
Alexander Shields' Response to Sir Robert Hamilton in 1690¹

JUSTIN B. STODGHILL

1. Beginning of the controversy

On 25th October 1690, at the first General Assembly of the Church of Scotland following the Glorious Revolution, three ministers, Thomas Lining, Alexander Shields, and William Boyd, were admitted into full fellowship in the Church.² When these three men – the last three surviving ministers of the United Societies – were received into the Church of Scotland, it marked the final end of the exile of Presbyterian ministers following the Act of Supremacy and the Act Rescissory imposed by Charles II in 1661, whereby he had declared the Crown to be the supreme head of both State and Church, and whereby he rescinded the Scottish National Covenant (1638) and the Solemn League and Covenant (1643), abolished the Presbyterian form of Church government and established Episcopacy (prelacy) in the Church of Scotland. Following these actions by the King, in 1662 more than four hundred Scottish ministers chose to be ejected from their pulpits rather than to submit to this violation of their ecclesiastical vows. When

¹ The bulk of the research for this article was conducted for a thesis submitted in December 2016 to the Faculty of the Department of History, American Military University, Charles Town, West Virginia, in partial fulfilment of the degree of Master of Arts in History, entitled “Stalwart Saints or Schismatics? An Historical-Theological Examination of the Continuing Separation of the United Societies from the Church of Scotland after the Revolution Settlement”.

² *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, M.DC.XXXVIII. – M.DCCC.XLII* (Church Law Society, Edinburgh, 1843), p. 224. Boyd and Shields were in fact still probationers at that stage, but the three – Lining, Boyd, and Shields – were often referred to as “the ministers” in contemporary documents.

William and Mary, Prince and Princess of Orange, were crowned King and Queen of Scotland on 11th May 1689, the new king set about restoring the Parliament and Church of Scotland to their former rights prior to the restoration of Charles II. This included the abolition of prelacy and the resumption of Presbyterianism.

From this brief synopsis, it would seem that the Scottish Covenanters would have been relieved and grateful for the Glorious Revolution and would have unquestioningly followed their three remaining ministers into fellowship with the Church of Scotland. This, however, was not the case. Instead, under the leadership of Sir Robert Hamilton, a substantial part of the United Societies remained separate from the Church of Scotland and, in 1743, constituted the Reformed Presbytery, precursor to the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland (and spiritual precursor to the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland and Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America).

2. Sir Robert Hamilton's "Protest"

Sir Robert Hamilton (1650-1701),³ second baronet of Preston, was the younger son of Sir Thomas Preston. He began attending the conventicles and became rapidly enamoured with the Covenanter doctrine and practice. Hamilton is of particular interest to this study because he was the primary leader of the continued separation from the post-Revolution Settlement Church of Scotland. Hamilton claimed credit for the Covenanter victory at Drumclog in 1679, even though he played only a minor role in the battle. His real demeanour in combat was seen at the Battle of Bothwell Bridge on Sabbath 22nd June 1679, which was a devastating defeat for the Covenanter forces against the superior Royalist troops under James, Duke of Monmouth. Monmouth ordered the cannon to fire upon the Covenanters' left flank, forcing the cavalry to attempt to reach a higher position. Seeing the cavalry fall back to regroup, Hamilton, thinking they were retreating, literally led the remaining army in full retreat. Wodrow recounts the result: "... one who was present there writes to me, Mr. Hamilton was among the foremost

³ For Sir Robert Hamilton, see the entry by T. F. Henderson in *Dictionary of National Biography (DNB)*; M. Jardine, "The United Societies: Militancy, Martyrdom and the Presbyterian Movement in Late Restoration Scotland, 1679-1688" (PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2009); John Howie, *Biographia Scoticana* (Glasgow, 1781), pp. 584-594.

[to take flight], 'leaving the world to debate whether he acted most like a traitor, coward, or fool'.⁴ Shortly after the battle, Hamilton escaped to the Continent and did not return until the Revolution in 1688.

At the General Meeting of the United Societies at Douglas on 6th November 1689, Sir Robert Hamilton attended, and was requested to address the members. Staunchly opposed to King William and to any reunion with the Church of Scotland, Hamilton issued his Protestation. Although the original protest, in writing, has been lost, the summary of his complaint has been preserved from the minutes of that meeting. In the speech, Hamilton lists the following five objections against any discussion of rejoining the post-Revolution Church of Scotland. Michael Shields, Clerk to the General Meeting, records Hamilton's points:

1st, The owning of the Prince of Orange to be King upon such conditions as they had done, and without taking of the covenants.

2dly, The raising of Angus's regiment, which was a sinful association with malignants.⁵

3dly, The admitting any to be at General Meetings, who came from the regiment, or were for trafficking for union with them.

4thly, Mr. Boyd his sitting in General Meetings, or being employed by them to go to Edinburgh to treat with the ministers.

5thly, Joining with these ministers whom formerly we had withdrawn from, upon the terms which our ministers were desiring to do it in.⁶

While these objections are clearly recorded as a summary without every detail, it is immediately apparent that Hamilton's objection was

⁴ Robert Wodrow, *The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland* (4 vols., Glasgow, 1832), Vol. 3, p. 107; see also J. K. Hewison, *The Covenanters* (2 vols., Glasgow, 1908), Vol. 2, p. 311. For a sympathetic account of Hamilton's conduct at the two battles, see William Wilson, *A true and impartial relation of the persecuted Presbyterians in Scotland; their rising in arms, and defeat at Bothwell-Bridge, 1679* (Glasgow, 1797).

⁵ The Lord Angus' Regiment had been raised in May 1689 at Douglas by James, Earl of Angus, the eldest son of the 2nd Marquis of Douglas; see A. Crichton, *The Life and Diary of Lt. Col. J. Blackader* (Edinburgh, 1824), pp. 70-74. Many Society People enlisted, but others, such as James Howie of Lochgoin (the great-grandfather of the celebrated John Howie) objected to the association; see R. Wodrow, *Analecta* (4 vols., Maitland Club, Edinburgh, 1842-3), Vol. 1, p. 189. In August 1689, the regiment heroically and successfully defended Dunkeld against the Jacobite rebels.

⁶ Michael Shields, *Faithful Contendings Displayed: being an historical relation of the State and Actings of the Suffering Remnant in the Church of Scotland, who subsisted in Select Societies, and were united in general correspondencies during the hottest time of the late Persecution, viz. From the year 1681 to 1691* (Glasgow, 1780), p. 419.

more than a matter of ecclesiology. Hamilton, and members of his party, rejected the legitimacy of William of Orange as King of Scotland. Hamilton and his party were not content to see the restoration of the Church of Scotland to the establishment of 1592, but insisted that the new King should re-establish the Church to the height of Second Reformation principles and autonomy (*c.* 1649). They also insisted upon the revival of the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant, and further required that all ministers who had acceded to the various “tolerations” under Charles II and James VII fully, and publicly, confess their sins and openly repudiate them.⁷ Anything less was seen as a compromise with evildoers and a corruption of the covenanted Reformation, as well as open ingratitude to the many faithful martyrs during the twenty-eight years of persecution.

