



**University of Dundee**

## **The Urban Community in Restoration Scotland**

Kennedy, Allan

*Published in:*  
Northern Scotland

*DOI:*  
[10.3366/nor.2014.0072](https://doi.org/10.3366/nor.2014.0072)

*Publication date:*  
2014

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Kennedy, A. (2014). The Urban Community in Restoration Scotland: Government, Society and Economy in Inverness, 1660-c.1688. *Northern Scotland*, 5, 26-49. <https://doi.org/10.3366/nor.2014.0072>

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**The Urban Community in Restoration Scotland:  
Government, Society and Economy in Inverness, 1660-c.1688**

More than twenty-five years ago, Michael Lynch, as part of a summary of the state of early-modern urban studies in Scotland, remarked that ‘urban politics in the Restoration period is known only in outline’.<sup>1</sup> Although this observation remains relevant, recent decades have witnessed an up-tick in research sufficient to demonstrate two distinct approaches to Scottish urban history in the later seventeenth century. Firstly, some work has considered the burghs as an estate. Both John Toller’s assessment of the convention of royal burghs and Gillian MacIntosh’s investigation of parliament emphasise the extent to which these institutions provided the burghs with not only a feeling of corporate identity, but also a sense of direct involvement in the workings of the Scottish state.<sup>2</sup> The second general approach considers towns as individual entities, and studies of this kind have posed a number of important questions about the nature of burgh communities. What were their social dynamics, particularly in terms of the relationship between merchants and other social groups? How were their governing elites composed, and what was the extent of their competence? What trading patterns did burghs display? How were urban economies linked to their rural hinterlands? Such questions form the core around which much of the existing work on Scottish burghs has been built.<sup>3</sup>

While all of this has immeasurably improved our understanding of Scottish towns in the later seventeenth century, important limitations remain. The ‘burghs-as-estate’ paradigm has as yet been sketched only in outline; the general conclusions of Toller and MacIntosh await proper verification through detailed case-studies. Meanwhile, the ‘burghs-as-community’ approach is heavily dependent upon research

into the four (inherently atypical) big towns which would later evolve into Scotland's major cities, namely Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dundee and Aberdeen.<sup>4</sup> The present article therefore seeks to build upon the existing framework through a detailed analysis of one town, Inverness, during the Restoration. By adding data drawn from a mid-sized burgh, such a study will help test both of the dominant paradigms, not least because, as the only major town in the Highlands, Inverness faced a distinct set of social, cultural and geographical challenges which render its case particularly interesting. The article will be divided into four sections. First, it will explore the size of Inverness, both in absolute terms and in relation to Scotland's other towns. Second, it will look at burgh society, concentrating specifically on professional structures and the role of the Church. Third, it will consider the nature and preoccupations of burgh governance. The article will conclude with a survey of Inverness' relationship to the wider world beyond the confines of the town.

### Status and Size

A general sense of Inverness' place within the urban landscape of Scotland can be gained from a survey of tax rolls. Toller has divided the sixty-four burghs included in these lists into three classes – forty-eight small burghs, eleven mid-sized towns and five large cities.<sup>5</sup> Inverness can be placed towards the top of the mid-range. In 1665, the town's share of burgh taxation, as calculated by the convention of royal burghs, stood at 2.2%. This was the eighth-largest contribution, behind the five big towns of Edinburgh (36%), Dundee (7%), Aberdeen (7%), Glasgow (6%) and Perth (4%), and the mid-sized centres of St Andrews (2.7%) and Kirkcaldy (2.4%). Revisions in 1670 reduced the Invernessian share to 1.8%, or joint ninth alongside

Stirling and Haddington and now below Montrose, while further adjustments in 1683, despite leaving the Invernessian contribution unchanged, raised the town to joint-eighth by reducing the burdens on St Andrews and Hamilton.<sup>6</sup> These figures suggest that, by the later seventeenth century, Inverness was firmly anchored in its position as one of the ten or eleven most economically significant towns in Scotland.

Tax rolls also reflect something of Inverness' provincial significance. It was easily the most important urban centre within eighty miles in any direction. Along the Moray coast, Nairn's tax burden stood at 0.2% in 1665, altering to 0.15% after 1670. The figures for Forres remained consistent at 0.3%, while those for Elgin (Inverness' closest local rival) rose from 0.7% in 1665 to 1% in 1670 and 1.2% in 1683. To the north, the next largest contribution came from Tain, which accounted for 0.5% of total tax, followed, in descending order, by Cromarty (0.3%), Fortrose (0.3%), Dornoch (0.15%), Wick (0.15%) and Dingwall (0.1%). If all this suggests that Inverness' position during the Restoration was not wholly stable, both in absolute terms and relative to its local rivals, it does not alter the more fundamental conclusion that it must have been (as it remains today) the most significant town in the north-west, and certainly in the Highlands, where it outstripped all the other royal burghs combined.<sup>7</sup>

The introductions, in 1691 and 1693 respectively, of the hearth and poll taxes provide the best opportunity for estimating the populations of Scottish towns in the late seventeenth century.<sup>8</sup> Both of these levies have left documents relating Inverness, but in both cases the material is problematic. The poll tax in particular is of limited value, since information survives only from 1699 and records just ninety-three pollable persons, which, if one person is taken to represent one household, and if a multiplier of 4.5 persons per household is applied (a figure which has been advanced by a number of historians as an acceptable estimate), would suggest an implausibly

small population of 419.<sup>9</sup> The hearth tax documents are more valuable in this context, but, thanks largely to a lack of national standardisation in their compilation, are still potentially misleading.<sup>10</sup> They show collection of hearth money from 145 individuals, as well as eleven people who failed to pay and thirty-two poor persons. This would suggest a total of 188 households by the end of the seventeenth century, which (again using the multiplier of 4.5) yields a population estimate of 846. This is also far too low, and can be explained by some peculiarities within the documentation. The rolls show that there were 1,163 hearths in Inverness by the mid-1690s.<sup>11</sup> Dividing this total by the number of respondents suggest an average of 6.2 hearths per household – a figure which, given estimates that the Scottish average was around 1.5, as well as Helen Dingwall’s calculation that the average in Edinburgh was between 1.5 and 3, is clearly far too high.<sup>12</sup> This oddity arises from the fact that a few respondents gave a combined figure for themselves and all their tenants or dependents. For example, the merchant William Cumming paid for thirty-two hearths, while provost William Duff paid for thirty, and both the laird of Inshes and John Stewart paid for twenty-nine. In confirmation of this problem, it should be noted that the surviving poll tax records, limited as they are, record around fifty individuals not included in the hearth tax registers and who must therefore have been lumped together with their landlords.

If, instead of dividing the total number of Invernessian hearths by the number of respondents, Dingwall’s figure of 1.5 is used, this gives an estimate of 775 households, which in turn suggests a total population of 3,487. This, however, is too large, since the manuscripts make no distinction between domestic and commercial hearths – clearly some of the seven hearths attributed to the sword-shaper John Clerk were in his workshop, not his home, and the same goes for the ten hearths ascribed to

the glazier Robert Innes or the eight hearths of the brewer William Miller. Dingwall's analysis of Edinburgh suggests that some 85% of the capital's total hearths were domestic, and if this figure is extended to Inverness, it implies that there were around 989 domestic hearths.<sup>13</sup> Using the same formulae as above, this yields estimates of 659 households and 2,965 people. Of course, all of these calculations must remain highly speculative, but it seems reasonable to estimate that Inverness' population by the later seventeenth century was somewhere in the region of 2,500-3,000, naturally much smaller than current estimates for Edinburgh (*c.*27,000-30,000, rising to *c.*40,000-47,000 if satellite settlements are included), Glasgow (*c.*12,000), Aberdeen (*c.*9,000) and Dundee (*c.*8,000), but probably comparable with such mid-sized centres as Stirling or Ayr.<sup>14</sup>

### Social Structures

Historians have long recognised the value of hearth and poll tax documents in helping reconstruct the social composition of Scotland's towns, but the relative dearth of such data makes this task much harder for Inverness.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, there is sufficient information to suggest that Inverness, in common with most other mid-sized burghs, was a merchants' town. No fewer than seventy-one of the ninety-eight pollable persons recorded in 1699 were engaged in trade. Merchants were the only people incorporated into a guild (at least prior to proposals of 1676, for which see below), and they dominated the town's burgh class. Moreover, the hearth tax records indicate that some of them were very consequential individuals indeed. When most merchants held 1,000-5,000 merks of stock, provost William Duff and dean of guild John Barbour each held 40,000, as did bailie John Mackintosh; bailiff Robert

Ross, David Fraser and John Dunbar each had 20,000; and seven different people had 10,000.<sup>16</sup> Such wealth – which was very respectable even by the standards of the largest Scottish burghs – ensured these men represented the very cream of merchant and thus burgh society.<sup>17</sup>

