS Volume No 15. Referred to as "Edin.
Quarterly Meeting Book".

"General Record of Friends in the West of Scotland". 1656.(Book "U")
** In the Friends' Meeting House Safe 207 Bath Street,
Glasgow. MS Volume No 16: the oldest Record of Minutes
of Friends in Scotland.

"The Kelso Meeting Book" 1748. In the Friends' Meeting House Safe,
207 Bath Street, Glasgow. MS Volume No 17.

"A Register of the Marriage Certificates of the People called
Quakers belonging to the Monthly Meeting of Edinburgh
in the County of Midlothian, North Britain. In the
Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street, Glasgow.
MS Volume No 19.

"Edinburgh Monthly Meeting Minutes" 1794. In the Friends' Meeting
House Safe, 207 Bath Street, Glasgow. MS Volume No 29
or 'T'.

"Edinburgh Two Month's Meeting Minute Book" 1822 to 1831. In the
Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street, Glasgow.
(MS Volume No 30.)

"Edinburgh Two Month's Meeting Minute Book". 1831-1847. In the
Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street, Glasgow.
(MS Volume No 31)

"Edinburgh Two Month's Meeting Minute Book". 1848. In the Friends'
Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street, Glasgow. MS
Volume No 32.

"Minute Book of the General Meeting for Scotland" 1786-1833. In
the Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street,
Glasgow. MS Volume No 46. Referred to as "Gen. Meeting
Book 1786".

"General Meeting Minutes". 1834 (Edinburgh and Aberdeen) In the Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street, Glasgow. MS Volume No 47.

"Edinburgh Two Month's Meeting Accounts". 1789-1826. In the Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street, Glasgow. (MS Volume No 50.)

"An Account of the Distraints on Friends of the Monthly Meeting of Edinburgh". In the Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street, Glasgow. MS Album No 73.

"A Remembrance or Record of the Sufferings of some freinds of truth in Scotland". 1656-1693. Original MS Record in the Friends' Meeting House Safe, 207 Bath Street, Glasgow. (Referred to as "MS Register of Sufferings".)

*

Anonymous.

"A Few Queries and Remarks offered to the consideration of Dr Wardlaw & the Writer of the Review in the Evangelical Magazine of his "Letters to the Society of Friends". By a Constant Reader of that Periodical 8th month 1836. (Original MS in Euston Library.)

"Analecta Scotica: Collections illustrative of the Civil, Ecclesiastical and Literary History of Scotland, chiefly from original MSS. Edited by J Maidmint. Vol. I Edin: T G Stevenson, 87 Princes St, (1834)

"Ane Account of Some Service and Sufferings for the Blessed Holy Truth in the Town of Montross, which was in the tenth month 1672". (Bound with "A Breiff Historicall Account", and referred to as "Some Service and Sufferings") Euston Library.

*

"Commissariat Edinburgh Testaments". (Record of Edinburgh Wills) Vol III, Part I. and Vol 112, Part 2. (1747 and 1749) In the Register House, Edinburgh.

"Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of Friends held in London, to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings in Great Britain, Ireland, and Elsewhere from 1681 to 1817 inclusive". London: Printed and Sold By W & S Graves, Cheapside. (1818)

"Epistles Received, 1683-1706". Volume I. (Letters to London Yearly Meeting) MS Vol in Euston Library.

"First Publishers of Truth, The: Being Early Records (now first printed) of the Introduction of Quakerism into the Counties of England and Wales". Edited by Norman Penny L.L.D. London: Headley Bros, Bishopgate. (1907)

MS Register of the City Council of Edinburgh. Volume 28. (1674-1677) (In Edinburgh City Chambers)

*

Miller, William F.

"A Dictionary of all Names of Persons mentioned in the Meeting Books belonging to the Edinburgh Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, (Commonly called Quakers) from the first recorded date 1656 to about 1790". Compiled by W.F. Miller. MS Volume in Euston Library.

Minute Book of the London Yearly Meeting 1694-1701. Volume 2. (Euston Library)

Minutes of the London Yearly Meeting, 1734-1740. (Volume 8) Folio at Euston Library.

Minutes of the London Yearly Meeting for 1835. Folio at Euston Library.

"Record Book of Friends of the Monethly Meeting att Urie, The".
* in J.F.H.S. Vol VII. (The original Records in Euston Library are in too frail a condition to be consulted)

"Records of the United Presbries of Aberdeen and Kincardine O neal", commencing 1697. (MS Volume No IV of Aberdeen Presbytery Records in General Assembly Library, Tolbooth, Edinburgh.)

"Registrum Secreti Concilii, Acta." Volume for Sept 1696 to July 1699. (MS Volume in Register House Edinburgh.)

"Registrum Secreti Concilii Decreta". Volume for July 1697 - August 1700. (In Register House, Edinburgh) (MS)

"Register of Seisins from 13 October 1729 to 28 February 1732 - Vol 81 Folio 189-190. (Seasine John Purdon of a back tenement of Land and piece of waste ground and yard above the Cross, on the resignation of Alex. Pollock, dated and registered 27th July 1730) (Archives of Municipal Buildings, Glasgow.)