To Hamilton and his followers there could be no peace of union, with either Church or State, as long as there was impurity in the form of either government. Central to both institutions were the Covenants. William was a professed Protestant, and an avowed enemy to the Roman Catholic Church, but he was indifferent to the form of ecclesiastical government. He was more than happy to have a Protestant Episcopal Church in England, and a Protestant Presbyterian Church in Scotland. Such a compromise was utterly rejected by the Societies because they still maintained that both countries were bound by the Solemn League and Covenant, which sought the “. . . extirpation of . . . Prelacy (that is, church-government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors, and Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical Officers depending on that hierarchy).”⁸ To Hamilton, the “Act Rescissory” of Charles II, whereby he annulled the Covenants, was illegal and did not, in any way, release the governments and citizens of Scotland or England from being bound to uphold and promote complete abolition of the Episcopal form of Church government.⁹ That William did not revive the Covenants, and did not himself subscribe to the Covenants, was seen as an illegal usurpation of the Scottish throne.

⁷ William Maxwell Hetherington, *History of the Church of Scotland: From the Introduction of Christianity to the Period of the Disruption in 1843* (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1856), p. 299.

⁸ “Solemn League and Covenant,” *Westminster Confession of Faith* (Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 2003), p. 359.

⁹ Hetherington, p. 210.

More than this, however, the separated remnant desired the restoration of the position of the Church of Scotland to the height of its power in 1649. What William did, however, was promote an Act in the Scottish Parliament that restored “. . . the Government of the Church by Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial-Synods, and General Assemblies, ratified and established by the 114 *Act*, JAMES VI. *Parl.* 11. *Anno* 1592”.¹⁰ To be sure, prelacy was abolished¹¹ and the Presbyterian form of Church government was restored, but not according to the “high-water mark” of the 1640s. The vast strides of Reformation were restored under William’s reign, but not the level of Reformation that Hamilton wanted to see. Perhaps most pertinent to the discussion was the continued insistence by Hamilton and his party that any possibility of reunion with the Church of Scotland was directly dependent upon the open confession and repentance of past defections by the ministers who had complied with Charles II and James VII.¹²

Sir Robert Hamilton remained the central figure in the United Societies until his death in 1701, even though there is no record that he was ever ordained to any office. The Societies then remained without a designated leader, or any ministerial oversight, until 1706 when John Macmillan, a deposed minister from the Church of Scotland, was called as their pastor.¹³ When Thomas Nairne left the Associate Presbytery (the Secession Church) and accepted a position as a pastor in the United Societies in 1743, the Reformed Presbytery was formed. The organization grew in structure and numbers so that, by 1810, there were three Presbyteries (the Eastern, Northern and Southern Presbyteries) leading, in 1811, to the first General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland. In 1876, the majority Synod of this body united with the Free Church of Scotland. In 1900, the Free Church of Scotland united with the United Free Church which, in 1929, rejoined the Church of Scotland. It is clear, then, that there was a final reunion of the majority of the separatists with the National Church (after 239 years of separation), but a minority remained separated and still retain the name

¹⁰ “Act Ratifying the Confession of Faith, and settling Presbyterian Church-Government,” in Alexander Shields, *An Enquiry into Church-Communion Or, A Treatise against Separation from the Revolution-Settlement of this National Church, as it was settled Anno 1689 and 1690* (Edinburgh: William Gray, 1747), p. 117.

¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 114.

¹² *Faithful Contendings Displayed*, p. 421.

¹³ See M. Hutchison, *The Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland: Its origin and history, 1680-1876* (Paisley, 1893), p. 152.

of the Church. The Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland continues its separated existence today with four congregations and a Church plant in Edinburgh.¹⁴

3. Journal entry of Alexander Shields

Alexander Shields (also spelled “Sheilds”, “Sheils”, and “Sheill”) was born about 1660 and earned the Master of Arts degree from the University of Edinburgh at an early age in 1675.¹⁵ In 1679, he travelled to the Netherlands, where he studied theology at Utrecht. He returned to Scotland, but then moved to London where he worked for John Owen, the famous Puritan pastor and theologian. While in London, he was licensed as a preacher by the Scottish Presbyterians. Arrested for his Covenanter views in 1685, he was sentenced to imprisonment on the Bass Rock. In later 1686, however, he escaped and rejoined the Covenanters, notably accompanying and assisting the last of the major Covenanter martyrs, James Renwick. Along with Thomas Lining and William Boyd, he was the last of the ministers of the United Societies prior to the Revolution in 1688. He was a consistent and staunch Covenanter, but was determined to press forward for the unity of the Church.¹⁶ After being admitted into the Church of Scotland, Shields went on to serve as a Chaplain for the Cameronian Regiment (the 26th of Foot), being ordained on 4th February 1691. In 1696, he was called to the second charge of the St. Andrews parish. In 1699, by authorization of the General Assembly, Shields and three other ministers travelled to the Caribbean as part of the “Darien scheme”. In 1700, contracting a “malignant fever”, Shields died in Jamaica. In addition to being the chief writer of the three remaining preachers as outlined below, Shields is most famous for his *A Hind Let Loose* (1687), a defence of the Covenanter cause, and for his biography of James Renwick.

¹⁴ Johannes G. Vos, *The Scottish Covenanters: Their Origins, History and Distinctive Doctrines* (Edinburgh: Blue Banner Productions, 1998), p. 181; G. J. Keddie, “The Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the Disruption of 1863”, *Scottish Reformation Society Historical Journal (SRSHJ)*, Vol. 6 (2016), pp. 133-172 (see p. 171).

¹⁵ For biographical information on Shields, see the entry by Alexander Gordon in *DNB*, and H. Macpherson, *The Cameronian Philosopher: Alexander Shields* (Edinburgh, 1932).

¹⁶ For Shields’ pursuit of scriptural Church unity, see Matthew Vogan, “Alexander Shields, the Revolution Settlement and the Unity of the Visible Church: Part I. History and General Principles”, *SRSHJ*, Vol. 2 (2012), pp. 109-146; and “Alexander Shields, the Revolution Settlement and the Unity of the Visible Church: Part II. Church-Communion enquired into”, *SRSHJ*, Vol. 3 (2013), pp. 109-157.

The following transcript is of a journal entry, written by Alexander Shields in 1690, and containing his answer to the objections raised by Sir Robert Hamilton at the General Meeting at Douglas on 6th November 1689 against union with the Church of Scotland. The original entry has been lost, but it was copied out into a second journal belonging to Robert Wodrow.¹⁷ The letter is incomplete, ending abruptly on the sixteenth page. According to John Howie, the eighteenth-century editor of *Faithful Contendings Displayed*, Alexander Shields did not finish the letter because “Mr. Shields in his Journal, mentions several days, in which he was writing an answer to this Protestation, in the last of which he says he was seized with a sweating sickness and fainting which obliged him to lay it aside unperfected”.¹⁸ This document, however, is a remarkable piece of evidence that comes nearest in time to the controversy between Hamilton and Shields. The full answer against Hamilton would be written in Shields’ treatise, *Church-communion enquired into*, published posthumously by Thomas Lining in 1706.