Yet Inverness also boasted a not insignificant complement of craftsmen and artisans. Surviving testaments mention sixteen craftsmen during the Restoration, comprising tailors, shoemakers, glovers, tanners, malters, carpenters, weavers, bakers and smiths.<sup>18</sup> Given the notoriously patchy nature of testament data this can only be a proportion of Inverness' artisan population, and indeed the poll tax returns provide further examples. They refer to an apothecary (Joseph Robertson), a goldsmith (Robert Elphinstone), a wig-maker (George Anderson), a watch-maker (Thomas Killgour), three glovers over and above those leaving testaments (Thomas Richie, John Polson and Angus Polson) and a glazier (Robert Innes). To this list can be added artisans mentioned in the hearth tax records but who did not leave surviving testaments in this period, such as four weavers (Donald Henry, Alexander Henry, John Henry and James Mackay), two carpenters (John McConnachie and Andrew Munro), two smiths (Gilbert Gow and Alexander Munro), a sword-sharpener (John Clerk), two masons (Andrew Ross and Alexander Tulloch), a tailor (John Baillie), a butcher (James Fraser) and no fewer than seven shoemakers (Robert Robertson, James Fraser, Thomas Green, Donald Cuthbert, James Winson, William Baillie and William Slavin).<sup>19</sup> Inverness may have been a merchants' town, and there is certainly nothing to suggest that its artisans achieved the heights of influence won by their counterparts in a place like Perth, but merchants needed access to a wide range of services, and these Inverness was clearly well able to provide.<sup>20</sup>

Merchants and craftsmen dominated the upper stratum of Invernessian society (aside from scattered references to petty functionaries like sheriff-clerks or notaries, there is little evidence that the town had developed the kind of professional class present in Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Perth or St Andrews), while the vast bulk of the population must have consisted of a faceless mass of labourers, unincorporated traders and resident poor.<sup>21</sup> Yet elite status did not necessarily translate into a luxurious existence. Winifred Coutts' study of early- to mid-seventeenth-century Dumfries has demonstrated the value of testament data in reconstructing urban lifestyles, a methodology which has also been utilised by Laura Stewart in relation to Edinburgh. While Coutts and Stewart uncovered clear hierarchies of affluence capped by some very rich individuals, Invernessian testaments reveal rather more modest patterns of moveable wealth.<sup>22</sup> Most testators left a handful of animals, usually cows or horses, although other animals did occasionally appear – Alexander Baillie (d.1668) owned three ducks, while John Dick (d.1669), a cobbler, had six sheep. The largest recorded menagerie, which consisted of four horses, six cows, three ducks and eighteen sheep, belonged to merchant burgess James Fraser (d.1664).<sup>23</sup> Merchant wares or professional equipment was also of course common. Margaret Dunbar (d.1666), the widow of cobbler Thomas Greine, left twenty-four hides and ten pairs of completed shoes; merchant Alexander Grant (d.1667) held a wide array of goods including measuring jugs of various sizes, two stones of iron, two stones of wool, twenty-four stones of 'strae wald' (a type of dye) and more than 200 ells of mixed fabric; and baker Alexander Hopkirk (d.1680) owned substantial quantities of wheat, flour and oatmeal, alongside baking wheels and storage containers.<sup>24</sup>

That said, a substantial minority of people owned some personal affects. Mettie Macconchie (d.1666), widow of shoemaker William Monro, left a fairly



extensive inventory which included pewter crockery, three chests, a feather bed and a gold ring. Glover John Hossack (d.1668) owned, amongst other items, a table (with a ‘tassle’), four chairs, three beds, two towels and assorted pots, pans and containers. James Cuthbert, town clerk (d.1679) held crockery, mostly pewter but some silver, along with tables, chests and a sword.<sup>25</sup> But these collections were rarely of any great value – Hossack’s whole estate was worth just £31 Scots, while Cuthbert’s amounted to £128 Scots – and the testament evidence seems to suggest a generally modest level of consumption for most Invernessians.

Testament data also demonstrates the ready availability of credit in Inverness; testators, on average, died owing around £400-£450 Scots and with £350-£400 Scots owing to them. Much of this was unpaid duties or simple credit advanced to cover the cost of goods and services, but some individuals supplemented their incomes by acting as money-lenders. Robert Polson, at the time of his death in 1660, maintained a ledger of unpaid cash debts owed by numerous individuals in Scotland and the Netherlands amounting to some £1500 Scots. Most of the £695 Scots owing to Thomas Sadge (d.1667) came from cash loans plus interest. The most compelling example, however, was burgess John Cowy, who had advanced credit exceeding £6600 Scots to a vast number of local individuals before he died in 1667.<sup>26</sup>

A striking feature of all this is the near-invisibility of Gaels. The families which dominated Invernessian society – the Cuthberts or the Duffs for example – were all of Lowland extraction. That it not to say, of course, that Gaelic names were absent; John Macconchie was a merchant burgess in the 1660s (worth more than £680 Scots at the time of his decease), while Donald McGealmish worked as a weaver prior to his death in 1680, although of course it is not certain that such individuals were linguistically Gaels. The example of John Mcconchie vic tawie, a man of unknown

occupation who died in 1664 leaving no moveable goods save the ‘worth of self’, is a reminder that there must also have been a Gaelic component amongst the common townsfolk – indeed, the English traveller Thomas Kirk, who visited Inverness in 1677, went so far as to suggest that ‘all in the town of Inverness do generally use that language [Gaelic], except some few of the better sort’.<sup>27</sup> But Gaels generally stood outside the official burghal community; none served as magistrates in this period, and only eight individuals with Gaelic names appeared on the roster of the town council (a Macian, a Macbean, three Mackintoshes and three Macleans). The absence of Gaelic preaching throughout the Restoration – the Gaelic charge established under the covenanters in 1641 had lapsed by 1660, and no effort was made to resurrect it until after the 1688-89 Revolution – further testifies to Highlanders’ marginal status within the town.<sup>28</sup> This accorded with Inverness’ view of itself as an emphatically Lowland centre, which in turn, given its geographical situation, produced an ingrained siege mentality. Such nervousness was clearly on display in the council’s reaction to the projected withdrawal of the Cromwellian garrison in 1662:

The quhilk day The Counsell wnderstanding that the garisone ar to remov schortlie and that this burghe Lyand in the mouth of the hylands quhair ther ar many disaffected personis subject to povertie and givin to thift and robarie foir preiventins of any such Inwasiones wpon this place the Counsell think it expedient and verie necessar That ewrie Inhabitant of this burgh be sufficientlie furnished with wapons for ther owne defence.<sup>29</sup>

In short, despite its proximity to Gaeldom and its hosting of a large Gaelic population, Inverness displayed precious little sympathy with or receptivity to Gaelic culture.

Rather, it tended to view itself as an island of Lowland civility surrounded by wild Highland barbarity.

Invernessian society, like urban society across Scotland, was thus fundamentally hierarchical, unequal and exclusive. But a sense of shared identity cutting across such division was provided by the Church, which also promoted ideals of civic harmony tending to reinforce secular authority.<sup>30</sup> In the Invernessian case, the population was served by two parish churches, one (the first charge) on the east banks of the river Ness, and one (the second charge, often known as the ‘chapel’) on the west. The extant records are relatively silent on the state of provision in these two charges, and given that these same records are awash with reports about the poor condition of church buildings elsewhere in Inverness presbytery, this would seem to suggest that the town’s churches were in a comparatively good state.<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, concerns were sometimes raised, particularly in relation to the second charge, whose church had already been regarded as unfit for use in 1641. It was said to be in need of urgent repair in 1674, while its churchyard dyke was condemned as ‘ruinous’ in 1686, although the extent of the decay denoted by this word is unclear.<sup>32</sup> Both Invernessian charges benefited from fairly smooth succession of ministers. The first was served by three, James Sutherland, Alexander Clerk and Angus Mcbean, whose ministries were separated by gaps of only a few months in 1673-4 and 1683. The second, meanwhile, also had three ministers in this period, James Sutherland, Alexander Clerk (both serving briefly before transportation to the first charge) and Gilbert Marshall, again with only a few months of vacancy in-between.<sup>33</sup>

Yet Invernessians did not feel the Church solely, or even primarily through its physical presence. The early-modern Church was for many Scots the most immediate and influential manifestation of public authority in their lives, a position maintained

especially through its social functions.<sup>34</sup> Lack of records unfortunately makes it impossible to reconstruct the precise contours of this relationship – we cannot, for example, know how the Invernessian Church dispensed poor relief, although the town did boast a hospital throughout the period and £40 Scots was set aside by the council each year for the assistance of the poor.<sup>35</sup> Nonetheless, the Kirk's authority would clearly have been felt, especially through ecclesiastical discipline, the rigorous enforcement of which Inverness shared with the rest of the country. In 1673, for instance, Bessie Dean was summoned before the presbytery because she had given birth to a child ten months after her husband had left for France, although because no 'scandalous conversatione or bad report' was entered, she was able to convince the authorities that the child was simply overdue, and so escaped censure.<sup>36</sup>

