

The Scottish Episcopal Church: Religious Conflict in the Late Stuart Period

by

Paul Joseph Fox II

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
August 3, 2013

Copyright 2013 by Paul Joseph Fox II

Approved by

Donna J. Bohanan, Chair, Joseph A. Kicklighter Professor of History
Daniel Szechi, Professor of Early Modern History, University of Manchester (UK)
Christopher J. Ferguson, Assistant Professor of History
Kathryn H. Braund, Hollifield Professor of Southern History
Randall T. Beard, Professor of Economics

Abstract

In 1689 the Scottish Parliament overthrew the Church of Scotland's Episcopal government and replaced it with a Presbyterian church structure. Traditionally, historians have interpreted these events as evidence of the Episcopal Church's lack of popularity and as symptomatic of a trend towards modernization and secularization within Britain as a whole. *The Scottish Episcopal Church: Religious Conflict in the Late Stuart Period* suggests a reconceptualization of the period. Far from being unpopular, the Scottish Episcopal Church enjoyed considerable support throughout the country. This had several important implications for not only Scotland, but for Britain and Europe as a whole. The reformation in Scotland was not a *fait accompli* established with a few acts of Parliament, but rather a protracted struggle over ecclesiology and theology that began in the sixteenth-century with John Knox, George Buchanan, and Andrew Melville; this was an endeavor only truly resolved in the early eighteenth-century. *The Scottish Episcopal Church* examines this process and explores the continued centrality of religion in politics and society. The Scotland that produced some of the Enlightenment's greatest minds remained gripped with religious fervor at this time and, the Scottish Episcopalians created and developed an alternate view of church and state relations that contrasted with the Whig vision typically associated with the eighteenth-century. It was a political vision of a nation based on an indefeasible, hereditary, divine right monarchy in which the

church and state cooperated in a synergistic manner and supported the other's right to rule in its respective realm. It is only with a solid understanding of the religious situation in Scotland that one can make larger assessments anent the situation in Britain as a whole.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to a number of people whose support over the years has helped bring this dissertation to completion. I would like to start by thanking my parents, Paul and Kathleen Fox, whose love and support made my fifteen year odyssey in higher education possible. I am grateful to the Auburn University History Department for all the financial support I have received. A very special thank you is extended to all of the members of my dissertation committee for the hard work and time they afforded this project. Specifically, I would like to acknowledge Christopher Ferguson for keeping me focused on the big picture and for the sharing his expertise on all matters, technical and theoretical; Daniel Szechi for sticking with me from across “the pond” and for making sure that I understood the complexities of early modern Britain; Kathryn Braund and Randy Beard, for joining my committee and providing a non-European perspective on things; and last but certainly not least, Donna Bohanan, who never imagined she would end up directing a dissertation on early modern Scotland when she arrived at Auburn University. Without her going above and beyond time and again this dissertation would not exist today.

I would like to recognize Joseph Kicklighter for making my time at Auburn a more enjoyable experience than I could have imagined through his wise council and friendship, and Morris Bian, for his wisdom, guidance, and support over the years. I

would like to express my gratitude to Frank Smith, for letting me impose upon the verbal talents that enable him to complete the Sunday *New York Times* crossword in ink.

A very special acknowledgment goes to the staff members of the Ralph Brown Draughon Library, the National Library of Scotland, the British Library, and the Lambeth Palace Library for their help in accumulating my sources, and most of all to those at the National Archives of Scotland for always seeming to know what I needed before I did.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Scottish Religion in 1688-1689	31
Chapter 2: The Politics of Loyalty	82
Chapter 3: Expanding the Fight	119
Chapter 4: Royal Policy in Scotland	164
Chapter 5: The Church After the Union	213
Conclusion	257
Bibliography	270

“Though the might have beens are not facts, the political hopes and fears they engendered are facts, and often influenced people’s conduct.”¹

Introduction

The late Stuart period (1688-1714) remains one of the most controversial in British history. It witnessed seven elite Englishmen invite a Dutch invasion; it saw the forcible removal of James II (VII of Scotland) and the dubious succession of William III (II of Scotland).² While instigated by the English, the consequences of the Glorious Revolution were felt throughout the Stuart kingdoms. The Scots abolished Episcopacy, the Lords of the Articles, and their parliament assumed greater autonomy from the crown. Ireland, and its majority Catholic population, lost not only its monarch, but a co-religionist. At the same time, England legalized religious dissent. And, in 1707, the great Stuart project of union between England and Scotland ironically was realized as a means to ensure that the Stuart dynasty would forever be displaced by the German Hanoverians and their descendants as a means of preserving a Protestant succession.

The Glorious Revolution served as the defining moment of this period. Studies of the Revolution focus primarily on England and on two fundamental questions: was the

¹ Conrad Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603-1642* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1990), 233.

² Throughout this dissertation I will use English enumeration to designate monarchs: James I, James II, William III, and James III for the Old Pretender.

Glorious Revolution really a revolution, and why did it occur? While this dissertation is not explicitly concerned with these questions, how one answers them affects any interpretation of the events of the period, including all that occurred in Scotland. Historians have answered these questions in two basic ways. The first major interpretation holds that the Glorious Revolution was in fact a revolution in so far as it marked the moment in which English government and society changed, and it occurred because of the concerted efforts of people who represented larger trends of modernity in English society and, by extension, Scotland. The larger causes, trends, or intentions of the revolutionaries vary with the school to which the historian belongs and will be discussed shortly. The second major interpretation holds that the character of the Glorious Revolution was more corrective than revolutionary, concerned more with the temporary problems caused by the Restoration settlement and James II's Catholicism. The phenomenon of Jacobitism has problematized studies of the Glorious Revolution by raising the important question of what to do with those who believed that William had usurped James's lawful authority and were therefore disaffected by the Revolution? For historians of Jacobitism, the Jacobites remained an important part of the political, religious, and cultural fabric of England and Scotland during the succeeding generations.

Glorious Revolution Historiography

Whig historians were the first to argue that the Glorious Revolution was a true revolution. For them, the march of parliamentary democracy defined the seventeenth century. In the first half of the century Charles I failed to understand this, and he lost his

kingdom and his head. His son, James II, failed to comprehend this as well, resulting in the loss of his kingdoms in the Glorious Revolution. From this point forward England (and subsequently Britain) continued to progress unabated, ultimately becoming the liberal parliamentary democracy of the nineteenth century that Thomas Babington Macaulay admired so when he wrote his classic multivolume work *The History of England from the Accession of James II* (1848-1855).³

Marxists have placed their teleological spin on the Revolution, naturally focusing on economics. The seventeenth century witnessed the rise of capitalism, and Marxists argue that Charles I lost his kingdoms because he stifled the nascent bourgeoisie, and, James II fell from power for the same reason. The Glorious Revolution marked the moment at which England (and again subsequently Britain) embarked unimpeded on a path toward modern capitalism. Such was the view of historians like Christopher Hill in *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714* (1961).⁴

The final historical school that subscribes to the idea of a “revolutionary” Glorious Revolution is the Post-Revisionist. They argue more recently that the “makers” of the Revolution had an agenda defined by modernization, one that closely followed the program of William of Orange in the Dutch Republic. The English actively resisted an alternative Catholic program of modernization initiated by James II, and the Glorious Revolution marked its end. The English embraced secularization, realigned their foreign

³ Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James II*, 5 vols. (Philadelphia: H.T. Coates, 1880).

⁴ Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714* (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1961).

policy, and shifted their economic priorities. Steve Pincus is a primary proponent of this view of 1688.⁵ The collection of articles edited by Alan Houston and Pincus, *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration* (2001) and Pincus's *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (2009) are forceful articulations of Post-Revisionist thought.⁶

The rebuttal to the idea of a “revolutionary” Glorious Revolution is found in the works of the Revisionists. The Revisionists contend instead that the Glorious Revolution offers evidence of the conservative nature of English society. The Revolution was not about England going in a new direction or embracing a prevailing tide, but was based rather on a simple desire to undo the innovations of the Catholic James. The English were still a religious people and their politics and worldview reflected it. Jonathan Clark's *English Society 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology, and Politics During the Ancien Regime* (1985, 2000) is a seminal work of Revisionist scholarship.⁷

Revisionists do not suggest, however, that the Glorious Revolution did not produce major consequences. First, all three kingdoms in the British Isles had a new monarch. James II fled to France, and failed to retake his kingdoms after an unsuccessful attempt to reestablish control over Ireland. Second, the Revolution forced the Scottish and English religious establishments to contend with serious challenges: in Scotland the Convention abolished Episcopacy, and in England Parliament legalized Trinitarian

⁵ Terms like “modernization” and “secularization” will be defined shortly.

⁶ Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

⁷ J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology, and Politics During the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

dissent. Third, in 1707 Scotland and England ceased to be separate kingdoms and became Great Britain. Fourth, in 1714 Stuart rule in Great Britain and Ireland ended. The radical nature of these events might appear to confirm the revolutionary interpretation of the Glorious Revolution and late Stuart period, but Revisionists argue it should not. All of these events were motivated primarily by religion and driven by contingency, thus confirming the Revisionist view that religion served as the major motivating force of the period. The whole purpose of the Act of Union, for example, was to ensure the Protestant succession in Scotland. Religious concerns dominated late Stuart Britain.

The final consequence of the revolution was the creation of a movement of disaffected subjects in the form of Jacobitism. Jacobite historiography is divided in to three schools of interpretation: optimists, pessimists, and rejectionists. Historians in the first two schools contend that Jacobitism was a major force in British politics for the decades that followed the Glorious Revolution, the difference between the two being how close the Jacobites came to succeeding. The rejectionists see Jacobitism as a movement on the margins of society. If the optimists and pessimists are correct and Jacobitism was not a movement confined to the margins of British politics, Britain appears to have been more religiously and politically conservative Britain than the Whig, Marxist, and, post-revisionist historians have assumed.⁸ This dissertation is informed by the Revisionists and by the optimist school of Jacobite scholarship.

Religion in Scotland from the Reformation to the Glorious Revolution

How one interprets the revolution in England instructs one's view of events in Scotland. It is easy to see the Presbyterians as a societal force leading the Scottish march of liberty against the bishops in the First Estate of parliament, or as members of an ascendant bourgeois order rising against a feudal institution and its association with the old landed economic interests. One can even see them as harbingers of an era of secularization, since the post-Revolutionary church did not exercise the same hegemony over religion as its Restoration predecessor. Scotland, according to these interpretations, existed as a Presbyterian nation from the outset of the Reformation, and only the tyranny of the Stuarts thwarted the religious preferences of the masses. Historians who share the Whig, Marxist, or Post-Revisionist interpretations are therefore likely to view the religious consequences of the Glorious Revolution in Scotland as a logical outcome. After all, Samuel Rawson Gardiner stated that, "Calvinism was eminently favourable to the progress of liberty," and W. Croft Dickinson observed the role class had played in the Scottish Reformation when he wrote, "the middle classes of the towns were prepared to sound a note of class war in order to rouse the urban mob to do their 'reforming' for

⁸ Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe 1688-1788* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 6. For an excellent review of the historiographical interpretations of Jacobitism and the historians associated with each one, see the introduction to Szechi's *Jacobites*.

them.”⁹ However, the history of religion in Scotland from the Reformation to the Glorious Revolution presents a more complicated picture of religious change in the seventeenth-century, and throws into doubt the inevitability of a post-Revolutionary Scottish Presbyterian ascendancy.