"Scotch Priests' Five Cusses The." 1657. (A MS Copy almost identical with the version in "The Doctrines and Principles of the Priests of Scotland", in "Swarthmore MSS" Vol VII. (No 25) - original.

Session Minute Book of the Parish of Glassford. (Minute of 7th January 1700.) In the custody of the Minister of Glassford.

"Some Records of Births, More especially connected with the Descendants of William Miller the Patriarch and some other Scots Friends". Album bequeathed to Devonshire House by Wm F Miller in 1918. Now in Euston Library.

B. STATE RECORDS AND DOCUMENTS. ETC.

"Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638-1842".
Edited by Thomas Pitcairn etc. Edinburgh: The Edinburgh Printing and Publishing Co. (1843.)

"Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, The". Vols VII, VIII, IX.
Printed by command of His Majesty, King George the Fourth in Pursuance of an Address of the House of Commons of Great Britain". (MDCCCXX)

"Act of the Privy Council of Scotland, discharging Persons to Travel from Edinburgh without Passes". Edin: Heirs and Successors of A Anderson. (1696) (Copy in National Library, Edinburgh. Pamphlets, Vol I, No 290.)

Barron, Rev Douglas Gordon. D.D.

"The Court Book of the Barony of Urie in Kincardineshire, 1604-1747." Edited from the Original MSS with Notes
Edin: T & A Constable, for the S.H.S. (1892.)

Brown, M.P. Advocate.

"Supplement to the Dictionary of the Decisions of The Court of Session". Volume III. Edin: W & C Tait, 78 Princes St. (1826)

"Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series".

1654, 1656-7, 1660-1, 1661-2, 1665-6. Edited by Mary Anne Everett Green. London: Longman and Co. (Various Years) (Referred to as "S.P.D.")

"Charters and other Documents Relating to the City of Glasgow".

Edited by Sir Jas. D. Marwick, L.L.D. and Robert Renwick. Vol. II. Glasgow: Scottish Burgh Records Soc. (1906)

"Collection of Acts of Parliament and Clauses of Acts of Parliament, relative to those Protestant Dissenters... called.. Quakers, from the year 1688, A". London: Luke Hinde. (1757)

"Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe Esq, A".

Secretary First to the Council of State, and afterwards to the Two Protectors, Oliver and Richard Cromwell". Vols I, III, IV, VI, VII. London: Printed for the Executor of the late Mr Fletcher Gyles by Thomas Woodward and Charles Davis. (1742)

"Declaration of His Highnes William Henry, By the Grace of God Prince of Orange etc, The". Given at the Court of the Hague, 10th October 1688. (Among the "Cameronian Papers 1679-1700" - Laing MSS 344 University of Edinburgh Library. Printed.)

"Documents relating to the Province of Moray".

Edited by E Dunbar Dunbar. Edinburgh: David Douglas. (1895)

"Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen, 1643-1747." Edinburgh: Printed for the Scottish Burgh Records Society. (1872)

"Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Glasgow, 1691-1717".

Glas: Scottish Burgh Records Soc. (1908)

Do: 1573-1642.

"Extracts from the Records of the Royal Burgh of Lanark. AD 1150-1722". Edited by R Renwick. Glasgow: Carson and Nichol. (1893)

Extracts from Fetteresso Kirk-Session Records, quoted in
"Selection from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of St
Andrew's and Cupar. 1641-1698". (1837)

"Extracts from the Session Records of Old Machar", 1709 and 1715.
(In "Records of Old Aberdeen 1557-1891" edited by
Alex M Munro. Volume II. Aberdeen: New Spalding Club.
1899.)

Fountainhall, Lord. (Hon. Sir John Lauder)
"The Decisions of the Lords of Council and Session from
June 6th 1678 to July 30th 1712". Vol II. Edin: Printed
for G Hamilton and J Balfour. Folio. (1761)

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson, L.L.D.
"The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution"
1628-1660. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (1889)

Halsbury, The Right Hon. the Earl of. etc.
"The Laws of England, being a Complete Statement of the
Whole Law of England". Volume IX. London: Butterworth
and Co. (1909)

"His Majesty's Declaration to all His loving Subjects of His
Kingdom of England and Dominion of Wales concerning
Ecclesiastical Affairs". Given at our Court at Whitehall
this Twenty-fifth Day of October 1660". (In "A Third
Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts.. of Lord
Somers". Vol III. London: F Cogan, Fleet St. 1751.)

