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

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

This article advocates that Scottish parliamentary rolls are a valuable and hitherto untapped seventeenth-century source for scrutiny of Covenanting factionalism as evidenced through the institution of the Scottish Parliament. Given the lack of parliamentary voting data, parliamentary rolls offer an accessible means of identification of Covenanting personnel along party lines. Who were the ‘Covenanters’? Scottish historiography has tended to concentrate on the more flamboyant figures of James I, The Parliaments of Scotland. Both and Share Commissioners, ed. M. Young. (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1992–93).


Graham, 5th Earl and 1st Marquess of Argyll at parliamentary rolls, however, the Scottish localities accord.

The Covenanting Movement of radical and conservative streams in Scotland and the curtailling of the power of the earl of Mar was evidenced at an early date. The Covenanting oath to the Solemn League and Covenant held public office. Radicals witnessed the rise of conservatism in Edinburgh 1648–9.

Factionalism is examined of the Scottish Coronation P of 1639 are scrutinised in the opposition in the 1633 Parliament, 1644–47, are commencing on 2 March 1648. Members adhering to the Earl of Argyll also sat in the parliaments of Charles I (as King of Scots) and January 1647 (Scottish English Parliament). This enacts within Parliament, 1646–47, southern kingdom. Thirdly of 1648 are compared with following military defeat at Raid on the Scottish capital Cromwell, which was a vehicle of comparative analysis proved the 1648 Parliament which defend Charles I in the his Restoration Parliament of are compared with all pre

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

The Covenanting Movement was not homogenous; it was composed essentially of radical and conservative strands vis-à-vis the diminution of the royal prerogative in Scotland and the curtailing of royal power within the King's northern kingdom. This was evidenced at an early date in the Cumbernauld Band of 1640, articulated by Montrose, in an attempt to create an opposition party to Argyll and the dominant radical mainstream. Pragmatic royalists have been classified as those royalists who subscribed Covenanting oaths and bonds (most notably the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant) in order to gain admittance to Parliament and to hold public office. Radicals were in the ascendency until the mid-1640s. 1645–46 witnessed the rise of conservatism in a parliamentary context, which culminated in the alliance of the conservatives/pragmatic royalists in the Engagement of 1648. The defeat of the Engagement facilitated the establishment of an extreme radical regime in Edinburgh 1648–49.

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

6 See Young, 'Scottish Parliament', I.
parliamentary Members of the Restoration Parliament who had served in Parliaments of the Covenanting era can therefore be ascertained.

1. What is a Scottish parliamentary roll?

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

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

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


The burghal estate was composd of the royal burghs, and were Burghal attendance had been held. The body which oversaw the behind the lobbying of Parm. burgh in Parliament was hence a. with the exception of the cap. Commissioners.11

Parliamentary rolls indicate the opening day of each Parliament three sessions of the second Par. of the First Ten. Parliament, 1648-51, consisted of only four of the contemporary commentator for attendance for two of the s. rolls (26 November 1650 and 1

Whilst parliamentary rolls the nobles, gentry and burgs. session, they do not necessarily trends throughout each of those for the 1644 Convention of E of the 1644 Convention, E to the opening day of a parliament that those members listed in the 1

1 Young (ed.), *The Parliaments of of the Covenanting Movement*, pp. 12 Pryde, *The Estate of the Burgess in Thoughts on the Union*, p. 48; Terry. 12 A Conv. of Est. did not usually it was held for a sufficient and of 1625) or only 43-4; Rait, *The Parliaments of Scotland* the 1643 Convention of Est. was through the medium of parliamentary order to secure Scottish entry into the with Charles I; Scottish R.O., P.A. Commission for Receiving the Brot Proceedings of the Scots Commerce 1643, 6 S.; Register of the Privy Co. Edinburgh, 1899-1908), VII, 9-4. 13 A.P.S., V, 251-2, 258-59, X 429-430, 440-1, 474-5, 612-3. 14 Ibid., VI, ii, 3-4, 124-6, 277-2 Mar. 16 June 1648, 4 Jan.-16 & recorded for the remaining parliam Mar. 1651; and 23 May 6 June 1651 15 Sir James Balfeur, *Historical 1 16 A.P.S., VI, i, 60, 61, 63, 65.
The burghal estate was composed of the Commissioners of the Burghs, who represented the royal burghs, and were elected annually by their respective town councils. Burgh attendance had been recently refined by the 1621 Convention of Royal Burghs, the body which oversaw burghal interests in the kingdom in general and was behind the lobbying of Parliament for the burghal estate in particular. Each burgh in Parliament was henceforth to be represented by one Commissioner only, with the exception of the capital, Edinburgh, which was permitted to send two Commissioners. 11

Parliamentary rolls indicate those nobles, gentry and burgesses in attendance at the opening day of each parliamentary session. Rolls of Parliament are printed for all three sessions of the second Parliament of Charles I, 1639–41, both sessions of the Conventions of Estates 12, 22 June–26 August 1643, 3 January–3 June 1644, and all six sessions of the First Triennial Parliament, 1644–47. 13 The Second Triennial Parliament, 1648–51, consisted of eight parliamentary sessions. However, rolls are only recorded for four out of those eight sessions. 14 In addition, Sir James Balfour, a contemporary commentator and participant in events, lists details of parliamentary attendance for two of the sessions where there are no official printed parliamentary rolls (26 November 1650 and 13 March 1651). 15

Whilst parliamentary rolls therefore provide invaluable historical data relating to the nobles, gentry and burgesses present on the opening day of a parliamentary session, they do not necessarily provide a coherent indicator of attendance data and trends throughout each of those sessions. Uniquely, ten parliamentary rolls are available for the 1644 Convention of Estates, 3 January–3 June 1644. 16 With the exception of the 1644 Convention, however, every other parliamentary roll, 1639–51, pertains to the opening day of a parliamentary session. Moreover, it cannot be firmly established that those members listed in the parliamentary rolls were actually present in Parliament.