What was the nature of the Church of Scotland following the Reformation? Specifically, was the Kirk Presbyterian, Episcopalian, or something more complicated? Julian Goodare’s overview describes the religious fluctuations in Scotland. He places the origins of the Reformation in the context of Scotland’s political factions. One group, the reformers, beginning with the Earl of Arran, looked to the English for support. At the same time, the Catholic faction relied on the French. According to Goodare, the support the Scots showed for either Reformed doctrines or Catholicism depended upon their perceptions about who posed the greater threat to Scottish independence, the English or the French. While these conflicts persisted at home, the theological leaders of the Scottish Reformation spent their time in Geneva; this ensured that the Reformation, if and when it happened, would have a Calvinist bent. Fearful of a possible merger with the French crown, the Scottish reformers were able to secure English support for expelling

⁹ S.R. Gardiner, *The History of England From the Accession of James to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895), 1:22; W. Croft Dickinson, *Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603*, ed. Archibald A.M. Duncan (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 339.

the French and for religious reform in the late 1550s. It is what happens from this point that is controversial among historians.¹⁰

The traditional interpretation of post-Reformation Scotland was one of Presbyterianism triumphant. It argues that the Scots cast off the corrupt Catholic establishment and returned to the true Christian roots of Scotland, Presbyterianism. The sixteenth-century Presbyterian scholar, George Buchanan, first placed the history of Christianity in Scotland within this Presbyterian context. Although Buchanan lived more than a century before the Glorious Revolution, his premise, that ancient Christianity in Scotland resembled the Presbyterian polity he loved, gained great currency. The papacy, he argued, along with its bishops, had co-opted the Scottish church, and the Scottish Reformation had removed this unnatural and un-Scottish institution. For those following Buchanan, Scottish Christianity was synonymous with Presbyterianism, so it was only natural for the Scots, once they were rid of the tyrannical James II, to restore their true religion. Colin Kidd credits Buchanan with creating the Presbyterian mythology that has colored many people's perception of Scottish religion.¹¹ The narrative of Presbyterian

¹⁰ Julian Goodare, "Scotland," in *The Reformation in National Context*, eds. Bob Schriber, Roy Porter, and Mikulas Teich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 95, 98-99.

¹¹ Colin Kidd, *Union and Unionism: Political Thought in Scotland, 1500-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 52; *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 21.

success is largely inspired by the fact that after 1690 they emerged victorious and never again relinquished control of the Church of Scotland.¹²

In response to Buchanan the Archbishop of St. Andrews, John Spottiswoode, wrote a defense of the Episcopal establishment in the *History of the Church of Scotland* in 1639. Written in honor of James I and published posthumously, Spottiswoode defended the Episcopal cause and praised James's management of the church, but his opinion did not become dominant.¹³ Daniel Defoe returned to the Buchananite position in 1734. He explicitly stated that the people of Scotland wanted the true, reformed, and national church, which, of course, was Presbyterian. Defoe made clear that, although the Scots preferred Presbyterianism, Episcopalianism had been imposed upon them by tyrants and only survived through oppression and violence.¹⁴ This school of thought believed that Scotland had gone from Catholic to Presbyterian and then had Episcopalianism thrust upon it by "tyrannical" kings. Again, if this were so, it would appear that Scotland fit well into the Whig, Marxist, and Post-Revisionist vision of history. But was this the case? Had James I inherited a Presbyterian church? Like most historical questions the answer is complicated.

¹² Alasdair Raffe, "Scotland Restored and Reshaped: Politics and Religion, c. 1660-1712," in *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, eds. T.M. Devine and Jenny Wormald (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 256.

¹³ John Spottiswoode, *The History of the Church of Scotland* (New York: AMS Press, 1973), 1:13.

¹⁴ Daniel Defoe, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. Containing The State of the Church of That Nation, From the Time of Queen Mary to the Union of the Two Kingdoms, Being the Space of 154 Years* (London, 1734), 194.

Gordon Donaldson argued against the notion that Scotland had gone directly from Catholicism to Presbyterianism, and held that Presbyterianism did not develop until the 1570s under the direction of Andrew Melville. The church polity of the 1560s was in his opinion a type of congregationalism supervised by the state and bishops.¹⁵ Gardiner stated that the Second Book of Discipline of 1581 established Presbyterianism only to be undone by parliament when it passed the ‘Black Acts’ in 1584, which it placed church government in the hands of the bishops. For him, the ‘Golden Acts’ of 1592 marked the beginning of true Presbyterianism.¹⁶ If one accepts Gardiner’s timeline, the Church of Scotland never actually became Presbyterian until James assumed the helm of state thirty-one years after the Reformation in Scotland began.

I return here to Goodare’s narrative because its detailed description of the reforming process calls Gardiner’s account into question. The presence of the English made it possible for the reformers to gain support from parliament for some religious changes. Specifically, parliament adopted a Calvinist confession of faith and repudiated the pope and the mass. In 1561, the reformers presented parliament with the *First Book of Discipline*, which would have established a Protestant system of church government, but, as Goodare points out, it failed to gain support as the old (Catholic) order was too entrenched to be swept away by a single legislative act. Michael Lynch also cautions against looking for a “magical” moment of conversion to Protestantism. Popular

¹⁵ Gordon Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 146-147.

¹⁶ Gardiner, *History of England*, 1:47, 50.

enthusiasm for the Reformation only developed slowly, over decades, throughout Scotland.¹⁷ The gradual acceptance of the Reformation meant that the early reformed Kirk was in a peculiar situation: reformed doctrines with overlapping Catholic and reformed church structures.¹⁸ At least three bishops and at least a quarter of the old Catholic clergy conformed to the new theology.¹⁹

It was in this context, somewhere between official proclamations and popular reception of the reformed ideas, that the Scottish Reformation took place.²⁰ In reformed communities the Kirk became the backbone of the parish and its representatives formed presbyteries in the early 1580s. The state initially gave them power to approve the crown's nominees for bishop, but, state appointed bishops still existed.²¹ The General Assembly acted as the national body of the reformed church, and the state remained skeptical of the assembly's political pretenses. The reformers pressured the state with mixed results, and thus began a reformer-state tension that persisted throughout the Stuart era. The General Assembly lobbied for anti-Catholic laws and for legal enforcement of

¹⁷ Michael Lynch, "The Scottish Early Modern Burgh," in *Scotland Revisited*, ed. Jenny Wormald (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), 77.

¹⁸ Goodare, "Scotland," 98, 100-102, 104-106.

¹⁹ Ian D. Whyte, *Scotland Before the Industrial Revolution: An Economic and Social History, c. 1050-1750* (London: Longman, 1995), 101.

²⁰ Martin Ingram, "From Reformation to Toleration: Religious Cultures in England, 1540-1690," in *Popular Culture in England c. 1500-1850*, ed. Tim Harris (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 96. Ingram's argument was directed at England, specifically between the Reformation and the Act of Toleration, but the fluctuations of Scotland's reformation and ecclesiological changes make his idea applicable to Scotland.

²¹ Goodare, "Scotland," 98-106.

Kirk discipline, but, according to Goodare, the state was content with “civic Protestantism.” The Presbyterian reformers did not gain control of the church until the late 1580s and early 1590s.²²

Much of this was the fault of the reformers themselves. Remember that these were the same men who had deposed James’s mother, Mary, Queen of Scots. Moreover, to the consternation of the king, leading Presbyterians, like George Buchanan and Andrew Melville, promoted the “two-kingdoms” theory.²³ This theory held that there were two kingdoms in Scotland: the state, headed by the king, and the church, headed by Christ and administered by the General Assembly. The king stood below the church in matters spiritual, but the church was not beneath the king in matters temporal. The job of the state was to support the mission of the Kirk in society by financial assistance and enforcement of the Kirk’s censures on immorality.²⁴ This insult and threat to James’s authority caused him to view the Presbyterians with great hostility, a situation made worse when the radical Protestant Lord Gowrie kidnapped the young king in August, 1582 in what was known as the Ruthven Raid. The fact that the General Assembly endorsed this outrageous crime further worsened the relationship between church and state. James and his supporters in parliament responded in 1584 with the passage of the

²² Ibid.

²³ The two-kingdoms theory will be discussed throughout this dissertation in more detail.

²⁴ Jenny Wormald, “Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929,” in *Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929*, ed. Norman Macdougall (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1983), 78-79.

‘Black Acts.’ These laws affirmed the position of the bishops in the church, and expressly gave the king power over the church and the right to name the time and place of any meetings of the Presbyterian assemblies.²⁵ Writing more than 300 years later, the Scottish born British statesman Lord Arthur Balfour described the ‘Black Acts.’ He stated that, “freedom of Assemblies, freedom of speech, freedom of spiritual jurisdiction, were all destroyed, and Episcopacy stood revealed as the ally and tool of civil and religious despotism.”²⁶ This criticism demonstrates the potency of the continuing Presbyterian version of Scotland’s history. These acts were passed by parliament and were in direct response to the Presbyterian kidnapping of the king. They hardly appear as irrational despotism.

James, worried about Catholic plots against his life in retaliation for the execution of his mother, needed to pacify and gain the support of the more radical reformers. The ‘Golden Act’ of 1592 shifted power from the bishops, now referred to as supervisors, and to the assemblies and synods of the Kirk. Only at this moment did Presbyterianism assumed a dominant position within the Church of Scotland. Importantly, the act also contained language that affirmed the power of the crown over ecclesiastical affairs, and, in accepting the benefits of the act, the Presbyterians implicitly acknowledged that they were subordinate to the crown.²⁷

²⁵ Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation*, 210.

²⁶ Arthur Lord Balfour, *An Historical Account of the Rise and Development of Presbyterianism in Scotland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 69.

If the history of Scotland's early Reformation seems confusing today, it was equally confusing to the people of the late Stuart period. David Allan has commented on the debate between seventeenth-century Episcopalians and Presbyterians about events of the previous century, including their disagreement over the church structure John Calvin and Theodore Beza advocated.²⁸ In the 1690s Episcopalian Alexander Cunningham and Presbyterian Thomas Forrester disagreed over the true character of the reformed church. Cunningham quoted from Beza's reflections on the seven letters found at the beginning of the Book of Revelation: "To the Angel, that is, To the President, as whom it behooveth, especially to be admonished, touching those matters; and by him both the rest of his fell Collegues, and the whole Church likeways. But unto you, that is, unto you the Angel the President, and the Assembly of your Collegues, and to the Rest, that is, to the whole Flock." For Cunningham this passage was an endorsement of Episcopacy, since "the Angel of any Church Representative, is the President Bishop over the other Ministers, within the Respective Dioces, Province, or Patriarchat."²⁹ This meant that some ministers had greater authority and roles within the church than others. Forrester

²⁷ Alan R. MacDonald, "The Parliament of 1592: A Crisis Averted?," in *The History of the Scottish Parliament: Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1567-1707*, ed. Keith M. Brown and Alastair J. Mann, vol. 2 of *The History of the Scottish Parliament*, ed. Keith M. Brown (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1983), 2:68-69.

²⁸ David Allan, "Protestantism, Presbyterianism and National Identity in Eighteenth-Century Scottish History," in *Protestantism and National Identity Britain and Ireland, c. 1650 – c. 1850*, eds. Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 187.

²⁹ Alexander Cunningham, *The Divine Right of Episcopacy Demonstrated from Calvin and Beza: Together with a Letter to a Presbyterian Minister* (n.p., 1689), 2.

rebutted by insisting that Calvin had made it clear that “the Office both of Apostles and Evangelists, is expired, and that no pre eminent Office, over that of the Pastor, is in his Judgment continued in the Church.”³⁰ Hence, there was no ecclesiastical position within the church that entitled an individual to exercise dominion over other ministers. Gordon Donaldson and Ian Whyte conclude that the historical evidence favored the Episcopalian argument. Donaldson states that the reformers did not have a problem with all bishops, only with bad bishops.³¹ Whyte observes that Knox’s *First Book of Discipline* was more concerned with the election of elders and deacons than with superintendents and the General Assembly. In fact, according to Whyte, Knox believed that certain ministers needed to be free from the distractions of their own congregations in order that they might supervise others.³² For these scholars, the debate over the validity of Episcopacy persisted in the late Stuart period.

In 1603, James VI of Scotland became James I of England, and so began the long march towards the union of the kingdoms. Religion served as one of the most important issues of the day. The English Puritans greeted James with high expectations. They hoped the new king would bring the Scottish church south, a church they rightly

³⁰ Thomas Forrester, *A Counter-essay, or, A Vindication and Assertion of Calvin and Beza’s Presbyterian Judgment and Principles: Drawn from their Writings, in Answer to the Imputations of a Late Pamphlet, Entitled, An Essay Concerning Church-government ... Attempting to Fasten Upon Them an Episcopal Perswasion ... / by a Minister of the True Presbyterian Church of Scotland, Established by Law* (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1692), 30.

³¹ Gordon Donaldson, *The Shaping of a Nation* (London: David and Charles, 1974), 187.