Jonas, A.C.
"Extracts from Fenwick Parish Records, 1644-1699". Art in
"Proceedings of the Society of Antiquarians of Scotland",
4th Series, Volume X, P 30. (1911-12)

"The Lauderdale Papers, The". Edited by Osmund Airy. Vols II, III.
London: The Camden Society. (1885)

"Letters and State Papers chiefly addressed to George, Earl of
Melville, Secretary of State for Scotland 1689-91".
The Bannatyne Club. Printed at Edinburgh. (1843)

"Missives to the Provost, Baillies and Council of the Burgh of
Aberdeen" 1594-1688. (In "The Miscellany of the Spalding
Club", Volume Fifth. Aberdeen: Spalding Club. 1852)

"Manuscripts of J.J. Hope Johnstone Esq of Annandale, The". Part VII (Correspondence of William, Earl of Crawford, 1689-1698) (Hist. MSS Comm. Fifteenth Report Appendix, Part IX) London: Eyre and Spottiswoode for H.M. Stationery Office. (1897)

"Narratives and Extracts from the Records of the Presbytery of Ellon, 1597-1709". Edited by (Rev) Thomas Mair, Ellon. Aberdeen: W Jolly and Sons. (1898)

Penny, Norman, F.S.A. L L.D.

"Extracts from State Papers Relating to Friends 1654-1672". Edited by Norman Penny. London: Headley Bros. Bishopgate, E.C. (1913)

"Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland" held at Edinburgh, May 1846". Edin: John Greig and Son. (1846)

"Proclamation of the Privy Council against Tumults in Edinburgh, A". Edin: Heir of Andrew Anderson. (1693) (Copy in National Library, Edinburgh. Pamphlets, Vol I, No 147.)

"Records of the Meeting of the Exercise of Alford, 1662-1688". Edited by Rev. Thomas Bell. Aberdeen: New Spalding Club. (1897)

"Records of the Parish of Ellon". Edited by (Rev) Thomas Mair. Aberdeen: A Brown and Co (1876)

"Records of the Proceedings of the Justiciary Court, Edinburgh, The" 1661-1678. Edited by W.G. Scott-Moncrieff. Vol II. Edin: Scot. Hist. Soc. (1905)

"Records of the Sheriff Court of Aberdeenshire". Edited by David Littlejohn L.L.D. Vol III. Aberdeen: New Spalding Club. (1907)

"Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark,
1623-1709". Edin: Abbotsford Club. (1839)

"Seventh Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts".
Part I, Report and Appendix. London: Eyre and
Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen. (1879.)

"Statutes of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, The".
Edited with Notes, References and an Index by Thomas
Edlyne Tomlins. Volume I London: Printed by George Eyre
and Andrew Strahan. (1804) (Act to Raise and Establish
a Militia Force in Scotland. Cap. XCI. 1802.)

C. Other Source Works. (Doctrinal etc.)

Alexander, John.

"Jesuitico - Quakerism Examined, or A Confutation of The
Blasphemous and unreasonable Principles of The Quakers;
With a Vindication of the Church of God in Britain
From Their Malicious Clamours and Slanderous Aspersions".
London: Dorman Newman. 1680.)

Baillie, Robert, Principal.

"The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, A.M.,
Principal of the University of Glasgow, 1637-1662".
Vol III. Edinburgh: The Bannatyne Club. (1842.)

Baxter, Richard.

"One Sheet against the Quakers". London: Printed by
Robert White for Nevil Simmons, Book Seller. (1657.)

Blair, Robert.

"The Life of Mr. Robert Blair, Minister of St. Andrews, containing His Autobiography from 1593 to 1636 etc"
Edited by Thomas M'Crrie, D.D. Edin: Printed for the Wodrow Society. (1848.)

Brodie, Alexander.

"The Diary of Alexander Brodie of Brodie, 1652-1680".
Edited by David Laing. Aber: The Spalding Club. (1863.)

Brown, John. ("A well-wisher to the good old cause".)

"An Apologetical Relation of the particular sufferings of the faithfull Ministers and professors of the Church of Scotland since August 1660". Printed in the Year 1665. (No Printer's Name or Place.)

Brown, John, of Wamphray.

"Quakerisme the pathway to Paganisme, or A View of the Quakers Religion". An Answer to Barclay's "Apology."
Edin: Printed for John Cairns etc. (1678.)

Calvin, John.

"Institutes of the Christian Religion". A new Translation by Henry Beveridge Esq. In two Volumes. Books I, II and IV. Edin: T and T Clark. (1879.)

Clarke, William.

"The Clarke Papers: Selections from the Papers of William Clarke", Secretary to General Monck. Edited by C.H. Firth M.A. Volume III, London: Longmans, Green, and Co. (1899.)

"Cloud of Witnesses for the Royal Prerogatives of Jesus Christ: A."

Being the Last Speeches and Testimonies of Those Who have suffered for the Truth in Scotland, since the year 1680". Edited by Rev John H. Thomson. Edin: Johnstone, Hunter, and Company. (1871.)

"Confession of Faith, The.

Professit and Belevit be the Protestantis within the Realme of Scotland, published by Thame in Parliament etc..." (The "Scots Confession of Faith". 1560.) In "The Works of John Knox". Edited by David Laing LL.D. Vol II. Edin: James Thin. (1895.)

Croese, Gerard.

"The General History of the Quakers, containing the Lives, Tenets, Sufferings, Tryals, Speeches and Letters of all the Most Eminent Quakers, Both Men and Women, From the first Rise of that Sect down to this present time". London: Printed for John Dunton, Jewen St. First English edition (1696) (Hostile, and very inaccurate on Scotland.)

