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Abstract

The Brechin Diocesan Library was founded in Laurencekirk in 1792 and developed on the foundational collections of the books of eighteenth-century clergymen. This thesis examines the variety of episcopal identities, which were supported and preserved in the diocesan library, and the annotations in the books themselves. It demonstrates how the books of the diocesan library preserved a distinctive nonjuring identity, and contextualises this with a study of the library and marginalia of Alexander Jolly, Bishop of Moray. It also examines the development of intellectual cultures within the Brechin Diocesan Library, and how these developed throughout the nineteenth century. It reveals the importance of the bishop of the diocese in shaping the library into a repository representative of their own theological and intellectual identities. It considers the library as an essential tool for the education of the clergy in the early nineteenth century, in a Church which lacked any formal systems of education. Theological identities and engagement with contemporary events of the Anglican Church are revealed through an examination of the use of the library. This includes using case studies of users of the diocesan library through the analysis of the borrowing registers. Lastly, it asserts the importance of intergenerational gifting of books, and the value of provenance inscriptions, in preserving the nonjuring identity and history of the eighteenth-century clergy through the Brechin Diocesan Library.
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Introduction

In 1814, Bishop George Gleig (1753-1840) wrote to his clergy in the diocese of Brechin, advising them that he had purchased new books for the Diocesan Library at Laurencekirk. Following this, he had some advice on reading them:

“I begin with telling you that there is not one of these volumes which you will receive that does not contain something that is exceptionable, as well as much that is excellent; but every one of them is calculated to compel the serious and attentive reader to think for himself: and it is such reading only as produces this effect that is really valuable. Clergymen who wish to improve their knowledge of divinity do not read one or two approved works with the view of committing their contents to memory as a child commits to memory the contents of a catechism…”

What follows is a discussion of the books Gleig has chosen for the library, some of which he warns are “deemed not orthodox” and thus require Gleig’s guidance on how they “may be read with advantage.” He then evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the chosen authors, to ensure that his clergy are well equipped to read them. He writes that Dr Taylor of Norwich was “certainly an Arian if not a Socinian;” William Warburton was “an inconsistent Churchman,” and Dr Paley “a very low Churchman.” More important is what the books have in common, and why Gleig valued them: all contain schemes of evidence in favour of Christian Revelation. For Gleig, these were necessary for a clergyman to defend his congregation against what he perceived as one of the Church’s greatest threats: Unitarians. Among other beliefs, the Unitarians denied the doctrine of the Trinity and rejected the Divinity of Christ.

Gleig informed his clergy that the Dean of the diocese was “under every possible obligation to make himself acquainted with the present Unitarian controversy.” In Gleig’s opinion, the modern Unitarians by “magnifying the intellectual powers of man” had called into question “the authenticity or inspiration of such passages of Scripture as teach doctrines, which no human—perhaps no created—being can fully comprehend…” Gleig ends his discussion of the books by advising that “in a word, the books you will receive you ought to read with attention, but at the same time with caution: for it is my wish that you think for yourselves.”

1 Br MS 4/1/1/1 Synod Minutes, 1770-1814. August 3rd 1814
2 George Gleig, Directions for the Study of Theology (London: Thomas Cadell: 1827), p.4
3 Br MS 4/1/1/1 Synod Minutes, 1770-1814. August 3rd 1814
Gleig’s letter to his clergy is striking. It shows a bishop taking control of the education of his clergy and directing them towards material he deemed necessary for the defence of Christianity; it demonstrates the intended use of the diocesan clerical library for this purpose; and it is evidence of how broadly and critically clergymen read or were indeed advised to read. Surprisingly, it also shows that a bishop of the Scottish Episcopal Church – which in 1814 was impoverished, marginalised, and recovering from its illegal status in the eighteenth century - thought that dissenting opinion on Revelation from God as the standard of Christian faith, was the single most important subject for his clergy to educate themselves on. Yet no current historiography of the Scottish Episcopal Church can adequately explain the significance of Gleig’s letter or contextualise it within the intellectual culture of the diocese of Brechin and its library. By examining the library this thesis will consider the intellectual cultures and identities which were sustained, developed and preserved through the clerical library, and its essential role in the education of the clergy.

The Brechin Diocesan Library survives almost entirely intact in the care of Archive Services at the University of Dundee. The Brechin Collection, as it is now referred to, contains over eight-thousand items, from an edition of Thomas Aquinas’ *Summa Theologica* published in Basel in 1485, to mid nineteenth-century issues of the Scottish Episcopal Church periodical *The Scottish Guardian*. Records of the library have also been preserved, including its borrowing registers, a register of donations from 1853, and the correspondence of its librarians. The minutes of the annual diocesan synod also provide information of the library accounts, rules, and purchases. This evidence enables a reconstruction of the library’s development, expansion and use throughout the nineteenth century. The comprehensiveness of its records, and survival of its books are only a few of the attributes which make the Brechin Collection an important resource in the history of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

The Brechin Diocesan Library was established by the clergy in 1792 at the annual diocesan synod, and was the first of its kind in the Scottish Episcopal Church. It was initially housed in the newly built manse of the incumbent of Laurencekirk, and comprised of books gifted by clergy present at the synod. These clergy had served the Church in a period of poverty and marginalisation, brought on by an increase in the penal laws. Little is known of library’s use until a significant bequest of over six hundred books was made in 1808, by the former Bishop of Brechin, William Abernethy.

---

Donated by the Rev. Robert Kilgour Thom in August 1856. Br MS 4/6/2/1 Books Presented to the Diocesan Library 1853

5 Details of the penal laws are discussed in more detail below.
Drummond. Abernethy Drummond had inherited the surviving library of the Drummond’s of Hawthornden, via his wife Barbara Mary Drummond, and thus a significant number of books in the Brechin Diocesan library contain the provenance of the seventeenth-century Hawthornden family, including the poet William Drummond’s annotated copy of the works of Ben Jonson. Abernethy Drummond’s own books were also a highly valuable addition to the library, and included both contemporary works of theology, as well as rare editions of the Church Fathers such as the works of St Ambrose, printed in Paris in 1614.

The bequest was managed by the newly consecrated Bishop of Brechin, George Gleig, who sought to expand the library and encourage its use by the clergy to improve their education of contemporary theological disputes. By 1819, the library required a purpose built room, which was provided in the chapel in Laurencekirk. Rules and regulations were set, including the use of a borrowing register. In, 1821 an additional library was created within the diocese. It was formed on the bequest of the Rev. Alexander Jamieson (d.1823), formerly a priest in the diocese before his removal to Glasgow in 1788, who gave his library of over 300 books to the diocese. He left them with the instruction that they should form a separate library for the clergy, to be kept in the house of the incumbent of Brechin. Both libraries were subsequently used by the clergy. The Laurencekirk library was maintained with additional books purchased with money raised by annual library dues, as well contributions from clergy and local benefactors, while Brechin library remained largely static.

In 1854, the libraries were united in a newly built library room in Brechin, financed by the bishop of the diocese, Alexander Penrose Forbes. It was around this era that the library became a home for antiquities, including a backgammon table allegedly owned by Mary Queen of Scots. The table had been preserved by various bishops in the north east of Scotland until 1857, when it was given to the library by the dean of the diocese, the Rev. John Moir. Moir’s successor, the Rev. Robert Kilgour Thom (d.1874), also added objects of antiquarian interest to the library, including the library’s first incunabula, donated in 1863. This was Postilla sive Opus praedicabile de Evangelii ac Epistolis, the sermons of Simon of Cremona, a thirteenth-century preacher of the Augustinian order, printed in Reutlingen in 1484.

---

8 Br MS 4/6/4/3 Mary Queen of Scots Backgammon provenance, authored by Bishop Abernethy Drummond. Br UF 230.2 A 496
9 Br Q 252 P 734

8
Though the library functioned as a place to preserve antiquities, the surviving borrowing registers attest to the library flourishing as an educational resource for the clergy into the early 1880s. It continued to receive several significant bequests, including the extensive theological library of Bishop Forbes in 1876. There was also short-lived and hitherto unrecognised library in Dundee, used between 1870 and 1875, comprised of the books of the late Rev. Archibald Wilson (d.1865), incumbent of St Mary’s Dundee, and housed by his widow in her home on South Tay Street. The library was thus well maintained and used for the majority of the nineteenth century by the clergy of the diocese of Brechin.

The library’s continual use is one reason why this thesis focuses on the Brechin Diocesan library, rather than its nearest comparable library, the Aberdeen Diocesan library. The latter was founded in 1804, and according to a 1999 estimation, contains approximately 2,500 volumes, and 3,000 pamphlets. It was deposited into the care of the University of Aberdeen in 1926. The 1999 survey is the only contemporary published account of the Aberdeen Diocesan library, which is surprising given it is reported as containing an extensive collection of Scottish Communion Offices, and books owned by sixteenth-century Scottish Bishops. However, unlike the Brechin Diocesan Library, records of the library’s development are insubstantial. The Synod minutes are vague on details of which books were purchased, using phrasing such as “several new works were directed to be added to the library.” In contrast to this, the diocese of Brechin synod minutes list the titles of books purchased or donated. Additionally, unlike the Brechin Diocesan Library, no borrowing register has survived from the Aberdeen Diocesan Library. In theory, there should be a record of borrowing, as the 1821 rules states that “The librarian shall, in prescribed form, keep an account of the books lent.” However, there is no register which fits this description in the records of the library at the University of Aberdeen.

Unlike the Brechin Diocesan Library, the Aberdeen Diocesan Library appears to have fallen out of use in the second half of the nineteenth century. In 1853, it is reported as being in a “flourishing condition,” with “several important works” added to the library.” However, Francis C. Eeles, the

---

10 The Rev. Wilson was ordained in the diocese of Glasgow and Galloway in 1847. He was only briefly acitive in Dundee, from 1864-1865. Bertie, p.490.
There is in fact another Aberdeen Diocesan Library, under the care of the honorary Diocesan archivist Stuart Donald, referred to as the Christie Memorial Collection, comprised of around 5,000 volumes. However, it has no searchable online catalogue, and its care is undertaken by volunteers. It appears to be a branch of the original library, containing less valuable books. Thanks to Stuart Donald for this information.
12 Aberdeen University Library MS 3320/1/2/1/9/1 Minute book of the Diocesan Senate, 1842 – 1871, 6th August 1845, p.37
13 Aberdeen 1821 Catalogue, p.iv
librarian of the collection in the twentieth century, reports that after this time the library was
neglected. He writes that “Little more is heard of the library till 1857, when the Rev. Patrick Cheyne
of St John’s Aberdeen proposed the building of Church House, primarily to hold it, and also for
other purposes, a proposal which was favourably received but which came to nothing.”\textsuperscript{15} This is
again a key difference between the Aberdeen and Brechin libraries, as the latter was extensively
used in the period in which use of the Aberdeen library declined.

Consequently, the Brechin Diocesan Library offers a unique opportunity to study intellectual
culture and Episcopal identity in Scottish Episcopal libraries over the course of the nineteenth
century. Its records are more complete, and its lifespan more substantial than its nearest equivalent
at Aberdeen. Furthermore, as this thesis will demonstrate, the Bishops of the diocese of Brechin
shaped, and directed the use of, the diocesan library. With their oversight, the library was
positioned as an important tool in the intellectual development of the clergy, and essential for
clerical education.

Though there is a wealth of evidence in surviving Scottish Episcopal libraries that can aid our
understanding of the intellectual culture of the eighteenth and nineteenth century Church, there
has been no comprehensive study of any of the episcopal diocesan libraries. The only
contemporary study of the Brechin Diocesan Library was undertaken by John R Barker, formerly
librarian at the University of Dundee, who previously had care of the books.\textsuperscript{16} He presented his
research to the Abertay Historical Society in 1988, and his talk is preserved as an unpublished
typescript in the university archives. Barker gives a general overview of the library, outlining its
history, important bequests, and books of interest. He also draws on the printed pamphlet \textit{History
of Brechin Diocesan Library, extracted from minutes of the Diocesan Synod} (1928), authored by William
Christie, Dean of the Diocese and collector of episcopal history.\textsuperscript{17} While it is a helpful starting
point for the library’s history, its scope is narrow, and subsequently, it does not engage with any
wider themes of Scottish Episcopal identity, history, or the intellectual culture of the diocese. One
of the strengths of the Brechin Diocesan Library is its scholarly value for examining these themes.

The absence of any evaluations of Scottish Episcopal libraries leaves a large gap in our
understanding of religious libraries in Scotland in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, leading

\textsuperscript{15} This is recorded in a newsletter of the Aberdeen Diocesan Library and Archive, sent to me by Stuart Donald,
honorary archivist of the Diocese of Aberdeen. It is said to come from the research of the diocesan librarian Francis
C. Eeles.
\textsuperscript{16} Br MS 4/2/14 (8) “The Brechin Diocesan Library: its History and Collections”. Talk given on the Brechin
Diocesan Library by John Barker, Librarian of the University of Dundee, to the Abertay Historical Society in
January 1988
\textsuperscript{17} Br MS 4/6/7/5 ‘History of the Brechin Diocesan Library’, 1928
to incorrect statements and assumptions by scholars working in the field. In his article on ‘The Scottish Library Scene,’ John Crawford does not mention episcopalian, and refers only to the Church of Scotland and the Free Church. He states that “church and religiously based libraries were usually small and of short duration.” This is not a generalisation which would apply to the Brechin Diocesan Library, which was large and flourishing for the majority of the nineteenth century. Graham Best’s article ‘Libraries in the Parish,’ discusses British parochial libraries in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, though its main focus is England. He fails to mention that the established Church of Scotland was a different denomination from the Church of England, and speaks in broad terms without mentioning Presbyterian or Episcopalian, a very important distinction. Indeed, misunderstandings or complete unawareness of the Scottish Episcopal Church has rendered the libraries of the Scottish Episcopal Church invisible in library history.

Religious libraries of all denominations in Scotland have rarely been given the attention they deserve. The library of the Catholic seminary of St Mary’s College, Blairs (Blairs College), in Aberdeenshire, which contains over twenty-seven thousand items, has had no book-length studies of its historic collections. Significantly, it was the nineteenth-century repository of the libraries of the Scots Colleges, founded in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Paris and Rome (among other European cities). Audrey Cairns and Peter Reid’s article The Historical Development of the Library of St Mary’s College, Blairs, Aberdeen, 1829–1986 provides an essential introduction to the development of the library in the nineteenth century, outlining the history of its librarians, catalogues, acquisitions and use. The study demonstrates that the historic collections of the library were not as useful to students as books published in the nineteenth century. It also notes that records illustrating the use of the library are limited, and this is potentially one reason for a lack of scholarship on other religious libraries, which also highlights the significance of the intact records of the Brechin Collection. The authors observe that the collection “bears witness to the education and scholarly interests of the Scottish clergy and Catholic Community from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries,” which highlights the scope for scholarly interventions and the gap in our knowledge of religious libraries in Scotland.

21 Ibid, p.253
22 Ibid, p.261
The history of Scottish lending libraries and its intersecting discipline of the history of reading, is much better served with studies on circulating and subscription libraries, and readership of works of the Scottish Enlightenment, romantic novels, history, and general religious works. Scottish circulating libraries and subscription libraries before 1825 have been examined by K.A Manley, while John Crawford has written extensively on reading in mutual improvement societies and community libraries. However, the majority of scholarship on Scottish lending libraries in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century has tended to focus on borrowing records, with an aim of charting reading vogues or finding evidence for a specific kind of reading. The institutional history of these libraries is secondary in these studies.

Vivienne Dunstan’s PhD thesis ‘Reading habits in Scotland circa 1750–1820’ examines practices of reading in Scotland and uses library records to demonstrate how and where Scots accessed books, what they read and how tastes changed over the course of the century. Similarly, Mark Towsey’s Reading the Scottish Enlightenment examines the reading experiences of the contemporary readers of the Scottish Enlightenment, drawing on a variety of sources which include borrowing registers, common place books, and marginalia. Notably, he is the first historian to have examined the annotations of Bishop Jolly, which are also examined in detail in this thesis. While Towsey clearly demonstrates the variety of library provision in provincial Scotland in the eighteenth century, he examines borrowing registers for specific evidence of readers engaging with the Scottish Enlightenment. Subsequently the books and readers of these libraries are detached from the development of the library’s collections and history, highlighting the limitation of “reading vogue” analysis without institutional histories.

In contrast, Jill Dye’s PhD thesis ‘Books and their Borrowers at the Library of Innerpeffray c. 1680-1855’ is founded on a complete dataset of the borrowings at Innerpeffray Library, examined in the context of the library’s development. Dye demonstrates that a thorough understanding and detailed history of a library is an essential context to have for examining the motivations behind the borrowings of its users, and provides an ideal methodological framework in which to consider borrowing registers. Following Dye’s example, the borrowing registers of this thesis are examined after a history of the Brechin Diocesan library, and in the context of contemporary events and circumstances in the Scottish Episcopal Church. They are also used as evidence of

---

25 Jill Dye, Books and their Borrowers at the Library of Innerpeffray c. 1680-1855, Doctoral Thesis (University of Stirling, 2018) & dataset
library use and clergy interest and engagement with particular topics, such as Tractarianism, but do not claim to be evidence that a book was definitely read. As Dye argues, borrowing a book does not equal reading a book.\textsuperscript{26} Additionally, this thesis does not aim to give a full account of the books borrowed by the clergy, but rather uses the borrowing registers to assess the purpose of the library, especially its role in sustaining intellectual culture within the diocese.

This thesis examines the purpose of the clergy library, both as it was intended by its founders, and developed by the clergy and bishops of the nineteenth century. It will argue that the foundation, growth and use of the library was connected to the theology of the eighteenth century Church, and developments and threats to this in nineteenth century. The historical context of its establishment is thus important when considered the purpose of the diocesan library. The Brechin Diocesan Library was founded by clergy who had historically been nonjuring. The nonjurors refused to pray for the Hanoverian monarch of the United Kingdom, and supported the claims of the House of Stuart to the British throne. In 1788, Charles Edward Stuart, the last viable Jacobite heir died, and freed the nonjuring clergy from their allegiance. Consequently, the clergy, including the aforementioned Bishop Abernethy Drummond, began a campaign for the toleration of the Church, and a repeal of the penal laws, which had restricted its worship and suppressed its growth, particularly in the second half of the eighteenth century. The library was thus established at a time of renewal and growth for the Church, but also at a complex time for its identity, as it distanced itself from its historic Jacobitism and considered its place as a legally tolerated Church, free from the restrictions of the penal laws.

The penal laws had been imposed upon the Episcopal clergy in 1689, after the refusal of the bishops to pray for William of Orange, and their continuing support for the Stuart claim to the throne.\textsuperscript{27} In consequence, the office of bishop was abolished, and the Church of Scotland was established on Presbyterian values. The clergy and bishops who refused to conform formed the nonjuring Scottish Episcopal Church, an unlawful Church with restrictions and penalties placed upon its worship.\textsuperscript{28} Despite these restrictions, the first half of the eighteenth century was a time of intellectual fermentation within the Scottish Episcopal Church, as its members reckoned with their illegal status and sought to counter claims of schism. Scholarly clergy such as Archibald Campbell, Thomas Rattray, Robert Forbes and Robert Keith proposed, revised, and discussed their visions for the governance and doctrines of the Church. These works are preserved in the Brechin Diocesan library and other Episcopal Church libraries, many of which contain annotations from

\textsuperscript{26}Ibid, p.11
\textsuperscript{27} The particulars of this are discussed in Chapter 2
\textsuperscript{28} The particulars of this are discussed in Chapter 2
the clergy who read them, and aimed to preserve their doctrines. They formed part of the intellectual culture and identity discussed throughout this thesis.

Though they used the Book of Common Prayer, the nonjurors developed their own liturgical traditions, most commonly expressed in the Scottish Communion Office. These scholarly clergy, alongside the English nonjurors, created an intellectual inheritance, which underpinned a particular nonjuring Scottish Episcopal identity, common to the northeast of Scotland, where the Brechin Diocesan Library was established. This thesis will explore how that identity was preserved within the diocesan library, and will argue that books and libraries became repositories for this type of Scottish Episcopal identity, which was threatened by toleration, anglicising influences, and evangelical incursions in the nineteenth-century Scottish Episcopal Church.

The threat of anglicisation of the Church had its seeds first sown a number of years earlier, by the 1712 Act of Toleration, which had created Qualified Chapels. In theory, these were a legal branch of the Scottish Episcopal Church, who used the Book of Common Prayer, and prayed for the Hanoverians. In practice, they were essentially congregations of the Church of England, led by English ordained clergy, and without any episcopal oversight, as the Scottish Episcopal Bishops had no authority over them. The long-term consequence of this was the creation of congregations that were excluded from the liturgical developments of the Scottish Episcopal Church in the eighteenth century. These congregations were gradually absorbed back into the Church after 1792, but were largely opposed to native traditions, such as the Scottish Communion Office.

As a result, there were two competing factions of clergymen in the early nineteenth century. The northern clergy upheld the native theology of the Church; the clergy south of the Tay were generally more anglicised and sought conformity with the Church of England. The Brechin Diocesan Library was established in the former. Its clergy in the in the early nineteenth century were native northern Churchmen, educated by nonjuring clergymen. The contents of the library reflected this, and represented the dominant theology of the Church at the turn of the nineteenth century. This theology was under threat from anglicising influences within the Church, which by second half of the nineteenth century had come to dominate the Church. As Rowan Strong points out in 1800, “there were six bishops, all of whom were Scots. By 1877 there were seven bishops, of whom six were Englishmen.” As the library was founded on the books of nonjuring clergymen, but managed and used by clergy of the nineteenth, the Brechin Diocesan Library offers a new lens

---

through which to examine the nonjuring identity of the Church, and its survival in the nineteenth century.

Consequently, this thesis aims to add to the historiography of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Rowan Strong is arguably the foremost historian of the nineteenth-century Scottish Episcopal Church. His work *Episcopalianism in Nineteenth-Century Scotland: Religious Responses to a Modernizing Society* is a social and cultural history of the Church, which examines its various identities, undermining the idea that it was simply the religion of the anglicised Scottish middle class. Instead, he describes “a plurality of identities, each of which could legitimately describe itself as Episcopalian.” One of these identities is an indigenous Scottish Episcopalian identity, based on the Scottish Communion Office and the native Scottish traditions, distinct from the Church of England.

It is almost surprising that this must be argued for; as will be demonstrated during the course of research for this thesis, the nonjurors of the eighteenth century constructed a distinctive identity, founded on their claims to be a continuation of the primitive Church, and supported by scholarly works authored by their clergymen. However, as Strong points out, by the end of the nineteenth century, the anglicisation of the Church was so pervasive, that a Church leader argued in the *Scottish Guardian* that historically, the Scottish Episcopal Church was an English institution. Consequently, a motivating factor of this thesis is Strong’s statement that “The ultimate claim of Episcopalianism to Scottish religious identity in the nineteenth century is that Scots themselves maintained this connection with the religion of their forebears…a native Episcopal identity was a great deal more energetic than historians have credited it.” This thesis examines the ways in which this identity was nurtured and preserved through the Brechin Diocesan Library, as well as the books of nonjuring clergymen such as Bishop Jolly.

Episcopal identity in the nineteenth century has also been considered by Eleanor Harris in her PhD thesis “The Episcopal Congregation of Charlotte Chapel, Edinburgh 1794-1818.” Harris’ study provides an understanding of Evangelical Episcopalians through a social history of Charlotte Chapel which examines the theology and influence of their minister, Bishop Daniel Sandford. She concludes that “Daniel Sandford’s Evangelical preaching successfully reclaimed Episcopacy from

---

31Ibid, p.296
32Ibid, p.290
33Ibid, p.295
34Eleanor M. Harris, The Episcopal Congregation of Charlotte Chapel, Edinburgh 1794-1818, Doctoral Thesis (University of Stirling, 2013)
the Jacobite remnant as a fashionable and enlightened form of Protestantism, re-evangelising the disenchanted male intelligentsia.” Harris’ examination of the Church in the south of Scotland provides a useful contrast with the attempts by bishops and clergy of the northeast – especially Bishop Jolly, examined in Chapter 5 - to preserve the Jacobite nonjuring theology against Evangelicals. It also demonstrates the potential of one place – in this case Charlotte Chapel – as a microcosm of a particular identity within the Church, which aids our understanding of the Church as a whole.

This thesis thus aims to provide a greater understanding of the Brechin Diocesan Library, including its purpose, its contents and its use by the clergy, as well as contributing more broadly to the historiography of the Scottish Episcopal Church. An investigation of the diocesan library offers a unique framework for accomplishing this, as the questions it seeks answers to necessitate investigations into neglected areas of the history of the Church. For example, examining the purpose of the library and its role in the education of the clergy, requires a knowledge of the systems of education in place in the church, and the educational requirements for ordination. As there is no sufficient historiography for this, this thesis aims to illuminate the education of clergymen in the late eighteenth century, and nineteenth century of the Church, while also assessing the importance of the diocesan library, and a wider culture of book sharing amongst clergy, to education.

Anchoring the exploration of identity and intellectual culture in the diocesan library also allows for this thesis to make contributions to both the eighteenth and nineteenth century history of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The history of the diocesan library in the second half of the nineteenth century was steered by Bishop Alexander Penrose Forbes, who was consecrated Bishop of Brechin in 1849. Forbes was the first Tractarian Bishop of the Anglican Church and was a significant figure in the growth of the church in nineteenth century Dundee. Rowan Strong’s work *Alexander Forbes of Brechin, The First Tractarian Bishop* is a study of the development of Forbes’ theology and his ministry in Dundee, which engages with the opposition to Tractarianism in Scotland, and Forbes’ role in the preservation of the Scottish Communion Office. As the library was outwith the scope of Strong’s study, he only briefly notes that it was Forbes’ pet project. Consequently, Forbes instrumental role in developing the library as a place to engage with doctrines he considered as representing the true Catholic faith has gone unnoticed. By examining the acquisitions of the library during Forbes’ tenure, as well as the borrowing registers, this thesis aims demonstrate how

the library was shaped as place for the clergy to engage with the Oxford Movement, and Anglo Catholicism.

Evidently, anchoring this study in the establishment of the diocesan library and its history, allows for a meaningful exploration of Scottish Episcopal identity and intellectual culture. It also demonstrates the breadth of historical examination and meaning which can be achieved through library history. The scope of its historical enquiry is in opposition to the limitations of library history put forward by Alistair Black, in his provocative essay ‘Information and Modernity: The History of Information and the Eclipse of Library History.’37 In the essay, Black argues that the discipline of library history lacks the intellectual framework necessary for valuable contributions to wider historiography, and limits itself by its institutional anchorage, which narrows the scope of its investigations. For Black libraries are institutions, like hospitals or farms, whose histories are undertaken as part studies by established sub-disciplines of history, such as the history of medicine or agriculture, which provide the necessary research framework for serious historical investigations. Black argues that in order to be recognised an important sub discipline of history, the history of libraries should reconceptualise itself as part of the sub discipline of information history. Information history, he argues, provides the methodological questions and foundational literature necessary for exploring the meaning and implications of libraries, including the “the collection, organisation and dissemination of information within particular historical settings.”38

On its initial publication in 1998, Black’s essay ignited a discussion on the future of library history, which was contributed to by Donald G. Davis & Jon Arvid Aho.39 In their response, the authors interrogated Black’s definition of institution, arguing that it was too narrow, arbitrary and too ambiguous. They argued that the history of a library is distinct from a “farm, hospital or a barracks,” which all fall under the definition of institution. Though, like institutions, libraries serve a function, and have their own internal operations, they also work within the broader intellectual framework of “ideas.” Thus, in libraries “something more than operations takes place, something more than collecting books, organizing them, and checking them out and back in again.”40 While Black argues the lens of institutional library history is not equip to interrogate this in a meaningful way, Donald G. Davis & Jon Arvid Aho disagree, arguing that there are many different types of

38 Ibid, p.40
40 Ibid, p.25
library history, whose methodologies allow for the exploration of ideas. This thesis aims to challenge Black’s argument for the limitations of library history, by showing the breadth of historical enquiry possible from a study grounded in the history of a library. One of the ways in which this thesis achieves this is through its methodology. It uses the physical books of the library to understand the purpose of the library, and its role in the intellectual culture and identity of the diocese.

As discussed, though the library was used by the clergy in the nineteenth-century, its foundation collection was provided by nonjuring clergy, who often inscribed their names on their books, or annotated them. The impetus for this study originated after a chance encounter with one of these annotated volumes in the Brechin Collection. The book was William Robertson’s *The history of Scotland during the reigns of Queen Mary and King James VI, till his accession to the crown of England*, and its title page was preceded by a long annotation.41 The book’s previous owner warned prospective readers of William Robertson’s unsympathetic treatment of Mary Queen of Scots. The annotator advised the reader that after reading Robertson’s account, they should, “in justice to” the “most amiable and most injured Princess Mary,” immediately afterwards read “Mr Tytler’s historical and critical enquiry.” The annotator then assured the reader that by doing this, they will “perceive how grossly she has been abused by both Dr Robertson and Mr Hume.” The previous owner was clearly concerned with the reputation of Mary Queen of Scots, and sought to invalidate Robertson’s negative portrayal of her.

The discovery of this annotation prompted a number of queries, beginning with the identity of the annotator – who had owned this book before it arrived on the shelves of the Brechin Diocesan Library? As David Pearson points out, embarking on provenance research can be a frustrating experience, and the identity of a book owner may never be established. The book may have been part of a much larger library, now dispersed and difficult to trace. The evidence needed to trace the books “which exists in books on shelves, or hidden in sales catalogues” can be difficult or impossible to find, and some evidence may have been destroyed.42 An anonymous annotation presents further challenges. In this case, the answer to the annotator’s identity lay in the *Catalogue of the Library deposited at Laurencekirk for the use of the clergy of the diocese of Brechin*, printed in 1846 – a very rare and incredibly useful document, which lists the books contained in the library and the

name of its donator. An “A” for Bishop William Abernethy Drummond is at the end the listing for the 1761 edition of Robertson’s *The history of Scotland*.43

Further investigations into the Brechin Diocesan Library revealed that this was not the only book annotated by Bishop Abernethy Drummond, and that the bishop was not the only episcopal clergymen to have annotated books in the collection. Indeed, a distinctive feature of the books in the diocesan library is that they contain marks of ownership from more than one clergymen. These inscriptions reveal that senior clergymen donated their libraries to their juniors, resulting in books owned by multiple generations of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century clergymen. This thesis investigates these annotations and ownership inscriptions, and considers them in the broader context of the intellectual culture of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

It is not unusual for early-printed books to have evidence of past ownership, or for previous readers to have annotated their books. Indeed, the study of provenance is a well-established field, which primarily seeks to identify book owners through their inscriptions, bookplates, binding stamps, and other marks left in their books. Often, this is the only surviving evidence that a specific individual owned or read any books. The Brechin Collection contains numerous examples of this, especially as the owners of its books were often minor clergy of whom we know very little about. Examining this provenance allows us to develop a greater understanding of the intellectual and spiritual lives of individuals. As David Pearson states in his work *Provenance Research in Book History*:

> the mere fact of ownership of a book, whether annotated or not, provides evidence of past interest. Knowing the contents of someone’s library has an obvious relevance to the study of the life and thinking of that individual. Looking at the contents of many libraries enables us to understand patterns and trends over time, to see what books were and were not typically owned.44

Examining this provenance allows us to develop a greater understanding of book owners, book-history, and the history of ideas, as it allows us to reconstruct dispersed libraries, and examine what individuals owned and read. This was shown by R.H MacDonald in his study of the library of the Drummonds of Hawthornden, which provided a catalogue of the private library of William Drummond of Hawthornden, and a discussion of its contents.45 MacDonald demonstrated that knowing the contents of someone’s library adds to our understanding of intellectual history, in this case the early seventeenth century, revealing the tastes and interests of the period. MacDonald
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43 1846 Catalogue, p.30
44 David Pearson, *Provenance Research in Book History*
45 MacDonald, *The library of Drummond of Hawthornden*
used the contents of William Drummonds’s library to further our understanding of Drummond’s education, intellectual pursuits, and influences on his poetry.

The catalogue of Drummond’s library added to our existing knowledge and understanding of the poet, but the lives of many book owners of the past are more mysterious. As Mark Towsey points out, ownership inscriptions often “constitute the only evidence that a particular individual was interested in books…” which is indeed the case for many of the books in the Brechin Diocesan Library. As will be discussed in Chapter 1, the annotations of the Rev. Patrick Gordon, which often include the date and location of where he purchased the book, are the only evidence that exists which shows he owned and read books. They provide insight into his tastes and reading habits, as well as aiding a broader understanding of the intellectual culture of the nonjuring Scottish Episcopal Church. Evidence of book ownership thus allows for the reconstruction of the libraries of eighteenth-century clergymen hitherto unknown, providing the opportunity for insight into what the clergy were reading, and the authors most important to them. This is explored in Chapter 2, which outlines the intellectual framework underpinning the nonjuring identity of Scottish Episcopal clergy, using book ownership and annotations as part of its evidence.

While physical books can contain a wealth of evidence for identifying provenance, the majority of book owners leave little evidence of their ownership. In these instances, book ownership may be traced through auction and sale catalogues, registers of donations to libraries, legal documents such as wills, as well as library catalogues. These records are especially useful when a book contains minimal evidence of ownership. Bishop Abernethy Drummond, for example, inscribed his name in only a few books given to the library. Subsequently, library records in the diocesan archive were used to establish when a book entered the diocesan library, and the identity of the donator.

The most important of these records is the aforementioned Catalogue of the Library deposited at Laurencekirk for the use of the clergy of the diocese of Brechin, printed in 1846. It is the earliest surviving catalogue of the diocesan library, and provides the fullest available account of its contents before 1846. It is also the only complete record of the library’s first benefactors, as it contains a list of the names of contributors to the library, with their initials next to every book they donated. When the rules of the library were first formally established in 1819, recording the identity of donators was a priority. It was addressed in the first rule, which stated that:

A book shall be kept in the library, in which an exact copy of the Right Reverend Bishop Abernethy’s bequest, and the conditions annexed thereto, shall be inserted; also, the names

---

of subsequent contributors, and the conditions on which their donations have been severely made; and in the case of future donations, the same rule shall be observed…

Acknowledging the clergy who donated to the library was thus important to the users of the diocesan library, and the practise was undertaken by other Scottish Episcopal libraries.

Aberdeen Diocesan Library acknowledged its donors in its earliest surviving catalogue, printed in 1821. The catalogue contains a list of the library’s donors, with some additional details of who they were, and marks each book they gifted with their initials. It also notes where there are significant annotations in a book. For example, “Writers on Old and New Testaments, (Catalogue of interleaved with M.S Notes, by Bishop Alexander (C)).”

Subsequent catalogues for both Aberdeen and Brechin do not contain such detailed information on provenance, possibly due to the increase in items listed in the catalogues, with provenance information extending the printing process. Though it was not published in the catalogue, provenance was still recorded in Brechin library, with a record of “books presented to the Brechin Diocesan Library” started in 1856. Likewise, St Ninian’s Cathedral Library in Perth kept a book from 1854 listing the donors and the books they presented to the library. While useful these catalogues and registers have limitations for the study of provenance in the diocesan library, as they identify the last known owner of a book. It is only by physically examining the book that other owners can be identified.

The Laurencekirk catalogue is valuable for more that identifying owners, as it provides a picture of the library and its contents before 1846. This is useful for examining how the library was used by the clergy, as it provides a record of the books available for them to borrow in the first half of the nineteenth-century. In conjunction with the library catalogue printed in 1869, it is also useful for charting the development and growth of the library. These catalogues can aid not only in establishing when a book was added to the library, but what books have been lost, sold, or even stolen over the course of the library’s existence. Indeed, the possibility of loss is something that
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Henceforth referred to as “1846 Catalogue.”
Unfortunately the book in question is not preserved in the Brechin Collection
48 Due to Covid restrictions, very few of the volumes of the Aberdeen Diocesan Library were examined for their provenance and annotations, so the 1821 Aberdeen Catalogue is an especially useful resource.
49 Catalogue of the Aberdeen Diocesan Library (Aberdeen, 1821), p.21
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50 Br Ms 4/6/2/1 Books presented to the Brechin Diocesan Library
51 Catalogue of the library in St Ninian’s Cathedral, Perth. (Perth: privately printed, 1905), p.vi
NLS Dept. 251 22a St Ninian’s Record of donations
must be considered when evaluating the contents of a library, and attributing value to whether or not a particular title is there. This is why the contemporary online library catalogue of the Brechin Collection is an inadequate tool for analysing the contents of the diocesan library. For example, when examining instances of the works of John Tillotson (1630-1694), the contemporary library catalogue of the Brechin Collection lists five volumes. Yet in 1846, there was a ten-volume octavo set of Tillotson’s work owned by the Rev. Alexander Jamieson, evidently no longer in the Brechin Collection.

The potential of provenance as a source for the study of history was demonstrated by John Durkan and Anthony Ross in their seminal work *Early Scottish Libraries*. The work lists over three-hundred pre-reformation Scottish book owners and the surviving contents of their library, split into three categories – bishops, individuals, and institutions (such as Monastic Houses). Detailed descriptions of the physical features of surviving volumes are provided, which include transcriptions of ownership inscriptions, details of bindings, and remarks on the presence of marginalia. Many of the volumes listed contained multiple ownership inscriptions, enabling the discovery of connections between sixteenth-century Scotsmen hitherto unknown. The work also sheds light on how early-printed books arrived in Scotland, and moved around the country. As Anthony Ross neatly summarised in his introduction to the volume, *Early Scottish Libraries* provides “a most valuable source of material for the study of sixteenth century Scotland especially,” and tapped into a source of evidence, which had been “hitherto almost wholly neglected.” The work demonstrates that the study of private libraries has the potential to enhance and revise understandings of religious and intellectual culture. The physical books of the Brechin Diocesan
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52 The works listed in the current Brechin Collection by John Tillotson are:

- The works of the Most Reverend Dr. John Tillotson, late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury: containing two hundred sermons and discourses, on several occasions... 2nd edn. (London: Printed for Timothy Goodwin, Benjamin Tooke, and John Pemberton, in Fleetstreet; John Nicholson in Little-Britain, and Jacob Tonson in the Strand, MDCCXVII. [1717]), annotated by the Rev. Patrick Gordon and the Rev. Thomas Beatt. Br UF 252.03 T 578
- The works of the Most Reverend Dr. John Tillotson, late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury: volume the third, containing two hundred sermons and discourses on several occasions. (London: Printed for J. and R. Tonson and S. Draper, 1752), Br UF 252.03 T 578
- The second and last part of the devout Christian’s companion... (London: Printed for E. Curll; E. Sanger; and R. Gosling, 1711), Br U 249
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54 John Durkan and Anthony Ross, *Early Scottish Libraries*, (Glasgow: John S. Burns; 1961)
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Library are thus an important, and hitherto untapped resource for understanding eighteenth and nineteenth century Scottish Episcopal intellectual culture and identity.

Subsequently, a fundamental part of this thesis is the examination of the physical books of the Brechin Diocesan Library. As the library has survived largely intact, and is kept together as the Brechin Collection, it was possible to browse the shelves of the diocesan library, and remove books to examine them for marks of past ownership. This was one of the primary research methodologies for this thesis, as through an examination of the library’s books it was revealed that many volumes have inscriptions of multiple past owners. Their identities are usually straightforward to establish, as they are typically eighteenth- and nineteenth-century clergymen of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Many of the books have evidently passed through multiple generations of clergymen before arriving in the Brechin Diocesan Library. Unravelling the greater meaning and purpose of these ownership inscriptions and other annotations – such as marginal notes, indexes of page of interest, and content warnings – is a key aim of this thesis.

In order to assess the significance and meaning of these annotations, this thesis also examines the library of Alexander Jolly (1756-1838), Bishop of Moray. Over his lifetime, Jolly amassed a library of close to three thousand books, which he gifted to the Church in 1826, to form the library of its first Theological College. An extraordinary feature of Jolly’s library is the extent to which he annotated his books. The front and end leaves, the title page, and the margins of the text are often full of his notes. He also possessed many volumes previously owned by nonjuring Episcopal clergymen, most notably Archibald Campbell (d.1744), Bishop of Aberdeen. Jolly’s library is preserved in the National Library of Scotland, and thus, unlike the Brechin Diocesan Library, it was not possible to browse the shelves for books with annotations. Instead, books were individually requested to be consulted in the reading room at the NLS. A familiarity with books and authors important to Episcopal clergy, as well as the MS notes often described in the NLS catalogue, made it possible to view a substantial number of volumes containing Jolly’s inscriptions.

In order to understand the importance of the diocesan library, it is necessary to know what came before it. This thesis thus begins by giving an account of intellectual culture in the Scottish Episcopal Church before the establishment of the library, focusing on how books were acquired, shared and used among eighteenth-century clergy. This is a topic which has hitherto not been touched upon in the historiography of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Yet, as will be demonstrated throughout this thesis, access to books was critical for sustaining the Church’s informal system of education in both the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The beginning of chapter 1 outlines how clergy accessed books before diocesan libraries, and argues that there was a culture
amongst senior Episcopal clergy of bequeathing books to their juniors which the foundation of the Brechin Diocesan library was a part of. This discussion leads to answering the questions of why and how the diocesan library was established, as well as how it was developed and managed.

This institutional history of the library in Chapter 1 discusses the circumstances of its establishment, as well as its regulations, the particulars of how a book was borrowed, and how the diocesan library expanded. The conditions of use of a library, its geographic location, its acquisition of new books all have an impact on how a library is used, and why particular books were borrowed. Indeed, the necessity of understanding how a collection did or did not change over time is highlighted by Jill Dye in her thesis ‘Books and their Borrowers at the Library of Innerpeffray c. 1680-1855,’ in which she shows that the popularity of a work may be less to do with its contents, and more to do with it being the most modern book available. The chapter provides a foundation for understanding how the contents of the library were added to and developed by the clergy and bishops of the diocese, as well as the intended use of the library by its bishops.

Chapter 2 provides the intellectual framework necessary for understanding the diocesan library, as well as annotated books, in the context of the theological developments of the eighteenth and nineteenth-century Church. Specifically, it addresses the constitution of the Church, the Scottish Communion Office, Orthodoxies and Heterodoxies, and definitions of High Churchmanship. These topics are examined with reference to the books in the diocesan library and the private libraries of episcopal clergy, demonstrating how the identity and intellectual culture of the eighteenth-century Episcopal Church was preserved in the diocesan Library.

Chapter 3 considers the library’s management by Bishop Gleig, and his plans for the library’s use as an educational tool. It provides a history of the education of young ordinands in the church, and assesses the importance of the diocesan library in educating them. It uses a case study of two Candidates for the Holy Orders in the diocese of Brechin, and examines what they borrowed from the library. It considers Bishop Gleig’s ideal clergymen against the realities of borrowings by the clergy. It also examines the influence a bishop had over the education of a clergyman, and shows the different Scottish Episcopal identities Bishop Gleig and Bishop Moir directed their clergy towards.

Chapter 4 is focused on the library in the second half of the nineteenth century. It challenges historiography which claims there was little interest in Tractarianism by clergy of the Scottish
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56 By looking at the development of the library, Dye was able to establish that the initial popularity of the works of John Locke was most likely due to it being the most modern item in the collection until the completion of the new building. Jill Dye, Books and their Borrowers at the Library of Innerpeffray c. 1680-1855, Doctoral Thesis (University of Stirling, 2018) & dataset. p.234
Episcopal Church by showing the ways in which library was used to engage with it. It uses evidence of the acquisitions of periodicals, and works by High Churchmen and Tractarians to illustrate this engagement with theological discussions in the wider Anglican Church. It argues that Bishop Alexander Penrose Forbes attempted to use the library to promote his ideal Catholic Truths. Forbes donations and acquisitions for the library are examined for this purpose and considered as part of a unique intellectual culture in the diocese. Borrowing registers in the later nineteenth century are also examined and considered against Forbes’ system of education designed to defend the Anglican Church against atheism.

Chapter 5 focuses on provenance and marginalia, using the example of Bishop Alexander Jolly. It considers the importance of particular authors and works to Jolly, and the ways in which his library exemplified a reverence for antiquity and the nonjuring Church. It argues that Jolly attempted to preserve and defend these doctrines through his marginalia, which was directed at the future clergy of the Church. Jolly’s annotations are used to examine the marginalia and ownership inscriptions of other Episcopal clergy, and the ways in which they represent a desire to preserve the nonjuring inheritance of the Church through physical books. Overall, it argues for the importance of studying the provenance and marginalia of works owned by Episcopal Clergy to understand the identity and intellectual culture of the Church in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.
Chapter 1: The History of the Brechin Diocesan Library

The Brechin Collection at the University of Dundee is a library of multitudes. It contains libraries within libraries; each incarnation of the diocesan library is found on its shelves, and within these are the libraries of generations of Episcopal clergymen, as well as many of the books of the Drummonds of Hawthornden, and volumes from the Gardenstone Inn at Laurencekirk. To understand the contents of the library, and its use by the clergy in the nineteenth century, it is necessary to understand its history, its structure, and its regulations. This chapter outlines the history of the Brechin Collection, beginning with the first clergy library at Laurencekirk in 1792. It details the establishment of the Jamieson library in Brechin in 1821, the merging of Laurencekirk and Brechin in 1854, and the short-lived library in Dundee from 1870.

This chapter will also examine how Episcopal clergy bought, borrowed, and read books before the establishment of the diocesan library. There is little surviving evidence of this directly associated with the diocese of Brechin, other than the books donated to the library. However, the ways in which clergy accessed books is largely applicable to the whole Church, particularly as the Church’s clergy often lived rurally. The discussion of how eighteenth-century Episcopal clergy formed their personal libraries has, to this author’s knowledge, never featured in Scottish Episcopal historiography. Neither has the informal system of lending books between clergy, and the theological disputes and discussions, which were a part of borrowing books from brethren and friends. Both are advantageous contexts for understanding the impact of diocesan libraries on intellectual culture and identity.

Acquiring and Reading Books before Diocesan Libraries

Before the establishment of clerical libraries, the clergy, particularly those in rural parishes, relied on their own private libraries, or borrowed books from their brethren. While there may have been subscription or public libraries in Scottish towns, the likelihood of them acquiring or having the newest publications relevant to Episcopal clergy is low.\textsuperscript{57} There were, of course, exceptions to this. William Erskine (1709-1833), Episcopal minister at Muthill, made use of the library of Innerpeffray, borrowing twelve titles (or twenty-nine volumes) between 1769 and 1776.\textsuperscript{58} Jill Dye’s...
analysis of Innerpeffray Library in the eighteenth century found a significant proportion of the library’s religious acquisitions were by Anglican authors. She states that there was “a strong tendency towards the Episcopal within the collection” owing to the influence of patron and governor of the library, Robert Hay Drummond (1711–1776), who from 1761 was Archbishop of York.  

Erskine’s borrowings included sermons by Samuel Clarke (1675-1729), a controversial Anglican scholar and minister who denied the doctrine of the trinity; and Dissertatio de S. Scripturarum interpretation...(1714) by Anglican clergyman Daniel Whitby (1638-1726), in which Whitby attempted to show that the Church Fathers were not adequate authorities for the debate on the Trinity. As discussed in Chapter 2, in the second half of the eighteenth century, Arianism and the denial of the trinity was a much-debated topic in the Scottish Episcopal Church, as many of the northern clergy and bishops were adherents of Hutchinsonianism. Significantly, Erskine was able to use the Innerpeffray library, essentially his local library, to educate himself on the dispute. Mark Towsey has also noted that Bishop Gleig, who was based in Stirling, and Alexander Cruickshank (d.1834) incumbent at Muthill, borrowed from the Leighton Library at Dunblane.  

However, these borrowers are the exception, rather than the rule. There is evidence which suggests a collection of books for the use of the clergy of Aberdeen was started before the diocesan library was founded in 1804. Archibald Campbell, the nonjuring Bishop of Aberdeen (1721-1724) is said to have donated a book to the presbyters of Aberdeen with the inscription “hunc librum Archibaldus Episcopus Aberdonensis prebyteris et diaconis sui dono deidt.” Thus, it is likely that there was sometimes a small collection of books in the Vestry of the Church which the incumbent could use. Regardless, the clergy still had to rely on other means to acquire books.  

Clergy based in Edinburgh generally found it much easier to consult books and buy books than their brethren elsewhere. Firstly, they had access to the advocates’ library, whose librarians in the  
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59 Dye, Books and their Borrowers at the Library of Innerpeffray, p.73  
61 This is recorded in a newsletter of the Aberdeen Diocesan Library and Archive, sent to me by Stuart Donald, honorary archivist of the Diocese of Aberdeen. It is said to come from the research of the diocesan librarian Francis C. Eeles. However, the title of the book is not given, and the Aberdeen University Special Collections, where the book is deposited, has not recorded the inscription in the online catalogue.  
62 It is likely that the clergy in Aberdeen and St Andrews used their town’s university library, though this is a statement based on conjecture, rather than archival evidence.
mid eighteenth century were the Jacobite and Episcopal scholars Thomas Ruddiman and Walter Goodall. Secondly, Edinburgh was a book town. There were countless bookshops, including that of James Robertson, who was the bookseller of choice for many Episcopalian authored works. Robert Lyon (1690-1761)\(^64\) bought Henry Dodwell's *A discourse concerning the one altar and the one priesthood* (1683) from “Mr James Robertsone stationer” in 1730.\(^65\) Additionally, there were book auctions. Bishop William Falconer (1707-1784), primus of the Church (1762-1782) and resident in Edinburgh from 1746, was infamous for his attendance at auctions in the late 1750s.\(^66\) His Leith based colleague the Rev. Robert Forbes (1708-1775),\(^67\) who nicknamed him “Modestus” in correspondence with the Rev. John Alexander (1694-1777),\(^68\) was worried about the financial difficulties the bishop’s book buying had caused, calling it a “miserable disease.” He writes to the Rev. Alexander that “In a word Modestus & the auctions are becoming a common proverb now.”\(^69\) Falconer was a bibliophile; at auctions, he was not looking for specific scholarly works to aid him in the course of his clerical duties, but rather a nice edition of Virgil to add to the ten he already owned.\(^70\)

Conversely, book buying options for clergy in other dioceses existed, but were more limited. Aberdeen was the nearest urban centre for those in the northeast, and while it had bookshops, their stock was limited. Though we can construct the libraries of some of those based in the northeast, there are few records of where clergy bought their books.\(^71\) Clergy based in Edinburgh also had the advantage of visiting each other more easily and copying and borrowing books from each other. In a letter to the Rev. John Alexander in 1759, the Rev. Robert Forbes alludes to offering his colleague Falconer the opportunity to borrow the manuscript of, presumably, a volume of his work *Lyon in Mourning*, for Falconer to copy. Forbes writes that “he [Falconer] says he can have access to my copy; & that’s enough.”\(^72\) While this suggests that clergy in Edinburgh could easily consult each other’s libraries and manuscripts, it was also clearly an insult to Forbes,
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“Ten or 12 editions of virgil! 8 or 9 of Horace! 5 or 6 if several others! a game only fit for a D[uke] of Hamilton, an Earl of Hopton [sic], or a Charteris.”

\(^{71}\) Bishop Jolly managed to amass a sizeable collection of second-hand books but leaves little evidence of where he bought them. Occasionally the clergy leave inscriptions stating that they bought a book from a particular person, rather than a bookseller.

\(^{72}\) NRS CH12/23/1063 Robert Forbes to John Alexander 12 Mar [1759]
who stated to Alexander that “I am sure he has not in all his much over-grown collection of books, a single one useful for him qua clericus scoticanus as that same thing would be.”

The nonjurors who had taken up residence in London in the early eighteenth century were able to expand their libraries while there. Bishop Rattray, then a priest, bought *A summarie of devotions* by William Laud (Oxford, 1667) in London in 1716, as well as *The Sibylline Oracles Translated from the best Greek copies*, by John Floyer. His colleague Bishop Archibald Campbell, who remained in London, built an extensive library. In 1738 he attempted, to sell his “books by Scottish authors and concerning Scottish Affairs” to the Advocates’ library, which comprised of seven folios, forty quarts, forty-seven octavos, twenty-seven octavo and smaller, and ninety-two duodecimo and smaller volumes. Thomas Ruddiman refused to purchase them for the library, as many of the books were duplicates or not considered of value. Campbell was also well placed to acquire and send books to his colleagues in the north. For example, in 1712, Bishop John Falconar (1660-1723), based then at Kellie in Fife, wrote to Campbell requesting books to convince the fife gentry of the validity of ordinations of the Church of England against the Romanists.