³² Whyte, *Scotland Before the Industrial Revolution*, 102.

understood as Calvinist, but, in so doing, they incorrectly overestimated the influence of its presbyteries.³³ James instead used his experience with the Episcopal Church of England to shift further the balance of power within the Church of Scotland in favor of the crown and bishops, as well as to bring about some uniformity between his churches.³⁴ How a historian interprets the Reformation in Scotland then shapes his or her interpretation of subsequent political events. According to Gardiner, James had gravitated towards the Episcopal polity as early as 1597-98, largely because of political concerns with the independent nature of the Presbyterian Church. Yet James had already demonstrated his preference for Episcopacy thirteen years earlier with the ‘Black Acts.’ After 1603, the royal supremacy he enjoyed over the bishops in England inspired two things that would forever be associated with him: his Hampton Court Conference declaration of “no bishop, no king” and the re-branding of the church’s supervisors as bishops in Scotland.³⁵

Goodare concurs with Gardiner that James’s experience in England led him to re-introduce the title of bishop to Scotland, and the decision to make his two churches uniform came at a time of high anxiety among the Scottish elites as their native monarch

³³ Mary Fulbrook, *Piety and Politics: Religion and the Rise of Absolutism in England, Wurttemberg and Prussia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 114.

³⁴ Brian P. Levack, *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union, 1603-1707* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 106.

³⁵ S.R. Gardiner, *History of England*, 8:70-74, 156-57, 302-306.

became more and more enamored of his new kingdom and its customs and institutions.³⁶ David Allan writes that “in an intensely status-conscious society, where ritual and formality were presumed to express fundamental political and social values, an increasingly Baroque style of kingship supposedly alienated many of the Stuart monarchy’s traditional supports in Scotland, convincing them – rightly or wrongly that their own interests had been relegated, their Scottish name and titles devalued.”³⁷ James appeared to be rejecting Scotland, and his attempts to reform the Scottish church were met with resistance.³⁸ This reform was one part of James’s efforts to remake the Scottish church along English lines, an initiative that culminated in 1618 when he disallowed meetings of the General Assembly.³⁹ Conveniently, he gained the assembly’s reluctant acceptance of the Five Articles of Perth prior to its dissolution, thereby bringing disciplinary changes that reintroduced a more formal style of worship to the Church of Scotland.⁴⁰

³⁶ Goodare, “Scotland,” 106-107.

³⁷ David Allan, “‘What’s in a Name’: Pedigree and Propaganda in Seventeenth Century Scotland,” in *Scottish History: The Power of the Past*, eds. Edward J. Cowan and Richard J. Finlay (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 165.

³⁸ Lynch, “The Scottish Early Modern Burgh,” 80.

³⁹ Goodare, “Scotland,” 106-7.

⁴⁰ The Five Articles of Perth required: 1) that communion would be received kneeling, 2) it allowed for private baptism, 3) and for private communion for the sick, 4) confirmation by a bishop, and 5) reinstatement of the observance of Holy Days.

Despite James's efforts at uniformity, his two churches grew more distinct.⁴¹ His church in England gravitated toward Arminianism while his Scottish church remained Calvinist. The program for a common ecclesiastical policy was set into full motion after Charles I and the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud, visited Scotland for his coronation. This led to the introduction of new canons and a new prayer book. In recent years historians have distinguished between uniformity and Anglicanization. Keith Brown and Joong-Lak Kim doubt that Charles wanted to Anglicize his Scottish church, in part out of respect for Scotland; rather Charles sought simply to create parallel ecclesiastical structures.⁴² Regardless of Charles's intent, Christopher Hill believed the result catastrophic and argued that Charles's policies in Scotland created a solidarity between the Scottish aristocracy and the English Puritans.⁴³ Riots broke out in Scotland, and the escalation of conflict resulted in the National Covenant (1637-8), two wars between England and Scotland (1639, 1640), the Great Civil War (1642-1649), Charles's execution (1649), and the eleven-year abrogation of the monarchy (1649-1660). These events are not in dispute, even if historians disagree about the underlying causations.

⁴¹ Keith M. Brown, "British History: A Sceptical Comment," in *Three Nations – A Common History? England, Scotland, Ireland and British History c. 1600-1920*, ed. Ronald Asch (Bochum: Universitätsverlag Brockmeyer, 1993), 123.

⁴² Ibid.; Joong-Lak Kim, "The Scottish-English-Romish Book: the Character of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637," in *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland: Essays for John Morrill*, eds. Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 17, 20.

⁴³ Hill, *Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*, 90-92.

The memory of Charles I and the Covenant cast a long shadow that lasted throughout the late Stuart period. The Covenanters comprised the bulk of Scottish resistance to Charles, and Episcopalians blamed them for his death for years afterwards. The Covenant did not expressly condemn or repudiate Episcopacy; in fact, its oath-takers even pledged loyalty to Charles and his authority. Yet, by an act of parliament, they successfully purged the church of bishops.⁴⁴ In the minds of Episcopalians the Covenanting movement was linked to Presbyterianism and therefore, rightly or wrongly, to anti-monarchical feeling. It is important to note that Presbyterians did not oppose all monarchy, only bad and ungodly monarchy. George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, who served Charles II in Scotland and supported the Episcopal cause after the Glorious Revolution, reflected on the Covenant and the fate of Charles. He wrote that, “it is necessary to represent, That in the Year 1637, we liv’d under the most Pious and Orthodox Prince of the Age, and yet a Rebellion was form’d against him, as a *Papist, and a Tyrant*, by which all the Fundamental Laws were shaken, and all honest Men ruin’d.”⁴⁵

Thus, when the Stuarts inherited England they sought to create a common ecclesiology. In England they enjoyed wide power over ecclesiastical matters, but in Scotland the king’s powers were more circumscribed in practice, although not necessarily in points of law. Theological leanings notwithstanding, it was clear that the Church of

⁴⁴ Alasdair Raffe, *Culture of Controversy: Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660-1714* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012), 66; Ian Michael Smart, “The Political Ideas of the Scottish Covenanters, 1638-88,” *History of Political Thought* 1 (1980): 165.

⁴⁵ George Mackenzie, *A Vindication of the Government in Scotland During the Reign of Charles II Against Mis-representations Made in Several Scandalous Pamphlets* (Edinburgh: James Watson, 1691), 4.

England provided the monarch with the most convenient and manageable religious settlement. Episcopalianism better served the Erastian needs of the state. Religious issues in England and Scotland greatly affected both realms in the first half of the seventeenth century, and they would continue to do so through the first part of the next century as well.

The altogether sudden collapse of Episcopacy and the ensuing Presbyterian ascendancy of the late 1630s raises questions about fundamental changes in Scotland. Had the nation embraced Presbyterianism? Did the majority really oppose Episcopacy? Traditionally, the views set forth in the narratives of Buchanan and Defoe prevailed and historians, especially historians of England, assumed that Presbyterianism held the loyalty of most Scots. The Stuart repression of the Presbyterian Scots in turn fit the narratives of Whigs and Marxists in which the Stuarts were absolutists who naturally acted to stifle those who resisted their will. Hill summarized this view when he wrote that Charles I did not appreciate the mass support Presbyterianism had in Scotland.⁴⁶ It is clear from the riots that followed the introduction of the prayer book in 1637 that the Stuart project of ecclesiastical uniformity between the Church of Scotland and Church of England was unpopular in parts of the lowlands, but should this be interpreted as mass opposition to the Episcopacy throughout the country?

T. Christopher Smout and David Stevenson, writing in the late 1960s and early 1970s, argued otherwise. They took on the challenge of demonstrating the popularity of Episcopacy, which they found enjoyed wider support than had previously been

⁴⁶ Hill, *Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*, 90-92.

assumed.⁴⁷ The number of committed Presbyterians was rather small, but their “zeal and bravery” helped them accrue a devoted following.⁴⁸ Essentially their fervor made their numbers seem larger than they actually were. This interpretation did not remain unchallenged. In 1986, David George Mullan responded and argued that Episcopacy had little support outside of the monarchy and its collapse at the onset of the Covenanting movement demonstrated the shallowness of its foundation⁴⁹ This interpretation has periodically reappeared. Recently, Carla Gardina Pestana writes about the Revolutionary era, “The Episcopal Church not having succeeded in capturing the allegiance of most Scots, they supported a return to Presbyterianism, which was achieved in 1688.”⁵⁰

In 1638, if the collapse of Episcopacy served as evidence of its unpopularity, should its restoration in 1660 then be evidence of a resurgent popularity? Pestana argues to the contrary and insists that Scotland was forced to accept Episcopacy.⁵¹ On the other hand, Rosalind Mitchison attributes the restoration of the Episcopacy to the initiative of

⁴⁷ T. Christopher Smout, *A History of the Scottish People, 1560-1830* (London: Collins, 1969), 65; David Stevenson, *The Scottish Revolution, 1637-44: The Triumph of the Covenanters* (London: Trinity Press, 1973), 47. Stevenson discusses the grievances made by the Scots after the issuing of the new liturgy. He argues that the problems the Scots had with the innovations had to do with liturgy, the new cannons, and the secular power of the bishops; not their spiritual authority.

⁴⁸ Smout, *A History of the Scottish People*, 65.

⁴⁹ David George Mullan, *Episcopacy in Scotland: The History of an Idea* (Edinburgh: John Donald Press, 1986), 187, 197.

⁵⁰ Carla Gardina Pestana, *Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 142.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 163.

parliament and not to Charles II, who, according to Mullan, acted as the Episcopal cause's only major supporter. The state reimposed the episcopate successfully in the north and more than half of the clergy of the south accepted the new order.⁵² While this does not prove the popularity of Episcopalianism, it does cast doubts on the level of Scottish commitment to Presbyterianism. For P.J.W. Riley the revival of dogmatic Presbyterianism after the Glorious Revolution seems improbable, given the wide spectrum of religious thought pervading Scotland at the time.⁵³ Even with the Presbyterian persecution of Episcopalians in the late Stuart Period, nearly forty percent of Scots remained Episcopalian.⁵⁴ If so many Scots chose that faith in the face of harassment and discrimination, how many would have stayed with it if no coercion existed?

Those who lived in the late Stuart period had different opinions about the religious significance of the Restoration. Such diversity of opinion once again reflected differences in ecclesiastical affiliation. For the Presbyterians the restoration of Episcopacy and repudiation of the Covenant was a tragedy portending disastrous consequences. Presbyterian minister Alexander Shields wrote about Charles II's disregard for the Covenant and observed in a letter to the Presbytery of Edinburgh that,

⁵² Rosalind Mitchison, *Lordship to Patronage, 1603-1715* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1983), 69-74.

⁵³ P.J.W. Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1978), 8-9.

⁵⁴ Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 24.

“he spake never a word of the Covenant, our *Magna Carta* of Religion and Righteousness.”⁵⁵ For the Presbyterians the Covenant was the defining moment in Scottish history, the official consecration of the nation to God. Charles and parliament had turned their backs on it in favor of the bishops, “which he, and with him the Generality of the Nobility, Gentry, Clergy, and Commonality, did promote and propagate, untill the Nation was involved in the greatest Revolt from, and Rebellion against God, that ever could be recorded in any Age or Generation.”⁵⁶ Mackenzie recalled the events of the Restoration differently, beginning with his opinion of the Covenant. When Scotland’s Restoration parliament met, “they enquired very seriously into the Occasion of such Disorders. And soon found that they were all to be charged upon the *Solemn League and Covenant*.”⁵⁷ According to Mackenzie, had the Presbyterians disowned the Covenant, they would have been left in charge of the Church of Scotland. Once they refused, parliament, “by Vote (which may be called unanimous, seeing only four or five dissented) restored Episcopacy, and that so much the rather because that Government had in *no Age or Place forced its Way* into the State by the Sword, but had still been brought in by the *uncontroverted Magistrate*, without ever thrusting itself in by Violence, and yet the Government did sustain *Episcopacy* as a Part

⁵⁵ Alexander Shields, *The history of Scotch-presbytery: being an epitome of The hind let loose; with a preface by a presbyter of the Church of Scotland* (London: J. Hindmarsh, 1692), 16.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Mackenzie, *A Vindication of the Government in Scotland During the Reign of Charles II*, 5-6.

of the State, but never as a *Hierarchy wholly independent* from it.”⁵⁸ The historical literature gives credence to Rosehaugh’s account. Within the Presbyterian community two parties existed, the Protesters and the Resolutioners. The Protesters wanted the Covenant renewed, while the Resolutioners would have settled for just the establishment of Presbyterianism, but they would not have accepted Presbyterianism on the state’s terms, meaning subservience to the state. This proved to be an unacceptable condition for the Protesters and the Earl of Lauderdale, who, concerned with the security of Charles II’s government, moved parliament to accept Episcopacy.⁵⁹ In Mackenzie’s version of events, Episcopacy enjoyed the overwhelming support of parliament. Furthermore, this is an argument that the Episcopalians returned to throughout the period, one that underscores their compatibility of their beliefs with the “one-kingdom” model. Episcopacy was a part of the state, not above it or independent of it.⁶⁰ Episcopacy upheld divine right, indefeasible hereditary succession, and passive obedience, making bishops the idea ecclesiastical option for the Restoration government.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Ibid. Mackenzie’s annotation.