"Directory for The Publike Worship of God Throughout The three Kingdoms of Scotland, England and Ireland, A".

(With Acts of General Assembly and Parliament authorising the "Directory".) Edin: Printed by Evan Tyler. (1645.) (Referred to as "The Westminster Directory of Public Worship".)

Duncan, George John C.

"Memoir of the Rev. Henry Duncan D.D. Minister of Ruthwell". Edin: William Oliphant and Sons. (1848.)

Dunlop, Rev. William.

Memoirs of John Livingstone and William Guthrie. (In "Select Biographies", edited by Tweedie, 1847.)

Fountainhall, Lord.

"Chronological Notes of Scottish Affairs from 1680 till 1701, being chiefly taken from the Diary of Lord Fountainhall". Edited by Sir Walter Scott. Edin: A Constable and Co. (1822.)

Fraser, James of Brea.

Memoirs of Himself. (In "Select Biographies", edited by Tweedie, 1847.)

Hanna, William, LL.D.

"Memoirs of Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D. 2 Vols. Edin: T Constable & Co. (1854.)

[Higginson, Francis.]

"A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the Northern Quakers". Printed for T.R. and H.R. at the Sign of the Three Pigeons in Paul's Churchyard. (1653.)

Jameson, William, Professor of History, Glasgow.

"Nazianzen Querele et Votum Justum, the Fundamentals of the Hierarchy examin'd and disprov'd". Glasgow: Printed by Robert Sanders for the Author. (1697.)

Kirkton, Rev. Mr James.

"The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland from the Restoration to the year 1678". Edited from the MSS by Chas, K, Sharpe Esq. Edin: John Ballantyne. (1817.)

Lamont, John.

"Diary of Mr John Lamont of Newton, 1649-1671, The". Printed at Edinburgh for the Maitland Club. (1830.)

Large Broadside, beginning -

"To You the Parliament sitting at Westminster, our Request is to God that You Rule for His Honour... Here are severall of our Names, who thus suffers in the behalf of many more in the Nation of Scotland". (1659) (In British Museum. Very Rare.)

Law, Rev. Mr. Robert.

"Memorialls, or the Memorable Things that fell out within this Island of Brittain from 1638 to 1684". Edin. A Constable & Co. (1818.)

Mackenzie, Sir George, of Rosehaugh.

"Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland from the Restoration of King Charles II". Printed at Edinburgh. (1821.)

[Macquare, Robert.]

Postscript to Samuel Rutherford's "Letters", 3rd Edition. (1675.)

("A Lover of Truth".)

"The True Non - Conformist, In Answer To the Modest and free Conference Betwixt a Conformist and a Non-Conformist about the present Distempers of Scotland". Printed in the Year 1671. (No Publisher's Name or Place.)

Menzies, John.

"Roma Mendax: Or the Falsehood of Rome's High Pretences to Infallibility and Antiquity Evicted..". London: Printed for Abel Roper, Fleet Street. (1673.)

"Mr. Rutherford's Letters".

3rd Edition. Printed in the year 1675. (No Publisher's Name or Place.)

Nicoll, John.

"A Diary of Public Transactions and Other Occurrences, chiefly in Scotland from January 1650 to June 1667".
Edin: The Bannatyne Club. (1836.)

Nisbet, James.

"A True Relation of the Life of John Nisbet". (In
"Select Biographies", edited by Tweedie, 1847.)

"Quaeries and Quakers Cause at The second Hearing,...The".

London: Printed by I.G. for Nath. Brooke at the
Angel in Cornhill. (1653) (A very rare tract.)

"Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh and
Some other Brethern of the Ministry". Volume I,
1652-1657. Edited by Rev. William Stephen D.D. Edin:
T & A Constable for the Scottish History Society. (1921.)

[Reid, J.]

"A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances
Past and Present of the Presbyterians in Scotland,
Particularly.. Cameronians". [Edin.] Printed in the
Year 1690. (Brit. Museum Library.) Very Rare.

Rowe, John.

"The Diary of John Rowe". (In "Scottish Notes and
Queries". Volume II (1894.), PP 164-5.)

Rutherford, Samuel.

"Joshua Redeivivus or Three Hundred and Fifty-Two
Religious Letters, with a Testimony of the Covenanted
Work of Reformation between 1638 and 1649, By the late
eminently pious Mr Samuel Rutherford, Professor of
Divinity at St. Andrews. To which is prefixed A Life
of the Author including his last words". Glasgow:
Maurice Ogle, 9 Wilson Street. (1824.)

"Scotsman The" or "Edinburgh Political and Literary Journal",
Wednesday, June 3 1846. Edin: Printed and Published
by Chas. Maclaren, 257 High Street.

Scott, Sir Walter, Bart.

Meeting Letter to a friend in the North who had enquired about any possible Monthly Minutes among the family papers at Abbotsford. Dated Abbotsford, 1829. (In "The Friends' Monthly Magazine", Vol I, PP 186-7. Bristol: Wright and Bagnall 1830.)

"Select Biographies".

Edited for the Wodrow Society, chiefly from MSS in the Library of the Faculty of Advocates". [National Library] by Rev. W.K. Tweedie. Volumes I and II. Edin: Wodrow Society. (1847.)