Ecclesiastical authority was also felt in education, something for which the Scottish Church would remain statutorily responsible until the nineteenth century. There had long been a school in Inverness, and at the start of the Restoration its master was named as William Cumming. He was replaced in 1663 by James Stewart, and the names of five further schoolmasters are also known – John Cuthbert (1669), Alexander Rose (1673), George Dunbar (before 1682), John Munro (1682) and Alexander Sutherland (1685).<sup>37</sup> The council, in its capacity as patron, proved an assiduous supporter of the school, both by ensuring a steady succession of masters and by offering material reinforcement; not least, the master was paid £113 6s 8d Scots per year out of the burgh's 'common good'.<sup>38</sup> More broadly, plans were set in motion for providing a new school-house at the end of 1663, when it was decided that a building owned by the council 'at the bridgend' should be repaired for this purpose, but by mid-1664 it had instead been decided to construct a brand new building beside the hospital. This seems to have been achieved, and by 1665 there was further talk of

building a new lodging-house for the master and children.<sup>39</sup> This apparently never happened, but the ‘Gramer School’ was nonetheless said to be ‘thriveing’ in 1672.<sup>40</sup>

The support provided by the council in educational matters reflected a broader trend of close cooperation between secular and ecclesiastical authorities.<sup>41</sup> This might take the form of the council protecting the Church’s resources. In 1675, for example, it ordered that in future ‘no persone presume to erect or build up any monument in the [...] chappelyeard’ without express permission, while in 1683, ‘for the better erecting and building of the chappelyaird dyck’, charges were imposed for all those wishing to bury their dead.<sup>42</sup> The civil authorities might also lend their weight to the Church’s moral agenda, as in 1680, when a number of statutes ‘for the advancement of peace’ included regulations against selling liquor, leading animals or travelling on the sabbath. The following year, an ordinance was passed threatening imprisonment on anybody caught swearing.<sup>43</sup> The Church also sought the assistance of secular elites (many of whom probably served as elders) in the enforcement of discipline. John Forbes of Culloden, for example, was requested in 1667 to help the minister of the first charge, Alexander Clerk, in investigating a case of sabbath-breaking involving some of his tenants.<sup>44</sup> At the level of burgh government, therefore, the authority of ‘Church’ and ‘State’ was closely intertwined, a situation which reflected the position of the Church in wider Scottish society and in Scottish towns in particular.

The close cooperation between civil and ecclesiastical authorities should not be allowed to obscure the very real problem of religious nonconformity. Three men were reportedly fined for displaying presbyterian proclivities in 1671, while the wife of George Cuthbert of Castlehill was suspected of harbouring a presbyterian cell in the early 1680s.<sup>45</sup> Perhaps more seriously, the minister of the first charge, Angus Macbean, abandoned the established Church in the wake of the 1687 Toleration

Edicts, which permitted worship outside the official Church of Scotland, proceeding to hold a number of house conventicles within the town. There were also occasional reports of Catholic adherence. One John Bishop was processed against for being a Catholic in 1668, and was apparently persuaded to re-join the episcopalian Church. More notably, Sir John Byres of Coats was rumoured in 1674 to have hosted ‘a great conventione of Papists in the Castell’. He was excommunicated for his troubles.<sup>46</sup> Such stories thoroughly alarmed the town authorities, but individual dissent of this kind never threatened to undermine the established Church. Rather, it seems that most Invernessians were willing to conform, and certainly there is nothing to suggest the levels of religious unrest found in many of the larger towns or in the urban centres of the presbyterian south-west.

### Burgh Government

If urban society in Inverness conformed to the basic patterns of other Scottish towns in the early-modern period, albeit with some local twists, the same can be said for its systems of government.<sup>47</sup> At the pinnacle of political authority stood a group of seven men. The provost was the symbolic head of the urban community. Four bailies were responsible for enforcing order through the burgh court, as well as for collecting taxes. A treasurer, charged with managing the ‘common good’, and a dean of guild completed the office-holding elite, or ‘magistrates’. Assisting these men was a larger, annually-elected town council generally twenty-one strong. Theoretically, all burgesses were eligible for election to the council. In practice, since an outgoing council elected its successor, it was subject to tight oligarchic control. Usually between 70% and 90% of councillors at any given time had also served during the

immediately preceding year, producing a total pool across the entire Restoration of sixty-one different men representing thirty-two families.<sup>48</sup>

The magistracy itself was similarly closed. The position of provost, with the exception of Robert Rose's brief service (1662-63), alternated during the Restoration between members of the Cuthbert and Dunbar families, and more specifically between just three men – Alexander Cuthbert, Alexander Dunbar and John Cuthbert. The twenty-four recorded elections of bailies between 1660 and James VII's suspension of urban elections in 1685 reveal just thirteen different office-holders, two each from the Cuthbert, Fraser, Robertson and Stewart families and one each from the Barbours, Duffs, Foulers, Hepburns and Roses, each serving on average seven terms. There were five different deans of guild, but for at least half the period Robert Barbour held the post. As for the position of treasurer, six different incumbents are recorded – George Cumming, William Duff elder and younger, Hugh Robertson, William Robertson and James Stewart. Altogether, a strangle-hold on the magistracy was maintained by a group of just ten office-holding dynasties, and these same families were similarly ubiquitous as representatives to parliament and the convention of royal burghs. To the former, Inverness sent Cuthberts (on six occasions), Frasers (four), Barbours (one) and Duffs (one); to the latter, choice fell on Cuthberts (thirteen), Barbours (five), Duffs (three), Frasers (three), Polsons (one) and Stewarts (one).<sup>49</sup> In short, active involvement in Invernessian government was the preserve of a tight clique, whose solidarity was certainly reinforced by inter-marriage.<sup>50</sup> The entrenchment of oligarchic government was common to most Scottish burghs in the post-Reformation period, and Inverness' pattern was in this respect entirely typical.<sup>51</sup>

As the embodiments and guardians of the privileges laid down in their foundation charters, burgh governments in early modern Scotland discharged a

number of common duties. They provided certain social services, usually in partnership with the Church, and we have already seen how Inverness' council sought to furnish the town with facilities for education and poor relief. Beyond this, burgh councils' activities can be divided into two broad classes – the maintenance of public order, and the oversight of common resources. The Invernessian case conformed to these general patterns, although naturally the details reflected the unique dynamics of local society.<sup>52</sup>

Nonetheless, the primary concern facing Inverness' council at the start of the Restoration was distinctly atypical, for it was faced with deciding the fate of the town's Cromwellian citadel. Built in the mid-1650s, reputedly at a cost of £80,000 sterling, the fort had been amongst the largest of the republican regime's military installations in Scotland.<sup>53</sup> With the return of the king, such martial control went decidedly out of fashion, and on the very day it reconvened in July 1661, the privy council issued orders for the demolition of the four major forts at Inverness, Leith, Ayr and Perth. In each case, the job of supervising this process was given to a local luminary who would, by way of compensation, be permitted to retain the building materials for himself.<sup>54</sup> Alexander Stewart, 5<sup>th</sup> earl of Moray was the man chosen for Inverness, but his task proved difficult. In January 1662, six months after its initial orders, the privy council complained that the tardiness of the demolition work was delaying the English withdrawal.<sup>55</sup> Despite this rebuke, progress remained elusive, largely because Moray's rights did not go unchallenged. In April, the earl ordered the people of Strathspey to work on the demolition, but the most important local laird, James Grant of Freuchie, absolutely refused to allow this.<sup>56</sup> Freuchie staked his own claim to the fort in June by reaching an agreement with the privy council to send workers, but when these men reached Inverness, they declared themselves unable to



carry out the work because Moray had failed to send an overseer – perhaps a retaliatory act of sabotage.<sup>57</sup> The citadel was still standing in 1666, when the government allocated its materials to pay the still outstanding arrears owing to the workmen who had during the 1650s constructed the fort at Leith. A merchant named John Sempill was appointed to carry out the demolition. This latest project was however foiled by the council, which, arguing that the materials belonged to the burgh since the sconce was built on its common land, ordered a campaign of sabotage against Sempill. The sale of part of the fort to the English timber speculator Phinaes Pett later in the year was looked upon with more favour. Control over the obsolete citadel was a lucrative business, and the resulting competition ensured that it was never fully demolished.<sup>58</sup>

Local resistance may also have played a part in stalling the process of demolition. The government had initially envisaged that the English soldiers would remain in place until after the demolition work had been completed, so as to avoid the empty citadel falling into the wrong hands. Until the demands of English foreign policy forced the troops to leave in the spring of 1662, Invernessians had not been keen to see them go. The council, for its part, feared that English withdrawal would have an adverse impact upon the town's security.<sup>59</sup> More generally, James Fraser of Wardlaw claimed that the soldiers, having been stationed at Inverness for more than a decade, had developed an emotional bond with the townspeople:

Never people left a place with such reluctance. It was even sad to see and heare sighs and teares, pale faces and embraces, at their parting farewell from that town. And no wonder; they had peace and plenty for 10 yeares in it. They made that place happy, and it made them so.<sup>60</sup>

The garrison had also provided economic opportunities. During its construction, one local laird, Hugh Fraser of Struy, earned thirty thousand merks – some £240,000 Scots – selling timber, while the generous wages of one shilling per day paid to the workman caused so many people to volunteer that, according to Fraser of Wardlaw, there was almost nobody left for any other work. Relations with the garrison thereafter were equally lucrative. In April 1655, the council granted it the use of some carseland, but only in return for feu duties amounting to forty shillings, and a promise by the garrison that it would contribute towards repairing the bridge over the river Ness. Equally, the soldiers attracted exotic English goods which could then be accessed by the townspeople. These luxuries included superior-quality cloth, fine claret, a pint of which could be bought for one shilling, and reliable medical services under the army's physicians and surgeons.<sup>61</sup> Given all of this, it is not hard to imagine that Inverness may have viewed the English withdrawal with a fair degree of sadness.