⁵⁹ Keith M. Brown (ed), “Act for the Restitution and Reestablishment of the Antient Government of the Church by Archbishops and Bishops,” *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/1662/5/9> (accessed July 4, 2013); (accessed July 4, 2013); Ian B. Cowan, “Repression and Religious Dissent in Scotland, 1660 – 1689,” *International Review of Scottish Studies* 8 (1978): 8; Richard L. Greaves, “Conformity and Security in Scotland and Ireland, 1660-85” in *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland, 1550-1700*, eds. Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006), 229.

⁶⁰ Julia Buckroyd. “Anti-Clericalism in Scotland During the Restoration,” in *Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929*: ed. Norman Macdougall, 171-172.

There is nothing in the religious history of Scottish from the Reformation through the Restoration that indicates that Episcopalianism was doomed after the Glorious Revolution. Scotland's Protestant ecclesiology was complicated and certainly not exclusively Presbyterian. Episcopalianism still commanded the loyalty of a large number of Scots, and the Presbyterians were not as numerically superior as traditionally assumed. I will demonstrate that, even in a period of Presbyterian ascendancy, there were political factors that encouraged Episcopalians, in particular the prospect of union. Political merger with England meant unity with a thoroughly Episcopalian nation, a point not lost on the Presbyterians of Scotland who passed numerous laws in an attempt to protect their religious establishment from English interference.⁶² Despite these laws, the new British Parliament would come to the assistance of the Episcopalians of Scotland. Even though the Scottish Episcopalians had hesitated to accept William as king, it was the Presbyterians who had the more problematic relationship with the state because of the Covenant and the "two-kingdoms" theory.

Objectives, Sources, and Significance

⁶¹ Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 3.

⁶² National Archives, "The Act for Securing the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church Government, 1706," <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aosp/1707/6> (accessed May 17, 2013). This act is typically cited as the major act in defense of Presbyterianism preceding the Act of Union. There were several others which will be discussed throughout the dissertation.

The primary objective of this dissertation will be to tell the story of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Glorious Revolution, through the Union, and finally to the conclusion of the Stuart era. I will argue that the Episcopal Church was popular at the time of the Glorious Revolution and remained so until the Hanoverian succession in 1714. The presence of Episcopalians who were reconciled to the government and those, although not necessarily Episcopalians, who claimed they could represent the Episcopal cause in parliament and with William III is evidence of their strength. Scottish Episcopalians actively courted and sought English support for their cause and attempted to bring English public opinion to bear on affairs in Scotland, thereby influencing William and later Anne. Episcopalians loyal to the government and favorable English public opinion provided crucial support in preserving the Episcopal community and preventing the Presbyterian Church from consolidating power. Also, William and Anne on occasion were able to offer protection to the beleaguered Episcopalians. Finally, the Act of Union affected positively the Episcopal community as it was assisted by the new British Parliament, where, after 1710, the Tory majority worked with Scottish Episcopalian representatives and disregarded the protections the Act for Securing the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church Government provided the Church of Scotland.

This study of Scottish Episcopalians relies on manuscript sources from Scotland and England. From the National Records of Scotland, Lambeth Palace, the National Library of Scotland, and the British Library I consulted correspondence of Episcopal leaders and between these leaders and the political actors they attempted to sway to their

cause. To establish the ongoing public discourse over these religious affairs, I rely on an array of printed essays and treatises.

As with most research, there were certain challenges faced in the completion of this project. First, from the meeting of the Scottish Convention in 1688-89, Episcopalianism was disestablished and many of its members were involved in Jacobitism, which was treasonous. The clandestine nature of Jacobite activities means that some documents are more difficult to obtain and to interpret. For this reason I examine complaints from the Presbyterian Kirk about the movements and plans of Episcopalians in Scotland, keeping in mind that these, like all polemical sources, are rife with bias. Second, it is important to clarify terminology. I use *secularization* to refer to the move away from a state-church religious monopoly that saw religion become increasingly a private matter. *Modernization* refers to the view that British politics shifted away from religious motivations and toward a systematic program designed to remake the British polity along the Dutch model, that is, commercial and tolerant. I use *Erastianism* to refer to the idea that the state should be supreme in church affairs and that the church should serve the interests of the state. Finally, the most complicated terms are *Episcopalianism* and *Anglicanism*; often used interchangeably, here they will have specific meanings. *Anglicanism* refers to a denomination with clearly defined doctrines and a church polity structured around a hierarchy of bishops. *Episcopalianism* will specifically refer to the church polity in which bishops act as governors, even when their power is tempered by some other deliberative body.

This dissertation will contribute to the historical scholarship by showing that in the late Stuart period Scotland's was an ongoing reformation. Raffe has put forward the idea that Scotland remained in the grips of religious controversy in the late Stuart period.⁶³ My study will likewise demonstrate that the religious turmoil that emerged over time as the result of the Reformation, Jacobean-Carolinian reforms, Covenanters, and Restoration still persisted between 1688 and 1714. It thus adds an expansive British dimension to a debate that has traditionally treated the churches in Scotland and England as separate issues. Scottish-Anglo Episcopal cooperation was a major factor in the survival of Scottish Episcopalianism, and this period marked a major stage in the development of an Anglican communion through the increased use of the English liturgy and growth in Arminian theology in the Scottish Episcopal Church.

In the late Stuart period, religion mattered a great deal, and the Church of Scotland expected the state to promote religious orthodoxy and to play an active role in promoting conformity. Episcopalianism was still viable within Scotland following the Union, both in terms of retaining a following and also as an alternative model for the state church. The continued existence of a Scottish Episcopal population and the persistence of a political vision of the nation with an indefeasible, hereditary, divine right monarchy that changed evolved from a "one kingdom" ideal to a "two-society" model which reflected these values while accommodating their new unestablished condition. In this world the church and state cooperated in a synergistic manner and supported the others' divine right to authority in their respective realms. In this worldview and

⁶³ Raffe, *Culture of Controversy*, 66

ideology, the Episcopal community retained many of the tenets of the earlier seventeenth century church-state ideologies and cast serious doubts on precisely how “modern” Britain was becoming in this period.

Finally, I will argue that Britain’s “secularization” or “modernization”, as defined by Whig, Marxist, and Post-Revisionist historians, did not occur or even begin in this era as they contend. To the contrary, both English and Scottish politics were primarily motivated by religion during this time. Both C.D.A. Leighton and Daniel Szechi have pointed out that only religion could have justified killing one’s family and countrymen *en masse*.⁶⁴ Moreover, the “liberal” Church of Scotland that participated in the Scottish Enlightenment did not exist yet.⁶⁵ After 1688, the Convention and settlement of the crown, and before 1714 religion and politics were inseparable.⁶⁶ The decisions of individual clergymen made as to whether or not they should reconcile themselves to the new regime make this clear. Scottish Episcopalians waged an aggressive campaign to sway English public opinion to support the material and legal relief of their coreligionists. Many of the royal policies of first William’s, and later Anne’s, reigns were to balance Scotland’s competing religious factions. Finally, the focus of the British Parliament with regard to Scotland was the ongoing religious struggle between the Episcopalians and

⁶⁴ C.D.A. Leighton, “Scottish Jacobitism, Episcopacy, and Counter-Enlightenment,” *History of European Ideas* 35, no. 1 (2009): 2; Szechi, *1715*, 28.

⁶⁵ Donaldson, *The Shaping of a Nation*, 193.

⁶⁶ Alasdair Raffe, “Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics After the Revolution of 1688 – 1690,” *The Historical Journal* 53, no. 2 (2010): 321.

Presbyterians. Religion dominated the political landscape of Scotland from the Glorious Revolution through the end of the Stuart period.

Chapter 1: Scottish Religion in 1688-89

Introduction

In 1688, when William of Orange answered the request of the “Immortal Seven”¹ and arrived in England with an army, the debate between Episcopalians and Presbyterians over church government erupted anew as it had periodically since the Reformation. The man on whom the Scottish Episcopal establishment had depended, James II (VII of Scotland), had alienated his major base of support in England, the established church. James’s governmental mismanagement brought his one-time allies, the Tories, into an alliance of convenience with their Whig adversaries.² The sudden collapse of James’s

¹ “Invitation of the Seven to William of Orange,” in Steven C.A. Pincus, *England’s Glorious Revolution, 1688-1689: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford St. Martins, 2006), 37-39.

The Immortal Seven consisted of Henry Sydney, Earl of Romney; Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby; Charles Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury; William Cavendish, later the Earl of Devonshire; Richard Viscount Lumley; Henry Compton, Bishop of London; and Edward Russell, Earl of Orford. These seven men signed the invitation that requested William invade England.

² E.L. Ellis, “William III and the Politicians,” in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, ed. Geoffrey Holmes (New York: Macmillan, 1969), 115; Henry Horwitz, “The Structure of Parliamentary Politics,” in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution*, ed. Geoffrey Holmes, 108.

regime and the shock of the Dutchman's arrival caused a panic in the Episcopal establishment and invigorated Presbyterian dissent. Within a few months the Scottish Convention declared the Bishops and "*Prelacy*," the favorite word among Presbyterians for their opponents, a grievance, and William assented to their abolition. From July 22, 1689 until June 7, 1690 the Church of Scotland lacked any form of ecclesiastical government. The shape of the new ecclesiastical settlement dominated Scottish politics for the next year. William hoped for a comprehensive church settlement that would allow for both Episcopalians and Presbyterians to remain communicants in the state church; however, neither the Episcopalians nor Presbyterians had much interest in such compromise. The ferocity of the conflict that ensued was reminiscent of the ecclesiastical debates that occurred in the reigns of James I, Charles I, and Charles II. Like the previous Episcopalian and Presbyterian conflicts, this one had little prospect but to end, at best, in acrimonious coercion or, at worst, a bloody conflict.

This chapter addresses three crucial aspects of Scotland's ecclesiastical situation at the time of the Glorious Revolution. First, it describes the confessional allegiances of the Scottish people and the differences among the groups involved. Second, it considers the reasons for the failure of the Episcopalians to maintain control over the Church of Scotland in 1688 and early 1689. Finally, it examines the Revolutionary religious settlements in both Scotland and England, and how these two settlements affected one another. The religious situation in Scotland was complex, but nothing about it made the overthrow of Episcopacy inevitable. Episcopalianism failed to hold the church establishment not because it possessed inferior numbers to its Presbyterian counterparts,

but rather failed because of an ideological paralysis and an inability to organize effectively when the Scottish Convention met in 1689. The result was that they were outmaneuvered by the Presbyterians who had reconciled themselves quickly to William's rule.

The Religious Composition of Scotland in 1688-90.

From the resurrection of the Scottish Episcopacy in 1661 until the reign of James II, the Church of Scotland, with active support of the monarchy and the Scottish state, had enforced conformity and cracked down on the remnants of the Covenanter movement in the west of Scotland. The Covenanters represented an extreme wing of the Presbyterian community. They refused to join the Church of Scotland after the Restoration, and the radicals within the movement, the Cameronians, excommunicated Charles II for his failure to live up to the Covenanter idea of a "godly king." The persecutions of nonconformists between 1661 and 1687, when James granted an indulgence to Catholics and nonconformists, had suffocated dissent. The radicals were crushed and moderate Presbyterians driven into conformity with the Episcopal Church of Scotland.³ Whether this strategy would have succeeded in the long term has been questioned by Ian Cowan, but he acknowledges that in the short run, at least, the

³ Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms* (London: Penguin Books, 2006), 373; *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (New York: Penguin Books, 2007), 180.

repression achieved its goal of conformity.⁴ A contemporary account of Scotland's religious situation recorded that, "[Charles II] left this Church of Scotland in more peaceful condition, then it had been of a long time before."⁵ Thus, the Presbyterians were in no position to advance their own cause, much less overthrow the Episcopal establishment, when James became king.⁶ However, within a few short years dissent reappeared. For all practical purposes, Scotland in 1688 had four religious communities: the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, the radical schismatic Cameronians, and finally, the Catholics.