Shields’ journal entry, though incomplete, gives a point-by-point refutation to the verbal charges levelled by Sir Robert Hamilton in the November 1689 General Meeting at Douglas. Hamilton’s first objection to any consideration of reunion with the Church of Scotland after the Revolution Settlement had specifically to do with his contention that William of Orange could not be lawfully considered the King of Scotland. Shields replies that he, and his colleagues, were in no position to be instrumental in William’s accession to the throne. But he concedes: “Yet I will not deny but we were some way active, in showing our good will to the setting in the throne the prince of Orange and his princess, for before all others we publicly prayed for him that the Lord would make him ane instrument for good and bless him with conduct and success. . . .”¹⁹ Nevertheless, his argument was that such support for the lawful calling of a King to the throne of the Scottish monarchy was no

¹⁷ Alexander Shields, MS. “Journal Entry, c. 1704”, Wodrow Collection, Quarto XVI, folio 99, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh. Other extracts from Shields’ journals are given in Wodrow, *Analecta*, Vol. 1, pp. 177-205. These were extracted by Wodrow in September 1708 (p. 177).

¹⁸ *Faithful Contendings Displayed*, p. 425. Shields’ response to Sir Robert Hamilton was written sometime between 6th November 1689 and the General Meeting of the United Societies on 5th February 1690, at which reference was made to it. From its opening apology to Sir Robert for the long delay in responding, it would seem to have been written probably in January 1690.

¹⁹ Shields, MS. “Journal Entry”, p. 5.

grounds for charging the ministers with impropriety, unless Hamilton could prove from Scripture that such support was sinful.

Appealing to the Scriptures and the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, Shields contends that, while there are legitimate grounds for opposing a monarch, such could not be proved to be the case with respect to William. Instead, according to Shields, William was both capable and competent to hold the office of King of Scotland because “. . . being a protestant, and an enemy to popery, and all heresies and so a brother in so far, and tho his present practice in countenancing prelacy in England be different from our Testimony, yet such a difference in religion, at least does not make voyd the magistrate just and Legall authority nor free the people from their due obedience to him”.²⁰ In short, since William was both capable and competent to rule, and since he had been lawfully called by the Scottish Parliament and Estates to be King, there was no basis – whether Scriptural, Confessional, or Legal – to reject, or oppose, the authority of his government.

A more serious charge against King William III was made by Hamilton when he rejected the legitimacy of William’s rule because he had not subscribed the Solemn League and Covenant. Shields reminds Hamilton that Charles II had subscribed the Solemn League and Covenant (twice) and had immediately repudiated his oath. Furthermore, even though William had not subscribed the Solemn League, “. . . he engaged into his part of the National Covenant viz. the oath of Coronation which added to the preliminary stipulations upon which he accepted the crown does give all the security of the Solemn league would have done yea and more plain and particular security than that alone . . . ”.²¹ If Hamilton would argue that the Solemn League and Covenant must be revived and impressed upon, Shields argues that such a measure would be vain and empty unless the entire nation also subscribed to the same. Instead, he contends: “. . . the Solemn league and Covenant cannot be renewed nationally in the present circumstances till at least the body of both kingdoms be either better reformed or altogether better disposed for a reformation and except it be nationally renewed the King cannot well engage in it personally as a security to the nation.”²² This is a vital point to Shields’ defence,

²⁰ *ibid.*, p. 7.

²¹ *ibid.*, p. 11.

²² *ibid.*, p. 12.

considering that the previous occasions on which the Covenants were subscribed were civil matters that involved members from the various classes of society, and were taken freely as expressions of genuine and heartfelt revival. It would, therefore, be the cause of sin to impose such an oath upon King William when the rest of the nation – and, in the case of the Solemn League and Covenant, both England and Scotland – were not in a state of spiritual reformation or civil agreement to subscribe to such an oath themselves.

Having cleared himself and his fellow ministers from any “sin” associated with the accession of William to the throne of Scotland, Shields proceeds to address the second concern that Hamilton had mentioned, namely, their part in the raising of Lord Angus’ Regiment and the consequent association with “malignants”. In defence, Shields first reminds Hamilton that to reject the defence of King William is to strike a blow in favour of King James VII – something that Shields contends even Hamilton would strenuously object to.²³ But Shields admits that there were reports of scandalous officers in Lord Angus’ Regiment, and contends that this is much to be lamented. While he advises prayer for revival within the Regiment, he also contends that, even though such “sons of Belial” may among the ranks, “. . . it is not so easy in the midst of such an associated enemy to witness against the sin of the association and yet to maintain the duty of fighting for Religion, Liberty, and Country in despite of all that will either oppose or concur. This that Regiment hath done, they thought it their duty to appear in this expedition and that none had greater right or reason or obligation to fight against the common enemy than they.”²⁴

Note about the document

The following transcription of the document is a word-for-word transcription from the handwritten journal entry by Wodrow’s scribe. Individual page numbers and lines have been left intact, with the exception that several line breaks have been added between major points and paragraphs. The spelling has been left precisely as found in the entry, but footnotes have been added to elucidate the more difficult old Scots words, Latin phrases, and historical and bibliographical references. There are two instances where a word is still uncertain, so an equivalent

²³ *ibid.*, p. 14.

²⁴ *ibid.*, p. 16.

word that fits the sense has been added in brackets, with the annotation footnoted. The original document is housed in the National Library of Scotland, in the Wodrow Collection (Quarto XVI, folio 99-107. Catalogue entry states: “copy, ?1704, of answer of to a protestation (ca.1690)”).

JOURNAL ENTRY OF ALEXANDER SHIELDS (c. 1690)

(Page 1)

A.S. To R.H.²⁵

The Answer to his Protestation

Much honoured Sir.

Yow may possibly expect this delay of giving answer to your protestation shall at length produce a reply either for prolixity or significancy proportioned to the time it hath taken to be digested, or at least ane apology for its lingering so long; but what the answer is, yow may-estimate as yow think fit, the less your expectations have been of its importance, your disappointments will be the less, and for its delay no other apology is needfull than to complain there should be need for any such writting at all: Yea so much doe I complain of it on whom this unpleasant talk is laid by others, who should have been a part of it, and might with more ease undertaken the whole, but being²⁶ at a distance from one another we could not doe it presently nor yet conveniently distribute, to each his share, so the rest declining and others urging, I behoved to bear the burden, tho with very great backwardness) That were it not for your importunity in pressing, and impatience for its delay, which I hear yow complain of, which may by some be abused to hurtfull effects, I would altogether have shifted it in silence at this time in the hope that providence will clear up those points ere it be long one way or other better than all our subscribings. The reason of my shieness is not taken from any-politick consideration of per-

²⁵ A.S., “Alexander Shields”, to R.H., “Sir Robert Hamilton”.