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


16 A.P.S., VI, i, 60, 61, 63, 69, 71, 73, 83–4, 93. See Young, Scottish Parliament, II, 814–18.
on the noted day. In the Restoration Parliament commencing on 1 January 1661
the official parliamentary records state that17

It is to be remembered that all their personages abovenamed were not present at the
first meeting but at most of the meetings they were present thereafter.

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

2. The Parliaments of 1633 and 1639

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

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

17 A.P.S., VII, 5.
18 MacInnes, Charters 1 and the Making of the Covenanting Movement, p. 87; Stevenson, Scottish
107-111; Gordon, `An Act for the Government of Scotland as it was before the late troubles', pp. 398-9.
19 A.P.S., V, 7-9. The 71 nobles consisted of one duke, three marquesses, 28 earls, five viscounts,
29 lords and five officers of state; George Hay, 1st Earl of Kinnoull, Chancellor; William Douglas, 6th
Earl of Morton, Treasurer; Thomas Hamilton, 2nd Earl of Haddington, Privy Seal; William Alexander,
Earl of Stirling, Secretary; and John Stewart, 1st Earl of Traquair, Treasurer Deputy. Traquair exercised
the proxies of the Earls of Galloway and Carrick, Viscount Dunbar and Lord Cameron. Morton exercised
the proxies of the Earl of Argyll and Lords Gray and Kinloss.
20 Ibid. The lack of finance in 1639 Parliament Wigtown and 1
21 Ibid.
22 James VI had determined
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20 Ibid. The lack of finance in the Borders/south-west appears to be confirmed by the fact that in the
1639 Parliament Wigtown and Kirkcudbright were represented jointly (ibid., pp. 251-2).
21 Ibid.
22 James VI had determined in 1617 that a maximum of eight officers of state were to be permitted
to sit in Parliament (Rait, The Parliaments of Scotland, pp. 279-280; Diccony and Rait, Thoughts on the
Union, p. 10; Stevenson, Scottish Revolution, pp. 167-8).
23 A.P.S., V, 7-9.
24 Ibid., pp. 251-2.
25 Ibid., pp. 7-9, 251-2. Three shires which had been represented in the 1633 Parliament were not
represented in 1639, two of which were Highland shires (Cromarty and Tarbat). The combination of
geographic isolation and lack of ready cash to pay Commissioners would appear to explain this trend. Lack
of representation for the shire of Dumfries is surprising, although it is located at the edge of the
Highland/Lowland divide. Four shires which had not been represented in 1633 secured representation in
the Covenanting Parliament of 1639 (Clackmannan, Annandale, Forres and Sutherland). For the technical
status of Sutherland refer to footnote 26 below. The fact that the shire of Forres managed to send two
all shires in 1639 with only one Commissioner were geographically isolated and predominantly Highland (Nairn, Sutherland\(^{26}\) and Bute).

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

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

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

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

\(^{26}\) Charles I had granted a charter to the Earl of Sutherland in 1631 which created Sutherland as a distinct shire, previously it had been incorporated within the shire of Inverness. This grant was ratified by the 1633 Parliament (Rait, The Parliament of Scotland, pp. 216, 223; Deycy and Rait, Thoughts on the Union, p. 56; A.P.S., V, 62).
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Traquair, King's Commissioner. The elections were carried out under the direction of the Tables. The Tables constituted the political élite of the Covenanting Movement, with each of the political estates represented (nobles, gentry and burghs) along with the ministry. In particular, the Fifth Table (the executive Table, which did not include representatives of the clergy) provided the ultimate tier of organisation, leadership and policy formulation. Whilst the clergy representatives were present for ideological advice, their input was limited with regard to financial, military and diplomatic purposes. The lack of Crown influence in the parliamentary elections, combined with the organisational strength of the Tables, ensured an overwhelming Covenanting majority in the election of the Commissioners of the Shires and Burghs.

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

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

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

A.P.S., V, 7-9, 251-2. The gentry representing eastern shires were as follows: Sir Thomas Morton of Cambo (Fife), Sir Thomas Crombie of Kennay (Aberdeen) and William Drummond of Rizzatown (Linlithgow). Sir Thomas Hope of Craighall, Lord Advocate (included in both parliamentary rolls), also had his domain in the east coast. Sir Patrick Hamilton of Little Preston represented the shire of Edinburgh in 1633 and that of Haddington in 1639. Sir George Forrester of Comynpich represented the shire of Edinburgh in 1633, but by 1639 he had been promoted into the peerage and took his seat in 1639 at Lord Forrester. The gentry representing western shires were Sir William Cunningham of Cuncinghamthead (Ayr) and Sir Ludovic Houston of that Ilk. Houston represented the shire of Dumbarton in 1633 and that of Renfrew in 1639. He had been ordered by the Privy Council in 1633 to transfer as commissioner...
Jack (Lanark) and Robert Cunningham (Kinghorn), were to play crucial roles within the burghal estate in the parliamentary forums of the 1640s.