Sheriff, Alexander; Leslie, John; Gellie Paul.} M.A.

"Quakerism Canvassed: Robin Barclay baffled in the defending of his Theses against young Students at Aberdene and he together with Mr George Keith and the rest of his friends found guilty of blasphemy, treason lying, shifting, quibbling...". Printed in the Year 1675. (No Publisher's Name or Place.)

Shields Michael.

"Faithful Contendings displayed"... "Collected and kept in record by Mr Michael Shields, who was clerk unto these general Societies, and personally present at most of their Meetings". Glasgow: Printed by John Bryce and Sold by him at his Shop, Opposite Gibson's - Wynd, Saltmarket. (1780.)

Spalding, John.

"The History of the Troubles and Memorable Transactions in Scotland and England from 1624 to 1645." Volume I. Edin: The Bannatyne Club. (1828.)

Stewart, Sir James. ("A Friend to true Christian Liberty".

"Jus Populi Vindicatum" or "The People's Right to defend themselves and their Covenanted Religion, vindicated". Printed in the Year 1669. (No Publisher's Name or Place.)

Walker, Patrick.

"Six Saints of the Covenant". Edited by D. Hay Fleming LL.D. Volumes I and II London: Hodder and Stoughton. (1901.)

Ward, Richard; A.M. Rector of Ingoldsby.

"The Life of the Learned and Pious Dr Henry More, Late
Fellow of Christ's College in Cambridge.." London:
Printed and Sold by Joseph Downing. (1710.)

"Witness, The":

Issues of May 9, May 16, and June 2, 1846. Published
twice weekly by Hugh Miller and Robert Fairly at 297
High Street Edinburgh.

Wodrow. Rev. Robert.

"Analecta". Vols I and III. The Maitland Club. (1842.)

"The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow". Ed.
Rev Thos. M'Crie. Vols I-III. Edin: The Wodrow
Society. (1842-3.)

"The History of the Sufferings of the Church of
Scotland from the Restoration to the Revolution".
Vols I, II, IV. Glasgow: Blackie, Fullerton & Co.
(1828-9.)

DIVISION B.2.- BEST SECONDARY AUTHORITIES.

A. General. (Non-Quaker.)

ANONYMOUS.

"Friends and Independents: or Remarks upon the Controversy in the Society of Friends; and upon Ralph Wardlaw's 'Friendly Letters' to that Society". Glasgow: John M^cLeod, 20 Argyll Street, etc. (1836)

Aldis, Harry G.

"A List of Books printed in Scotland before 1700".
Edinburgh Bibliographical Society. (1904.)

Alexander, William Lindsay. D.D.

"Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Ralph Wardlaw D.D."
Edin: A & C Black. (1856).

Barclay, Rev Charles W, compiler.

"A History of the Barclay Family, with Full Pedigrees from 1066 to 1924. Part I. (1924)

Barclay, Lt-Col. Hubert F, compiler.

"A History of the Barclay Family, with Pedigrees from 1067 to 1660. Part II. (1933).

and Alice Wilson-Fox, compilers.

"A History of the Barclay Family" with Pedigrees from 1067 to 1933. Part III. (1934)
(All the above three Parts of one work, Published by the St Catherine Press, London. It is a very full and well-documented work except in Scots MSS Records, but is inaccurate in many places. The latest work on the Barclays, it does not however claim to be exhaustive.)

Bartholemew, J.G. L L.D.

"The Survey Atlas of Scotland". A Series of Sixty-eight Plates of Maps and Plans. Edin: The Edinburgh Geographical Institute, for the R.S.G.S. (1912.)

"Bibliography of British History, Stuart Period, 1603-1714". Ed. by
Godfrey Davies. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (1928)

Black, George Fraser, L.L.D.

"A List of Works relating to Scotland". The New York Public Library. (1916)

Blaeu, Jean.

"Sixième Volume de la Geographie Blaviane, contenant Les Livres XII & XIII de l'Europe: Escosse, qui est le XII Livre". (Tome VI.) Amsterdam: Chez Jean Blaeu, (1667)

Brailsford, Mabel Richmond.

the "A Stuart among Quakers". Art in J.F.H.S. Vol X.
^ (1913) PP 263 ff.

"Cromwell's Quaker Soldiers". Art in "The Contemporary Review", Volume CVIII. (Nov. 1915) London: The Contemporary Review Co Ltd. (1915)

"A Quaker from Cromwell's Army: James Nayler". London: Swarthmore Press Ltd. (1927.)

"May Drummond". Art. in "The Friends' Quarterly Examiner", Volume LXIV. (1930) P 212.

Brown, Thomas, D.D. F.R.S.E.

"Annals of the Disruption". Edin: Macniven and Wallace. (1884)

Burke, Sir Bernard, Ulster King of Arms.

"A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Landed Gentry of Great Britain". 12th ed. London: Harrison & Sons, Pall Mall. (1914.)

and Ashworth, P.