With the loss of the English garrison, responsibility for the security of Inverness devolved back onto the council. Its response – establishing a nightly watch – paralleled that of many burghs in this period, although constraints of size and resources ensured that Inverness had to settle for a citizens' militia instead of the professional guards sometimes deployed in larger towns like Edinburgh.<sup>62</sup> In March 1662, the council commissioned three burgesses to investigate how well supplied were the town's residents with weapons, and to suggest how many new weapons would need to be acquired. The following month, a nightly guard of twelve men was inaugurated, in which all male inhabitants would serve on a rotating call-up. In 1677, the council laid out exactly how this force would be organised. From October to

April, a full armed watch was to be maintained between 9pm and 6am. This was to be reduced to four men between 6am and dawn, who were to patrol the ‘marcat place’ and the ‘back laines’. The same would happen from April to October, but the full watch would convene between 10pm and 4am only. During the night, armed guards were to be placed at the tolbooth, the provost’s house and the guard house, while the rest of the men were to undertake armed patrols throughout the town every two hours. The captain of the watch was also instructed to keep a detailed roster of his force, and any man who failed in his duty, or who slipped away during the night, would suffer a hefty fine. The captain would be similarly liable in case of failure.<sup>63</sup>

Despite these grandiose plans, actually sustaining the watch proved difficult. By 1664, there was ‘so much slacknes and want of observance’ that a new supervisory structure had to be imposed. In 1669 it was ordered that the watch would be called together by ringing the tolbooth bells to mark the start and end of the watch period; any man failing to report would have his name recorded for punishment, possibly even imprisonment. A spate of fraudulent claims for exemption caused the council in 1672 to issue a declaration that nobody (save ex-magistrates) was excused from serving. By 1674, the captains of the watch, whose ‘great slacknes’ was much lamented, were being strenuously enjoined to display more dedication (as they were again in 1681), and from 1678 the magistrates themselves were having to make regular inspections of the watch.<sup>64</sup> The town authorities may have considered the maintenance of a nightly watch a crucial precaution against disturbance and attack, but it seems that the townsfolk were not entirely willing to give up their time and resources to serve the council’s purpose.

The council also sought to uphold justice by providing itself with the capacity to imprison wrong-doers. To this end it allocated some £53 Scots per year from its

common good to rent a vault within the tolbooth from the merchant Alexander Cuthbert for use as a gaol. The effectiveness of this was somewhat reduced by the difficulty of finding reliable gaolers. In February 1667 the incumbent, John Innes, was deprived of his post because he had facilitated the escape from the tolbooth of a prisoner named James Moire. Innes tried to excuse himself by claiming that he had temporarily entrusted the prison keys to one Alexander Blackwood, but the council was unimpressed. A new system, whereby the keys were entrusted each night to one of the magistrates, was swiftly created, but from the following year the keepership was entrusted to a rotating commission of some twenty eminent townsmen. Still the gaol remained problematic; a nightly guard of five armed sentries was imposed in 1674, and in 1680 the council rebuked the key-holders for negligence and threatened to fine them for any costs incurred through prisoners' escape.<sup>65</sup>

Linked to the issues of security and gaol provision, the council also concerned itself with regulating vagabonds. On one level, beggars were regarded as an unsightly nuisance, as a regulation passed in 1680 implies:

Item that no vagabound or idle persone be found going in the streets in tym of Sermon wnder the paine of Warding ther persounes and punishing them at the Magistrats discretion and that noe person vaig in the streets after Sermone vpon the lords day but that all withdraw themselves to ther homes and houses.<sup>66</sup>

Of equal concern, however, was the perennial worry that poor people in the town might be incomers who had contributed nothing to the community but were nonetheless seeking to support themselves from its resources – people like Margaret McHendrick, who in 1674 was reported to be 'going about from Paroche to paroche

begging, not having anything of her own'.<sup>67</sup> The burgh authorities took the challenge posed by such individuals very seriously. In March 1670, it was ordered that one of the bailies would 'wiewe ewerie streit' in order to locate and imprison any unknown vagabonds receiving alms. A similar statute was passed in 1676, after the council received word that 'ther ar sewerall persons strangers [...] stolen in quyetlie to this brughe' and who now 'wanting calling and wocationes, yet are manteaned be the paying and trawells of honest persons'. By 1685, a slightly different approach was being tried. All innkeepers were instructed, under pain of fining, to inform the town magistrates whenever they gave rooms to strangers, presumably with a view to monitoring and ejecting them.<sup>68</sup>

Resource management was the final great preoccupation of internal burgh governance. Maintenance of public buildings was part of this; money was advanced in 1669 to construct 'ane double doore of daills with cheekis of oak at the nether stop of the stair going up to the over counsell hous with sufficient locks bands and steaples'.<sup>69</sup> Funds were allocated to repair the door of the town gaol in 1680, and eight years later the mason James Dick was employed to construct a new steeple for the tolbooth – this on top of the £40 allocated each year for its general maintenance.<sup>70</sup>

In addition, common land was jealously protected. The council's sabotage of John Sempill's efforts to dismantle the Cromwellian fortifications has already been noted, but a rather more protracted conflict erupted in 1674, when the council heard that Sir John Byres of Coats was using part of the town's haugh land as pasture. On being challenged, Coats stated that he had licence from the marquis of Huntly, who claimed ownership of the land in question. Demurring, the council launched a legal challenge. The outcome of this is not recorded, although matters were clearly

unresolved in 1683, when the council was trying to stop Huntly from building a mill on the disputed land.<sup>71</sup>

Public cleanliness was of equal concern. In both 1668 and 1675 the council decreed that the many dunghills and middens encroaching on roadways should be removed; in 1677 it instructed that no ‘muck or dung’ was to be transported across the bridge, since doing so caused ‘harme and prejudice’; it was ordered in 1682 that all ‘curr dogs’ must be immediately culled; and to protect against flooding, all houses on the western banks of the river were in 1684 ordered to build bulwarks.<sup>72</sup> Natural resources were carefully husbanded. In 1681, a proclamation was issued prohibiting anyone from cutting green wood on the Ness islands, while another decree two years later sought to protect the pasture land on these same islands by banning the townsfolk from grazing their animals upon it. Slightly differently, the council grew alarmed in 1684 when a ‘water wark’ (perhaps cruives or weirs and sluices for a mill) built upstream from the burgh by William Baillie of Dunean threatened to curtail its access to fish and timber from Loch Ness. A three-man delegation was dispatched with orders to persuade Dunean to ‘remove the same and give passage to the fishing and timber as of old in former tymes’.<sup>73</sup>

However, the clearest example of the burgh’s involvement in resource and environmental management related to the bridge over the river Ness. The existing wooden structure was in a sorry state by the early 1660s, and in 1664 the council arranged for the purchase of timber from eighty trees to provide material for repairs. But the bridge collapsed before this could be completed, reputedly with 200 people upon it at the time (none, apparently, were killed). A new wooden replacement was quickly erected, but this proved unsatisfactory – Thomas Kirk condemned it as ‘rotten’ in 1677, and fifty trees had to be purchased for repair work in 1679 alone. A

sturdier stone bridge thus came to be seen as essential, but since the town itself was unable to bear the cost of such a project, the privy council in 1680 authorised a nationwide voluntary contribution. Collection of this was sluggish (although by 1685 nearly £6,000 Scots had been collected, mainly from the north and north-east), and so in 1681 parliament agreed that tolls of between 2d and 6d could be levied for a period of nineteen years after the completion of the bridge. Work seems to have commenced in late 1682, and was apparently completed by the spring of 1684. Although some unhappiness was initially expressed regarding the quality of the work carried out by the mason, James Smith, the magistrates were clearly proud of their new bridge; a commemorative panel was commissioned in 1685, due to include, among other things, four coats of arms (the king's, the burgh's, the provost's and the laird of Macleod's, the latter in recognition of his substantial financial contribution, although quite why he should have been so concerned is unclear) and the dates of the bridge's foundation and completion, while in 1687 a further order was passed 'to cause cast downe the porch of the Bridge on the East end therof' and construct 'a larger new Porch and a more glorious entrie'.<sup>74</sup> The burgh authorities had of course been heavily involved throughout the process of planning and constructing this new bridge, a stance which left it with debts of nearly £15,000 but which also emphasised the importance attached by the council to overseeing and maintaining burghal resources.