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

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

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

30 (continued) form Rentfrew to Dumbarton due to the scarcity of firewood in Dunbartonshire (Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, II, 812-3). Sir George Elphinstone of Blythswood, Justice Clerk, also had his domain in the west. The gentry representing Borders' shires were as follows: Sir William Douglas of Cavers (Roxburgh), Sir Robert Gresston of Lag (Dumfries), Sir John Chariert of Aunsfield (Dumfries) and Sir Patrick MacKie of Lag (Kirkcudbright and Wigtown). The gentry representing Highland shires were Sir Duncan Campbell of Auchinbreck (Argyll), Sir John MacKenzie of Tarbat (Inverness) and Hector Bannatyne of Kares, younger, (Bute) (at the lower western end). The burgesses representing eastern burghs were as follows: John Williamson (Kirkcaldy), Robert Keith (Montrose) and Robert Cunningham (Kinghorn). Andrew Baird (Baird) represented a far north eastern burgh. William Glendoning (Kirkcudbright), James Williamson (Peebles) and Robert Gordon (New Galloway) formed the grouping of burgesses from the Borders. Thomas Bruce (Dingwall) represented the central belt, while John Semple (Dumbarton) and Gideon Jack (Lanark) represented the west. Matthew Spence (Rochesray) represented a burgh in the vicinity of the western Highland/Lowland divide.
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custody of the English Parliament. 31

Agonistasim on the part of the conservative faction of the Covenanting Movement
(which was growing as a political grouping within the Scottish Parliament and had
only been outmanoeuvred in the House through the political ineptitude of James,
3rd Marques of Hamilton) led to a power struggle in the Committee of Estates of
20 March 1647 which culminated in the Engagement Treaty in December 1647.
Based on a pragmatic alliance between the royalists and the conservative wing of the
Covenanting Movement, at the expense of the radicals, the Engagement treaty was
designed to restore the authority of Charles 1 in his Scottish and English kingdoms,
providing a trial period of three years for the establishment of presbyterianism in

England. 32

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

1646.

Forty-eight nobles, 50 gentry representing 28 shires 34 and 56 burgesses representing
48 burghs are recorded in the parliamentary rolls of 3 November 1646. Hence the
total membership of the sixth session of the First Triennial Parliament amounted to
154. In terms of total membership such an attendance level was higher than any of
the previous five sessions of the First Triennial Parliament and was equalled only by
that of the Convention of Estates, 22 June 1643. Similarly, in terms of the breakdown
of attendance per estate, the same scenario applies to the attendance levels of the
nobility estate, the Commissioners of the Shires and the Commissioners of the Burghs. 35

31 D. Stevenson, Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Scotland, 1644–1651, (1977), pp. 72-5, 80;
and Actions of James and William, Dukes of Hamilton and Castleherald (1838), p. 293; A.P.S., VI, i, 669;
Glasgow University Library, Ogilvie Collection, Ogilvie 4468, Some Papers Given in by the Commissioners
of the Parliament of Scotland, To the Honourable Houses of Parliament of England. In answer to their votes
of the 24 of September 1646. Concerning The disposing of His Majesties Person. To which is added, The
Speeches of the Lord Chancellor of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1646), pp. (I)-69.

32 For a detailed discussion of the power struggle within the Committee of Estates refer to Young,
"Scottish Parliament", 1, Chapter 18; Constitutional Documents of the Parliam Revolutio
ed S.R. Gardiner
9th edn., Oxford, 1900), pp. 347–52; Stevenson, Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Scotland, pp. 94,

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

34 A.P.S., VI, 1, 612–3. Five of the 28 shires (18 per cent) were represented by one Commissioner
only: Sutherland, Clackmannan, Kirkcudbright, Barf ord and Caithness.

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

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

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

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

36 Dated, VI, ii, 3–4. Five shires are listed with only one Commissioner: Sutherland, Elgin, Nairn, Kincardineshire and Caithness.
37 Dated, VI, 1, 612–3, VI, ii, 3–4.
38 See Young, 'Scottish Parliament', I.
in the parliamentary rolls of 4 January 1649 are also recorded in those of 3 November 1646 and 2 March 1648.39

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

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

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

39 A.P.S., VI, i, 612-3, VI, ii, 3-4, 124-6. The seven radical gentry recorded in the parliamentary rolls of 3 Nov. 1646, 2 Mar. 1648 and 4 Jan. 1649 are as follows: Sir Archibald Johnston of Warriston (Edinburgh and Argyll), William Settle of Foulwood (Dumbarton), William Gordon of Banton (Killearn), Andrew Agnew of Lochinver (Wigtown), Sir Ludovic Houston of that ilk (Renfrew and Dumbarton), Walter Scott of Hartwoodanne (Selkirk) and James Campbell of Arthog (Argyll). The seven burgesses who also came into this category are George Paterfield (Glasgow), George Jamieson (Couspe), George Garden (Bathstane), Robert Cunningham (Kington), Gideon Jack (Lanark), John Hay (Elgin) and John Forbes (Inverness).
40 Ibid., VI, i, 612-3, VI, ii, 3-4.
42 A.P.S., VI, i, 612-3.
44 This has been strongly argued in Young, ‘Scottish Parliament’. I.
the rolls of the Scottish Parliament provide evidence of the growing political confidence of the burghal estate and its willingness to challenge the increased strength of the shires.