²⁶ Or, “living.” By the end of January, if not earlier, Shields was with Lord Angus’ Regiment in Montrose; *Faithful Contendings Displayed*, p. 425.

sonall inconveniency or hazard to my self in meddling in these ticklish points of the present establishments, tho' some regard to your obnoxiousness, which infers – my hazard, but indirectly by way of misprision hath some influence on my aversness, being loath to have ane hand in any thing which may have any tendency to occasion your suffering, especially in a matter which yet cannot be accounted a case of confession; Nor is it any jealousie lest I discover my inconstancy and change of principles, which possibly yow may expect to espie, tho I hope yow shall be disappointed, which makes me so unwilling to move in this debate. I know no principle that ever I espoused in all the contendings wherein I was engagd that I had ever any thought to alter or saw any cause to rew or be ashamed of, or yet can see any need to resile from in this contradiction to your sentiments expressed in your paper. Tho indeed I may fear as I might have exceeded sometimes in fervour of expression against the other extream, so I
 may

(Page 2)

may against that which yow are running upon, and there may be some change discovered, and some offense may follow upon it, but this will proceed from my weakness and should be imputed to it which I had need to jealous, but neither shall be my designe. But in truth one cause of my averseness to treat upon these theams, is the objective darkness and difficulty of these controversies which are among the thornish points that have puzzled the wits of all ages together with my subjective incapacity and weakness no way fit to manadge such a debate. If we had the sence of the real intricacy of these matters in themselves and had less confidence in our own understanding we would find it more suteable and seasonable to look to break our hearts upon the many sad causes and evidence of the Lord's wrath that occasions these debates, than to
 break
 our brains upon the debates themselves, considering also which is another reason that after so many debates and divisions that we have had already, of which one would think it now time to be weare²⁷

²⁷ "Beware."

and after we have seen their very dismall effects in many extravagancies to the right hand and the left, and many rackings and torturings of consciences plunged into many discords and darkness thereby he must have a strange spirit very unlike the gospell that will itch now after new shifts²⁸ the beginning whereof are always like the letting out of water, and wherefore should be left off before they be meddled with.²⁹ It is a more proper work for enemies either intentionally to sow discord among brethren, which is one of seven things the Lord hates by way of excellency, or occasionally to provoke to debates and be the beginners of strife, than for brethren, who whereto they have attained should walk by the same rule even when otherways minded and of different sentiments about some incident controversies. Considering again what a tendency these new debates may have to multiply differences and subdivide those that were united in taking one part in former contendings and so weaken their hands and strengthen their opposition, yea to fortify them so far as to verifie their obloquies alledging we maintained such principles, as would disallow all order and union in the world, which before when we stood together, we had the confidence to allow more manifold calumnies and reproaches, but now if these debates go on it may be feared that confidence shall fail us and we shall not be in case to demonstrate the contrary. It's sad that our former contendings should be buried before the time either in rending from them yielding the cause, or under the ashes of contempt & reproach raised and roborate³⁰ by new debates before the old ones were brought to some conclusion, especially in the last place considering the times (which men of understanding should know and consider)

wherefore
the

(Page 3)

the mercies of the times, or their miseries the grounds of praise or matter of mourning it would be thought never could such –

²⁸ Scratched out and replaced by marginal reading, “strifes”.

²⁹ “The beginning of strife *is as* when one letteth out water: therefore leave off contention, before it be meddled with” (Proverbs 17:14, Authorized (King James) Version).

³⁰ “To confirm, ratify (an agreement, treaty, etc.)”; see *Dictionary of the Scots Language (DSL)* online.

debates now unhappily or unseasonably, be broached, the wonders of the Lord's right hand in the revolution of days, bringing forth so many considerable advantages, not only to our selves, but to the cause and our contendings for it whereby justified & vindicated in a great measure by means of some of these instruments – now quarreled in these debates doth certainly call for some other and better improvement and a more fruitfull proof of our thankfulness than breaking our selves in-to pieces, by these debates and peevishly scorning and disdaining our mercies already obtained because we cannot get them all which we have been and are looking and hoping for like pettish children casting away what they have in hand because they cannot have all they covet. And on the other hand past and present continuing and growing causes and efforts of the Lord's indignation burning up and like to consume this Church and Kingdom which are matters of mourning if we have duly experienced with them would certainly shape out for us some other suitable work than this byting and devouring one another in debates while the Lord in his holy Judgements and men in their wicked designs like to devour us all. These few considerations and several others not convenient to be mentioned doe very much preponderat with me not only to delay the answering of your protestation but to demure the meddling in this strife at all, for fear it be like the letting out of waters, not easily stopped again.³¹ But some other considerations have prevailed to draw from me this simple discovery of my judgment about these matters, in opposition to what I dissent from in yours, not by way of confutation or redargution³² in ane essay for victory, but in a manner of correction of what I think mistaken in yours, showing how farr I confess and wherein I much dissent with some reasons for it.

The reason of my choice of this shortest and easiest method of answering, refusing that of ane enlarged formal disquisition by way of dispute is not only respond to the above mentioned considerations and to the ground of my other encumbrances besides the work of

³¹ Proverbs 17:14, again.

³² "To confute (a person) by argument," see *DSL*.

my vocation, but because it seems most suitably adapted to your paper, which (as the title of it bears) is only the account of your judgment of which yow verbally declared to the general meeting by way of protestation which the ministers undertook to refute and yow according to give in the reasons of your judgement viz. of the sinfulness of these things following from Scripture
and

(page 4)

and principles of our Church. Here Sir I now leave to note.

1. That this being only ane account of your judgment first verbally delivered and now put in writing, and in both without any subjoyned reasons it were sufficient to answer it simply with ane account of my dissenting judgment as ane antithesis to your thesis without any additions of reasons except yow intend to prepare them as theses to be impugned by the which now more proper to be done in personall presence than at a distance by writing. But this yow may remember yow refused in the meeting, and we might have as good reason to refuse it this way. And what yow say the ministers undertook to refute it and yow according to give in the reasons of it, I can remember no such preposterous undertaking, but only that after yow declined to take ane answer to your verbal protestation which indeed was undertaken to be refuted in presence of the meeting, and it was several times pressed upon yow in some heat, yow was designed and promised to give it in in writing with the reasons of it and in that case we undertook to refute it. But for us to undertake a refutation of simple assertions, and the asserter bring in his reasons or probation after our refutation is ridiculous and against all order of dispute for *Asserenti primum incumbat probatio*.³³ T

2. This being delivered by way of protestation, it would have been expected it should have been backed with reasons as protestations use to be, which being desiderated and yet expected may be reason

³³ This essentially means that “the burden of proof lies upon the one making the assertion”.

enough to suspend our consultation until the reasons be seen. But here we are left in the dark not knowing what the protestation levels at, whether only against the sinfulness of these sic particulars mentioned in the paper, in which sense it was necessary that with respect to each of them it should have been backed with – reasons, or if it be against the meeting, or a party in the meeting owning these things, the sinfulness whereof is protested against, – And if so then these six things following are subjoined as reasons either of their exclusion from the meeting who own them, or your separation from the meeting where they are there owning these things wherein I have this advantage, that I am not simply or so much to consider them whether they be sinfulness or not, as their moment, importance and weight, whether they be sufficient grounds of excluding us from the meeting, or your withdrawing from it, but the first of these should have been first discussed before the other had been meddled with.

3. Yow have undertaken to prove the sinfulness of these things from Scripture and principles of our Church, which not only
we

(page 5)

we desiderat as not done yet, but think it will be a task very hard to perform, the things being particulars in Hypothese and not questions stated in Thesi and rather about matters of fact than of Jus, and consequently many of them at least of that nature which without abuse cannot be condemned by the Scripture or principles of our Church which never spake either pro or con for or against some of these particulars as here stated. E.G. the fifth and sixth theses are escapes in the threshold. But I shall proceed to the consideration of these particulars.