Meeting these various responsibilities required money, and most such costs were supposed to be met out of the 'common good', the financial resources belonging to the burgh as a community and managed by the town treasurer. The common good consisted of two broad streams of revenue (customs and feu duties) which together yielded an income of, on average, £1,150 Scots per year. However, regular expenditure was closer to £1,360 Scots each year, a deficit which, by 1684, had

saddled the burgh with debts of nearly £6,400 Scots (on top of obligations related to the construction of the bridge). Interest alone was costing £280 Scots per year.<sup>75</sup> This situation was fairly typical; expenditure in most Scottish burghs exceeded income throughout the Restoration.<sup>76</sup> The gap was presumably filled by borrowing, although additional stents were sometimes levied for specific purposes, something which the council imposed in 1665 (to pay the schoolmaster's salary), 1668 (for arrears of taxation) 1672 (to provide seamen for national naval service), 1675 (to pay legal costs incurred in Edinburgh) and twice in 1685 (to fund contributions towards the regional militia).<sup>77</sup>

### Outside Linkages

The distinctive patterns of urban society and government meant that Inverness, like other Scottish towns, was in many ways a closed, self-contained community. Yet at the same time, the burgh maintained important links with the world beyond its own limits. At the most basic level, Inverness shared in Scotland's common political culture by recognising royal milestones. For instance, the town celebrated the birthday of Charles II, and the anniversary of his return to British soil, by staging a parade of 'the wholl fensible men wethin this burghe' on 29 May each year, and it arranged a similar parade, accompanied by 'bone fires to be set on the streits befor each mans doore', to mark the accession of James VII in 1685.<sup>78</sup> A more tangible marker of the town's engagement with the wider Scottish scene was its attendance at parliament. As a royal burgh, Inverness was entitled to send a commissioner to each of the ten sessions of the Scottish parliament held under Charles II and James VII. It did so in all cases. Inverness also attended two out of the three conventions of estates



held during the Restoration – only at the convention of 1665 was an Invernessian commissioner missing. This was a more solid attendance record than any other Highland burgh. Dingwall and Tain both attended eleven meetings, Fortrose ten, Inveraray nine, Dornoch seven, Wick six and Cromarty (which ceased to be a royal burgh in 1685) only three.<sup>79</sup> Inverness clearly took its relationship with parliament seriously.

Partly, no doubt, this was because parliament had the power to confirm the town's accustomed rights. Thus, its charter and privileges were endorsed by the first parliament of Charles II's reign in 1661, and the same thing occurred in 1685 during the first parliament of James VII.<sup>80</sup> Moreover, Inverness, like every other burgh, recognised that the theatre of parliament allowed it to measure itself against competing towns. The commissioner for the 1685 session, John Cuthbert of Draikies, entered a protest for precedence over Haddington 'and other burghs ranked after that burgh and before Inverness'. He then wrote to the council requesting further instructions, which told him in response that if he could 'find ane oppen doore for him to get it done easily without debate at small charges' he should have the affair 'put to a touch at this present parliament'. A similar precedence protest had been entered in 1661, and in that year Inverness had also been quick to advertise its perceived superiority over both Fortrose and Cromarty by protesting against their admission to parliament.<sup>81</sup> This kind of positioning over relative seniority was an endemic and perennial feature of parliamentary politics, and Inverness' partaking of it reflects the town's conscious involvement in the national scene.

Alongside parliament, the other national institution with which Inverness was closely involved was the convention of royal burghs. Here Invernessian engagement was also strong; with a commissioner recorded at twenty-seven of the thirty-one

general convention meetings during the Restoration, the town's attendance rate stood at about 87%.<sup>82</sup> Failure to attend was normally excused by citing either financial hardship (as in 1671) or localised disorder (as in 1685 in reference to Argyll's rebellion). This was a much more consistent record than any of the other Highland burghs, and it accorded with Inverness' willingness to obey convention instructions. In 1680, the convention ordered the commissioners of Inverness, Tain, Dingwall, Nairn and Elgin to investigate the condition of Cromarty, which was attempting to have itself expunged from the roll of royal burghs. The following May, the council duly issued a call for the investigation to be held in June 1681, a summons to which all but Elgin responded.<sup>83</sup>

A slightly different illustration of Inverness' deference to the convention came in 1676, when an electoral dispute arose between the town's magistrates, guildry and trades. The convention sent a delegation comprising representatives from Perth, Dundee, Aberdeen, Montrose, Brechin, Queensferry, Forres, Dingwall and Fortrose, which on 11 September issued a lengthy report containing five headline recommendations 'for the peace and tranquillity of [...] Inverness'. These provisions sought to tighten up electoral procedures for both the council and the guild; to provide for the incorporation of new artisans guilds; to regulate burgh taxation; and to annul all outstanding legal proceedings between the disputants. Fourteen days later, the council endorsed the report and promised to 'fulfill and perform the hail heds and conditions conteined in the said decret in all poynts'.<sup>84</sup> It was common for royal burghs to use the convention as an arbiter of inter- or intra-burgh disputes, and that Inverness shared this approach serves to highlight the extent to which it viewed itself as part of Scotland's wider urban community.<sup>85</sup>

Inverness also remained locked into regional power networks. This exposure was symbolised by the tradition of holding an annual horse-race in the vicinity of the town, a custom revived during the Restoration after a mid-century hiatus. Local worthies, including the earl of Moray, the earl of Seaforth, lord Lovat and lord MacDonnell (Angus MacDonald of Glengarry) reputedly attended, along with various clan chiefs and ‘a great number of gentlemen’. The burgh authorities revelled in their role as hosts:

The Provost and Magistrates of Inverness, with the citizens, came in procession over the bridge to their bounded march, and, with the usual ceremony, hung the silver cup with blew ribbons upon the hookes off the painted port, the Sadle and the Sourd sett upon the top of it.<sup>86</sup>

This anecdote reflects a distinct consciousness of position on the part of Inverness, and a clear desire to project itself as an equal player on the regional stage. But it also highlights the intimate connection between Inverness and the nearby landed elite. Some local gentry families had acquired a stake in the burgh through possession of feued land; the Baillies of Dunean, for instance, held land at Bught, while the Mackenzies of Suddie feued part of Kessock.<sup>87</sup> Such families had long been influential in town affairs, sometimes serving as magistrates or representing Inverness on the national stage. Co-operation offered potential advantages for both sides, but lairds’ interests were not always compatible with those of the burgh community. The challenges are amply illustrated by the case of the King’s Mill. This mill, lying just to the east of the burgh, had been feued out by the council earlier in the seventeenth century. In the early 1660s a dispute arose between the feuars and the burgh

regarding the extracting of multures (a duty payable upon the grinding of grain). Specifically, the feuars wished to extend the levy to cover Inverness' entrepôt trade, whereby grain was brought in from outside the burgh, turned into malt and then exported overseas. The burgh objected that only grain grown within the town and its territories was liable for such impositions. The case went all the way to the Court of Session, and although no outcome is recorded, it is notable that the man most vociferous in pushing it was John Forbes of Culloden, a neighbouring gentleman and the only feuar who was not a burgess. Indeed, the other feuars, after unsuccessfully trying to persuade the council that their complaint was against a few private individuals rather than the burgh community, abandoned the process at the end of 1663, leaving Culloden to fight on alone until at least 1664.<sup>88</sup>

If relations with lairds could be fraught, unwanted attention from predatory nobleman, some of whom were keen to secure Inverness within their spheres of influence, was even worse. In 1665, for example, lord MacDonnell, using the excuse that some of his kinsmen had been unjustly attacked at the town market, marched on Inverness at the head of an armed retinue. He forced the magistrates to sign an agreement which, among other things, tacitly recognised the subservience of the town to MacDonnell, albeit this treaty was repudiated as soon as the clansmen withdrew.<sup>89</sup> Similarly, in 1670 Lovat had Robert Barbour, the town's dean of guild, arrested after a fair at Beaulie, which Barbour had been attending in an unspecified capacity. Lovat detained him on account of 'his dehortment [...] at beulie mercat', fining him £100. Outraged by this attempt to claim jurisdictional authority over the burgh, the council resolved to raise 500 merks with which to explore the possibility of initiating legal action.<sup>90</sup> That noblemen such as MacDonnell and Lovat should have been interested in securing domination over a local burgh is neither surprising nor unusual.<sup>91</sup> Such

treatment reflected the typicality of the Invernessian experience, while also demonstrating the extent of its involvement in wider power politics.