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

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

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

45 Scottish R.O., P.A. 11/7, Register of the Committee of Estates, 22 Sept. 1648-Jan. 1649, ff. 1-7; Glasgow University Lib., Ogilvie Collection, Ogilvie 668, A True Account of the great Expressions of Love from the Noblemen, Ministers & Commons of the Kingdom of Scotland unto Lieutenant General Cromwell, and the Officers and Soldiers under his command. Whose mutual love each to other is hoped to be the beginnings of a happy Peace to both Nations. Declared in a Letter to a friend (London, 1648), ff. (3)-(7); Donaldson, James V-James VII, pp. 358-9; K.M. Brown, Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603-1715 (1992), pp. 133-3; Macnaghten, 'The Scottish Commission'.

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

47 Ibid., 3-4, 124-6.
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49 Ibid., pp. 3-4, 124-6. The 1649 were William Simpson (Din Cunningham (Kinghorn), James (Glasgow), James Campbell (Dun three Highland burgesses were Jo Thomas McBean was the one B

50 Ibid., pp. 3-4, 124-6.
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this grouping of gentlemen and burgesses. Of the 12 gentlemen recorded in both sessions, six (50 per cent) represented Borders' shires and three represented western shires. The remaining gentlemen contingent was composed of two Commissioners of the Shires from the Highlands and one from the east respectively. 48 Burgthal analysis reveals a stronger grouping of six eastern burgesses, combined with three each from the west and the Highlands and only one from the Border region. 49 Hence radical strength was not only limited to its heartland in the south-west, but could also command support amongst prominent and affluent eastern burgesses.

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

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

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

48 Ibid. The six gentlemen representing Borders' shires were as follows: Sir Andrew Kerr of Greenhead ( Roxburgh), Sir Thomas Kerr of Caver ( Roxburgh), William Critchens of Bavingston ( Roxburgh), Andrew Agnew of Lochnaw (Wigtown), Walter Scott of Hartwoodfand (Selkirk) and Patrick Scott of Thrustestone (Selkirk). William Semple of Foulwood (Dumfries), Sir William Cunningham of Cunninghamhead (Ayr) and Sir Ludovic Houston of that ilk (Dumbarton) were the three western gentlemen present in both sessions. Houston of that ilk represented Renfrew in 1648 and Dumbarton in 1649. The one land representing a Highland shire was James Campbell of Arkinglas (Argyll). Sir Arthur Erskine of Scotscraig (Fife) and Sir Archbold Jourston of Warriston (Edinburgh) constituted the two eastern gentlemen. Jourston of Warriston had represented Argyll in the Engagement Parliament; he could only secure election in 1648 through the patronage of his political ally Archibald Campbell, 1st Marquess of Argyll.

50 Ibid., pp. 3-4, 124-6. The six eastern burgesses recorded in the rolls of 2 Mar. 1648 and 4 Jan. 1649 were William Simpson (Dyvart), John Williamson (Kirkcaldy), George Janieson (Caupar), Robert Cunningham (Kingshorn), James Askenn (Colross) and George Garden (Burntisland). George Porterfield (Glasgow), James Campbell (Dumbarton) and Gideon Jack (Junark) formed the western grouping. The three Highland burgesses were John Forbes (Inverness), John Hay (Elgin) and James McColloch (Tain). Thomas McIverse was the one Borders' burgess present in both sessions.
Government, but this had not reached the statute book before the first Protectorate Parliament had likewise been dissolved. However, Scotland was allocated limited representation in the Cromwellian Parliaments of 1654, 1656 and 1659. The collapse of the Protectorate in England paved the way for the restoration of the monarchy in England. In 'British' terms the Restoration was essentially an English political event. Whereas the Covenanting Movement had been at the heart of the British political and military agenda of the 1640s, the military occupation of the Cromwellian era had ensured that in terms of the British archipelago the political reality of Union of the Crowns in 1660 had been firmly redefined in the direction of the southern kingdom.

In the aftermath of the restoration of Charles II in England (Charles II had already been crowned as King of Scots on 1 January 1651, although he had been declared as King of Great Britain, France and Ireland and by the Scottish Parliament on 5 February 1649) a large contingent of the Scottish nobility and gentry flocked to London in order to cultivate political favour around the King. In terms of the political administration of Scotland, the 1651 Committee of Estates was recalled as an interim provisional government, after a consultative process with the Scottish political nation gathered in London, until it was deemed expedient for a Scottish Parliament to be held. This was complemented by the fact that Charles had named his new Scottish ministry in July 1660, dominated by former Engagers. At this early stage it was nevertheless recognised that the Scottish constitutional settlement of 1639–41 was to be bypassed and that the King alone had sole power of summoning and convening Parliament. The Committee of Estates sat in the Scottish capital, Edinburgh, from 23 August until 8 December 1660. It had been originally planned to convene the Scottish Parliament on 23 October; this was then rescheduled for 8 December, but had to be postponed once more until the King's Commissioner, John, 1st Earl of Middleton, arrived in Edinburgh on 31 December. The Scottish Restoration Parliament duly met on 1 January 1661.

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


A.P.S., VII, 3–4. Three of the nobles (Chancellor Glencarn, Crawford—Lindsay, Treasurer, and
terms of both numerical composition per estate and total membership, the attendance figures for 1st January 1661 were higher than all previous sessions of the Scottish Parliament, 1639–51 (including Conventions of Estates). Such keen attendance of all three estates (particularly the nobility) can be explained by the return of Charles II, as King of Scots, the reintroduction of the Scottish Parliament and other national institutions, as a result of liberation from the yoke of Cromwellian occupation.