However, requests for books were not always fulfilled. In 1714, Campbell wrote to Falconar to inform him of the difficulties of acquiring the publications he requested. He wrote, “when modern books, especially pamphlets, have had their short run they are return’d and do become invisible, and ’tis very difficult to find them and if olde books you want they must be search’d for and may be had at some accedentall [sic] occasion and not again for a good while.” Though the availability of certain books fluctuated throughout the eighteenth century, and buying books in Scotland became easier, having colleagues with well-stocked libraries who were generous with sharing their books was an advantage for reading both new and old publications.

John Alexander (1694-1777), Bishop of Dunkeld, was one such generous colleague, who was known among his clergy for having an impressive library. Alexander was the son of the Jacobite
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79 Canon Cooper states that Alexander’s library was given to Arthur Petrie, who gave it to Alexander Jolly. While Petrie is know to have had the library, none of the books of the Jolly collection examined for this thesis contained provenance of either Petrie or Alexander.
and Episcopal Priest John Alexander ca. (1641-1717) of Browland, Auchindoir.  

In 1728, he purchased books from James Moir in Edinburgh, who in turn sent him several books totalling £1 2s. This included Edward Larkin’s (1623-1688) *Speculum partum* for 9 shillings. Moir writes that “no doubt you’ll think them too dear, considering how you bought some here, but the character of several authors increased and raised the price of them. They are all of a practical and instructive nature and pretty rare.” Moir’s letter draws attention to two facts; that acquiring books was an expensive pursuit, and that having contacts in Edinburgh was useful for purchasing books without visiting the city.

Alexander’s correspondence is filled with instances of borrowing books and lending them to his brethren. His correspondence discussing and sending books is evidence of a Scottish Episcopal intellectual culture sustained by the exchange of books and letters. On 23rd June 1739, Robert Lyon sent him a copy of Thomas Brett’s *Some Remarks on Dr. Waterland’s Review: Of the Doctrine of the Eucharist* [1738]. Though Brett was generally favoured amongst the Scottish Episcopal clergy, Lyon had some criticisms of this particular work, specifically that Brett had differed from Johnson’s work *The Unbloody Sacrifice* and the primitive church, in his interpretation of the Eucharist. He laments to Alexander that “such instances are warnings for everyman to take heed but then I think such beacons should be clearly pointed out to less considerate readers.”

Lyon’s letter is evidence of an intellectual culture sustained by circulating contemporary works amongst clergy. He shared the book and his thoughts with Alexander, clearly expecting his colleague to read and respond. In return, he requested that if Alexander had “got hold of Waterland imitated, or have that Dr’s performance on positive institutions, allow me the use of them, I wrote for both from old Geo. Strachan, but he sent me neither.” This again demonstrates that clergy relied on each other to share books. Alexander went on to recommend, and possibly send, the
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copy of Brett to his colleague in the diocese of Dunkeld, William Bell (1704-1779), incumbent at Doune. Bell wrote to Alexander that “I have read Dr Waterland Bret & the Cambridge gentlemen as you recommended to me & think the last a most reasonable dissertation.”

Bell’s letter contains further evidence of a scholarly culture of sharing and discussing books amongst clergy. He has read Alexander’s copy of Shuckford’s *The Sacred and Profane History of the World* (1728) and requests volume two. He states that “he cannot get your author to agree with Rollin & most other authors about the original of the Assyrian monarchy…” and starts a discussion about the founders of the Assyrian monarchy. He also sends his own book “Socrates’ Memorable things.” The necessity of sharing books amongst colleagues thus had the benefit of fostering intellectual discussion, of challenging views and sharing them, and leading to further reading and recommendations.

There is evidence of this exchange of books and opinions on works of theology and history until the end of the eighteenth century. Bishop Andrew MacFarlane of Ross (d.1819) regularly wrote to Bishops Jolly and Bishop Patrick Torry (d.1852) on the books he was reading, usually to disagree with authors who went against his Hutchinsonian views. In 1782, Jolly shared his difficulties reading Tertullian with his friend and colleague Bishop Arthur Petrie (1730-1787) in Meiklefolla, while also humbly asking for a better Latin dictionary. He wrote:

I have dipp'd into Tertullian, & that rough African is like to master me entirely. His Latin I think more difficult than St Justin's Greek - but the little fruit I am able to gather in him is exceedingly sweet & therefore I am still to try if I can come at it for all his Thorns. I am looking about for a better Latin Dictionary than the one I have (only Young's) but I am ashamed to apply to your Reverence - I have never found such a Usage of many Vocabularies as I must draw them to in him to make sense of them.

This letter is an insight into the reading habits of Bishop Jolly, and an instance of him reading purely for his own scholarly pursuit of better understanding the Church Fathers, whom he venerated, and sharing this with a respected friend and colleague. As Episcopal clergy were spread
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out so far, and often in far north or hard to reach places, friendships were sustained through correspondence, and for the scholarly and theologically engaged, an intellectual culture was sustained through letters and sharing books.

Bishop Jolly is also known to have shared his books with both colleagues and members of his congregation. Many of these books included Jolly’s marginalia, which often recommended further reading, as well as drawing attention to paragraphs of importance. As a young and scholarly priest, Jolly had benefited from borrowing books from his brethren, particularly Arthur Petrie and George Innes (1717-1781), both of whom he considered mentors. In July 1778, he wrote to Innes that he was returning two books, “which I return with my hearty thanks for the use of them.” In September of the same year, Jolly returned “three excellent discourses your reverence has kindly favoured me with when in town,” all of which he had copied. The education of young clergy depended upon the generosity of their seniors in recommending, gifting and lending books from their own personal libraries. In the eighteenth century, there was no formal system of educating ordinands, owing to the illegal status of the Church. As will be discussed in Chapter 3, the Brechin Diocesan Library played an important role in fulfilling the education of candidates for the holy orders. Before the diocesan library, ordinands were reliant on the libraries of senior colleagues, especially those who took on the role of tutoring them.

Thus, an important aspect of Bishop Alexander’s library (and indeed, his apparent generous nature) was the access he gave to young candidates for the holy orders to pursue their studies. In October 1749, Bishop Alexander took in Thomas Beatt (d.1787) to “wait” on him, as a favour to the Rev. Patrick Gordon (1695-1755) in Edinburgh, under whose care Beatt had been. In June 1749, Beatt, resident in Edinburgh, had been ordained a deacon in the diocese of Dunkeld and Dunblane “having passed the customary tryals [sic].” He appears to have been tutored for this by the Rev. Gordon, who requested that Alexander fulfil the education Beatt required for his ordination as a priest. While thanking him for taking Mr Beatt in, Patrick Gordon wrote to Alexander explaining that as Beatt “is now in some prospect of a settlement, I’m persuaded your reverence will not be
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wanting in doing what is necessary to complete your own work; by giving him such assistance as he shall stand in need of.”

There is no record detailing Beatt’s time with Alexander, but when he left him in November, he had borrowed books from Alexander's library. On his way to the Carse of Gowrie to find his first settlement, Beatt wrote to Alexander “I have sent you by the carrier the two books & the pamphlets which I had from your reverence, and for the use of which I return you a great many thanks.” Beatt was ordained priest in 1750 and afterwards settled in Fingask.

Bishop Alexander extended the same hospitality to his nephew Arthur Petrie (1731-1787), who lived in Aberdeenshire. Petrie’s biographer states that in 1760, while considering ordination, Petrie lived with his uncle to pursue a course of theological study, where he would have access to his uncle’s vast library. Bishop Alexander bequeathed his library to his Petrie, who in turn took on the role of tutoring candidates for the holy orders in his home in Meiklefolla.

The gifting of books and entire libraries to junior clergy was an important and integral part of intellectual culture and clergy education in the Scottish Episcopal Church, which extended to the eventual establishment of diocesan libraries. The Rev. William Smith (d.1774), Dean of Aberdeen, left his books for the use of his successors. These went on to form nearly half of the Aberdeen Diocesan Library, when they were given to the library by Bishop Skinner in 1820. Alexander Lunan (1703-1769) incumbent at Luthermuir, left books to his successor Alexander Jamieson, which went on to form part of the diocesan library in Brechin.

Beatt settled in Fingask, situated around ten miles from Perth, and later became presbyter of Inchyra (1774-1787), a congregation that existed only under his incumbency. After he was ordained priest, Beatt benefitted from books given to him by the Rev. Patrick Gordon. The majority of Beatt’s library bears marks of provenance of Gordon. Gordon is indeed an interesting but mysterious character, whose entry in Bertie’s *Scottish Episcopal Clergy* is unsatisfactorily short,
owing to a lack of records concerning him. It is his books which bear witness to the life of an Episcopal clergyman who is otherwise difficult to trace.


Thomas Beatt and Patrick Gordon’s library became a part of the library at Laurencekirk. Their books are an example of the libraries within libraries that the Brechin Collection contains. Their books demonstrate that before the repeal of the penal laws, books moved from the personal library of one clergyman, into those of another. The establishment of diocesan libraries created a place where these books could be collected, and made accessible to all of the clergy. Consequently, the Brechin Diocesan Library contains libraries within libraries, and many of the books on its shelves were owned by generations of clergy, gifted and sometimes annotated, for the future clergy of the Church.
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Both books are annotated by the Rev. Patrick Gordon and the Rev. Thomas Beatt.
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It is possible Gordon’s movements were linked to Jacobitism, but further research is required to establish this.
The Establishment of the Laurencekirk Library

At the annual diocese synod, held at Drumlithie on 18th April 1792, Bishop Strachan (d. 1810) and the clergy of the diocese of Brechin “took into consideration the propriety and utility of having a publick Library for the benefit & improvement of the clergy of this district…” They were “unanimously of the opinion that each Clergyman should pay up to an appointed collector two shillings and six pense [sic] yearly for the purpose of buying Books for the said Library.” The establishment of the library came just a few months before the repeal of the penal laws, which the bishops of the Church had been pursuing in Westminster since 1788, after the death of the last viable Stuart heir. At first glance, this may appear the most important motivating factor in forming a library for the use of the clergy. The church could now begin considering its future and presenting itself publicly; a library was a celebration of this. However, this was only one important circumstance for the formation of the diocesan library.

The library at Laurencekirk was the first public episcopal library established in the eighteenth century. The diocese of Aberdeen established its library in 1805, and the diocese of Edinburgh did not found its library for the use of the clergy until 1839. There were two essential conditions, which allowed the diocese of Brechin to form a library earlier than the rest of the Church. The first of these was an endowment of books; the second was a place to keep them. The latter came first. In 1790, the diocese of Brechin was in the unique position of building a new chapel and parsonage, based in Laurencekirk, owing to the generosity of Francis Garden, Lord Gardenstone (1721-1793). The parsonage became the first home of the Laurencekirk Library.

The securing of the chapel and manse for Laurencekirk from Lord Gardenstone was the result of his convivial relationship with Bishop Abernethy Drummond, the primus of the Church, and a former Bishop of Brechin. Abernethy Drummond had been in correspondence with Gardenstone since at least the beginning of 1790, presumably having made his acquaintance in 1788, when the bishop’s synod met in Laurencekirk. Gardenstone had also been very affected by Abernethy Drummond. He describes a letter received from him as having been written “in [the] true spirit and character of a Christian Pastor, without guile or partial motives.” His subsequent generosity
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towards the Church likely inspired Abernethy Drummond to bequeath his library of over six-hundred books to the clergy of Brechin.

Francis Garden was a Judge of the Court of Session in Scotland, and in 1762, purchased the estate of Johnston at Laurencekirk, Kincardineshire. His great ambition was to turn Laurencekirk into a manufacturing village for the benefit of the public, and he offered land on generous terms to encourage people to settle. He secured a King’s Charter for the village in 1779, by which it became a burgh. Subsequently, in 1780 he published his intentions for the town in a pamphlet entitled A Letter to the People of Laurencekirk. In the Letter, he is not modest about his project, and compares himself to the Greeks and Romans, among whom “persons of the highest ambition aspired at a character of being founders of societies and cities.” His address focuses on creating a town for the public good, and it may be argued that toleration of other faiths, and aiding the Episcopalians in their freedom of religion, helped to fulfil Gardenstone’s vision for the town.

Gardenstone was not an episcopalian and as a young man had volunteered for Hanoverians in 1745. He states in a letter to the Bishop that:

Tho bred a Presbyterian I have ever revered the order & decency of the Episcopal Church and as I have declared to you and others of your communion, my deliberate resolution (now that you have publicly conformed to the Revolution System & Establishment of government) to induce & establish a Scotch Episcopal Church in my village of Laurencekirk.

However, the annals of local history suggest less lofty motives, and claim that Gardenstone was motivated by a grudge against Laurencekirk’s Church of Scotland minister. Allegedly, Lord Gardenstone was complemented by intentions of the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church to meet in his town in 1788, to discuss the abrogation of the penal laws. Subsequently he “wrote the Parish minister asking him to entertain one or two in the manse, as there was little room in the


123 An anecdote which is recounted when Gardenstone’s name is mentioned, is that he was supposed to be spying for the Hanoverians in Musselburgh, but instead spent the afternoon drinking sherry and eating oysters. He was subsequently caught by the Jacobite forces and avoided being hung on the plea of being “drunk and incapable.” William Ruxton Fraser. History of the Parish and Burgh of Laurencekirk (Edinburgh : William Blackwood and Sons Edinburgh and London, MDCCCLXXX [1880]), p.117
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The response of the minister betrays the animosity felt between the Presbyterians and the Episcopalians, as the minister not only refused to host the Bishops but added that he “‘liked to see neither them nor their houses.’” On receiving the letter, Lord Gardenstone supposedly remarked “Very well, he’ll soon see both,” and set about choosing a site for the new Episcopal Chapel.

Regardless of his motivations, Gardenstone’s terms on which he proposed his gift to the Church were very generous. He bound his future heirs to the perpetual burden of the Chapel, ensuring the incumbent’s future sustenance. Significantly, he states that the Church will be treated equally, and with the same regard, as the parish and clergy of the Church of Scotland, which included providing a manse for the incumbent. He writes:

Secondly, I, my heirs & successors shall be bound to furnish a competent manse & a moderate glebe, subject to the same Rules & Regulations, in all time coming, with regard to the obligations incumbent on my heirs & successors, & on the successive incumbents, as take place with regards to Rectors of Parishes and incumbents in the Established Kirk of Scotland.”

The incumbent is also presented in perpetuity with “40 sterling in money and forty Bolls of good and sufficient oatmeal yearly.

These conditions were beneficial to the establishment of a library in Laurencekirk, as not only did the books have a home in a newly built manse, but there would always been an incumbent there, supported by Gardenstone, to care for the books. It was a permanent place of residence. The rest of the diocese was in a much more precarious condition.

After 1689, most of the Episcopal clergy had been removed from their charges and been replaced by Church of Scotland ministers. Those that survived lost their chapels during the eighteenth century. In Laurencekirk, the Episcopal clergy had been ousted from their chapel in 1693. Subsequently they met at a meeting house in Redmyre, which was burned down by the authorities in 1746. A new meeting house was established in East Redmyre in 1760.

Towards the end of the century persecution was not so severe, but the Church was steadily losing numbers, and the clergy were living in poor conditions. The new chapel in Laurencekirk was a proper place to worship, and the endowment provided an incumbent with security, a place to live (supplied with firewood)
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and a livelihood. It was one of the few, if not the only place in provincial Scotland, to have this. Indeed, the parsonage, which was where the library was based in its first few decades, was arguably as important as the chapel. Parsonages provided a permanent residence for a clergyman, which offset the low wages of the clergy. In 1792 the parsonage was the only one in the diocese; this number increased to seven by 1853, out of forty-two in the entire Church. There were still one-hundred clergy without a permanent residence in 1853. In this context, we can observe the lasting impact of Gardenstone’s gift to the diocese.

Gardenstone is arguably an underrated figure in Scottish Episcopal history. His decision in January 1790 to see the chapel and manse built was impeded by the penal laws, which were not repealed until 1792. A clergyman could only legally officiate to five people or fewer. In consequence, Gardenstone became involved in the repeal of the penal laws. Bishop Abernethy Drummond, along with Bishop Skinner (1744–1816) of Aberdeen and Bishop Strachan (d.1810) of Brechin, had been lobbying the government in Westminster to have the penal laws repealed since 1788 but receiving relief had not been straightforward. In particular, Lord Chancellor Thurlow had objected to the bill that bishops proposed in 1789 and was preventing it from passing through the House of Peers, although it had been accepted by the House of Commons. The Bishops were disappointed and frustrated by the result, as they felt that the repeal had been prevented by a situation that they could not have foreseen.

Lord Gardenstone took it upon himself to use his position as a Judge in Scotland to write to Lord Thurlow, whom, owing to his position, he had briefly been acquainted with in London. According to the son of Bishop Skinner, the letter to Thurlow was written of Gardenstone’s “Own accord, without the solicitation of anyone.” Gardenstone wrote to Lord Thurlow offering his “humble testimony in favour of the Episcopal clergy in Scotland.” He goes on to write that “I am so much convinced that this measure will be a public good, that I have resolved to endow and establish, at my private expense, an Episcopal Chapel in my village of Laurencekirk, now in a remarkably flourishing progress.” Thus Gardenstone was an integral figure, albeit unintentionally, in the establishment of the library at Laurencekirk. It is also likely that it was Gardenstone who inspired Bishop Abernethy Drummond to make the first significant endowment of books to the Laurencekirk library in 1808.
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William Abernethy Drummond was the Bishop of Edinburgh and Glasgow, and Primus of the Church. In 1787, he held the see of Brechin, but not long after being consecrated, resigned in favour of Edinburgh, and took on the responsibility of Glasgow too. He was born in Corskie, Banffshire, son of Alexander Abernethie. Like many of the northern Episcopalians, he was educated at Marischal College in Aberdeen, from 1735 to 1739. His surname Drummond was assumed upon marrying Mary Barbara MacGregor, the heiress of Hawthornden and descendent of the poet William Drummond. Consequently, the Brechin Collection holds several books with provenance from the poet, and the Hawthornden family library.

Abernethy Drummond began his career in the Church in the diocese of Dunkeld. He had been made deacon on the recommendation of Bishop Alexander in 1744, who wrote to the clergy that “the lad was very deserving” of entering the orders. He ministered at Logiealmond in the diocese of Dunkeld from 1744 until 1746. He then moved to Edinburgh to minister for a nonjuring congregation there. In the aftermath of the Jacobite rebellion, he had hoped to travel to England to be a chaplain for a nonjuring nobleman, but this was not to be. Apparently, his impervious nature and “fiery temper” had acted against him in this matter. Instead, he decided to study medicine at the University of Edinburgh, graduating in 1754. Gerald M.D Howat points out that he was over sixty years old before he came to prominence in the Church, which Howat suggests was as a result of his personality and opinions. Indeed, he is remembered in Russell’s edition of Keith’s *Catalogue of Bishops* as a good theologian “whose intemperate manner defeated in many cases the benevolence of his intention.” In the late 1780s he had turned down the Bishopric of Dunkeld, alluding to his reasons in a letter to the Dean of Dunkeld, George Skene, stating “you all know how ill I stand with those who rule over us.”

Abernethy Drummond was very grateful to Gardenstone for his gift. The evidence for this is found in a volume of *Johannis De Fordun Scotichronicon* (Edinburgh, 1749), which Abernethy Drummond had gifted to Lord Gardenstone, to add to his library in Laurencekirk. The flyleaf contains an inscription from the Bishop, dated 3rd July 1792, which reads:
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To the Keeper of Lord Gardenstone’s Library at Laurencekirk, Sir, I have desired my brother Rev Watson\textsuperscript{142} to send this & other volumes of Fordun’s history to Lord Gardenstone’s library immediately: and after a year elapses, to deliver two volumes of Mr Skinner’s ecclesiastical history of Scotland also. And when it shall please God to all me (I must to a better world), my trustees have orders to send forty vols more of the ancient and modern history, & two vols of a supplement: in all 42 vols to his Lordship’s library as a token of my respect for & gratitude (as Bishop of the Church of Scotland, for his noble benefaction in building and endowing an Episcopal Chapel in his village of Laurencekirk)…\textsuperscript{143}

Gardenstone’s library was located in a room attached to his village inn, the Boar’s Head. The library had been there since before 1773, when Johnson and Boswell visited. They were largely unimpressed with the library, which at that point was only a small room with “a glazed book-case,” containing volumes collected by Gardenstone. In 1781, Gardenstone decided to expand the library and began requesting books from his associates as well as money. He states that he had “collected about £80 stg…” £10 of which was expended in the purchase of books.\textsuperscript{144} Gardenstone was as ambitious about his library as he was about his town. Classical motifs ran through the new library, which was described in the 1930s as an elegant apartment, which retained “a fine mantlepiece of Adam’s design,” and a “gilded statue head, almost certainly of Aristotle.”\textsuperscript{145} Thus, the Bishop’s gift of books was appropriate for him.

Abernethy Drummond’s gratitude towards Gardenstone suggests that his bequest of books to the diocesan library was tied to the symbolic and practical importance of the new chapel and manse. The library had the potential to provide the clergy with books useful to improve their education and aid them in their duties as priests. From this perspective, the library was a part of the regeneration of the diocese made possible by Gardenstone. By supplying the library with books, Abernethy Drummond was ensuring the library’s success and its usefulness to the clergy. Indeed, surviving evidence suggests that his gift was not only the catalyst for the library’s growth, but that it was considered the real foundation of the library.

\textsuperscript{142} Jonathan Watson, who was Bishop of Dunkeld between 1792 and his death in 1808, and first incumbent of Laurencekirk. Bertie, p.146


\textsuperscript{144} John Barker ‘Lord Gardenstone’s library at Laurencekirk’, \textit{The Bibliothek}, 2 (1971), 41-51, p.44

The 1846 catalogue of the diocesan library states that on 3rd November 1808, Abernethy Drummond sent a letter to the Rev. George Gleig, who had been appointed Bishop of Brechin only a few days before. The letter is recorded as stating his intention to “leave his books to the Bishop and Clergy of the diocese of Brechin, for the purpose of founding a Library for the use of the said Clergy, with liberty also to the Clergy of the diocese of Dunkeld,” and his wish that it should “be established within the said diocese, and in the place where it had been founded.”

From this statement, it would appear that little progress had been made on the library since 1792, and that the bishop’s donation was seen as a proper endowment on which to establish a library for the use of the clergy.

It is uncertain how many books were in the manse at Laurencekirk before Abernethy Drummond’s bequest, as little evidence has survived to date donations to the library. The Bishop certainly supplied the library with some books before his death in 1808. His last will and testament, dated 19th May 1804, requested that “such books as are in the press of the Gallery or in a catalogue addressed to the Bishop Watson I desire may be sent to Laurencekirk to the said Bishop Watson or his successor in that charge at my expense to be added to the books which I formerly sent there.” There had also been a bequest of books left by George Skene, incumbent of Forfar, who on his death in 1797, left his books to the “United library of Dunkeld and Brechin.” However, Skene’s books did not arrive until 1830. In consequence, it is not possible to know exactly when the library’s earliest donations became accessible to clergy. However, through inscriptions, as well as the provenance recorded in the 1846 catalogue, these benefactors and their books can be identified.

The library’s earliest benefactors were the clergy present the 1792 synod. The Rev. Greig (1712-1793), incumbent at Stonehaven (1745-1793) and Dean of Brechin from 1778 until 1786 left several volumes. It is rather striking to discover that one of these volumes was a folio of a Hebrew bible, with interlinear Latin translation, printed by the famous Plantin Press in Antwerp in 1584. The Rev. Patrick Rose (d.1799), incumbent of Arbroath (1768-1799), who was Dean of Brechin from 1786, also donated a number of volumes. Rose’s donation is rich in seventeenth-century editions of the Greek and Latin patristic fathers. He donated a three-volume set of St Basil,
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Bishop of Caesarea ca.(329-379), printed in Paris in 1638.\(^{152}\) He also owned many of the works of seventeenth-century Anglican Church Divines, including *Origines Ecclesiasticae* (1674) by Herbert Thorndike (1598-1672).\(^{153}\) Like Thomas Beatt and Patrick Gordon, very little survives of him in the historical record; he endures in the legacy of his books. The donations of Rose and Greig are important examples of the scholarly culture of the Episcopalians in the northeast and the impressive libraries nonjuring clergymen acquired.

**Rules, Regulations and the Development of the Laurencekirk Library**

Regardless of the number of books living in the home of the incumbent of Laurencekirk, it is clear that Bishop Abernethy Drummond’s bequest, combined with the elevation of George Gleig was the point at which the collection of books purposefully became the diocesan library. The terms of the 1808 bequest had constituted Gleig as “sole guardian” of the library, but the authority invested in him by the episcopate gave him the right to manage all the affairs of the diocese, which included the library.\(^{154}\) As Giles Mandelbrote and K.A Manley point out, “The history of libraries is not primarily about institutions, but about the individuals behind them. Four walls and a few bookshelves do not make a library; only a repository; a library has to be exploited to serve any kind of purpose…”\(^{155}\) Its purpose was directed by Gleig when he assumed management of the library, and encouraged his clergy to make use of it in the pursuit of better theological education.\(^{156}\)

Gleig directed the clergy to use the library, and began purchasing books with the aim of supplying the library with more useful works. In 1814, he exchanged “the worst copies of such books as you have duplicates or triplicates of, for others of value which you have not at all.” Gleig had contacted a bookseller to make the exchange and chose the books which he declared would make “a valuable accession to your library.”\(^{157}\) He advised the clergy that he and the bookseller had “made the best bargain for you that we could” even although he paid “one pound ten for Eusebius alone.” Despite


154 Br MS 4/1/1/1 Synod Minutes, 1770-1814: Brechin, 3rd August 1814


156 There is a gap in the Synod minutes between Stonehaven 5th August 1803, and the next recorded meeting at Montrose 28th September 1808, at which George Gleig elected to succeed John Strachan as Bishop. There is another gap in 1809.

157 Br MS 4/1/1/1: Synod Minutes 1792-1814, Brechin, 3rd August 1814
this, he assures the clergy that they are gaining more than they are losing, especially as the books “which have been disposed of were useless to you.”

He goes on to explain to his clergy the best way to read these new books. Although there is no record of borrowing at the time, Gleig’s letter suggests borrowing was already taking place, especially as he is encouraging the clergy to read the new acquisitions. He also he states that he has borrowed one of the new books, William Magee’s *Discourses and dissertations on the Scriptural doctrines of atonement & sacrifice* (1812).

The next significant intervention in the development in the library occurred in 1819. On 23rd June 1819, the bishop and clergy met to take the matters of the library “into their serious consideration.” Rules for the library were drawn up, a librarian was appointed, and it was decided that each clergyman would pay five shillings annually for the upkeep of the library, including the printing of the rules and a catalogue. Since Abernethy Drummond’s gift “considerable additions had been made…so that the number of books collected together was both large and valuable.” However, the books were still kept at the manse at Laurencekirk, and “no room had been provided for the reception of them.” Subsequently, the clergy resolved unanimously to “fit up, at their own expense, with such assistance as the clergy of the diocese of Dunkeld might be inclined to give them, a room under the roof of the Episcopal Chapel at Laurencekirk, to receive the books.”

The next year in June 1820, Robert Spark (1756-1837) incumbent at Laurencekirk and consequently the first librarian of the library, produced a “statement of the expense incurred in fitting up the room in which the library is deposited…. Which amounted to twelve pounds and 16 pence. [£12..16.] of which nine pounds and nine shillings [£9.9.] was raised by subscription from the clergy of the diocese of Brechin. It was decided that the deficit of three pounds and seven pence [£3..7.-] would be collected from the diocese of Dunkeld, as the clergy “have a right to the use of the library and have hitherto contributed nothing at all.” Consequently, the first library committee was appointed to approach the clergy of Dunkeld. “Mr Spark, Cushnie and Moir” were instructed to meet the clergy of Dunkeld in Laurencekirk in August, so that the former can “give sanction to the measures which have already been adapted for the preservation of the library” and discuss any objection they may have to the library rules.

---

158 This is the first, but not the last instance, of books being sold from the library.
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162 We can only assume this happened, as there is no mention of the Brechin Diocesan Library in any of the synod minutes for the Diocese of Dunkeld.
The rules of the library had been decided upon during the meeting of the clergy in 1819, when the Rev. Robert Spark was first appointed as librarian by merit of his position as the incumbent of Laurencekirk. It was decided that the incumbent at Laurencekirk would be the “Librarian, unless it seem meet [sic] to the bishop and clergy of the diocese to appoint another.”163 Appointing a clergy member as librarian was commonplace in ecclesiastical libraries in Britain and given that the new library was attached to the chapel at Laurencekirk, it made sense that its incumbent would look after the library. In the library of the diocese of Aberdeen, the librarian was also a member of the clergy, though he did not need to serve a specific Church. The rules at Aberdeen only stipulated that the librarian must be “One of the subscribers, resident in Aberdeen.”164 This was one of the advantages of a clerical library in a city: more congregations and thus more choice of clergy for the role. Owing to the position of Laurencekirk as a small town in rural Kincardineshire, the librarian had to be the incumbent. It is also worth noting that this was an unpaid position. While some clergy in English ecclesiastical libraries earned additional money for providing this service, particularly for compiling catalogues, there is no evidence to suggest this was the case at Laurencekirk.165

Among the responsibilities of the librarian established at the clergy meeting in 1819 was the instruction that the librarian should keep “a book, in which he shall regularly enter the date when, and the names of, the persons to whom, all books are given out…” These borrowing records are an invaluable source for analysing how the library was used by the clergy, and what books they were interested in. The “Statement of Books given out from the Library, established in the Village of Laurencekirk, by the Episcopal Clergy of Brechin” dates itself on its title page as 1831, but the first record goes as far back as 1817 when Mr Alex Nicol borrowed *Lexicon Trilingue* (No.139).166 This is likely Alexander Nicoll (d.1838), incumbent at Meigle and Alyth (1811-1823) in the diocese of Dunkeld, previously incumbent at Arbroath in the diocese of Brechin (1801-1811).167 While there are too many lexicons in the library catalogue to pinpoint exactly which book Nicol borrowed, his record demonstrates that the library was being used while in the manse at Laurencekirk. Borrowings by the Rev. David Moir (1777- 1847) in 1819 and 1820168 and the Rev. Robert Dyce (1819-1832), incumbent of Drumlithie, in 1819 further confirm this.169

163 Robert Spark incumbent at Laurencekirk (1818-1837). Bertie, p.446
164 Aberdeen 1821 Catalogue, p.iv
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The Laurencekirk library, both at its home in the manse and in its later purpose-built room, was not a place for the clergy to gather and study. It was a place where the books were stored, and was accessed primarily by the librarian. There is no evidence that clergy consulted the books in a communal or social setting, or that it served as a place for them to study the books without borrowing them. It did not have regular hours in which the clergy were permitted to use it. Instead, books requested, in writing, from the librarian. This is in contrast to the clerical library in Edinburgh, established in 1839, which was open to students for the purposes of consultation every weekday from 11am to 2pm, on the proviso that every book used was afterwards returned to its proper place. Bishops and clergy were also allowed to “take out books at any time he pleases and return when he pleases,” as long as it was recorded in the borrowing register, and, if returned at an irregular hour, replaced on its proper shelf. A key difference between these libraries is that one was in a city with multiple congregations, and used primarily by clergy and students within the city. Comparatively, the Laurencekirk library was thirty-five miles from Dundee, its nearest city, and used by clergy from all over the diocese.

The library’s geographic location is an important consideration when discussing its structure and use. The diocese of Brechin hugs the east coast of Scotland, from Dundee up to Muchalls (north of Stonehaven) and stretches out into the Cairngorms to Lochlee (now Tarfside) in Glen Esk. In 1819, there were nine congregations which survived the aftermath of 1745 Jacobite rebellion. These were Arbroath, Brechin, Drumliethie, Dundee, Laurencekirk, Lochlee, Montrose, Muchalls, and Stonehaven. In 1819, the nearest congregation to Laurencekirk was Drumlithie, approximately nine miles away. The library sat almost twelve miles from Brechin, and over nineteen miles from the most northern point in the diocese, Muchalls. Thus, it was difficult for the clergy, or indeed the parishioners of the diocese, to regularly consult the library. There was no library catalogue until 1819, which created further obstacles to borrowing.

The annual diocesan synod was the arena in which updates to the library were shared, and dues received. Clergy were informed of new acquisitions or donations, and the accounts of the library were recorded. As will be discussed, this was also where suggestions for new books were given, and sometimes voted on. If the synod was held in Laurencekirk or Brechin, it was also an opportunity for the clergy to physically consult the library, and borrow books. This is evidenced

---

170 NRS CH12/11/1 Rules of the Scottish Episcopal Library, unpaginated, 1843 Rules, Rule 5
171 NRS CH12/11/1 Rules of the Scottish Episcopal Library, unpaginated, 1843 Rules, Rule 3
172 Bertie, pp.549-560
173 Dating the first catalogue is difficult. The first mention of its existence is in the 1819 rules of the library, which survive only in the synod minutes from 1827. At this synod meeting it is decided to print a new catalogue, none of which have survived. The earliest surviving catalogue is from 1846.
by borrowing records that coincide with the synod. More commonly, the clergy borrowed books by post. It was the responsibility of the librarian to send books to out to the clergy, but the expense of this was not covered by the library. The rules stated that “books shall be sent for and returned at the expense and risk of the person taking them out” up to a maximum of six books at any one time.\textsuperscript{174} Initially, books were delivered via carrier, and then, when available, by railway.

This change is demonstrated by the borrowing of the Rev. James Smith (1804-1854), incumbent at Muchalls. In September 1847, he wrote to the Rev. William Goalen (d.1875), the librarian at Laurencekirk, stating that he is returning “all the books which I find in my possession belonging to the library except 	extit{Parkhurst Heb. Lexicon} and the April no. of 	extit{The Christian Remembrancer}.”\textsuperscript{175} He requests that Goalen “Be so good as to send me by the carrier as many of the following as you can,” and lists of nine volumes, eight of which are sent to him.\textsuperscript{176} The next time he borrows books is in August 1850, he requests Goalen to send him the books by railway.\textsuperscript{177}

Interestingly, Parkhurst’s 	extit{Hebrew Lexicon} was the first book taken out by James Smith in November 1830, and it seems it was still unreturned and in his possession in 1847.\textsuperscript{178} This gives us an indication of how seriously rule number five was taken, which dictated that a book could only be retained by a person for three months. However, it is added that a “fresh application” can be made to the librarian to request longer, and it is possible James Smith had done this, although this would mean a loan extension of seventeen-years. Breaking the rules was punishable by a fine but this does not appear to have been acted on. Transgressions included detaining a book longer than the appointed time “and when, called upon” refusing to give it up, punishable by a fine of one guinea, doubled if the fine is not paid within three months. At the expiration of six months, “the offender shall be suspended from all use of the library, until such time as his fine be discharged and an apology made by him to his brethren for his past misconduct.”\textsuperscript{179} There is no existing evidence showing that any patron was fined in this manner.

In 1842, the library moved from the chapel, back to the parsonage of the incumbent.\textsuperscript{180} There are no records as to why this occurred. The library was under the care of the Rev. Goalen, incumbent at Laurencekirk, who was protective of the library and its contents. He objected to a proposal to
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move the library to Brechin, to be joined with the Jamieson library, and a further plan to disperse duplicate volumes between the two collections. In 1845, he wrote to the Rev. John Moir, who had care of the library at Brechin, that

the scheme is questionable not only as regards honourable dealing towards the donors of the books of the library but also as to its legality for the books having been given to the clergy of the diocese, the present incumbents have no right to dispose of their successors property.

Goalen felt that Gardenstone’s endowment at Laurencekirk provided the ideal situation for the library. In the same letter he describes that

The whole of said library is now deposited in a good apartment, properly fitted up for it, where a fire is kept burning for nine months of the year, twelve and quarter hours a day at no expense to the clergy; and yet even with this benefit some of the books require to be taken from the shelves occasionally and placed before the fire…

He was clearly concerned that the new location of the library would cost too much to heat, and causing the books to deteriorate from poor conditions. Lastly, he felt that the longevity of the library could only be ensured by its continuing residence in the parsonage, pointing out that

there will always be a clergyman at Laurencekirk because of the endowment – who for his own benefit will doubtly [sic] be glad to give the books a room in his parsonage; which of they were deposited at any abandoned charge, who can tell whether they might not eventually share the lamentable fate of Arch Bishop Leighton’s library in Dunblane.181

Goalen’s letter draws further attention to how pivotal Gardenstone’s gift was to the establishment and maintenance of the library. His arguments successfully prevented the move from Laurencekirk to Brechin in 1845. However, ten years later, in 1854, the diocesan libraries were under the direction and influence of Bishop Alexander Penrose Forbes, who had been consecrated Bishop of Brechin in 1847. Under his authority, and his financial assistance, the Jamieson library at Brechin and Laurencekirk library were united under one roof.

181 Br MS 4/6/5/5 Letter to Rev John Moir from William Goalen dated “Parsonage at Laurencekirk March 18th 1845”
The Jamieson Library

In 1827, the synod minutes record that the final shipment of books from Alexander Jamieson have been received by the Rev. David Moir, incumbent at Brechin. Alexander Jamieson had written to Moir in 1821, discussing his desire to leave his books to the diocese, under the charge of Moir in Brechin. Subsequently, a second library was established in the diocese of Brechin. Alexander Jamieson (1743-1823) was latterly the incumbent of a congregation in Glasgow (1788-1823) but had spent his early career in the diocese of Brechin. He was ordained deacon at East Redmyre on 20th April 1770, and appointed to serve the congregation at Luthermuir, five miles from Laurencekirk. He later became presbyter and remained there until 1787, when he moved to Glasgow. Jamieson’s link with the diocese continued throughout his life; he was supported by Abernethy Drummond who had been his bishop in both dioceses, and who left him ten pounds sterling a year in his will. In his own will, Jamieson left some of his possessions to clergymen of the diocese of Brechin, indicating an ongoing relationship with his former colleagues.

These links alone may have been a deciding factor in why he chose to leave his books to the diocese of Brechin, as opposed to Glasgow, but the diocese of Glasgow likely lacked the infrastructure to support a library. Glasgow had suffered badly after the disestablishment of episcopacy in 1689, and the See was administered from Edinburgh between 1809 and 1837, after which William Routledge was appointed as Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway. After the establishment of a congregation at Paisley in 1817, Greenock in 1824 and Peebles in 1828, the diocese was gradually revived, but when Jamieson was deciding where to leave his library, there arguably were not enough congregations in Glasgow to sustain it.

Jamieson wrote to Moir on 24th August 1821 offering “a small collection of books, by way of a supplement to the Episcopal Clergy of the Brechin Diocesan Library at Laurencekirk.” He suggested that it may “perhaps be more convenient for some of the clergy” to have the books at Brechin and asked the Moir to take responsibility for the books provided he could “command a proper room for them” and become “their librarian.” Evidently at some point Moir replied giving his assent, as a month later there were five packages of books on board the Mary of Montrose, eventually bound for Brechin. It is specifically mentioned that the clergy of Dunkeld also have...

---
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“the privilege of reading the books.” In the present-day Brechin Collection his books are easily identifiable, as each volume is inscribed with “Presented to the clergy of the diocese of Brechin & Dunkeld by the Rev Alex[an]d[er]. Jamieson 1822.” The 1828 catalogue of his books is also the earliest recorded library catalogue in diocese, as there appears to be no surviving copies of the Laurencekirk library’s first catalogue.

Nothing has survived to indicate how the first library at Brechin looked. Like the early and latter days of Laurencekirk, it was kept in the parsonage. The Rev. Jamieson wrote to Moir in October 1821 suggesting that “it would be desirable to have folding doors before your book presses, to keep out dust & other offensive intruders; & that the getting of them will not be very oppressive if each of our Brethren will contribute a proposition.” Whether this happened is not clear, but the library was active within a few months of arriving at Brechin. The first borrowing was by the Rev. Jolly of Glen Esk, who borrowed six books on 10th November 1821.

The library functioned in the same way as Laurencekirk: the clergy wrote to the Rev. Moir to request books from him, and he sent them out at the borrower’s expense. Moir often lent some of his own books, which discussed in more detail in chapter 3. The clergy did not subscribe to the Jamieson library; their subscription was solely for the Laurencekirk library. New acquisitions were part of the stock at Laurencekirk. The exception to this was some pamphlets and sermons purchased in the 1840s. It may have been that these were circulated around the diocese like periodicals and then deposited in their final stop at Brechin. There was an overlap of books between the two libraries, observed and recorded when the Jamieson and Laurencekirk libraries were united. There were duplicates of thirty-one folios, eight quartos, and one hundred and fifty “octavo and infra”. In all, one-hundred and eighty-nine volumes overlapped between the two libraries.

Clergyman borrowed from both libraries, and there does not seem to have been a preference between them.

The Library at Brechin

In 1847, Alexander Penrose Forbes was consecrated Bishop of Brechin. He was an ambitious and scholarly clergyman and famously, the first Tractarian Bishop in the Anglican Communion. He instigated and financed the building of a new library in Brechin, where the Laurencekirk and
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Jamieson libraries were united. The synod minutes record the first meeting of the clergy of the diocese in the “beautiful new library” on 1st August 1855 and state that for the erection of the new library they are “solely indebted to the bishop’s generosity.”\textsuperscript{191} The library was a part of series of building erected by Forbes, which included a library room and chapter house, a church school and a school house.\textsuperscript{192}

John Barker, who cared for and studied the Brechin Collection as the University of Dundee’s librarian, suggests that Forbes’ attachment to the medieval Church had influenced him to reinitate Brechin as the centre of the diocese, as it had been in the medieval Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{193} William Perry, Forbes biographer, also believed that Forbes had erected the library in Brechin in order to maintain historic connections with the ancient cathedral town.\textsuperscript{194} In his aforementioned objections to the move from Laurencekirk to Brechin, William Goalen argued that the library belonged in Laurencekirk as it was “the most central charge of the diocese.”\textsuperscript{195} Forbes had evidently decided that Brechin was to become the new intellectual centre of the diocese, and the annual synod was held in the library for a number of years.

However, gradually, under Forbes’ tenure, the real centre of the diocese became Dundee. Forbes lived in Dundee, built the diocese’s Cathedral of St Paul’s there, and used the city as a base for his missions to serve the impoverished families of the growing industrial town. Brechin gradually became an inconvenient town for hosting the library, particularly as the congregations and clergy in Dundee were rapidly expanding. Nevertheless, the library was used extensively by the clergy and its contents grew as a result of donations and purchases.

William Perry’s biography of Forbes includes a description of the new library, the only one found during research for this thesis. He states that “the library was erected on rising ground near the church, and forms one of a group of buildings, the others being the day school and the verger’s house. It is Gothic in style and consists only of an oblong room lighted by four high, mullioned windows, each having armorial bearings in stained glass. Over the door is a large flat stone with the Forbes arms and the initials R.F. and I.M.”\textsuperscript{196}
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The joining of the libraries and its ever-expanding stock caused issues for those who were charged with classifying the library and producing a new catalogue. In 1855, the Rev. Henry Howard (1826-1891)\textsuperscript{197} incumbent and librarian of Laurencekirk, had, with the help of “Mr Stevenson,” been tasked with recalling all books out on loan from Laurencekirk and moving the entire library contents to Brechin.\textsuperscript{198} This was completed by the following August 1856.\textsuperscript{199} However, a catalogue of the combined libraries did not appear until 1869. The records of the library committee, if they ever existed, have not survived, but there were evidently difficulties cataloguing the books. On behalf of the committee, Dean John Moir reported to the synod in 1867 that “progress had been made in the formation of the new catalogue. The sheets were now ready for the press.” The synod then “remitted the matter to Rev Hunter and Rev Crabb authorising them to get it printed as soon as possible.”\textsuperscript{200} Owing to “delays at the printing office,” the printed catalogue did not appear until 1869.\textsuperscript{201} Subsequently, officially, borrowing did not begin again until 1867, when the borrowing register for Brechin begins, leaving a thirteen-year gap in the borrowing records. As new books, pertinent to ongoing controversies in the Church, were being acquired annually, it seems unlikely that borrowing ceased entirely, even if there is no record.\textsuperscript{202}

The Library at Dundee

In 1870, the clergy benefitted from an additional library, located in Dundee, when Archibald Wilson (d.1865), former incumbent of St Mary’s Lochee, left his library to the diocese. The library was kept in the house of his widow on Tay Street, only a fifteen-minute walk from Castle Hill, where many of the Dundee clergy lived. Wilson had only lived in the diocese for two years, likely moving there because of Bishop Forbes’ Anglo-Catholic sympathies, which he shared. Wilson attended Queen’s College, Cambridge in 1843 and his inscriptions on his books indicate that this is when he became engaged with the Oxford Movement and bought books and pamphlets by written by its adherents.\textsuperscript{203} Subsequently, his library has a particularly Anglo-Catholic and Tractarian flavour, discussed in the broader context of the Oxford Movement in the diocese in Chapter 4.
Wilson was ordained in Glasgow and Galloway, where he was incumbent at Dumbarton between 1848 and 1851. He then moved to the Anglo-Catholic Cumbrae Cathedral where he was Canon until 1851. There is a gap in his career due to illness, until his move to Dundee in 1864.204 The existence of the Dundee library has previously gone unrecognised in any literature concerning the Brechin Collection. However, a hitherto unidentified borrowing register in the archives of the diocese of Brechin confirms its use by clergy.205 The shelf marks recorded in the borrowing register correspond with those in the appendix to the 1869 catalogue, which separately lists Wilson’s books and identifies them as residing in Tay Street.

The library was active from 1870 to 1875, and had eleven borrowers. Six of the borrowers are incumbents or deacons in the Dundee area over the period of the register, which is reasonable given the geographic convenience of the library as compared with Brechin. The register runs until 1875, as Mrs Wilson’s decision to sell the house meant the end of the Dundee library. However, on their departure from South Tay Street in 1876, the duplicates from Wilson’s gift were proposed by Forbes’ successor, Bishop Hugh Willoughby Jermyn (1829-1908), to be “deposited in the new See House for the use of the Bishops of the Diocese” meaning that the clergy, dependent on the Bishop, still had access to a library in Dundee.206

The Library in the Twentieth Century

In 1920, the clergy were keen to move some books to Dundee if a place could be found to keep them. The clergy present at the synod meetings between 1920 and 1927 are heavily dominated by those representing congregations in Dundee or the nearby area, suggesting that there was a desire for the books to be more conveniently located. In 1921, it was decided that a “sub-library” was not possible owing to the annual running expenses “estimated at not less than £20” and the “comparatively small nucleus of modern books at the library at Brechin, certainly not exceeding 30 volumes.” Four years later in 1924 “certain books” were moved to the Cathedral house in Dundee.207 The expenses for the library in this period heavily outweigh the income from subscription. In 1926, the library had an income of £34 4 shillings and an expenditure of £40 9

204 Berrie, p.490
205 Br MS 4/6/3/3 Borrowing register [Dundee] 1870-1875
206 Whether this happened is not clear, though Willoughby did donate some of his own books to the “See House.” BrMS 4/1/1/3 Synod minutes (1849-1885), Dundee 1st August 1876, p.210
207 Br MS 4/1/1/5 Synod of the Diocese of Brechin Agenda and Minutes 1918-1929, [page numbers are for separate minutes from each date, they don’t run in sequence]
shillings and 6 pence. The library building also required extensive work, which the Walker Trust gave £50 to complete in 1927.

It is in the synod minutes of the 1920s that it becomes clear that many of the books are now considered historical artefacts rather than part of a working theological library. The lament that there are only 30 volumes of modern works supports the idea that the library was becoming outdated. The librarian reports in 1924 that “an interesting collection of curios” had been lent for an exhibition at the Church congress, and in 1928 Mr MacHugh becomes librarian “on the understanding that he would be relieved of any responsibility for the care of the relics in the Library.” It is in this year that the library committee is instructed to look into the history of the library, including the trusts connected with the library and its property.²⁰⁸

At the same meeting in 1928, the Rev. J. E Macrae offered to present to the library a large collection of books on Sunday School Work, and housing was to be arranged for the books by the library committee. The synod minutes of this period regularly mention the Sunday School Teacher’s Union and discusses lectures on the methods of teaching Sunday School, which makes it likely that the books were not taken to Brechin but were housed somewhere in Dundee, so that the clergy could make use of them more easily.

In the 1930s, the clergy become increasingly keen to find a new home for the library (though in 1932, Dean Christie’s books were moved from Stonehaven to the library at Brechin). Plans were made to consult the National Library in Edinburgh and the librarian of Central Carnegie Library in Dunfermline to consult on the books.²⁰⁹ A year later, the librarian of University College Dundee, Mr Harry Willshner, examined the books and MSS left by Christie and completed a catalogue of them. On seeing the catalogue of the complete library, he advised the clergy that the books were of “great historical value” and recommended that some of them be moved to the university to be within reach of students.²¹⁰ In 1942, the incumbent of Brechin was relieved of the role of librarian, on the motion of the provost John Chappell Sprott. The provost “was of the opinion that the books of the library had not been properly cared for,” and that “some volumes of value were missing.” Consequently, Canon Douglas was appointed as librarian.²¹¹

By 1954, the diocesan library report states “as usual little or no use had been made of the library, probably due to its geographical position.” The congregation at St Andrew’s Brechin was anxious
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to use the room the library was kept in, and it was asked if the library could be transferred to Dundee. The suggestion was also made that the library should be modernised by the buying of new books “and destroying old and useless ones.” Eventually, in 1962 an agreement was made with the University Court of the University of St Andrews, which agreed to transfer the library books to Queen’s College Library at Dundee (now the University of Dundee).

This chapter has provided the first detailed history of the Brechin Collection, and considered how it developed from a collection of books into a Diocesan Library. It has clearly demonstrated the need for the library, and the circumstances of its foundation. It has shown how the library developed and expanded in the nineteenth century and introduced the Bishops who shaped its contents and use. Subsequent chapters will discuss the individual books on the library shelves, which aid our understanding of the intellectual development of the Church’s theology and indeed, the intellectual culture within the diocese of Brechin.

212 Ibid, “Dundee 6th May 1954”
213 Ibid, “Dundee 7th June May 1962”
Chapter Two: Intellectual Framework of the Scottish Episcopal Church

On the shelves of the diocese of Brechin library is a copy of Bishop John Skinner’s work on the Scottish Communion Office, previously owned by the Rev. John Moir (1814-1889).\(^{214}\) On the inside of the front board is a hand-written contents page, listing the pamphlets which have been bound in with the communion office. Opposite this is a transcription of an article entitled “History of the Scottish Communion Office” from the Scottish Guardian, 1 April 1881. In the nineteenth century the Scottish Communion Office was the last vestige of the Scottish identity of the Church, and its most venerated spiritual inheritance from the Episcopal theologians of the eighteenth century. At the beginning of the century, the Scottish Liturgy was the primary Communion Office in the Church, and its position as such was enshrined in the 1811 Canons of the Church. However, by 1863 the Church was dominated by clergymen who favoured uniformity with the Church of England and the English Office was elevated to the status of the preferred office.\(^{215}\) In 1881 when the history of the office was published in the Scottish Guardian, it was becoming a relic. The thoroughly anglicised Scottish Episcopal Church favoured the English office, found in the Book of Common Prayer.

Yet even in 1881 there were still clergymen who upheld the office and sought to preserve its use. John Moir was the son of the former Bishop of Brechin David Moir (1777-1847), and had served as Dean of Brechin between 1848 and 1861.\(^{216}\) He encircled his copy of Skinner’s Communion Office with articles and treatises defending and upholding the Scottish office. Bound in with the office is *An Earnest plea for the retention of the Scotch Liturgy* by the Anglican clergyman John Mason Neale (1818-1866), as well as *The Scottish Communion Office Vindicated* (1843) by the Episcopal priest the Rev. Patrick Cheyne (1793-1878).\(^{217}\) Both Cheyne and Neale were adherents of Tractarian teaching on the Eucharist, which had become entangled in the preservation in the Scottish Office, and caused further division within the Church.\(^{218}\) The transcription of the history of the office, and
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the works Moir chose to have alongside, suggest that Moir was creating a repository not only for understanding and defending the liturgy, but for preserving the history of the fight for an intrinsic part of his Scottish Episcopal identity.219

Moir’s copy of the Scottish Communion Office illustrates one way in which Scottish Episcopal clergy used and read their books, which is a part of the intellectual culture this thesis examines. It is also an example of the necessity of outlining and understanding the intellectual and historical context of Scottish Episcopalians in order to fully understand the significance of Episcopal Libraries and individual books. The significance of John Moir’s copy of the Communion Office cannot be unravelled without understanding the theological, political and intellectual circumstances which led to its creation, veneration, and ultimately its sacrifice in the anglicisation of the Church. Similarly, the library of the diocese of Brechin, the Jolly library, and – more broadly – the Episcopal canon of books, cannot be understood without examining the ideas and beliefs which were engaged with, maintained, and challenged, by both eighteenth and nineteenth-century Episcopal clergy.