"A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Peerage and Baronetage, the Privy Council and Knightage". 85th, ed. London: Burke's Peerage Ltd. (1927.)

Burnet, Gilbert, D.D.

"History of His Own Time". New Edition. London: Reeves and Turner, 196 Strand. (1883.)

Burnett, W Kendall.

"Genealogical Tree of the Family of Burnett of Leys".
(Large sheet in folder) No Publisher. (1893)

Chambers, Robert.

"Traditions of Edinburgh", Vol II. Edin: W & C Tait,
Princes Street. (1825)

"Domestic Annals of Scotland from the Reformation to
the Revolution". 2nd edition. Vols II, III. Edin:
W & R Chambers. (No date.)

Cunningham, John, D.D., Crieff.

"The Quakers; from their origin till the Present
Time". An International History. Edin: John Menzies
& Co. (1868)

Davidson, Rev. John, D.D. of Inverurie.

"Inverurie and the Earldom of the Garioch". Aberdeen:
A. Brown and Co. Edin: David Douglas. (1878)

De Wit.

"The Plan of Edinburgh Exactly done From the Original of
ye Famous De Wit". Reprinted for the Edinburgh
International Exhibition, 1886, by T & A. Constable,
Printers to Her Majesty.

"Dictionary of National Biography, The".

Volumes XXX, XXXVII, LVI. (1898)

Douglas, Sir Robert, of Glenbervie, Baronet.

"The Baronage of Scotland, containing an Historical
and Genealogical Account of the Gentry of That Kingdom..."
Edin: Bell and Bradfute etc. (1798.)

Dowden, John, D.D. L.L.D.

"The Bishops of Scotland". Edited by J Maitland Thomson,
L.L.D. Glasgow: Jas. Maclehose and Sons. (1912)

Edwards, Rev Jenkyn. Rector of Fenny Drayton.

"Fenny Drayton: its History and Legends". 2nd edition.
Printed at "Chronicle" Press, Nuneaton. (1924)

"Encyclopaedia Britannica, The" 11th edition. Vol. II. (Art on "Society of Friends"): 22. (Art on "Prison") New York.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

Edited by Jas Hastings D.D. etc. Volume 6. Edin:
T & T Clark. (1913)

Ferguson, Richard. S. M.A.

"Early Cumberland and Westmorland Friends". London:
F.B. Kitto, 5 Bishopgate Without. (1871)

Firth, C.H. L.L.D.

"The Last Years of the Protectorate 1656-1658." Vols I
and II. London: Longmans Green & Co. (1909)

"Cromwell's Army". Ford Lectures, Oxford 1900-/. London;
Methuen and Co. (1902)

Foxcroft, H.C.

"A Supplement to Burnet's History of My Own Time,
derived from His Original Memoirs, His Autobiography,
His Letters to Admiral Herbert and His Private
Meditations, all hitherto unpublished". ("Burnet's
Original Memoirs") Edited by H.C. Foxcroft. Oxford:
Clarendon Press. (1902)

Furly, Benjamin.

"Bibliotheca Furliana sive Catalogus Librorum
Honoratiss. & Doctiss. Viri Benjamin Furly". Rotterdam:
Tritsch and Bohm. (1714)

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson, L.L.D.

"History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate". Vols I
and II. London: Longmans Green and Co. (1897)

Greenshields, J.B.

"Annals of the Parish of Lesmahagow". Edin: The
Caledonian Press. (1864)

"Glasgow Register, Being an exact List of the Magistrates and other
Office-bearers in that City from the most ancient records
down to the present Year, The". Glasgow: Printed by
John Bryce. (1781)

Godwin, William.

"History of the Commonwealth of England from its Commencement to the Restoration of Charles the Second". Volume III. London: Henry Colburn. (1827)

Gumble, Thomas, D.D.

"The Life of General Monck, Duke of Ablemarle etc". London: Thomas Baffet. (1671)

Henderson, G.D. D.Litt; D.D.

"Mystics of the North-East". Edited with Introduction and Notes by G.D.Henderson. Aberdeen: Printed for the Third Spalding Club. (1934.)

Hunter, Rev. A Mitchell, D. Litt.

"The Teaching of Calvin: A Modern Interpretation". Glasgow: Maclehose, Jackson and Co. (1920.)

Keith, Right Rev. Robert.

"An Historical Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops down to the Year 1688". New Edition. Edin: Bell & Bradfute. (1824)

King, Robert.

"The Covenanters in the North". Aberdeen: George and Robert King. (1846.)

Lockhart, George, of Carnwath.

"Memoirs Concerning the Affairs of Scotland from Queen Anne's Accession to the Throne to...May 1707". London: Booksellers of London and Westminster. (1714.)

M^c Arthur, John.

"Plan of the City of Glasgow, Gorbells, and Caltoun. From an actual survey by John M^c Arthur...Engraved by Alex^r Baillie and James Lumsden. (1778)

Macfarlane, Walter.

"Genealogical Collections concerning families in Scotland made by Walter Macfarlane, 1750-1751". Edited by James Foshagh Clark. Vol II. Edin: T & A Constable for the Scots. History Society. (1900.)