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

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


56 Ibid. This analysis includes officers of state for the Restoration Parliament. The Earl of Dundee (1661) had been included in previous parliamentary rolls as Viscoun Dunblane. Lord Balmerino (1661) was included in previous parliamentary rolls as Lord Coupar. Two nobles had been recently promoted into the peerage. Lord Halkerton had represented the shire of Kirkcudbright (as Sir Alexander Falconer of Halkerton) in the Convention of Estates, 1643–4 and five out of the six sessions of the First Triennial Parliament. He was created Lord Halkerton in 1646 but is not recorded in the noble estate in any of the available parliamentary rolls of 1648–51 (Ibid.; Young ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, I, 235; The Scots Peerage, ed. Sir J. Balfour-Paul [9 vols., Edinburgh, 1904–14], V, 249). Lord Ruthven had represented Perthshire (as Sir Patrick Ruthven of Perethoven) in all eight sessions of Parliament 1639–41, Forfar in the 1644 Convention of Estates, Perthshire in two of the six sessions of the First Triennial Parliament and Perthshire in the sessions of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649. He was promoted into the peerage in 1651 (A.P.S., V, 251–2, 258–9, 300–1, 302, 303–4, 305–6, 308, 331–2, VI, i, 73, 95–6, 284–5, 429–30, 440–1, 474–5, 612–3, VI, ii, 124–5, 277–8, Scott Peerage, VII, 386; Young ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, II, 655–6). In addition, Andrew Glen represented the burgh of Linlithgow in the Restoration Parliament. Glen is not recorded in any official parliamentary rolls for 1639–51, but is recorded in Sir James Balfour's roll for 13 March 1651 (Balfour, Historical Works, IV, 258–62). Allan Dunlop (Irvine) and John Rutherfurd (Jedburgh) are recorded in the burghs estate for 1 Jan. 1661. Dunlop is recorded in the rolls for 4 June 1664 and 24 July 1665, whilst Rutherfurd is recorded extensively in the rolls from 31 Aug. 1659 to 23 May 1649. For clarification purposes it should be stated that these are not the two individuals who sat in the Restoration Parliament (Young ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, I, 219–20, II, 603–4). All three burgesses have not been included in common membership analysis. Alexander Black (Austenriethaster) is listed in a dual commission for 4 Jan. 1649, as well as a single commission for 1 Jan. 1661. As per the rolls of 4 Jan. 1649 either Alexander Black or William Hamilton could represent Austenriethaster in the House (A.P.S., VI, ii, 124–6). Young states that Black had been elected to serve in Parliament, 1640–1, but never took his seat (The Parliaments of Scotland, I, 53). In accordance with this, Black is not recorded in any of the parliamentary rolls for 1640–1 (A.P.S., V, 251–2, 258–9, 300–1, 302, 303–4, 305–6, 331–2).

The 11 gentry associated with the Engagement and/or conservatism are as follows: Sir James Foulis of Colquhoun (Edinburgh), Sir James Lockhart of Lee (Lanark), Sir John Crawford of Kilbirnie (Ayr), John Murray of Polmais (Stirling), Sir Archibald Stirling of Carden (Stirling/Lothian), Sir Alexander Fraser of Phillour (Aberdeen), Sir William Scott of Andrews (Fife), Sir Alexander Abercornbrough of Birkenbog (Banff), Sir James Sinclair of Murrkhill (Caithness), Sir Robert Iones of that ilk (Elgin) and Thomas MacKerre of Piusgord (Elgin).
affiliation. Sir Gilbert Ramsay of 3alname (Kincairdine) was included in three of the eight parliamentary rolls, 1639-41, and one of the six sessions of the First Triennial Parliament. He had also been included on his local Committee of War in 1644 (relating to the Engagement). Ramsay was appointed as Commissioner of the Treasurer of Argyll from 1645 to 1646, and had assented to the Tender of Union at Dalkeith in 1652 (A.P.S., V, 238-9, 308, 331-2, VI, i, 474-5; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, II, 579).

George Steill (Brec'hin) is included in the rolls of 3 Nov. 1646 and 2 Mar. 1648. He was a member of the Committee of War for his locality in 1647 and 1648, as well as a member of the Committee of Estates. Steill collaborated to a certain extent as he was a Commissioner of the Treasury in 1655, 1566 and 1660 (A.P.S., VI, i, 613-3, VI, ii, 3-4; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, II, 656). James Lawler (Dunbar) is listed in the rolls of 31 Jan. 1645 and 2 Mar. 1648. Lawler was member of the 1648 Committee of Estates and his local Committee of War, 1647-8 (A.P.S., VI, i, 204-8, VI, i, 3-4; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, II, 411). John Auchterlonie (Arrochar) is recorded in the rolls of the 1643 Convention, five of the six rolls of the First Triennial Parliament, and in the 1648 Engagement Parliament. Auchterlonie served extensively on parliamentary committees including the Committee of War in 1644, 1645, 1646 and 1648, and the Committee of Estates in 1644, 1645, 1648 and 1651. He was also a Commissioner of the Cess in 1655 (A.P.S., VI, i, 3-4; 95-6, 284-5, 400-1, 474-5, 612-3, VI, ii, 3-4; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, I, 28). Four of the eight rolls, 1639-41, contain David Spence (Rutherglen). He is also recorded in the rolls of the 1643 Convention, the rolls of 3 Jan. 1645, 3 Nov. 1646 and 2 Mar. 1648. Spence secured membership of his local Committee of War in 1645 and 1647, membership of the Committees of Estates in 1646 and 1651 and was a Commissioner of the Cess in 1655, 1656 and 1660 (A.P.S., V, 251-2, 258-9, 308, 331-2, VI, i, 3-4, 284-5, 612-3; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, II, 653). John Ross (Nairn) is listed in the rolls of the Engagement Parliament and was a member of the 1648 Committee of Estates (A.P.S., VI, ii, 3-4; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, II, 595). John Henderson (Lochmaben) is listed in the rolls of three sessions of the First Triennial Parliament, as well as those of the Engagement Parliament. Henderson was likewise a member of his local Committee of War of 1647 (A.P.S., VI, i, 284-5, 640-1, 612-3, VI, ii, 3-4; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, I, 339).