The Constitution of the Church in the Eighteenth Century

In the aftermath of the glorious revolution of 1689, the Bishops of the Church of Scotland refused to take an oath of allegiance to the new monarchs, William and Mary. The binding nature of their oath to James VII/II prevented them from doing so. The Presbyterians, their rivals within the Church of Scotland, supported the new King. As a result, the Revolution settlement of 1689-1690 removed the Bishops from governing the Church of Scotland, and restored Presbyterian governance, which entirely abolished the rank of Bishop. The worship of the Scottish Episcopalians would not be tolerated again until 1792. 220 In the south of Scotland, where the Presbyterians were the dominant faction within the Church, Episcopal clergy were turned out of their congregations. Their eradication in the traditional Episcopal heartlands north of the Tay was much more gradual, though this changed after the 1715 Jacobite rebellion. 221 Subsequently, in the eighteenth century, the north-east of Scotland cultivated a particular non-juring Episcopalian identity, shaped by the disestablishment of the Church, and to some extent, Jacobitism. It was this

219 Moir’s were gifted by his daughters in 1927, and resided in St Paul’s cathedral. The daughters of the late Dean Moir “had offered to give to the library the books belonging to their father.” Br MS 4/1/1/5 Synod of the Diocese of Brechin Agenda and Minutes 1918-1929, February 4th 1927
220 The exception to this is Qualified Chapels; clergy and congregations who would pray for the Royal Family and conform with the Church of England. This is discussed in more detail further on.
221 George Grub, An ecclesiastical history of Scotland : from the introduction of Christianity to the present time, Volume 3 (Edinburgh : Edmonston and Douglas, 1861), p.376
identity which was under threat from anglicisation of the Church in the nineteenth century, which clergy such as the Rev. Moir attempted to preserve in books and libraries.

Rowan Strong defines Episcopalian theology prior to the ‘glorious revolution’ of 1689 as a theology “devised by Scots committed to an episcopal polity as opposed to a presbyterian government.” Both the Presbyterian party and the Episcopalian party were part of the Church of Scotland, though the Church was governed by the Episcopalian faction. In the period following the 1662 restoration of Bishops, services between the two differed only in the use of the Lord’s Prayer, the doxology, and the creed at baptism. Distinct confessional identities and cultures between Presbyterians and Episcopalians emerged after the revolution settlement. Previous to this, they existed in a religious landscape that Alasdair Raffe describes as “multiconfessional,” where Catholics, Quakers and Presbyterians were tolerated alongside the established Episcopalians.

In the period leading up to the arrival of William of Orange, the rivalry between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians grew, as the latter took advantage of their toleration and sought to attract conforming Episcopalians to their own Presbyterian congregations, expanding their worshipers as well as forming new congregations. While the Scottish Bishops refused to accept the new monarch, the Presbyterians supported the new King, and seized the opportunity to abolish Episcopacy. In the aftermath of this, Scotland experienced the emergence of “opposing confessional cultures,” both with claims to orthodoxy and highly critical of their rivals. Thus the Episcopal clergy began the eighteenth century disestablished and dissenting, forced to defend their legitimacy to not only the Presbyterians, but to the Church of England and new monarch. This defensive position is key to understanding the intellectual culture of the Scottish Episcopal clergy throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth century.
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The Divine Right of Bishops

Without the endorsement of the state, Episcopal bishops and clergy needed a theological and historical foundation on which to argue the legitimacy of Episcopal governance of the Church. The confessional identity which emerged, and which was sustained throughout the eighteenth century, rested on their claim to be the most primitive, apostolic Church, continuing the traditions — including episcopacy — of the early Church. The most notable and influential work of the immediate post settlement period to validate episcopacy was the Principles of the Cyprianic Age (1695) by John Sage (1652–1711), formerly a clergyman in Glasgow, who had already published on the persecution of the Church. Sage’s work was in response to Gilbert Rule, a presbyter in the Church of Scotland, who argued that Bishops were not a part of Church government in antiquity. Sage responded to this by arguing that “In St Cyprian’s time, every Church all the World over, at least, every Church, constituted and organised, according to the Principles which then prevailed, had a Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons, by whom she was Ruled.”

Sage’s argument that Bishops were both divinely instituted and the successors of apostles (rather than a later institution in the Church) was one of the most significant aspects of his work for Episcopal clergy. Through apostolic succession, the Bishops of the Church of Scotland were a continuation of the true, apostolic, primitive Church, and had been appointed by God to govern it. Furthermore, as St Cyprian defined schism as “when one separateth from his own Bishop,” the Scottish Presbyterians were schismatic. Strong states that Sage’s work “formed the beginning of a belated theological identity for Scottish Episcopalians, alongside their bishops’ contentious and gradual development of an Episcopal polity for their adherents.”

This interpretation of St Cyprian by Sage was influential among the Church’s theologians. Thomas Rattray (1684–1743), the Church’s most notable scholar — and later Primus of the Church - drew heavily on the testimony of St Cyprian to support the spiritual independence of the Church and its Bishops from Civil authority.

Principles of the Cyprianic Age is almost always present in Episcopal libraries. It was both a useful text and a book symbolic of a theological turning point in the Church. There are four copies in the Brechin Collection, and three copies of Sage’s expanded edition of the text, entitled A vindication
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228 John Sage, The principles of the Cyprianic age, with regard to episcopal power and jurisdiction; asserted and recommended from the genuine writings of St. Cyprian himself, and his contemporaries. By which it is made evident, that the vindicator of the Kirk of Scotland is obliged by his own concessions to acknowledge, that he and his associates are schismaticks. In a letter to a friend. By J.S. (London: printed for Walter Kettilby at the Bishop's Head in St. Paul's Church-yard, MDCXCV. [1695]), p.5
230 Sage, The Principles of the Cyprianic Age (1695), p.5
231 Rowan Strong ‘Episcopal Theology 1689–c. 1900’ p.266
232 Discussed later in this chapter.
of a discourse entitled The Principles of the Cyprian age, published in 1701. The first copy of Principles to enter the Diocesan library was the 1695 edition, donated by Alexander Jamieson, in his bequest of 1822. Jamieson’s copy has the bookplate of “Col. John Scott of Comestoun” likely a relation of Colonel James Scott of Comestoun, Member of Parliament for Kincardine in 1722. A copy of the expanded text, Vindications (1701) in the Brechin Collection, is inscribed with the name of “James Robertson, Esquire of Lude 1759.” Both of these suggest an eighteenth century readership beyond the clergy.

Analysing Episcopal library catalogues for copies of Principles also reveals two interesting points about Principles and Sage. Firstly, Principles was often acquired by nineteenth and twentieth-century Episcopalian lay members and clergy as a piece of Episcopalian heritage, rather than as a tool for theological learning and defence. Three of the four copies of Principles in the Brechin Collection were donated after 1869, by figures in the Church more likely interested in the book as piece of non-juring history. The second point of interest is that other texts authored by Sage were more widely owned and presumably read, by eighteenth-century clergy than has previously been discussed.

An example of this is Sage’s work The Reasonableness of Toleration, published in 1704. The work aimed to demonstrate the theological and scriptural evidence for tolerating Episcopalians. Sage did not address the state politics of toleration, but advanced upon the subject using “Church Principles, taken from the sacred scriptures and writing and uniform practise of the first and purest ages of Christianity.” This perspective would have made it a useful work not only for countering the views of Presbyterians, who vehemently opposed Episcopal toleration, but its theological grounding would have also appealed to Church of England clergy sympathetic to the
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233 John Sage, *A vindication of a discourse entituled The principles of the Cyprianic age, with regard to episcopal power and jurisdiction: being a reply to Gilbert Rule’s Cyprianic bishop examin’d and found not to be a diocesan…* (London: printed by G. Croom for Robert Clavel at the Peacock at the west end of St. Pauls, and George Strahan at the Golden-Ball overagainst the Royal Exchange, MDCCI [1701]).
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Episcopalian. There are three copies of the work in the Brechin Collection, a copy was also present in Aberdeen Diocesan Library in 1821, and in Jolly’s library.239

The first copy to arrive in the Brechin Diocesan Library was via the bequest of William Abernethy Drummond.240 There is also a copy of the 1705, which was owned by the Rev. Patrick Rose, before passing to “Ja[mes] Kyd” and lastly to the historian George Grub in 1836.241 For Grub, the work was likely a source for researching the history of the Scottish Episcopal Church, whose history he was writing. The third copy in the Brechin Collection is particularly interesting as it is inscribed with “ex dono magistri Gul[i]elmi Seton 1753.” William Seton was the incumbent of Forfar (1729-1754)242 and gifted the volume to the Rev. George Skene (d.1797). Skene was the incumbent at Blacklunans until 1754, when he moved to Forfar.243 The inscription “gift of the teacher” indicates both that Seton had been mentoring Skene, and that the text was deemed valuable for a young clergyman.244 Skene inherited many volumes from Seton, but this is the only one that is inscribed as a gift. The Reasonableness of Toleration was thus clearly a significant work to Episcopal clergy, and hitherto unrecognised in its importance.245

Similarly, The Fundamental Character of Presbytery printed in 1695 and again in 1697, is another work by Sage which appears in the Brechin Collection, and in the Aberdeen Diocesan library.246 In the work, Sage picked apart the authority of the Presbyterians, by exposing “the failures of our Reformation and the weakness of our reformers” and disproving the Presbyterians right to govern the Church of Scotland.247 There are three copies of the text in the Brechin Collection, one of which was owned by William Abernethy Drummond.248

The ownership of these texts among multiple generations of episcopalian, highlights not only the importance of Sage as a theological authority within the Church, but also the enduring nature of
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his works. Toleration and the legitimacy of the bishops were issues for the clergy throughout the eighteenth century. As the prospect of toleration for the Church became likely, the Presbyterians attempted to undermine the bishop’s claims to apostolical succession and the validity of episcopal government. Sage’s texts were arguably as relevant in this context as they were in the aftermath of disestablishment, and thus his works remained a part of the library of Episcopal clergy and lay members.

While Sage was the first writer to use St Cyprian specifically in the service of the Scottish Episcopal Church, he drew on the work of earlier theologians, such as Henry Dodwell (1641-1711). Dodwell had argued for the importance of St Cyprian’s testimony with regards to episcopal government, and more broadly, the importance of antiquity. He was an Anglo-Irish scholar, described by Quantin as having developed “the most elaborate theory of the authority of antiquity on historical lines.”

Dodwell believed that attempts to understand scripture without recourse to antiquity led to misunderstanding and ignorance; the best interpreters of the scriptures were the Church Fathers, who lived closest to the times in which the scriptures were written, and thus could better understand the Apostle’s minds. His dissertation on Irenaeus (c.130-c.202) “was devoted to the ordinary means that enabled the Fathers of the second century – Irenaeus and his contemporaries – to know apostolic traditions.” Above all, Dodwell believed in the primitive truth of the anti-Nicene Fathers, and their use for solving the controversies of modern Christianity.

With regards to episcopacy, which Dodwell thought of as the fundamental structure of the Church, scripture alone had no clear answer for Church government. Quantin summarises that Dodwell’s view was that “God gave no special instructions on ecclesiastical government to the primitive Christians because he expected them to pay the same duties to the governors of the Church that they had paid to their secular governors, according to the common nature of every human government and more specifically to the customs and notions of the age.” The episcopal government described by the anti-Nicene Fathers, such as St Cyprian, was thus the correct form of Church governance. The importance which Dodwell placed on the early Church Fathers was shared by eighteenth-century Scottish Episcopal clergy, who valued the testimony of Church Fathers with regards to both the constitution of the Church and its liturgy.

250 Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, p.369
In 1775, George Innes (1717-1781), incumbent at St John’s Aberdeen, gifted Alexander Jolly his copy of Dodwell’s *A discourse concerning the one altar and the one priesthood insisted on by the ancients in their disputes against schism*. When he received the gift, Jolly was at the beginning of his theological studies, and was studying to become a deacon. This context indicates that Innes felt the book was an important and foundational work for a young ordinand to read as part of his studies. Evidence of Jolly’s reading of the text supports this. Jolly used a flyleaf to create a list of page of interest, signposting to topics such as “the three orders” and “the Presbyterians” – basic but essential tenants for prospective priest to understand. In the work, Dodwell states that “disunion from the bishop was a disunion from Christ and the Father,” a sentiment which Jolly found to be of importance, as he marked it with an “X.” This statement was relevant to the nonjuring opinion on both Presbyterians and the Qualified Chapels.253 In the section of the work flagged by Jolly as relevant to the topic of “Presbyterians,” Dodwell argued that those without Episcopal ordination “can pretend no signification of God and Christ, in their sacraments…” The implication of this in the nonjuring context was that the Church of Scotland had no spiritual authority, as their ministers were not ordained by a bishop. Consequently, the sole ordinary means of grace could not be validly administrated by them.254 This point of view was supported by many Episcopalians, including Jolly.

Dodwell’s ideas, and his place in eighteenth-century Episcopal libraries, are evidence of influence late seventeenth- century nonjuring scholars had the on the intellectual culture of the Church. This included the English nonjuror George Hickes, whose work on the divine right of bishops was influential among Scottish nonjurors.255 Both English and Scottish nonjurors supported the idea that bishops were appointed by God and had a divine right to their office – they could not simply be deprived of their office by an act of civil government. Hickes took the idea of Divine Right further in his two-volume *Two treatises: one of the Christian priesthood, the other of the dignity of the Episcopal order, an answer to the deist Matthew Tindal’s Rights of the Christian Church, 1706*, first printed in 1707.256 This was followed by a more distilled version in 1716, entitled *The Constitution of the Catholic Church and the Nature and Consequences of Schism*. This took the form of a fifteen-page pamphlet, which
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concisely laid out Hickes’ opinions on the schism in the Church of England, and the authority of royalty and bishops.

Hickes argued that the nonjuring Church of England – composed of Anglicans who would not break their oath to James VII – was the true Church of England. The jurors, who had disavowed their oath before God were in schism. As a usurper to the throne, William of Orange and his successors did not possess the power to deprive the bishops of their spiritual authority, as the bishops derived their authority from Jesus. This occurred as part of the apostolic succession – the belief that the authority of the apostles to govern the Church has been transmitted through a continuous line of bishops through their consecration, from Christ to the present day. Resultantly, only those who held the office of bishop could deprive other bishops of their office.

Hickes further argued that the priests and bishops who replaced the deprived clergy were also usurpers. He stated that those clergy could “perform no valid acts of Priesthood; their prayers are sin; their sacraments no sacraments…” Consequently, carrying on the Apostolic Succession of nonjuring bishops was of tantamount importance to the continuation and survival of the Apostolic Church. Hickes was active in ensuring that the line of nonjuring bishops continued, subsequently consecrating several new bishops, including the Scot, James Gadderar ca.(1655–1733) in February 1712. Hickes’ points on continuing the apostolic succession were equally relevant to the disestablished Scottish Church. As will be discussed in more detail, protecting the line of bishops was a matter of urgency, particularly after the creation of legal toleration for Episcopalians who agreed to pray for the royal family.

Like many of the English nonjurors, Hickes was a popular author amongst Episcopal clergy, from the early eighteenth century and into the nineteenth. The Rev. Patrick Gordon owned George Hickes _Several Letters which passed between Dr George Hickes and a Popish Priest…. _ (London, 1705) inscribed with “Bordx 1738”, as well as _Two Treatises in Priesthood_ (London, 1711), inscribed with “Cohill 1726”. Both of these books were later in the possession of Thomas Beatt, who donated them to the library at Laurencekirk. Abernethy Drummond owned a copy of Hickes’ _Collection of Tracts, Controversial Discourses_, as well as _A second collection of controversial letters relating to the Church of England, and the Church of Rome_ (1711), a copy of _The Spirit of enthusiasm exorcised_ (1709), and _Two

treatises, one of the Christian priesthood, and the other of the dignity of the Episcopal order (1711)259 The Rev. George Garden, minister at Muchalls (1782-1793) and later Stonehaven (1793-1834), owned Hickes’ The constitution of the Catholick Church, and the nature and consequences of schism260 and his Devotions in the ancient way of offices (1765), which was a Catholic primer, reformed for protestant worship.261

George Garden’s ownership of two of Hickes’ texts is interesting, as his donations to the library at Laurencekirk, which were presumably almost the full expanse of his personal library, comprised of only fifty-one titles.262 Many of these were medical texts such as Observations on the Harveian doctrine of the circulation of the blood (1816).263 Whether he had an interest in medicine or practised, is unclear, though it would not have been uncommon for him to do the latter – Bishop Abernethy Drummond practised medicine before his career in the Church, and the Rev Robert Kilgour Thom (d.1874) is recorded as “a physician as well as a minister.”264 Garden’s library, with two exceptions, was comprised entirely of the more affordable format of octavos and duodecimos. In the context of such a limited library, the inclusion of Hickes points to his importance as a theological authority in the Church.

Further evidence of Hickes’ status as part of the Episcopal Canon is represented by Bishop Jolly’s copy of Hickes’ Christian Priesthood. The volume contains an endorsement from Jolly, which reads: “A copy of singular value and high estimation, given by the Rev. Mr Walker to Alexander Jolly.”265 An additional inscription states that it previously belonged to George Hickes, and contains his corrections and additions. The Brechin Collection also contains an edition of Hickes’ work inscribed by the author; a copy of Three Short Treatises (1709) contains an inscription by Hickes, dated London, November 1708, giving it to an unknown recipient.266
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An additional copy in the Brechin Collection was also owned by the Rev. Archibald Wilson, bought by him 1847, when he was studying at Queen’s College Cambridge. Wilson also owned *Two treatises, one of the Christian priesthood, and the other of the dignity of the Episcopal order* (1707) and Hickes’ *Collection of Sermons* (1713). Wilson’s ownership of the texts is interesting as it brings attention to the different meaning of texts to different generations of clergy. Though Wilson, a native of Greenock, was a Priest of the Scottish Episcopal Church, he had been educated in Cambridge, and while there, was exposed to the Anglo-Catholic revival in the Church of England. Wilson was undoubtedly a Tractarian, evidenced by his library, and his subsequent appointment at the Cathedral of the Isle of Cumbrae, a Church established and funded by Oxford Movement supporters. In the 1840s, Oxford Movements adherents in the Church of England were attempting to define Anglicanism in terms of the past, which encompassed the Church Fathers, Caroline Divines and the nonjurors. The latter two themes were accomplished through the publication of the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, which published a new edition of *Two treatises on the Christian priesthood and on the dignity of the Episcopal order* between 1847-1848. Wilson owned the entire *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*. Thus, Wilson’s interest as a student in Hickes may have been inspired by his engagement with the Oxford Movement.

The Constitution of the Scottish Episcopal Church

The 1712 Act of Toleration divided the Scottish Episcopal Church into nonjurors and jurors through the institution of Qualified Chapels. It allowed Episcopal ministers who would take oaths and pray for Queen Anne and Princess Sophia of Hanover during public services, to lead “qualified congregations.” These Qualified Chapels had no Episcopal oversight, as the Scottish Bishops were still considered unlawful. Those ministers who legally qualified for toleration abjured the right of succession of the Stuarts and used the liturgy of the Church of England. The Qualified congregations were thus aligned theologically with the Church of England and alienated from the Episcopal traditions developed by the nonjurors in the eighteenth century, in particular the Scottish Communion Office. Harsher penal legislation passed in response to Episcopalian involvement in the Jacobite rebellions of 1715, 1719, 1745 pressurised the laity of nonjuring
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congregations to move to Qualified Chapels, as the 1748 Act extended the penal laws to apply to the laity.\textsuperscript{272} There were already civil disadvantages of being connected with the Church, namely that baptisms and marriages officiated by nonjuring Episcopalians were illegal. Wealthy Episcopalians were dissuaded from attending worship by the threat of being barred from civic privileges such as voting and holding office.\textsuperscript{273}

As a result, nonjuring congregations dwindled in the second half of the eighteenth century. The 1748 legislation also severed any remaining connection between the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Qualified chapels, as it recognised only ministers ordained in England or Ireland as legitimate. The Qualified Chapels only increased the disparity between Episcopalians in the northeast of the country, and the south. English ordained ministers and the English Book of Common Prayer drew congregations of English immigrants, particularly in Edinburgh. Episcopalians in the south became “increasingly Anglicized and cut off from their nonjuring brethren.”\textsuperscript{274} The widening gap of theology and worship between the two caused problems when the Qualified and nonjuring congregations started to unite after the 1792 toleration act.

When the juring Episcopalians broke off to form their own congregations, and settled into conformity with the Church of England, the theology of the nonjurors, and the constitution of their Church, was still developing. From 1689 until 1715, the Episcopalians had been motivated by Jacobitism.\textsuperscript{275} The church was both tied to the Jacobite cause, and under the authority of the Stuart King. This, however, posed ecclesiastical challenges for the Church, as James VII reserved the right of episcopal nominations. As it was considered impractical to nominate and consecrate bishops as the singular authority of a diocese, bishops were instead elected to an “Episcopal College.” The purpose of the college bishops was to sustain the Episcopal Communion and apostolic line of succession, rather than for the bishops to govern the Church. Without the traditional system of diocesan government, the nonjuring bishops did not reside within a diocese and had no authority over the clergy of a district.\textsuperscript{276} In the college system, bishops were appointed by royal nomination alone, rather than being elected by the clergy. In a few cases this led to the appointment of clergy thought to be unfit for the office of bishop, but who supported the King
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and his agent in Scotland, George Lockhart of Carnwath.\textsuperscript{277} The Jacobite defeat of 1715, which coincided, as Kieran German points out, with a generational change among the Episcopal bishops, resulted in a challenge to the ecclesiological unsound practise of the college of bishops. The new bishops and clergy were less concerned with a return to “the glory days under Stuart sovereignty,” and focused instead on the “reconfiguration of the disestablished Church,” which included putting “ecclesiastical ambition above Jacobite Commitment”.\textsuperscript{278}

The event which triggered the division of the bishops into the “college party” and “diocesan party” was the death of Bishop Rose of Edinburgh in 1720. His death deprived the Church of its last diocesan Bishop.\textsuperscript{279} Bishop Fullarton was then elected by his brethren to replace Bishop Rose as Bishop of Edinburgh, and to take the title of primus. The election of Fullarton as Bishop of Edinburgh had the unintentional consequence of encouraging the restoration of the diocesan system of government, and a rift between those in favour of the college, and those who wished to return to the diocesan system. The diocesan party, who ultimately succeeded against the college Bishops, argued that the Church should return to traditions as practised in the primitive Church. They used the writings of the Church Fathers, including St Cyprian, as evidence for the earliest Church practises. They argued that as the inheritors of the true, apostolic Christian Church, the Scottish Church should continue these practises. Specifically, they desired the re-establishment of the diocesan structure and the election of a Bishop by the clergy of the diocese, as opposed to nomination by the monarch.\textsuperscript{280}

Chief among the theologians defending the Diocesan party was Thomas Rattray (1684–1743), ordained Priest in around 1713 and Bishop of Brechin in 1727. He had initially been elected by the clergy and laity of the diocese to serve as bishop in 1723, but the college party bishops, who at that time were in the majority, overturned his election. His election was part of a series of rival consecrations by both Diocesan and College party bishops, attempting to bolster their numbers and gain a majority. He resigned the see of Brechin in favour of the college Bishop John Ochterlonie in 1731 and was then elected Bishop of Dunkeld in the same year.

Rattray had begun his career in the Church among the nonjurors in London, where he had assisted the nonjuring English Bishop Nathaniel Spinckes, one of the Bishops consecrated by George
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Hickes, in translating into Greek a proposal to unite the Greek Orthodox Church and the nonjurors, proposed initially by another Scottish Bishop in London, Archibald Campbell. There he had become embroiled in the dispute to restore the primitive liturgies in the Church, which travelled north when Rattray and his colleague James Gadderar ca. (1655-1733) returned to Scotland from London. The usagers also tended to be part of the diocesan party, and Rattray was an expert theologian and scholar of both.  

In the anonymously published *Essay on the Nature of the Church, and a Review of the Elections of Bishops in the Primitive Church* (1728) Rattray put forward his argument not only for the diocesan system of election, but for the independence of the bishops from the powers of Princes. When the church “has not so much as the Benefit of the Civil Protection” or “when she shall find it necessary for her own preservation” then the Church is only answerable to God. This sentiment had already been expressed by Rattray’s contemporaries Bishops John Falconer ca. (1660-1723) and Gadderar. While both professed a loyalty to James VII, they also declared that a meeting of the Episcopal College concerning the ongoing controversy among the bishops had “no concerns with the affairs of state” and were hostile to the involvement of the King’s agent, George Lockhart.

Subsequently, the diocesan party nonjurors developed an anti-erastian stance, which prioritised the succession of bishops and Episcopal traditions, while limiting the Jacobite influence on the Church.  

The publication was a joint effort between Bishops Keith and Rattray, with Rattray penning the *Essay* and Keith *Review*. Most of the cost of printing was borne by the diocesan bishops themselves. Bishop Rattray wrote to Bishop Keith on 5th December 1730, outlining an account of what was owed to the bookseller James Robertson in Edinburgh and stating that Bishop Gadderar & Dunbar “seemed willing to join with me in bearing their proportion of it, and to take their hazard of such a number of undisposed of books as should answer,” while also adding that Mr Rait in Dundee still had “to answer for 23 copies.” The total amount initially owed to Robertson was £59 4s 3d, a substantial amount, indicating the importance to the diocesan and usager party of
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publishing their account, and defending themselves. The fee likely included binding, as every copy examined was bound almost identically in brown calf skin, in a Cambridge panel style.

Aberdeen has two copies, one of which was a gift from Bishop Gerard to the Rev. William Smith, a clergyman who became dean of Aberdeen in 1767. The Rev. David Rae (d.1755) of Edinburgh gifted a copy to an unknown recipient. Bishop Jolly owned two copies, one of which had been owned by Bishop Archibald Campbell. The Brechin collection has three copies; Abernethy Drummond’s copy, a copy with unknown provenance acquired after 1869, and a copy owned by Sir John Wedderburn, the Jacobite who was hanged for treason in 1746. William Christie, Dean of the diocese of Brechin and a collector of Episcopal history, recognised the book’s importance and annotated it. He inscribed the correct authors of Rattray and Keith, noting that he has checked MS502 in the Episcopal Chest to confirm this, as it went against the received history of George Grub and Bishop Wordsworth, who attributed the whole work to Rattray. Archibald Campbell similarly annotated his copy with the correct authorship, and Jolly mirrored this in a second copy.

It is worth noting that this book, an important piece of scholarship developing the constitution of the Scottish Episcopal Church, was never borrowed in the Brechin Diocesan Library. It is recorded in the Laurencekirk Catalogue (1846) as merely “Essay on the Church” without its authors and is likewise anonymous in the catalogue of 1869. It is also recorded this way in the Aberdeen catalogues of 1821 and 1889. It may be that the nineteenth century clergy were not aware of its existence, importance, or its illustrious authorship by two of the foremost scholars of the eighteenth-century church. This would explain why Bishop Jolly spent time annotating and contextualising his copy, as well as Dean Christie’s additions.

Over the course of the next decade, the balance of power tipped in favour of the Diocesan party. Many of the college bishops had died, and were subsequently replaced with bishops favouring the diocesan model of church government. Rattray was elevated to Primus of the Church (1738-1743) and drew up several Church canons. With regards to Church government, this cemented the diocesan model. The canons also stated that new bishops were to be elected by the consent and majority of the college of bishops, and that the nomination to preside over a vacant diocese would
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come from the presbyters of that diocese. The primus would be chosen by the bishops, and their authority would be limited to the presiding over the synods and the convocation of synods, without any other privileges above their brethren. The 1743 Church Canons were passed by the bishops, without the consent of the clergy or laity, demonstrating the full authority the bishops had over the Church.291 This upset many presbyters, particularly in Edinburgh, as they were not consulted on the canons, and their powers had been limited by them. The issue of the authority of the bishops only grew, particularly in the nineteenth century when the wealthy laity desired more power within the Church.

The core of the constitution of the Church was episcopal government, and the apostolic succession of bishops. Accordingly, their episcopal powers could not be stripped from them by secular authority, invalidating any claims that their authority had been abolished by parliament. The eighteenth-century clergy very clearly saw themselves as The Church of Scotland, with a pedigree of apostolic succession originating with the earliest ages of the Christianity in Scotland, continuing to the present day. Bishop Robert Keith’s work Catalogue of Bishops (1755) very clearly reflects this, as he attempted to preserve the memory of the bishops of the Church before the revolution and the deprivation of bishops.292

Robert Keith was born at Ursa, in the diocese of Brechin in February 1681, and died in Bonnyhaugh near Leith in January 1757, aged 76. He was ordained deacon in the diocese of Aberdeen in 1710, and raised to the priesthood in 1713. Afterwards he ministered to a congregation in Edinburgh, which he retained until his death. In 1727, he was raised to the episcopate and given the superintendence of Caithness, Orkney and the Isles, though he remained resident in Edinburgh; later in 1733 he took on the superintendence of Fife. In 1743, he succeeded Bishop Rattray as Bishop of Edinburgh.293 Keith was a scholar and an antiquary, which led him to be one of the foremost scholars of the Church in recording its history and restoring it to its primitive roots in constitution and worship.

In 1755, Keith’s Catalogue of Bishops of the Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland, Down to the Year 1688 was published, having already amassed substantial subscribers since its publication was

292 Robert Keith, A large new catalogue of the bishops of the several sees within the Kingdom of Scotland, down to the year 1688. Instructed by proper and authentic Vouchers: Together With Some other Things necessary to the better Knowledge of the Ecclesiastical State of this Kingdom in former Times: AS Also, A brief Preface concerning the first planting of Christianity in Scotland, and the State of that Church in the earlier Ages. (Edinburgh: printed by Tbo. and Wal. Ruddimans, and sold by the booksellers in town, M.D.CCL.V. [1755]), hereafter shortened to Keith, Catalogue of Bishops (1755)
proposed in 1753. The book complemented his earlier work *The History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland* (1734), discussed in more detail in chapter 5. The catalogue covered every Scottish see in Scotland from the earliest times to the disestablishment of episcopacy, and was a useful and practical work, quickly becoming a standard work of Episcopal Church History. In an unpublished preface to the work, Bishop John Alexander stated that the intention of the work was to

make out a compleat list of the Scottish Bishops, as far as they can be recovered from the first planting of Christianity in Scotland; to deduce their succession regularly, in the several sees since the first foundation of them; & so, to rescue and preserve the memory of those venerable persons from oblivion; by which it will at the same time appear that the Episcopal order, however at present depressed, made no inconsiderable figure among us in former times.

Kelsey Jackson Williams summarises that it “left its readers in no doubt as to the vital part played by the Episcopal hierarchy in Scotland’s ecclesiastical past.” It was reissued in 1824 by Bishop Michael Russel (1781-1848), who brought the catalogue up to date with the biographies of the Scottish bishops consecrated since disestablishment. Jackson Williams has observed that Keith’s *Catalogue* “became the focus of extensive annotation and commentary by subsequent Episcopal scholars.” Indeed, Bishop Alexander’s unpublished preface was transcribed by Bishop Robert Forbes, into his copy of the work. Forbes, a close colleague of Keith’s, extensively annotated his copy, which is now preserved in the National Library of Scotland, having been subsequently owned by Sir Thomas Graham of Balgowan (later Baron Lynedoch), Viscount Melville, Robert Graham Redgorton, and Bishop John Durdan.

Surviving copies and subscriber lists are evidence of a readership of the work outside of the clergy, as well an interest by English clergymen.

There are two copies of Keith’s 1755 edition in the Brechin Collection, one of which belonged to Bishop Abernethy Drummond, and the other to the Rev. Alexander Jamieson. In 1886, a further copy was donated to the library, but it is missing from the shelves. Archibald Wilson purchased Russell’s 1824 edition while he was in at Queen’s College Cambridge, and either he or a user of

---

295 Robert Forbes’ inscription in his copy of Keith, *Catalogue of Bishops* (1755), annotated by Bishop Robert Forbes. NLS MS 21196
296 Jackson Williams, *The First Scottish Enlightenment*, p.183
297 Jackson Williams, *The First Scottish Enlightenment*, p.183
298 NLS MS 21196 MS Catalogue Record. The motivations behind Forbes’ annotating are discussed in Chapter 5.
300 Archibald Wilson purchased Russell’s 1824 edition while he was in at Queen’s College Cambridge, and either he or a user of
the library, has marked the sections which pertain to the Bishop of Brechin. 301 Interestingly, when Bishop Alexander Penrose Forbes was briefly incumbent in Stonehaven, he borrowed Keith’s _Catalogue_ from the Jamieson library. 302 Due to its usefulness as a historical record, Keith’s _Catalogue_ had an enduring quality as a reference work, but its importance as a contribution to the validity of the Scottish Bishops, and the authorship of Keith entrenched it as a symbol of Scottish Episcopal identity. 303

**The Transition to Toleration**

When the constitution of the Church was settled in the 1740s, the Church, though illegal, was treated with some degree of toleration, and worshipped semi-publicly. This changed after the 1745 Jacobite rebellion; nonjuring chapels and meetinghouses were burned throughout the northeast by the government forces, and stricter penal laws were enacted. In the diocese of Brechin, the Rev. John Petrie of Drumlithie, the Rev. John Troup of Muchalls, and the Rev. Alexander Greig of Stonehaven, were all imprisoned for six months in Stonehaven tolbooth during the winter of 1748 to 1749, for illegally leading worship. 304 Though part of the identity of the Church was Jacobitism, the theological basis of the Church was primitive episcopacy, rather than political allegiance to the Stuart cause. 305 Ongoing links with the latter were crippling the Church, and the survival of the continuation of the primitive Church in Scotland was in jeopardy. Thus, towards the end of the eighteenth century, the younger clergy sought to break links with the Stuart cause.

As early as 1786, two years before the death of Charles Edward Stuart, the northern clergy of the church (Including Alexander Jolly, Patrick Torry, John Cruickshank, John Skinner) met in the diocese of Aberdeen to discuss the penal laws, and unanimously agreed on motions concerning the past, present and future of the Church. These motions emphasised the spiritual independence of the Church, while also indulging in historical revisionism that disassociated the Church from its historic Jacobitism. The first motion pointedly referred to the Church as the Church of Scotland, who derived her authority from Jesus Christ through the succession of Bishops from the apostles. The Church was “therefore independent of the authority or sanction of all civil powers for the
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continuation of that succession…” The importance of this statement was to defend against any accusations by the Church of England that the Bishops of the Scottish Church were invalid.

The second motion stated that as a spiritually independent Church, “it cannot admit of those political attachments that have been attributed to her…and that she has never made the profession of any particularly political principles, or the adherence to any particular party, a term of communion.”306 Here, as Strong points out, the Church was asserting that the primary communion within nonjuring Church was not Jacobitism, but episcopacy. 307 This was not strictly true, as Jacobitism had been entwined with religious belief for many of the Episcopal clergy, such as Bishop Kilgour of Aberdeen, and it was still an important part of Episcopal identity for many in the 1780s. However, as Charles Edward Stuart died in 1788 without leaving a legitimate heir and successor, and the Church was able to move forward with praying for the King and seeking toleration. 308 Nevertheless, sacrificing Jacobite ties was arguably the least challenging aspect of seeking toleration, as the British parliament and Church of England set further conditions for toleration.

In 1789, Bishops Abernethy Drummond and Bishop Skinner went to London to negotiate the repeal of the penal laws. While there, they declared that the Church was in full communion with the Church of England, without the permission of the College of Bishops. Bishop Jolly was unhappy with the announcement and wrote to Bishop Abernethy Drummond that he hesitated in his assent “to that declared” and he “humbly wished the state of her communion to have been debated and argued before anything had been declared by authority.”309 Jolly’s objection was founded on the early nonjuring belief that the Church of England was in schism. He wrote to Abernethy Drummond that

We are all agreed that after the Revolution Tillotson and his associates involved themselves in a gross schism against the faithful and canonical Bishops - a schism which not only carried with it the guilt of division, but that also of false doctrine – in particular the lawfulness of resistance and lay deprivation of Bps the one of which struck at the Church as a sect, the other as a society.310
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Jolly was referring to the deprivation of English bishops who refused to take an oath to William and Mary, with Tillotson taking the see of Canterbury from Archbishop Sancroft. According to the principles of the Scottish and English nonjurors, the deprived Bishops could not have their episcopal powers taken from them by a secular hand. The bishops who had taken over their sees were in schism, and so were all their episcopal descendants.\(^{311}\)

Dodwell had argued that the deaths of the deprived bishops had settled the schism, but Jolly was not satisfied that the “revolution schism was healed” by their deaths. He heavily quotes Bishop Campbell’s response to Dodwell, which argued that as the Church of England had neither acknowledged, nor repented its schism, it was still acting according to schismatical principles. Jolly’s response demonstrates that he acted and thought according to the principles of the earliest nonjurors of the Church; for him, these principles did not become outdated, were not superseded by events, and were to be strictly adhered to, which is important to consider when analysing his marginalia in Chapter 5.

Bishop Jolly was also worried about the implications of the Church seeking a closer relationship with the Church of England, partly based on his wariness of the Qualified Chapels. He referred to these as “schismatical intrusions into Scotland”, which divided the Church by sending “irregular clergymen to rend its unity…”\(^{312}\) Indeed, the toleration of the Church meant that these Qualified Chapels would have to be joined with the nonjuring Chapels. Jolly could already foresee the sacrifices the Scottish Church would have to make for a reunion between the two, particularly as the Qualified Chapels viewed the nonjuring clergy and congregations with suspicion. This is demonstrated in the experiences of the Rev. John Skinner.

John Skinner’s (1721–1807) work *A Letter from an old friend to the congregation of the chapel at Old Deer* highlighted the effect the English clergy leading the Qualified Congregations had had on their congregation’s perceptions of the nonjurors. \(^{313}\) Skinner had felt the effects of the penal laws following the 1745 rebellion. He was imprisoned for six months in 1753 for holding a service and while in the gaol, his congregation at Old Deer united with a neighbouring congregation, and invited an English-ordained clergyman to be their pastor. In the letter, Skinner writes to his former
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congregation, describing the ill effects of the English ordained clergy on the Scottish Episcopal Church. He writes that

It was therefore alleged, that there was really no sort of difference between those English-ordained Clergy and us, but in the bare article of praying for the king by name, which difference you will observe is now completely done away…at the time Presbyterians were considered as the only enemies of Episcopacy…these settlements of English-ordained Clergy, instead of being friendly and favourable, have been most hurtful and prejudicial to the interests of Scotch Episcopacy, as could be shewn in a number of instances, wherein the opposition has been plainly avowed, and every method taken to prejudice the people, and keep them at a distance from our communion.314

Eleanor Harris points out that while the qualified congregations were ecclesiologically unsatisfactory, particularly due to their lack of bishops or indeed any connection to the Episcopal Church, they were necessary for the preservation of the episcopal communion in Scotland. Harris states that the qualified chapels were important in providing “a pragmatic holding-pool for lay families who would otherwise be likely to have lost their allegiance to Episcopalianism altogether, and who retained an active interest in restoring the Scottish Episcopal Church.”315 While this is true, their isolation from the liturgical development of the Church in the eighteenth century made their reunification with the Church difficult and aided in the eradication of native traditions.

Unsurprisingly, the toleration of formerly non-juring Episcopal clergy was challenged by Presbyterians. The idea of episcopacy, as well as the continuation of apostolical succession through the non-juring Bishops, was contested by George Campbell (1719–1796), a prominent Church of Scotland minister and Professor of Divinity at Marischal College. In his posthumously published work Lectures on Ecclesiastical History (1800), he explained the episcopal hierarchy as a papal corruption and accused the Scottish Episcopal Church of “farcical” ordinations after the Revolution.316 The Episcopal clergy were incensed, with Bishop Abernethy Drummond condemning it as “a paper castle, which a blast of truth will instantly throw down.” However, he was worried that “if not confuted it will do much hurt… the Doctor is an antagonist well worthy
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of being opposed, and the subject is – dignus vindice nodus.”  Abernethy Drummond then published a response in the Gentleman’s Magazine, while the Rev. George Gleig wrote six articles on the topic for the Anti-Jacobin.

The most significant work to emerge was Bishop Skinner’s (1744-1816) book Primitive Truth and Order. Skinner drew on the theological foundation developed by Sage, Rattray and their contemporaries, by grounding the nature and constitution of the Church as a continuation of the early Christian Church. He argued “That a part of this holy, Catholic, and apostolic church, though deprived of the support of civil establishment, does still exist in this country, under the name of the Scotch Episcopal Church; whose doctrine, discipline and worship, as happily agreeing with that of the first and purest ages of Christianity, ought to be steadily adhered to, by all who profess to the of the Episcopal Communion, in this part of the Kingdom.” Skinner’s work spoke to the Qualified Chapels, as well as to the Presbyterians. He was intent that the former should be brought into communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church, both to avoid the sin of schism, and to ensure the growth and continuation of the Church, who needed the qualified congregations for survival.

When it came to union with the Qualified chapels, the constitution of the Church and the validity of its bishops was not its biggest hurdle. Rather, it was the retention of the Scottish Communion Office. The native clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church were not willing to sacrifice their Communion Office, but the anglicized congregations and clergy of the former Qualified Chapels desired the office of the Church of England. As previously discussed, the juring congregations had not been involved with the controversy surrounding royal authority and the college of Bishops. They had also been isolated from the development and spread of the Scottish Communion Office, which was inextricably tied to the usages controversy.

318 John Skinner Primitive truth and order vindicated from modern misrepresentation: with a defence of episcopacy, particularly that of Scotland, against an attack made on it by the late Dr. Campbell, of Aberdeen, in his lectures on ecclesiastical history, and a concluding address to the Episcopalians of Scotland (Aberdeen: printed by J. Chalmers, 1803), p.27
The Liturgy of the Church in the Eighteenth Century

In the first half of the eighteenth century, the Episcopal Church was not only divided by issues of royal authority, but also by the usages controversy. The “usages” were; the mixing of water and wine in the Chalice at the Eucharist; the use of an epiclesis or an invocation of the Holy Spirit in the consecration of the eucharist; the use of the prayer of Oblation during the Eucharistic Prayer; and the commemoration in prayer of the faithful departed (Prayers for the dead). In essence, the usages were an attempt to restore the primitive liturgies of the Church, drawing on patristic sources and greatly influenced by the Eastern Church. The usagers advocated that where the scripture was not explicit, the traditions of the Church should be followed, which in turn led to the revival of ancient liturgies from the east. It was an endeavour which drew together the English and Scottish nonjurors, while also causing divisions amongst their ranks. Among the Scottish Episcopalians it was the diocesan party bishops of the northeast, most of whom had resided or did reside in London, who supported the usages. The usages were a significant chapter in the intellectual and liturgical development of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

In the period following disestablishment, worship in the Scottish Episcopal Church was varied. There were no church canons to stipulate the precise worship and doctrine of the Church. In his account of the period preceding the death of Bishop Rose in 1720, Rattray states that “we had no such thing as any offices or liturgies used among us” and that some parts of worship, including the Eucharist, were similar to that of the Presbyterians. A concerted effort was made by the Rev. James Greenshield and his contemporaries to promote the use of the 1662 English Book of Common Prayer, in the hope that conformity with the Church of England would lead to greater toleration for juring Episcopalians in Scotland. The imprisonment, trial and subsequent appeal of Greenshield, for ministering in Episcopal meeting houses, eventually led to the 1712 Act of Toleration. As a result of his efforts, and those of sympathetic Church of England clergymen,
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Bishop Rose acquired a shipment from London of the 1662 English Book of Common Prayer in 1711.\textsuperscript{323}

But many Episcopalians, particularly in the north, did not use the 1662 prayer book. They preferred the 1637 Scottish Book of Common Prayer, which had not been reintroduced in the restoration period. On his assessment of the prayer books, Rattray commented that “the differences betwixt them are not very material, save only in the Communion Office.”\textsuperscript{324} Though the latter would come to divide the nonjurors, in 1712 the focus for many Episcopalians was revitalising the Church. When, in 1712 James Calder arranged for 1,500 copies of the 1637 Scottish Book of Common Prayer be printed by James Watson, he was heavily criticised by Greenshield and others for putting the project of toleration in jeopardy, as it relied on English support.\textsuperscript{325} As Tristram Clarke writes, “for the moment expedience dictated that refinements of liturgical expression were secondary to the prime task of propagating the English form as widely and as quickly as possible in a manner calculated to create maximum support in England.”\textsuperscript{326} The passing of the Toleration Act required congregations who qualified to use the English Liturgy, and congregations all over Scotland adopted it.

However, the death of Queen Anne in 1714, and the Jacobite Rebellion changed the political and liturgical landscape. As discussed in relation to the Diocesan Bishops vs College controversy, a new generation of clergy saw the opportunity for liturgical and constitutional change. The liturgy of the English Book of Common Prayer, like the College System of Bishops, was found to be doctrinally unsatisfactory to the clergy who saw the Scottish Episcopal Church as a continuation of the primitive Church.

As previously discussed, the English and Scottish nonjurors were connected by their joint consecrations, which protected the apostolic line of succession of the nonjurors in both communities. The Scots in London – Campbell, Gadderar and Rattray – further bonded the two communities by their involvement with the English nonjurors in a proposed union with the Greek Orthodox Church, and in the revision of the liturgy of the Church. The English usagers, led by Thomas Brett and Jeremy Collier, and aided by the Scots Archibald Campbell and James Gadderar,
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  \item \textsuperscript{323} See Tristram Clarke, The Scottish Episcopalians 1688-1720 (Doctoral Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1987) Chapters 4 to 6
  \item \textsuperscript{324} Rattray quoted in Dowden, \textit{Annotated Communion Office}, pp.52-53
  \item \textsuperscript{325} There are two copies in the Brechin Collection; \textit{The book of common-prayer, and administration of the sacraments; and other parts of divine service for the use of the Church of Scotland. With a paraphrase of the Psalms in metre by King James the VI.}
  \item \textsuperscript{326} Tristram Clarke, The Scottish Episcopalians 1688-1720, p.345
\end{itemize}
looked to restore aspects of the first Book of Edward VI 1549. These were the usages, two of
which survived in the 1637 Scottish Prayer Book. Their efforts resulted in the 1718 Nonjurors
Liturgy, which the Scots sought to have approved by the Episcopal College. The Episcopal College
was at this point dominated by Bishops against the restoration of the usages, and thus they did not
become a sanctioned part of Church worship. However, the issue of the usages would not go away.
A compromise was agreed to in 1731 when the bishops of the Church agreed to “only make use of
the Scottish or English liturgy,” which sanctioned the use of the 1637 Scottish Prayer Book.327

Central to the nonjuring liturgy, and indeed the 1764 Scottish Communion Office, was virtualism.
Though distinct from transubstantiation, the detractors of the Office used it to accuse the
Episcopal Church of popery. Virtualism held that the bread and wine became the body and blood
of Christ but only in virtue and power, which was then passed to the believing communicant.
Unlike in transubstantiation, the Eucharistic elements remained unchanged physically.328 It was an
“unbloody sacrifice” and the material sacrifice in the Eucharist was emphasised.329

It was this sacrificial nature and presence of Christ in the Eucharist, which was present in the 1549
Prayer Book but removed from subsequent English liturgies. It was restored by the usages, through
the inclusion of the prayer of oblation and the epiclesis (also known as the Invocation) in the
prayer of consecration. The epiclesis invoked God to bless the elements of the bread and wine,
with the blessing extended to include the communicants.330 The oblation rehearsed the redemptive
acts of Christ and “the memorial of the one sacrifice is offered before God.”331 Both the oblation
and the epiclesis were present in the 1637 Scottish Book of Prayer, which was sanctioned for use
in a 1731 concordant between both sides. In the concordant, the bishops promised not to use the
usages, but the invocation and the oblation were inadvertently sanctioned when the Communion
Office of 1637 was formally recognised.332

Archibald Campbell was a vocal supporter of the usages, and the superiority of the prayer book of
Edward VI. He owned a copy of The booke of the common prayer and administracion of the Sacramentes,

327 Dowden, Annotated Communion Office, p.79
328 Strong, Alexander Forbes of Brechin, p.102
329 Peter Nockles, 'Our Brethren of the North": the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Oxford Movement' Journal of
330 This virtualist understanding of the eucharist was expounded by John Johnson in his Unbloody Sacrifice, discussed
in Chapter 3.
332 Ibid, p.6
333 Dowden, Annotated Communion Office, p.79
and other rites and ceremonies of the Church: after the use of the Church of England (1549). On the inside front board of his copy, he made a note of the other copies he knew of, writing:

I have seen another folio edition at London and both a quarto and folio edition printed at Worcester. The quarto belongs to a library at Cambridge and the folio was sold at a public auction at London for [blank] m 1728.

This suggests that in the early eighteenth century, the edition was difficult to find. Campbell gave his copy to the Rev. Robert Keith, who has inscribed the edition “Robert Keith his book. August id 1749.” Keith then donated his copy to the Advocates’ library in 1754, with the additional inscription “This is the first & valuable edition and presumed the only one within Scotland.” It was delivered by the Rev. Robert Forbes, contemporary of Keith and author of the Lyon in Mourning on 17th July 1755. Forbes writes underneath Keith’s hand that he has delivered it into the “hands of Mr Walter Goodall” by order of Keith. Goodall (1706-1766) was the assistant librarian at the Advocates’ library, as well as an Episcopal and Jacobite scholar. He had contributed to Keith’s Catalogue of Bishops. Their relationship, and the Episcopal sympathies of the librarians Thomas Ruddiman (1674 – 1757) and Goodall, may have encouraged Keith to donate the book to give scholars access to a rare and theologically valuable book.

In their 1731 concordant, the Scottish bishops agreed not to use two usages. These were the Commemoration of the faithful departed, and the Mixing of the Chalice. Neither were present in the 1637 Scottish Prayer Book but they were found in the first Book of Edward VI 1549. The Mixed Chalice was the mixing of water and wine at the Eucharist, and its use in the primitive Church was supported by the Church Fathers. In his work arguing for the restoration of the usages, Jeremy Collier cited “Justin Martyr (A.D. 149) who “…related expressly that water was mixed with the wine,” as did Irenaus (A.D. 178) , Clemens Alexandris (A.D. 200), St Cyprian (A.D. 258) who “plainly declares our blessed Saviour mixed water with wine at the institution of this sacrament; and that we are strictly bound to the same observance.” It was also known to have been in use in worship in Scotland, particularly in the northeast. Bishop Falconer is said to have used both the


335 Jeremy Collier, Reasons for Restoring Some Prayers and Directions: As They Stand in the Communion-service of the First English Reform’d Liturgy, Compiled by the Bishops in the ... Reign of King Edward VI (London: Printed for John Morphew, near Stationers-Hall. MDCCXVII), pp.4-5
1637 Scottish Liturgy and the mixed cup before the controversy of the usages began. By the repeal of the penal laws almost all the northern congregations used the mixed chalice, which further distinguished their worship from the former qualified chapels.\textsuperscript{336}

An interesting volume relating to the liturgies of the Church and used by Bishop Rattray as part of his comparisons of the liturgies, was Hamon L'Estrange's \textit{The Divine Alliance}. The copy in the Brechin Collection was first owned by Bishop John Falconer, who has inscribed his name on the title page.\textsuperscript{337} It then came into the hands of Bishop Thomas Rattray, whose marginalia is found throughout the book. Afterwards it went to the. Rev George Skene, then the. Rev John Moir. Rattray gave his attention to chapter 6 on “The order for the administration of the Lords Supper or Holy Communion”, and chapter 7 on “The Communion”\textsuperscript{338} He inserts the rubrics of the 1549 prayer book into, or beside the text. For example, in the section “Let us pray for the whole state of the Church,” he has bracketed off “militant here in earth” to show that this was omitted in the Book of Edward VI, and also added “Then the priest turning him to the alter shall say or sing plainly and distinctly this prayer following.”\textsuperscript{339} He also amends the prayers to include phrases which originally appeared in the 1549 text, completing “Grant us therefore (gracious Lord) so to eat the flesh of thy dear son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood” with the addition of “in these Holy Mysteries that we may continually dwell in him and he in us.”\textsuperscript{340} Rattray has done this throughout the book, and has very clearly compared a copy of the 1549 prayer book against the text.