The Episcopalians

The Episcopal community of Scotland had dominated ecclesiastical affairs since the Restoration. The aristocracy moved quickly to re-establish the Episcopal Church in the early 1660s. Charles II was popular in Scotland when he returned from exile as both the nobility and king sought to regain the authority they had lost since the late 1630s.⁷ Episcopalianism commanded the loyalty of a majority of Scotland's nobility and gentry,

⁴ Ian Cowan, "Repression and Religious Dissent in Scotland, 1660 – 1689," *International Review of Scottish Studies* 8 (1978): 21.

⁵ Quoted in Harris, *Restoration*, 373.

⁶ William Law Matheison, *Scotland and the Union: A History of Scotland from 1695-1747* (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1905), 12-13.

⁷ Elizabeth Hannan Hyman, "A Church Militant: Scotland 1661-1690," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 26, no. 1 (Jan 1995): 53.

and the Restoration witnessed a three-way marriage between it, the crown, and the Episcopal Church. James I's maxim of "no bishop, no king" had proved prophetic in the aftermath of the National Covenant in the late 1630s. In a little more than a decade, Scotland lost its bishops and, as a result of the actions taken by Oliver Cromwell's Commonwealth, the country also lost its king and national independence. For the Scottish nobility, political independence and power therefore remained closely linked to the Episcopal Church rather than the Presbyterian Church after the Restoration. Episcopalian polemicist and regent at St. Andrews, Alexander Cunningham, recalled the words of James II in his defense of the Episcopal Church, "King James oft declared, that Presbyterians could not be Loyal; and that he could ever so much forget the Murder of his Royal Father of ever Blessed Memory, as to trust them himself"⁸ Recalling the admonitions of James I, the author of the *Prelatical Churchman* declared, "Who have ever been Enemies to Crown'd heads: Let 'em talk what they will, he who hates a Bishop, can never love a King. And he who treads on a Mitre, will quickly pull off the Crown, so that still the Maxim will prove true, no Bishop, No King."⁹ The timing of these admonitions coincided with the Scottish parliament's deliberations on the future of the Church of Scotland. Cunningham and the "Prelatical Churchman" warned William and parliament that without the bishops the monarchy could not be secure.

⁸ Alexander Cunningham, *Questions Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland* (London, 1690), 23.

⁹ *The Prelatical Church-Man Against the Phanatical Kirk-Man, or, A Vindication of the Author of The Sufferings of the Church of Scotland* (London, 1690), 6.

The gentry had every reason to associate with the Episcopal cause, and the aristocracy and the Episcopal Church reinforced one another's social position.¹⁰ Very few nobles, only a small percentage of the gentry, and a mere handful of the middling sorts supported Presbyterianism in this period. The overwhelming majority of the nobility renounced the Solemn League and Covenant, thereby indicating their support for Episcopalianism or at least a rejection of Presbyterianism. In 1690 Cunningham went to lengths to emphasize this point. He stated that less than one in forty of the gentry had not taken the Test Act, and only fifty accepted the indulgence James offered and left their parish churches. The Test Act, passed in 1681, required its subscribers to uphold Protestantism, and the 1669 Act of Supremacy demanded acknowledgement of the king's authority in spiritual matters.¹¹ Royal supremacy was an Erastian understanding of church and state relations and consistent with the ideas of the Episcopalians. Erastianism takes its name from the Swiss theologian Thomas Erastus, who proposed that the state, not religious authorities, maintained the discipline of society. Erastus argued that civil authorities possessed the power to punish and excommunicate sinners, a position in direct conflict with John Calvin's ideas that the church possessed powers independent of the state.¹² Erastus's ideas restricted church interference with the state, and it stopped the

¹⁰ Hyman, "A Church Militant: Scotland 1661-1690," 53.

¹¹ Keith M. Brown (ed.), "Act Anent Religion and the Test," *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/1681/7/29> (accessed July 4, 2013); "Act asserting his majesties' supremacie over all persons and in all causes ecclesiasticall," *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/1669/10/13> (accessed July 4, 2013).

¹² Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation: A History* (New York: Viking, 2003), 345.

church from alienating the politically powerful over matters of a purely spiritual nature. This stood in contrast to the “two-kingdom” theory espoused by the Presbyterians. Anyone who took this oath accepted the king’s authority over the church and at the same time rejected the independence of the church.¹³ Town councilors had to qualify under the Test Act to hold office. Essentially, unless these people were unscrupulous perjurers they must have been inclined towards Episcopalianism, or willing publically to conform.¹⁴ Writing in 1690, Episcopal minister John Sage offered a tempered appraisal of the religious composition of Scotland but still believed the Episcopalians to be the larger party: “And yet the Church Party [Episcopalians], both in Number and Quality, was predominant in this nation. The Nobles and Gentry are generally Episcopal and so the people, especially northward.”¹⁵ A large portion of the aristocracy therefore remained unreconciled to William’s government as a result of the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church.¹⁶

Cunningham and Sage were both Episcopal pamphleteers and thus possessed an ulterior motive in their writing. Their mission was to convince both William and

¹³ Gillian H. MacIntosh, *The Scottish Parliament Under Charles II, 1660-1685* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 190-194.

¹⁴ Cunningham, *Some Questions Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland*, 29-31.

¹⁵ John Sage, *Account of the Persecution of the Church in Scotland in Several Parts* (London, 1690), 2.

¹⁶ Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650- c. 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 19.

parliament that only the Episcopal Church commanded the loyalty of the Scottish people. In particular, they argued that only the Episcopal Church could guarantee William the support of the greater part of Scotland's aristocracy. This argument was to a large extent successful. Although they may have exaggerated the level of support the Episcopal Church enjoyed among the nobility, the crown believed their assertions, and as a result sought to establish peaceable relations with the disaffected nobility. Nobody, including Cunningham and Sage, could have known exactly how many Episcopalians remained in Scotland, especially since both men wrote their pamphlets while the Church of Scotland was without a church government. Cunningham's and Sage's success does demonstrate, however, a general recognition that Episcopalianism had not disappeared. Several others also enjoyed successful careers in the late Stuart period by claiming the ability to reach out to the Episcopal aristocracy; whether they delivered on their promises is another matter. Viscount Tarbat, the Duke of Queensbury, the Earl of Stair, and finally the Earl of Tullibardine all served William and Anne while claiming to have strong ties to the Episcopal community.¹⁷

Scotland's Episcopal community drew its greatest support from the northern region of the kingdom, where the traditional ties between the nobility and the people remained strongest and the hierarchical relationship between bishops and parish clergy

¹⁷ Allan Macinnes, *Union and Empire: The Making of the United Kingdom in 1707* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 253.

closely resembled the clan hierarchy.¹⁸ Episcopal strength in the region was evidenced by the population's residual loyalty to the Episcopal Church even after its disestablishment in 1689. North of the Tay, Episcopalianism remained strong, and in the Highlands the Episcopal Church enjoyed the protection of the local lairds and aristocrats.¹⁹ Historians estimate that at least half of the clans identified as Jacobite were Episcopalian.²⁰ Moreover, northern Scotland was in many respects isolated from the rest of the kingdom, which explains why Aberdeen remained strong for Episcopacy well after the Revolution.²¹ Most of the clergy had qualified themselves for holding their parishes, but even those who did not were still able to illegally hold their livings due to Episcopacy's popularity.²² The Presbyterian Church of Scotland only succeeded in

¹⁸ Lisa G. Curry, *Catholicism and the Clan MacDonell of Glengarry: Religions and Politics in the Highlands of Scotland, 1650-1750* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2007), 81.

¹⁹ Stewart J. Brown, "Religion in Scotland," in *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain: Blackwell Companions to British History*, ed. H.T. Dickinson (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2006), 261.

²⁰ Curry, *Catholicism and the Clan MacDonell of Glengarry*, 87; Julian Hoppit, *Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 249. Lisa Curry states that there were 26 Jacobite clans, and 15 of them were Episcopalian. Julian Hoppit counts 28 clans, with 14 being Episcopalian.

²¹ Roger Emerson, "The Enlightenment and Social Structures," in *City and Society in the Eighteenth-Century*, eds. Paul Fritz and David Williams (Toronto: Hakkert, 1973), 108.

²² William Reginald Ward, "Anglicanism and Assimilation; or Mysticism and Mayhem in the Eighteenth-Century," in *Crown and Mitre: Religion and Society in Northern Europe Since the Reformation*, eds. W. M Jacob and Nigel Yates (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993), 84.

dislodging Episcopalianism from many of the parishes in the north after the 1715 rebellion, when the government's interest in eradicating Jacobitism coincided with the Church of Scotland's desire to claim those parishes.²³ The strength of Episcopalianism in the north did not mean that the Episcopal Church only had support in this one region. The Episcopal Church had adherents throughout much of the rest of Scotland, even Glasgow and the southwestern part of the kingdom where the Cameronians had been prevalent continued to possess Episcopal congregations.²⁴

The Presbyterians and Cameronians

There were essentially two Presbyterian communities: moderate and Cameronian. The moderate Presbyterians were defined by their willingness to conform to the Restoration Church of Scotland, although some Presbyterian ministers chose exile in the Netherlands. They conformed for two major reasons. First, there were few doctrines and practices on which the two churches differed. The second reason was that moderate Presbyterians wanted to distinguish themselves from the fiercely anti-government Cameronian Presbyterians.²⁵ They hoped that conformity to the state church and demonstrating their loyalty to the government would improve their standing. The

²³ Macinnes, *Union and Empire*, 252-3.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion, and Ideas* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 212.

moderate Presbyterians who went into exile served an important role in the long term revival of Presbyterianism, and while they lived in Holland they presented the case of the Presbyterian clergy to William. William Carstares was one such exiled minister. After the Rye House Plot of 1683 Carstares went to Holland and became a close confidant of William. Their relationship continued throughout William's reign and Carstares served as the royal chaplain in Scotland. Much of what William believed about the religious situation in Scotland prior to his arrival was due to influence of the Presbyterian exiles and this explains why William's early attitude toward Scotland reflected a pro-Presbyterian bent. And, when the exiled ministers returned to Scotland in 1687, after James issued his second indulgence, these men became the backbone of a Presbyterian organization that would lead the new Church of Scotland beginning in 1689. While James had hoped that his indulgence would facilitate conversions to Catholicism it served instead to bring the moderate Presbyterians back from exile and into the open since its generous terms did not require ministers to swear to the Test Act.²⁶ Under these conditions some Presbyterians began to leave the Episcopal Church and the moderate Presbyterians distinguished themselves from the radicals who refused to accept the indulgence.²⁷

²⁶ F.W. Schneider, "Scottish Episcopalians and the English Politicians: The Limits of Toleration," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 45 (1976): 277.

²⁷ Richard L. Greaves, "Conformity and Security in Scotland and Ireland, 1660-85," in *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland, 1550-1700*, eds. Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006), 250; Tim Harris, *Revolution*, 173; Harris, *Restoration*, 336.

The Cameronians represented the radical wing of the Presbyterian movement and had their strength in the southwest of Scotland.²⁸ These people held firm to the National Covenant of 1638 and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643, and were determined to hold Charles II to the oath he took in 1650. The movement took its name from its leader Richard Cameron. Willie Thompson describes its composition as “almost without exception tenants, tradespeople or lower on the social scale, resisted in arms. But, in spite of the character of the struggle, no recognizable social radicalism emerged within the Covenanter ranks. Their demands remained at the level of total repudiation of any episcopacy or secular authority over the Kirk, and never escaped theological bindings.”²⁹ Early in his reign Charles made his true feelings toward the Covenant clear, and the Cameronians decided to take action by denouncing Charles and his now Catholic brother. They pronounced them excommunicates in their field conventicles³⁰, and open rebellion soon followed. The government responded quickly and with severity. In 1680 dragoons attacked the Cameronians and killed Cameron and his important lieutenant David Hackston among many others. Hackston had been a part of the team that assassinated the

²⁸ Luke Brekke, “Heretics in the Pulpit, Inquisitors in the Pews: The Long Reformation and the Scottish Enlightenment,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 44, no. 1 (Fall 2010): 83.