Economically too, Inverness was firmly anchored in the larger Scottish scene. Historians have become more and more aware in recent years that official records alone cannot provide a complete picture of early-modern trading patterns.<sup>92</sup> Nonetheless, the substantial customs books surviving from Restoration Inverness, particularly for the decade after 1680, can offer some important insights.<sup>93</sup> Of the 175 export journeys recorded for the period 1667-86, fully 115 of them, some 65%, were destined for the Dutch Republic, with the next largest export markets being England and Norway (12% each). Exports were dominated by three products – grains, skins and plaid. All of this aligned closely to national export patterns, which saw Scotland rely upon sending a mixture of raw agricultural produce and low-grade manufactures, principally to England, Scandinavia and the Low Countries. If Inverness diverged from the national norm, it was in the degree of its concentration on raw agricultural produce and rough textiles, at the expense of some of the less common Scottish exports, such as fish (exported only occasionally from Inverness), coal and salt (both recorded in no export cargoes). Such a pattern of specialisation was however fairly typical of burghs north of the Tay.<sup>94</sup>

Similar observations can be made regarding imports. Scotland had a number of core relationships in this area. Timber came from Norway; iron from Sweden; wine, salt and small manufactures from France; and emporium goods from England and the Dutch Republic. Lesser trading links were also forged with the southern Baltic, particularly Danzig and Königsberg, while some west-coast towns maintained channels with Ireland and, increasingly and often illicitly, America.<sup>95</sup> There is little to suggest Invernessian involvement in these latter relationships, but the town did

generally replicate core import patterns. Of the 126 recorded incoming loads between 1665 and 1686, fifty-nine (47%) came from the Dutch Republic, with France (17%), England (15%) and Norway (13%) sharing most of the remaining carriage. The goods received from these sources were entirely unremarkable. France tended to supply salt and wine, as well as brandy, vinegar and occasional other items. From Norway, Inverness received mainly timber, sometimes accompanied by associated materials like tar and whale bone. England and the Dutch Republic, meanwhile, provided a dizzying array of goods, including madder, alum, dried fruit, spices, tobacco and small manufactures.

Many burghs traded at least as frequently with Scottish as with foreign ports, creating internal networks for moving foreign products around the country. So, for example, Aberdeen received many of its imported goods from Montrose; Dutch imports usually reached Glasgow via Bo'ness; and most of the shipping entering Dundee, often carrying salt and coal, departed from ports in the Lothians or Fife.<sup>96</sup> By their very nature, Inverness' surviving customs accounts deal only with overseas trade and do not explicitly record coastal exchange, but they nonetheless provide clues that it existed. The usual approach for exporters was to purchase space on ships registered to other Scottish ports; only about 17% of exports were carried on Inverness-registered ships. Vessels were in fact most commonly from Leith, but could also originate from a large number of other ports from Findhorn to North Berwick.<sup>97</sup> Just as striking, some two-thirds of export cargoes were in fact not logged by Invernessian traders at all – about one-third came from Elgin (perhaps reflecting the fact that it had poorer access to the sea than Inverness), with the remainder owned by merchants from other east-coast burghs, including Forres, Aberdeen, Dundee, Edinburgh and Leith. Inverness may therefore have acted as the final major stop in an

export network, with ships, presumably partially-laden from prior stops elsewhere, picking up additional cargoes before setting off overseas.

Invernessian shipping was only slightly more prominent in imports than in exports, accounting for just one-quarter of incoming vessels. The bulk of the remaining 75% consisted of ships registered to other east-coast ports (most commonly Findhorn, Leith and Queensferry, but also many others), alongside a few non-Scottish centres, particularly London.<sup>98</sup> Local merchants, however, were much more dominant; at least 45% of incoming cargoes were logged by Invernessians, with a further 34% belonging to men from Elgin. Thus, there may well have been a pattern whereby Inverness imported goods either for itself or for immediate overland distribution to nearby centres, using ships which had previously unloaded cargoes at other Scottish ports.

All of this builds up a consistent picture. In the case of both exports and imports, commodities and trading partners conformed to Scottish norms. Moreover, the nature of the trade, dominated by merchants from Moray-coast burghs, is indicative of Inverness' centrality as a local hub. At the same time, the town's extensive use of outside shipping, combined with the frequent appearance as exporters of merchants from beyond the immediate hinterland, demonstrates its dependence upon the wider trading networks of eastern Scotland, with Inverness possibly acting as the end-point for internal exchange. Invernessian trade, then, was rooted in the wider trends of the Scottish economy.

## Conclusion

Throughout the Restoration, Inverness, with a population numbering up to 3,000, remained easily the largest and most important burgh in the Scottish Highlands. But despite its location, the town displayed precious little sympathy or engagement with Highlanders; Gaels were rarely prominent in burgh society, and when they were acknowledged at all it was usually in the guise of wild bandits ready to overrun the community. This Invernessian self-image as an oasis of civility in the wild Highlands was clearly exaggerated, but it also reflected the fundamental fact that Inverness cleaved to the common attributes of the burgh estate. Its social composition – a mix of merchants, artisans, resident poor and local gentry bound together (porously and imperfectly) by a sense of community reinforced through religion – was unremarkable. Its government, tightly controlled by an oligarchy of around ten office-holding dynasties, concerned itself with a typical range of issues surrounding internal security and resource- and financial management. Its trading activity was similarly normal, dominated by familiar import and export patterns. And, like other towns, Inverness maintained consistent social, economic and political links to the outside world, whether the immediate hinterland, other burghs, or central government.

Dig a little deeper, however, and the Invernessian experience begins to develop its own particular rhythms. It was a town dominated by its merchants, with much less occupational variety than Edinburgh, Aberdeen or Glasgow, and testament data in particular suggests fairly modest standards of personal wealth for most. Invernessian paranoia about the security threat posed by the surrounding Highlands reached levels shared by very few towns of comparable size, an intellectual posture which might, incidentally, help explain the council's strikingly detailed oversight of the nightly watch. Inverness' relationship with the Church was in broad terms fairly standard, but the precise patterns of ecclesiastical provision, secular engagement and



nonconformity were naturally distinct. Trading activity may not have been radically different from that characterising other east-coast burghs, yet the absence of explicit references to commerce within Scotland might indicate a peculiar position in the network of internal exchange. Furthermore, the specific patterns of regional lordship ensured that, while Inverness' relations with neighbouring nobles and gentlemen were typical in their difficulty, the manner of interaction was often unusual – few other significant towns were likely by the Restoration to face the force of armed warriors mustered by lord MacDonnell in 1665.

Inverness' experience can therefore make a contribution to both of the dominant paradigms of early-modern urban history in Scotland. In its adherence to the common patterns of burgh experience, its consciousness of position and its avid engagement with the national political culture, Inverness helps confirm the validity of the 'burghs-as-estate' approach, while indicating that towns' relationships with the wider environment were also informed by their own individual interests and preoccupations. At the same time, the 'burghs-as-community' framework benefits from greater appreciation of Invernessian patterns, since this mid-sized town's demographic, social, political and economic attributes were in their fine details quite distinct from the superficially similar trends uncovered for the better-understood 'big four' burghs. In short, Inverness provides local colour which serves as a reminder that, while accepting the fundamental commonality of the burgh experience in seventeenth-century Scotland, historians should be wary of underestimating the importance of regional distinctiveness.

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Lynch, 'Introduction: Scottish Towns 1500-1700' in M. Lynch (ed.), *The Early Modern Town in Scotland* (London, 1987), 1-36, at 18.

---

<sup>2</sup> J.M. Toller, ‘Now of little significance’? The Convention of the Royal Burgh of Scotland, 1651-1688’ unpublished PhD thesis (University of Dundee, 2010); G.H. MacIntosh, *The Scottish parliament under Charles II 1660-1685* (Edinburgh, 2007). Also see A.R. MacDonald, *The Burghs and Parliament in Scotland, c.1550-1651* (Aldershot, 2007), which has used this approach for an earlier period.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, H.M. Dingwall, *Late Seventeenth-Century Edinburgh: A Demographic Study* (Aldershot, 1994); R.A. Houston, *Social Change in the Age of the Enlightenment: Edinburgh, 1660-1760* (Oxford, 1994); T.M. Devine and G. Jackson (eds.), *Glasgow, volume 1: Beginnings to 1830* (Manchester, 1995); E.P. Dennison, D. Ditchburn and M. Lynch (eds.), *Aberdeen before 1800: A New History* (East Linton, 2002); C. McKean, B. Harris and C.A. Whatley (eds.), *Dundee: Renaissance to Enlightenment* (Dundee, 2009).