Rattray was part of a group of English and Scottish usagers who held the 1549 prayer book in great esteem, and looked to undo the revisions subsequent reformers had made to it. They wanted to bring back into use elements of the liturgy which had been removed in subsequent editions, as they felt the 1549 was closer to the liturgies of the Apostolic Church. The first prayer book of Edward VI bid the congregation to pray “for the whole state of Christ's Church.” Subsequent prayer books, including the 1637 Scottish Prayer Book, limited this with the clause “militant here in earth,” and removed commendation “of the souls of the faith departed to His mercy,” as the

\textsuperscript{336} Francis Carolus Eeles, \textit{Traditional Ceremonial and Customs Connected with the Scottish Liturgy} (Londonmans, Green and Co 39 Pasternoster Row, London New York, Bombay and Calcutta, 1910), p.34
\textsuperscript{337} Hamon L'Estrange, \textit{The alliance of divine offices, exhibiting all the liturgies of the Church of England, since the Reformation: as also the late Scotch service-book…The third edition. To which are added, in this edition, the form of ordination &c. Additions and alterations in the liturgy &c…}(London : printed for Ch. Brome, at the Gun at the west end of St. Paul's, 1699), annotated by Bishop Falconer, Bishop Rattray, the. Rev George Skene, and the. Rev John Moir. Br UQ 264.03 Rattray's signature and hand writing has been compared with a letter of his date March 1712. Falconer had a very distinctive seventeenth century hand. NRS CH12/12/599
\textsuperscript{338} Ibid, Annotations between pp.151-195
\textsuperscript{339} Ibid, p.157
\textsuperscript{340} Ibid, p.191
reformers of the prayer book felt prayers for the dead endorsed the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory.\footnote{Dowden, \textit{Annotated Communion Office} pp.69-70.}

This position was contested by Bishop Archibald Campbell, who in 1721, published \textit{The Doctrines of a Middle State between Death and Resurrection: Of Prayers for the Dead: And the Necessity of Purification}, a revised edition of a similar work published in 1713.\footnote{Archibald Campbell, \textit{Some Primitive Doctrines Reviv’d; or, The Intermediate or Middle State of Departed Souls (as to Happiness or Misery) before the Day of Judgment: Plainly Proved from the Holy Scriptures and Concurrent Testimony of the Fathers of the Church. To Which Is Prefix’d the Judgment of the Reverend Dr. George Hickes Concerning This Book, and the Subject Thereof.} (London: Printed for the Author, and sold by Mr. W. Tayler at the Ship in Paternoster-Row., MDCCXXI. [1721]), p.ii} In the work, he refuted the Roman Doctrine of punitive purgatory, while providing scriptural and patristic evidence for a peaceful place where the soul of the departed waits until the second coming of Christ. He argued that reward and punishment for “deeds done in the flesh” happened “after the resurrection and judgement.” Consequently, “there is a middle state for those that die to remain until resurrection.”\footnote{Ibid, p.158} Based on this, Campbell advocates for prayer for the departed stating “That to pray and to offer for, and to Commemorate, our deceased brethren, is not only lawful and useful, but also our bounden duty.”\footnote{Kornahrens ‘Praying for the Christian departed,’ pp.50-56}

Campbell supported his position with a variety of sources including the Old and New Testaments, the Church Fathers (in chronological order) and learned protestant divines. The latter included Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester \textit{Preces Privatae Graece & Latine} (Oxford, 1675) specifically his prayer \textit{Viventium et mortuorum miserere O Domine} (O Lord have mercy upon the Living and the Dead).\footnote{Andrewes \textit{ Devotions}, which looked to the East, were extremely popular with the eighteen-century Episcopalians. He also cites the authority of Doctor William Forbes, Bishop of Edinburgh, whose chapter \textit{De Purgatorio} in his work \textit{Considerationes Modestae} (London, 1658) heavily influenced Campbell’s interpretation. William Forbes was favourable to restoring the primitive doctrines of the Church.\footnote{Kornahrens ‘Praying for the Christian departed: a brief view of the doctrine and practice in Scottish Episcopacy’ \textit{Theology in Scotland}, 18:2 (2011): 47-79, p.55} Campbell, however, was not universally supported in his interpretation, even among the usager supporting English nonjurors, many of whom received a copy from the author. Thomas Brett’s descendent Nicholas Brett transcribed a copy of a letter from Collier into
his ancestor’s copy of the book, which stated that Collier declared his “dissent” to many of the ideas, but did not “reckon them of that bulk wch necessitates a breach of communion.”

However, his contemporary Thomas Rattray was supportive of his position. Rattray argued for and promoted the Prayers for the dead in unpublished and published works. His work *The Ancient Liturgy of Jerusalem* (1744) included praying for the departed. He stated believed that “prayers for the dead, especially at the holy Altar, is so very early a practise of the primitive Church, that undoubtedly it must have been derived from apostolical tradition…” This highlights the crux of Rattray’s position, that the prayers for the dead and the ancient liturgy had a place in the Scottish Episcopal Church, as the Church was a continuation of the primitive Church. While Campbell grounded his argument in those of the church fathers, and the English protestant divines (the Scottish exception being William Forbes), Rattray almost exclusively engaged with scripture and early Christian thought.

Campbell’s unwavering and at times stubborn, dedication to the usages and the practises of the primitive Church meant that he was controversial figure amongst his contemporaries, and his legacy amongst nineteenth-century Episcopalians is varied. The nineteenth-century Episcopalian historian George Grub (1812–1892) described his consecration as an “ill-advised proceeding,” citing his lack of residence in his diocese and his “peculiar theological opinions,” as evidence of this. Campbell’s entry in Michael Russell’s updated edition of Bishop Keith’s *An Historical Catalogue of Bishops*, incorrectly claimed that he resigned the charge of the diocese of Aberdeen as his views on the usages “were not approved by the greater number of his brethren.” However, Campbell actually resigned due to ill health and was replaced by Gadderar, who shared his opinions on the usages. Russell’s phrasing suggests that Campbell’s theological opinions, which greatly influenced the Scottish Liturgy, were a minority opinion, which was clearly untrue as they were adopted by the Church. This is notable as the author Bishop Michael Russell was not a supporter of the Scottish Communion Office.

---
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However, Russell supplemented this biography with a much more sympathetic assessment by John Skinner. In his 1788 ecclesiastical history, quoted by Russell, Skinner wrote that Campbell was “highly commendable for his learning and other valuable accomplishments” and was “of great service to our Church.” Skinner then goes on to account the later years of Campbell’s life where he formed a separate nonjuring communion in England, choosing to describe Campbell’s uncanonical act of consecrating a bishop by himself as merely “an extraordinary step.”

Skinner’s more generous assessment of Campbell is representative of the view of eighteenth-century Episcopalians, whose commitment to the Scottish Communion Office and traditions of the Church was expressed as a high regard for those involved in its creation.

Venerating, remembering, and essentially not forgetting the early nonjurors is likely why Campbell’s work is often inscribed with a biography of the bishop by the book’s owners. As discussed in more detail further on, Campbell’s work on prayers for the dead was surpassed by Rattray’s, and as he lived in London, his influence and legacy was more indirect than his contemporaries. The Rev. Alexander Lunan (1703-1769) incumbent at Luthermuir, and notable for persuading Skinner to convert to Episcopalianism, inscribed his copy with a short biography of Campbell.

In 1748, Lunan wrote “the author and writer of this book was the honourable Archibald Campbell, a nonjuring Bishop of the Episcopal Church of Scotland & dyed at London above the 80th year of his age, the 15th of June 1744. Animus [...] Requiesce in pace.” This book then passed on to his successor at Luthermuir, Alexander Jamieson.

Walter John Forbes Robberd’s (1863-1944), Bishop of Brechin (1904-1934) and Primus of the Church (1908-1934) inscribed his copy of the 1713 edition with “by Archibald Campbell Bishop of the nonjuring Church – the author argues that prayer for the dead is lawful and useful.”

In typical fashion, Bishop Jolly’s annotations on his copy are more extensive. Like the others, his copy begins with a biography of Campbell. He copies Samuel Johnson’s quite extensive account of Archibald Campbell’s life, and his opinion on the Bishop which ends “He was the familiar friend of Hicks and Nelson; a man of letters, but injudicious; and very curious and inquisitive, but

---
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credulous.” Though Johnson’s account is generally favourable, he still nods to the “injudicious” decisions of Campbell.

Jolly’s annotations go on to encompass more than a biography of the Campbell, and address the validity of the prayer for the dead. He excerpts from theological authorities which supported Campbell’s position by refuting the Catholic idea of hellish purgatory, but supported the belief that there is a place that the Christian departed rest until the resurrection. Jolly copies a section of Archbishop Leighton’s *A practical commentary upon the two first chapters of the first epistle of St Peter* (1693) which states that

> The souls of the Faithful departed to enter into the possession of it, when they remove from their houses of clay; yet is not their happiness complete till that great day of the appearing of Jesus Christ. They are naturally imperfect till their bodies be raised and rejoined to the souls, to partake together of their bliss: and they are mystically imperfect till all the rest of the members of Jesus Christ be added to them.

Bishop Leighton was a restoration Scottish Bishop, with Presbyterian learnings. Jolly may have chosen to quote him in a deliberate attempt to demonstrate that the belief that the faithful departed were not complete in body and soul until the resurrection, was compatible with protestant beliefs. By choosing Leighton as his authority, Jolly intended to remove this belief from its Catholic association, and demonstrate a protestant precedent for the prayers.

He does similar with another full-page transcription from *The Protestant Evidence* (1635) by Simon Birkbек, which details the differences between the popish practise of praying for the dead, and the ancient Church’s “supplications for the dead.” Jolly has centred and enlarged the quotation “You cannot deny for, but that prayer for the dead is protestant” (though the actual quotation says ancient, not protestant). Jolly was further distancing the practise from Catholicism and drawing attention to its use in ancient church, therefore reinforcing its place in Protestantism.

By the time Jolly was inscribing his book, the usages controversy had been resolved and its doctrines were a part of the Scottish Communion Office. Jolly’s inscription was instead written in the context of nineteenth century opposition to the Scottish Communion Office by clergy who

---
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358 Simon Birkбек, *The Protestants evidence, taken out of good records; shewing t*hat for fifteene hundred yeares next after Christ, divers worthy guides of Gods Church, have in sundry weightie points of religion, taught as the Church of England now doth: distributed into severall centuries and opened... (London: printed [by Augustine Mathewes and Thomas Cotes] for Robert Milbourne, and are to bee sold at the signe of the Grayhound in Pauls Church-yard, 1635.), p.169
desired uniformity with the Church of England, whose Communion Office did not include prayers for the dead.

The usages controversy had been solved by sheer perseverance of its proponents, who had ignored its ban by the Episcopal College. In 1721, Archibald Campbell was elected Bishop of Aberdeen by the presbyters of the diocese, but remained in London, sending Bishop Gadderar to act as his vicar. Tensions between the College Bishops and the two clergymen were already high, as the College had failed to acknowledge either as part of the Episcopal College. Campbell refused the College’s request not to propagate the usages, and they in turn refused to ratify his election, however he still considered himself to have been canonically elected.359 Owing to Campbell’s ill health, Gadderar succeeded him as Bishop of Aberdeen, and though he promised the College that he would not use the usages, in 1712 he had 1637 Scottish liturgy reprinted, and used it the celebration of the Eucharist.

This was the first of the “wee bookies” which followed the folio edition of the 1637 liturgy, and was printed in Edinburgh by the Jacobite Thomas Ruddiman, and circulated for use by Bishop Rattray.360 By 1735 the office had moved beyond a reprinting of the office of 1637, and Gadderar inserted directions into the margins which departed from the office, including the removal of the limiting clause “militant here in earth,” which in effect introduced the usage of praying for the dead. Wallace Kornahrens argues that it was Rattray’s influence, rather than Campbell’s, which brought the practise of praying for the departed into the Scottish Liturgy. He argues that “The publication of the Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem was the precipitating event that produced the Liturgy of 1764 twenty years later…Bishop William Falconer’s text published in 1755 is heavily dependent on Rattray’s work. In turn Bishop Robert Forbes’s text of 1764 is based directly on Falconar’s.”361

By 1743, Gadderar had prepared the first standard edition of the Scottish Communion Office, which recommended of the use of all clergy in the Church canons of the same year. The strength of the usager/diocesan party had been steadily increasing, and the division among the Bishops had ceased with the deaths of the anti-usagers and college party; the primus Bishop Freebairn died in 1739 and was replaced by Bishop Rattray, and Bishop Ouchterlonie died in 1742.362 Though

---
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Rattray died in May 1743, his drafts of the Church Canons were added to and ratified by the synod in 1743, passing the first formal canons of the Scottish Episcopal Church.\textsuperscript{363}

In 1764, the 1743 Office was succeeded by a new Scottish Communion Office, composed by Bishop Robert Forbes and Primus William Falconar. Skinner narrates that the aim of revising the Office was to bring it into “as exact a conformity with the ancient standards of Eucharistic service as it could bear.” The invocation was restored to its “original position after the oblation” instead of coming before the words of the institution.”\textsuperscript{364} The 1764 Office was based on Falconar’s office of 1755, which had, in turn, been heavily influenced by Bishop Rattray’s \textit{The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem}. Rattray’s work was one of the most influential and coveted works by Scottish Episcopalians, both for its influence on what became the standard office of the Church, and for its display of patristic and ancient learning.

Though the work was published posthumously and anonymously in 1744 Rattray had been working on the Office since at least the 1730s. The work is a synopsis of the Eucharistic prayer of the Liturgy of St James in Greek and English, alongside evidence of Cyril of Jerusalem and the Clementine Liturgy. Rattray looked to provide a liturgy of apostolic purity and put forward the argument that this was to be found in the Liturgy of St James, the ancient liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem. He provided a translation to provide a Communion Office as close to a perfect ancient model as he could. Stuart G. Hall states that Rattray had both an antiquarian and practical interest in the work. The Office is shown to be an interesting antiquarian object through the introduction, synopsis and appendices Rattray provided. However, Rattray also presents it as a practical object as the Office of the ancient liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem is a separate, useable office, with its own title page.\textsuperscript{365} Rattray was attempting to create a definitive liturgy, which would restore the worship of the Church to as close to the primitive, apostolic Church as possible.\textsuperscript{366}

John Dowden, the late nineteenth-century historian and Bishop of Edinburgh, did not view the Scottish Communion Office as a part of native Scottish theology, but rather a doctrine which “reached Scotland from the South” through the works of English divines such as George Bull and Lancelot Andrewes and nonjurors such as Thomas Brett.\textsuperscript{367} While Wallace Kornahrens does not deny the influence of these writers upon eighteenth and nineteenth Scottish Episcopalians, he argues that “there also existed a strong Eucharistic tradition native to Scottish Episcopacy which
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not only created and maintained the climate in which the congenial English ideas could flourish, but was itself a potent and defining influence.” Indeed, the works of the Aberdeen Doctors demonstrate that liturgical scholarship not only flourished in Scotland during the reign of Charles I, but also influenced the nonjurors and nineteenth century Episcopalians understanding of the Communion Office.

The clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church used the Scottish Communion Office in conjunction with the English Book of Common Prayer. George Garden’s copy of the Book of Common Prayer (1712), inscribed by him in 1808, was bound with an undated copy of the Scottish Communion Office. George Skene’s copy of the prayer book (1716) was bound with an edition of the 1764 Office, printed in Edinburgh in 1787. The use of this office set the Scottish Episcopal clergy apart from the clergy in the Qualified Chapels, and the Church of England. It came to represent the identity of the northeast nonjurors, especially after they relinquished the “nonjuring” aspect of their theology after the death of Charles Stuart in 1788. Indeed, even from the very beginning of the nineteenth century, it was an office that was associated with the northern dioceses and used less in the central belt. In 1808, George Gleig wrote to Bishops Skinner stating that he was the “only Clergyman within the diocese of Edinburgh who administers the Lord’s Supper by the Scottish Communion Office.” However, he adds that he is not the only clergyman “who perceives its superiority over the English form,” highlighting the impact anglicized congregations had on the use of the office, even if their Priest was in favour of it.
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The Nineteenth Century

With the 1792 Relief Act passed, the Church now had to bring the Qualified Chapels back into Communion with the Church. This was led by Bishop Skinner, who had realised that the clergy would have to adopt the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England to be considered acceptable to the Qualified Congregations. At the convention of the Church held at Laurencekirk in 1804, the clergy accepted the articles and the joint use of the Scottish Liturgy and the English Book of Common Prayer. However, the use of the Scottish Communion Office proved unsuitable to the Qualified Chapels, who desired to have complete conformity with the Church of England.

In his preface to his work on the Scottish Communion Office, introduced at the beginning of this chapter, Skinner complained that the adoption of the thirty-nine articles should have laid to rest “even the suspicion of a difference” between the principles of the two Churches, but that “the Scottish Communion Office is adduced as an instance of a difference even now subsisting!”

Skinner’s republication of the Communion Office, complete with a doctrinal explanation of the office, had caused worry amongst the former qualified clergy and in the southern congregations. Yet it was in response to the growing influence of these congregations, many of whom had links to the Church England, that led Skinner to republish the Office. The northern clergy were aware of the traditions and doctrines which they had inherited from their nonjuring brethren and were not willing to give it up. This friction between anglicised and Scottish congregations continued to grow, particularly as the former grew in power. Those whose valued the native traditions of the Church were thus continually on the defensive, an attitude which is important to consider when interpreting the books owned by Episcopal clergy.

The anglicising faction in the Church grew larger, in part due to the increase of English and Irish immigrants and clergy. However, in 1811 the majority of the bishops were native northerners who had endured the latter penal years of the Church. The Scottish Communion Office was an integral part of the native traditions of the nonjurors, inherited from their greatest theologians. At the Laurencekirk Synod in 1811, the Church’s canons were revised for the first time since 1743. The 1804 convention had permitted the “use of the English Office in all congregations where the said office had been previously in use.” The 1811 Canon XV reaffirmed this. However it also secured the primacy of the Scottish Office, enacting that it would be used in the consecrations of all bishops, and that “every bishop, when consecrated, shall give his full assent to it, as being sound
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in itself, and of primary authority in Scotland, and therefore shall not permit its being laid aside, where now used, but by the authority of the College of Bishops.” Preservation of the Doctrine of Belief and native traditions were seen to be of the utmost importance by the former nonjuring clergy.

By the middle of the nineteenth-century, two major reforming movements, Evangelicalism and Anglo-Catholicism were impacting Scottish Episcopalians. Evangelicalism emerged in the Church in 1820, with the arrival of the English Evangelical minister the Rev. Edward Craig in Edinburgh. He started a pamphlet war with the Rev. James Walker over the issue of baptismal regeneration, a key doctrine in the Scottish Episcopal Church. The evangelicals believed that the baptism of infants was a merely a symbol of the salvation that would be received through personal faith when they were older. This clashed with the Book of Common Prayer, which held that the baptism of infants was a sacrament which effected a new birth, or regeneration, in the infant. Walker encouraged Bishop Jolly to publish on the topic, and in 1826 he produced A friendly address to the Episcopalians of Scotland, on baptismal regeneration.

Evangelical Episcopalians also disagreed with the Holy Communion. Bishop Gleig had objected to the Evangelicals changing the words of the Eucharist to conform with the doctrine of partial atonement, and felt the Church was threatened by those doctrines, which in turn led to correspondence with Craig. The High Church Episcopalians were united in their anti-Evangelicalism, yet as the latter was a powerful and dominant part of Victorian religious culture, it persisted in causing divisions in the Church, and establishing independent congregations. The Evangelicals were relentless in their portrayal of the High Churchmen as popish, using the Scottish Communion Office as their key example.

Rowan Strong points out that the Evangelical and Presbyterian suspicion towards the Episcopal Church and its apparent Romanising tendencies was “undoubtedly stirred up by the advent of the Oxford Movement in Scotland.” The sympathetic outlook of the latter towards the Scottish Communion Office cast suspicion on doctrine, which was already disagreeable to those who desired conformity with the Church of England. The bishops of the Church had long defended
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themselves against accusations that the Office indicated the Episcopalians were “inclining to
popery.” However with the advent of toleration, this was exacerbated by the anglicised Qualified
Chapels joining the Communion of the Church, furthered by the powerful lobbying of the
Evangelicals and the advent of the Oxford Movement. The 1811 Church Canons, and the 1838
Church Canons had given primacy to the Office, but by 1838 this was indicative of the support of
the bishops, rather than the congregations. By the 1840s, the Scottish Communion Office had
become a greater divisive issue between the anglicised south and the north-east; the former desired
the English Communion Office, while the latter wanted to protect a native Episcopal tradition.
The diocese of Moray, Ross and Argyle had petitioned the Bishops to repeal the XXI Canon which
gave primacy to the Office.

In 1843, Patrick Cheyne considered it to have become an Office used by a “minority,” despite it
being the primary Office of the Church according to the Church canons. He states in his 1843
pamphlet vindicating the Office that “the attacks upon it have been frequent” and the silence of
clergy members who would have been expected to defend it “has led many to infer that there is
no really strong feeling” in favour of the office. The advantage of the Office, which he felt that
many congregations and clergy were indifferent to, was that the Church possessed “a Eucharistic
service so comfortable to the primitive liturgies.” Like the nonjurors who had developed the
Office, Cheyne valued the doctrine as “testimony to primitive truth” expressed more fully in the
Scottish Office than in the English. He felt himself more entitled to defend the Office than others
as due to the circumstances of his own congregation, he was obliged to use the English Office.
He defended it against accusations of teaching the doctrine of transubstantiation by pointing out
that it was based on the Oriental Liturgies, rather than “that of a Roman Missal.”

The threat to the Scottish Communion Office by its detractors drew the attention of the
Tractarians, who saw its value as a primitive doctrine. Like the nonjurors, the Tractarians valued
antiquity, and were not theologially satisfied with the Church of England’s liturgy. Nockles states
that it “provided not only a primitive liturgical model for the Church of England to recover, but
an authoritative rule for interpreting the otherwise defective English Prayer Book.” The support
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of the office exerted the suspicions and the criticisms of the Church’s enemies, and indeed of those within the Church itself, who feared the encroachment of the Oxford Movement upon Scotland. Many were anxious to clear the association of the Church with the Tractarians. However, its interest in the office was welcomed by some of the clergy who upheld the office, who, as discussed above, were struggling with their own Church’s rejection of the office and found common ground with the Tractarians. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

Heterodoxy and Orthodoxy

The nonjuring theology of the Church is in many ways, quite simple. As this chapter has demonstrated, it can clearly be distilled into a reverence for antiquity, the doctrine of the Eucharist as expressed in the Scottish Communion Office, and an anti-Erastian vision of Church Government, resting on the apostolic succession and the primacy of the office of the bishop. Broadly speaking, the clergy of the nonjuring Church agreed on these principles, which were expressed in the Canons of the Church passed in 1743. However, this is arguably where the uniformity of opinion among the nonjurors ends. The most divisive issue among the Bishops and clergy of the northeast was Hutchinsonianism, and the denial of the eternal generation of the son based on this system of belief (distinct from Arianism).

Hutchinsonianism was the system of belief developed by the theologian and naturalist John Hutchinson (1674-1737). Hutchinson interpreted the Hebrew of the Bible in a distinctive way, alleging that the literal letters of the Old Testament revealed God’s divine plan. He believed that the Hebrew had been tainted by Jews, and so restored the missing vowel points to the Hebrew Masoretic text. Using this system, he created an alternative reading of Genesis to provide a “true natural theology” as an antithesis to Newton’s natural philosophy. He argued that Newton’s Theory of Gravity “tended towards paganism.” In refuting Newton and natural theology, Hutchinson claimed that the scripture alone was sufficient not just for revelation, but also for science. His system of belief gained a following among many Episcopalians in the north east, notably the Rev. John Skinner of Linshart (1721-1807), father of Bishop Skinner, and a great Hebrew scholar. Skinner became acquainted with English High Church Hutchinsonians, who were instrumental in aiding the Scottish Church to appeal the penal laws.
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Skinner’s Hutchinsonianism is significant as he taught many of the clergy of the northeast. Consequently, Hutchinsonianism had a considerable following and longevity in the northern dioceses.\textsuperscript{392} Strong states that Skinner believed that Hutchinsonian theology could be used to “combat attacks on orthodox Trinitarian theology from those influenced by Newtonian science and Unitarianism.”\textsuperscript{393} As C.D.A Leighton points out, the most influential aspect of Skinner’s Hutchinsonianism was his rejection of the doctrine of eternal generation of the son. Leighton summarises Skinner’s views stating that he rejected “the Greek and Latin doctrines of the Trinitarian processions by denying the eternal filiation of Christ. The second person of the Trinity, he maintained, had taken the character of the Son only at the incarnation.”\textsuperscript{394}

In his 1982 article on Hutchinsonianism, Gavin White addresses Skinner’s rejection of the doctrine of Eternal Generation of the Son, and indeed the subsequent generations of Episcopal clergymen who rejected the Athanasian Creed.\textsuperscript{395} However, in his chapter on John Skinner in his \textit{The Scottish Episcopal Church: A new History}, he mentions that this was an aspect of Hutchinsonianism, but does not pursue it as an important and influential component of Skinner’s theology.\textsuperscript{396} Yet it was the denial of this doctrine which most concerned his colleagues Bishop Abernethy Drummond and Bishop Jolly, the latter of whom who was unique among the northern Scottish Bishops for his rejection of Hutchinsonianism. Skinner was joined in this belief by Bishop MacFarlane (d.1819) of Ross and Argyle, who had resigned the see of Moray to Bishop Jolly in 1798.\textsuperscript{397} MacFarlane and Jolly corresponded on the issue, with the former complaining to Bishop Torry in August 1801 that “I had a letter from Bishop Jolly, on the eternal generation scheme, which did not at all please me.”\textsuperscript{398}

Skinner published his views in his \textit{Letters for Candidates of the Holy Orders} which demonstrate quite clearly the doctrines he was teaching theological students. A significant proportion of the letters deal exclusively with the topic; the second letter used Tertullian and the scriptures to support his views, while the 11\textsuperscript{th} letter evaluates Trinitarian orthodox theologians Daniel Waterland and George Bull (among others) and their use of the Church fathers supporting the doctrine and
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criticises their methods. The alleged misuse of the Church Fathers was a source of ire for Bishop MacFarlane. He wrote to Torry that “Pearson, Bull, Waterland, etc. with Clarke and Whiston” had “all picked out the Fathers to support their several false theories; the truth agreeing with the Holy Scripture these men have left unnoticed!” He argued that there was an “abundance in the Fathers” to support his position. Though Samuel Clarke and William Whiston also denied the trinity, they did so in the context of upholding Newtonianism, which MacFarlane felt “tends to Atheism.” He criticised his own brethren on account of their veneration of the Fathers and complained to Torry that both Abernethy Drummond and Jolly “will easily give-up the obvious sense of the Holy Scripture rather than the anti-Christian reasonings of some paganic-Philosophical Fathers.” MacFarlane and Skinner’s influential views caused concern amongst his brethren, and both Abernethy Drummond and Jolly endorsed and criticised works in their own personal libraries for a future audience.

George Bull’s *Defensio fidei Niceni*, first published in 1680, was one of the most acclaimed texts defending the Nicene Creed. Jolly’s English translation of the work has an extensive annotation on the front leaves, transcribed from Daniel Waterland’s (1683-1740) *A second vindication of Christ’s Divinity or, a second defence of some queries, relating to Dr Clarke’s Scheme of the Holy Trinity*. The quote endorses Bull’s character and learning on the trinity, stating that

> When Bishop Bull’s books came to be known abroad, they met with the universal esteem of the learned in Europe, as well Papists as Protestants; who from that time at least have appeared generally well satisfied in the faith of the Ante-Nicene writers, and have stood up in defence of it. As to Protestants, I might mention our own countrymen, Bishop Stillingfleet, Dr. Cave, and many others...As to the foreign Reformed, Fabricius and M.Bayle, two very learned men, have declared themselves in favour of the same sentiments

---
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The annotation is transcribed from Daniel Waterland, *A second vindication of Christ’s divinity: or, a second defense of some queries relating to Dr. Clarke’s scheme of the Holy Trinity: in answer to the country clergy-man’s reply. Wherein the learned Doctor’s scheme as it now stands, after the latest correction, alteration and explanation, is distinctly and fully consider’d.* (London : printed for W. and J. Innys; and Corn. Crownfield in Cambridge, 1723.)
Jolly’s annotation reminds the prospective reader of his high acclaim. As an authority of Orthodox Trinitarianism, Bull was often criticised by both Skinner and MacFarlane. MacFarlane claimed that “Mr Skinner, had once a MS against Bull, which I wish much published; it would fell that Dagon to the ground.” Jolly’s annotations will be discussed in more detail in chapter 5, where it will be argued that he was annotated his books in this fashion not only to defend his own beliefs, but to contextualise them and endorse them with authoritative figures for the eventual audience of the Edinburgh Theological School.

Abernethy Drummond also took notice of the unorthodox views of his brethren, and though he did not agree with them, he found it difficult to completely condemn them. In his preface to An Abridgement of the Reverend Charles Daubeny’s Guide to the Church he writes that “there are many learned and worthy men in England, and some in Scotland, who believe a Trinity in Unity, but do not admit of any subordination in Deith, therefore he thinks it improper for him to declare, that, in order to be saved, it is necessary to agree exactly with the Athanasion creed.” Regardless, a copy of Bull’s works in Latin and his sermons and life, were given to the diocese of Brechin library as part of Abernethy Drummond’s original bequest.

Abernethy Drummond was perhaps more concerned with Arians, than Hutchinsonians, as he annotated his books with warnings regarding the latter. He wrote “I am somewhat doubtful of these Devotions, as I perceive no mention of the Trinity” in the front of Fifty Six Forms of Morning and Evening Prayers For the Use of Christian Families Likewise, in a copy of The Christian Common Prayer Book, or Universal Liturgy he writes “The author of this Prayer Book I suspect is not sound in the belief of our Lord’s Divinity, nor in that of the Holy Ghost; and is probably disguised Arian. For which reason ought to be read with caution.” Hutchinsonianism is an example of clergymen in both the English and Scottish Churches, diverging from established High Church Orthodoxy. This statement brings attention to the
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necessity of defining terms like High Church and Orthodox, which are used liberally throughout this thesis. In his discussion of the enlightenment and intellectual developments in the English Church in the eighteenth century, Robert G Ingram provides a useful definition of “orthodox Christianity.” He states that it has “as its core the belief in the revealed, triune Christian God.”

In very simplistic terms, this means that an Orthodox Anglican clergyman believed in the trinity, and that the bible is the revealed word of God. Both doctrines were under attack in the eighteenth century, and aspects of orthodox belief, such as miracles, were questioned.

David Hume defined miracles as “a transgression of a law of nature by a particular volition of the Deity,” which lacked sufficient evidence to prove their existence, as the revealed word of God alone was not enough. As humans, whose nature is prone to error, the apostles were not reliable witnesses to the existence of miracles. Hume was challenged by the Rev. George Gleig in his extensive essay on miracles in the third edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica (1788-97), which was also edited by Gleig. Gleig argued that Hume’s questioning of the testimony of the apostles as potentially false “would have been a deviation from the laws of nature less probable in itself.”

While defining what it meant to be orthodox is, as Ingram points out, “fraught with terminological difficulties,” in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century Scottish Episcopal Church, a belief in the trinity and the revealed word of God were important attributes of an Orthodox Scottish High Churchman, as indeed they were in England.

The term High Churchman is itself a contested term, whose definition depends on time-period and country. Peter Nockles states that “no label has been more subject to misapplication than that of High Church.” This is largely due to its misappropriation in later historiography to equate ‘High Church’ with the Tractarianism of the Oxford Movement. This definition associates High Church theology with sympathy for the rituals of Catholicism, which Scottish and English High Churchmen of the mid nineteenth and earlier centuries were averse. A more precise term for mid nineteenth-century protestant Churchmen associated with these rituals is perhaps Anglo-Catholic,
but this too has different meanings, as it was a term which described Anglican theological tradition which had existed since the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{414}

There is no adequate, detailed discussion of Scottish Episcopal High Churchmanship in the nineteenth century to provide satisfactory definitions of High Churchmanship in Scotland. This is in part due to a lack of detailed analysis of the theology of the Church’s bishops, whose biographies were written in the nineteenth century. Bishop Jolly and Bishop Gleig both suffer from a lack of scholarship, as does Bishop Abernethy Drummond and Bishop Walker. The theology of these clergymen overlapped, but was also quite distinctive, having been shaped by their own education and historical context. Rowan Strong’s biography of Alexander Penrose Forbes and Eleanor Harris’ thesis on Daniel Sandford both demonstrate the individual characteristics a clergyman’s theology could have, while still being part of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The misunderstandings of Harris’ definitions of Scottish High Churchmanship are also evidence that inadequate scholarship on the bishops of the Scottish Church leads to incorrect assessments and definitions.

Harris states that there were two distinct positions of High Churchmanship in Scotland in the early nineteenth century: Hutchinsonianism and Toryism. She conflates Hutchinsonianism with nonjuring theology, considering the opinion of Bishop Skinner that the Church was established upon, and thus should be defended upon pure and primitive Church principles, as a Hutchinsonian belief, rather than a foundational element of the Church’s nonjuring identity. Likewise, she considers a preference for the Scottish Communion Office as a Hutchinsonian belief.\textsuperscript{415} As demonstrated above, while all Scottish Hutchinsonians were nonjurors, not all Scottish nonjurors were Hutchinsonians. A better description of this is native Scottish High Churchmanship.

The theology of the native Scottish High Churchman in the early nineteenth century was inherited from the nonjuring Church, as discussed in this chapter. The earliest examples of these clergyman were formerly nonjuring, but after the repeal of the penal laws, their Jacobitism was historic, confined to a sympathy for the Stuarts and an understanding of Scottish history received from scholars such as Bishop Keith and the Episcopalian George Mackenzie.\textsuperscript{416} They believed in the independent spiritual authority of the Church, and the primacy of the Scottish Communion
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If any one man exemplified all of these, it was Bishop Alexander Jolly. While Jolly respected the Church of England – and with the exception of the Communion Office, used the liturgies of the English Book of Common Prayer – he did not desire conformity with it, and valued the independence of the Scottish Episcopal Church and her bishops.

In contrast to this was the Anglicised High Churchmen of the Scottish Episcopal Church, who were either completely opposed to the Scottish Communion Office, or valued conformity with the Church of England over the Office. The motivation for many of these clergymen was the pursuit of the removal of the legal disabilities on Episcopal clergy ministering in England. This was the reason that Bishop Low, formerly a nonjuring clergyman, came to oppose the Scottish Communion Office, on the grounds that it was tradition which differentiated the Scottish Church from the English and inhibited full toleration. Indeed, Bishop Low highlights how difficult such categorisations can be, as his own background surely differentiates him from a Scottish clergyman who had been isolated from such theology and found it alien or too catholic.

A lack of historiography prevents any sweeping statements on the Anglicised High Churchman’s preference for the Church to be established by the state with the monarch at its head, rather than spiritually independent. The unanimous condemnation by the Episcopalian bishops in 1851, on the English state’s ruling on the Gorham Controversy, in which a secular court determined the validity of an ecclesiastical doctrine, suggests that this is not a clear-cut matter. This is a weakness of Harris’ “Tory High Church” category, which confuses a nonjuring tradition of referring to the Scottish Episcopal Church as the Church of Scotland, with a preference for re-establishment.

Communion Office aside, the theology of Native Scottish High Churchmen and English High Churchmen overlaps in several ways, particularly in valuing the use of the Church Fathers, the emphasis of doctrine of sacramental grace in the baptism and Eucharist, and the apostolic order of bishops. However, the spiritual authority of the Scottish Episcopal bishops rested entirely on this doctrine, whereas the Church of England was legally established, and the authority of its bishops was enshrined in law. English High Churchmen placed a high value on this. Nockles summarises that they “upheld the importance of a religious establishment but insisted also on the duty of the state as a divinely ordained, rather than merely secular entity, to protect and promote the interests of the Church.” This also meant that ecclesiastical authority was intertwined with
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In the 1830s, political reform decreased the Church of England’s influence on the state, and the state was increasingly reluctant to defend the Church. It became “imperative for the Church to defend itself,” and thus the Oxford Movement emerged, which Mark Chapman describes as a “response to a crisis in authority.” Chapter 4 will discuss the Oxford Movement in more detail, but it is worth noting that the spiritual authority which the Tractarians argued for, was already a part of the Scottish Episcopal Church’s constitution.

Understanding the breadth of scholarship with sustained the nonjuring identity is important for understanding the role of the library in preserving it. Likewise, examining specific copies of these texts for annotations can shed light on which books were important to different generations of episcopal clergy. As will become clear throughout this thesis, many of the important works of the eighteenth century not engaged with but were still valued for their part in nonjuring history of the Church. These works were also valued for their provenance. Yet some clergy were determined to pass on the doctrines of these works and feared their loss in the anglicisation of the Church. Bishop Jolly was clearly aware of this, and his marginalia, examined in Chapter 5, discusses how he attempted to draw attention to the importance of these works to future clergy by annotating them. However, the use of the diocesan library was often determined by the necessity of circumstances, and the works of the eighteenth century were not always relevant. The development and use of the library was shaped and decided by its users, rather than its benefactors.

---

Chapter 3: Education and the Library under Bishop Gleig

In 1810, Bishop Gleig addressed his clergy in a letter to the annual synod, reminding them of their “excellent theological library” which gave the clergy an advantage over “any other diocese” in “supplying the defects of [their] theological education.” Gleig centred the library as the solution to the poor education of the Church’s clergy, and directed the clergy in how to make use of their access to books, stressing that it was their “duty to improve” their minds. In both the synod minutes, and his own 1827 publication Directions for the study of theology: in a series of letters from a bishop to his son on his admission into holy orders, Gleig recommended books for a course of study, aimed at aiding clergymen in their clerical duty to instruct their congregation in the correct religious doctrines. He intended that the clergy of the diocese of Brechin use the diocesan library to accomplish this.

Over the course of the next century, under three different bishops, the diocesan library became the centre of both education and intellectual engagement within the diocese. Due to a lack of formal theological education in the Church, the education of the candidates was dependent on senior clergy tutoring young students, and consequently, evidence for how this was achieved before the diocesan library is scant. Furthermore, the curriculum of study in the eighteenth and nineteenth-century Church has never been examined, largely due to a lack of evidence.

This chapter will use the records of the Diocesan library to examine the essential role of the library in the education of Candidates for the Holy Orders in the diocese of Brechin. It will use two prospective clergymen as its case studies, one ordained by Bishop Gleig, and the other ordained by his successor Bishop David Moir, and analyse their borrowings from the library. Consequently, the borrowing registers in the Brechin Diocesan Library are an invaluable resource for examining clerical education. There are a total of four borrowing registers for the libraries of the diocese of Brechin, covering the period 1817 to 1954. One register covers books borrowed from the library at Laurencekirk from 1817, while a second register covers the same time from the Jamieson library at Brechin, up until the move of the books of both libraries to the new library at Brechin in 1854.
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These will be examined in the context of requirements for clerical education from the mid-eighteenth until the mid-nineteenth century, which also lack any historiography. As discussed in the introduction, Bishop Gleig had an “ideal education” in mind for the clergy and intended that the library be used to fulfil this. This chapter will also discuss his “ideal” education, against the realities of the education clergymen in an impoverished, rural diocese, with a shortage of clergy.

At the diocesan synod in 1810, Bishop Gleig expressed his dismay at the state of education in the Church:

You know the disadvantages under which a candidate for holy orders prosecutes their studies, from having no regular theological school that they can safely attend. You know that in consequence of this, young men are sometimes admitted in our Church into the order of Deacons, when their theological knowledge is extremely slender. This was my own case: and I doubt not the case of some of you…Indeed it could not be otherwise.\(^{426}\)

That the slender theological education of deacons “could not be otherwise” was due to the legal status of the Church, which had prevented the clergy from undertaking any formal theological education. While Scottish universities did offer divinity degrees, these were in accordance with the faith of the Established Church of Scotland (i.e., the Presbyterians). Undertaking such a degree required a subscription to the Confession of Faith of the Established Church. Before the repeal of the penal laws in 1792, students were also required to take oaths of allegiance to the ruling monarch and an oath of abjuration of the Stuarts, all of which were unthinkable to a nonjuring Scottish Episcopalian.\(^{427}\) Thus, in the Episcopal stronghold of the northeast of Scotland, the formal education of Episcopal clergy tended to end after taking an arts degree, usually from King’s College or Marischal College Aberdeen.\(^ {428}\) Degrees themselves were also taken much earlier in Scotland, and most graduates were aged eighteen. In consequence, the provision for the theological education and the training up on new priests lay with the clergy themselves. Education before ordination was an informal affair, and its quality was geographically and clerically dependent.

There has been no satisfactory study of the education of candidates for the holy orders in the Scottish Episcopalian Church during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The curriculum for students has only ever been discussed in general terms. Similarly, the specifics of the examinations for ordination as both deacon and priest have not been given much attention. This is in some part
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due to the difficulty of reconstructing an informal education, which took place in the home of a clergyman or independently. What is recoverable from the eighteenth century comes mostly from the memoirs and biographies of bishops, recounting in general terms the clergy who mentored them. Thus, we know that a few clergymen were notable for fulfilling the role of mentor for generations of young men. Arthur Petrie (1730-1787), Bishop of Aberdeen, taught young men from his house at Folla, which was described by the Episcopalian historian Grub as a “seminary for the education of young men intended for the ministry of the Church.” Petrie himself was “a kind of theological Professor” who taught from a vast personal library. As discussed in Chapter 1, he had inherited this from his mother’s brother, Bishop John Alexander of Dunkeld, allegedly left to him for the purposes of a seminary.

Yet the term seminary is misleading. “Seminary” gives the impression of a community of learners, rather than the reality of young man being tutored by a senior clergyman. The prospective candidate depended entirely on the theological framework of one clergyman, and their learning experience was isolated. The issues with this are exemplified by another notable Aberdeen tutor, the Rev. John Skinner of Linshart. Within the Church, Skinner was famous as an instructor of devout young men. In 1782, Patrick Torry (1763–1852), later Bishop of St. Andrews, spent a month residing with Skinner, and converted from Presbyterianism to join the Church. As discussed in Chapter 2, Skinner was a Hutchinsonian, and taught these beliefs to the clergy he tutored. He outlined his framework for teaching in his *Letters Addressed to the Candidates for the Holy Orders*. Eleven of these *Letters* are against the Eternal Generation of the Son. This insular form of education may be one reason why Hutchinsonianism is recorded as a popular belief among the clergy of the northeast. There was no recourse for hearing or learning another point of view. On the other hand, it may have also served to protect native nonjuring theology, as it ensured a reverence for the Scottish Communion Office. By having control over what clergyman were taught, they protected them from the anglicising influences of the south.
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434 Gavin White, *The Scottish Episcopal Church A New History* (Edinburgh: General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church. 1998.), p.2
The 1743 Church Canons outlined the expectations the Church had of the education of its clergy. Canon X, authored by Bishop Rattray stated that

That every Bishop shall be careful to recommend to his clergy, & to such also as may be candidates of for holy orders, to apply themselves diligently to the study of the holy scriptures, & of the Fathers of the apostolical, & two next succeeding ages; & to take all proper opportunities in their sermons, & otherwise, to instruct their people in the true Catholic principles of that pure and primitive Church.  

This furthers the evidence in chapter 2 that the foundation of nonjuring theology, and thus the native Scottish High Churchman, was the apostolic Church, and that patristic study was seen as essential. Canon X is evidence of what was recommended, rather than a reflection of the reality of the studying undertaken by clergy and Candidates. Due to the upheaval caused by the Jacobite Rebellion, and the subsequent destruction of Chapels, the diocese of Brechin does not have synod minutes from this period, which is generally where the stipulations for the “tryals” of Candidates for ordinations were recorded. The earliest recorded trial took place in the diocese of Dunkeld and Dunblane. On 10th April 1744, Mr Donald Robertson, student of divinity in Perth was recommended by the. Rev Laurence Drummond, presbyter of Perth, as “fit to be admitted to trial” in order to advance into the Holy Orders. It was decided that on 12th June 1744, Donald Robertson would submit to trial, where he would give

in a written discourse, in the Latin tongue, upon the Christian doctrine of Justification, by way of exegesis; also a written discourse, in the method of a sermon, upon S John III. Chap. & 5.ver. Except a man be born of water, & of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God; both of his own composition; & to apply himself with diligence in the mean time to the reading of the antiquity of the Christian Church, particularly those of the second and third centuries, that he may be better prepared to answer such questions as shall be put to him relating to the history, heresy[sic] and schism of that period; Likewise that he shall have his thoughts much employed upon the canon of the holy scripture, & its divine authority, that he may answer such questions as may be put to him relative thereto.

A few months later, Robertson passed his trial; his discourses were found to be “accurate and orthodox” and after being interrogated, it was found that the sentiments expressed in them “were
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the real thoughts of his heart.” 438 All of this indicates that the clergy of this period were relatively well educated, and their education conformed with nonjuring theology and Orthodox High Churchmanship, which emphasised the authority of revealed religion and the ante-Nicene Fathers. However, in 1773, when Gleig was educated for ordination in the same diocese, he recounted that his theological education had been slender. This was likely a consequence of the harsher penal legislation enforced after the 1745 Jacobite Rebellion, which diminished and suppressed the Church. In the second half of the eighteenth century, the diocese of Dunkeld and Dunblane (which previously had separate Bishops) were combined, owing to vacant sees caused by a lack of suitable clergy; a widespread problem in the Church. 439 Subsequently, Gleig was examined for ordination in the diocese of Brechin. Bishop of Brechin, James Rait, wrote to the annual diocesan synod requesting they prescribe to Gleig the “ordinary pieces of tryall” necessary for his entry into the holy orders. Gleig was prescribed “a popular discourse on the twelfth chapter of St Luke’s gospel & latter part of the first.” and a date was set a month later for his examination. 440 On 21st July 1773 he delivered his assigned discourse and was then examined “upon his knowledge in the Latin & Greek languages, & in several points of divinity.” Having proved himself to their satisfaction, his examining presbyters recommended him to the Bishop for ordination as a deacon. 441

The Rev. Alexander Jamieson, whose personal library was bequeathed to the diocese in 1821, was also ordained in the diocese of Brechin. He was recommended to the Bishop of Brechin for ordination in 1770, where it was noted that he “studied Divinity under the direction of Reverend Mr John Leith” in “the North Country.” 442 He was examined on 20 April 1770, delivering “a popular discourse from 2 Cor V. 21” before being tested on his “knowledge in the Greek language, & on several points of divinity.” 443 Compared to the detail of the trial from 1744, requirements for candidates seem to have been less stringent, perhaps due to the shortage of clergy. However, given the requirement for Latin and Greek, candidates clearly had to be relatively well educated, but perhaps required further independent study after their ordination. Trials for the clergy ceased to be recorded in the synod minutes after the 1780s, so these accounts are especially valuable.
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The next recorded example of the diocese of Brechin’s requirements for Candidates of the Holy Orders is in 1838, when the Synod of the Church proposed a change to educational requirements. These proposals were submitted to the diocesan synods, where they were discussed and amended. Significantly, when it comes to the examination of candidates for holy orders, the diocese is much more specific in its requirements than the Church at large, which can be observed through a comparison of the synod minutes with the canons eventually passed by the Church. The Church requires a candidate for deacons’ orders to be acquainted with the “whole of the New Testament in Greek,” whereas the diocese specifies that they should be “sufficiently acquainted with the 4 gospels & the Acts of the Apostles in the Original Greek.” The Church requires that a prospective deacon answer questions “connected with Theology and Ecclesiastical History” whereas the diocese is much more specific, requiring questions on “Christian Revelation & likewise such questions on ecclesiastical history, as may embrace the period from the Creation to the conclusion of the 1st Christian Century.”

Specifying an understanding of Old Testament theology and revelation alludes to the orthodox views of the diocese, and its emphasis on the evidence of divine inspiration of the bible. A knowledge of the Old Testament was seen by clergyman such as Gleig as necessary for understanding “that the doctrines and precepts were revealed to mankind by God,” and for defending that viewpoint against dissenters. The diocese also had amendments to make in the assessments for candidates seeking admission to priestly orders. Clergy in the diocese were to be examined as to their “acquaintance with the writings of the Apostles in the original Greek… knowledge of the subject matters of all the canonical books of Scripture” and were required to answer questions on “theology and ecclesiastical history of the Church from the conclusion of the 1 century to the establishment of the reformation.” This inclusion of understanding the first Christian centuries, or primitive Christianity, demonstrates the native High Churchmanship of the diocese, which while not surprising, was at odds was with some Episcopal Evangelicals in the south. Thus, the diocese of Brechin set its own requirements for the knowledge required of its candidates for holy orders, which is an important background for assessing the borrowing records of young ordinands.
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The Diocesan Library and Bishop Gleig’s System of Study

As previously discussed, Bishop George Gleig believed the clergy of the diocese of Brechin were poorly educated and sought to shape the diocesan library into a place where this could be remedied. An educated clergy was of deep importance to Gleig, as he believed it was key to mending the schism in the Church caused by the continuing existence of the Qualified Chapels. He expressed this to his clergy in 1809, advising them that the only way to unite the congregations was through the daily service of the Church, and the sermons of the clergy, which could only be accomplished successfully if the clergy had a “connected view of the doctrines of Christianity” and “a competent knowledge of ecclesiastical history…” which in turn could only be achieved through “regular study.” Despite focusing on the importance of basic ecclesiastical knowledge to promote unity within the Church, when Gleig outlined a system of learning for his clergy a year later in 1810, his main concern was natural religion.

After advising the clergy of the advantages of having a theological library, Gleig told his clergy exactly how they were going to “profit” from it. He instructed his clergy that at their “regular meetings” they will “in rotation preach sermons: original sermons or theological lecture on the subjects which I shall by the mouth of the dean from time to time prescribe.” These three topics, and the only ones recorded in the synod minutes, all concerned discussions broadly related to disproving natural religion. Questions to be examined included if the “being and any of the attributes of God discoverable by mere human reason?” and “by what process might the discovery be made, and how many of the divine attributes would it probably comprehend?” as well as “Supposing the being and attributes of God to be demonstrated by human reason independent of written revelation, what are the duties of men resulting from this?” Though Gleig told his clergy that they were surrounded by “rancorous enemies,” he had singled out those who magnified “natural religion at the expense of revelation.” Qualified Chapels and Church unity were given no mention.

Countering the threat posed to Orthodox Christianity by natural religion, dissenters, and the rationalist thinking expressed in the Scottish Enlightenment, continued to be a priority for Gleig. The books he added to the library in 1814 reflect this. This included Dr Nares’s Remarks on the

449 Extract from A charge delivered at Stonehaven, on Tuesday, the 22nd August, 1809, to the Clergy of the Episcopal Communion of Brechin. (Edinburgh, 1809) Quoted in The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review, Volume 34 (London, 1810), p.518
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451 Br MS 4/1/1/1 Synod Minutes, 1770-1814. August 3rd 1814
Unitarian version of the New Testament, a “very valuable book” given to Gleig by the author;\(^{452}\) and William Paley's *The principles of moral and political philosophy*, which provided arguments supporting divine revelation and the reliability of the testimony of the apostles, against the position of David Hume, whose religious opinions had been opposed by Gleig in many articles.\(^{453}\) As he felt Paley was too often a “low Churchman,” he also sent Edward Pearson’s response to Paley’s work, *Remarks on the theory of morals* “as a kind of antidote.”\(^{454}\)

Gleig’s continued focus on this topic may be because Gleig viewed the Scottish Episcopal Church as a branch of the Church of England. Not in terms of being under the authority of the Church of England, but rather as part of the same Anglican Communion, facing the same threats to doctrines. Gleig was thoroughly entrenched in the disputes of the Church of England, as he regularly contributed to the English periodicals such as the *British Critic* and the *Anti-Jacobin Review*, as well as the third edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1788-97), which he had edited.\(^{455}\) Gleig had contributed extensively to the latter, providing an immense essay on ‘Metaphysics’ including ‘Of the Being and Attributes of God,’ as well as an essay on ‘Theology’ which devoted special attention to ‘Natural Theology,’ and ‘Miracles.’\(^{456}\) Thus, he perceived the Unitarianism, and other disputes effecting the Church of England in the eighteenth century, as a major threat to the whole of Orthodox Anglicanism, which included the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Anglicisation of the Scottish Episcopal Church was not a worry to him, as it was to Bishop Jolly.

That Gleig was considering threats to the whole Anglican Church is further evidenced his work *Directions for the study of theology*, which was published in 1827. The work provided and a “course of reading” for students of theology and the younger clergy. Much of the advice given to clergy in 1810 and 1814, which emphasised the importance of Christian Revelation and the necessity of reading widely and critically to counter it, was in it. Importantly, its intended audience was not the Scottish Episcopal Church, but rather Anglican students throughout the United Kingdom, as it was written for his son, a priest in the Church of England, and who had received his B.A. (1819) and M.A. (1821) from Oxford. It is advantageous to consider Gleig’s ideal plan of study as it provides a framework for understanding the use of the library by the clergy and the extent to which their education and borrowing was influenced by Gleig.