James Borthwick (Edinburgh) is listed in the rolls of the radical parliamentary sessions of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649, plus that of 7 Mar. 1650. Borthwick was nominated to the 1649 Committee of Estates (A.P.S., VI, ii, 124-6, 277-8, 355-6; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, I, 62). John Williamson (Kirkcaldy) is noted in five parliamentary sessions, 1639-41, the 1643 Convention of Estates, the 1648 Engagement Parliament and the radical parliamentary sessions of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649. The 1649 rolls stipulate that Williamson's commission was a dual one (either Williamson or James Law was to represent the burgh). The fact that Williamson secured membership of the Committee for Plantation of Kirk's and Valuation of Tenents may well indicate that it was indeed William who represented Kirkcaldy in 1649 (A.P.S., V, 251-2, 238-9, 308-5, 308, 331-2, VI, i, 3-4, VI, ii, 3-4, 124-6, 277-8; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, II, 734). A similar problem arises with Alexander Black (Ahnurather Eater); he is recorded on a dual commission for 4 Jan. 1649 (either Black or William Hamilton was to represent the burgh). The fact that Black had been deemed suitable to serve in the 1649 Parliament indicates that he was of radical persuasion (A.P.S., VI, ii, 124-6; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, I, 53). George Garden (Barnstaple) is included in six out of eight rolls, 1639-41, all six sessions of the first Triennial Parliament, the 1648 Engagement Parliament, and the sessions of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649. Garden's commission for 1649 was also a dual one (either Garden or John Brown was to represent the burgh). In common with
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302, 308, 331-2, VI, ii, 3-4, 124-6, 277-8; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, II, 595). John Henderson (Lochmaben) is listed in the rolls of three sessions of the First Triennial Parliament, as well as those of the Engagement Parliament. Henderson was likewise a member of his local Committee of War of 1647 (A.P.S., VI, i, 284-5, 640-1, 612-3, VI, ii, 3-4; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, I, 339).

James Borthwick (Edinburgh) is listed in the rolls of the radical parliamentary sessions of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649, plus that of 7 Mar. 1650. Borthwick was nominated to the 1649 Committee of Estates (A.P.S., VI, ii, 124-6, 277-8, 355-6; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, I, 62). John Williamson (Kirkcaldy) is noted in five parliamentary sessions, 1639-41, the 1643 Convention of Estates, the 1648 Engagement Parliament and the radical parliamentary sessions of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649. The 1649 rolls stipulate that Williamson's commission was a dual one (either Williamson or James Law was to represent the burgh). The fact that Williamson secured membership of the Committee for Plantation of Kirk's and Valuation of Tenents may well indicate that it was indeed William who represented Kirkcaldy in 1649 (A.P.S., V, 251-2, 238-9, 308-5, 308, 331-2, VI, i, 3-4, VI, ii, 3-4, 124-6, 277-8; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, II, 734). A similar problem arises with Alexander Black (Ahnurather Eater); he is recorded on a dual commission for 4 Jan. 1649 (either Black or William Hamilton was to represent the burgh). The fact that Black had been deemed suitable to serve in the 1649 Parliament indicates that he was of radical persuasion (A.P.S., VI, ii, 124-6; Young, ed., The Parliament of Scotland, I, 53). George Garden (Barnstaple) is included in six out of eight rolls, 1639-41, all six sessions of the first Triennial Parliament, the 1648 Engagement Parliament, and the sessions of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649. Garden's commission for 1649 was also a dual one (either Garden or John Brown was to represent the burgh). In common with...
(Cral) cannot be ascertained from the available evidence.\(^2\)

Despite the zeal for the restoration of the monarchy and the management of the elections to the Restoration Parliament, pockets of radicalism still prevailed and could not be eradicated. On the other hand, it can also be tentatively suggested that some, if not all, of those gentry and burgesses with a radical political background may simply have modified their political allegiance in response to changing political circumstances. Pragmatism, self-interest and the desire to secure influence under a new royalist regime, may have been paramount in the minds of many Members. Effective royalist management of the elections to the Restoration Parliament was conducted through the employment of the gentry in the localities for fractional purposes. The electoral process commenced in late November 1660 and continued throughout December. A contemporary observer, Sir George MacKenzie of Rosehaugh, described this procedure. Letters were dispatched to the most influential royalist laird in each shire informing him who was to be elected as commissioners for that particular shire. The nominated royalist laird would then convene the electoral meeting and secure the elections of the desired Commissioners. In light of this electoral procedure, it is clear that in several shires such a manoeuvre had failed to prevent the election of gentry with a radical political heritage.\(^3\)