Macgeorge, Andrew.

"Old Glasgow: the Place and the People". 3rd edition. Glasgow: Blackie and Son. (1888)

Macpherson, Rev. Hector, Ph.D.

"The Covenanters under Persecution". Edin: W.F. Henderson.
(1923)

M'Kerrow, John, D.D., Bridge of Teith.

"History of the Secession Church". Revised and
Enlarged Edition. Edin and London: A Fullerton & Co.
(1848.)

Memoirs of Sir Ewan Cameron of Locheill, Chief of the Clan Cameron,
with an Introductory Account of the History and Anti-
quities of that Family, and of the Neighbouring Clans".
Edin: The Maitland Club. (1842.)

Moll, Herman.

"A Set of Thirty-Six New and Correct Maps of Scotland,
Divided into its Shires etc". London: Sold by H. Moll
over-against Devereux-Court etc. (1725) (Moll's 'Atlas'.)

"Mosheim's Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern",
translated by James Murdock D.D. and revised with
supplementary notes by James Seaton Reid D.D.,
University of Glasgow. London: Simms and M'Intyre. (1848.)

Munro, Alexander M. F.S.A. (Scot)

"Memorials of the Aldermen, Provosts, and Lord Provosts
of Aberdeen". 1272-1895. Aberdeen: Printed for the
Subscribers. (1897.)

Neal, Daniel, M.A.

"The History of the Puritans or Protestant Nonconformists
from the Reformation in 1517 to the Revolution in 1688".
New Edition, reprinted from Toulmin's edition. Vols II
and III. London: T. Tegg and Son, Cheapside (1837)
(Based largely on Gough, but inclined to bias and
inaccuracy.)

"New Statistical Account of Scotland. The".

Edited by John Gordon. Edin: Wm Blackwood & Son. (1845)
Vols I & XII.

Nicolson, Marjorie Hope, Prof.

"Conway Letters: The Correspondence of Anne, Viscountess
Conway, Henry More, and their Friends, 1642-1684.
Collected from Manuscript Sources and Edited with a
Biographical Account". Oxford and Yale University
Presses. (1930.)

Pirie, Alexander, Minister at Newburgh, Fife.

"A Dissertation on Baptism, intended to illustrate the Origin, History, Design, Mode...wherein the Mistakes of the Quakers and Baptists on that subject are pointed out etc". Perth: Printed for the Author. (1786.)

Pocock, Edward, [Junior.] M.A.

"Philosophus Autodidactus, sive Epistola Abijaafar Ebn Ebn Tophail de Hai Yokdhan etc". Ex Arabicâ in Linguam Latinam versa âb Edvardo Pocockio, A.M. Oxonii: Excudebat H. Hall, Academiae Typographus. (1671.)

"Proceedings of the Society of Antiquarians of Scotland."

4th Series, Vol X. (1911-12)

5th Series, Vol II. (1915-16)

Edin: Printed for the Society by Neill & Co., Ltd.

Prynne, William of Swainswick Esq.

"The Quakers Unmasked, and clearly detected to be but the Spawn of Romish Frogs, Jesuits, and Franciscan Fryers, sent from Rome to seduce the intoxicated, Giddy-headed English Nation". Second Edition Enlarged. London: Printed for Edward Thomas at the "Adam and Eve" In Little Britain. (1664.)

Rait, Sir Robert S. Principal, L L.D.

"The Universities of Aberdeen: A History". Aberdeen: James Gordon Bisset. (1895.)

Robertson, Joseph.

"Illustrations of the Topography and Antiquities of the Shires of Aberseen and Banff". Vol IV. Aberdeen: The Spalding Club. (1862.)

Russell John,

"The Haigs of Bemersyde" : A Family History. Edin: Blackwood and Sons. (1881.)

Scott, Hew. D.D.

"Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ". New Edition. Volumes I, III, VI. VII. Edin: Oliver and Boyd. (1915-1928.)

"Scottish Notes and Queries".

2nd Series, Vol III. (1901-2)

3rd Series., Vol II. (1924-5)

_____ Vol III. (1925-6)

_____ Vol VI. (1928-9)

_____ Vol IX. (1931-2)

_____ Vol XII. (1934-5)
Various Publishers (1887-35)

Shorthouse, John Henry.

"John Inglesant: A Romance". London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd. (1902)

"Spalding Club Miscellany, The". Vol V. Aberdeen: The Spalding Club. (1852.)

"Statistical Account of Scotland, The".

Edited by Sir John Sinclair, Bart. Edin: Wm Creech etc. (1791-8) Vols II, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XVII, XIX, XXI.

Taylor, Charles.

"The Quakers of Glasgow and their Burial Grounds". Art. in "Transactions of the Glasgow Archeological Society". New Series, Vol V, Part I. (1908.)

"Transactions of the Glasgow Archeological Society".

New Series, Vol V. Glasgow: Maclehose & Sons. (1908.)

Turner, Prof. G. Lyon, M.A.

"Original Records of Early Nonconformity under Persecution and Indulgence". Transcribed and edited by G Lyon Turner. Vol III. London: T Fisher Unwin. (1914.)