\(^{452}\) Edward Nare, *Remarks on the version of the New Testament edited by the Unitarians* (London: Printed for T Cadell and W Davies, 1814)

\(^{453}\) William Paley, *The principles of moral and political philosophy* (London: Printed for Adam Black, 1811)

\(^{454}\) Edward Pearson, *Remarks on the theory of morals : in which is contained an examination of the theoretical part of Dr. Paley’s Principles of moral and political philosophy* (Ipswich: Printed and sold by M Jermyn etc, 1800)

\(^{455}\) Walker *Life of the Right Reverend George Gleig*, pp.226-231
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According to Gleig, a student’s priority was to satisfy themselves with the divine origin of the Christian religion, through a study of the Holy Scriptures. He advised that this should be done chronologically, and recommends several books, generally from authors of the late seventeenth and eighteenth century.\(^{457}\) He recommends Thomas Stackhouse’s (1681-1752) History of the Bible, an accessible reference work which had been in print since 1733, and which Gleig had edited a new edition of in 1817.\(^{458}\) Additionally, he lists Humphrey Prideaux’s (1648–1724) The Old and New Testament Connected in the History Of The Jews and Neighbouring Nations, a history of the Jews which was aimed at a general reader and was printed into the nineteenth-century,\(^ {459}\) as well as Samuel Shuckford’s (1693/4–1754) The Sacred and Profane History of the World, which was written as an introduction to Prideaux’s work, and was one of the works which the Rev. Doune discussed with Bishop Alexander in 1744 (discussed in chapter 1).\(^ {460}\)

George Townsend’s (1788–1857) The New Testament, Arranged in Chronological and Historical Order (1825) was one of the most current works recommended by Gleig, and was written by an English clergyman and high churchman.\(^ {461}\) He also suggested William Hales’s (1747–1831) A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography, History and Prophecy, a three-volume work published between 1809–1812, which dealt with the chronology of the Bible and the early history of the world.\(^ {462}\) Hale’s book was bought for the library by order of the synod in 1833.

While the accessibility of many of these works suggests that they were a reasonable starting point for divinity students, Gleig’s focus on biblical chronology is the beginning of an orthodox

\(^{457}\) Gleig, Directions for the Study of Theology, p. 82
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educational model. Although biblical chronology had been a topic of scholars for centuries, it was particularly relevant in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when studies in geology and later evolutionary theories began challenging the chronological framework of the Bible.

This traditional model of education continues with Gleig’s advice that in order to critically study the doctrines and precepts of the Christian Religion, a clergyman should understand the scripture in the original Hebrew and Greek. He recommends several books to aid in this endeavour, and specifically recommends Taylor’s *Hebrew Concordance* as the most useful for “ascertaining the sense of difficult passages in the Old Testament.” After recommending what he considers the basics of ecclesiastical education, his work develops into a guide aimed to help guard the clergy “against innumerable errors” which were circulated among “all ranks of people,” in particular the misinterpretations of Scripture by the Unitarians.

Gleig’s work was summarised by the *Gentleman’s Magazine* as advice to make Gleig’s son “as divine as himself, and ensure that he was easily qualified to handle every difficult point of theological discussion.” Indeed, it was a model of “ideal education.” The borrowing registers of the diocese, offer a somewhat different reality.

**Case Studies of Young Ordinands**

William Webster (1810–1896) provides a case study of a self-taught clergyman, who relied on the library both for passing his examinations for ordination, and for performing the duties of an incumbent, while still only a deacon. He had attended Marischal College in Aberdeen between 1824 and 1828, though what he was doing in the six years between graduating and taking deacons’ orders in the diocese in 1834 is unknown. He was appointed as the incumbent of Drumlithie in April 1834, very soon after having been ordained a deacon. This was highly unusual; it was common practise for a deacon to assist an incumbent in his duties, rather than to have sole charge of a congregation without supervision. However, his appointment was made from necessity, as the man originally intended for the charge, William Oldfield, had resigned the responsibility of Drumlithie only six months after being ordained as its priest in 1833.
Oldfield was an Englishman who had come north at the request of Bishop Gleig, who had been struggling to find a suitable candidate for the congregation at Drumlithie. It was hardly an appointment to be coveted; the salary was extremely slight—only thirty pounds per annum guaranteed from its congregation—and it had no parsonage or nearby accommodation. It was, and still is, situated in the northwest of the diocese in a rural location, surrounded by farmland. Much to the dismay of Gleig, due to the lack of suitable accommodation Oldfield took up residence in Laurencekirk, seven miles from Drumlithie. At such a distance away, he was unable to carry out the duties expected of a domestic minister, and soon after resigned from his position. Fortunately, Webster, “a young clergyman of native birth” was found fitting for the charge and served there until 1841.469

Thus, due to a lack of suitable clergy, combined with the rural and underprivileged nature the charge, William Webster was left to tend to the charge of Drumlithie while only halfway to priesthood. His borrowings from both the Jamieson library at Brechin, and the library at Laurencekirk, between May and September 1834 represent the borrowing and reading practises of a self-taught clergyman and highlight the necessity of the library in the diocese’s informal system of education. Webster first borrowed seven titles from the Jamieson Library on 16 May 1834.470 He borrowed George Stanhope’s (1660–1728) A paraphrase and comment upon the Epistles and Gospel, first published in 1705, and into its ninth edition by 1775.471 Stanhope was an English Divine and the Dean of Canterbury, and his work was an enduring popular devotional book.472 It included the appropriate Collects, Epistles, and Paraphrases for certain Holy Days (for example, the first Sunday in advent), with Stanhope’s comments, and would have provided Webster with a clear-cut outline to follow for his own services.

Webster also borrowed Matthew Hole’s (1639/40–1730) Practical discourses upon the collects, epistles and gospels to be us’d thro’out the year, a similar work to Stanhope’s, published between 1714 and 1719.473 Hole was known for his straightforward style and, like Stanhope, his work included appropriate passages from Scripture, as well as Discourses, for Holy Days. Its inclusion is again indicative of Webster borrowing books that would aid him in his most basic clerical duties. The

---
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other titles Webster borrowed from Jamieson’s library were sermons, including those of Jeremiah Seed (d.1747) who in the later nineteenth century was venerated for his sermons' style; The Archbishop of York John Sharp (1645–1714) also noted for his sermons' style; and Robert Moss (1666–1729), a high churchman and Bishop of Ely, praised for his preaching abilities. It would seem likely that Webster was using the sermons of notable preachers to learn how to compose his own. All of these works were authored by eighteenth-century Orthodox High Churchmen and would have likely met with the approval of Bishop Gleig.

A month later, on 2 June 1834, Webster began borrowing from Laurencekirk. Notably, he borrowed William Thomas Lancaster’s (1787–1859) *The harmony of the law and the Gospel with regard to the doctrine of a future state*, a relatively new addition to the library, bought by the Rev. Moir on the instruction of the diocesan synod in August 1831. Gleig was present at the synod and had recommended the work as one which “every young clergyman [would] do well to place in his library.” Gleig recommended the book as part of a clergyman’s instruction in the subject of Mosaic dispensation, the idea that the purpose of Judaism and the Old Testament was “to prepare the world for the advent of the messiah.” Published in 1825 by the vicar of Banbury, it was a work which would have been easier to follow than the alternative on the subject, also mentioned by Gleig, William Warburton’s (1698–1779) *Divine Legation of Moses*, a more combative work written by an infamous eighteenth-century religious controversialist. The latter had been one of Gleig’s purchases and reading recommendations in 1814.

On the same occasion, Webster borrowed three other titles, including an issue of the *British Critic* (number 18, dated April 1831) and a pamphlet entitled *Christ, not St Peter, the Rock of the Christian*

---


475 There are many sermons by John Sharp in the library and so the exact book cannot be identified.

476 Robert Moss, *Sermons and discourses on practical subjects... 2nd ed* (London: W.B. for Richard Williamson etc., 1736-38), 8 vols

477 Br MS 4/6/3/2 Borrowing register (Laurencekirk), 1831-1853, p.21

478 William Thomas Lancaster *The harmony of the law and the Gospel with regard to the doctrine of a future state* (Oxford: Printed at the University Press for J. Parker, 1825)

479 Gleig, *Directions for Candidates*, p.159

480 Gleig, *Directions for Candidates*, p.149


Church (London, 1812) by Bishop Burgess, which argued against the Catholic Church’s assertion that the Church was founded on St Peter, in order to prove that the Church in Britain was independent of Rome and more ancient than the Catholic Church. Additionally he borrowed Practical Observations on Miracles (London, 1702) by Francis Bragge. The choice to engage with a work on miracles is clearly influenced by Gleig, who, as discussed, was concerned with defending the apostle’s testimony as proof of their truth.

Webster borrowed four more titles between the 14 and 21 July, which included a further two issues of the British Critic, (numbers 16 and 17). Its inclusion in Webster’s borrowings suggests an interest in the wider Anglican Church and the Tractarian disputes dominating the Church of England. The British Critic is described in more detail in Chapter 4. He also borrowed A view of the Times, their principles and practices, in the Rehearsals by Charles Leslie (1650–1722). Of all the works borrowed by Webster, this was the one which had the most relevance to nonjuring theology, as its author was a nonjuring clergyman of the Church of Ireland, who defended the constitution of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

After 1834, Webster did not borrow from the Jamieson library again, and only borrowed once more from the Laurencekirk Library in 1837. Evidently, he used the library solely out of necessity, relying on it for learning the skills needed to compose and give sermons to his congregations, and to pass his clerical exams. His borrowing also demonstrates that the library was clearly an essential tool in the informal education in the diocese, and access to books provided a solution for learning in a difficult position. The books he borrowed focused on topics of relevant to the theological disputes of eighteenth century Anglican High Churchmen, such as miracles, which had carried on into the nineteenth century.

Indeed, what is striking about Webster’s borrowing is the extent to which they do not engage with nonjuring theology; there are no books on the Eucharistic doctrine, or summaries of the works of the Patristic Fathers. This contrasts with the previous century, when Bishop Alexander Jolly – discussed in chapter 5 – read Bishop Rattray’s The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem (1755) before even being ordained a deacon. The key difference is that Alexander Jolly was tutored by George Innes (1717–1781), the nonjuring Bishop of Brechin, whose own work of catechism was based on Bishop Rattray’s, and who had gifted Jolly The Ancient Liturgy in 1771. In contrast,
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Webster’s bishop, who clearly had some influence over his education, was Gleig, who was clearly more connected to the eighteenth-century Church of England, than the eighteenth-century nonjurors.

In 1837, Gleig was succeeded by Bishop David Moir (1777—1847), incumbent at Brechin and librarian of the Jamieson library. Moir was a native Scottish High Churchman. In 1816, his congregation at Brechin had opposed his use of the Scottish Communion Office, which he had refused on the grounds of the primacy of the Office and his preference for it. While Gleig had supported him, and stated his preferred the Scottish Office, he also stated that he “cannot convince my own mind that its superiority should be put in the balance and made in any case protonate, against the unity of the Church.” Moir’s first intervention in the diocesan library as Bishop, was to instruct the Rev. Goalen, librarian at Laurencekirk, to purchase for the library “Dr Burton’s Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Father on the Divinity of Christ.” Notably, there was very little engagement with patristic teaching at the library in the first half of the nineteenth century. Chapter 4 discusses the relative inaccessibility of the works of the Church Fathers in the library. It is thus notable that Moir immediately sought to rectify this. The work attacked Unitarianism, but it did so on the testimonies of the Church Fathers, rather than through Christian revelation like the works favoured by Gleig.

Moir undertook the direction of the education of Alexander Simpson (1815–1871). Alexander Simpson graduated from King’s College Aberdeen in 1835 and began borrowing from the Laurencekirk library on 16th February 1837. This date is particularly significant, as at this point Simpson had not taken his deacons’ orders (he was ordained a deacon in the diocese in June 1838) and was clearly borrowing in preparation for entry to the Church. The evidence that Simpson’s reading was directed comes from a slip of paper written by Bishop Moir, tucked into the borrowing register of the Jamieson library. The Jamieson library was housed in the manse at Brechin, where Moir served as incumbent and librarian. Moir lists the books “lent to Mr Simpson” from the libraries at Laurencekirk, Brechin, and his own personal library and states that Simpson had “all
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the books recommended to him by me in a late letter.” He also lists three further books which he “must try to get for him.”

The course of study which Moir created for Simpson was targeted at aiding Simpson in passing his examinations for ordination as both deacon and priest. This is evident in the extent to which the topics of the books borrowed correspond which the questions and topics of the examinations for Holy Orders, enshrined in the 1838 canon. Furthermore, Moir’s own borrowing from Laurencekirk suggests he was thinking of clerical examinations, as on 1 April 1837, he borrowed a pamphlet on Preparation for the Priests Orders. However, it should be noted that in this period, his son John Moir (1814–1889), was also studying to become a priest, and was ordained in Aberdeen in 1838.

Before taking his Deacon’s Orders, Simpson was lent eight books from the Laurencekirk library, the Jamieson library, and Moir’s personal library. All the books but one (with an indecipherable title) were recommended to him by Bishop Moir. On 16th February 1837, Simpson borrowed An introduction to the critical study and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures by Thomas Hartwell Horne (1780-1862). It was a standard text for scriptural teaching in Anglican schools and universities and would have aided Simpson in the first stage of clerical education: studying the Holy Scriptures. It was also a book with which Moir was familiar, as he had borrowed it himself in August 1832, and had been present when it had been purchased by a diocesan synod in August 1830. Significantly, Thomas Hartwell Horne was an Evangelical, demonstrating that the clergy were willing to engage with material written by Evangelical clergymen, if it was on a topic for which there was a shared consensus.

Between February and April Simpson borrowed both volumes of the History of the Church in Scotland; a relatively new book, published in 1834, and written by the Rev. Michael Russell, then Dean of Edinburgh, but later Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway. This history of the Scottish Church began with the arrival of Christianity in Scotland and ended with the repeal of the penal laws in 1792. An Episcopal perspective on the history of the Church in Scotland would have
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provided Simpson with historical context for the Church he was joining, while presumably also aiding him in the ecclesiastical history section of his exams.

Moir also recommended him two books by William Jones of Nayland (1726–1800), a Church of England clergyman and biographer of George Horne, Bishop of Norwich (1730–1792). Significantly, William Jones was a Hutchinsonian, whose scholarly works aimed to defend it. Simpson borrowed *A course of lectures on the figurative language of the Holy Scripture*, and he was lent *The Scholar Armed Against the Errors of the Time; or collection of Tracts on the Principles and Evidences of Christianity, the Constitution of the Church, and the Authority of Civil Government* from Moir’s personal library. The latter was a collection of tracts dominated by works of the nonjurors George Horne and Charles Leslie, with other tracts by William Jones. These tracts supported the spiritually independent constitution of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the nonjurors of England.

The recommendation of this text is particularly interesting, not only in its relation to native nonjuring High Churchmanship, but to its relevance for discussions on the constitution of the Church of England, prompted by the Tractarians. As discussed in Chapter 4, the clergy of the diocese of Brechin were well informed of Tractarianism, due to the library’s subscription of *The British Magazine* and *The British Critic*. The early Tractarians respected the disestablished status of the Scottish Episcopal Church and her spiritual independence from the state and aimed to rebuild the Church of England on apostolic Church principles, removed from the British state.

Two other books formed part of Simpson’s course of study: Burnet’s *Pastoral Care* from the Jamieson Library and William Magee’s (1766–1831) *Discourses and dissertations on the Scriptural doctrines of atonement & sacrifice*. (London, 1812). The latter had been purchased for the library by Bishop Gleig in 1814, as part of the course of reading he devised for his own clergy. Magee’s work was directed at the “misguided opinions of Unitarian Divines like Joseph Priestley and Thomas Belsham.” Burnet’s *Pastoral Care* had been popular in the Church of England since its
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publication, and likely had relevance to the Episcopal Church as it emphasised the Unity of the Church in the face of dissenters; its seventeenth-century English context had a parallel with the schisms in the Scottish Church caused by the Qualified Chapels. Burnet argued that the character, learning and labours of a clergyman was the key to bringing dissenters back to the Church, something which had been echoed by Gleig in his sermon to the clergy in 1809.\(^{503}\) The works recommend by Bishop Moir were much more sympathetic and relevant to native High Churchmanship that the works recommended by Gleig.

Simpson’s course of study clearly aided him, as on 14th June 1838 he was “licensed to preach the Gospel and exercise the ministry or office of a Deacon to the congregation of Lochlee as assistant to the Curate Reverend Peter Jolly.”\(^{504}\) Lochlee (Tarfside) was possibly the most rural of the diocese's congregations, being in the north-west of the diocese in the Cairngorms. After his ordination as deacon, Coadjutor-Bishop Moir was still taking an interest in Simpson’s education, as on the slip of paper dated 18 February 1839, Moir states he still must get Johnson’s *Unbloody Sacrifice*, Hooke’s *Ecclesiastical Polity* and the *Clergyman’s Instruction* for Simpson.\(^{505}\) The first two titles show that Moir was now encouraging Simpson towards a more advanced reading curriculum.

John Johnson’s (1662–1725) *The Unbloody Sacrifice, and altar, unvail’d and supported*, first published in 1714, is described as a “trenchant exposition of the High-Church doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist” and deeply influenced the Eucharistic liturgy of the eighteenth-century nonjurors and proponents of the “usages” including the Scottish Episcopalians Badderar and Campbell.\(^{506}\) Indeed, the work would have helped the young clergyman to understand the origins of the Scottish Communion Office, and the necessary of the belief in the sacrifice in the Eucharist, allowing him to defend the virtualist understanding of the Office, and ensure he used it with his congregation.

Moir’s other recommendation, Richard Hooker’s *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* was also a challenging read. Hooker was an Elizabethan polemicist, whose writing shaped the “via media between the Protestant Reformation and Roman Catholicism…known as Anglicanism.”\(^{507}\) It was first published in eight books between 1593 and 1662, and was important, as was the man himself, in


\(^{504}\) Br MS 4/1/1/2 Synod Minutes, 1817-1848, p.103
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shaping Anglicanism after the reformation. Very little is said in the synod minutes of the details of Simpson’s clerical exams. Moir, now bishop, appointed Dean Horsley and the Revered William Henderson to examine him “in the terms of the Canons,” and having been recommended for promotion, he was ordained priest on 13 May 1840 and took over the sole charge of Lochlee from Peter Jolly.508

The use of the library by Simpson and Webster demonstrates that in the first half of the nineteenth century, the Brechin Diocesan library was essential for preparing Candidates for the Holy Orders for the examinations, and for performing their duties as clergymen. For clergymen living in rural locations, and on low stipends, the library provided essential access to books necessary for their profession. Webster’s preference for discourses on the epistles and sermons show that he was more concerned with covering the essentials needed for serving his congregation, than engaging with works intended to defend or challenge doctrines of the Church.

The requirements for candidates in 1743 were clearly grounded in an understanding of the doctrines of the apostolic Church. In 1838, in the diocese of Brechin under Bishop Moir, it was still desirable for a clergyman to have a grounding in the first ages of the Church. The intervening years of Gleig and his anglicized ideal plan of education demonstrate the variety of theological identities in the Church and the use of the library to promote them and educate young ordinands in them. The clear contrast borrowing between Webster and Simpson are evidence of the extent to which the bishop of the diocese shaped the intellectual culture and identity of the library. Gleig was clearly more interested in opposing natural religion and Deists, than educating his clergy in nonjuring theology. Bishop David Moir was more aware of contemporary circumstances in the Scottish and English Churches, as well as having an appreciation for nonjuring theology. He clearly desired Simpson should be educated in the nonjuring Constitution of the Church, and the virtualist understanding of the Communion Office. He aimed to ensure the preservation of his Native Scottish High Churchmanship and used the library to accomplish this.

Chapter 4: The Library under Bishop Alexander Penrose Forbes

The modern catalogue of the Brechin Collection contains almost every notable Anglo-Catholic author of the nineteenth century. There are numerous works by the Tractarian, and mentor of Alexander Penrose Forbes, Edward Pusey and most of the works by the Tractarian turned
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Catholic, John Henry Newman. The Tracts for Our Times appear in multiples, as do the works by the leader of the German Old Catholic movement Ignaz von Döllinger (1799-1890). The breadth of the Tractarian movement with its beginnings as the Tracts in the 1830s to the Eucharistic Controversies of the 1850s and the promotion of Anglo-Catholic Reunion in the late 1860s, is represented on the shelves of the library. Later nineteenth and early twentieth-century historians of the Scottish Episcopal Church would not view this as surprising. The Oxford Movement is recorded by them as having had a revitalising influence on the Scottish Church Episcopal Church.

The Anglo-Catholic historian and biographer of Alexander Penrose Forbes, William Perry, portrayed the Oxford Movement as the saviour of the Scottish Episcopalian Church, representing the views of the Tractarians as near identical to traditional nonjuring beliefs. He wrote that the nonjurors were “Tractarians long before the Tracts for the Times.” Perry was writing about the Oxford Movement in 1933, when the Anglo Catholic faction dominated the Church of England, and his work was an uncritical celebration of the Oxford Movement. Later historians, such as Peter Nockles and Rowan Strong have disputed these uncritical histories, and demonstrated the theological differences between nonjurors and Tractarians, as well as the opposition to the Tractarians by Scottish High Churchmen.

It would be natural to assume then, that the Catholic contents of the library are due to the gift of the Tractarian Bishop, Alexander Penrose Forbes, who, on his death in 1876, bequeathed 1800 volumes to the Diocesan library. However, the books of John Henry Newman, Henry Manning and Robert Wilberforce – to name a few of the Tractarian Catholic converts – were on the shelves before the death of Forbes. While Forbes was a decisive influence on the books bought by the diocesan synod for the library, his clergy were a receptive readership, and played a part in choosing and acquiring the books, especially in the 1870s, when Anglo Catholicism was less divisive. Thus,
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Forbes will states that his “theological books are to go to the Diocesan Library at Brechin, George getting the duplicates and Mr Irvine Mr Keble’s Bible. My antiquarian and curious books are to go to William.” George and William were his brothers.

SC45/31/26 Dundee Sheriff Court via National Records of Scotland. 1876, Forbes, Alexander Penrose.
the reality of how the clergy’s library was shaped into a repository of Anglo-Catholic material, and how it was accessed and used by clergy, is a more nuanced tale of the overlap between nonjuring beliefs, High Churchmanship and Tractarianism, and the effect the Catholic revival had on the intellectual culture of the diocese.

This chapter will examine the extent to which Tractarianism and Anglo-Catholicism shaped the library. It will discuss the curation of the library by both Bishop Forbes and his clergy. Focusing on the period before Forbes’ arrival in the diocese, and ending with his death in 1876, it will explore the theological material with which the clergy engaged. It will also examine how the library enabled Forbes to set his clergy a course of reading intended to defend the orthodox beliefs of the Church against the rising tide of biblical criticism and disbelief.

Tractarianism in the library before Forbes

In 1842, Bishop Russell of Glasgow complained of the unfounded associations between the Bishops and the Oxford Movement, stating that if the bishops really were Puseyites “it must be by nature or inspiration, for I believe that five out of six have not read the tracts at all.” He was referring to the *Tracts for our Times*, the publication through which the doctrines of the Oxford Movement were initially expressed, and from which the name Tractarian originates. The *Tracts* were published with the object of “contributing something towards the practical revival of doctrines, which, although held by the great divines of our Church, at present have become obsolete with the majority of her members.” Though the movement is perhaps most famous for the *Tracts*, limiting engagement with the Oxford Movement to them alone is an inadequate measure of the bishops’ relationship with the Tractarians. Tractarianism was expressed in pamphlets, periodicals, in publishing ventures such as the *Library of the Fathers*, and in books written by its members. Furthermore, as this chapter will demonstrate, examining the Tractarianism of the Episcopalian bishops alone, neglects the critical engagement that the clergy had with the movement.
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The Oxford Movement had begun as a response to the threat of the state reforming the English Church after the Reform Act of 1832. It quickly evolved into the pursuit of an ideal Anglo-Catholic Church, recovering the ritual and spirituality of the Church before the reformation, while challenging the principles on which Anglicanism was established. Pusey and his contemporaries believed that the Catholic truths of the Church of England had been “unhappily watered down in the meagre practical teaching of the eighteenth century,” and the movement sought to uncover, teach, and reinvigorate the present Church of England with the rituals, spirituality and theology of the earlier Church.

Initially, the Tractarians had advocated for “the apostolic succession of English bishops, the sacramental character of Anglican rites, and a vision of Catholicity articulated by Caroline divines.” As George Herring argues, the Tractarians aimed for these ideas to have a practical application, and the Tracts were a vehicle for inspiring practical change in parochial parishes, rather than merely a place to discuss theories on Anglican worship. Newman aimed a “reawakening of parish life,” which in practical terms would include – among other things – more daily services, frequent administration of the Eucharist, and celebration of Church festivals.

Much of the recent historiography on the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Tractarians has focused on refuting the work of Anglo-Catholics who have exaggerated the relations between the Oxford Movement and the Scottish Episcopal Church. Nockles argues that in Oxford Movement historiography, the differences between the nonjuring High Church traditions of the northeast and the Tractarians “have been overlooked or understated,” an assessment shared by Rowan Strong. A clear example of this is in the work of Scottish Episcopal Historian Marion Lochhead who regards nonjuring theology and Tractarianism as one and the same. She writes that “the Oxford Movement was very new, very exciting, startling indeed to most English Churchmen: to the Church in Scotland it was only a bringing forth of treasures long hidden, the merging into
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the daylight from the shadows of neglect the tradition and doctrine that the faithful remnant had known and taught.’

Lochhead, like Perry, considered the Oxford movement as something revitalising and welcome in the Scottish Church.

Gavin White, while assessing the movement’s reception in Scotland as mostly negative, still concludes that it was necessary for the survival of the Church. He argues, “the Oxford view was inevitable if the church was to exist in the Victorian age…in successive years it came through various channels and had it not done so the Episcopal Church would never have survived.”

However, Strong has demonstrated that its influence on the Church was mostly divisive, particularly the Eucharistic Controversy, which centred on the charge given by the Bishop of Brechin in 1857.

In the 1830s, there was a mutual admiration between the Tractarians and some Episcopal bishops, such as Bishop Walker of Edinburgh and Bishop Torry of St Andrews. In 1838, Bishop Walker of Edinburgh instructed Henry Wilberforce to thank Newman for sending him the Tracts “which he exceedingly admires both for their talent and for their apostolical principles.”

Many Tractarians saw the nonjuring traditions of the Scottish Church, such as its reverence for patristic theology and antiquity, the Scots Communion Office, and its anti-Erastianism, as upholding a more primitive, early Christianity. The Tractarians admired the Scottish Communion Office, holding it up as a more primitive office, and defending it from attacks when Anglicized Bishops and clergy of the Scottish Church attempted to have it removed. However, the patronage of the Tractarians left the Episcopal clergy as the target of low Churchmen and Evangelicals, who charged them with “Puseyism” and popery.

Nevertheless, the movement did inspire some sectors of the Church, namely aristocratic Churchmen, educated in England. In 1851, George Fredrick Boyle, later 6th Earl of Glasgow founded an Anglo-Catholic Collegiate Church on the Isle of Cumbrae, intending that it would be a celibate priestly training academy. He also commissioned a Cathedral, which the college was attached to. Archibald Wilson, who left his books to the clergy of the diocese of Brechin, was resident canon and chanter at the Cathedral.

Additionally, St Ninians’s Cathedral, the centre for
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ritualism in Scotland, was built in Perth, designed in the gothic revival style by the Tractarian architect, William Butterfield. It was the “brainchild” of the aristocratic Tractarian laymen Horace Courtney Gammell Forbes (later Lord Forbes) and George Frederick Boyle, who used their wealth to pursue their plans for Anglo-Catholic revival of the Church. Strong, Episcopalianism in Nineteenth-Century Scotland, p.250

Both men had been young aristocrats at Oxford, with Forbes having studied at Oriel College, where Newman was based. Strong, Episcopalianism in Nineteenth-Century Scotland, pp.249-257

St Ninians was not well received amongst most native Episcopalian clergy, and was a continuing source of contention within the Church. The High Churchman John Torry, son of the Bishop Patrick Torry, was an initial supporter, but by 1851 opposed it, fearing it too closely imitated Roman Catholic worship. The Cathedral was initially staffed with English ordained ritualists, with little to no knowledge of the Scottish Church, driven by a desire to implant ritualist worship in Scotland. Strong, Episcopalianism in Nineteenth-Century Scotland, p.254

Strong summarises that “in the 1840s, Anglo-Catholicism remained a tiny plant imported into the life of the Episcopal Church by the unilateral initiative of wealthy Tractarian aristocrats.”

However, as George Herring points out, the ritualists represented a fundamental shift in Tractarianism, which Newman, Pusey and other Tractarians had sought to prevent. The ritualists moved the focus on tradition from the early Church to the middle ages, and desired a revival of medieval liturgical ceremonials. In the 1840s and 1850s these were incredibly divisive views; the “reintroduction of medieval liturgical vestments and practises” were seen as unnecessary and a threat to Anglican unity. They were not representative of the Oxford Movement until the 1860s, when they were subsequently displayed “as the badges of the party.”

Thus, it is not correct to measure Scottish Episcopal clergy engagement or approval of the Oxford Movement in the 1840s and 1850s, with the doctrines and practises of the ritualists, as they were not representative of Tractarian values in this period. Neither is it useful to measure interest in the Oxford Movement by how many bishops read the Tracts.

Consequently, it is of significance that prior to the arrival of Bishop Forbes, the clergy of the diocese of Brechin were engaging with materials written by or about the Oxford Movement. The library was an active part of this engagement, and the borrowing registers and acquisitions of the Brechin Diocesan library provide an opportunity to re-evaluate the engagement of the Episcopal clergy with the Oxford Movement. This is achieved through an assessment of the
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periodicals subscribed to by the clergy, Tractarian pamphlets acquired, as well as the revival of interest in the Church Fathers. This evaluation does not seek to argue that the diocese was in favour of the Oxford Movement, but rather that the clergy were more aware of and interested in Tractarianism than has hitherto been recognised. Their interest in the theological developments of the wider Anglican Church impacted the intellectual culture of the diocese, which the library was central to as it provided access to these new texts and periodicals.

**Periodicals**

The clergy of the diocese of Brechin engaged with events in the wider Anglican Church and the theology of the Tractarians mainly through periodicals. Periodicals had several advantages over books: they were quarterly, and thus provided a continual stream of new reading material, and they could be circulated around the diocese cheaply and quickly by post. By 1841, the entirety of the library’s income - £2 14 – was spent on periodical subscriptions, with no money left over for books. Their arrival was a highly anticipated event. The synod minutes for 1844 record plans “to expedite the circulation of the periodical,” limiting an individual to holding it for no more than five days.536 A form attached to a copy of *The Scottish Guardian*, December 1867 is filled with clergyman’s signatures and dates from when they received the periodical, to the day they forwarded it, with seven days as the maximum “time allowed for reading.”537 The longest running subscriptions during the 1830s and early 1840s were to the *British Critic* and the *British Magazine*. Both periodicals were subscribed to in 1833 and can be seen as an attempt by the clergy to engage with current events in the Church of England. Clergymen of the Church of England were extremely anxious about the state’s interference in Church Matters, and periodicals were the outlet of their agitation.

The *British Magazine* was an ecclesiastical magazine first published in 1832, in response to the reforming movements of the liberal government, from which it attempted to defend the Church of England.538 It contained articles, book reviews and updates on various religious societies. In 1833, it published a series of articles on the history of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the “Present State of the Scottish Episcopal Church,” which may have been the motivation for the
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initial subscription. The magazine did not shy away from criticising the Oxford Movement, particularly towards the end of the 1830s.

Contrastingly, the British Critic was the voice of the Tractarians. The British Critic was a theological periodical established by High Churchmen in 1793, which included political, religious, and social commentary, as well as book reviews. When the clergy voted to subscribe to it in 1833, it was in its “pre-Tractarian phase.” Between 1836 and 1838, John Henry Newman attempted to take it under control. From 1838 to 1843, it was the “Tractarian House Magazine” shaped by the doctrinal attitude of its editors Thomas Mozley and Newman. In 1841, when Thomas Mozley took over editorship of the British Critic from Newman, the review began to take an extreme direction. Articles by Frederick Oakley and William George Ward began to alarm High Churchmen. The reformation was denigrated in articles such as Oakley’s attack on Bishop Jewel, and Roman doctrine and practice was promoted as a model for a new reform of the Anglican Church. Pressure from Anglican churchmen led Mozley to resign, and the publication was terminated.

The cessation of the British Critic was part of a wider crisis in Tractarianism. Some of its original adherents were alienated by the Romanists such as John Henry Newman, who later converted to Roman Catholicism. The clergy of the diocese were clearly following these events and were interested in reading the literature pertaining to them. At the synod of 1842, on the suggestion of the Rev. William Henderson, it was decided that the money saved from ending the subscription to the British Magazine the year before, would be used to purchase new pamphlets. These would be “circulated among the clergy and afterwards deposited in the library.”

The vast majority of the pamphlets purchased the following year were written by Tractarians, or those with Tractarian sympathies, and concerned the tumultuous events of the previous years. These are bound together in one volume, entitled “Sermons etc.” Notable among them is Palmer’s Narrative of Events, which was written when anti-Tractarian fury was rising as the movement begin to drift Romewards. As a traditional Old High churchman, Palmer sought to preserve the “church principles” of the Tractarians, while distancing them from the recent Romanising tendencies of the movement, in particular separating the extreme views of readers and contributors of the British Critic from those of the authors of the Tracts. Palmer offered an “account of the views on which the movement at Oxford, in 1833, was commenced, in order to
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show that our objects were wholly unconnected with party, or with any tendency to Romanism”

He sought to draw a line between leading Church principles, and Romanising and Ultra Protestantism. It was the first documentary record of the Oxford Movement, and upon publication was criticised for its vindication of the Tractarian leaders, and its picture of old High Church and Tractarian harmony. It was perhaps reading this pamphlet which inspired the clergy to begin subscribing to The English Review in 1844, which had been started by William Palmer in the same year. This was dropped in 1845, and a subscription to The Christian Remembrancer was started instead.

The Christian Remembrancer was a High Church magazine, extremely sympathetic to Tractarians. Issues for the year 1845 included articles by John Keble, and an article condemning the treatment of Edward Pusey after a controversial sermon, for which he had been censured, discussed below. The magazine felt it their duty to “record the facts” of the Pusey case and detailed the “grotesque features” of the handling of it by the University of Oxford. James Pereiro describes The Christian Remembrancer as an “intellectual secure harbour to those Oxford Movement sympathizers buffeted by its crisis in the 1840s.” Its subscription demonstrates that the clergy of the diocese were receptive to Tractarianism in its High Church and Anglo-Catholic form.

One of the pamphlets acquired by the library was Pusey’s sermon The Holy Eucharist a comfort to the Penitent (1843). His views and subsequent censure were so controversial that he became national news. The library acquired a copy, and notably, so did a female member of congregation, who resided in Ninewells. The sermon was one of Pusey’s earliest expressions of the doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist, a doctrine which would come to dominate discourse in the Scottish Church in 1857, after the Bishop of Brechin’s charge. In the sermon, Pusey stated that “in the Holy Eucharist there is forgiveness of sins,” meaning that the Eucharist contained the power of forgiveness. This was considered an extremely controversial opinion, and Pusey was subsequently suspended from preaching before the University of Oxford for two years.

544 Nockles Oxford Movement in Context, pp.290-291
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British Critic cited it as having passed through “thirty thousand copies” and having attracted a great deal of media attention.\textsuperscript{550}

Other pamphlets purchased during the year included Rev E Morris’s \textit{On Ascension Day} (1843), a sermon for which he was admonished by the University of Oxford for heterodoxy, for canonising Archbishop Laud as St. William of Canterbury.\textsuperscript{551} Also acquired was \textit{Letter by Percival on the Subscription to the XXXIX Articles} (1842) by Arthur Philip Percival, a Tractarian and author of various tracts in the \textit{Tracts for our Times}. Additionally, Walter Farquhar Hook’s work \textit{Mutual Forbearance} (1843) was bought. The work was dedicated to dedicated to Pusey, supporting him after the publication of his sermon. Hook was a Tractarian, though he broke with them over the issue of the doctrine Justification, in the early 1840s.\textsuperscript{552} The sermon asks for mutual forbearance among divided churchmen, who are connected by love to Jesus, and united in love.\textsuperscript{553} Alongside the periodicals subscribed to by the library, these pamphlets, evidently of Tractarian flavour, are hitherto unrecognised evidence of clergy interest in Tractarianism in the diocese of Brechin. The native High Churchmen of the northeast may have been more sympathetic to the works of the early Tractarians, due to the similarities of some of its doctrines with nonjuring theology. Yet this does not detract from the significance of their engagement with developments in the Anglican Church, and their familiarity with the doctrines of the Anglo Catholics before Forbes became their Bishop.

\textbf{The Clergy and the Church Fathers}

An aim of the Tractarians was to prove the Church of England’s continuity with the pre-Reformation Church, which was accomplished through a study of the Church Fathers. As they conceived their ecclesiastic authority as resting on apostolic succession from the early Church, they focused on “the undivided church up to the Council of Chalcedon (451AD)” to demonstrate the validity of this doctrine. Pusey claimed “the circumstance that the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic is founded upon Holy Scripture and the agreement of the Universal Church; and that therefore the knowledge of Christian antiquity if necessary in order to understand and maintain
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her doctrines, and especially her creeds and her liturgy.”\(^{554}\) Nockles states that this “appeal to antiquity gave an appearance of continuity between the Oxford Movement and the seventeenth-century divines,” whose Anglo-Catholic theology had similarly valued patristic teaching.\(^{555}\) To promote the study of the Church Fathers, the leaders of the Oxford Movement decided to publish translations of their works in a series entitled \textit{A Library of the Fathers}. Between 1838 and 1845 twenty volumes were published, edited, and introduced with prefaces by both Tractarians and High Churchmen.\(^{556}\) Previously, the works of the Church Fathers were generally only available in Latin and Greek, in editions published in seventeenth century Paris. In contrast, the \textit{Library of the Fathers} were relatively cheap, accessible, translations, and useful to a broad audience of clergymen.

The Tractarians were not unique in valuing the Church Fathers; High Church contemporaries such as Bishop Kaye, similarly “stood squarely within the Caroline tradition of theological method and patristic learning.”\(^{557}\) The nonjuring clergy of the Scottish Church, and the native High Churchmen who had inherited their theology, also highly valued the Church Fathers. As discussed in Chapter 2, the anti-Erastian and spiritually independent constitution of Scottish Episcopal Church, as well as its Communion Office, was underpinned by patristic evidence. Bishop Rattray wrote that “those things wherein the Catholick Church have been agreed from the beginning, and are attested by the early Fathers of the second and third centuries, are undoubtedly derived from the apostles and ought to be firmly adhered to as such.”\(^{558}\) The high regard for the Church Fathers was one of the mutual points of admiration between Scottish High Churchman and the Tractarians, but it is also one of the reasons that the two parties have been conflated and erroneously supposed to have been in theological unison. This should be considered when assessing the acquisition of, and engagement with, the Church Fathers in the Brechin Diocesan Library.

Traditional English High Churchmanship appealed to the Fathers as witnesses, usually for their testimony on particular pieces of disputed doctrine, such as the Trinity or the Eucharist. Positions on Socianism, Unitarianism and non-orthodox positions were vindicated through an appeal to the Fathers. However, the Tractarians began appealing to the Fathers in “a new, more systematic way” which departed from the Carolinian tradition.\(^{559}\) Nockles summarises that in the hands of the Tractarians “antiquity became an absolute standard and final court of appeal, rather than as with

\(^{554}\) Quoted in Mark Chapman, \textit{Anglican Theology} (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2012), pp.129-130
\(^{555}\) Nockles, \textit{The Oxford Movement in Context}, p.107
\(^{556}\) Pereiro, ‘A cloud of witnesses’ Tractarians and Tractarian Ventures’ in \textit{The Oxford Movement Handbook of the Oxford Movement}, p.114
\(^{557}\) Nockles, \textit{The Oxford Movement in Context}, p.106
\(^{559}\) Quantin, \textit{The Church of England and Christian Antiquity}, p.28
most old High Churchmen, merely a corroborative testimony to the truth of the Church of England’s formularies…”560 The Church Fathers became a model for orthodoxy, rather than a place to seek out supporting evidence for, as Newman put it, “modern dogmas” like the Thirty-Nine Articles.

The situation of the Scottish Church was different; they used the Fathers as witnesses but additionally their doctrines had the provenance of antiquity. The foundational scholar of their nonjuring theology, Thomas Rattray, looked to antiquity as the absolute standard, and based his idea of the ideal liturgy and Church polity on this. As recent scholarship by Wallace Kornahrens has shown, the Scottish Communion Office 1764 took many aspects directly from Thomas Rattray’s order of the liturgy, in his The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem, based on the earliest available liturgies used in the Catholic Church.561 Yet is it difficult to say the extent to which the nonjuring use of patristic learning differed from the Tractarians, as there seems to be both overlap and variations, especially in the later Tractarian understanding of the real presence in the Eucharist. The specifics of the Scottish Episcopalian understanding and use of the Church Fathers, and how this developed and changed in the nineteenth century is an area of research which deserves more attention. In the context of the Brechin Diocesan Library, it means that while engagement with the Church Fathers cannot be said not to represent Tractarian sympathies, it more than likely represents the native Scottish High Church theology of the clergy in the diocese.

The Tractarians also valued the Nicene Fathers above the anti-Nicene Fathers. Robert Isaac Wilberforce, in his work The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist (1853) explained why it was necessary to consult these later authorities. He states that “the value of these writers is [above the anti-Nicene Fathers…] that the controversies of their times, and their own high intellectual culture, gave a scientific form to those truths which had been believed from the beginning. And their authority ought on every ground to be admitted by English Churchmen; for the reference of our law on heresy to the four first councils shows that the English Church supposes herself to accord in Principle entirely with the Nicene.”562 The Nicene Fathers were thus used to challenge High Churchmen’s claims that their formularies were in accordance with antiquity. As the Tractarian movement developed, the Nicene fathers were also used to support the growing disenchantment with the Reformation, the Thirty-Nine Articles, and the Eucharist. Tractarians began to interpret

560 Nockles, The Oxford Movement in Context, p.114
them in the most Catholic sense, which gave way to the Eucharistic controversies discussed in more detail further on.

The bequests of the nonjurors had already endowed the clergy library with works of both the ante-Nicene and Nicene Fathers. These were mostly unwieldy folios; huge, heavy, very old, and usually in Latin or Greek. Abernethy Drummond’s copy of the works of St Ambrose was an enormous folio, measuring 39cm (length) x 27cm (width) x 7.5cm (depth), published in Paris in 1614. The library’s copy of Tertullian had belonged to both Thomas Rattray and George Skene, and was a folio published in Paris in 1675. The works of St Basil, in Latin and Greek, donated by the Rev Rose, were again folios, published in Paris in 1638, measuring 35.5cm x 23.5cm. Likewise, his copy of the works of St Clement of Alexandria was a large folio, 38cm x 24cm, published in Cologne in 1688. The size and inaccessibility of these works is important when considering why they were not borrowed prior to 1830, when James Smith (1804–1923), incumbent at Muchalls (1827–1854), borrowed the Latin folio Cyprian Opera (1682). Smith borrowed further volumes of the Church fathers in 1836, when he borrowed St John Chrysostom’s Commentarium in Acta Apostolorum, Desiderio Erasmo Roterodamo interprete, a duodecimo donated by Rev Beatt. In August of 1840, he borrowed volume eleven of John Chrysostom’s Epistle to the Hebrews donated by Abernethy Drummond, a large folio measuring 38cm x 25cm. The only other borrower of similar works in the 1830s was George Ironside, who in 1854 replaced James Smith at Muchalls. At this point in his career, Ironside had not taken orders, and is recorded as a “teacher and student at Auchenblae,” five miles from Laurencekirk. He was recommended to the librarian by R.K Thom and subsequently given permission to borrow from the library. In 1837, Ironside borrowed Justin Martyr Opera, Clement Alexander Opera, Tertullian opera and Reeves an Apologia.

566 Saint Cyprian of Carthage, Sancti Cæcilii Cypriani Opera recognita & illustrata per Joannum Oxoniensem episcopum. Accedunt Annales Cyprianci, sine tredecim annorum, quibus S. Cypriamus inter Christianus versatus est, brevis historia chronologice delineata per Joannem Cestriensem. (Oxonii : e Theatro Sheldoniano, anno MDCLXXXII. [1682]), donated by Bishop Abernethy Drummond. Br UF 281.3
Given the importance which nonjuring theology place on the Church Fathers, it is interesting that they were borrowed so infrequently. As discussed, Gleig had placed emphasis on the study of Christian Revelation, rather than patristic learning. Sermons and the works of seventeenth and early eighteenth-century High Churchmen had been the works he encouraged the clergy to read. This may be evidence that the clergy were not especially invested in the study of nonjuring theology, as they were more concerned with the practical aspects and duties of being a clergyman. It may also be that the original works of the Fathers were inaccessible as they were only available in large formats in Latin and Greek. Given that borrowers had to pay for the postage of books, these works may not have seemed very attractive. This makes the borrowings of James Smith and George Ironside more interesting, as they must have been highly motivated to study them.

The Tractarian project for reprinting the Church Fathers thus reintroduced texts hitherto rare and inaccessible. Consequently, the appearance of *The Library of the Fathers* on the shelves of the Laurencekirk Library transformed the clergy’s access to patristic learning. They were donated by William Ewart Gladstone in 1842. Gladstone donated all of the *Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church* published at that point. He had used the Laurencekirk library during August of 1841, 1843, and 1844, when he was staying on his father’s estate in Fasque. His Father was a patron of the Church, and built a chapel on the estate, where he retained a minister. Gladstone was also to become involved in the future of the diocese in 1847, when he planned, with his cousin William Goalen, the consecration of Alexander Penrose Forbes as Bishop of Brechin. *The Library of the Fathers* arrived in the library as octavos, bound in a simple blue pasteboard binding. The volumes were borrowed immediately by members of the clergy. Between their arrival in 1842 and the closure of the Laurencekirk library in 1854, *The Library of the Fathers* were the most frequently borrowed books.

James Smith continued his reading of the Fathers, borrowing the works of Saint Augustine, and Saint Cyril in 1847, and in 1850, two volumes of works by John Chrysostom. In 1845, John Moir, who later became dean of the diocese borrowed two volumes S Chrysostom on the Epistle to the Romans and St Augustine’s *Confessions*. On 5th December 1846 he borrowed Gregory the Great on Job; In 1847 he borrowed St Athanasius *Tracts*; In 1850, 2 volumes of Augustine’s
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sermons. Robert K Thom, who was most certainly a Tractarian, borrowed both the works of St Chrysostom and St Augustine's *Confessions* in 1842; in 1843 he borrowed St Cyprian and St Athanasius; in 1844 more works by St Cyprian and Chrysostom; in 1846 volume 8 of Tertullian. By 1854, he had read almost every volume of *The Library of the Fathers*. Afterwards, from 1848, he began borrowing the earlier Latin volumes of St Augustine and St Ambrose. This revival of interest in the Church Fathers can arguably be considered evidence that the Tractarians did have a revitalising effect on the clergy of the diocese of Brechin. Patristic learning was an important aspect of native Scottish High Churchmanship which the clergy of Brechin reacquainted themselves with due to the publication of the *Library of the Fathers*, and the attention drawn towards their importance by Tractarians, which the clergy were aware of through the periodicals.

The Library under Bishop Forbes

In 1857, Bishop Forbes gave his infamous “Primary Charge on the Eucharist” at the annual diocesan synod. In his charge, he argued for the doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist, which opposed the “virtualism” of the Scottish Communion Office, and sparked a Eucharistic controversy which divided the Scottish Church for the next three years. He chose to give his charge in the newly built library room in Brechin, which he himself had funded. At the same meeting it was announced that the Bishop had gifted £100 to the library, and presented the works of Gregory the Great, St Anselm, St Zeno of Verona and St Gaudentius of Brescia. This was Forbes’ endowment for the new library. The physical books make an impressive statement; the four folios of Gregory the Great are large volumes with wooden boards, bound in heavily decorated pigskin, with blue foredges and ornate clasps. Likewise, the edition of St Anselm is magnificently...
presented in an unusual seventeenth century binding combining white pig skin and brown calf, with blind tooling. The works of St Verona and St Gaudentius are fine editions printed in Augsburg, with red and black title pages, and red foredges.

The books reflect the esteem in which Forbes held the Catholic truth of the early Church, and of the value of medieval Catholicism to his vision for the doctrines of Anglican and Scottish Episcopal Churches. Pope Gregory the Great (c. 540–604) was one of the most significant Doctors of the Catholic Church, who reintroduced Roman Christianity to England, and shaped “the theological landscape of the Latin West in the Middle Ages more than any other author, save Augustine.”580 He cultivated ascetic practices as part of his Christian Faith, incorporating a spiritual and physical regime which incorporated all of the typical forms of early Christian renunciation (including the regulation of food, the divestiture of money and family, and the rejection of sexual desire). 581 This was the monastic life that Forbes aspired to in the clergy house in Dundee. Similarly, St Anselm longed to live a life of monastic devotion. To Forbes, he also represented an “old traditional Christianity,” particularly pertinent as this was the lens through which Forbes believed the Thirty-Nine Articles had originally been interpreted, rather than the “low school” of later centuries. 582

Like all the works which Forbes made accessible to his clergy, the books he donated echoed his own Catholic piety. He was the first Tractarian Bishop in the Anglican Church, and his curation of the library reflected his belief in true Catholic doctrine, and the necessity of it becoming the doctrine of the Anglican and Scottish Episcopal Church. The solution to the religious doubt, biblical criticism, and atheism of the nineteenth century was the adoption of the Catholic Truths of the Church. The library and the culture of study he created in the diocese were one of the ways in which Forbes encouraged his clergy to engage with these truths.

Bishop Forbes was a Tractarian who respected and upheld the nonjuring traditions of the Scottish Episcopal Church, even when he did not necessarily believe them to be the correct doctrine. 583 He and his brother, the scholar and priest George Forbes, were brought up as Anglo Scots with nonjuring influences. Forbes was born in 1817 into a family of Episcopalians in Edinburgh. His father John Hay Forbes (Lord Medwyn) was a committed Episcopalian, who helped to financially support the church’s impoverished clergy, most notably Bishop Jolly, as well as aiding in the

581 Ibid, pp.18-19
583 Strong, Alexander Forbes of Brechin, pp.4-5
erection of St Paul’s, York Place (1818) in Edinburgh.\textsuperscript{584} His Grandfather, the banker William Forbes, had been instrumental in the building and affairs of the Cowgate Chapel in Edinburgh, and the promotion of the union of qualified and nonjuring congregations.\textsuperscript{585} Forbes and his family were part of the congregation of St Paul’s chapel in York Place, an anglicised congregation of middle and upper class parishioners, who used the English Book of Common Prayer.\textsuperscript{586} However, Forbes was descended from the Jacobite Lords of Pitsligo; his grandfather William Forbes had purchased the ancestral lands confiscated from the family following the 1715 uprising. Both William Forbes and John Hay Forbes had a love for nonjuring Jacobite traditions of the Church, which were passed on to George and Alexander Forbes.