1. The first sin yow charge me with and protest against is, In being active many ways in setting on the throne the prince of Orange and his princess, not only without their engadgment in the Solemn league and covenant, but the moving and acting contrary most part of the articles of the same.

To which I shall say first, Sir, yow are very defective in not clearing your charge, in thesi or hypothesi, either as

to the factum or jus: either that we were so active many ways in enthroning the prince or princess of Orange now King and Queen, or that this was our sin, if we had been so active or if they were moving and asking contrary most part of the articles of the Solemn league and cov. All these yow should have cleared and proven. 2ly. As to the first of these it can hardly be supposable such mean persons as yow tax could be very active many ways in contributing toward the advancement of the prince and princess, being in a capacity which could have no influence on such an effort. But that which is very remote mean persons which have the least interest in the property of the nation can have but very little share in the government, or access to the settling thereof. It savours a little of pride to think or alledge the throne could not be disposed of, or government settled without us: Yet I will not deny but we were some way active, in showing our good will to the setting in the throne the prince of Orange and his princess, for before all others we publickly prayed for him that the Lord would make him an instrument for good and bless him with conduct and success, in his undertakings to rescue these nations from popery and slavery, and at the renewing of the covenant at Lesmahago,³⁴ we espoused his interest, appropriating and applying the articles in the national³⁵ Covenant which concern the King, to his Highness, if he should be chosen and called to govern protesting and promising that we should defend his person and authority with

(page 6)

with our goods, bodies and lives in the defense of Christ his evangel, liberties of our country, ministration of Justice and punishment of iniquities, against all enemies, within this Realme or without. And accordingly shortly thereafter in op-

³⁴ i.e., Lesmahagow. The meeting of the United Societies at Lesmahagow lasted from 2nd to 4th March 1689, with the Covenants being renewed on Sabbath 3rd. See *Faithful Contendings Displayed*, pp. 380-391.

³⁵ "national" inserted above the text.

position of obtaining the legall degredation of the popish Tyrant and abolition of prelacy and restitution of reformation and liberties, as we were active in soliciting the meetings of the shyres to elect commissioners for the ensuing convention of Estates which might promote those good designs, so understanding the contrary devices and designes of the popish, prelati- call and malignant faction to come to the convention in great numbers to overawe it we were active in offering our assistance to the defense of the meeting of Estates³⁶ against all their attempts, and then prepared a petition for settling the Government of Church and state upon just and necessary preliminaries, which tho we could not have access to present or get read publickly, yet in effect we obtained much of our desires wherein in the settlement of the government upon the prince of Orange and his princess, upon such preliminaries as we acquiesced in for the time. Finally afterwards in season of the nation's hazard from the Intestine Insurrections and foreign Invasions of the publick enemies in contradiction to the model of the militia the convention had fallen upon for opposing him, and in the remembrance of the obligation lying upon us from our Covenants so lately renewed, we offered to levy a Regiment under the Command of the E. of Angus and obtained it on terms satisfying at the time. 3ly. This being all our activity in setting on the throne, the prince of Orange and his – princess, yow will have much to do to justify your protestation against it viz. not only that these actions were sinfull upon the matter (and not only in the manner of managing them, for as to that we will not absolve ourselves, but this confession will doe yow no good) but that they were of such heinousness, as to be a
ground of
protestation against the meeting upon the account thereof, and a
ground
of separation from the meeting, this yow have to prove from Scrip-
ture and principles of the Church.

³⁶ The Convention of Estates met in Edinburgh on 14th March 1689. Many Society People gathered in Edinburgh at that time to prevent the Convention from being disrupted by Jacobites; *Faithful Contendings Displayed*, p. 388. For the background to the meeting, see Jeffrey Stephen, *Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland, 1689-1716* (Farnham, 2013), pp. 19-76.

Now I cannot see how this can be done from either, for this will at least infer a quarreling at his advancement, and a not owning of his authority when advanced, which I find no ground for in either of these, for first in Scripture I owne indeed there are grounds for disowning usurpers or Tyrants, but none that will
 condemn

(page 7)

condemn the owning of this prince's authority. In it we find an obligation to own, honour and subject ourselves to a morall or lawfull power and authority Prov: 8.15. Rom: 13.1 and 1 Tim: 2.2, 3. Tit: 3.1. 1 Pet: 2.13, 14, 15. 2 Pet: 2.10. Jude v.8. As also the 5th Command. Now to the making up of this morall or lawfull power these four things are sufficient whosoever wants them is not to be owned (1) The person holding the power must be both capable off, and competent to the holding of it capable of the Character of the magistrate Rom: 13. And of the qualifications Deut: 17. The popish usurper was not capable of these, but incapacitated by the Laws both of God and man none can alledge that this man is a prohibited person uncapable of these honours by Laws Divine or humane being a protestant, and an enemy to popery, and all heresies and so a brother in so far, and tho his – present practice in countenancing prelacy in England be different from our Testimony, yet such a difference in religion, at least does not make voyd the magistrate just and Legall authority nor free the people from their due obedience to him, Conf: of faith, Chap: 23. The answer given to this argument for owning Tyrants & usurpers will be of no use here. (2) There must not only be a lawfull person but a Lawfull title to the power, and not only possession by providence tho I confess there is so much of God to be observed and admired in this overruling and effective providence, that brought over and made this prince king of Brittain, that it may make any fearer of God stand in awe to quarrel with it, several princes doe pretend to authority from several titles, this prince can plead all alledgible; As for that of just conquest, meer conquest indeed can give no right but that which is grounded on Justice including the consent of the
 people,
 may be owned, and it is granted by all, that tho in the beginning

the conquering be unjust yet by after compared it may turn to a Just title, Cesar³⁷ was owned in Christ's time tho he had no other title so Cyrus by those which returned from Babylon who had no other title but conquest, especially if at all it is be owned that it is not the conquest of a kingdome but of a tyrant oppressing a kingdome, and the war was not against the kingdome, but to rescue it from the Tyrant, as it was in the present case, Next he can plead hereditary succession, which indeed is not a valid title merely Juro hereditaris,³⁸ but when pleaded only vi Legis³⁹ and according to the kingdome's Constitution, it must be sustained and is consonant to the Scriptures, but chiefly he can produce his
legall

(page 8)

his legall investure by the constitution of the people, which is the way the Lord sets up government among men whose magistracy 1 Pet: 2.13. is called ane ordinance of man because constituted by man's transaction, the Scripture shews the way of setting up Governours, first the peoples counsel was had, then their chosing 2 Sam: 16.18. when the Lord and the people choose, and then their making him king by compact Judges 11.6.11 2 Sam: 5.3. 1 King: 12.1.16. 2 King: 11.17. which was not always by their renewing the Covenant with God as party, we read of that but one in the Scripture last named, most frequently it was only by covenant between king and people before God as witness. Now this prince hath title by all these he had. The consent election and compact of the people or their representatives, none expressly dissented except popish or malignant enemies, yea with the declared consent of those that had disowned the former Tyranny. In all these [things (*scratched out*)]
actions wherein
yow charge them with being too active in setting on the throne the prince and princess of Orange. The compact is extant in the declaration of the Estates of the kingdome containing the claim of Right and the offer of the Crown April 11.1689 declaring

³⁷ Or, "Caesar".

³⁸ "Hereditary right."