Indeed, four cases of disputed elections in the shires were dealt with by the House on 4 January 1661 and all were settled in favour of the Crown.\(^4\) In tandem with electoral manipulation in the shires went a

\(^2\) James Moncrieff (Cral) is recorded in the rolls of the 1644 Convention of Estates and the rolls of 3 Nov. 1646 (A.P.S., v, i, 73, 612-3; Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, II, 504). A similar lack of evidence applies to the political inclination of Andrew Glen (Lunanigow), the burgess not recorded in any parliamentary rolls, 1639-51, but listed in Balliol's rolls for 12 Mar. 1651. Glen had been included on the 1651 Committee of Estates (Balliol, Historical Works, IV, 258-62; Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, I, 277-8). The parliamentary rolls list Alexander Wedderburne as the burgess representative of Dundee. This is noted to Alexander Wedderburne of Kingennie and Easter Powrie and not Sir Alexander Wedderburne of Blackness. Wedderburne of Blackness was one of the most influential figures within the burghal estate. Although acting as a royalist agent in 1660, he had a formidable political track record; he had attended the 1638 Glasgow Assembly, was a member of the Committees of Estates of 1640, 1641, 1646, 1647, 1648 and 1651 and had been a member of the Scottish diplomatic delegation for the Treaty of Rapon. Wedderburne is listed in the rolls of 26 July 1645, 26 Nov. 1645, 3 Nov. 1646 and 2 Mar. 1648 (A.P.S., v, i, 440-1, 474-5, 612-3, VII, 5-4; Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, II, 722-3, 725).

\(^3\) MacKenzie, Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, p. 12.

\(^4\) The commissions to William Murray of Stenhouse and Sir Archibald Murray of Blackbarony, younger, (both Peebles), James Critchton of St Leonards and Robert Ferguson of Craigdarroch (both Dumfries), Sir John Urquhart of Cronamy and Thomas MacKenzie of Pluscardine (Inverness, Elgin) were approved on 4 Jan. 1661 (A.P.S., VII, 2). Robert Ferguson of Craigdarroch is the same individual as John Ferguson of Craigdarroch recorded in the rolls of 4 Jan. and 23 May 1649 (ibid., VI, ii, 124-6, 277-8). This is due to a technical error made in the recording of Ferguson's full name in 1649 (Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, I, 239). No rival election was noted in the parliamentary commission for the shire of Peebles as per Nov. 1660. Critchton of St Leonards and Ferguson of Craigdarroch had been elected on 20 Nov., although a rival election was later held on 27 Nov. Two rival elections took place for the shire
complementary process of political pressure in the burghs. Rothes had been attempting to secure a political base in support of John Maitland, 2nd Earl of Lauderdale in the burghs throughout November 1660. To facilitate his campaign Rothes had recruited the influential Sir Alexander Wedderburne (Dundee), one of the most prominent figures within the burghal establishment, to whip up support. William Cunningham, 9th Earl of Glencairn, Chancellor, also appears to have been involved in the exertion of electoral influence in the shires and burghs. The end result, in both the shires and the burghs, was successful. According to Robert Ballie, minister of Kilwinning, a close ally of the Marquess of Argyll and a leading figure within the Church of Scotland throughout the Covenanting epoch, 'the chancellor so guided it, that the shires and burroughs' elected only those 'that were absolutely for the king'.

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

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

Scottish parliamentary rolls cover the study of seventeenth-century petitioning for a Scottish constituent. That there was a shift toward burghs in 1646–48 has been shown in the 1648 Parliaments that were attended by people from the perspective of the burghs in 1646–48; however, the Scottish Covenanting Members of the Scottish parliamentary rolls can be translated into real movement as evidenced through

---

64 (continued) from pages 29 Nov., paralleled by two similar rival elections for Elgin or 22 Nov. The election for 20 Nov., although a rival election was later held on 27 Nov. Two rival elections took place for the shire of Inverness on 29 Nov., paralleled by two similar rival elections for Elgin on 22 Nov. The election for the shire of Inverness had taken place on 29 Nov., but by the time the Restoration Parliament convened Hugh Fraser of Belladrum had been replaced by Colin Mackenzie of Redcastle. Sir John Urquhart of Cramortary retained the remaining commission for Inverness (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/2/17, 3, F.A. 7/25/11/5/1–2, P.A. 7/25/17/3–4, P.A. 7/25/23/3/1–2, P.A. 7/25/26/3, A.P.S., VII, 4; Young, ed.). The Parliament of Scotland, I. 263, II. 456. Two disputed elections had taken place on 3 Dec. relating to the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright. The issue was taken on board by the Restoration Parliament on 8 Jan. 1661 which ordered a Commissioner to be elected. A further election was duly held on 5 Feb. whereby David MacBrair, the initial choice of 3 Dec., was elected. MacBrair took his seat in the House on 13 Feb. (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/20/4/5/1–2/6; A.P.S., VII, 10, 32; Young, ed.). The Parliament of Scotland, II. 444–5. Scottish R.O., Supplementary Parliamentary Papers, IX, 1661, P.A. 7/9/2–6, provides a detailed account of the background to the cases of the disputed elections.