In 1840, Forbes decided on a career in Holy Orders, and enrolled in Brasenose College, Oxford. He had initially worked for the East India Company before ill health forced him to leave. During his studies, Forbes began a lifelong friendship with the Professor of Hebrew, Dr Edward Pusey.\textsuperscript{587} Pusey was at this point moving theologically to an extreme Tractarian position, which emphasised the incarnation – the belief that Jesus was a union of human and God – as the central doctrine of Christianity.\textsuperscript{588} This belief extended to seeing the sacraments – for example, baptism and the eucharist – as extensions of the incarnation, which brought spiritual benefits to the receiver through a connection with Christ. This was a precursor to his belief in the real presence in the Eucharist. Pusey’s piety greatly influenced Forbes, who became devoted to the Tractarian cause, as well as immersed in the study of the Church Fathers.\textsuperscript{589}

Many of the books which Forbes read in this period are in the Brechin Collection, and bear marks of provenance from his days at Oxford. He encountered Keble as early as 1840, when he purchased an edition of Keble’s selections from Hooker, which he inscribed with his name and pasted in his heraldic bookplate.\textsuperscript{590} He also inscribed a quote from Livy 6.1 “quae autem ad sacra pertinebant a pontificibus maxime ut religione obstrictor haberent animos supressa.” This references Livy’s disapproval of the pontificate restricting common people’s access to sacral law. Keble’s edition of Hooker focused on his view of the Prayer Book and was an attempt to reclaim Hooker for the

\textsuperscript{584} William Perry, \textit{George Hay Forbes: A Romance in Scholarship} (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1927), pp.6-7
\textsuperscript{585} Lawson, \textit{History of the Scottish Episcopal Church}, pp.361-362
\textsuperscript{586} Strong, \textit{Alexander Forbes of Brechin}, p.2
\textsuperscript{587} Strong, \textit{Alexander Forbes of Brechin}, p.33
\textsuperscript{588} Brian Douglas, \textit{The Eucharistic Theology of Edward Bouverie Pusey: Sources, Context and Doctrine Within the Oxford Movement and Beyond} (Leiden: Brill, 2015), p.36
\textsuperscript{589} Strong, \textit{Alexander Forbes of Brechin}, pp.32-33

This contains a rare example of Forbes’ bookplate before his ordination as Bishop
Keble was willing to overlook Hooker’s attitude to the Eucharist and divine right episcopacy, in favour of the mystical beauty of his sacramental outlook, which mirrored those of the Church Fathers. His attitude aligned with the “sacramental principle” of the Tractarians, which “stressed the limits of human reason and intellect in perceiving religious truth” and emphasised the “deeper moral truths that lay above and beyond nature, in the unseen world.” Hooker was a valuable witness to this principle and the symbolism of the sacraments. A copy of Newman’s *Sermons bearing on subjects of the day (1843)* is also inscribed with “A.P Forbes Brasen Nose Coll: Oxford Dec. 8th 1843” and a set of *Tracts for the Times* printed in 1839 contain his pre-episcopate bookplate. After his ordination, Forbes served as a as priest in St Thomas’s, Oxford, before his mother’s ill health forced him north to Edinburgh, where he decided he would offer his services to the Episcopal Church. In 1846, he became the incumbent at Stonehaven, in the diocese of Brechin, and soon after began borrowing from both libraries.

In July 1846, Forbes borrowed Henry Hammond’s (1605-1660) *A paraphrase and annotations upon the books of the Psalms*, which had also been borrowed by Robert Kilgour Thom in 1842. Hammond was regarded as the embodiment of Anglicanism to Tractarians, and his *Miscellaneous Theological Works* (1847-50) were published in the *Library of Anglo Catholic Fathers*. In 1847, he borrowed Robert Keith’s *Catalogue of Bishops*, both the 1755 quarto edition belonging to Alexander Jamieson, and the 1824 edition belonging to Bishop David Moir. From Laurencekirk he borrowed Thomas Aquinas *Summa Theologia* and St Augustine’s *Sermons (Volume I Ennarationes in Psalmons)*, as well as seventeenth-century Anglican divine Isaac Barrow (1630–1677) *On the Pope’s...*
Supremacy, which made the case for apostolic equality against papal authority.\textsuperscript{599} His borrowings were characteristic of Forbes’ Anglo-Catholic theology, mix of Roman Catholic Saints, nonjuring history, and seventeenth-century Anglican Divines.

His appointment as Bishop of Brechin in 1847, from a junior position in the Church, was largely due to the influence of William Gladstone. Gladstone, whose father owned the estate of Fasque within the diocese, nominated Forbes as Bishop, finding that Forbes’ theology closely aligned with his own. Gladstone visited clergy within the diocese to garner support for Forbes’ election, as proposing and electing a candidate was for the Priests of the diocese to decide. Forbes was proposed by the Rev. Robert Kilgour Thom, an enthusiastic supporter of Forbes, and William Goalen, Gladstone’s cousin. Subsequently, Forbes was elected bishop by the diocesan synod in September 1847.\textsuperscript{600} Significantly, Forbes was the first Tractarian bishop to be appointed within the Anglican Communion. He ministered to the poor in the slums of Dundee, whose urban poverty had quickly grown due to expansion of jute manufacture in the city.

The Scottish Episcopal Church during Forbes’ time as Bishop was undergoing both disunity and growth. The traditional native high churchmanship of the northeast was increasingly under threat from the anglicisation of Churchmen driven by a desire for conformity with the Church of England. The diocese of Brechin consistently opposed the Church at large over issues of lay involvement in the Church, the Scottish Communion Office, and Forbes’ Tractarianism. Forbes and most of his clergy in the diocese were opposed to lay representation. Forbes was motivated by his Tractarianism, which exalted the independent power of the ordained over lay involvement. His clergy may have been similarly motivated, but there was also precedence for the opposition to lay representation by formerly nonjuring Bishops.

The idea was first proposed in 1823 by Bishop Skinner; the aristocracy who were paying for the upkeep of the Church wanted a say in its management. This was vehemently opposed by Bishop Jolly and Bishop Torry, who prevented all reforms. Both men adhered to the view of Bishops as part of the apostolic order, possessing full authority over their diocese, as explored more fully in chapter 2. Lay members had no place in deciding Church matters, and Jolly worried they would
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eventually demand to interfere with matters of doctrine. Forbes was similar in this regard and upheld the power and authority of the Bishop over his clergy. In 1852, when the matter again arose, the Brechin diocesan synod voted in favour of advising the synod of Bishops that “that they believe the position of the laity should remain unaltered.”602 By 1869, Brechin was the sole diocese to refuse lay participation in diocesan synods.602

Bishop Forbes was also in opposition to the Bishops of the Church over the supremacy of the Scottish Communion Office. It was not an issue of high churchmen versus low churchmen, but rather a desire to conform entirely with the Church of England. There were still laws in place preventing Scottish ordained priests serving in the Church of England, and the Scottish Communion Office, was seen as popish – no thanks to support given to it by the Tractarians – by many English clergy. The anglicisation of the Church had been almost inevitable since the union of the Qualified and nonjuring chapels, as the power base of the Church gradually moved from the northeast to Edinburgh.603 Bishop Torry, the last nonjuring Bishop of the Church, took matters into his own hands in 1849, when he unofficially published The Book of Common Prayer, According to the Use of the Church of Scotland, which included the Scottish Communion Office.

The bishops, excluding Forbes, took issue with the publication, as it gave the impression as being an official document of the Church, and sought to condemn it. Torry claimed that he published it “as a document of reference and authority” only prescribing its use, as was his right, to his own diocese.604 After the Bishops had censured the work, the clergy at the diocese of Brechin synod voted to thank the Bishops for their timely declaration, but added that they regretted that “the Episcopal synod should have thought it advisable to censure a work so pious and so necessary for the present times.”605 In contrast, Torry’s own diocese of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane, voted in favour of a proposal recording their “strong disapproval of the book” and for “canonical proceedings” to be taken against any clergyman who used it.606 At the same synod, the Rev. George Hay Forbes, brother of the Bishop, admitted to using the prayer book.

Bishop Forbes support and defence of Torry and the Scottish Office, lent him regard among native High Churchmen, many of whom later supported him after his Eucharistic charge. In 1854, the son of Patrick Torry gifted him the Bishop’s ordination manual “as a small token of my regard for
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the respect in which [you] held the memory of my Father." The book contained Torry’s own manuscript additions and subtractions, including the “form of proceeding” for the ordination of a Deacon in his diocese in 1845. It was bound with an 1819 edition of the Scottish Communion Office. One of Forbes most symbolic gifts to the library was an edition of Bishop Torry’s Prayer Book (1849), donated to the library in 1863, after the Scottish Communion Office was stripped of its status as primary authority in the Church.

Forbes first gifts to the library in 1849 are evidence of his immediate shaping of the library, directing the clergy towards works supporting his position in disputes on going in the English and Scottish Church. Of particular concern was the Gorham controversy, which had begun in 1847, when the Rev. George Cornelius Gorham (1787–1857), was refused a position by Bishop Henry Phillpotts, for denying the doctrine of baptismal regeneration in infants. Gorham appealed this in an ecclesiastical court, which confirmed the Bishop’s decision to remove him, and then in civil court. Forbes donated the works of William Maskell (1814-1890) and Remains of Alexander Knox (1844). Knox’s (1757-1831) wrote in support of baptismal regeneration, a doctrine which held that in “baptism one is born again as a child of God.” Knox’s work also discussed the Eucharist. He rejected the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, and memorialisation, in favour of virtualism, the theory that the bread and wine of Christ acquired a saving and sanctified power. This was the basis of the Scottish Communion Office.

The liturgical scholar William Maskell (1814-1890) and Remains of Alexander Knox (1844) illustrated the history and ancient sources of the Church of England’s liturgy. However, while he had his criticisms of the Book of Common Prayer, unlike the Tractarians, Maskell did not support liturgical restoration of ancient rites and customs. His work Holy Baptism, a dissertation (1848) was again pertinent to issues surrounding the accepted definition of the sacrament in the Church of England. In the work, Maskell discusses definitions of the doctrine of Baptism and its character as a sacrament, as well as subjects such as lay baptism (which he finds invalid) and the spiritual effects
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of baptism, namely baptismal regeneration.\textsuperscript{613} These works reasserted the doctrines of High Church theology against evangelical interpretations.

Sometime between August 1849 and August 1850, Forbes bought for the library the Tractarian Robert Wilberforce’s work the \textit{Doctrine of Holy Baptism} (1849).\textsuperscript{614} Wilberforce wrote \textit{Doctrine of Holy Baptism} in response to the aforementioned Gorham Controversy, which concluded in March 1850.\textsuperscript{615} Gorham had argued his case in a secular court, which overruled the decision of Bishop Phillipott, and found in Gorham’s favour. The ruling was significant, as a secular court had ruled on a religious issue, causing outrage among those who believed that the Church was spiritually independent from the state. It ultimately led to several Tractarians, including Wilberforce, ceding to Rome. In consequence of the ruling, the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church reaffirmed that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration was a protected and essential doctrine, but Forbes was still worried that the Scottish Church could also become subject to secular courts. The acquisition of books relating to the controversy clearly demonstrate that Forbes used the library as a tool for educating the clergy against threats to High Church doctrines.

A number other works were also added to the library at this time: Wilberforce’s \textit{the Doctrine of the Incarnation} (1849),\textsuperscript{616} William Palmer’s \textit{Treatise on the Church of Christ} (1839),\textsuperscript{617} Palmer’s \textit{Origines Liturgicae, Or, Antiquities of the English Ritual},\textsuperscript{618} Stephen’s \textit{The history of the Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the present day} (1843-1845)\textsuperscript{619} and Tytler’s \textit{History} at a cost of £5 4s.\textsuperscript{621} Palmer’s \textit{Treatise} argued for a branch theory of the Church; all Churches with apostolic succession were connected, as they all derived their holiness from Christ, and were part of one universal, Catholic Church. These Churches should desire and seek unity with the other Churches. It was a theory of the Church promoted by Tractarians, especially John Henry Newman.\textsuperscript{622} In the work, Palmer argued
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that the Church of Rome was in schism from the Church of England, and had separated itself from Christian unity. Palmer’s other work *Origines Liturgicae* (1832), emphasised the liturgical continuity of the Church of England with the primitive Church and aimed to dispel the notion that the Book of Common Prayer was purely the work of sixteenth century reformers. Instead, the prayers and offices of the Church had to be continually used and retained for more than twelve hundred years. Palmer differed from the other Tractarians as he did not find that the Book of Common Prayer was deficient, and that primitive doctrines such as the prayers for the dead, removed after the revision of the 1549 rite, should be restored.

Wilberforce’s *Doctrine on the Incarnation* is a significant addition to the library, as his theology was fully Anglo-Catholic, and a precursor to Forbes’ own opinion on the Eucharist. Wilberforce believed that on the basis of the incarnation, the Holy Eucharist was a real union with the perfect manhood of Christ. Summarised by Bruce D. Griffith, this meant “Our union with Christ’s manhood in the Spirit is the only way to salvation. To be united with Christ’s manhood is to be united with manhood not just perfect in its natural state, but raised beyond the natural state by the grace given in and through dwelling with the enteral son in the person of Christ.” This went beyond High Church understandings of the power of the Eucharist. Forbes was very clearly encouraging his clergy towards Anglo-Catholic and Tractarian understanding of the sacraments and using the library to do this.

His clergy, however, did not immediately engage with the materials he had supplied them with. In 1850, the Rev. Southey of Montrose borrowed Maskell’s *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*; In October 1850, the Rev. Robert Kilgour Thom, borrowed Maskell’s *Monumenta ritualia ecclesiae Anglicanae*; John Moir borrowed Wilberforce *Doctrine of Holy Baptism* in April 1853. This is the extent to which the clergy borrowed titles Forbes had purchased, up to the close of the borrowing registers in 1853. Volumes of *The Library of Fathers* remained the most popular choice. Perhaps it was this lack of interest by the clergy that motivated him to bring together the Laurencekirk and
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Jamieson libraries, which had been housed in the homes of clergymen, in one purpose built library, in the centre of the diocese.

Despite his defence of it, Forbes was not satisfied with the virtualist expression of the Scottish Commission Office and had not been as early as 1846. Like other Tractarians, he saw similarities between the early nonjuring traditions, and Tractarianism, and considered them as part of the same Catholic Truth. But, as his Tractarianism developed further, he came to see the northern tradition of virtualism in Eucharistic theology as a compromise with Catholic Truth. Forbes was not alone among the Tractarians in his doubts. Robert Isaac Wilberforce was among the first Tractarians to publish on the real objective presence in the Eucharist, in his book The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist (1853).

Wilberforce’s treatise intended to show that “Christ’s presence in the Holy Eucharist is a real presence; that the blessings of the new life are truly bestowed in it through communion with the New Adam; that consecration is a real act, whereby the inward part or thing signified is joined to the outward and visible sign; and that the Eucharistic oblation is a real sacrifice” which he attempted to prove through the testimony of Scripture and of the ancient Fathers.”

The book was bought for the library as soon as it was published. It was purchased by a committee comprising of the librarians William Goalen of Laurencekirk and John Moir of Brechin and the synod clerk the Rev. Southey, who had been appointed in 1851. Its purchase demonstrates that, at the very least, the library committee, were interested in the theological developments in the Anglican Church and thought it beneficial for their brethren to have access to these new works. It may have been a suggestion by Forbes, particularly given his emerging thoughts on the Eucharist, which he expressed in 1857, in his controversial charge at the diocesan synod.

Forbes delivered his charge to the clergy of his diocese of 5th August 1857, and afterwards had the charge published. Forbes’ early biographer William Perry held that Forbes had been motivated to give his charge by a general lack of piety by the Episcopalians in Dundee. However, Rowan Strong argues that it is more likely than Forbes was concerned with the Eucharistic Controversy currently being fought in the Church of England, which begun with the prosecution of George Anthony Denison. Denison had been prosecuted by the court of the Archbishop Sumner in 1856.
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for contravening the 28th and 29th articles of the Thirty-Nine Articles. In 1854, he had given a series of lectures on the real objective presence in the Eucharist and the Eucharistic sacrifice. 633

In his charge, Forbes referred to the case, regretting that “so sacred a doctrine” had been brought before the courts, more so that Denison’s appeal led to the doctrine being judged by “a tribunal, so constituted from the intermixture of laymen, as to exceed the powers given to it by God.” 634 Forbes was espousing the same belief held by the nonjurors, that the Church was spiritually independent of the state, and thus the state, in this case a civil court, had no authority to meddle in the affairs of the Church, being wholly unqualified to rule on matters of doctrine. Forbes was concerned with the ruling and reported to the diocesan synod that he had brought it to the attention of the College of Bishops “praying them to take into their fatherly considerations the best means of guarding the interests of the Church against any undue exercise of the civil power, and deprecating the acceptance of any conditions which might render the government impossible or very difficult, at any future period.” 635

In his charge, Forbes argued that the Thirty-Nine Articles should not be taken alone as the creed of the Church and the measure of all Anglican teaching. He argued a variety of authoritative documents should be consulted when assessing whether the real presence in the Eucharist is Anglican doctrine, including scripture and the testimony of the Church Fathers. As well as stating that there was a real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, he also advocated that the wicked receive Christ in Holy Communion. Of most relevance to the Scottish Church was Forbes’ criticism of the virtualism of the Scottish communion office, which conceived the real presence as one of power and efficacy only. Though Forbes speaks of the nonjuring liturgy with “great reserve and tenderness” he finds fault with it, asking “How can that which is not the body of Christ produce the effect of the body of Christ?” 636

The aftermath of Forbes’ charge became known as the Eucharistic controversy and was one of the most significant events in the nineteenth century Episcopal Church. Forbes adversaries came from both the northern clergy, who upheld the virtualist understanding of the Scottish Communion Office, and the Anglican party. Bishop Ewing of Argyll and the Isles, Bishop Trower of Glasgow, and Bishop Terrot of Edinburgh published a declaration in the December 1857 edition of the Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, rejecting the recent statements by an unnamed clergyman
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on the Lord’s Supper, which it considered contradictory to the teaching of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Terrot was the primus of the Church, and desired conformity with the Church of England, which included rejection of the Scottish Communion Office. In opposing Forbes, Terrot and the other Bishops desired to be seen as supporting the authority of the Church of England, particularly as many in the south thought of themselves as part of it. A further declaration in May 1858, signed by all the Bishops of the Church, stated that they found Forbes charge “unsound, erroneous and calculated to lead, if not resolutely opposed, to still graver error” and cautioned readers not to be led astray by Forbes’ teaching. This declaration was posted into the Brechin diocesan synod minutes, where a vote was taken in support of Bishop Forbes. At the synod, fourteen of the fifteen clergymen signed a statement in support of Forbes, sympathising with Forbes and the attacks he had endured. They assured him of “the entire confidence we have in your teaching, - and of our thorough conviction that it will ever be found in perfect accordance with the scriptural teaching of the Church.” The only clergyman to vote against the resolution was William Henderson, incumbent of St Mary’s Dundee.

Forbes’ clergy supported his right to hold the belief that there was, after consecration, a real and essential presence in the Eucharist, and that it was in line with Anglican teaching. However, while they believed it was his right to hold this belief, most of them did not hold it themselves. At 1859 synod, the clergy, with the exception of Henderson, declared their belief in the Real Presence, while also professing their faith in the Scottish Communion Office and the English Communion Office. They believed his view should be tolerated. Henderson did not and made an official complaint regarding Forbes’ charge to the synod of Bishops. Consequently, in 1860 Forbes was tried before the Episcopal Synod on accusations of heresy. Three members of St Mary’s in Arbroath, clergy, and vestrymen, accused Forbes of holding, maintaining, and teaching doctrines contrary to the Articles of Religion subscribed to by the Scottish Episcopal and Anglican Church, the Book of Common Prayer and the Scottish Communion Office.

It is most frustrating that in the period leading to and after Forbes’ charge, there are no borrowing registers for the library. The new library necessitated a new catalogue, and between 1854 to 1867, books were recalled, and subsequently there are no registers recording lending. This does not mean that interested clergy were not reading works associated with Forbes’ Charge and the doctrine of the Eucharist; the industrialisation of printing had made books cheaper, and it is likely clergy had
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their own libraries in which to consult books. It is possible that the clergy visited the library and there used the books, but there is no surviving evidence to support this interpretation. Regardless, of whether the books could be borrowed, the library was still acquiring books.

The purchases for the library during the aftermath of Forbes’ charge are almost all works which supported Forbes’ appeal to antiquity. The majority focus on the historical development of the articles of faith and rituals of the Church of England, as well as the testimony of the Church Fathers in determining correct religious doctrine. These were pertinent to Forbes’ situation, as well as religious disputes among Evangelicals and High Churchmen in the English and Scottish Churches, witnessed in the denial of baptismal regeneration by George Gorham. In 1858, the year following Forbes’ charge, the library committee purchased one book; Edward Cardwell’s (1787-1861) *Documentary annals of the Reformed Church of England: being a collection of injunctions, declarations, orders, articles of inquiry, etc. from the year 1546 to the year 1716* and *A history of conferences and other proceedings connected with the revision of the Book of Common Prayer from the year 1558 to 1690* (1844). Cardwell’s work comprised of transcriptions of “the laws and orders issued for the government of the reformed Church of England,” including acts of parliament, decrees of synods, and royal mandates. While Cardwell was hostile towards Tractarians, his work was a useful body of evidence for investigations into the development of the Church of England since the reformation, including royal and civil authority in the Church.

In 1859, eight new books were bought for the library, many of them published by Joseph Masters in 1858, and nearly all appropriate to the Eucharist controversy. Joseph Masters was a London printer who published religious works, which included Forbes’ *Primary Charge* as well as many of Forbes’ earlier tracts, so it is quite likely that a relationship had been established with him through Forbes. This means that either the library committee had chosen newly published, relevant books to purchase from Masters, or that Forbes had influenced and supervised the new acquisitions. One of these was John Purchas’ *Directorium Anglicanum: being a manual of directions for the right celebration of the Holy Communion* (1858).
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Purchas discussed various elements of the celebration of the eucharist, and rituals and ceremonies of the Church, while also comparing ecclesiastical custom to the ecclesiastical laws and canons of the Church of England. He argues that *The Book of Common Prayer* is an insufficient and incomplete guide for directing rituals in the Church, and supplements it with ancient liturgies, medieval service books, Edward VI prayer book, and the customs of both the ancient Church and the Divines of the Church of England. He argues that “custom is indeed a sort of ecclesiastical common law and sanctions this; but as desuetude does not repeal a law, so it would appear that any diocesan Bishop is free to act upon the ancient Canons and Provincial Constitutions.” Consequently, he uses this evidence to endorse rituals which were not orthodox in the nineteenth century Church of England. For example, he states that the “mixed chalice” of water and wine, used by the Scottish nonjurors, was also a custom “enjoined and used by Bishop Andrewes…ordered by Laud; authoritatively recommended by Cosin; pronounced lawful by Palmer in his *Origines Liturgicae*...is little likely to be violation of the Act of Uniformity or of the Canons of 1603.” Unfortunately, the established Church of England did not agree with his conclusions, and in 1869 Purchas was charged for using the mixed cup with his congregation. He was further charged with infringing the law of the established Church for using crucifixes, lighted candles on the altar, chasubles and stoles. Most of these were described in his book, and while not overtly advocated for, were considered by him to be “lawful ornaments” based on an inventory of ornaments and vestments during Edward VI’s second year of reign.

This addition to the library is interesting, as in the diocese of Brechin, Forbes’ Tractarianism was not expressed through ritualism. He was very cautious of upsetting his congregation at St Paul’s, who associated ritualism with popery. Holy Communion was not offered daily as Forbes would have preferred, and he retained the black gown for priests and forbade candles on the alter. However he did encourage his clergy to celebrate monthly communion, and by 1861 the Rev. Ironside had introduced it to his congregation at St Ternan’s, in Muchalls.
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The other books purchased mainly concerned the Church Fathers. The first of these was *An Introduction to the Study of Dogmatic Theology* (1858) by Tractarian and Priest Robert Owens (1820-1902). Owens systematically worked through evidence for the sacraments of the Church, with reference to the Church Fathers of the first five centuries, breaking with High Church tradition of using only the ante-Nicene Fathers. He used these to provide the reader with the evidence and arguments for sacraments such as baptismal regeneration, and the sacrifice in the Eucharist. Its format lends itself to being a useful guide and reference book for clergy looking for an authoritative summary on aspects of High Church Theology, which are compatible with those of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Like Forbes, Owens was not satisfied that theology should be “limited to the contents of the creeds” The creeds were, in his opinion, a summary of theology, and many important doctrines, such as Grace, were not fully expressed in them, yet were still of fundamental importance.

The work was complemented by another purchase, John Blunt’s (1794-1855) *On the right use of the early fathers: two series of lectures, delivered in the University of Cambridge*. (1857). Blunt was not a Tractarian; however, his treatment of the Fathers was similar. In particular, his demonstration that “their testimony is favourable to the Reformed Church of England” and his conviction that the present-day Anglican Church should emulate both the primitive Church and the seventeenth century Anglican Church. It was also a book which made an argument for the effectiveness and importance of the witness of the Fathers in religious disputes, and of correct doctrine, including the Eucharist. Blunt argued that “it is their early date, and that alone” which qualified them for clearing up obscurities, and that “no substitute or equivalent can be found for that advantage in commentators of modern days.”

This appeal to antiquity is a constant theme in the books purchased in 1859. Another example is *Catholic Antidotes* by William Edward Heygate, a work in favour of antiquity for revealing the Catholic Doctrines of the Anglican Church. The author writes in response to theologians who have attempted to discredit the use of Catholic Testimony based on it being too close to popery. Heygate argues that “Appealing to antiquity reveals doctrines which when strictly applied, are
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distasteful to Modern Roman Catholicism.” He then discusses a variety of topics, including original sin in relation to baptism, asserting the true Catholic doctrine against the theology of dissenters and Roman Catholics.

The acquisition of these works is notable, and indicative that the library committee (perhaps encouraged by Forbes) felt these works on the Church Fathers were relevant and of benefit to their brethren. As previously discussed, the clergy of the diocese had in the 1830s and 1840s, had already demonstrated an appetite for the Church Fathers. More books on the topic were acquired in the 1850s; Bishop of Lincoln, John Kaye’s (1783-1853) works on Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Justin Martyr were purchased in 1853, with the subsequent edition of his work on St Athanasius bought in 1854. These new books reflected both a continued reverence for antiquity, and a need for works using the Church Fathers to address specific questions on Anglican doctrine. With regards to Forbes’ circumstances, they supported his assertion that scripture, as interpreted by the early Church, was the “paramount rule of faith of the Anglican Church.”

Certainly, it appears in this period that the library was actively supporting and preserving a native High Church reverence for the patristic Fathers.

There was also another ongoing dispute in the Scottish Episcopal Church which these works were relevant to – the trial of Patrick Cheyne. Patrick Cheyne (1793-1878) was the incumbent at St John’s Aberdeen. In 1857, he gave a series of sermons which emphasised the real presence and published *Six Sermons on the Doctrine of the most Holy Eucharist* in 1858. He was suspended by the Bishop of Aberdeen, Thomas George Suther (1814-1883), who found him guilty of false teaching. At the synod of 1858, Forbes had brought attention to the case of Cheyne, and supported him in his appeal. It was in fact after this synod that Henderson lodged a formal presentment against Forbes for teaching doctrines contrary to the Thirty-nine Articles. Suther had also censured the Rev. James Smith (1816-1867), formerly of the diocese of Brechin and frequent user of the diocesan library, signing an act “contumacious to his judgement in the Cheyne case”.
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Smith had also supported Forbes and wrote to him that “the history of the Reformed church exhibits no parallel instance of judicial depravity…” and encouraged Forbes to remember that “with you rests perhaps the fate of the Catholic faith in this Church.”

William Bright, theological tutor at Trinity College, was also caught up in the eucharistic controversy. In correspondence with Bishop Trower, he had expressed agreement with John Keble’s book On Eucharistical Adoration (1859); subsequently Trower pursued his removal, and he was dismissed for not remaining neutral in the Eucharistic controversy, though Forbes believed it was Bright’s sympathy to his own charge which had resulted in his termination.

It was thus a period of intense turmoil and factionalism in the Church, and many of the clergy were critically engaged with the conflicts. John Moir, Dean of Brechin, advised Forbes in 1858 that he had read both Keble and Pusey. The curates who lived with Forbes in the clergy house in Castlehill, very likely had access to Forbes’ personal library, and the Rev. James Nicolson (1832-1889), who lived with Forbes, has left evidence in his marginalia demonstrating that he had read Pusey. Nicolson, who was chaplain to Forbes from 1856 to 1858, and incumbent of St Salvador’s in Dundee, followed the Cheyne case closely. He collected pamphlets pertaining to the case, and had them bound in one volume. This included Opinion of the Bishop of Brechin In the appeal of Rev P. Cheyne (1858) given “with the author’s compliments,” Opinion of the Bishop of St Andrews on the appeal of the Rev P. Cheyne (1858) and Charge delivered to the clergy of the United diocese of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane. (1859), the latter two were both written by Bishop Charles Wordsworth. Wordsworth was a High Churchman who was in complete opposition to Forbes, and his most vocal opponent.

In his copy of the pamphlets written by Wordsworth, Nicolson used the margins to criticise and question Wordworth’s position. Wordsworth writes, “In the first place, it is certain that our Church has nowhere in express terms made use of the language which the Appeallant uses to define Christ’s presence in the Eucharist.” In the margins, Nicolson has countered that “this also certain that our Church has nowhere in express terms made use of the language which you
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use to define Christ’s presence in the Eucharist, where does she say it is the *virtue and effecting*.” His point is that the doctrines of Church do not make explicit reference to the nature of the eucharist; they do not describe the “virtualism” of the Scottish Communion Office, or the “real presence.” Evidently, there was clergy engagement and interest in Anglo-Catholic doctrines, which also shaped the contents and use of the library. This is further exemplified by the text purchased in the lead up to Forbes’ trial.

In March 1860, Forbes was tried for heresy by the Bishops of the Church. Forbes argued that he did not claim his doctrine represented the Scottish Episcopal Church, had not forced it upon the clergy or congregations within his jurisdiction, and only desired that it be tolerated as a doctrine. He was admonished by the Bishops and sentenced to a declaration of censure. It is significant then, that during the year (unfortunately an exact date cannot be pinpointed), Pusey’s *The Real Presence* (1857) was purchased. Pusey, like Forbes believed in the real presence in the Eucharist, and like Forbes, his work had been written to defend George Anthony Denison’s teaching of it. Pusey reaffirmed his view that the Church of England teaches that though “the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances…the faithful verily and indeed take and receive the body and blood of Christ” and defends this view against accusations that the real presence was transubstantiation. Consequently, the acquisition of Pusey’s work was symbolic of the support Forbes clergy had for him in his trial, in his pursuit of the toleration of the doctrine of the real presence. It should be emphasised that it demonstrates the support they had of Forbes right to hold the doctrine, rather a belief in the doctrine.

From 1859, the clergy were given more control over new purchases for the library. Instead of a committee, each member of the library was requested to “lay before the annual synod a list of such books as he wished to be bought, with full practicalities of the title, publisher and price and that the synod should then agree upon what books were to be purchased.” This new acquisitions policy began at the synod of 1860, when the books were recommend and then purchased during the course of the year. The books bought were John Mason Neale’s *A History of the Holy Eastern Church: General Introduction* (2 vols., London, 1850) and *A History of the Holy Eastern Church: The Patriarchate of Alexandria* (2 vols., London, 1847) by the same author; as well as the Flemish,
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Catholic Priest Cornelius a Lapide’s (1567-1637) *Commentarii in Scripturam Sacram*. Neale’s *Histories* were his interpretation of Orthodox history, doctrine, and practise. His interest in the Eastern Church was a result of the “branch theory” espoused by John Henry Newman in 1829, who contended that although external communication had been broken between the Greek, Roman, and Anglican Church, they were all still linked through “the invisible ties of a common Catholic heritage.” This was also the basis of William Palmer’s *A Treatise on the Church of Christ*, bought by the library in 1850. This was grounds for an interest in the development of the Eastern Church, and a comparison between the Eastern and Western Churches. Forbes was keen to encourage this interest, and in 1863 donated Neale’s newly published *Essay of Liturgiology and Church History* to the library (though it should be noted that Neale was a close friend of the Bishop). Unfortunately, between 1863 and 1867, the synod minutes cease to record which books were bought, though £19 of expenses are listed in 1865.

While it is unfortunate that a lack of borrowing registers precludes any assessment of engagement with the texts purchased for the library between 1854 and 1867, the acquisitions by the library clearly demonstrate its important place in the intellectual culture of the diocese, and its preservation of High Church theology, especially the appeal to antiquity. It was a resource for clergy to conduct their own research into contemporary disputes within the Scottish Episcopal, and wider Anglican Church. Forbes very clearly shaped the library into a tool in which to promote his Anglo Catholic theology, but also a place where nonjuring theology sustained and preserved. It signifies the unique identity of the diocese of Brechin, in which nonjuring theology and Anglo Catholicism intersected.

The Education of the Clergy from 1870

After the Eucharistic Controversy, and the loss of the primacy of the Scottish Communion Office, Bishop Forbes turned his attention towards the reunion of Anglicans and Catholics. He was influenced by his mentor Pusey, who supported the cause, and in 1865 had published *The Church of England, a Portion of Christ’s One Holy Catholic Church and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity*, which promoted a reunion while also arguing against papal supremacy and infallibility. Mark Chapman
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states that Forbes “greatly welcomed the idea of an ecumenical council as a way of encouraging reunion among all catholic Christians against what he regarded as the common foe of rationalism and liberalism.” Indeed, Forbes feared that the rationalism of the nineteenth century endangered the future of the Church and believed that scepticism could be countered with church unity. In his work *An Explanation of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, which was his primary scholarly contribution to Pusey’s campaign for reunion, he wrote that “a divided Christendom will not be able to stand the assaults of infidelity… I therefore, in all that I have written, have had in view the future reunion of the Church.” The work attempted to show that the standard Anglican theological formularies of Thirty-Nine Articles could be interpreted in a “catholic sense.”

The work was written in the lead up to the Vatican Council announced by Pope Pius IX in 1867, called to clearly define the extent of pope’s authority. The Ultramontanists supported papal infallibility, but they were opposed by a group led by Ignaz von Döllinger (1799-1890) a German theologian and Catholic Priest. Döllinger became a friend to Forbes, who sent him a copy of *An Explanation of the Thirty-Nine Articles*. Papal Infallibility was a completely unacceptable dogma to Forbes and the Anglicans in favour of reunion. In Forbes’ opinion, it was not “part of the original deposit of revealed truth communicated by Christ to the apostles,” and was an illegitimate innovation. By creating a new object of faith, the Vatican Council had exceeded its authority. In 1870, the Ultramontanists prevailed. The disbelief and rationalism of the nineteenth century would not be countered with reconciliation between the Anglican and Catholic Churches.

However, Forbes was still concerned with these issues, and protecting the Church and Christians from them. He felt that liberalism was a consequence of uncertainty about religious truth. In his work *The Church of England and the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility* (1871), a publication which was originally given in 1870 as an address to the diocesan synod, he stated that “There cannot possibly be two opposite opinions on the same religious subjects equally pleasing to God.” He did not believe in the diversity of opinion on religious matters, believing it to promote an uncertainty of religious truth. This was in part why he found it so distressing that the Scottish Episcopal Church was not in agreement with him on the matter of the real presence in the Eucharist. Though he had
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initially desired toleration, he realised that it was not enough—he wanted the Church to accept what he considered the most primitive and correct form of the Eucharist.

For Forbes, the understanding of religious truth came from study, and from a scientific understanding of theology. In the aftermath of the First Vatican Council, he saw this as the solution to contemporary religious issues and considered it a duty of the clergy to pursue it. In 1870, he expressed to the diocesan synod that the Church “must cultivate a more scientific spirit among [the] clergy. Unless they are well grounded in systematic theology, they must fail in doing their duty.” He urged them to look towards German theologians, who had cultivated “scientific methods” in their Church histories and biblical criticisms. “The study of such books as those of Klee, Mohler, Dollinger, Alzog, Hefele, will do more for the clergy of the Church of England than any other course of study.” For Forbes, the studying of these authors and embracing a scientific spirit was defensive measure. Forbes had faith that studying these authors and embracing a scientific spirit would be of benefit not only to the clergy, but to the laity, stating that a “thorough grasp of the Catholic System will not me rely develop the religious lift of both, but it will do more to meet the difficulties from physical science and biblical criticism that anything else.” These works were the first line of defence against the religious doubt of the nineteenth century, and the library thus played an important part by proving the clergy with access to them.

Nineteenth-century Europe saw the growth of biblical criticism which questioned the historical and scientific accuracy of the bible. German philosophers attacked the authority of revealed religion and orthodox Christianity. One of these philosophers was David Friedrich Strauss, who doubted the historical credibility of the New Testament. He wrote a controversial historical critique of the gospel accounts of the life of Jesus, investigating it by the same methods and standards as a historian would a historical document, considering its factual accuracy and textual authenticity. Fredrich C. Beisder describes Das Leben Jesu (1835) as having “the greatest effect on the decline of religion” in the nineteenth century of any book, as it dramatically shook the Christian faith in the New Testament as a product of divine inspiration, and the bible as a true historical narrative. It was disseminated in England through a translation in 1846 by the novelist George Eliot, provoking a flurry of pamphlets, sermons and essays from clergymen. Bishop
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Forbes named the book as having done “evil.” In response to the publication, High Churchmen and Tractarians, published works aiming to reassert the divine authority of the Bible and the Church of England.

It is very clear from the library borrowings, and from books belonging to Forbes’ clergy, that there was an effort by the clergy to educate themselves on these matters. A significant example of this is the Rev. George Mackness, discussed below. Though unremarked in the synod minutes, which were concerned with the new library catalogue, in 1867/68 Ignaz von Döllinger’s *The first age of Christianity and the church* (second edition, 1867) was purchased for the library. In the work, Döllinger examined the first seventy years of the Christian Church, the foundation period of the Christian religion, evidently writing with Strauss *Das Leben Jesu/The Life of Jesus* in mind. The book was borrowed on its arrival to the Brechin library, on May 6th 1868 by the Rev. William Hatt (b.1838-1913), incumbent at Muchalls between December (1865 – 1913). It was then borrowed by the Rev. Robert Kilgour Thom immediately upon its return in October 1868 (who did not return it until November 1871). Further borrowings occurred in September 1872 by the Rev. James Gammack, and March 1874 by the Rev. W.C Simmons.

There is one clergyman whose borrowings demonstrate a programme of reading dominated by the liberal Catholic theology endorsed by Forbes. The Rev. George Mackness was one of the most prolific borrowers in the diocese between 1871 and 1875, borrowing thirty-one titles over the period. As a borrower, he is the image of Forbes's perfect clergyman, embarking on a course of reading which covered the creation of the nonjuring Church, the Church Fathers and the Christian Councils of the early Church, as well as numerous works defending the inspiration of the bible. Mackness, was from Northamptonshire, and was a newcomer to the Scottish Episcopal Church. He studied at Wadham and Lincoln Colleges, Oxford, and undertook his first incumbencies there.
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Mackness borrowed thematically. His first borrowings from the library were concerned with the religious history of Scotland. Notably, he read works from the points of view of both Presbyterians and Episcopalians. He borrowed George Campbell’s *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, a work which was extremely critical of the Episcopalian form of government and "Presbytery examined", an essay critical and historical on the ecclesiastical history of Scotland written by the presbyterian George John Douglas Campbell, the 8th Duke of Argyll, aimed at the English public, which sketched out the Scottish Reformation. From the Episcopalian side he borrowed Skinner’s *Annals of Scottish Episcopacy* and George Grub’s *ecclesiastical history*. Given the minority status of his congregation in Broughty Ferry, as compared with the Church of Scotland, it would have been advantageous to examine the opposing faith. His Church in Broughty Ferry was a relatively new Episcopalian outpost, and part of the expansion of Forbes’s ministry; the congregation was founded in 1848, and the Church was completed in 1858.

Alongside this, Mackness began a course of study which reflected the curriculum that Forbes had outlined in his address to the synod. In September 1871, he borrowed Newman’s *Grammar of Assent*, Hefele’s *A History of the Christian Councils* (1871) and Blunt on the *Early Fathers*. *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (1870) had been donated to the library by Forbes in January 1871 and was borrowed in September of that year by Mackess. Newman’s work encapsulated the “scientific spirit” which Forbes believed was the key to combating the nineteenth-century works of science and philosophy encouraging religious doubt. The book was a systematic study of truth and experience, which attempted to show “the new scientific spirits, who insisted on mathematical or empirical proofs for everything, that religious belief is…a normal and natural activity of the mind…”. At the same time he borrowed Karl Josef von Hefele’s *A History of the Christian Councils* (1871). Hefele, a prominent Catholic theologian and Bishop of Rottenburg, had been
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namechecked by Forbes as essential reading. Additionally, he also borrowed Blunt on the *Early Fathers*, discussed above, and Keble’s memoirs. Mackness’ borrowings are clear evidence that the library was being used to fulfil Forbes plans to defend the Church from rationalism through the systematic study of religious truth.

Forbes system of education appears to have been extended to Candidates for the Holy Orders, as in 1870, he broke with convention and personally undertook the education of George Grub. On 15\textsuperscript{th} December 1870, Forbes wrote to George Grub, son of the celebrated historian (who, additionally, had acted as Forbes’ legal defence in his charge of heresy) and offered him the position of assistant curate of St Paul’s Dundee. By Grub’s indication of his earlier life, not to mention who his father was, he was certainly not joining the Church ignorant of theology or of the historical background of the Church itself. However, he did not have any formal divinity diploma or degree. By this point, Glenalmond Theological College had been established, and several of the diocese of Brechin’s clergy were graduates, including the Rev. William Hatt. Prospective Deacons were required to take a diploma there, or at the University of Oxford.

By his own account, Grub had long planned to attend both, but had been prevented by the ill health of his father. Extraordinary, Forbes took the decision to dispense with this requirement for Grub, perhaps sceptical that Grub would be educated in the correct religious doctrines and Catholic truth. He told Grub that he would invoke clause 5 of the tenth canon, which allowed an ordaining bishop in "special and extraordinary circumstances" to dispense with the requirement of a candidate to attend the lectures of the Pantonian Professor of Theology.\footnote{The Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland (Edinburgh : R. Grant & Son, MDCCCLXIII [1863]), pp. 9-10} Grub accepted Forbes’ offer and moved to Dundee, where he was found suitable, after having read selected portions of the Greek New Testament to Forbes.\footnote{George Grub My Years in Dundee with Bishop Forbes of Brechin (1871-1875) (Dumfries: Robert G. Mann, The “Scottish Chronicle” Offices. Edinburgh: R.Grant & Son, 107 Princes Street. 1912) pp.1-2 Bertie, p.20} He was ordained almost immediately as deacon on 2\textsuperscript{nd} February 1871 and moved into the clergy house in Dundee.\footnote{Br MS 4/1/1/3 Br MS 4/1/1/3 Synod minutes 1849-1885, p.162. On p.170 it is stated he was ordained Priest on St Thomas’s day 1871}

The clergy house on Castlehill encompassed Bishop Forbes’s vision for ministry of Priests in Dundee, who lived among the urban community and actively served their parishioners. Rowan Strong states that Forbes had been influenced in his parochial model by both his experiences in St Thomas’s in England in 1846, and French examples of sacramental ministry, where the priest had a place in “the lives of his people and their growth in religion [which was furthered by]
administering the last rites…daily visiting round, and the Sunday Sermon.”

The domestic routine of the celibate Castlehill community also strongly resembled that of the Brotherhood of St Mary in Oxford, which Forbes had been a member of in 1846. Members of this pious society for devotional undergraduates subscribed to simple rules which included “to rise early; be moderate in food; spend a part of each day in ‘serious reading…”

From 17th February 1871, George Grub began borrowing books from the library at Dundee. He borrowed Alexander Cruden’s *Concordance to the Holy Bible* (Edinburgh, 1804), a fairly standard text which explained the words of the bible. He also borrowed *96 Sermons* by Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626), which had been published by the Library of Anglo-Catholic theology. There was a resurgence of interest in Andrewes in the nineteenth-century Church of England, as he was a recoverable perspective on the reformation in the Elizabethan period. He was held as an authority of “the real views of the Catholic Church”, relevant to nineteenth-century Anglo-Catholics who needed proof that their views were valid in law, the gospel, and formed part of a tradition dating back to apostolic times. For Oxford Movement leaders such as John Henry Newman, he encapsulated a perfect model of Christian devotion.

In addition to this, Grub borrowed George Moberly’s (1803–1885) *The Great Forty Days.* In his preface, Moberly discussed the validity of the pope as a form of Church government, considering the pope a monarchical constitution without historical grounding. He responds to Newman’s claims that “There is nothing in the early history of the Church to contradict papal supremacy.” Newman had converted to Roman Catholicism, and Moberly’s preface is a warning against conversion for Oxford Movement sympathisers, reminding the reader not only of all the evidence
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against Newman’s position, but that Newman had previously held these views.⁷²⁰ The extracts from Newman came from his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845),⁷²¹ which had argued that Catholicism was not a fixed set of doctrines inherited by the early Church. As its doctrines were not fixed, new articles of faith were allowed for to develop, which gave Newman grounds to argue for the validity of introducing papal infallibility. Forbes had been in correspondence with Newman on this topic in the 1860s, while he was writing *An Explanation of the Thirty-Nine Articles* and disagreed with Newman’s opinions.⁷²²

Given the number of titles by John Henry Newman in the Brechin Diocesan Library, it is not insignificant that *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845) was absent from its shelves.⁷²³ This was the work in which Newman justified his intellectual stance for converting to Roman Catholicism from the Church of England. It is not improbable that it was deliberately excluded by Forbes, in an act of censorship aimed at preventing conversion to Roman Catholicism, by clergy who were not equipped to counter its contents. This was a circumstance in which Bishop Forbes had direct experience. In 1868, the Rev. William Humphrey, the incumbent of Mary Magdalene, Dundee, who had been ordained Priest by Bishop Forbes, converted to the Church of Rome.

He describes the path to his conversion in his *Recollections of Scottish Episcopalianism* published in 1896.⁷²⁴ While at Glenalmond, which he attended between 1863 and 1865, he had a transformative reading experience:

> I came across Newman’s *Essay on Development*, Ward’s *Ideal of a Christian Church*, Wilberforce’s *Principles of Church Authority*, and similar works, such as converts in those days were want to write to inform the British public of the reasons for their submission to the Catholic Church. By the argument of one of those books I was much exercised and shaken…⁷²⁵

The book was Newman’s *Essay on Development*. Humphrey was impacted by the central thesis of Newman’s work that “the Roman pontificate was a necessary outcome by way of evolution.”⁷²⁶ He described himself as having been “staggered by what seemed to be the cogency of the argument.”⁷²⁷ Though the book shook his faith in the doctrines of the Scottish Episcopal Church,
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he continued with his studies. Afterwards, in 1865, Bishop Forbes invited Humphrey to the diocese for ordination. Humphrey agreed but discussed with Forbes his dilemma with the persuasive arguments of Newman. He expressed to the Bishop that he had a “mortal misgiving” regarding his ordination in the Episcopal Church and thought it might be better to submit instead to Roman Catholicism. Forbes was apparently non-plussed with this confession and considered Humphrey to have been “captivated by the beauty of a glorious ideal.” He outlined to him the issues with converting, particularly the party politics in the church between the Gallicans and the Ultramontanes, and the disunity that it caused. Forbes experience may also explain why he decided to undertake the education of Grub himself.

Grub’s preparation for the priesthood continued, though the books he borrowed from Dundee between March and July 1871 are far less of the standard fare expected of a divinity student. Arguably, they represent the swing in the diocese towards Anglo-Catholic theology under Bishop Forbes. Grub borrowed John Mason Neale’s *The Liturgies of St Mark*, which was aimed at improving Anglican familiarity with Eastern Christianity. The work compliments his other histories promoting “branch theory.” It was an introduction to the idea of Church Unity, favoured by Forbes. The last books Grub borrowed on 19th September 1871, before his ordination as Priest, were volumes two to four of the sermons (1845-50) of Henry Manning, a Tractarian Catholic convert, with a strong belief in the mystery of the sacraments. These are of course only the volumes recorded in the borrowing register. Given the collegiate atmosphere of the clergy house and Forbes emphasis on study, it is not implausible that Grub was given books by his brethren or directly from Forbes.

It is unlikely that the clergy were completely reliant on the library to follow Forbes’ reading advice, and thus their engagement with biblical criticism and church unity may have been pursued through purchasing the books themselves. The Rev. James Nicolson had a copy of Döllinger’s more well-known work *The church and the churches; or, The papacy and the temporal power* (1862), which promoted the idea of one universal Church, with one head; not “scattered multitudinous fragments” of national or political Churches. The most interesting aspect of Nicolson’s copy is that he has pasted in a transcription of a letter between Döllinger (excommunicated from the Catholic Church [728] Bertie, p. 306
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in 1871), and William Ewart Gladstone, dated 2nd April 1874. Gladstone was a friend and close correspondent of Döllinger, and important Anglican connection after the 1870 Vatican council. A excerpt reads:

I have before all at heart as you well know the ecclesiastical question which now more than ever is a question, would embracing and interwoven in the great course of universal history and to it may I dedicated the last faculties given to me by God.

It was written in the lead up to the Bonn conference, a meeting of “Old Catholics” and Anglicans still hopeful of a reunion, which Gladstone was involved in

On 5th October 1875, the Rev. Nicolson introduced the subject of the old Catholic movement in Germany at the diocesan synod. After referring to the origins and progress of the movement “and its many claims upon the sympathies of professing Christians” a motion was introduced in support them. The motion stated that the synod “deeply deploring the present divided state of Christendom, hails with satisfaction, any well conserved attempt to restore unity among Christians and desires to express its hearty sympathy with the work and effort to the bishops and theologians recently assembled in conference at Bonn” and prays for the success of their important labours for Christian Unity. The synod adopting the resolution shows the influence Forbes had had on his clergy, and is some indication that his system of education, whether pursued through the library or independently, had aligned the clergy with Forbes’ Catholic Truth.

In September 1852, Bishop Forbes wrote to Dr Routh, President of Magdalen College Oxford, asking for a subscription for the library he intended to build at Brechin. He wrote that “The name of the President of Magdalen seems rightly to be connected with any attempt to raise the standard of learning and respectability of our depressed clergy.” This was the central purpose of the library for Forbes: to educate the clergy. As this chapter has demonstrated, Forbes shaped the library as a place in which clergy could access the patristic learning, liturgical scholarship, and biblical criticism essential to educating clergy for the defence of native High Church doctrines and Catholic truths. Forbes believed faith, devotion to, and understanding of the Catholic doctrines were
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essential for the survival of the Anglican, and Scottish Episcopal Church, and used the library as part of his ambition to preserve Catholic Truth.

In many ways, Forbes’ shaping of the library mirrors that of Bishop Gleig. Both believed that the Church had enemies who threatened religious truth; both had distinct identities which they used the library to educate and encourage the clergy towards; both believed that education was critical to Christian, and used the library as a tool to accomplish this. The library was thus a place of a variety of Scottish Episcopal identities, and the library was a place in which to foster them through encouraging an intellectual culture in the diocese.
Chapter 5: The Marginalia of Bishop Alexander Jolly

The two preceding chapters have evaluated how the diocesan library was shaped and used in the nineteenth century, and its role in the education of the clergy. This chapter examines a different clerical library, that of Alexander Jolly, Bishop of Moray, whose personal library became the library of the Church’s first seminary of learning in Edinburgh. Jolly was notable not only for the size of his library, but for his predilection for annotating his books. In his examination of Jolly’s marginalia, Mark Towsey suggested that Jolly annotated his books with a wider audience in mind, intending for them to be read by the clergy of the Theological College. There is compelling evidence that this was indeed Jolly’s intention, and that he used his books to preserve his native Scottish High Church perspective, as well as attempting to educate students in these values. This chapter examines this marginalia, and explores the nonjuring values Jolly attempted to preserve and pass on to a clergy in an increasingly anglicised Church. It considers these alongside the provenance and marginalia in the Brechin Collection, placing Jolly both in the wider tradition of generations of Episcopal clergy passing on important texts to their colleagues, while also highlighting the distinctive and driven nature of Jolly’s excessive annotations. Jolly’s donation and the intentions his marginalia are valuable for considering the bequests of eighteenth-century clergymen to the Brechin Diocesan Library, and the extent to which they represent an attempt to preserve nonjuring identity.

In 1778, as a newly ordained priest in Turriff, a small town in north Aberdeenshire, the Rev. Alexander Jolly purchased Lancelot Andrewes’ Private Prayers, translated by Dean Stanhope (London, 1730). It joined an already growing collection of books, which Jolly had begun acquiring in, or perhaps before, 1771, when he was fifteen years old and living in Stonehaven.


737 Lancelot Andrewes, Private prayers for every day in the week, and for the several parts of each day: Translated from the Greek devotions of Bishop Andrews, with additions. By George Stanhope, D.D. late dean of Canterbury. Ed. George Stanhope. (London : Printed for Richard Williamson near Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn, MDCCXXX. [1730]), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.2462
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The front and end leaves, and the title page, are entirely covered in annotations, transcribed by Jolly from a variety of sources. The volume is supplemented by Jolly with excerpts copied from Bishop Andrewes’ *Holy Devotions*, which meditate on the correct form and function of the Lord’s Prayer. Jolly also draws on the Church Fathers, and transcribed passages from the fourth-century Saints Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose and John Chrysostom into the book. These were typical authorities for Jolly to consult, and indicative of his respect for the Fathers, who he valued as witnesses for the earliest ages of the Church. However, the most unusual feature of the volume is not that it is annotated - for Bishop Jolly, inscribing books was almost a past time - but that it is one of several editions of Andrewes’ *Private Prayers* owned by Jolly and annotated excessively.