<sup>4</sup> There are of course a number of more general studies of smaller towns, some of which contain useful discussion of the Restoration. See, for example, W. Coutts, ‘Provincial Merchants and Society: A Study of Dumfries Based on the Register of Testaments, 1600-65’ in Lynch, *Early Modern Town*, 147-6; C. Mair, *Stirling: The Royal Burgh* (Edinburgh, 1990); G. Jackson and S.G.C. Lythe, *The Port of Montrose: A History of its Harbour, Trade and Shipping* (Tayport, 1993); D. Alston, *My Little Town of Cromarty* (Edinburgh, 2006); R. Lamont-Brown, *St Andrews: City by the Northern Sea* (Edinburgh, 2006); P. Martin, *Cupar* (Edinburgh, 2006). J. Miller, *Inverness* (Edinburgh, 2004) has some interesting, though largely descriptive material on the Restoration.

<sup>5</sup> Toller, ‘Now of little significance’?, 120.

<sup>6</sup> J.D. Marwick (ed.), *Records of the Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland*, 6 vols (Edinburgh, 1866-1915), iii, 584-86 and at 622-23; iv, 40.

---

<sup>7</sup> Another Highland town, Inveraray, had been formerly accepted as a royal burgh in 1649, but was not included in the tax rolls until 1689, when its valuation was set at 4s in the pound, or 0.2%. Marwick, *Royal Burghs*, ii, 445-45; iv, 90. ‘Highland’ in this context is taken to mean those shires most usually so described by contemporaries, namely Caithness, Sutherland, Ross-shire, Cromartyshire, Inverness-shire and Argyllshire.

<sup>8</sup> Edinburgh, National Records of Scotland [NRS], Inverness-shire Hearth Tax Records, E69/12; NRS, Inverness-shire Poll Tax Returns, E70/6/1, 1699.

<sup>9</sup> M. Flinn (ed.), *Scottish Population History from the Seventeenth Century to the 1930s* (Cambridge, 1977), 192; R.A. Houston and I.D. Whyte, ‘Introduction: Scottish society in perspective’ in R.A. Houston and I.D. Whyte (eds.), *Scottish Society, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 1989), 1-36, at 4; Dingwall, *Late Seventeenth-Century Edinburgh*, 16.

<sup>10</sup> Flinn, *Scottish Population History*, 189.

<sup>11</sup> This figure included the town and its ‘territory’.

<sup>12</sup> Flinn, *Scottish Population History*, 198-99; Dingwall, *Late Seventeenth-Century Edinburgh*, 19.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 20-21; G. Jackson, ‘Glasgow in Transition, c.1660-c.1740’ in Devine *et al*, *Glasgow*, 63-105, at 91-92; K.J. Cullen, C.A. Whatley and M. Young, ‘Battered but Unbowed – Dundee during the Seventeenth Century’ in McKean *et al*, *Dundee*, 57-83, at 65; E.P. Dennison, A.T. Simpson and G.G. Simpson, ‘The Growth of the Two Towns’ in Dennison *et al*, *Aberdeen Before 1800*, 13-43, at 33; Flinn, *Scottish Population History*, 191.

---

<sup>15</sup> See, in particular, I.D. Whyte, 'The Occupational Structure of Scottish Burghs in the Late Seventeenth Century' in Lynch, *Early Modern Town*, 219-44.

<sup>16</sup> NRS, E69/12; NRS, E70/6/1.

<sup>17</sup> T.M. Devine, 'The Merchant Class in the Larger Scottish Towns in the Later Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries' in G. Gordon and B. Dicks (eds.), *Scottish Urban History* (Aberdeen, 1983), 92-112, at 99.

<sup>18</sup> NRS, Inverness Commissary Court, CC11/1/2, fos 80-1, fos 97-98, fos 143-5, fos 150-51 and at fo 164; Inverness Commissary Court, CC11/1/3, fos 41-43, fo 58, fos 210-11, fos 229-30, fos 260-61, fo 278, fo 297 and at fos 345-47.

<sup>19</sup> NRS, E69/12; E70/6/1.

<sup>20</sup> Whyte, 'Occupational Structure', 228.

<sup>21</sup> According to the hearth tax records, the resident poor alone may have numbered around 200.

<sup>22</sup> Coutts, 'Provincial Merchants', *passim*; L.A. Stewart, *Urban Politics and British Civil Wars: Edinburgh, 1617-53* (Leiden, 2006), 102.

<sup>23</sup> NRS, CC11/1/2, fos 54-5, fos 137-9 and at fos 150-1.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, fo 80-1 and at fos 112-3, CC11/1/3, fos 345-7.

<sup>25</sup> NRS, CC11/1/2, fos 143-4 and at fo 166; CC11/1/3, fos 265-6.

<sup>26</sup> NRS, Edinburgh Commissary Court, CC8/1/70, fos 357-63; NRS, CC11/1/2, fos 81-83 and at fos 130-34.

<sup>27</sup> NRS, CC11/1/2, fo 144 and at fo 165; NRS, CC11/1/3, fo 278; P.H. Brown (ed.), *Tours in Scotland, 1677 and 1681 by Thomas Kirk and Ralph Thoresby* (Edinburgh, 1892), 28.

<sup>28</sup> Inverness, Highland Archive and Registration Centre [HARC], Records of the Presbytery of Inverness, 1632-44, CH2/553/1, fo 87.

- 
- <sup>29</sup> HARC, Inverness Town Council Minutes, IB1/1/5, fo 5v.
- <sup>30</sup> Stewart, *Urban Politics*, 59; E.P. Dennison, 'Urban Society and Economy' in R. Harris and A.R. MacDonald (eds.), *Scotland: The Making and Unmaking of the Nation, c.1100-1707*, 5 vols (Dundee, 2007), ii, 145-65, at 163.
- <sup>31</sup> A.D. Kennedy, 'The Condition of the Restoration Church of Scotland in the Highlands', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, forthcoming.
- <sup>32</sup> NRS, Records of the Synod of Moray, 1668-86, CH2/271/3, fo 85; HARC, Inverness Town Council Minutes, 1680-1688, IB1/1/6, fo 60r-v.
- <sup>33</sup> H. Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae: The Succession of Ministers in the Church of Scotland from the Reformation*, 7 vols (Edinburgh, 1915-28), vi, 456-57 and at 460-61.
- <sup>34</sup> C. Whatley, 'Order and Disorder' in C. Whatley and E. Foyster. (eds.), *A History of Everyday Life in Scotland, 1600 to 1800* (Edinburgh, 2010), 191-216, at 194-97.
- <sup>35</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 8r, fos 38v-39r and at fo 193r-v; NRS, Common Good Accounts: Inverness, 1575-1684, E82/31/4.
- <sup>36</sup> W. Mackay (ed.), *Records of the Presbyteries of Inverness and Dingwall* (Edinburgh, 1896), 38, 40 and at 42.
- <sup>37</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fos 18r-19r, fo 30r, fos 106v-107r and at fos 155r; HARC, IB1/1/6, fo 18v and at fo 52r.
- <sup>38</sup> NRS, E82/31/4. There was also a 'Musik School', whose master was paid £53 6s 8d per year.
- <sup>39</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 31r-v and at fo 53r-v.
- <sup>40</sup> Mackay, *Inverness and Dingwall*, 23; Miller, *Inverness*, 90.
- <sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 104-11.
- <sup>42</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 169r-v; HARC, IB1/1/6, fo 27r.

- 
- <sup>43</sup> HARC, Inverness Burgh Court Books, 1654-1717, IB1/1/7/2 fos 369-76; HARC, IB1/1/6, fo 7v.
- <sup>44</sup> D. Warrand (ed.), *More Culloden Papers*, 5 vols (Inverness, 1923-30), i, 168-69.
- <sup>45</sup> Kennedy, 'Restoration Church of Scotland in the Highlands'.
- <sup>46</sup> NRS, Records of the Synod of Moray, 1646-68, CH2/271/2, fo 433; Mackay, *Inverness and Dingwall*, 43.
- <sup>47</sup> Stewart, *Urban Politics*, 23-28; C. Mair, *Mercat Cross and Tolbooth: Understanding Scotland's Old Burghs* (Edinburgh, 1988), 82-94.
- <sup>48</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 13r, fos 22v-23r, fo 41r-v, fo 71r-v, fo 84r-v, fo 93r-v, fos 107v-108r, fo 124r, fos 131v-132r, fo 143r, fo 154r, fo 168r-v, fos 173v-174r, fo 185r-v, fos 195v-196r, fo 207r, fos 219v-220r, fo 232r-v; HARC, IB1/1/6, fos 10r-11r, fos 22v-23r, fo 32v, fo 45r-v and at fo 55r-v.
- <sup>49</sup> K.M. Brown *et al* (eds.), *Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, [www.rps.ac.uk](http://www.rps.ac.uk) (St Andrews, 2007-2013) [RPS], 1661/1/2, 1662/5/2, 1663/6/2, 1665/8/2, 1667/1/2, 1669/10/2, 1670/7/2, 1672/6/2, 1673/11/2, 1678/6/3, 1681/7/2, 1685/4/2 and at 1686/4/2; Marwick, *Royal Burghs*, iii, 503, 508-09, 524-25, 527-28, 531, 546, 558, 562-63, 571, 575, 582, 610-11, 617, 621, 624, 633, 637, 648 and at 658; iv, 1, 7-8, 11-12, 15, 20, 24-25, 30, 35-36, 43, 49, 55, 62, 64, 68-69 and at 73-74.
- <sup>50</sup> Warrand, *More Culloden Papers*, i, 197-98.
- <sup>51</sup> Lynch, 'Introduction', at 13. For discussion of oligarchic government in individual towns, see M. Lynch and H.M. Dingwall, 'Elite Society in Town and Country' in Dennison *et al*, *Aberdeen Before 1800*, 181-200, at 187; J. McGrath, 'The Medieval and Early Modern Burgh' in Devine *et al*, *Glasgow*, 17-62, at 31-32; Stewart, *Urban Politics*, 100-03 and at 113-17.