Underhill, Thomas, "Citizen of London".

"Hell broke loose, or An History of the Quakers Both Old and New, Setting forth many of Their Opinions and Practices". London: Simon Miller at the Starre. (1660.)

Vere-Irving, George. F.S.A. Scot., and Murray, Alexander.

"The Upper Ward of Lanarkshire, Described and Delineated." Vol II. Glasgow: Thomas Murray and Son. (1864.)

Wardlaw, Ralph, D.D.

"Friendly Letters to the Society of Friends on some of their distinguishing Principles". Glasgow: Archibald Fullerton & Co. (1836.)

Letter to his Son, May 1836. (In W.L. Alexander's "Life and Writings of Ralph Wardlaw D.D." (1856) P 355.)

Webb, Maria.

"The Fells of Swarthmore Hall and their Friends". 2nd edition. London: F.B. Kitto, Bishopgate Without. (1867.)

DIVISION B.2. BEST SECONDARY AUTHORITIES.

B. Quaker.

"Annual Monitor, The".

NO. 4 for the year 1816: NO. 26 for the year 1838. 2nd edition. York. (W.Alexander & Co) (The "Annual Monitor" Series is the successor to "Piety Promoted".)

Balkwill, Helen.

"Birthright Membership". Art. in "Friends' Quarterly Examiner", Vol V, (1871) PP 524 ff.

Ball, William.

"On the Name 'Quaker'". Art. in "Friends' Quarterly Examiner", Vol II, (1868) PP 68 ff.

Braithwaite, William C. B.A. L L.B.

"The Beginnings of Quakerism". Macmillan & Co. (1912.)

"Society of Friends". Art. in Hastings' "Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics", Volume 6. Edin: T & T Clark, (1913) PP 142 ff.

"The Second Period of Quakerism". 2nd edition. Macmillan and Co. (1912.)

Brayshaw, Alfred Neave, LLB.

"Friends, Society of". Art. in "The Encyclopaedia Britannica", 11th Edition. Volume XI.

"British Friend, The".

A Monthly Journal. Glasgow: Wm and Robert Smeal. Years 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 1861, 1870.

Cadbury, M Christabel.

"Robert Barclay: His Life and Work". Headley Bros. (1912)

"Collectitia, or Pieces Religious, Moral, and Miscellaneous,
adapted to the Society of Friends". York: W Alexander
& Son. (1824.)

"Friend, The" A Monthly Journal.

Vols IV, VI, VII, IX, X, XI, XIII, London: Charles
Gilpin. Various Dates. (Vol. IV, 1846 - Vol XIII, 1855.)

"Friends" Quarterly Examiner: The". (F.Q.E.)

Vols I, (1867.) II, (1868.) V, (1871.) VII, (1873.)
XIV, (1880.) XXI, (1887.) XXIV, (1890.) XXVII, (1893.)
LVIII, (1924.) LXIV, (1930.)

Janney, Samuel M.

"The Life of William Penn: with Selections from his
Correspondence and Autobiography". Philadelphia:
Lippincott, Grambo, & Co. (1852.)

"History of the Religious Society of Friends from its Rise
to the Year 1828". Volumes II, III. Philadelphia:
Hayes Zell. (1859-67.)

Jones, Rufus M, D. Litt., D.D.

"The Later Periods of Quakerism". Vols I, II, London:
Macmillan & Co. Ltd. (1921.)

"Journal of the Friends' Historical Society The".

Vols I.II.III.IV.VI.VII.VIII.X.XI.XII.XIII.XIV.XVII.
XVIII.XIX.XXI.XXVI.XXIX. London: Headly Bros, Bishopgate.
(Dates from 1904 onwards.)

"Memorials of Hope Park, comprising some Particulars in the Life
of our Dear Father, William Miller", Printed for the
Compiler by Simmons and Botten, London: (1886.)

Miller, William F.

"William Miller at the King's Gardens". Art. in J.F.H.S.
Vol II, (1905) P 107 ff.

"Early Friends' Schools in Scotland". Notes in J.F.H.S.
Volume VII, (1910) PP 105 ff.

"Reminiscences of Some Old Edinburgh Friends". Art. in J.F.H.S. Volume X, (1913) PP 1 ff.

"George Swan of Glasgow". Art. in J.F.H.S. Vol XI, (1914) PP 22ff.

"Old Glasgow Meeting Houses". Art. in J.F.H.S. Volume XII, (1915) PP 1 ff.

"Stranger Friends Visiting Scotland 1650-1797". Art. in J.F.H.S. Vol XII, (1915) PP 79 ff.

Rowntree, John Stephenson.

"Quakerism Past and Present: Being An Enquiry into the Causes of its Decline in Great Britain and Ireland". London: Smith, Elder, and Co. (1859.)

Smith, C. Fell.

"Stephen Crisp and his Correspondents". Edited by C.F. Smith. London: E. Hicks Junr^r. [1892.]

Taylor, Ernest E.

"The First Publishers of Truth". Address in J.F.H.S. Vol XIX, (1922) PP 66 ff.