³⁹ "According to Law."

that K. James the 7th had assumed the Regal power and appointed the same in an arbitrary way invading the fundamentall constitution of the kingdome and violating the lawes and Liberties whereof by several acts of tyranny, all which acts they declared to be contrare to Law and consequently unlawfull for any succeeding governour to imitate. Claiming, demanding & insisting upon all and sundry the promises as their undoubted right and Liberties. In which claim and demand and the grievances⁴⁰ they quietly represent they seek and must be understood to require full security for Religion and Liberties that they may not again be in danger of being suborned either by popery or prelacy or absolute power or else their claim of Right hath no sense at all upon which terms and stipulations the King and Queen accept the Crown May 11.1689 swearing to preserve inviolate all these rights and Liberties in the oath of Coronation in the national Covenant which engages him to maintain the true Religion (which must be the presbyterian Reformation popery & prelacy being both before abolished) and to maintain our Liberties and root out hereticks and enemies to the true worship of God &c. Where all this is there must be a compact, and where this compact is not violated or evacuated there must be ane obligation

(page 9)

obligation of allegiance on our part as well as of right administration on his part. (3) The 3d required is that the matter of the power be lawfull and limited not extended beyond due measures as the late tyrants absolute power dispensing with both Divine and humane Laws was null upon this stands condemned Dan: 5.19.20. no man can deny but this King's power is Limited by preliminary provisions nor can any alledge that he hath a paramount to Law or which inverts or overturns the Ends of government Religious Liberty or safety or which is opposite to the relative obligation to the Fifth Commandment or incompetent

⁴⁰ The Claim of Right was adopted by the Convention of Estates on 11th April and the Articles of Grievance on 13th April 1689. See *The Grievances represented by the Estates of Scotland, to the Kings Majesty, to be redressed in Parliament. Together with his Majesty's Instructions to his Commissioner for redressing the same [31st May, 1689]* (London, 1689).

to a fiduciary patron unattainable to them which intrusted him and therefore this power as long as it keeps within these Limits cannot be disowned (4) The Last thing which legitimate authority is the Lawfull use and administration of it governing according to Law. Now I confess here yow have greater grounds of objection several steps in his conduct and administration not being according to the Law of God, for which I desire to be a mourner and in my capacity to witness against him, as his confederacy with popish princes, his countenancing and imposing with prelacy in England, his not appointing judgment upon the murderers of the Lord's people, his admitting unto power and trust into judicatories and armies malignant enemies to truth and godliness, his nominating Judges and officers of state without consent of parliament, his suspending so long the address of griefs, which are all matters of mourning and should provoke us to cry unto the Lord that he may open his eyes and make him sensible of the guilt and danger of these things which will doubtless bring wrath upon the throne and the kingdom if mercy prevent it not; but alas who ever told him of these things, how can a man in his circumstances stand out against so great tentation, how can he help some of these things under his so many disadvantages, and it seems he intended to help some of these things in the instructions given to his Commissioner lately printed, but however they cannot be altogether exercised yet yow would remember that expression in the Lanerk

Declaration⁴¹

we ought to cast the mantle of love on the lesser errors of “
governours, and give the best countenance to their administration “
which the nature of their actions will bear. Lex Rex & Jus populi⁴² doe “

⁴¹ The Lanark Declaration was drawn up on 15th December 1681 and published at Lanark on 12th January 1682. For the text, see *An Informatory Vindication* (Edinburgh, 1744), pp. 91-96 (and online at the “TrueCovenanter” website and at “Jardine’s Book of Martyrs: Declarations – 1682 – Lanark”). The words, “we ought to cast the mantle of love on the lesser errors of governours, and give the best countenance to their administration that the nature of their actions will bear”, occur on p. 92 of the printed text.

⁴² “Lex rex & jus populi,” in reference to Samuel Rutherford, *Lex, Rex, or the Law and the Prince; containing the Reasons and Causes of the Most Necessary Defensive Wars of the Kingdom of Scotland, etc.* (London: Printed for John Field, 1644); and [Sir James Stewart], *Jus Populi Vindicatum, or, the Peoples Right to defend themselves and their Covenanted Religion, vindicated* ([London], 1669).

expressly assert it is not every enormity in the civill magistrate either as to his way of entry into the office or in the execution
of

(page 10)

of it or in his private and personal behaviour that can denominate him a tyrant or usurper, it is not any one or two acts contrare to the Royal Covenant or office which doe denude a man of the royall dignity, yow never read in all the characters of tyrants or usurpers that such acts as these gave a man this denomination, many of the Scripture kings owned to be such were guilty of such maladministrations and yet owned for Kings, so yow will find it a hard task to prove your point from Scripture. Secondly Sir yow will also find insuperable difficulties in proving your point from principles of our Church, I find indeed the Gen: assembly in their seasonable and necessary warning July 27. Sess: 27. declaring “a boundless and illimited power is not to be acknowledged and that which is a mutuall stipulation and obligation betwixt the King and the people, accordingly Kings are to take the oath of Coronation to abolish popery and maintain the protestant Religion, and hereupon discharging the admitting of the King to the exercise of his power until he should give security for Religion and safety &c.”⁴³ but that saith this to His King’s authority who hath given this security, taken this oath, and whose power is not illimited and boundless. I find this also in the next kirk act the Commissioner of the G. Ass: declaring as they disclaim all the sin and guilt of the King and of his house, so they will not own him and his interest otherwise than with a subordination to God and so far as he owns and professeth the cause of God &c.⁴⁴ we require no further owning of this King but with those qualifications. Afterwards which when King Charles so owned as above degenerated unto arbitrary government the first Sanquhair Decla-

⁴³ *A Seasonable and Necessary Warning Concerning Present and Imminent Dangers, and concerning duties relating thereto from the Generall Assembly of this Kirk unto all the members thereof* (Edinburgh: Evan Tyler, 1649), p. 10; *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, M.DC.XXXVIII. – M.DCCC.XLII*, p. 206.

⁴⁴ Act of the West Kirk, 13th August, 1650; see Alexander Shields, *Hind Let Loose* (1687), p. 91; Wodrow, *History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*, Vol. 1, p. 188.

ration⁴⁵ disowns him for his perjury and breach of Covenant with God and his Church and usurpation of Christ's royall prerogative and for tyranny and breaches of his very *Leges Regnandi*⁴⁶ in matters civill, the Lanark Declaration following confirmed this and added some particular reasons of disowning him viz. the cutting of the neck of the constitution of Church and State his – aspiring unto matters both Civill and Ecclesiastical exceeding all measures, his arbitrariness, [*next scratched out*] in dissolving parliaments his supremacy over all persons and causes, his impoverishing the people to enrich a Catholic Court, providing a popish usurper, imposing the Test &c.⁴⁷ The inforatory vindication⁴⁸ again confirms this adding many particular acts of tyranny for which we vindicated our revolt. Finally the second
Sanquhair

(page 11)

Sanquhair Declaration⁴⁹ disowned the Duke of York's authority in regard he was a murderer which had shed the blood of the saints and an idolater whom to own is contrary to many laudable acts of parliament there cited. And the vindication⁵⁰ confirming it adding his arrogating to himself an absolute power &c. upon these reasons tyrants and usurpers have been discovered but how will these quarrel with the present authority where will yow find

⁴⁵ The (first) Sanquhar Declaration was published by Richard Cameron at Sanquhar on 22nd June 1680. For the text, see *Inforatory Vindication* (1744 edn.), pp. 89-91, and online at the "TrueCovenanter" website. The Declaration disowned Charles for "his perjury & breach of Covenant with God & His Church, & usurpation of His Crown & Royal Prerogatives, & many other breaches in matters Ecclesiastick, & by his tyranny & breaches of the very *Leges Regnandi* in matters Civil" (p. 90).