²⁹ Willie Thompson, “From Reformation to Union,” in *Scottish Capitalism: Class, State and Nation from before the Union to the Present*, ed. Tony Dickson (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1980), 80.

³⁰ Field conventicles were illegal church services held by the Cameronian and other radical Presbyterians. These meetings were held outside of cities and villages and often times attacked the monarchy in addition to the Episcopalian Church of Scotland and Presbyterians who had rejected the Covenant.

Archbishop of St. Andrews, John Sharp in 1679.³¹ Government action against the Cameronians continued until James issued his Indulgences. In particular, the Scottish Parliament passed additional acts against those who met in the field conventicles in an effort to strike at the core of the movement by depriving it of lawful means to meet outside the watchful eyes of the state. These laws achieved their desired ends and the Cameronians were successfully pacified through persistent persecution.³² The persecution of nonconformists reached a high point in this period in both Scotland and England, and in both cases the state succeeded in eliminating nonconformity.³³ In the waning years of Charles II's reign the government maintained control of the Cameronian heartland (the southwest) with a large military presence; however, when James ordered those troops to come to his assistance in England, the government lost control of the region and the Cameronians began to purge the Episcopal clergy from their parishes.³⁴ The Episcopal Church could not hold the region for James once he had removed the military presence.

³¹ Keith Brown, "Reformation to Union, 1560-1707," in *The New Penguin History of Scotland: From the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, eds. R.A. Houston and W.W. J. Knox (London: Allen Lane for the Penguin Press, 2001), 260; Harris, *Restoration*, 337.

³² Raymond Campbell Patterson, *A Land Afflicted: Scotland and Covenanter Wars, 1638-1690* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1998), 279; W. A. Speck, *James II: Profiles in Power* (London: Longman, 2002), 86.

³³ Mark Goldie, "The Hilton Gang: Terrorising Dissent in 1680s London," *History Today* 47, no. 10 (1997): 29.

³⁴ Magnus Magnusson, *Scotland: The Story of A Nation* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2000), 508.

For political reasons, the moderate Presbyterian leadership needed desperately to distinguish themselves from their radical brethren. Episcopalians tried to prevent this. In viewing the stated grievances of the Presbyterian party in 1688-89, Cunningham noted the striking similarities in their present demands with those of their Covenanting past and their Cameronian friends. Specifically, he pointed out the Presbyterian desire to weaken the crown's position in church affairs.³⁵ Episcopal minister and Edinburgh University principal Alexander Monro also challenged the moderate Presbyterians to explain how and where they differed from the radical elements in their movement and concluded that, "the present Ministers of the Presbyterian Church cannot instance any one thing that the Cameronians did upon this late Revolution, but what is justifiable from Presbyterian Principles, and though they could not be justified from their former Principle, why may not the present Presbyterians improve the Principles of the Predecessors?"³⁶ A key strategy of the Episcopal campaign against the Presbyterians throughout the late Stuart period was to conflate the moderate and radical factions within the Presbyterian community.

³⁵ Cunningham, *Questions Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland*, 25-28.

³⁶ Alexander Monro, *An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland, Chiefly oppos'd to the Censures, Calumnies, and Accusations of a Late Presbyterian Vindicator, In a Letter to a Friend. Wherein His Vanity, Partiality, and Sophistry are modestly Reproved, And the Legal Establishment of Episcopacy in that Kingdom, from the Beginning of the Reformation, is made evident from History and the Records of Parliament. Together with A Postscript, relating to a scandalous Pamphlet, Intituled, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence* (London, 1693), 7.

The Catholics

Finally, Catholics still existed in Scotland. Reformers had worked systematically since the mid-sixteenth century to eliminate Catholicism, but small numbers remained. By 1600 they had very little influence and had few benefices under their patronage.³⁷ The Catholic community at the time of the Glorious Revolution likewise had very few members. In all likelihood there existed only a few thousand Catholics in all of Scotland, and the overwhelming majority of them lived in Gailhealtachd, or the Gaelic speaking region of Scotland, where they were served by missionary priests and continued to be “a thorn in the flesh of the Church of Scotland.”³⁸ James spent much of his reign trying to revive the Catholic Church, and every overture to the Church of Scotland and to the Protestant dissenters had as its motive the relief of Catholics. Unfortunately the influx of Huguenot refugees who had fled Louis XIV’s persecution reinforced his kingdoms’ negative opinion of Catholicism.³⁹ Although James’s efforts failed miserably, the prospect of advancement and promotion encouraged some notable conversions. The Earl of Perth, the Earl of Melfort, and the Earl of Moray

³⁷ James Kirk, “Royal and lay Patronage in the Jacobean Kirk, 1572-1600,” in *Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929*, ed. Norman Macdougall (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1983), 146.

³⁸ Clotilde Prunier, *Anti-Catholic Strategies in Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2004), 22; Brown, *Reformation to Union, 1560-1707*, 268.; Magnusson, *Scotland*, 503; Joyce Miller, “Beliefs, Religions, Fears and Neuroses,” in *A History of Everyday Life in Scotland, 1600 to 1800*, eds. Elizabeth Foyster and Christopher A. Whatley (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), 248.

³⁹ J.F. Bosher, “The Franco-Catholic Danger, 1660-1715,” *History* 79, no. 255 (Feb 1994): 25.

converted while James ruled and they, along with the cradle Catholic Duke of Gordon, all advanced socially and politically as a result. However, outside of these few high profile conversions, the Catholic population remained stagnant.⁴⁰ Scotland's Catholic community did not receive its own bishop until 1700 when Thomas Nicholson, a Scottish born convert to Catholicism, received the post. In 1704 Peter Fraser was the first Catholic priest ordained on Scottish soil since the Reformation.⁴¹

Numbers

James II's decision to include the Presbyterians in his indulgence revived what had looked to be a dying, if not dead, movement. But how effective was it in shifting a majority of the Church of Scotland's conformist congregations away from the established church? Traditionally historians have argued that the indulgence was effective. It is assumed to have disestablished the Episcopal Church across southern Scotland while leaving the church in the north intact.⁴² The perception of a regionally strong Episcopal Church in the north of Scotland and a stronger Presbyterian presence throughout the rest of Scotland is typical. The visible disaffection of northern Scotland from the post-

⁴⁰ Harris, *Revolutions*, 149; Magnusson, *Scotland: The Story of A Nation*, 503.

⁴¹ Mark Dilworth, "Roman Catholic Worship," in *Studies in the Worship in Scotland*, eds. Duncan Forrester and Douglas Murray (Edinburgh; T&T Clark, 1996), 137; Brian M. Halloran, "Scandal or Repentance? John Gordon of Glencat," *Innes Review* 55, no. 2 (2004): 206; Wendy Doran, "Bishop Thomas Nicolson : First Vicar-Apostolic, 1695-1718," *Innes Review* 39, no. 2 (Autumn 1988): 109-110, 112.

⁴² Patterson, *A Land Afflicted*, 281.

Revolutionary church settlement is often viewed as evidence that Episcopalianism only had a regional following.⁴³ While historians safely assume that Episcopalianism enjoyed stronger support in the north than in the south, and the southwest where the Cameronians remained strong, one must be careful not to underestimate the support the Episcopal Church of Scotland had outside the north prior to disestablishment. While the Presbyterians presented their ecclesiology as the dominant one among the Scots and therefore the logical outcome of the Glorious Revolution, this was not inevitable. Andrew Drummond and James Bulloch remind readers that, “in Scotland, Episcopalianism was strong and the Presbyterian ascendancy anything but sure. Until the death of Queen Anne there was always a fair chance that Episcopacy might regain its former position.”⁴⁴ Clearly, this is no endorsement of the Presbyterian triumphalism that dominates the traditional historical narrative.

Indeed, too often the Presbyterian members of the Scottish Convention are taken at their word in the Claim of Right and Article of Grievances.⁴⁵ In March of 1689 the

⁴³ Richard Finlay, “Keeping the Covenant: Scottish National Identity,” in *Eighteenth Century Scotland: New Perspectives*, ed. T.M. Devine and J.R. Young (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 1999), 123.

⁴⁴ Andrew L. Drummond and James Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843: The Age of the Moderates* (Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press, 1973), 4.

⁴⁵ Brown (ed.), “The Declaration of the Estates containing the Claim of Right and the offer of the crowne [crown] to the king and queen of England,” *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/1689/3/108> (accessed July 4, 2013); An annotated version of the *Article of Grievances* can be found in David Lewis Jones, *Parliamentary History of the Glorious Revolution* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1988), 63-65.

Convention declared that James had forfeited the crown because he had violated the Scottish constitution, and imposed limits on William's power in Scotland. In the Article of Grievances the Presbyterian dominated Convention claimed prelacy was an unbearable grievance against the general inclinations of the people, and at first William operated under this premise. As previously observed, his early declarations of support for the Presbyterians were influenced by his contact with Presbyterian exiles in Holland. Yet once William crossed the channel and became better acquainted with the situation, he shifted his support away from the Presbyterians in order to bring the Episcopalians into his camp. Often overlooked by historians is the fact that William decided to change sides after he realized the strength of the Episcopal party.⁴⁶

Allan Macinnes, Andrew Drummond, and James Bulloch have each questioned the traditional interpretation of Presbyterian dominance. Analyzing the Claim of Right and the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church, Macinnes observes, for example, "On the distinctly erastian and dubious grounds that they no longer commanded the confessional allegiance of the majority of Scots, the Episcopalian clergy had been ousted from the Kirk in favor of the Presbyterians."⁴⁷ The implication is clear: the Episcopalians likely still commanded the confessional allegiance of a majority of the

⁴⁶ See the following references for examples of this oversight. Carla Gardina Pestana, *Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic World* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 142.; Stewart J. Brown, "Religion in Scotland," in *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain: Blackwell Companions to British History*, ed. H.T. Dickinson (Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, 2006), 261.

⁴⁷ Macinnes, *Union and Empire*, 252-253.

Scots. Drummond and Bulloch have cited Lord Tarbat's contemporary observation about Scotland's religious composition, "Episcopacy appears insufferable to a great party, and Presbytery as odious to another. The Presbyterians are the more zealous and hotter: the other more numerous and powerful."⁴⁸ The Presbyterians may have been the loudest, but the Episcopalians were the largest party.

Other sources also cast serious doubt on the dominant position some historians have traditionally assigned to the Presbyterians. Contemporary assessments portrayed the Episcopal position *vis a vis* the Presbyterians as quite strong. Writing in 1690, the author of *The Prelatical Church-man Against the Phanatical Kirk-man...* claimed that three out of four in Scotland preferred Episcopacy.⁴⁹ Others were even more generous in their assessments, and following the abolition of Episcopacy, those Episcopalian clergy who stayed in their parishes claimed to have larger congregations than their Presbyterian counterparts.⁵⁰

The language that the Episcopalians and Presbyterians used to describe their numerical strength reveals a pattern that illuminates the statistical reality. Presbyterians used phrases like the "general inclinations of the people" in the Claim of Right with respect to their numeric strength, while the Episcopalians used terms like "predominant" and statistics like "3 out of 4." The Presbyterian language is vague; and Episcopal

⁴⁸ Tarbat quoted in Drummond and Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843*, 4.

⁴⁹ *The Prelatical Church-Man Against the Phanatical Kirk-Man*, 8.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 59.

language precise and confident. Even after accounting for some exaggeration, the Episcopalians still appear to have been the larger party. Tony Claydon speculates that in the final analysis Episcopalianism possessed the adherence of a majority of the Scots.⁵¹ This conclusion seems the more likely when one considers the estimation of Jeremy Black that in 1700 forty percent of Scotland remained Episcopalian and possibly remained so as late as 1715, this according to Daniel Szechi, well after the Presbyterian persecutions and “rabblings” had begun.⁵²

Regardless of the exact number of Episcopalians and Presbyterians at the time of the Glorious Revolution, two things are clear: the Episcopalians enjoyed a significant following and the Presbyterians were in no way the numerically dominant party. Episcopalianism retained a large following which included the better part of the nobility and a virtually monolithic regional base north of the Tay.