Jolly made a point of owning and inscribing almost every edition of the book published. He acquired the definitive first edition in Greek and Latin, *Preces Privatae* (Oxford, 1675). He also owned Richard Drake’s inaccurate English translation *Holy Devotions: with directions to pray* (sixth edition, 1675), and George Stanhope’s English translation (London, 1730). Jolly had two copies of Stanhope’s translation, edited by Bishop George Horne, printed in 1815 and 1823. Almost every one of these volumes has been annotated by Jolly, and – as will be discussed in more detail – reveals something of the theological character of the man and his values. Significantly, the latter two volumes published in 1815 and 1823, offer convincing evidence that Bishop Jolly annotated his library for a future audience: the prospective students of the as yet unbuilt Episcopal theological college in Edinburgh.

**Forming a Library**

Alexander Jolly was born in 1756 in the northeastern coastal town of Stonehaven, in the diocese of Brechin. His upbringing was humble: his father had a business, which fell into financial difficulties, and consequently he relied on bursaries and scholarships to fund his son’s university
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education. Jolly’s religious education was directed by the Rev. Alexander Greig, the nonjuring incumbent of Stonehaven. Greig had been imprisoned in 1748 for officiating in front of more than four people, and it is likely his Jacobite and nonjuring sentiments shaped Jolly’s piety. Bishop Walker recalled that Jolly always acknowledged that he was “much indebted, in the commencement and progress of his religious education, to the pastoral care and guidance of the Rev. Alexander Greig.”

Like his contemporaries, Jolly attended Marischal College in Aberdeen while still in his early teens, and afterwards became a tutor to a family in Meiklefolla. There, he met Bishop Arthur Petrie, who prepared candidates for the holy orders in his home at Meiklefolla. In 1776, Jolly was ordained deacon, and in March 1777 he was ordained a Priest and appointed to the charge of a congregation in Turriff in the diocese of Aberdeen.

Jolly’s library began when he was a young man in Stonehaven and was driven both by intellectual curiosity and piety. His devotion was pursued through study and prayer, both of which were reliant on a suitable library. One of Jolly’s earliest books was Bishop Anthony Sparrow’s *A rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England*, purchased in 1771. His copy is a duodecimo edition, printed in London in 1676. Sparrow’s work explains each component of the *Book of Common Prayer*, and gives a list of the compilers of the 1549 edition with portraits. Sparrow explains definitions and translations, and the meaning and importance of praying. The work was published by Sparrow in 1655, during the prohibition of the prayer book, and sought to justify every element of the English liturgy. Thus, it was a very suitable purchase for the young Jolly, as it provided a justification for the use of the *Book of Common Prayer*. This was the service book used by the Scottish Episcopal Church, and one of the elements of their faith, which distinguished them from the Church of Scotland. Consequently, understanding the validity of the prayer book would have been advantageous in any defence of Jolly’s faith and membership of a minority, and impoverished Church, as well as his own piety.

While Jolly’s copy of Sparrow’s work is unannotated beyond his ownership inscription, it is clear he drew on the lessons of the work, particularly those pertaining to praying. His copy of *A New Manual of Devotions* contains a quote from Bishop Sparrow on the front board reading “…there is nothing harder than to pray.” *A New Manual of Devotions* was also an early addition to Jolly’s Library.
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inscribed “No. 19 Alexander Jolly Stonehaven 1772.” At this time Jolly was still numbering his books as he added them to his library. The book was produced by the Church of England and provided prayers for different occasions. Notably, it is a book which has been corrected by a nonjuror, either Jolly or a previous owner. King George’s name has been crossed out, and on one occasion crossed out and replaced with “Charles.”

Jolly’s dated ownership inscriptions demonstrate that he was engaging with nonjuring theology and the works of the Church Fathers early on in his theological education. He obtained a copy of William Reeves’ The Apologies of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Minutius Felix in 1775. An annotation in Jolly’s hand underneath his name states that the book was recommended by Bishop Hickes in his work Letter to the Author of Lay Baptism Invalid, for “pious inquisitive persons” interested in primitive Christianity. This demonstrates both a familiarity and respect for the nonjuror George Hickes, as well as suggesting that Jolly purchased the work on Hickes’ recommendation. Jolly was clearly interested in the use of the Church Fathers as witnesses of the primitive Church from an early age.

Instruction and guidance on these primitive Church practices came from Jolly’s mentors. George Innes (1717-1781) introduced Jolly to nonjuring theology both while he resided in Stonehaven, and when he began his studies at Aberdeen. Innes began his career as a priest at Forres in Aberdeenshire, and afterwards assisted Bishop Gerrard (d.1767) of Aberdeen at his meetinghouse in Blairton Lane. From 1767, Innes held the incumbency of St John’s Aberdeen. He was elevated to the episcopate in 1778 when he was consecrated Bishop of Brechin but died only three years later in 1781.

Innes published three pamphlets; Fourteen Discourses on Practical Subjects (1783) of which both Jolly and the Brechin Diocesan Library (donated by the Rev. Alexander Jamieson) have a copy; and the anonymously published The nature and constitution of the Christian church ... with a postscript containing some remarks on a late pamphlet, entitled, A vindication of the licensed chapels in Scotland (1750). Jolly’s
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copy of this is inscribed with a short biographical note stating “by Mr George Innes at Forres a presbyter of the Episcopal nonjuring Church in Scotland”\textsuperscript{753} Innes also published a “Forty Lesson” catechism, based on the teaching of Bishop Rattray. It was printed (according to Walker) in 1765, 1803 and 1819, and used in the northeast.\textsuperscript{754} It was reprinted by Bishop Samuel Seabury in New Haven in 1791.\textsuperscript{755} Strangely, neither the Brechin Diocesan Library nor the Jolly Library have a copy. Jolly certainly had multiple copies at one point, as he wrote to an English correspondent, the Rev. Bowdler in December 1829 that “it will give me much pleasure to send a few copies of Bishop Innes’ catechism to you.”\textsuperscript{756}

George Innes gifted Jolly two important books when he was just beginning his theological studies. The first of these was Rattray’s \textit{The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem} (1744) given to Jolly while he was living in Stonehaven on 3\textsuperscript{rd} August 1772.\textsuperscript{757} The second was Henry Dodwell’s \textit{A discourse concerning the one altar and the one priesthood insisted on by the ancients in their disputes against schism}, gifted to Jolly in 1775, before Jolly had even been ordained a deacon.\textsuperscript{758} The latter was also the copy owned by the Rev. Robert Lyon. As discussed in Chapter 2, these works were foundational to the theology of the early nonjurors, and exemplified its primitive Church principles. They also provide evidence that Jolly’s education was being shaped by clergy whose religious beliefs were firmly grounded in the theology of the first nonjurors. Many of the nonjuring theologians which Jolly encountered in this early period of his life became reliable, life-long favourites. While living in Stonehaven he acquired the nonjuror Robert Nelson’s (1656–1715) \textit{The Practise of True Devotion} – which was also book number one-hundred and fifteen in Jolly’s library.\textsuperscript{759} Nelson’s work was a guide to conducting a Christian life, and detailed an action plan for daily life to achieve this, including Morning Prayer, reading the scriptures, and avoiding keeping company with sinners. Notably, sometime in 1778 while he was a Priest in Turriff, Jolly wrote to an anonymous correspondent instructing them to write to Edinburgh for three dozen copies of Nelson’s \textit{Method’s of Devotions}, the demand for which “still increases.”\textsuperscript{760} It is more than
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plausible that Jolly was dispersing these among his congregation. Throughout his life, Jolly continued to recommend or gift the book to others. In 1811, he gave a copy to a youth doing service in the local militia, and in 1818 wrote to Miss Rattray recommending she read it. He also advised her to read Nelson’s *The Whole Duty of Man*, writing that “the oftener I read [it] the more I do admire it.”

Jolly’s eagerness to educate his congregation continued, and he appears to have had a relationship with the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge for fulfilling this. In 1815, the SPCK advised Bishop Walker that “Nelson’s *Christian Sacrifice* has recently been admitted on the society’s catalogue. Messrs Rivington will take an early opportunity of transmitting twenty copies of that tract to you in compliance with Bishop Jolly’s wishes.” This was a book which Jolly recommend in his own work on the Eucharist as “a small book of great value for its most important and useful doctrine and devotion, worthy of frequent perusal and constant use, as a guide to, and assistant of devotion at the Holy Altar.” It is clear that Jolly saw it as his duty as Christian Pastor to educate his congregation on conducting themselves as good Christians, which included a respect and knowledge of the Eucharistic Service.

Jolly’s correspondence where he discusses specific books, as well as his annotations, are valuable evidence for determining which books in Jolly’s expansive library were important to him. Especially as, by his early twenties, Jolly was a self-professed bibliophile. On being advised to curb his book buying habit by Innes, he responded that

Tho’ I am well convinced of the goodness of your advice as to the buying of books, yet I must confess w[il]t[h] shame, I find it hard to digest, and it is the only thing where I would fain beg a dispensation. – When I see a good book at a low price, as Marshall’s St Cyprian for 5 shillings, I cannot let it pass, especially as I find I can easily spare a trifle on that account...

His penchant for buying books never ceased, and by his death in 1838 he had acquired almost 3000 volumes. The majority of these were delivered to the theological college when it opened in
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1826, though Jolly had made the decision to bequeath his books fifteen years earlier, when the theological college was first proposed.

**Bishop Jolly’s Gift**

On 23rd January 1811, Jolly, now Bishop of Moray, wrote to his long-time correspondent the Rev. James Walker of Edinburgh, outlining his intentions to leave his books to the planned theological college in Edinburgh: “I now rejoice in the hope that all my books shall go to make up the Theological Library.” Just as Bishop Abernethy Drummond’s bequest of books was inspired by the generosity of Lord Gardenstone, so too was Jolly inspired by a generous gift. In 1810, Jolly’s parishioner Miss Katherine Panton of Fraserburgh, donated a substantial amount of money to the Church for the erection of its first seminary of learning. It was a gesture which greatly pleased Bishop Jolly, who could now envision a greater purpose for his library.

The first incarnation of the theological college was in the house of Bishop Walker, the first Pantonian professor of the Church. In 1826, he received all of Jolly’s “books and papers.” The papers were presumably the historical records of the church which Jolly had been acquiring and preserving in his house in Fraserburgh. These items are now kept in the National Records of Scotland and are known as the “Jolly Kist.” The kist is extensive, containing a wide range of materials related to the history of the Church, including correspondence between members of the clergy; materials belonging to important church figures such as the Rev. Robert Forbes; sermons; and original documents pertaining to Church matters, which have often been duplicated by hand by Jolly. For Jolly, preserving records of the Church’s past and the hardships that his mentors had endured for the survival of the Church and its traditions, was of the utmost importance. This project of preservation extended to the printed works of Episcopal theologians such as Bishop Rattray and Bishop Keith. Many of these books were annotated by Jolly, and crucially, many of them were annotated after he decided to donate his books to the theological college in 1811.

Though Bishop Jolly had always been an annotator of his books, between 1811 and 1826 he annotated his books with the prospective audience of young ordinands in mind. Evidence for this is found in a number of books with inscriptions written by Jolly after 1811. A 1728 edition of
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Samuel Clarke’s *A Discourse Concerning the Being and Attributes of God* is furnished with a quotation from Bishop Van Mildert’s edition of *The Works of the Rev. Daniel Waterland*, first published in 1823.® Clearly, this book was inscribed by Jolly after 1823. Jolly also transcribed excerpts from Van Mildert’s preface into a 1734 edition of Daniel Waterland’s *The importance of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity asserted, in reply to some late pamphlets*.™ Additionally, Jolly purchased and annotated new books, such as the 1815 and 1823 editions of Bishop Andrewes’ *Preces Privatae*. He also bought and extensively annotated a copy of John Brewster’s 1817 edition of *Practical Reflections on the Ordination Services for Deacons and Priests*. As will be discussed in more detail, viewing Jolly’s annotations as written with an intended audience in mind transforms their meaning and distinguishes them from other types of marginalia.

The annotations which Jolly left in his books are evidence that he saw gifting his library as an opportunity to preserve the history and theology of the nonjuring Scottish Episcopal Church, as well as a way to educate young ordinands on the correct interpretation of doctrine. Jolly was worried about the future of the Church, especially its communion office, the authority of Bishops, and its independence from the Church of England. He was also concerned by the threats of Arianism and the incursion of Evangelical clergy in the Church. Understanding Jolly’s concerns are essential for understanding his motivations for annotating his books.

**Jolly’s Marginalia**

Marginalia are the annotations written in books by their readers. As defined by Heather Jackson, they are “responsive: they need to be read as they are written, in conjunction with a prior text.”™ This distinguishes them from the notes and excerpts made by readers from books into their commonplace books. The practise of annotating books is found throughout the history of the written word; the wide margins of medieval manuscripts often contained annotations, and the era
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of print saw an abundance of writing in margins and on the flyleaves of texts. In the early modern period, annotations tended to fall into the category of reading notes, defined by Ann Blair as “notes primarily designed to facilitate retrieval and retention of interesting passages.” These sometimes included handwritten indexes on the front fly leaves, directing the reader to passages of interest already marked out with corresponding words or marks in the margin.

Readers of the renaissance, especially scholars and students, were encouraged to write in their books. Instruction manuals for young students taught them methods for marking their books to help with studying, advising that annotations would aid with memory and the retrieval of information. These scholarly notes also include non-verbal codes and marks of reading such as underlining, highlighting, asterisks, manicules, and exclamation marks. These categories of marginalia are not the personal responses that we associate with later readers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but they are still of value. William Sherman considers these marks an important component in understanding the reading practices of early modern readers. He states that “reading is just part of the process that makes for fruitful interaction with books. Only with marking and practise can books lead us to the kind of understanding needed to make them speak to our present needs.” This is indeed true of Jolly, whose own indexes of books reveal something of his values and scholarly priorities. The inside front board of his copy of William Reeves’ The Apologies of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Minutius Felix contains a long list of page numbers, usually corresponding with marks throughout the text, some labelled with specific subjects such as baptism and unity.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, marginalia evolved to include personal responses to texts from readers. This is the focus of Heather Jackson’s study which concentrates on “original discursive notes that express a reaction to the text or an opinion about it.” This type of annotation is found sporadically across the Brechin collection. In Hugh Farmer’s A Dissertation on Miracles, Bishop Abernethy Drummond leaves a long inscription recommending the text as “a sensitive and well written book and much approved of by many able and learned Divines of the Church,” but adds that “I’m persuaded the author is mistaken” on whether God permitted the
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Devil to work miracles and provides lengthy reasons why. He also adds a warning on *A Memorial of the Reformation* written by Presbyterian minister Benjamin Bennet. (1674–1726) writing “This is the most villainous Book that was either wrote or read and ought to be burnt by the hand of the Hangman *Cum Summa Dodscore. Amen.*”

For such a prolific annotator, these personal remarks are largely not a feature of Jolly’s annotating, though there are a few exceptions. In Jolly’s copy of James Stonhouse’s *The sick man’s friend,* he writes on the title page that the book comes recommended by the *Gentleman’s Magazine.* In his own words, he then adds an endorsement of the book, as well as advice for reading it:

> A awakening book which read and applied with judgment may be very useful – but with caveat against the methodistic, Calvinistic-like complexion of it, where with the amiable author was too much aligned.

Jolly’s lack of personal annotations are explained by his character. He was an exceptionally meek and modest man, who held up the authority of the words of authors above his own. In the preface to his work *The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist* (1831) he quotes at length a “learned and judicious friend” on recent history and opinion on Christ as a sacrifice in the Eucharist. He states that after his own research on the topic, he “distrusted his opinion” and requested “the perusal and opinion” of a learned friend, likely Bishop Walker. This is astonishing when considered alongside evidence of Jolly as a lifelong student of the Eucharist, who owned and read almost every authority quoted by Walker, and who, in short, could have written the section himself.

Consequently, Jolly’s most common form of annotating is transcribing the words of others. This “copying-out of somebody else’s remarks” is excluded from Jackson’s study, whose analysis is confined to original remarks. This is understandable given the abundance of this type of annotating among readers and the limitations of analysing it. In Jolly’s case, we have ample context
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and additional evidence for evaluating the meaning of his transcriptions. They were an educational tool for future readers, which pointed to further reading, emphasised points made in the text or supplied a more correct interpretation.

This was demonstrated in a study by Mark Towsey, who examined Jolly’s marginalia in the context of the historiography of the Scottish Enlightenment. Towsey compared Jolly’s copy of William Robertson’s *History of Scotland* against his copy of William Tytler’s *Historical and Critical Enquiry into the Evidence Produced against Mary Queen of Scots*. Towsey writes that Jolly “besieged Robertson’s Anglo-British narrative with material that undercut its textual authority and inherently unionist agenda.” Contrastingly, in his copy of William Tytler’s sympathetic *Historical and Critical Enquiry into the Evidence Produced against Mary Queen of Scots*, Jolly encircled the text with opinions belittling Robertson and supporting Tytler’s narrative. 784

Significantly, Jolly was not the only Episcopalian reader to treat Robertson’s work in this manner. Bishop Abernethy Drummond, the owner of the Brechin Collection’s copy of Robertson’s *History* used the front leaf to criticise Hume’s account of Mary Queen of Scots, and to endorse Tytler’s, to prospective readers of the history. 785 He wrote:

> Whoever reads this history, ought in justice to that most amiable & much injured Princess Queen Mary, read immediately after it, Mr Tytler’s historical and critical enquiry. Whereby he will perceive how grossly she has been abused by both Dr Robertson & Mr Hume. Mr Tytler is in my opinion, faulty only in that he too positively and I think without sufficient proof, condemns Earl Bothwell as guilty of King Darnly’s murder & does not vindicate the Queen’s marriage with that nobleman; which certainly he ought. For after such an application from almost the whole nobility of the Kingdom, her best friends as well as foes, had Queen Mary refused to marry that man whom they recommend, as the fittest person in the nation for her husband, she must have been justly condemned for her imprudence by the whole word. Besides having been a fortnight in power of Bothwell in Dunbar Castle no Prince after that, would have enquired about her, therefore the best thing she could do, was to marry him. 786
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Like Jolly, the annotator presumed a prospective audience for their words, likely the clergy of the diocese of Brechin, and was keen to ensure they had an interpretation of events sympathetic to the Stewart line. Robertson’s *History of Scotland* was one of the most popular accounts of Scottish history written in the eighteenth century, so its appearance in either library is not surprising, especially as it has come with a warning.

Though annotations in the Brechin Collection occur frequently enough to be of significance, they are not the most striking feature about the collection. Contrastingly, Bishop Jolly’s inscriptions are a defining attribute of his library, and he should be viewed as a unique clergyman. Bishop Walker recalls that “to his books he was devoted, rising both in winter and summer, at four o’clock in the morning, and dividing his day till eleven at night, when he went to bed... The time between his moderate dinner and his favourite beverage – tea, was generally devoted to transcription or copying.” His books are covered in excerpts copied from other books, which no doubt took up a significant proportion of his time to copy. For example, on Alban Butler’s *The moveable feasts, fasts, and other annual observances of the Catholic Church* he has copied an excerpt in excess of two thousand words from Dibdin’s *Typographical Antiquities* (1810), which describes *Liber Festivalis*, printed by William Caxton in 1483.

Many of Jolly’s annotations endorse the teaching of the Church Fathers as the ultimate rule of faith. His copy of William Reeves’ *The Apologies of Justyn Martyr*, is an example of this, and contains multiple transcriptions supporting the evidence of the Church Fathers. Opposite the title page is a long transcription taken from *Eight Sermons Preached (as Lady Moyer’s Lectures)* by English clergyman and librarian of Sion College, William Clements. It states “that the faith once delivered to the saints was not left to be better understood & taught in the present age, than it was in primitive times, by those who received it immediately from the apostles,” before going on to argue that only “adversaries of the Catholic faith” ignore “the best interpreters of the holy scriptures” and “propagate their contempt” by misrepresenting their writings. While Clements was writing in response to the denial of the Nicene Creed by Arians, Bishop Jolly’s use of the quotation can be
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read as defence against Arianism, and Evangelicals and dissenters interpreting scripture without the aid of the Church Fathers.

The preface to the book has also been annotated with a quote from Johnson’s *Unbloody Sacrifice* stating “we cite the Fathers only as witnesses; & don’t depend so much upon the acuteness of their arguings and the politeness or aptness of their phraseology or diction, as upon the unanimity of their testimony.”\(^{791}\) On the backboards, there is a further lengthy quotation, which responds to criticisms of the evidence of ancient testimony, attributed to Bishop Warburton. With these quotations, Jolly is providing a future reader with affirmations on the importance and validity of the Church Fathers.

As stated, one of Jolly’s motivations for supporting the Church Fathers as interpreters was the incursion of Evangelicals in the Scottish Episcopal Church. In 1822, Bishop Torry wrote to Jolly that in the Church in the south of Scotland “the modern Evangelists have found their way into every family more noted for fervency of piety than for soundness of judgement.” He added that unless they did something to stop “progress of this fanaticism” the Scottish Episcopal Church “will in a few years no more resemble what she was in our younger day than the present Church of Rome resembles that in the age of St Cyprian.”\(^{792}\) It is worth noting the observation of Eleanor Harris that Jolly’s contemporary Daniel Sandford, Bishop of Edinburgh, whose theology was largely (though not completely) Evangelical, cited only one Church Father, Chrysostom, in all of his published works.\(^{793}\) One the four characteristics of Evangelicals defined by David Bebbington, is their Biblicism; “their belief that all spiritual truth is to be found in its pages.”\(^{794}\) This was in contrast the nonjuring High Church Theology of Jolly, who believed that the Church Fathers were essential interpreters for a correct understanding of the Holy Scripture. Thus, fearing the spread of Evangelical theology in the Church, and in the knowledge that his books would potentially be read by the next generation of clergy, Jolly annotated his books authorities supporting the Fathers as interpreters of the Holy Scriptures.

Another significant doctrine defended in the annotations of Jolly is the Trinity, which in the eighteenth century was challenged by Arians such as Samuel Clarke, and Daniel Whitby. Daniel Waterland became engaged in the controversy, attacking the Arians and promoting the orthodox cause in a series of works, beginning with *A Vindication of Christ's Divinity* (1719). Subsequently he
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was part of a pamphlet war of responses and answers with Whitby and Clarke. Clarke argued
against the doctrine on scriptural grounds, and believed in judging doctrine by scripture alone. 795
Consequently, he criticised Waterland for relying on the testimony of the Church Fathers, which
was consistent feature in Waterland’s works.

The importance of antiquity in defending the doctrine of the trinity was reaffirmed in Waterland’s
work The Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity Asserted (1734).” 796 The inside front board of
Jolly’s copy is inscribed with the words: “A denial of the divinity of Christ is a denial of the whole
merit of his satisfaction so of the whole gospel salvation & necessity the most fatal heresy the
church ever knew.” 797 The works itself is then recommended, described as:

The incomparable treatise of Dr Waterland’s the importance of the fore doctrine of the
trinity – a book of such sound learning and knowledge and piety as merits every Christian’s
perusal & it is only to be lamented that it is not in this day especially in the hands of every
person baptised in the name of the Father, son & holy ghost. 798

Jolly was evidently very keen that any prospective reader of Waterland’s work knew immediately,
from Jolly’s inscriptions, that it was necessary reading on the trinity. A further annotation, taken
from Bishop Van Mildert’s review of the life and work of Waterland, is copied out. This excerpt
recommends further reading on the Trinity for divinity students, advising that the books listed
form a compendium of all that is necessary to establish them in the truth of that fundamental
article of our faith, the doctrine of the Trinity. These annotations are very clearly directed at
theological students, promoting the idea that the doctrine of the Trinity is a foundational element
of belief, and recommending further reading to reinforce this point of view. Like Bishop Gleig,
Jolly may have been concerned about the Unitarians, who did not believe in the Trinity, and aimed
to give Candidates for the Holy Orders directions for educating themselves adequately on it.
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Jolly often used inscriptions to recommend further reading to students. On his copy of *Waterland’s Regeneration Stated and Explained According to Scripture and Antiquity* he has cited a review from the *Anti-Jacobin Review*, from 1803. The review states that it contains eminently useful references to ancient and modern authors, advising that:

> The student in theology who shall pursue the course of reading here pointed out to him, will find his labours amply rewarded by the rich stores of piety and wisdom that will be laid open to his view & he can hardly fail of being completely armed against the errors of the times…

By including this, Jolly is advising students on works which will help them to discern the fallacies of the dangerous denial of baptismal regeneration, another doctrine integral to Jolly’s conception of Scottish Episcopal Church, which was also denied by Evangelicals.

This is only a small sample of the annotations Jolly left in his books directing students towards orthodox interpretations of doctrine. They are reflective of the generally defensive position of Jolly, who committed himself to the service of the Church and the protection of its doctrines. This is evident in his published works on the Eucharist and Baptismal Regeneration, and clearly demonstrated in the annotations he left in his books, destined for the Theological College. He was determined to influence, inspire, shape, and direct young ordinands and clergy, ultimately to preserve nonjuring values. This is further shown in Jolly’s propensity for using his books to archive, and thus preserve, the historical events of the nonjuring Church.

**Preserving the History of the Scottish Episcopal Church**

Bishop Jolly’s copy of *Essay on the Nature of the Church, and a Review of the Elections of Bishops in the Primitive Church* (1728) is an impressive example of Jolly using a book both to archive important records of the Church’s past, and to contextualise a text for prospective readers. *Essay on the Nature of the Church* was a pivotal text in the history of the nonjuring Church. As discussed more fully in chapter 2, it outlined the principles of the diocesan party Bishops, which would ultimately become part of the foundational canons of the Church. It was written in response to contemporary events; Bishop Millar been elected Bishop of Edinburgh by the presbyters of that diocese, and a contingent of Bishops objected to his election on the basis that this was not a right the presbyters had. The
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second essay *a Review of the Elections of Bishops in the Primitive Church* challenges this claim, asserting that the election of Bishop Falconer as Bishop of Edinburgh in 1720 had reasserted this right.  

Jolly owned two copies of the text, one of which was also annotated by Archibald Campbell. Campbell’s bookplate adorns a flyleaf, and his contributions – made in his distinctive handwriting – have been identified and labelled by Jolly as “Bishop Campbell’s.” This was the copy which Jolly chose to annotate, although he corrected the errata in his second copy of the text. He began by introducing the text to prospective readers by transcribing a letter from 1720, the contents of which provide a contentious historical record. On the front flyleaf, the reader is met immediately with a letter addressed to Bishops Archibald Campbell and James Gadderar in London, dated May 3rd 1720, from John Falconer, which has been copied from the original by Jolly. The letter begins:

> Our brethren Master Fullarton, Millar & Irvin Bishops in Scotland have committed it to mee to apprise you of what hath past there about the fixing of one of our number in this city, & these places that are adjacent to it where there are Presbiters & worship (for wee do not pretend to fill Diocese, but appropriate some to Districts & these by way of comendam)

The letter was written to inform the Bishops of the consecration of Fullarton as Bishop of Edinburgh. It narrates events leading up to Fullarton’s election. In April 1720, the clergy of Edinburgh and the Bishops Falconer, Fullarton, Arthur Millar and William Irvine had held a meeting to elect the successor to the see of Edinburgh. In a subsequent meeting the presbyters met without the Bishops and voted:

> the vote was stated elect or refer to the four Bishops in Scotland the designation of one of their number to be Bishop of the District of Edenburgh [sic] and it was carried to refer: their prolocutor and some others came to my chamber where wee four wer mett and told us what had been determin’d and we condescended on Mr Fullarton who is senior to whom we judg’d it fell in course…

This is indeed the most contentious part of the letter and reflects that it was written on behalf of the bishops Millar and Irvine, who both favoured the college system. In the original letter, copied exactly by Jolly, Bishop Keith adds a postscript in which he challenges that the clergy had chosen...
to “refer” rather than to “elect.” He writes, “this good man [Facieron] has been misinformed for indeed it carried Elect and elect Bishop Fullarton all in one vote. The division was very near equal.”

This was a very important distinction; by confirming the election by presbyters of a Bishop to their diocese, an ancient right for presbyters to elect their Bishop had been re-established, along with the diocesan system of government. This contravened the desires of the Jacobite monarch and his advisors in Scotland. While the chevalier retroactively approved of the election of Fullarton, he requested that future appointments were proposed to him in advance and reserved the right to nominate candidates for consecration. The clergy, however, were encouraged by the restoration of diocesan government, and subsequently the presbyters of Angus and St Andrews requested Bishop Falconer to become their Bishop, which he accepted.

This was the beginning of a decade-long feud between the diocesan-usager and the college-anti-usager parties, discussed in depth in chapter 2. Thus, Jolly introduces An Essay on the Nature of Church Government with the record of the very beginning of this schism, which would in time prompt Rattray and Keith to write this seminal text.

Introducing the text with the letter was Jolly’s first step in providing the prospective reader with the most complete form of the text, both in the sense of the text itself and its historical context. This was one reason for choosing to annotate Campbell’s copy of the text, as Campbell had already begun providing these details through his own annotations. Campbell’s additions are useful for ascertaining authorship of the book, which was published anonymously. While it is widely credited as Bishop Rattray’s work, it was in fact a combined effort of both Rattray and Keith. The opening text, “An Essay on the Nature of the Church” is attributed by Campbell to “Dr Thomas Rattray of Craighall,” and the following “Review of the Elections of Bishops” is inscribed as “written by the Right Reverend Bishop Keith.”

Jolly performed an exceptionally close reading of the printed text. He compared it to Rattray and Keith’s original manuscript, which he had in his possession. Throughout the book he writes in the margins that a particular section was “Not in the MS” as well as ascribing authorship of sections or even footnotes to Bishop Keith or Rattray. He also adds additional material from the MS, not in the printed edition. On the blank leaf opposite the beginning of “An Essay on the Nature of...
The Church” Jolly copies the introduction as written by Rattray in the MS, labelling it “beginning of the MS (in the Episcopal Chest No.5)”

That we may have the distincter [sic] view of the case of this Church at present, it will be proper to give a short and plain account of the true form of ecclesiastical government & the nature of schism as represented to us in the writing of the Fathers, from whence we shall be the better enabled to form a right judgement concerning this unhappy schism now most unnecessarily set among us. To begin then with the notion of a particular, or as we now call it Diocesan Church. St Cyprian defines it to be a people united etc...

This addition of Rattray’s text from the manuscript is a typical feature of how Jolly treated the works of Thomas Rattray, melding together manuscript and print to provide the fullest account of the text, ands to maintain Rattray’s scholarly contributions to Episcopal nonjuring theology and identity. This was part of Jolly’s project to collect and preserve the papers and correspondence of the clergy, many of which are now in the Jolly Kist at the National Records of Scotland. It was especially important in the preservation of Rattray’s legacy, as virtually all of Rattray’s works were published posthumously, and many of his manuscripts were not published at all.

Consequently, in his attempt to preserve legacy of the nonjurors, Jolly made copies of their unpublished MS. These included Bishop Rattray’s, which Jolly subsequently had bound into copies of Rattray’s printed works. An example of this archiving practise is found in Jolly’s copy of Rattray’s short work Some particular instructions concerning the Christian Covenant and Mysteries by which it is transacted and maintained, which was printed posthumously in 1748 by his contemporary the Rev. Robert Lyon.807 The book contained three essays, the first of which supplies the volume’s title. The second essay in the volume is on the necessity of confirmation before taking the Eucharist, while the third is entitled An Essay on the Nature of Man, as he is a creature endowed with reason, and thereby capable of religion. Interestingly, in a letter to the Rev. Bowdler, Rector of Addington in Kent, Jolly states that the first essay Instructions was written by Bishop John Falconer.808 This attribution of authorship to Falconer is also inscribed on the verso of the title page of a copy owned by Patrick Cheyne.809

---

807 Thomas Rattray, Some particular instructions concerning the Christian covenant, and the mysteries by which it is transacted and maintained. (London: Printed by James Bettenham: and sold by George Strahan, at the Golden Ball in Cornhill, MDCCXLVIII. [1748]), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.2468. Here after
808 CH12/14/149 to Mr Bowdler, 17 dec.
809 Rattray, Some particular instructions concerning the Christian covenant, and the mysteries by which it is transacted and maintained, Aberdeen University Special Collections DL Ratt s 1
Bishop Jolly owned two copies of the work *Some particular instructions*, and chose to annotate and amend the volume previously owned by Mr Cruickshank, possibly his lifelong friend the Rev. John Cruickshank, incumbent of Arbroath between 1812-1824. The work is encircled with quotations from theologians, and is bound with Rattray’s unpublished manuscript on confirmation. This manuscript is entitled by Jolly as “prefatory discourses of confirmation by Bishop Rattray – from his own hand-writing” and has been copied out by Jolly, and bound into the end of the text.

The text outlines Rattray’s position on confirmation, stating that “None shall be committed to the holy communion until such time as he be confirmed,” which Rattray cites as having been asserted in the “Scottish Common Prayer Book.” Members of the congregation who wanted to take the sacrament during Holy Communion were first required to be confirmed by their Bishop as worthy of taking it. Rattray’s work explains the “design of this holy ordinance of confirmation” for “conferring the Holy Ghost on those who are baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus.” The confirmation of communicants prior to taking the Eucharist is rarely commented upon in the historiography of the Scottish Episcopal Church, though it had been established as a requirement in the 1743 Church Canons. It was still a requirement in 1838: Canon XIX in the 1838 Church Canons, stated that every Bishop of the Church was required to visit his diocese once every three years to administer confirmation.

Following the transcription of Rattray’s discourse on confirmation, is another manuscript copied by Jolly. The original MS is attributed to Bishop Alexander, noted by Jolly as “Bishop Rattray’s immediate successor”. This MS concerns “the true method of the Apostles teaching in the schism of the Church of Christ.” It narrates the doctrines received by the Apostles and shared by the Bishops of the world in one faith and one communion, until the “bishops began unhappily to divide among themselves and teach contrary doctrine.” Its main point is that the truth of the Christian religion is found in the doctrines received by the First Bishops of the Church by the Apostles.

Jolly draws further attention to the points expressed by Bishop Rattray and Bishop Alexander, by following the texts with multiple pages of quotations from the Church Fathers and Anglican theologians. These quotes support the doctrines expressed by the Episcopal Bishops, as well as

---

810 The first of these, Jolly. 2468, has a few marks of reading in the margins, singling out specific paragraphs of interest. The identity of “Mr Cruickshank” inscribed on Jolly. 2521 could have been the Rev. John Cruickshank, incumbent in Turiff from 1788-1812, and a lifelong friend of Jolly. See Bertie, p.29 and Walker *The Life of the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly*, p.93

811 Rattray, *Some particular instructions concerning the Christian covenant, and the mysteries by which it is transacted and maintained*, Jolly.2521, p.49. Jolly has written an “X” next to this in his copy of the text

812 Lawson, *History of the Scottish Episcopal Church*, p.562
demonstrating that they are endorsed by Anglican theologians. For example, an extract on confirmation from Mr Wogan, states that Confirmation was the method “which by the ancient Fathers of the Church was called the completion of Baptism, being that ordinance, which perfected the baptised person and made him a complete Christian.” In transcribing these nonjuring texts, and encircling them with endorsements theologians of the Church of England, Jolly was both preserving nonjuring beliefs, and showing that they were also Anglican beliefs, and thus part of the intellectual inheritance of both the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church of England.

This is what Jolly had attempted to achieve in his own work on the Eucharist *The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist*, printed in 1831. In the work, he devoted Chapter IV to demonstrating that the doctrines expressed Scottish Communion – specifically that the Eucharist is a sacrament and a sacrifice – were held by English Church Divines, such as Lancelot Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor, and Henry Thorndike. Jolly writes that “The Scotch Liturgy, it is plain, spoke the sense of all the great and primitively-learned Divines of England…”813 Jolly’s use of this evidence argues against the distinctively Scottish nature of the Communion Office, to demonstrate that it has precedent and validity in the English Church.814 In presenting the Communion Office this way, Jolly was demonstrating that the retention of the Scottish Communion Office did not preclude conformity between the Church of England and the Scottish Episcopal Church. He used English Divines and theologians in both his published work, and his annotations, in an attempt to validate the nonjuring theology from anglicised congregations and clergy.

In the *The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist*, Jolly also discussed the Liturgy of St James, which he described as restored to “its primitive purity” by Rattray in his edition of *The Ancient Liturgy of Jerusalem*.815 Jolly states that this restoration by Rattray produced an edition of what may be considered “the most ancient and venerable Eucharistic office extant.”816 Evidence for these claims are provided in the appendix of the volume, which includes letters from Rattray discussing his motivation for the work, as well as material endorsing the authority of the volume. Notably, these materials have been bound into one of Jolly’s copies of *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem*.817

---

814 Wallace Kornahrens states that “Jolly’s work is the fullest and most explicit definition of the Eucharistic tradition of Scottish Episcopal Church begun in the 1620s and 1630s.” Kornahrens, Wallace Douglas. *Eucharistic Doctrine in Scottish Episcopal Church, 1620–1875* (PhD thesis, St Andrews University, 2008), p.209
816 Ibid, p.92
817 Rattray, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem*, annotated by Bishop Jolly, with additional material in the hand of Bishop Rattray. Jolly.2833(1)
The original letter from Bishop Rattray to the Rev. Robert Lyon, dated 1737 is bound into Jolly’s copy. Rattray sent the letter to Lyon with a manuscript copy of *The Ancient Liturgy*, and discussing his inspiration for the work. In the letter, Rattray states that it was Lyon who “who first put it in my thoughts, now some years ago” to collate and print the ancient liturgies of the Church. After some considerations on the corruptions to the various liturgies, Rattray settled on printing the St James. He writes, “I think we have no ground to doubt [St James] was the liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem in the time of St Cyril, and is generally owned to be of greatest authority and antiquity of any liturgy, which we know to have been used in any Church. And this has produced what I now send you.”

A second original letter, also transcribed in *The Christian Sacrifice in the Euchar*, has been bound in with this copy of *The Ancient Liturgy*. Dated 1745, it is written in French, from Father Pierre François le Courayer (1681-1776), a Roman Catholic Priest and theologian. It is addressed to the Rev. Robert Lyon, who prepared Rattray’s MS for the press, and published it in 1744, after Rattray’s death. Lyon had written to Le Courayer asking for his opinion on the text. In his reply, Le Courayer endorses the liturgy as a “precious monument of antiquity” and that states that “it appears certain to me that this Liturgy was constantly that of the Church of Jerusalem.” He gives a favourable opinion of Rattray’s editing of the Liturgy, particularly his rejection of a later “interpolation” on the Liturgy, which addressed the blessed Virgin, which Le Courayer believes is a visible alteration on the original liturgy. This is followed by an English translation of the letter.

In his work on the Eucharist, Jolly describes François le Courayer as having “completely defended the validity of the English Episcopat consecrations against the ridiculous falsifications of the Romish Jesuits.” Le Courayer had defended the apostolic line of succession in the Church of England, and argued that it was unbroken from the apostles to the present day. Jolly provided this information on le Courayer to establish that despite being a Catholic priest, he was a friend of the Church of England, and a reliable scholar. Thus his endorsement of Rattray’s work was more proof of the antiquity of St James Liturgy.

The significance of the Liturgy to Jolly was that it illustrated that the Christian Sacrifice was a primitive doctrine, the most ancient form celebrated in the Church, which was used until the “Church of Rome new framed and altered hers.” Over time, the liturgy of the Church had been

---

818 The letter is unsigned. However, Bishop Jolly quotes the letter, which he states is “copied from his [Rattray’s] own words.” A comparison has also been made between the letter and another letter from Rattray to Robert Keith 1730, NRS CH12/12/1619

Quoted by Jolly in *The Christian sacrifice in the eucharist*, p.253


corrupted, contracted errors, and left its original purity behind. Rattray’s attempt to restore the Liturgy of Jerusalem fulfilled the hope that “the pure stream might be found and drawn from the foundation head.”821

Interestingly, it appears Jolly was aided in the alterations he made to this copy of St James Liturgy. The transcription and translation of Le Courayer’s letter is in a different, very neat hand. The 1863 Catalogue of the Scottish Episcopal Library lists the volume as being “bound up with M. L. Courayer’s French Letter to the Rev. Mr R. Lyon, accompanied by a Translation of the Letter into English,” meaning unless it was altered sometime between 1838-1863, Jolly directed someone else to translate and transcribe the letter in his possession, and inserted it to be bound with the work. There is a printed Latin epitaph and verse for Thomas Rattray, bound in between the title page and leaf A2, which has a separate listing in the 1863 Catalogue, so it is not outwith the realms of possibility that the book was supplemented with material by another clergyman.

Jolly’s use of archival material to transform, supplement and provide the correct interpretation of nonjuring history inside his books, had precedent within the Church. Bishop Robert Forbes treated at least three books in a similar manner: Bishop Keith’s The History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland, From the Beginning of the Reformation in the Reign of King James V to the Retreat of Queen Mary into England, Anno 1568 (1734), Keith’s An Historical Catalogue of Bishops (1755), and Rattray’s The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem (1744).822 Forbes copy of Keith’s The History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland is in the Brechin Collection. Its provenance and annotations mark it as an especially interesting example of Forbes’ archival practise, as he addresses a future reader and directs them to material which endorses the scholarship of Bishop Keith.823 He writes on the verso of the title page that

In this copy there are several curious particulars in the manuscript, some of which are not to be found in any other copy. For strong and incontestable evidence of the author’s strict impartiality, & exactness, & readiness to acknowledge errors and mistakes when once convinced of them, See pag.124 of the History and appendix pag.118. This same

821 Jolly, The Christian sacrifice in the Eucharist, p.251
822 NRS CH12/20/2 “The Ancient liturgy of the church of Jerusalem. London, 1744. With copious notes by Bishop Robert Forbes and an original letter from Robert Lyon to Professor Campbell of St Andrews, 8 Nov. 1740, with an answer, 22 Sept. 1741”
Forbes chose to annotate Keith’s work because of its importance countering the presbyterian narrative of the reformation and intended to defend the honour and scholarship of its author. The work was published by the Jacobite printers Walter and Thomas Ruddiman in 1734. Keith’s work was the first Episcopalian account of the reformation, challenging the Presbyterian accounts of the period by John Knox and David Calderwood. He used archival sources extensively and transcribed many of them as appendices. As Kelsey Jackson Williams writes, “Keith’s work attempted to place the history of the Scottish Reformation on a solidly archival foundation…he attempted to use the lever of the archive to overturn the Presbyterian master-narrative of Scotland’s Past.”

In many ways, Forbes mirrors Keith's uses of archival materials by transcribing the primary sources which compliment Keith and refute his work. On the blank verso of an engraving of a map of Scotland, Forbes copies a letter from “Mr George Raitt (then studying surgery) at Paris Aprile 16th 1740” to Rattray. The letter concerns the reception of the book in France, with Raitt writing that

I can’t help giving you one instance of the reception your Book has met with among the French the Marquis d’Auboïs who is lookt upon by every body to be the greatest connoisseur in Historical matters just now in France is exceedingly pleased with it and often says that in almost every page he found a Discovery and is continually enquiring for the second part of it; this I was told by an English gentleman who is intimately acquainted w[j]t[h] the Marquis & who begs me to get some account from your self when they may expect to see it.

This inscription is a very clear endorsement of the work by a respected authority. Bound in opposite this is a four-page vindication of Keith work, written by Keith himself, which defends it from a negative response published by a Presbyterian in 1748. Robert Forbes cites the provenance of this transcript, and states that he [Forbes] copied it from Keith’s copy, while in his in the company at Leith 1753. Forbes additions transforms Keith’s history into what Jackson Williams terms “a living, growing repository of the Scottish ecclesiastical past” 825 This evaluation is only more accurate when considered with the additional provenance in the volume of the Rev. George

---

824 Jackson Williams, *The First Scottish Enlightenment* p.179
825 Jackson Williams, *The First Scottish Enlightenment* p.183
Skene and the Rev. John Moir, who inscribed the title page with their names. It was a volume passed down through generations of Episcopal clergy who wished to preserve it.

Provenance, Marginalia, and the Preservation of Episcopal Identity

Throughout this thesis reference has been made to the owners of the books donated to the Brechin collection, often recording that several Episcopal clergymen owned a volume before it was donated to the diocesan library. These texts were shared because they were useful to the clergy, who often relied on inheriting books from their senior brethren. These books were appreciated not only for their contents, but for who they had come from. For example, George Skene made a point of acquiring books which had once belonged to Bishop Rattray. Rattray’s provenance is among the most notable in the Brechin collection, and almost every volume was subsequently owned by Skene. It is not clear how Skene came to own so many of Rattray’s books, as the Bishop died before Skene began his career in the Church. Rattray’s books were not bequeathed to the diocese but were instead sold by his grandson at auction in the 1770s, so it is possible that Skene bought them. Evidence exists on one volume that indicates it was acquired interpedently by Skene, purely for its association with Rattray. In 1772, he purchased a copy of *The Sibylline Oracles* from Mr Bower, bookseller in St Andrews, which is inscribed with Rattray’s name.

In 1830, more than thirty years after Skene’s death, the books which he bequeathed to the diocesan library finally arrived in Laurencekirk. A decision was taken to sell the duplicates, which perhaps suggests that not all clergy had the same reverence for provenance inscriptions. However, the duplicates have miraculously survived, having either been bought by the Rev. David Moir (later Bishop of Brechin), or stored in his house and absorbed into his own library. This is evidenced by the inscription his son John Moir left on every volume owned by Skene. As discussed in Chapter 2, Rev. John Moir respected and preserved the traditions of the nonjurors, and was presumably pleased to write his name next to Rattray and Skene’s. Moir’s books were given to the diocese by his daughters in 1827.

---

826 Kornahrens cites a notebook in the hands of Rattray’s descendant at Craighall, which lists 328 books sold in the 1770s by Thomas Rattray’s Grandson Kornahrens Eucharistic Doctrine in Scottish Episcopacy, 1620–1875, p.110 Due to covid restrictions, it was not possible to follow through on an arrangement to see this notebook.


828 Br MS 4/1/1/2 Synod Minutes, 1817-1848, p.43

829 Br MS 4/1/1/5 Synod of the Diocese of Brechin Agenda and Minutes 1918-1129, February 4th 1927
Episcopal provenance was valued by many clergymen throughout the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Eighteenth century owners often had a personal connection to the clergyman who had bequeathed it. Subsequent generations respected earlier clergymen for their associations with the nonjuring Church and attempted to preserve books owned by them. For example, Bishop Jolly acquired several volumes previously owned Bishop Archibald Campbell, whose books have been otherwise dispersed and lost. Jolly owned (and signed) Campbell’s copy of *Basili Magni* which had been gifted to Campbell by the Rev. Charles Littlejohn (1650-1732), who had been deprived of his congregation by an Act of Parliament in 1690.

Later clergymen who sought out or were gifted books with Episcopal origin tended to have an interest in the history of the Church, and were familiar with its leading characters. Bishop Dowden of Edinburgh, a scholar of the Scottish Communion Office, was gifted Bishop Abernethy Drummond’s Bible (Edinburgh, 1722) by Canon James Wilson, later Bishop of Glasgow. It is explicitly mentioned on the title page that the volume “has the autograph of the learned nonjuring prelate Bishop Abernethy Drummond and an entry of the birth and baptism of his daughter” clearly demonstrating that it was admired and preserved as a part of Episcopal Church history.

These books are evidence that the physical books of Episcopal clergymen became items of nonjuring Episcopal history due to their annotations and inscriptions. What is particularly special about many of these inscriptions is that they also serve as evidence of books which were important to generations of Episcopal clergy. Furthermore, they have the potential to highlight texts hitherto unrecognised as important to nonjuring clergyman.

This is true of Lancelot Andrews’s *Preces Privatae Graece & Latine* (Private Devotions in Greek and Latin) in both the Greek and Latin edition, and the English translation by Dean Stanhope. Due both to its personal nature as a prayer book, and its contents, which drew together the primitive church, eastern orthodoxies, and connected it with Anglicanism, editions of Lancelot’s prayers in Episcopalian libraries are almost always inscribed. Furthermore, the prayer book is one of the most important examples of intergenerational preservation of a book amongst Episcopalians, and connects the values of Bishop Jolly for preserving, archiving and passing down with his brethren in the diocese of Brechin.


831 Berrie, p.81

832 The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments (Edinburgh : Printed by James Watson, printer to the King’s most Excellent Majesty., MDCCXXII. [1722]), annotated by Bishop Abernethy Drummond. Dowd. 942(1)
Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626), Bishop of Winchester, is considered a Father of the English Church, who, alongside Richard Hooker, provided an intellectual basis for the Church of England. His *Preces Privatae* was compiled for his own use and was published posthumously. It is described by F. E. Brightman as “a collection of material to supply the needs, daily and occasional, of his own devotional life, providing for the great departments of the life of the spirit – faith and hope and love, praise and thanksgiving, penitence and petition.” In the latter part of his life, he was rarely seen without the book, and devoted hours of this day to prayer. Andrewes used a range of materials to compose his prayers. He drew upon the holy scriptures; the devotions of the eastern church including the liturgies of St James, St Basil and St Chrysostom; Roman Breviaries; medieval meditations of St Augustine and St Anselm; a range of Church Fathers including St Cyprian, St Gregory Nazianzene, St Gregory of Nyssa and St Cyril of Alexandria. Very few of the sources for his prayers came from contemporary sixteenth-century sources. Brightman summarises that “They represent for the individual what it was the mission of Andrewes and his fellows to vindicate for the English Church – the inheritance of all the past, criticised by the best spirit of the renaissance, adjusted to the proportion of the Holy Scripture, and adapted to the needs of the present.” For Scottish Episcopalians, Andrewes represented a continuation of the Catholic Church with the more disagreeable parts removed. The prayer book was a polemic-free text, focusing on one of the most important parts of religious life: private prayer.

The 1675 edition of *Preces privatae* in Greek and Latin, is the first comprehensive edition of the text, and draws on three different sources. Earlier English editions of the text edited by Richard Drake are thought to have been translated from a manuscript in an “unfinished condition.” There are two copies of *Preces Privatae* (1675) in the Brechin Collection, and additionally both Bishop Jolly and George Skene owned this edition. Bishop of Edinburgh, William Falconer’s (1707-1784) copy was a very personal book of devotion. He inscribed his name and “Balgowan” in Perthshire, the location of his first incumbency, alongside the date 21st July 1730. The deaths of his father in 1737 and mother in 1740 are recorded on an end leaf. Opposite the title page he has transcribed quotes from Seneca including “illi mors gravis incubat, qui, notus nimis omnibus, ignotus moritur”

834 Ibid, p.xlv-xlvi
835 Ibid, pp.xiv-xix
838 He was incumbent here from 1728 – 1735, Berrie p.40

185
sibi” (Death presses heavily on that man who, being but too well known to others, dies in ignorance of himself). He also quotes from Tertullian, and there are multiple unidentified inscriptions in Greek. It was clearly a highly valued and presumably much used book by Falconer.

Significantly, the Rattray clan motto “Super Sidera Votum” is written on the front leaf in Bishop Rattray’s handwriting, suggesting this was a gift from Rattray to Falconer. In 1776, Falconer went on to become the Bishop of Edinburgh, and at some unknown point the book passed into the possession of Bishop Abernethy Drummond.839 This chain of provenance is an important feature of Preces Privatae amongst Episcopalians – the text was intergenerational, passed down and inscribed by Episcopal clergymen.

The second copy of Preces Privatae in the Brechin Collection exemplifies this. The book was part of the bequest by Alexander Jamieson. On the front leaf, Jamieson has written

This copy of the most excellent Bishop Andrewes Private Devotions belonged to the Rev Robert Taylor Episcopal minister at Laurencekirk & Montrose. The Rev Alex Lunan at Norwater Bridge & Luthermuir and the Rev Alex Jamieson Episcopal Minister at Luthermuir & Glasgow. The Names of these gentlemen on the title page are in their respective handwriting.840

As promised, the title page contains the names of the three clergymen, with Lunan’s name also inscribed with the date 1760. Lunan had received the book from Robert Taylor (1695-1759), a local man born in 1695 in Laurencekirk.841 Jamieson received the book from Lunan, alongside at others. Jamieson clearly saw the significance of this chain of ownership and inscribed the book for the readership of the library he established in Brechin.