⁴⁶ "Governing Laws."

⁴⁷ The various points listed are all enlarged upon in the Lanark Declaration of 1682 (see footnote 41 (p. 93) above).

⁴⁸ The *Inforatory Vindication* was written by James Renwick and Alexander Shields and published in 1687. Subsequent editions appeared in 1707, 1744, and 1791.

⁴⁹ The second Sanquhar Declaration was published at Sanquhar on 28th May 1685 with the title "The Protestation, & Apologetick Admonitory Declaration, Of the Contending & Suffering Remnant, of the true Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland. Against The Proclaiming James Duke of York, King of Scotland, England, France, & Ireland, The Lawfulness of the present pretended Parliament, And the apparent inlet of Popery, &c". For the text, see *Inforatory Vindication* (1744 edn.), pp. 100-108.

⁵⁰ *Inforatory Vindication* (1744 edn.), p. 26: "arrogating to himself an absolute power, more declaredly than any other formerly."

principles justifying the disowning of that in all our former Declarations and writings or among the words of our fathers.

4. Yow seem to adjoyne a two fold reason to prove that the setting on the throne the prince and princess of Orange was a sin or at least to aggravate the sinfulness thereof one is that it was not only without the engagement in the Solemn league and covenant. To which I answer (first) though our fathers did take King Charles engagement to the Covenant yet as they did not think that security sufficient for which see causes of wrath Art: 9. Apr: 5⁵¹ &c. so they neither declared before that without his taking the Covenant they would never admit him to the royal dignity for which I can read but without engaging and obliging himself for security of Religion and safety and while he stood in opposition to the publick office of the people for such security, they thought it a breach of Covenant to bring him to the exercise of his power seasonable and necessary warning fore-cited. Nor can I that ever they after enacted that no King should ever be admitted without engaging in the Solemn league and Covenant, if so be he give real security by a compact pro renata⁵² for Religion and liberty if yow remember such ane act either in Church or state I will be much obliged to yow to show it (2) tho he did not engage in the Solemn league and Covenant, yet he engaged into his part of the National Covenant viz. the oath of Coronation which added to the preliminary stipulations upon which he accepted the crown does give all the security that the Solemn league would have done yea and more plain and particular security than that alone without those could have done for tho that speaks of liberties of the parliament and of the

⁵¹ The reading "Apr." seems to be correct. The reference is to *Causes of the Lord's Wrath against Scotland, manifested in his sad late dispensations* (1653), Article 9, Step 5, pp. 6, 52-59: "The fifth is, The authorizing of Commissioners to close a Treaty with the King, for the investing him with the Government, upon his subscribing such demands as were sent to him, after he had given many clear evidences of his dis-affection and enmity to the Work and people of GOD, and was continuing in the same; and the admitting of him to the full exercise of his power, and Crowning him notwithstanding of new discoveries of his adhering to his former Principles and way, and of many warnings to the contrary."

⁵² "In the circumstances."

kingdom to be protected, yet it does not mention what liberties
 (3) as the case now stands, I doe not see how any could offer
 the Solemn league and Covenant to him or how he could take it
 except as it were as a Covenant with God and not as a league betwix
 the

(page 12)

the nation, with whom could he engage in a league either
 only with the godly antiprelatick, antisectarian &c. as we re-
 newed it at Lesmahego,⁵³ this would oblige him to several trans-
 actions, with several sorts of his subjects, and would make him
 stand under divers relations to whom ever else he would have no
 subjects but the godly sorts. Or with all the nobility, gentry,
 commons here and there in England, and so with the whole –
 malignant party which would be ane association worse than any
 ye object against for the Solemn league and Covenant is called ane
 association at the close of the conclusion thereof, for the truth is
 the Solemn league and Covenant cannot be renewed nationally
 in the present circumstances till at least the body of both
 kingdoms be either better reformed or altogether better disposed
 for a reformation and except it be nationally renewed the
 King cannot well engage in it personally as a security to
 the nation.

Another reason yow add reproving and aggravating the
 sinfulness this erection of the prince viz. when moving
 and acting contrary most part of the articles of the same
 Ans: (1) it is ane omission that yow doe not mention the
 particulars, but having mentioned some of these already
 this consideration above written may serve for⁵⁴ some of the same
 and would never take the Covenant, and yet was owned at
 the first making of it; the answers informally given to that case
 will not serve here as application to this King. (3) I conclude
 this head with ane earnest desire that yow will please to consider
 not only the administration of the people and governours what

⁵³ Lesmahagow.

⁵⁴ In the margin is written: "A solution (2) So was King Charles the first moving and acting contrary to the articles."

they are in themselves, right or wrong, but also the times & what is the duty of privat persons in reference to those administrations at this time, certainly I might be yielded there is some difference between our behaviour now towards this government and that towards the former, surely it cannot be pleaded a case of confession to avouch a withdrawing of subjection to this government even tho there were grounds of demure in ; owning it, when an open acknowledgement of it is not extorted of every one and no more subjection is imposed upon which your family have readily yielded over to those who were not then rightfull and righteous magistrates as that of Ezra Nehemiah Esther Mordecai to which such powers and the compliance of the Marquis of Argyle and Waristonne under Cromwell, we
 find

(page 13)

find not that any of them did protest against those which owned the authority of these rulers.

2. The second particular yow protest against the sinfulness whereof yow undertake to prove is the sinfull and scandalous association of Angus' Regiment. Since I have no time now to discuss this head at any length. But some what I shall grant and somewhat I might deny. 1. Tho it would seem your passion breaking out in these angry expressions of sinfull and scandalous association of Angus Regiment (I suppose yow mean my Lord Angus his Regiment) hath made yow forget your business in hand viz. to give ane account of your Judgement by way of protestation, which at length if yow did not think it fit to add reasons to confirm it, should have been proposed in clear enunciations that it might be understood what yow protested against whether that association in a Regiment or that regimenting themselves abstractly for both may be meant by the words, or whether association among themselves with some profane and scandalous officers having command among them which I confess yow have too great ground to quarrel at, or whether association with the Kings forces so modelled as they have been and are at present, yow should have expressed your

self more clearly which of these, or if all these yow meant
 Yet I confess it does not obviously appear how extensively
 yow understand it from the immodial and very consequential
 connexion it hath made the foregoing particulars, for if it was then
 sin to have any hand in setting the King on the throne then
 it follows it was sinfull and scandalous for them to associate in
 a Regiment to defend his Right and oppose his enemies
 whichever be the firmness or infirmity of this consequence, yet it
 would seem yow quarrel not only at the way of their associating
 or the party they associate with, but the cause they associate for
 the King's service (2) As to the first of these senses whereby
 your assertion may be taken as condemning their associating
 any way in a modelled Regiment in the King's service I confess
 yow speak consequentially to your own sentiments of affecting
 this King to whom yow will hardly own your self a subject
 But though yow should not have clearness upon some scruples
 either to engage in this King's service yourself or to encourage
 others

(page 14)

others to it, yet I am sure yow will not allow your self to
 doe so good service to K. James as the protesting against
 associating in a Regiment in opposition to him will amount
 to, nothing can doe K. James better service than to protest against
 serving K. William, which I am confident is far from your
 design. I know yow will quarrel at the cause, as a mean thing
 to fight for the quarrel of Kings, and I confess it is not so clearly
 stated as I wish and long and hope to have it ere all be done.