Differences between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians

Perhaps one of the reasons historians have had such difficulties in assessing the relative strengths of the Episcopal and Presbyterian parties is the fact that for much of the Restoration and Revolutionary era the two churches were indistinguishable in terms of beliefs and practices. Outside of a small number of Baptists, independents, Quakers, and

⁵¹ Tony Claydon, *William III: Profiles in Power* (London: Longman, 2002), 182.

⁵² Jeremy Black, *Eighteenth-Century Britain, 1688-1783* (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001), 127; Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 24.

Catholics, Scotland possessed a common religious culture.⁵³ The dissenter community, Catholics excluded, possessed their own common religious culture that, in the words of Sharon Achinstein, “carried on a tradition of free thought, self-government, and political radicalism.”⁵⁴ One must be careful not to confuse Episcopalianism and Anglicanism. Episcopalianism indicates the belief in ecclesiastical government by bishops, whereas Anglicanism is a particular version of Episcopalianism. The Episcopal Church of Scotland was not the Church of England in Scotland. The Crown and Parliament resurrected the Scottish Bishops at the Restoration, but they did not bring back the Prayer Book of 1637. In order to secure the allegiance of the nation, the Episcopal Church needed to consider the religious sensibilities of a Calvinist nation. After 1688, as William attempted to sort out Scotland’s religious situation, Episcopal polemicists presented him with a view of Scotland that minimized the differences between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, and, to be certain, they had a vested interest in conflating the two positions. If the two groups did not appear different, perhaps William might decide that the bishops had been good managers of the church and opt to leave them in power or at least forge a compromise between the two polities. It was important that the Presbyterians did not contest this version of a doctrinally and liturgically monolithic Scotland, and the final church settlement compromise left the Episcopalians

⁵³ Alasdair Raffe, “Presbyterians and Episcopalians: The Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715,” *English Historical Review* 125, no. 514 (2010): 570.

⁵⁴ Sharon Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent in Milton’s England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 8.

and Presbyterians virtually indistinguishable in all matters except ecclesiastical structure and political theory. As Alasdair Raffe points out, identifying these similarities in worship made the Episcopalians appear victims of irrational persecution from the Presbyterians.⁵⁵

Doctrinally the two churches were Calvinist. While Arminianism dominated the Restoration Church of England, the Episcopal Church of Scotland held firm to its Calvinist tradition and to the Westminster Confession of Faith until the 1700s.⁵⁶ The Archbishop of St. Andrews, Arthur Rose, and future Nonjuring bishop, John Sage, were accused of Arminianism because they were conspicuously reluctant to affirm Calvinist orthodoxy. They were part of a larger trend that marked the emergence of a “distinct” Episcopalian confession of faith.⁵⁷ The Episcopal Church carefully avoided offending its Calvinist members; in fact, a man who later became very important in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, George Meldrum, served in the Episcopal Church until he resigned

⁵⁵ Raffe, “Presbyterians and Episcopalians,” 581.

⁵⁶ Westminster Assembly, *The Confession of Faith: and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms* (Edinburgh, 1744). The Westminster Confession of Faith was a Calvinist formulation of Christian doctrines created by English and Scottish Calvinists during the Civil War. Following the Restoration, the Church of England largely ignored it in favor of Arminianism, while the Church of Scotland supported it.

⁵⁷ Alasdair Raffe, “Presbyterians and Episcopalians,” 584; “Scotland Restored and Reshaped: Politics and Religion, c. 1660-1712,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, eds. T.M. Devine and Jenny Wormald (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 257.

over the Test Act.⁵⁸ Alexander Cunningham challenged Presbyterian opponents to provide some area of substantive doctrinal disagreement. “Now let any Presbyterians discover, if he can, one single Article of the three and thirty Chapters of the Confession, that was ever condemned by the late Episcopal Church of Scotland.”⁵⁹ The Episcopal apologists consistently raised this point while the Revolutionary settlement was being debated. Cameronians aside, why change something that had worked as a comprehensive national church for nearly thirty years when, as one Episcopalian put it, “in the Doctrinal Truths of the Reformed Religion, and the Substantial parts of Divine Worship, all sober Protestants of Episcopal and Presbyterian Perswasion are firmly united together.”⁶⁰ Raffe notes that most Scots enjoyed the church that interfered least in their lives and left the high theological debates to others. This is evidenced by the fact that most Scots over the course of their lives had lived under both forms of church government, something made much easier because of similarities in pastoral care.⁶¹

Not only were the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches of one doctrine, they also shared a very similar style of worship. The Episcopal Church of England had a liturgy

⁵⁸ Gordon DesBrisay, “Catholics, Quakers and Religious Persecution in Restoration Aberdeen,” *Innes Review* 47, no. 2 (1996): 141.

⁵⁹ Cunningham, *Questions Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland*, 10.

⁶⁰ *A Letter to a reverend minister of the Gospel of the Presbyterian perswasion* (Edinburgh, 1689), 1.

⁶¹ Gordon Marshall, *Presbyteries and Profits: Calvinism and the Development of Capitalism in Scotland, 1560-1707* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 41; Raffe, “Presbyterians and Episcopalianism,” 597.

from a Prayer Book; the Episcopal Church of Scotland did not. English Episcopalian and Army Chaplain Thomas Morer explained the basic structure of the worship of these two churches to an English audience, “Their singing of Psalms, praying, preaching and collection are the same, and ‘tis the whole of their worship in both congregations. They both do it after the same manner, saving that after the psalm the Episcopalian minister uses the doxology, which the other omits, and concludes his own prayer with that of the Lord, which the Presbyterian refuses to do.” The essential differences in worship were the use of the doxology, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Apostles Creed during Baptisms.⁶² There would have been some small variations among congregations since neither the bishops nor the presbyteries attempted to enforce strict uniformity, but overall the two churches had far more in common than they had differences. George Mackenzie tried in vain to parlay these similarities into support for the Episcopal Church. He appealed to William to preserve the Episcopal Church settlement since, “that in the Church, as it is now established by Law under Episcopacy amongst us, we have no Ceremonies at all, not so much as any form of Prayer, no Musick but singing in the Churches the Doctrine and Discipline is the same both in the Church and Conventicle”⁶³ These similarities

⁶² Gordon Donaldson, “Covenant to Revolution,” in *Studies in the Worship in Scotland*, eds. Forrester and Murray, 68-69.

⁶³ George Mackenzie, *A Memorial for His Highness the Prince of Orange, In Relation to the Affairs of Scotland: Together with an Address of the Presbyterian Party in that Kingdom to His Highness; and Some Observations on that Address* (London: Randal Taylor, 1689), 8.

remained for at least a decade after the Revolution.⁶⁴ It would not be until the Scottish Episcopalians adopted the English *Book of Common Prayer* throughout their congregations in the early years of Anne's reign that the two churches diverged in terms of practice and doctrine.

Rather than doctrine, the major issue that separated Episcopalians and Presbyterians was that of church government. Should the Kirk sessions be governed by Bishops or by the Presbyteries? The Episcopalians argued the former while the Presbyterians believed the latter. This dispute reflected a long standing rift within the Scottish Protestant community that dated back to the Scottish Reformation itself and in some respects back even to the larger European Reformation. How ought a biblically based Protestant church be structured? Presbyterians believed that Calvin had laid out the proper church model in Geneva where he constructed consistories and presbyteries. Moreover, they held that since Calvin relied on these institutions instead of using bishops, he must have opposed Episcopacy. Scotland's Calvinist Episcopalians had a different understanding of Calvin and his ideas of ecclesiastical government. Cunningham, unusual for his time in arguing in favor of a divinely instituted Episcopacy in the 1680s, drew on Calvin's notes on scripture in the *Institutes of the Christian Religion* to demonstrate that Calvin was not hostile towards Episcopacy.⁶⁵ He

⁶⁴ Daniel Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnwath, 1689-1727: A Study in Jacobitism* (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2002), 141.

⁶⁵ Raffe, "Presbyterians and Episcopalians," 577.

maintained that Calvin accepted Episcopacy as a valid and scriptural church government.⁶⁶

At the heart of the argument over church structure was the question of church – state relations. Bishops answered to kings or popes while Presbyteries answered to no person on earth. Presbyterians, the Episcopalians argued, held to the “two-kingdoms” idea. They believed that the world was divided between the kingdom of God (the church) and the secular kingdom. While the secular king ruled in temporal matters, he remained a member of the kingdom of God and therefore was answerable to the church. The church, however, was not answerable to him. Any subjugation of the church to temporal authorities, whether by bishops, popes, or an Erastian relationship with the state would be anti-Christian.⁶⁷ The Episcopalians tried to manipulate this doctrine to their advantage.

⁶⁶ David Allan, “Protestantism, Presbyterianism and National Identity in Eighteenth-Century Scottish History,” in *Protestantism and National Identity Britain and Ireland, c. 1650 – c. 1850*, eds. Claydon and McBride, 187; Alexander Cunningham, *An Essay Concerning Church Government Out of the Excellent Writing of Calvin and Beza* (1689); *The Divine Right of Episcopacy, Demonstrated from Calvin and Beza Together with a Letter to a Presbyterian Minister From Union* (London: Randal Taylor, 1690); Gordon Donaldson, *The Shaping of a Nation* (London: David and Charles, 1974), 187; Thomas Forrester, *A Counter-essay, or, A Vindication and Assertion of Calvin and Beza’s Presbyterian Judgment and Principles: Drawn from their Writings, in Answer to the Imputations of a Late Pamphlet, Entituled, An Essay Concerning Church-government ... Attempting to Fasten Upon Them an Episcopal Perswasion ... / by a Minister of the True Presbyterian Church of Scotland, Established by Law* (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1692), 30.

⁶⁷ Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland’s Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 55.

Erastianism⁶⁸ lay at the heart of William's ecclesiastical policy, and in this conflict between the two kingdoms the Episcopal party made it clear that Presbyterians regarded the state as secondary to the church. Their covenanted allegiance to God outweighed their loyalty to King William or any secular ruler.⁶⁹

The Episcopalians conversely presented themselves as believers in the old Erastian church-state synergy that had defined Scottish ecclesiology since the Restoration. Episcopalians followed the law obediently, even when it did not suit their best interests, as in the case of James's indulgence. The Episcopalians held to the "one-kingdom" model, in which the monarch had total authority over all people and institutions within the kingdom conferred on him or her by God. This included the church.⁷⁰ Sir Robert Filmer, a political theorist from the first part of the seventeenth-century, articulated that passive obedience and indefeasible hereditary right were the pillars of the "one-kingdom" system. These ideas were not just political posturing; they were believed divinely inspired.⁷¹ The one-kingdom model was the more useful one for the state to support, and every Scottish monarch since James I reached his majority had

⁶⁸ Erastianism is used in this dissertation to mean the supremacy of the state over the church, even with respect to ecclesiastical matters.

⁶⁹ Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past*, 57.

⁷⁰ Julian Goodare, *State and Society in Early Modern Scotland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 198.

⁷¹ Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, *Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex, 1700-1745* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 15; Gordon Hammond, "High Church Anglican Influences on John Wesley's Conception of Primitive Christianity, 1732-1735," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 78, no. 2 (2009): 186.

adopted this position. Consequently, the Episcopal cause traditionally had support from the monarchy. The Episcopalians hoped this would help them to win William's support as well. The crown could count on the Episcopal Church to follow orders and the Episcopal Church could count on the crown to maintain its position. The mutually beneficial relationship worked well until James II started to undermine the position of the bishops. James broke the compact between the Episcopal Church and the state by issuing the indulgence.⁷² Throughout the Restoration era the Episcopalians failed to develop a justification for their existence outside royal prerogative.⁷³ This is not to suggest that the bishops did not believe in Apostolic Succession. Their apologists could quote scripture at length when they defended the bishops, but the church itself did not claim authority independent of the state. The crown and parliament re-established the Episcopal Church because they deemed it expedient and useful; they did not re-establish the church because it possessed some sort of inherent *jure divino* to be the state church. Julia Buckroyd illustrates this point quite well. She observes that while James Sharp, the Archbishop of St. Andrews, had been granted the right to nominate bishops, he was in fact "bullied" by the Earl, later Duke of Lauderdale, Charles II's Secretary of State for Scotland into accepting his recommendations.⁷⁴ Furthermore, when parliament passed the Test Act in 1681, it in effect made the king the "pope" of the Church of Scotland.⁷⁵ This

⁷² Harris, *Revolution*, 147.