Like Falconer’s copy, the book is inscribed with theological quotations which lend the prayer book a more personal nature. Robert Taylor inscribed his name for a second time, under the words “summa religionis est imitari quem colis” a quotation attributed to St Augustine, and used by Lancelot Andrewes in his Lent sermon, meaning in this context, “The highest form of religion is to conform himself to Christ”.842 This quotation is a very personal spiritual reminder in a book of prayers, which also suggests a familiarity with Andrewes’ other works. The book has also been annotated to mirror the English edition of Private Devotions (Editions published in 1648, 1670, 1674, 1682, 1692), which, preceding the contents page, contains various quotations in Latin and Greek.

839 1846 Catalogue, p.41
840 Andrewes, Preces Privatae, Br U 248.37
841 Little is known of Taylor. No surviving correspondence. Bertie, p.141
842 Latin quotation from Lancelot Andrewes, Ninety-six Sermons (Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1841-43), 5 vols., vol.2 p.75
from Saints and theological writers. Either Lunan or Taylor has taken the time to copy four quotes in Latin and Greek into *Preces Private* (1675), which does not feature these introductory quotations. The excerpts offer advice or comments on praying and reading, such as a quotation from St Jerome which translated reads “You pray: You speak to the bridegroom. You read: He speaks to you.” There is also a quotation from William of Paris which translated reads “Reading enriches prayer; by prayer reading is enlightened.” Additionally, the annotator has also chosen to introduce the author of the text by transcribing the short biography of Lancelot Andrews from the frontispiece portrait of the English edition, which reads “If ever any merited to be the universal Bishop this was he: great Andrews! Who the whole vast sea did drain of learning and distilled it in his brain: (these pious drops are of the purest kind which tricked from the limbeck of his mind.)” The inclusion of the latter quotation is evidence of the high regard in which Andrews was held by these nonjuring clergy. With the additions of the quotations, like Falconer’s copy, the book becomes a more personal and intimate prayer book, particularly as many of the excerpts are offering spiritual advice for praying.

George Skene owned and inscribed with his name a variety of editions of Andrews’ work. He owned *Preces Privatae* (1675) as well as Dean Stanhope’s English translation published in 1730, based on the *editio princeps* of 1675. This copy was also owned by Bishop Rattray. Skene’s copy ultimately became a gift from the Rev. John Moir to his wife Jane Moir on “Xmas Day 1852.” Skene also owned a 1692 edition of Drake’s earlier incomplete English edition, which has again been inscribed by John Moir.

Bishop Jolly encountered Lancelot Andrews at the beginning of his first incumbency in Turriff. He purchased Stanhope’s English translation (1730) in 1778, and inscribed the title page with Greek and Latin quotations such as “Ascendat oratio descendat Gratia” (Let prayers ascend, and

---

843 Andrewes, Lancelot. *A manual of the private devotions and meditations of The Right Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrews. late Lord Bishop of Winchester* (London : printed by W.D. for Humphrey Moseley at the Prince’s Arms in S. Pauls Church-yard, MDCXLVIII. [1648]) pp. B3v – B4r
845 Original annotation reads Lectio orationem impinguat. Lectionem oratio iluminat
He appears to have sought out every edition of the prayer book, and owned Drake's English edition of 1648, *Holy Devotions with Directions to Pray* (London, 1675), *Preces Privatae* (Oxford, 1675), Stanhope's English Translation (London, 1730) and an 1815 and 1823 of Stanhope's translated edited by Bishop Horne. His copy of *Holy Devotions: with directions to pray* (sixth edition, 1675) is incomplete, however Jolly has rectified this by inserting the missing text as an additional manuscript in his own hand.

Jolly likely viewed these prayers as daily devotions which connected an important part of his religious life with primitive Christianity. His only annotation in his edition of *Preces Privatae* (Oxford, 1675) reflects this. Over several pages, Jolly has transcribed “Hymn to Christ the Saviour” written by Saint Clement of Alexandria. The hymn is considered to be the most ancient hymn of the Christian Church, but did not become mainstream in the Anglican Church until it was translated during the Oxford Movement. Unsurprisingly, Andrewes' prayers were part of Jolly’s daily habits of devotions. He is remembered as having “made use of Bishop Andrews short ejaculations for the different hours of the day.”

Perhaps one of the most important things which Lancelot Andrewes prayers highlights is that what was most important to the clergy was prayer, not polemic. Andrewes prayers were the way in which they could most completely worship God, in the same manner he had been worshipped in the primitive Church, connecting them with the earliest Christians, united in their devotion to God.

The annotations of Bishop Jolly were at their core about preserving the Christian identity and Christian truths, which most closely connected him to Jesus Christ, whether that was through the

---


849 Catalogue of the Scottish Episcopal Church Library (1863) (Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Anderson. MDCCLXIII.) p.10

850 Lancelot Andrewes, *Institutiones piae. Holy devotions: with directions to pray. Also a brief exposition upon the Lords prayer, the Creed, the Ten commandments, the 7 penitential psalms, the 7 psalms of thanksgiving, together with a letany. By the Right Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrews late Bishop of Winchester. 6th edn.* (London: printed by Andrew Clark, for Charles Harper, and are to be sold by him at the Flower de Luce, over against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleetstreet, 1675.), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.2192


852 Thanks to Panagiotis Georgakakis for translating the Greek annotation

spiritual efficacy of his body and blood in the Eucharist, or other sacraments. For Jolly, these Christian truths were from the most primitive and apostolic Church and were represented in the eighteenth century nonjuring identity of the Church, and sustained through the study of the patristic fathers, and preserved in the scholarship of Bishop Rattray. This identity was being threatened, and Jolly’s most prized possession – his library – was his way of attempting to preserve it. He was clearly not alone in using books as a repository of this identity, and the Brechin Diocesan Library is evidence of this.
Conclusion

Sometime before he bequeathed his books to the Brechin Diocesan Library, Bishop Abernethy Drummond inscribed the flyleaf of his copy of Charles Daubeny *A guide to the church, in several discourses*, published in 1798. He wrote:

This is a well written and most excellent book worthy of being read & attended to [sic] studied by all who are in earnest servants of God & want to know & do both as members of the Church & State what is incumbent on them in order to obtain salvation.\(^{853}\)

Daubeny’s work was a High Church perspective on Church Unity and schism, topics which were on the mind of Bishop Abernethy Drummond following the legal toleration Scottish Episcopal Church. The bishop valued the tract for its proof that all Christians should be of one communion, and was inspired to produce an abridgement of Daubeny’s work aimed at Presbyterians and English ordained Episcopal clergy. His *Abridgment* proposed that the Scottish Episcopal Church is such a Church, as all Christians in this country, not only may, but are in duty bound to communicate with: Because if her communion is pure, and all Christians ought to be of one communion, (both points which the Editor imagines, is clearly proved in this little tract), then it follows, that all who are separated from her must be in the wrong, and are, for their own safety, obliged instantly to unite with her.\(^{854}\)

By Abernethy Drummond’s reasoning, the Scottish Episcopal Church was built on the purest and most primitive of Church principles, and therefore offered Christians the best chance to unite in pure communion, for their own salvation. The Scottish Episcopal Church was the answer to “heal the breach” in the Church of God caused by the disestablishment of episcopacy more than one hundred years previous.\(^{855}\)

Yet Bishop Abernethy Drummond recognised that in order for the Church to be united, the clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church must be educated in the proofs of its primitive doctrines, and in the arguments for church unity. His foundational bequest of books for the Brechin Diocesan Library was aimed at encouraging and providing for the sort of intellectual culture required to

---

\(^{853}\) Charles Daubeney, *A guide to the church, in several discourses: to which are added, two postscripts: the first, to those members of the church who occasionally frequent other places of public worship, the second, to the clergy.* (London: Printed for T. Cadell, Jun. and W. Davies 1798), annotated by Bishop Abernethy Drummond. Br U 283.42 D 235


\(^{855}\) *Ibid*, p.xx
uphold and defend the doctrines and identity of the native Scottish Episcopal Church. His inscriptions were a part of this. He intended for the annotation on his copy of Daubeny’s work to be read by the clergy of the diocese of Brechin and the diocese of Dunkeld and St Andrews. He desired for the book to be studied by the clergy, and for the idea of church unity to be given the proper attention it deserved.

When Bishop Abernethy Drummond donated his library to the Brechin Diocesan Library, the Church was undergoing a reconstruction of its identity, after cutting its ties with Jacobitism. For Abernethy Drummond – and indeed for other members of the Church, such as Bishop Jolly – this meant focusing on the Church’s true inheritance from the nonjurors: the recovery of the “liturgies of the pure and primitive Church of Christ.”856 These liturgies, as well as works by theologians defending them, were contained in Abernethy Drummond’s donation to the diocesan library. They were also a part of the library of the Rev. Alexander Jamieson, who in 1821 donated his library to form a second library in the diocese, in Brechin.

The thesis has established that the early years of the Brechin Diocesan Library were connected to this new era in the Church, and the desire of the clergy of the northeast to protect their connection to the most primitive Church, through the preservation of the doctrines they had inherited from the nonjurors. The key to this was ensuring that the future clergy of the Church were educated in these doctrines, especially that of the Scottish Communion Office. The books donated to the diocesan library were a part of the eighteen century clergy’s attempt to preserve the theology of the native High Church Episcopalians, which is also reflected in the annotations Bishop Jolly left in in books, for the students of the Church’s first theological college.

Bishop Abernethy Drummond gifted his books for the benefit of the future clergy of the Church, to ensure that they had access to books to pursue their studies. The library was designed to be a central point in the rural diocese of Brechin in which clergy could access the books required for their vocation. The rural character of the diocese was part of what made the library unique, and important in allowing clergy far from the city, in area dominated by Presbyterians, to borrow the books they needed. In order to fully understand the importance of this, this thesis began by investigating how the clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church accessed books before the diocesan library. It argued that expense, scarcity, and rural location affected the ability of the eighteenth century clergy to own or access all of the books required for their scholarly pursuits. Thus the intellectual culture of the Church, as well as the education of its clergy, relied on sharing books. Through exchanging books with each other, intellectual discussion was fostered between clergy.

856 Daubeny, An abridgement of the Reverend Charles Daubeny’s Guide to the Church, p.xvii
and views on topics such as ancient history and the eternal generation of the son were discussed through correspondence by clergy scattered all over Scotland.

Through this analysis, it was also revealed that the education of candidates for the holy orders relied on the more extensive libraries of senior clergy. Of particular importance were clergymen such as John Alexander (1694-1777), Bishop of Dunkeld, who granted access to his library to young ordinands. Access to books was integral for the education of the clergy, in a Church which lacked a formal system of education. This chapter also established that many of the books belonging to these senior clergymen were bequeathed to junior clergymen. This was demonstrated by examining books belonging to the Rev. Thomas Beatt, donated by him to the Brechin Diocesan Library. The ownership inscriptions on many of his books showed that they had previously belonged to the Rev. Patrick Gordon (1695-1755), the man who had initially educated Beatt for ordination. The passing down of these books was important for generations of clergy to have scholarly libraries, and for the establishment of public clerical libraries. The Brechin Diocesan library, as well as the Aberdeen Diocesan Library and Theological College, all initially relied on books collected by its nonjuring clergymen.

These insights were gained from examining the physical books of the Brechin Diocesan library, and for asking how and why they arrived on its shelves. One of the most important contributions this thesis has made to both the field of library history, and intellectual history, is demonstrating the wealth of evidence existing in physical books, and the insight that can be gained from taking into account book ownership, marginalia, and provenance inscriptions in our assessment of religious and intellectual cultures. This use of this evidence has allowed this thesis to interrogate the intellectual culture and identities of the Brechin Diocesan Library, and to understand the history of the Brechin Collection. It has also demonstrated that the study of a surviving library is not complete without the physical examination of its collections – studies that focus on the borrowings of a library but do not engage with where the books borrowed came from, or contextualise them in the history of the library, are missing an essential piece of evidence in their assessment. Furthermore, the institutional history of the collection is an important part of understanding the use of a library.

Chapter 1 provided this essential history of the Brechin Diocesan Library, and examined the circumstances of its establishment, as well how it was shaped and managed by the bishops and clergy of the diocese of Brechin. It showed that though the clergy were certainly influenced in their decision to found the library by the Church’s toleration, they were only afforded the opportunity to do so because of the generosity of Lord Gardenstone at Laurencekirk. It argued that the building
and endowment of a manse for the incumbent at Laurencekirk by Lord Gardenstone was vital component in the establishment of the library, as it provided somewhere warm and dry to store the books. It arguably also symbolised the promise of an era of renewal and recovery for newly tolerated Church. The future of the library was further secured by Bishop Abernethy Drummond’s bequest of over 600 books. By using the annotations left in William Drummond’s copy of *Scotichronicon*, chapter 1 further demonstrated that in providing an endowment for the Church, and the future of the diocese of Brechin, Lord Gardenstone had inspired Bishop Abernethy Drummond to donate his large library for the use of the clergy of the diocese of Brechin.857

Chapter 1 also showed how important structure and management is to a library, in order for it to be simply more than a collection of books. Bishop Gleig’s initial management of the library brought attention to its potential as a resource for education, but also supplied the structure necessary for it to function as a library. It was under his tenure that the library at Laurencekirk moved to a purpose built room, and rules for the library were established. Chapter 1 and Chapter 3 also showed the extent to which the library’s contents and use was shaped by the diocese’s bishop. Bishop Gleig cultivated the library as a tool for educating the clergy in the orthodox doctrines of the Church, especially the importance of the doctrine of Christian Revelation.

Indeed, the apostolic authority of the bishop clearly extended to the management of the library and its contents. Chapter 1 and 4 confirmed that it was Bishop Forbes who was instrumental in uniting the libraries of Laurencekirk and Brechin into one library, in order to develop Brechin as the intellectual centre of the diocese. He ensured that the library was stocked with up to date works, pertaining to topics affecting the contemporary Anglican Church. However, due to the urban ministry of Bishop Forbes, the real centre of the diocese was Dundee. Chapter 1 and 4 revealed that there was a hitherto unrecognised library at Dundee, built on the books of the Tractarian clergymen the Rev. Archibald Wilson. This was of more geographic convenience for the clergy in Dundee, and was used by them until it closed in 1875. Indeed, by the early twentieth century, Brechin was a very inconvenient place for the library, which along with the lack of modern additions to the library, led to its decline.

---

In order to understand the contents of the library, and to examine the books borrowed from the library, Chapter 2 provided an intellectual and historical framework of the eighteenth and nineteenth century Church. Its analysis proved that even if a book was not borrowed by a user of the library, understanding how and why it arrived on its shelves reveals something of its reception and meaning to different generations of the Church. Chapter 2 also added to existing literature on the theology of the eighteenth-century Church by using annotations and book ownership to draw attention to works hitherto unrecognised as important to clergy. An examination of ownership inscriptions on surviving copies of John Sage’s *The Reasonableness of Toleration* revealed the importance of the work to Episcopal clergy, and argued that it was a more practical and enduringly valuable work than Sage’s better-known work, *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*. Provenance inscriptions on the latter work were used to argue that it was in the nineteenth century that *Principles of the Cyprianic Age* acquired a reputation for symbolising nonjuring identity and theology. Though it was clearly an important text in the formation of the nonjuring Church’s principles on Church Government, other works by Sage were equally useful to the clergy. This method of analysis showed that provenance inscriptions are valuable in assessing how books were used, and how their meaning changed over time.

This chapter also discussed in detail the construction of the nonjuring identity of the Church, and the scholarly works which represented this identity. It gave a detailed analysis of the components of the Scottish Communion Office and Church Government, and used annotated examples of scholarly works by nonjurors, to demonstrate how these works represented a native Scottish High Churchmanship. Robert Keith’s *Catalogue of Bishops of the Several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland* was used as an example of a text which was admired both for its usefulness, and its symbolism. The work represented and protected the Scottish Episcopal Church’s connection early Christianity in Scotland, and affirmed the legitimacy and legacy of its bishops. The analysis of annotations in this chapter revealed that works authored by Scottish Episcopalian nonjurors tended to attract annotations from Episcopal clergymen and lay persons, who used the physical books as a way of archiving the past, as well as defending aspects of its doctrines against the threat of Anglicisation. This was further shown in chapter 2 through an examination of Jolly’s copy of Archibald Campbell’s *The doctrines of a middle state between death and the resurrection*.

The book was inscribed by Jolly with quotes from protestant theologians, distancing it from its associations with Roman Catholicism, to demonstrate that praying for the dead was a protestant doctrine, arguably in an attempt by Jolly to defend and protect this component of the Scottish Communion Office. Indeed,

---

858 Campbell, *The doctrines of a middle state between death and the resurrection* (1721), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly. 2951
though like Abernethy Drummond, Jolly’s books were designed to educate on the High Church principles of the Church, they were annotated by Jolly with the view that the nonjuring theology and history of the Church was under threat. By using ownership inscriptions and annotations, a more complete canon of books important to native Scottish High Churchmanship has been unearthed, which will contribute to further analysis of Episcopal libraries, such as the Aberdeen Diocesan Library, as well as the Church’s intellectual culture.

By exploring the preservation of this nonjuring identity in Scottish Episcopal libraries, this thesis has contributed to understandings of the religious and intellectual culture developed throughout the nineteenth century in the diocese of Brechin. It has shown that for some, like Bishop Gleig, the theology of the nonjurors was secondary to the threats posed to the Anglican Communion by Unitarians, and challenges to High Church doctrines. For Bishop Alexander Penrose Forbes, who struggled with accepting that his Anglo-Catholic values were not those of the Church, the library was cultivated as a place which embodied Catholic Truths. Indeed, the most constant feature of the library, is its use by its Bishops to uphold the Church doctrines they felt were integral to Christian unity and salvation. Both Gleig and Forbes created a plan of study for their clergy, and intended that the library would be used to fulfil it, thus attempting to create an intellectual culture in the diocese through the use of the library.

Education has been a central theme of this thesis, both in terms of the values annotated books attempted to cultivate, and how the Brechin Diocesan Library was used for the education of the clergy. Indeed, anchoring this study in the Brechin Diocesan Library has allowed this thesis to explore the informal system of education in the Church, and to contribute to the historiography of the Scottish Episcopal Church in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Chapter 3 established the specific requirements for candidates for the holy orders, showing the focus on primitive Church doctrines in the first half of the eighteenth century. It argued that the educational requirements and education of deacons and priests was impacted in the later eighteenth century by the poor status of the Church and its lack of clergy. Bishop Gleig hoped that the diocesan library would help to solve the clergy’s ignorance, and provided a plan of reading to accomplish this.

Subsequently Chapter 3 used the borrowing registers of the libraries at Laurencekirk and Brechin to show that the using the library was a vital part of the education of young ordinands in the diocese. It argued that this was a consequence of the need for clergy in the diocese of Brechin, combined with the informal system of education within the Church. The use of the library as an educational tool was examined through a case study of two Candidates for the Holy Orders in the
diocese of Brechin. This chapter argued that Gleig’s ideal clergyman was well read on topics impacting the entire Anglican Communion, such as the assault on the divine inspiration of the bible, primarily by the Unitarians but also by Scottish Enlightenment thinkers such as David Hume. Gleig was more concerned with this than directing to the clergy towards understanding and defending the Scottish Communion Office.

In contrast to this was his successor, Bishop David Moir, who took an active part in directing the studies of the Rev. Alexander Simpson (1815–1871) towards works such as John Johnson’s *The Unbloody Sacrifice, and altar, unval’d and supported*, which supported the nonjuror’s virtualist interpretation of the sacrifice in the Eucharist. This chapter demonstrated the different identities which were supported in the diocesan library through its management by the Bishops of the diocese. It also highlighted the limitations of this, as the borrowings of the Rev. William Webster revealed his circumstances dictated that his most pressing educational need was to learn the basics of interpreting the scripture and composing sermons. Essentially the library provided him with the skills necessary to serve his congregation, rather than the greater good of the entire Anglican Church, as Gleig intended.

Chapter 4 also used the records of the library, including the acquisition of books and the borrowing registers, to assess the clergy’s engagement with the theological controversies of the wider Anglican Church in the second half of the nineteenth century. It focused on Tractarianism, Baptismal Regeneration, and the Catholic reunion. The first half of the chapter revealed that the clergy were engaged with the Oxford movement before the arrival of Bishop Forbes, who hitherto been assumed to have introduced the clergy to its theology. The chapter argued that the acquisitions and borrowings of the library show that while similarities between the Scottish Episcopalian Church and the Tractarians have been overstated, the engagement of the Scottish Episcopal Clergy with the intellectual outputs of the Tractarians has been underestimated. Previous assessments of this engagement limited their analysis by using only the *Tracts for the Times* as a measure of engagement, and primarily focused on the bishop’s interaction with it. The diocesan library affords the unique opportunity to assess the lesser clergy’s interaction with the Tractarians, and this chapter showed that they did this by subscribing to periodicals, and purchasing pamphlets written by the early Oxford movement adherents, which were circulated throughout the diocese.

The chapter also looked at the role of Forbes in the management of the library in the second half of the nineteenth century, and the role he intended for it. By looking at the books acquired by the library under Forbes tenure, and relating them events in the Church of England, it was revealed that Forbes’ intended to use the library as a tool for educating the clergy against contemporary
threats to High Church doctrines. He encouraged the clergy to engage with contemporary debates, such as the Gorham controversy, in which the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration was challenged, as well as the spiritual authority of the Church of England’s bishops. Significantly, works relating to this, such as Wilberforce’s *Doctrine of Holy Baptism*, were purchased for the library by Forbes, in an attempt to arm clergy with the knowledge necessary to defend the Church’s doctrines.\(^859\) A gap in the borrowing registers prevented an examination of the extent to which Forbes’ clergy read the books he purchased

Forbes saw the library as a vehicle for promoting the Christian truths integral to his faith, which he also believed were essential for the future of the Church. His acquisitions for the library in the period following his *Primary Charge*, as well as in the aftermath of the Vatican Council’s decision on Papal infallibility, are evidence of his vision for the library as a place for the clergy to educate themselves on Catholic Truth. He encouraged the clergy to follow a system of education designed to aid them in their duty of upholding these truths against the threat of disbelief, and took on the education of the Rev. George Grub to ensure he was educated properly. The borrowing registers show that a number of Forbes’ clergy engaged with the materials he directed them towards, and are further evidence that the diocese of Brechin’s library was integral to the diocese’s intellectual culture.

This thesis has examined the registers of the Brechin Diocesan Library with a specific focus in mind, namely the extent to which the library was used for the education of young clergy, as well as the extent to which the library was used to fulfil the educational plans of Bishops Gleig and Forbes. This was a necessary limitation, as interpreting the borrowing of clergy requires that each book borrowed be examined within the larger context of the historical and contemporary circumstances of the Church. This has been demonstrated by the case studies used in this thesis. The primary focus of this thesis was not to see exactly what the clergy was reading, but to examine the intellectual culture stimulated by the library, and the theological identities it contained. Furthermore, what was examined in this thesis required a large amount of original research to contextualise and understand it, such as a history of the diocesan library, details of how clergy in the Church were educated, as well as an understanding of theological developments such as Tractarianism. Thus, there is still scope for a large-scale analysis of the borrowing registers of the Brechin Diocesan Library. However, this thesis has arguably provided the groundwork for this to be achieved. It has also shown that the meaning and purpose of a library of Episcopal libraries starts before the borrowing of books.

---

\(^{859}\) Robert Isaac Wilberforce *The Doctrine of Holy Baptism...* 2nd ed. (London: J. Murray, 1849)
In his work *Books as History: the Importance of Books beyond their Texts*, David Pearson wrote that “a book can be written in, defaced, altered, beautified or cherished to produce a preservable object with an individual history.” This thesis has shown that the Brechin Diocesan Library and the Jolly collection are full of such preservable objects, created by their clergy through their ownership inscriptions and annotations, and valued for them by generations of clergy. The importance of these books beyond their texts to the clergy is illustrated by the Rev. Alexander Jamieson, who, in 1821, gave his books to the diocese of Brechin to form a second diocesan library. When arranging his bequest, he advised the Rev. David Moir that his copy of Stillingfleet’s *Origines Sacrae* “is a good book, tho not a good copy; but I value it because it belonged to my excellent friend Bishop Forbes.” It is further exemplified by Bishop Alexander Jolly, who collected works belonging to Bishop Archibald Campbell and labelled the former’s annotations, and by the Rev. George Skene, who valued works owned and inscribed by Bishop Thomas Rattray.

The significance of this provenance did not go unnoticed by the nineteenth-century clergyman, the Rev. John Moir, Dean of the diocese of Brechin. As this thesis has shown, Moir added his name to the chain of episcopal provenance found on the title pages of many of the books he owned. His copy of L’Estrange’s *The Alliance of Divine Offices* was inscribed by the nonjurors Bishop John Falconar (1660-1723), Bishop Thomas Rattray (1684-1743), and the Rev. George Skene (d.1797). His Greek new testament had been owned not only by Rattray and Skene, but also by Bishop John Sage (1652-1711), author of the *Principles of the Cyprianic Age*. Significantly, when Join Moir inscribed his name in these books, the nonjuring theology of the Church created and promoted by these other inscribers, was being eradicated by the anglicisation of the Church.

---

861 Emphasis mine. Br MS 4/6/5/2 Alex Jamieson, Glasgow to David Moir, Brechin, 18th October 1821. The work was not part of Jamieson’s initial bequest (See 1846 Catalogue, p. 58). In the letter Jamieson says the work was in the hands of the Rev. Robert Spark. Every copy of this work in the contemporary Brechin Collection was examine for the provenance of the Rev. Jamieson and Bishop Robert Forbes, but it does not appear to have made it into the library.


862 Hamon L'Estrange, *The alliance of divine offices, exhibiting all the liturgies of the Church of England, since the Reformations: also the late Scotch service-book…The third edition. To which are added, in this edition, the form of ordination &c. Additions and alterations in the ligirt{y} &c…* (London : printed for Ch. Brome, at the Gun at the west end of St. Paul’s, 1699.), annotated by Bishop Falconer, Bishop Rattray, the. Rev George Skene, and the. Rev John Moir. Br UQ 264.03

The analysis of Bishop Jolly’s library and marginalia in chapter 5 provided further evidence of Rowan Strong’s claim that “native Episcopal identity was a great deal more energetic than historians have credited it.” Jolly’s annotations illuminate one of the ways in which this preservation was attempted, as well as the variety of threats to native Scottish Episcopal theology. Jolly’s reverence for the Church Fathers and defence of their use as interpreters of the scripture is clear from his annotations endorsing them, and it is also evidence of his worry of the influence of Evangelical element of the Church. His concern that the future clergy of the Church will prefer the English Communion Office to the Scottish is clear from his annotations endorsing the latter. His method for achieving this was to show that the Scottish doctrines were endorsed and supported by English Church Divines, and did not negatively distinguish the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Church of England.

Bishop Jolly’s books also revealed his concern that the history of the nonjurors and their contributions to theology would be forgotten, or indeed misrepresented by those who sought conformity with the Church of England. This was also reflected the use of books by Bishop Robert Forbes, who added additional material to the scholarly works of nonjurors such as Bishop Keith and Bishop Rattray, to ensure their legacy was maintained. This thesis has argued that the ownership inscriptions discussed above were also a part of this archival practise, used to maintain a connection with the formative years of the Church. The use of these annotations has added another dimension to our understanding of Episcopal intellectual culture and identity, and shown that books were a place for clergy to archive the past, to maintain their native Scottish Episcopal identity, and to save it for future generations, so it was not forgotten.

Perhaps one of the most important contributions this thesis has made is to the field of library history. It has provided a serious historical investigation of Scottish Episcopalians and their religious and intellectual culture, and achieved this through the lens of the Brechin Diocesan Library. It goes against Alistair Black’s argument that for serious analysis, library history must reconstruct itself as ‘information history’ or find a place for itself in ‘book history,’ or another sub discipline. This thesis has not been limited by its anchorage in the institution of a library, but enriched by it. Furthermore, its investigation of the Brechin Diocesan Library has demonstrated the potential the study of libraries offers for scholarship on intellectual and religious culture, especially the wealth of evidence offered by the surviving contents of a library. Simply by asking

865 Black, ‘Information and Modernity: The History of Information and the Eclipse of Library History’ *Library History*
how a book arrived in the library, and who, if anyone, read it, opens up a wide range of possible avenues for investigations, and opportunities for original contribution to knowledge. Clearly, the surviving libraries of Scotland's clergy offer a valuable source of evidence for studying their intellectual and theological developments, which this thesis has contributed to the understanding of.
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Forbes, John.

- Instructiones historico-theologicae, de doctrina Christiana & vario rerum statu, ortisque erroribus & controversiis, jam inde a temporibus Apostolicis, ad tempora usque seculi decimi-septimi priora. Prece & studio Ioannis Forbesii ... (Amstelodami : Apud Ludovicum Elzevirium M DC XLV. [1645]), with the signature of “Ana Melvill.” Donated by Bishop Abernethy Drummond. Br UQ 230.3 F 693


Gregory I, Pope. Sancti Gregorii Papae I, cognomento Magni, opera omnia : ad manuscriptos codices Romanos, Gallicanos, Anglicanos emendata, aucta, & illustrata notis. ed. Guillaume Bessin. (Parisii:


Hickes, George.

- *Several letters which passed between Dr. George Hickes, and a Popish priest, upon occasion of a young gentlewoman's departing from the Church of England to that of Rome. To which is added, I. The answer of Dr. Bull, now Bishop of St. Davids, to a query of the Bishop of Meaux. II. Mr. Lesley's answer to the same query. III. A letter written to an English priest at Rome. With an appendix containing several remarkable papers.* (London: printed by W.B. for Richard Sare, at Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn, 1705.), annotated by the Rev. Patrick Gordon and Rev. Thomas Beatt. Br U 282 H 628

- *The constitution of the Catholick Church, and the nature and consequences of schism: set forth in a collection of papers, written by the late R. Reverend George Hickes, D.D. ([London?]: [s.n.], Printed in the Year, MDCCXVI, [1716]), Br U 283.42 H 628

- *Three short treatises, viz. I. A modest plea for the clergy, &c. II. A sermon of the sacerdotal benediction, &c. III. A discourse published to undeceive the people in point of tithes, &c. Formerly printed, and now again published [sic] by Dr. George Hickes, in defense of the priesthood…* (London: printed for W. Taylor, 1709.), annotated by Bishop George Hickes. Br U 262 H 628

- Another copy, annotated by the Rev. Archibald Wilson


Innes, George.


Johnson, John. The unbloody sacrifice, and altar, unveiled and supported: In which the nature of the Eucharist is explain'd according to the sentiments of the Christian church in the four first centuries… (London: printed for Robert Knaplock, at the Bishop's-Head, in St. Paul's Church-Yard, MDCCXIV. [1714]), annotated by Bishop David Moir. Br U 265.3

Keith, Robert.

- Another copy, annotated by Bishop David Moir.
- Another copy, annotated by the Rev. Archibald Wilson
- A large new catalogue of the bishops of the several sees within the Kingdom of Scotland, down to the year 1688. Instructed by proper and authentic Vouchers: Together With Some other Things necessary to the better Knowledge of the Ecclesiastical State of this Kingdom in former Times: AS Also, A brief Preface concerning the first planting of Christianity in Scotland, and the State of that Church in the earlier Ages. (Edinburgh: printed by Tho. and Wal. Ruddimans, and sold by the booksellers in town, M.D.CC.LV. [1755]) annotated by the Rev. Alexander Jamieson. Br U 922.341 K


L'Estrange, Hamon. The alliance of divine offices, exhibiting all the liturgies of the Church of England, since the Reformation: as also the late Scotch service-book…The third edition. To which are added, in this edition, the form of ordination &c. Additions and alterations in the liturgy &c…(London: printed for Ch. Brome, at the Gun at the west end of St. Paul's, 1699.), annotated by Bishop Falconar, Bishop Rattray, the Rev. George Skene, and the. Rev John Moir. Br UQ 264.03


Parkhurst, John. *An Hebrew and English Lexicon, without points: in which the Hebrew and Chaldee words of the Old Testament are explained in their leading and derived senses...* (London: printed for Robinson 1742.), Br UQ 492.4 P 246

- Another copy, annotated by Sir John Wedderburn


Sage, John. - *The fundamental charter of Presbytery, as it has been lately established in the kingdom of Scotland, examin'd and disproov'd, by the history, records, and publick transactions of our nation. The second edition. To which is added, a preface; wherein the vindicator of the Kirk is freely put in mind of his habitual infirmities. And contents of the whole never before printed. By the author of The Cyprianic age.* (London: printed for C. Brome, at the Gun, at the West End of St. Paul's Church-yard, 1697.), owned by Bishop Abernethy Drummond. Br U 285.241
- *The principles of the Cyprianic age, with regard to episcopal power and jurisdiction: asserted and recommended from the genuine writings of St. Cyprian himself, and his contemporaries. By which it is made evident, that the vindicator of the Kirk of Scotland is obligated by his own concessions to
acknowledge, that he and his associates are schismaticks. In a letter to a friend. By J.S. (London: printed for Walter Kettily at the Bishop's Head in St. Paul's Church-yard, MDCXCV. [1695]) annotated by Alexander Jamieson. Br U 262.12
- Another copy annotated by the Rev. William Christie and bound with Sages 'Vindication (1701)
- Another copy, annotated by Rev. William Seton, Rev George Skene and Rev. John Moir
- A vindication of a discourse entituled The principles of the Cyprianic age, with regard to episcopal power and jurisdiction: being a reply to Gilbert Rule's Cyprianic bishop examin'd and found not to be a diocesan... (London: printed by G. Croom for Robert Clavel at the Peacock at the west end of St. Pauls, and George Strahan at the Golden-Ball overagainst the Royal Exchange, MDCCI. [1701]), annotated by James Robertson, Esquire of Lude 1759. Br U 262. 12
- Another copy, annotated by John Hay Forbes, Lord Medwyn (1776-1854)


'Sermons etc' containing multiple printed pamphlets bound in one volume, Br 252.03 R 178

Skinner, John. The office for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; or, Holy Communion according to the use of the Episcopal Church in Scotland: with a preliminary dissertation on the doctrine of the Eucharistical sacrifice, a copious local illustration and an appendix, containing the collation of offices, etc., drawn up by the late Dr. Samuel Horsley, Lord Bishop of St. Asaph (Aberdeen: Printed by J. Chalmers and Company, 1807.), annotated by the Rev. John Moir. Br U 265.3 S 628

Stillingfleet, Edward.
- Origines Sacrae: or a rational account of the grounds of natural and reveal'd religion. 7th edn. (Cambridge, Cambridge : Printed at the University-Press, for Henry Mortlock, at the sign of the Phœnix in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1702.), with the ownership stamp of the Rev. Arch Wilson. Br UF 210 S. 857
- Another copy with the bookplate of George Lockhart of Carnwath, Br UF 210 S. 857

Tillotson, John.
- The second and last part of the devout Christian's companion... (London : Printed for E. Curl ; E. Sanger ; and R. Gosling ,1711), Br U 249

‘Tracts for the times’ containing multiple issues of the pamphlet *Tracts for the Times* (1839-1866), bound in five volumes, with the bookplate of Bishop Alexander Penrose Forbes. Br 265.3 E 86


Glasgow University Library

MS Murray 148 (5): To Reverend Arthur Petrie from Alexander Jolly (Turiff, December 12th 1782)

Lambeth Palace Library

Andrewes, Lancelot.


- *Private prayers for every day in the week, and for the several parts of each day: Translated from the Greek devotions of Bishop Andrews, with additions. By George Stanhope, D.D. late dean of Canterbury. Ed. George Stanhope.* (London : Printed for Richard Williamson near Grays-


Hickes, George. *The spirit of popery speaking out of the mouths of phanatical Protestants*… (London : printed by H. Hills, and are to be sold by Walter Kittleby, at the Bishops-head in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1680.), annotated by Bishop George Hickes, with the bookplate of Bishop Archibald Campbell. B46.21 H52


National Library of Scotland

Andrewes, Lancelot.
- *Institutiones piae* Holy devotions: with directions to pray. Also a brief exposition upon the Lords prayer, the Creed, the Ten commandments, the 7 penitential psalms, the 7 psalms of thanksgiving, together with a letany. By the Right Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrews late Bishop of Winchester. 6th edn. (London : printed by Andrew Clark, for Charles Harper, and are to be sold by him at the Flower de Luce, over against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleetstreet, 1675.), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.2192
- *Private prayers for every day in the week, and for the several parts of each day: Translated from the Greek devotions of Bishop Andrews, with additions. By George Stanhope, D.D. late dean of Canterbury.* Ed. George Stanhope. (London : Printed for Richard Williamson near Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn, MDCCXXX. [1730]), annotated by Bishop Alexander Jolly. Jolly.2462

The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments (Edinburgh : Printed by James Watson, printer to the King's most Excellent Majesty., MDCCXXII. [1722]), annotated by Bishop Abernethy Drummond. Dowd. 942(1)


Campbell, Archibald. *Some primitive doctrines reviv'd The doctrines of a middle state between death and the resurrection: of Prayers for the Dead: And the Necessity of Purification; plainly proved from the Holy Scriptures; and the Writings of the Fathers of the Primitive Church: And acknowledged by several Learned Fathers, and Great Divines of the Church of England, and others, since the Reformation...* (London : printed for the author, and sold by Mr. W. Tayler at the Ship in Pater-Noster-Row., MDCCXXI. [1721]), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.1110


Dodwell, Henry. *A discourse concerning the one altar and the one priesthood insisted on by the ancients in their disputes against schism...* (London : printed for Benj. Tooke, at the Ship in S. Paul's Church-Yard, 1683.), annotated by the Rev. Robert Lyon, Bishop George Innes, and Bishop Alexander Jolly. Jolly.623


Innes, George.

- Fourteen discourses on practical subjects (London: printed for J. Murray, 1783), Jolly.733
- The nature and constitution of the Christian church ... with a postscript containing some remarks on a late pamphlet, entitled, A vindication of the licensed chapels in Scotland ([s.n?]: Printed in the year, 1750.), annotated by Bishop Alexander Jolly. Jolly.1840

Keith, Robert.

- A large new catalogue of the bishops of the several sees within the Kingdom of Scotland, down to the year 1688. Instructed by proper and authentic Vouchers: Together With Some other Things necessary to the better Knowledge of the Ecclesiastical State of this Kingdom in former Times: AS Also, A brief Preface concerning the first planting of Christianity in Scotland, and the State of that Church in the earlier Ages. (Edinburgh: printed by Tho. and Wal. Ruddimans, and sold by the booksellers in town, M.D.C.C.LV. [1755]), annotated by Bishop Robert Forbes. MS 21196


Nelson, Robert. The practice of true devotion, In relation to the end, as well as the means of religion. With an office for the Holy Communion. By Robert Nelson, Esq; the sixth edition. To which is added, the character of the author. (London: Printed and sold by Jos. Downing Bartholomew-Close near West-Smithfield, 1724.), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.2163

Rattray, Thomas.

- The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem: being the liturgy of St. James, freed from all latter additions and interpolations... (London: printed by James Bettenham 1744), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.2834
- Another copy, annotated by Bishop Jolly, with additional material in the hand of Bishop Rattray. Jolly.2833(1)
- Another copy
- Some particular instructions concerning the Christian covenant, and the mysteries by which it is transacted and maintained. (London: Printed by James Bettenham; and sold by George Strahan, at the Golden Ball in Cornhill, MDCCXLI.VIII. [1748]), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.2468

Reeves, William. The Apologies of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Minutius Felix. In Defence of the Christian Religion, with the Commonitory of Vincentius Lirinensis, ... Together with a Prefatory Dissertation ... By

Robertson, William. The history of Scotland : during the reigns of Queen Mary, and of King James VI. till his accession to the crown of England... (London : printed for the booksellers, 1794.), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.1183

Sage, John.

- A vindication of a discourse entituled The principles of the Cyprianic age, with regard to episcopal power and jurisdiction: being a reply to Gilbert Rule's Cyprianic bishop examin'd and found not to be a diocesan... (London : printed by G. Croom for Robert Clavel at the Peacock at the west end of St. Pauls, and George Strahan at the Golden-Ball overagainst the Royal Exchange, MDCCI. [1701]), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.2577(1)

- The principles of the Cyprianic age, with regard to episcopal power and jurisdiction: asserted and recommended from the genuine writings of St. Cyprian himself, and his contemporaries. By which it is made evident, that the vindicator of the Kirk of Scotland is obligated by his own concessions to acknowledge, that he and his associates are schismatics. In a letter to a friend. By J.S. (London : printed for Walter Kettily at the Bishop's Head in St. Paul's Church-yard, MDCXCV. [1695]), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.2577(2)

- The principles of the cyprianic age, with regard to episcopal power and jurisdiction, asserted and recommended from the genuine writings of S. Cyprian himself, and his contemporaries. By which it is made evident, that the vindicator of the Kirk of Scotland is obliged by his own concessions to acknowledge, that he and his associates are schismatics. In a letter to a friend. By J.S. 2nd edn. (London : Printed for Walter Kettily, and sold by Richard Wilkin at the King's-Head in S. Paul's Church-yard, MDCCXVII. [1717]), annotated by Bishop Alexander Jolly. Jolly.897(2)

Stonhouse, James. The sick man's friend; or Helps for conversation between the sick, and those, who may attend them. To which are added, suitable prayers. By James Stonhouse, M.D. formerly of St. John's College, Oxford; rector of great and Little Cheverel, Wiltshire, (London : Printed for John, Francis, & Charles Rivington, at No. 62, in St. Paul's Church-Yard; sold by E. Palmer, in Wine-Street, Bristol; and to be had likewise of the booksellers in the country on a short notice, 1788.), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.2311


Waterland, Daniel.

- Regeneration stated and explained according to Scripture and antiquity (London : printed for W. Innys and R. Manby, 1740), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.1001(7)

the West End of St. Paul's Church-Yard, MDCCXXXIV. [1734]), annotated by Bishop Jolly. Jolly.796
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Printed Works Published Before 1880


- A manual of the private devotions and meditations of The Right Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrews, late Lord Bishop of Winchester... (London: printed by W.D. for Humphrey Moseley at the Prince’s Arms in S. Pauls Church-yard, MDCXLVIII. [1648])

Barrow, Isaac. A treatise of the Pope’s supremacy. To which is added a discourse concerning the unity of the Church... (London: printed by Miles Flesher, for Brabazon Aylmer, at the Three Pigeons over against the Royall Exchange, in Cornhill, M DC LXXX. [1680])

Birckbek, Simon. The Protestants evidence, taken out of good records; shewing that for fifteeene hundred yeares next after Christ, divers worthy guides of Gods Church, have in sundry weightie poynts of religion, taught as the Church of England now doth: distributed into severall centuries and opened... (London: printed [by Augustine Mathewes and Thomas Cotes] for Robert Milbourne, and are to bee sold at the signe of the Grayhound in Pauls Church-yard, 1635.)


Blunt, John James. On the right use of the early fathers: two series of lectures, delivered in the University of Cambridge (London: J. Murray, 1857)

Brett, Thomas. Some remarks on Dr. Waterland’s Review of the doctrine of the Eucharist, &c. With Regard to the seeming Difference between Him and Mr. Johnson’s, concerning the Sacrifice and some other Points... (London: printed by James Bettenham; and sold by A. Bettesworth and C. Hitch, at the Red-Lion in Pater-Noster-Row, MDCC.xxxviii. [1738])


The British magazine and monthly register of religious and ecclesiastical information, parochial history, and documents respecting the state of the poor, progress of education, etc. (London: John Turrill 1832-1849), Vol. 20, 1841


Burnet, Gilbert. *A discourse of the pastoral care...* (Glasgow: Printed by Robert and Andrew Foulis, 1762)

Burton, Edward. *An inquiry into the heresies of the apostolic age; in eight sermons preached before the University of Oxford, in the year MDCCXXIX., at the lecture founded by the Rev. John Bampton* (Oxford, 1829)


Catalogue of the Scottish Episcopal Church Library (1863) (Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Anderson. MDCCCLXIII.)

Campbell, George. *Lectures on ecclesiastical history: To which is added, an essay on Christian temperance and self-denial* (London: Printed for J. Johnson, St. Paul's Church-Yard, and A. Brown, Aberdeen, by Bye and Law, St. John's Square, Clerkenwell 1800) 2 vols

Campbell, George Douglas. *Presbytery examined: an essay, critical and historical, on the ecclesiastical history of Scotland since the Reformation* 2nd ed. (London: Edward Moxon 1849)

Cardwell, E. *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England; being a collection of injunctions, declarations, orders, articles of inquiry,...* from the year 1546 to the year 1716: with notes historical and explanatory (Oxford: at the University Press, 1844) 2 vols


Collier, Jeremy. *Reasons for Restoring Some Prayers and Directions: As They Stand in the Communion-service of the First English Reform'd Liturgy, Compiled by the Bishops in the... Reign of King Edward VI* (London: Printed for John Morphew, near Stationers-Hall. MDCCXVII. [1717])


Episcopal Church in Scotland, *The communion office for the use of the Church of Scotland, as far as concerneth the ministration of that holy sacrament. Authorized by K. Charles I. Anno 1636.* (Edinburgh: printed by Mr. Thomas Ruddiman, 1724.)


The Gentleman’s Magazine and Historical Chronicle. From January to June, 1827. Volume XCVII (Being the Twentieth of a New Series.) Part the First , June 1827, (London: Printed by J.B Nichols, 1827)

Gleig, George. *Directions for the study of theology : in a series of letters from a bishop to his son on his admission into holy orders* (London: printed for Thomas Cadell ... and William Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1827)


Hales, William. *A new analysis of chronology : in which an attempt is made to explain the history and antiquities of the primitive nations of the world, and the prophecies relating to them* (London : Printed for the author and sold by F.C. & J. Rivington 1809-1812), 4 Vols.


Hickes, George. *The Constitution of the Catholic Church and the Nature and Consequences of Schism*, ([London?] : [s.n.], Printed in the Year, MDCCXVI, [1716])

- *George Hickes, Two treatises: one of the Christian priesthood, the other of the dignity of the Episcopal order; an answer to the deist Matthew Tindal's Rights of the Christian Church, 1706*.
  (London : printed by W.B. for Richard Sare at Grays-Inn Gate in Holborn,

Hole, Matthew. *Practical discourses upon the collects, epistles and gospels to be us'd thro'-out the year : In three parts...* (London: Printed by J.D. for T. Varnam and J. Osborn, 1716) 3 vols.


Jolly, Alexander. *A friendly address to the episcopalianes of Scotland, on baptismal regeneration: shewing, that it is the doctrine of scripture, of the earliest and purest christian antiquity, and of the reformed Episcopal church, as expressed in its liturgy: attention to which is earnestly recommended , as the best guard against the dangerous
deviations of modern times ((Aberdeen : Printed for A. Brown & Co. ; Edinburgh: Bell and Bradfute ;
London: C. and J. Rivington, MDCCC.XXVI. [1826]))

- Observations upon the several Sunday services and principal holydays prescribed by the Liturgy
throughout the year; with a few general remarks upon the design of the inferior holydays… 3rd edn.
(Edinburgh : Robert Grant and Son, 1840)

- The Christian sacrifice in the Eucharist : considered as it is the doctrine of Holy Scripture : embraced by
the Universal church of the first and purest times, by the Church of England and by the Episcopal
Church in Scotland. (Aberdeen : Printed for A. Brown and Co. Aberdeen; Robert Grant
and Sons, Edinburgh; and C. J. G. and F. Rivington, London, MDCCCXXXI [1831]),

Jones, William. A course of lectures on the figurative language of the Holy Scripture (London: Printed for
the Author, and sold by J.F. and C. Rivington, 1787)

- The Scholar Armed Against the Errors of the Time; or collection of Tracts on the Principles and
Evidences of Christianity, the Constitution of the Church, and the Authority of Civil Government
(London: Society for the Reformation of Principles, Printed for F. and C. Rivington,
1795), 2 vols.

Kaye, John. The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, illustrated from the writings of

- Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria (London: : Printed for J. G.
& F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall., 1835)

- Some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr 3rd ed. (London : F. and J.
Rivington, 1853)

- Some account of the Council of Nicea, : in connection with the life of Athanasius (London : Francis
& John Rivington, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, 1853)


Lancaster, William Thomas. The harmony of the law and the Gospel with regard to the doctrine of a future
state (Oxford: Printed at the University Press for J. Parker, 1825)

Lapide, Cornelius. R. P. C. Corenlii a Lapide e societate Jesu ... commentarii in Scripturam Sacram
(Lugduni.. Apud J B Pelagaud et Socios, 1854), 10 vols.

Larkin, Edward. Speculum patrum: = a looking-glasse of the Fathers, wherein, you may see each of them
drawn, characterized, and displayed in their colours… (London : printed for Henry Eversden, at the
Greyhound in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1659.)

Lawson, John Parker. History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the present time
(Edinburgh : Gallie and Bayley, George Street. London: James Burns, Portman Street, Portman

Leslie, Charles. A view of the times, their principles and practices: in the first volume of the Rehearsals. By
Philaletes. (London : printed for W. Bowen, near St. Paul's, MDCCL. [1750])

Magee, William. Discourses and dissertations on the Scriptural doctrines of atonement & sacrifice… 3rd edn.

- *Monumenta ritualia ecclesiae Anglicaean : or, Occasional offices of the church of England according to the ancient use of Salisbury, the Prymer in English, and other prayers and forms with dissertations and notes* (London : William Pickering 1846-1847), 3 vols.


Moberly, George. *The sayings of the great forty days, between the Resurrection and Ascension, regarded as the outlines of the kingdom of God : in five discourses, with an examination of Mr. Newman’s theory of developments…3rd edn.* (London: Francis & John Rivington, 1846)


- *An Earnest plea for the retention of the Scotch Liturgy…* (Aberdeen : Reprinted and published for the Scottish Church Union by A. Brown & Co. ; Edinburgh : S.S. Anderson ; London : J. Masters & Son, 1873.)


Owen, Robert. *An introduction to the study of dogmatic theology* (London: Joseph Masters, 1858)


- *Origines Liturgicae, Or, Antiquities of the English Ritual…2nd ed.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1836)
Pearson, Edward. *Remarks on the theory of morals: in which is contained an examination of the theoretical part of Dr. Paley's "Principles of moral and political philosophy* (Ipswich: Printed and sold by M Jermyn etc, 1800)

Prideaux, Humphrey. *The old and New Testament connected in the history of the Jews and neighbouring nations, from the Declension of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah to the Time of Christ...* 2nd edn. (London: printed for R. Knaplock at the Bishop's Head in St. Paul's Church-Yard, and J. Tonson at Shakespear's Head over-against Catherine-Street in the Strand, MDCCXVI. [1716])

Purchas, John. *Directorium Anglicanum: being a manual of directions for the right celebration of the Holy Communion, for the saying of Matins and Evensong, and for the performance of other rites and ceremonies... according to ancient uses of the Church of England; with plan of chancel and illustrations...* (London: Joseph Masters, 1858)


Scottish Episcopal Church, *The Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland* (Edinburgh: R. Grant & Son, MDCCCLXIII [1863])


Shuckford, Samuel. *The sacred and prophane history of the world connected, from the creation of the world to the dissolution of the Assyrian empire at the Death of Sardanapalus...* (London: printed for R. Knaplock in St. Paul's Church-Yard, and J. Tonson in the Strand, MDCCXXVIII. [1728]-30.)

Skinner, John. *A Letter from an old friend to the congregation of the chapel at Old Deor* (Aberdeen: Printed by J. Chalmers and Co. 1798)


- *Annals of Scottish Episcopacy* (Edinburgh: Printed for A. Brown; Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1818.)

- *The office for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, according to the use of the Episcopal Church in Scotland: with a preliminary dissertation on the doctrine of the eucharistical sacrifice... and an appendix containing the collation of offices, &c. / drawn up by the late Dr. Samuel Horsley* (Aberdeen: J. Chalmers, 1807)

Skinner, John (Bishop). *Primitive truth and order vindicated from modern misrepresentation: with a defence of episcopacy, particularly that of Scotland, against an attack made on it by the late Dr. Campbell, of Aberdeen, in his lectures on ecclesiastical history, and a concluding address to the Episcopalian of Scotland* (Aberdeen: printed by J. Chalmers, 1803),


Stanhope, George. *A paraphrase and comment upon the Epistles and Gospels, appointed to be used in the Church of England on all Sundays and Holy-Days throughout the year…* 5th edn. (London : printed for J. and J Knapton; A. Bettesworth and C. Hitch; J. Hazard; E. Parker; R. Williamson; [and 4 others in London], 1732), 4 vols.

Stephen, Thomas. *The history of the Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the present day* (London: John Lendrum, 1843-1845)


Tytler, William. *An inquiry, historical and critical, into the evidence against Mary, Queen of Scots and an examination of the histories of Dr. Robertson and Mr. Hume, with respect to that evidence…* 4th edn. (London : printed for T. Cadell, in the Strand; and W. Creech, Edinburgh, MDCCXC [1790])
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