But yow would consider (1) as it is not insolent nor unusuall
 for the godly in the Scriptures to fight for one King against another
 as for David against Ishbosheth and Absalom for Abijah against
 Jeroboam And so our fathers after subscribing the declarations
 at Dunfermline did espouse the quarrel of Charles the 2nd against
 Oliver Cromwell⁵⁵ (2) as it is said in the nationall Covenant

⁵⁵ See Jock Purves, *Fair Sunshine: Character Studies of the Scottish Covenanters* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 2003), pp. 184-85. "In 1650, a year and a half after his father's execution, when [Charles II] was using all endeavours to recover the two thrones, he had

that the quietness and stability of our Religion and Kirk doth depend upon the safety and good behavior of the King's Majesty as upon a comfortable instrument of God's mercy granted to this Country, so the cause might be understood to be stated completely involving and including together with the King's interest all other previous interests of Religion and liberty in opposition to the same enemy designing the destruction of all together in order to the preserving of those priviledges already obtained and to the procuring of those not yet obtained I never read or heard that [anyone]⁵⁶ stated it otherwise nor that our fathers ever sought for
that
may not fight for now. (3) As the persecuting enemy hath the starting of the Cause for which people doe suffer, so the invading enemy or that maketh insurrection hath the greatest influence in determining the state of the cause for which people must fight in defending viz. every thing that he opposes. But as in the former case it is not left to people to choose the head they would suffer upon; but they must take up Christ's cause and suffer cheerfully for every truth they are called to confess this comparatively never so little, so in the case of asking it is not left to people to choose the head they would fight for, but they must defend valiantly every interest they are called to contend for against the enemy that would destroy all their interests and certainly we may doe it more cheerfully when we are called to fight against the same thing that we suffered against viz. K. James his pretended authority. But I
fear

(page 15)

fear as in suffering times some could never get a head to suffer upon, so now some shall never get a head to fight for (4) But whatever others did it is not ours that by agreement both with some

offered to subscribe and swear the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant, and actually did so on the 23rd June. A month later he had accepted the Dunfermline Declaration, in which he deplored his father's opposition to the work of religious Reformation, confessed his mother Henrietta Maria's Popish idolatry, professed his own sincerity and detestation of all 'Popery, superstition and idolatry, together with Prelacy' and all other errors and heresies, and announced his determination not to tolerate them in any part of his dominions." For the text of the Dunfermline Declaration, see [T. Henderson], *Testimony-Bearing Exemplified* (Paisley, 1791), pp. 364-372.

⁵⁶ Unclear in the original. Editorial suggestion to fit the sense.

members of the Counsell with general persons in the army viz. Gen: Major McKay⁵⁷ and Brigadier Balfour.⁵⁸ And with the field officers of my Lord Angus his Regiment is not permitted and allowed to whom to state the cause to their satisfaction both at our first levy at Douglas and at Down⁵⁹ before their first march to the Highlands as is to be seen in papers relating to both read at the head of the Battalions.

3. As to our associating with some offensive officers among these fellows, I confess it is both sinfull and scandalous that they should have been either admitted at first or continued [and connived]⁶⁰ at afterwards.

But whose sin was it what was or is the remedy. My Lord Angus Regiment was hereby imposed upon in this and [believed]⁶¹ they had this provided [expressly]⁶² in the conditions agreed to at Douglas that none such should be thrown in among them. These gentlemen that proved afterwards scandalous were not known but afterward to be well affected and of a good conversation, severall that offered themselves were rejected upon the account of their known scandals, others were thrust in afterwards by violence with unrest and contendings against them, this hath been a griefance under which they have groaned all along, this hath been constantly contended against witnessed against every way and represented wherever there was access, and to this day they never left off quarreling for a redress though they have been as the sons of Zeruah too strong for them. Pray Sir what would yow have had them doing in this case, mutinying or deserting there hath been

⁵⁷ For General Hugh Mackay of Scourie, see the entry by T. F. Henderson in *DNB*; John Mackay, *Life of Lieut. Gen. Hugh Mackay of Scourie* (Edinburgh, 1836).

⁵⁸ Brigadier Barthold or Bartholomew Balfour commanded a regiment from the Scots Brigade in Holland, see *Life and Diary of Lt. Col. J. Blackader*, p. 68. He was killed at the Battle of Killiecrankie on 27th July 1689.

⁵⁹ The Lord Angus' Regiment was at Doune on 7th July 1689 when it received orders to march to Inverary; Wodrow, *Analecta*, Vol. 1, pp. 190-191.

⁶⁰ Inserted above text.

⁶¹ Unclear in the original. Editorial suggestion to fit the sense.

⁶² Inserted above text.

too much of already, which as it is inexpressibly scandalous,
So nothing
 hath more strengthened these men and weakened the Regiment's
 hands in contending against them than the way which hath been con-
 stantly condemned in all ages. This yow have to prove that
 it is always ane association sinfull not only to them that
 admit offensive officers but to them that join when they are ad-
 mitted to command in a Regiment, and there is no other way for the
 Regiment in that case to free themself of the sin of that association but
 by dissolving and coming off; If this had ever been the sentiment
 of the godly in former times, I wonder how ever they would stay
 so long in Regiments, as many times they have done, for I
believe

(page 16)

I believe it cannot be instanced upon or proven there was a Regiment
 in this world that wanted sons of Belial which broke out in
scandalous
 offenses. And I wonder that our enemies never could fall upon the al-
 ready expedient which this nation might suggest to them to break all
 the honest Regiments in the earth by sending some wicked officers
 to insinuate their fellows into command among them which by their
 scandals ought make them all run and so needed never any
 armies to oppose them but make them break among themselves.

4. As to their associating with the army wherein there are employed
 and intrusted many enemies of truth and godliness, I confess this
 is a very grievous sin being upon the land, upon the King, upon the
 state, upon the general officers, upon the Church wherewith
 a malignant enemy of truth and godliness should be admitted and
 crept into places of power and trust, I wish it were honestly and
 faithfully remonstrated to the world, My Lord Angus, his Regiment
 hath essayed it severall times, and I am apt to believe hath done
 it more publicly and plainly than any party now standing
 in the earth hath done. It is very easy for men at a distance
 to speak of that sin behind backs, and to withdraw from contending
 against it. But it is not so easy in the midst of such ane associated
 enemy to witness against the sin of the association and yet to

maintain the duty of fighting for Religion, Liberty, and Country in despite of all that will either oppose or concur. This that Regiment hath done, they thought it their duty to appear in this expedition and that none had greater right or reason or obligation to fight against the common enemy than they.

They were the first⁶³

End of Document

⁶³ The journal entry ends abruptly with these words.