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

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

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

69 Thomas Watson was commissioned as per 8 Dec. 1660 to represent Anstruther Wester, but that burgh and burges are not recorded in the rolls of 1 Jan. 1661 (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/38/4; A.P.S., VII, 5; Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, II, 719). No electoral commission is recorded/has survived for the burghs of Montrose. However, John Ronald represented Montrose in the Restoration Parliament (Cromwell R.O., P.A. 7/25/82/2–3; A.P.S., VII, 5; Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, II, 595). The clerk in the Restoration Parliament appears to have made mistakes concerning the names of the representatives of three burghs. William Simpson was elected on 24 Dec. to represent Dysart. In the rolls of 1 Jan. 1661 the burghal representative for Dysart is listed as William Seaton. Dysart is listed immediately after Haddington in the parliamentary rolls; Haddington’s Commissioner was indeed a William Simpson who had been duly elected on 1 Dec. 1660. Therefore the clerk has either confused Simpson with Seaton or simply made an error in noting down the names when the rolls were called (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/58/3; P.A. 7/25/65/2; A.P.S., VII, 5; Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, II, 630, 639).

60 Patrick Nisbet was elected on 1 Dec. 1660 to represent the burgh of Lanark. The rolls of 1 Jan. 1661 list Patrick Nisbet as the appropriate representative (Scottish R.O., P.A 7/25/78/3; A.P.S., VII, 5). Patrick Nisbet is not recorded in Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland. This would again appear to be an error on the part of the clerk when the rolls were being called out. On 1 Dec. 1660 Robert Dickson, eldest son of the deceased John Dickson, minister of Kells, was elected to represent the burgh of New Galloway in the Restoration Parliament. Young also identifies Robert Dickson as the elected Member. The parliamentary rolls, however, list John Dickson as the relevant Member (Scottish R.O., P.A. 7/25/84/2; A.P.S., VII, 5; Young (ed.), The Parliaments of Scotland, I, 185). Given the noted unreliable record of the clerk, it would therefore also appear that he has had made a similar blunder in the case of Dickson.
Appendix I:

Attendance Figures of the Three Estates, 1648–1651
The top line of the figure shows two communications. The maximum possible cost is $25, the minimum is 25. The formula for the maximum number of communications is:

\[ \text{Maximum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]

The formula for the minimum number of communications is:

\[ \text{Minimum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication (1)</th>
<th>Communication (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Formulas

- **Number of communications of primary =** number of communications of primary
- **Number of communications of secondary =** number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary + number of communications of primary or secondary

---

**Notes:**

1. The formula for the maximum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Maximum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]
2. The formula for the minimum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Minimum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]

---

**Formulas:**

- **Number of communications of primary =** number of communications of primary
- **Number of communications of secondary =** number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary + number of communications of primary or secondary

---

**Notes:**

1. The formula for the maximum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Maximum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]
2. The formula for the minimum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Minimum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]

---

**Formulas:**

- **Number of communications of primary =** number of communications of primary
- **Number of communications of secondary =** number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary + number of communications of primary or secondary

---

**Notes:**

1. The formula for the maximum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Maximum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]
2. The formula for the minimum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Minimum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]

---

**Formulas:**

- **Number of communications of primary =** number of communications of primary
- **Number of communications of secondary =** number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary + number of communications of primary or secondary

---

**Notes:**

1. The formula for the maximum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Maximum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]
2. The formula for the minimum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Minimum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]

---

**Formulas:**

- **Number of communications of primary =** number of communications of primary
- **Number of communications of secondary =** number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary + number of communications of primary or secondary

---

**Notes:**

1. The formula for the maximum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Maximum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]
2. The formula for the minimum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Minimum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]

---

**Formulas:**

- **Number of communications of primary =** number of communications of primary
- **Number of communications of secondary =** number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary + number of communications of primary or secondary

---

**Notes:**

1. The formula for the maximum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Maximum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]
2. The formula for the minimum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Minimum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]

---

**Formulas:**

- **Number of communications of primary =** number of communications of primary
- **Number of communications of secondary =** number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary + number of communications of primary or secondary

---

**Notes:**

1. The formula for the maximum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Maximum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]
2. The formula for the minimum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Minimum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]

---

**Formulas:**

- **Number of communications of primary =** number of communications of primary
- **Number of communications of secondary =** number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary
- **Number of communications of primary and secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary
- **Number of communications of primary or secondary or both =** number of communications of primary + number of communications of secondary + number of communications of primary and secondary + number of communications of primary or secondary

---

**Notes:**

1. The formula for the maximum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Maximum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]
2. The formula for the minimum number of communications is:
   \[ \text{Minimum number of communications} = \text{Number of communications} \times \text{Number of communications} \]
APPENDIX 2:
Analysis of the numerical composition of the Scottish Estates, 1648–1651

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Nobility Movement per session</th>
<th>Gentry Movement per session</th>
<th>Burgesses Movement per session</th>
<th>Total Movement per session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 March 1648–4 January 1649</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-1 (Maximum)</td>
<td>+1 (Maximum)</td>
<td>-40 (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 January 1649–23 May 1649</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>-1 (Minimum)</td>
<td>+2 (Minimum)</td>
<td>-39 (Minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May 1649–7 March 1650</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1 (Maximum)</td>
<td>+1 (Maximum)</td>
<td>+5 (Maximum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+3 (Minimum)</td>
<td>-1 (Minimum)</td>
<td>+6 (Minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-20 (Minimum)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-25 (Minimum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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