---

<sup>52</sup> G. DesBrisay, E. Ewan and H.L. Diack, 'Life in the Two Towns' in Dennison *et al*, *Aberdeen Before 1800*, 44-69, at 46, 48-50 and at 58-60; McGrath, 'Medieval and Early Modern Burgh', at 35-41; E. Foyster, 'Life Outside the Medical Centre: Health and Sickness in Early Modern Dundee' in McKean *et al*, *Dundee*, 111-28, at 116-17; Houston, *Social Change*, 164-71 and at 246-53; Mair, *Stirling*, 110-23.

<sup>53</sup> James Fraser, *Chronicles of the Frasers: The Wardlaw Manuscript Entitled 'Polichronicon Seu Policratica Temporum, or, The True Genealogy of the Frasers, 916-1674*, ed. W. Mackay (Edinburgh, 1905), 414-15.

<sup>54</sup> P.H. Brown *et al* (eds.), *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, Third Series, 1661-91*, 16 vols (Edinburgh, 1908-70) [*RPCS*], i, 6-7.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 149

<sup>56</sup> NRS, Seafield Papers, GD248/363/3/13, Alexander Mackintosh to James Grant of Freuchie, 13 April 1662.

<sup>57</sup> *RPCS*, i, p.220; W. Fraser (ed.), *The Chiefs of Grant*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1883), iii, 344-45.

<sup>58</sup> J. M. Thomson (ed.), *The Register of the Great Seal of Scotland*, 11 vols (Edinburgh, 1882-1914), xi, 451; HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 69r-v; T.C. Smout, A.R.

MacDonald and F. Watson, *A History of the Native Woodlands of Scotland, 1500-1920* (Edinburgh, 2005), 327; B.P. Lenman, *The Jacobite Clans of the Great Glen 1651-1784* (Dalkeith, 1995), 39; Fraser, *Wardlaw*, 447.

<sup>59</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 5v.

<sup>60</sup> Fraser, *Wardlaw*, 447.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.414-5; W. Mackay, H.C. Boyd and G.S. Lang (eds.), *Records of Inverness*, 2 vols (Aberdeen, 1911-24), 210.

<sup>62</sup> Houston, *Social Change*, 310-11.

- 
- <sup>63</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 5v, fos 6r-7r and at fos 198r-199r.
- <sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, fo 40r-v, fo 110r-v, fo 111r-v, fo 1414-v, fo 158r and at fo 208v; HARC, IB1/1/6, fo 9r, fo 12v, fo 13v and at fo 28r.
- <sup>65</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fos 77v-78r, fo 97r, fo 110r-v, fo 159r, fo 161r, fo 190v-191r and at fo 226r; NRS, E82/31/4.
- <sup>66</sup> HARC, BI/1/7/2, fos 369-76.
- <sup>67</sup> Mackay, *Inverness and Dingwall*, 44.
- <sup>68</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 116v and at fo 176r; HARC, IB1/1/6, fo 49v.
- <sup>69</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 97r.
- <sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, fo 233v; IB1/1/6, fo 80v and at fo 81v; NRS, E82/31/4.
- <sup>71</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 160v, fo 169r-v and at fo 189r; HARC, IB1/1/6, fo 29r.
- <sup>72</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 97r, fo 192v and at fo 201v; HARC, IB1/1/6, fo 19r-v and at fo 48v.
- <sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, fo 8v, fo 28r and at fo 45r.
- <sup>74</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fos 38v-39r, fos 41v-43r, fo 76v, fo 137r, fos 193r-194r, fo 201v, fo 203r, fo 223r and at fo 229v; HARC, IB1/1/6, fo 5r, fo 17v, fo 18r-v, fo 19r-v, fo 20r, fo 21r-v, fo 25r-v, fo 28r-v, fo 29v, fo 31r, fo 35v, fo 53r, fo 54r, fo 57r-v, fo 58r, fo 59r, fo 72r, fo 73v and at fo 74r; Brown, *Tours in Scotland*, 27; Fraser, *Wardlaw*, 455; *RPS*, 1681/7/72, 1685/4/68 and at 1685/4/90; *RPCS*, vi, 403, xi, 524-31; C. Fraser-Mackintosh (ed.), *Letters of Two Centuries, Chiefly Concerned with Inverness and the Highlands, from 1616 to 1815* (Inverness, 1890), 115-16; NRS, CH2/271/3, fo 162; Miller, *Inverness*, 90-92.
- <sup>75</sup> NRS, E82/31/4.
- <sup>76</sup> Toller, ‘Now of little significancy’?, 113-34.



---

<sup>77</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 53r-v, 91r, fo 138r-v and at fo 172r-v; HARC, IB1/1/6, fo 49v and at fo 53r.

<sup>78</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fos 21r-22r; HARC, IB1/1/6, fo 51v.

<sup>79</sup> RPS, 1661/1/2, 1662/5/2, 1663/6/2, 1665/8/2, 1667/1/2, 1669/10/2, 1670/7/2, 1672/6/2, 1673/11/2, 1678/6/3, 1681/7/2, 1685/4/2 and at 1686/4/2.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 1661/1/181 and at 1685/4/112.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 1661/1/3, 1661/1/14, 1661/1/291 and at M1685/4/3; IB1/1/6, fo 52v.

<sup>82</sup> Marwick, *Royal Burghs*, iii, 503, 508-09, 524-25, 527-28, 531, 546, 558, 562-63, 571, 575, 582, 610-11, 617, 621, 624, 633, 637, 648 and at 658; iv, 1, 7-8, 11-12, 15, 20, 24-25, 30, 35-36, 43, 49, 55, 62, 64, 68-69 and at 73-74.

<sup>83</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 131r; HARC, IB1/1/6, fo 5v.

<sup>84</sup> HARC, BI/1/7/2, fos 791-95; HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 184r and at fo 185r.

<sup>85</sup> Toller, ‘Now of little significancy?’’, 15-25.

<sup>86</sup> Fraser, *Wardlaw*, 447-48.

<sup>87</sup> NRS, E82/31/4.

<sup>88</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fo 28r-v, fo 29r and at fo 30r-v; NRS, Fraser-Mackintosh Collection, GD128/26/2; Miller, *Inverness*, 95.

<sup>89</sup> Fraser, *Wardlaw*, 479-80; *RPCS*, ii, 150-52; HARC, IB1/1/5, fos 53r-66v; Miller, *Inverness*, 92-94.

<sup>90</sup> HARC, IB1/1/5, fos 124v-125v.

<sup>91</sup> Lynch, ‘Introduction’, at 20-23; K.M. Brown, *Noble Power in Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution* (Edinburgh, 2011), 82-83 and at 118-19.

<sup>92</sup> This point has most recently been reiterated in S. Talbott, ‘Beyond ‘the Antiseptic Realm of Theoretical Economic Models’: New Perspectives on Franco-Scottish

---

Commerce and the Auld Alliance in the Long Seventeenth Century', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 31:2 (2011), 149-68, at 149-50.

<sup>93</sup> NRS, Inverness Customs Books, 1665-91, E72/11.

<sup>94</sup> T.C. Smout, *Scottish Trade on the Eve of Union 1660-1707* (Edinburgh and London, 1963), 140-41 and at 205-38.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 152-204. For examples of individual towns' experiences, see G. Jackson, 'The Economy: Aberdeen and the Sea' in Dennison *et al*, *Aberdeen Before 1800*, 159-80, at 165-68; Jackson, 'Glasgow in Transition', at 69-78; Cullen *et al*, 'Battered but Unbowed', at 69-71.

<sup>96</sup> Jackson, 'Economy', at 166; Jackson, 'Glasgow in Transition', at 71; Cullen *et al*, 'Battered but Unbowed', at 70-71.

<sup>97</sup> The home-port of the exporting ship is unrecorded in roughly 6% of entries.

<sup>98</sup> The port of registration is unrecorded for roughly 4% of importing ships.