⁷³ Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, 114.

⁷⁴ Julia Buckroyd, "Anti-Clericalism in Scotland During the Restoration," in *Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929*, ed. Macdougall, 171.

⁷⁵ Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, 115-117.

arrangement worked as long as the monarch supported the church, but it left the church unable to defend itself when the crown decided to undermine it. The bishops could not justify resistance to James. The Church did not develop a full scale defense of *jure divino* until after it had lost its established position and needed an independent reason to exist.

The Revolution, Conventions, and Settlements

By the end of the spring of 1688 the opposition to James's regime had grown to a critical mass in England. Throughout his reign James had systematically alienated his supporters. In Scotland his second indulgence resulted in the resignation of Rosehaugh who had previously proven a loyal defender of the crown.⁷⁶ In England James republished his indulgence in late April and required the Anglican clergy to read it to their congregations on successive Sundays in early May. Seven bishops objected and chose to disobey the king's order, for which they subsequently stood trial.⁷⁷ Ironically, all but two of the bishops, Lloyd of St. Asaph and Trelawny of Bristol, remained loyal to James after the Revolution. Before the bishops' trial commenced, Mary of Modena gave birth to a son, James Francis Edward, who was immediately baptized a Catholic and who now was next in line to the throne. The bishops were acquitted but James's perceived

⁷⁶ Ginny Gardner, "A Haven for Intrigue: the Scottish Exile Community in the Netherlands, 1660-1690," in *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Alexia Grosjean and Steve Murdoch (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 291.

⁷⁷ The Seven Bishops were William Sancroft of Canterbury, Thomas Ken of Bath and Wells, John Lake of Chichester, Francis Turner of Ely, Thomas White of Peterborough, William Lloyd of St. Asaph, and Jonathan Trelawny of Bristol.

tendency toward absolutism and his overt assistance to his fellow Catholics, coupled now with the prospect of a continuing Catholic dynasty proved too much for some of his subjects. It was at this time that the Immortal Seven sent their request to the Hague that implored William to come and restore their liberties. The timing proved fortuitous. A break in the action in William's war effort against France allowed him to leave the country with a part of his Dutch army. Holland feared James would enter the war on the side Louis XIV, and therefore the States General approved of William's mission to England.⁷⁸

When William arrived at Torbay on November 5, he came not only at the head of a Dutch army, but also accompanied by a mass of expatriates who had sought refuge in Holland from either Charles II or James II. Many English Whigs had moved there in the 1680s, and these men helped William understand the political dynamics of England.⁷⁹ William also had many important Scottish elite exiles with him in Holland that played important roles in post-Revolution Scotland; men like David Melville, the Earl of Leven; Andrew Fletcher of Saloun; Patrick Hume of Polwarth; James Dalrymple, Viscount Stair; and James Stewart of Goodress.⁸⁰ Many of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland's major intellectual figures had also lived in Holland in the 1680s. George Campbell, Gilbert

⁷⁸ Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 459.

⁷⁹ Robert Beddard, "The Unexpected Whig Revolution of 1688," in *The Revolutions of 1688 The Andrew Browning Lectures 1988*, ed. Robert Beddard (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 20.

⁸⁰ Gardner, "A Haven for Intrigue," 279.

Rule, Thomas Forrester, and Alexander Pitcairn all served as professors or principals of Scottish universities after the Revolution, while Thomas Hog and David Blair served William as chaplains following the Revolution.⁸¹ Holland had been a center for Scots who pursued education abroad. Esther Mijers estimates that 1027 Scottish students attended one of the four main Dutch schools, and she states that these schools served as Scotland's sixth university.⁸² There were also many Scots who joined William's invasion force. Sir Duncan Campbell of Auchinbreack and Henry Erskine, Third Lord Cardross, served as captains in William's army. Within the invasion party there was a Scots-Dutch brigade.⁸³ Scotland did not start the Glorious Revolution, but many Scots were posed to play a major part in it.

The Revolution could not have gone any better for William. Key defections like those of John Churchill, the future Duke of Marlborough and lieutenant general in James's army, and Princess Anne all demonstrated the growing strength of William's position. William moved Dutch troops to secure London, and began to act as *de facto* king in December.⁸⁴ James's attempt to escape to France failed and he was returned to London where he received a surprisingly warm welcome. He met with the bishops of the Church of England and promised to respect the privileges of the church and the Protestant

⁸¹ Ibid., 298.

⁸² Esther Mijers, "Scottish Students in the Netherlands, 1680-1730," in *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period*, eds. Alexia Grosjean and Steve Murdoch (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 303.

⁸³ Gardner, "A Haven for Intrigue," 293.

⁸⁴ Scott, *England's Troubles*, 466.

monopoly on office. He offered to turn over to William the power to make war and peace on behalf of England for the duration of William's life, and agreed to any laws that Parliament might deem wise in order to secure the Protestant religion.⁸⁵ While none of this came to fruition, James's reception upon his return and his apparent willingness to make concessions help explain why he would retain a loyal following even after his successful escape to France at the end of the month. It was his second flight that marked the beginning of the Revolution in Scotland. James's position there had been much stronger than in England; for many Scots he was viewed as an improvement over his brother, and unlike in England where the clergy helped bring about his downfall, however unintentionally, the bishops in Scotland were unwilling to create problems for their king.⁸⁶

The English settlement came first. The English Convention started on January 5, 1689 with its members to decide the fate of the monarchy. The Convention pondered three options: one completely Whig in its understanding, and two potential Tory solutions. The Whigs wished William to rule as king with the right of Parliament to "elect" the king explicit in the offer. This plan resembled the future Scottish settlement where the Convention declared the throne vacant and then offered it to William. A Tory plan that would have had William serve as regent for James failed by three votes. The

⁸⁵ Beddard, "The Unexpected Whig Revolution of 1688," 15.

⁸⁶ Ian B. Cowan, "Church and State Reformed? The Revolution of 1688-9 in Scotland," in *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, ed. Jonathan I. Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 163.

other Tory solution called for Princess Mary to be offered the crown. Lord Danby proposed this plan in order to preserve hereditary right, and, at the same time, the Earl of Nottingham opposed any plan that called for the “ancient lineal succession be altered.”⁸⁷ William helped break the stalemate by informing the Convention that either they offer him the crown or he would return to Holland.⁸⁸ The Convention acquiesced and declared William and Mary joint monarchs. The Whigs got the king they, and the Tories preserved, at least in part, the hereditary succession with Mary serving as joint monarch. Moreover, since James was deemed to have abdicated, the Tories did not have to accept the idea that Parliament could remove the monarch. Geoffrey Holmes stated that the solution was not the unmitigated victory the Whigs had wanted, nor was it the disaster the Tories had feared.⁸⁹

James’s loss of England created a crisis for the Scots; they too needed to settle their crown. Starting in March 1689 the Scottish Convention began to meet to settle not only the throne, but also the Church of Scotland. Prior to the meeting of the Convention the Episcopal Church had as good a claim on the allegiance of the Scottish people as any other church. It enjoyed a strong base in the north and appeared to have William’s support. Thus, the crucial turning point for the disestablishment of Episcopacy was not

⁸⁷ Geoffrey Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power: Later Stuart and Early Georgian Britain, 1660-1722* (London: Longman, 1993), 213-215.

⁸⁸ Magnus Linklater and Christian Hesketh. *For King and Conscience: John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee (1648-1689)* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989), 150.

⁸⁹ Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power*, 215.

the loss of public support, nor the intervention of William, but instead the failure of the Episcopal party to understand the gravity of the Convention and its lasting impact. Like the English Convention, the Scottish Convention decided both James's fate and Scotland's official response to the Glorious Revolution. The Episcopalians hesitated and refused to support William unconditionally and this cost the church dearly. Still, had it been better organized and turned out in numbers that represented the actual composition of Scottish society, Episcopalians might have prevailed. In fact, the Episcopal party acted in a disorganized manner, both in the election campaign and later in the Convention, whereas the Presbyterians acted more in unison. The Episcopalians could not decide on how to deal with the question of legitimacy that surrounded the Convention. Moreover, shortly after the Convention had opened, the Episcopal leader Viscount Dundee departed in order to start a rebellion in favor of James and initiate an alternative convention at Stirling.⁹⁰

At the same time there appeared something of a fatalistic nonchalance on the part of the Episcopal community. The tenor of the Episcopalian George Mackenzie's *Memorial for His highness the Prince of Orange* captured this tone. He stated, "That You being come to support our Laws, You are in honor bound to support Episcopacy, which is confirmed by twenty-seven Parliaments"⁹¹ His message was simple: if William was bound to "support our Laws," then he had no choice but to support the Episcopate because it had been established and confirmed by statute. If William supported

⁹⁰ Murray Pittock, *Jacobitism* (London: Macmillan Press, 1998), 20-21.

⁹¹ George Mackenzie, *A Memorial for His Highness the Prince of Orange*, 5-7.

overturning the Episcopal establishment then he had lied about his intentions. He reminded William of the need for an Episcopate to maintain the monarchy and proceeded to point out to William that the extreme persecutions suffered by the Presbyterians were in fact the designs of the monarchy. “That Episcopacy is necessary for the support of the Monarchy, and that the Scottish Presbytery is not opposed to us as an Ecclesiastical Government, but as having incorporated into it many horrid Principles, inconsistent with humane Society, in which the Monarchy is more concerned than we.”⁹² Mackenzie essentially argued that, first, the Presbyterians were angry with the Episcopate not because of things done to them of the bishops’ own volition but rather at the crown’s direction, and, secondly, that the Episcopate was so loyal to the monarch it would carry out his wishes even to these extremes. Mackenzie’s whole address presumptuously told William in effect that he had no choice but to support the Episcopal cause.

The election of delegates proved decisive. Tim Harris attributes the Presbyterian success in the elections to James’s behavior. Following his indulgence, James’s indulgence alienated his supporters and allowed the Presbyterians to develop a more organized front.⁹³ James’s actions placed many of the elite in an uncomfortable position. As historian Keith Brown has described the situation, “While few were prepared to fight for James VII in 1689, many were uncomfortable with his removal.”⁹⁴ This reluctance created paralysis within the Episcopal community. John Sage demonstrated this attitude

⁹² Ibid., 2.

⁹³ Harris, *Revolutions*, 147.

⁹⁴ Brown, *Reformation to Union*, 260.

when he wrote, “That in the beginning of this Revolution, the Episcopal Party in Scotland, not knowing at that time how far the things would go, judged it best for them to keep a distance; and having a deep Impression of the Allegiance to King James, they appeared a little too tender and unconcerned in the election of Members of the Convention: by which means the Discontented and Presbyterian Party, as they are in themselves always very active, so upon this occasion they became more numerous, and carried it against those few Gentlemen that showed themselves for the Church and old Constitution.”⁹⁵ Residual Episcopal loyalty to James kept members from appearing in large numbers at the Convention and opened the door for the Presbyterians to take over, even though nine bishops attended the early sessions.⁹⁶ At the same time many moderate Episcopalians from the north of Scotland decided against attending because they feared for their safety in light of the violence against them that had been occurring in the southwest since James’s flight to France.⁹⁷ In addition, many Episcopalians abstained from the election because they believed that it was in violation of the Test Oath, that it met without the consent of the king.⁹⁸ Ian Cowan also detects division among James’s supporters. Cowan accuses them of being “self-interested” and “venal” and points out that some of them even went to London to try and make peace with William, while

⁹⁵ Sage, *Account of the Persecution of the Church in Scotland*, 3.

⁹⁶ Julian Goodare, “The Estates in the Scottish Parliament, 1286-1707,” in *The Scots and Parliament*, ed. Clyve Jones (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996), 11.

⁹⁷ Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion, and War* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 211.

⁹⁸ Harris, *Revolutions*, 147.

William's supporters were "single minded" in their position.⁹⁹ Two factions existed within James's camp inside the Convention, the non-compounders led by the Lord Melfort and the compounders led by Lord Middleton. Melfort's faction wanted James's unconditional restoration, while Middleton's group wished to have James restored but with protections for Protestantism and limitations on royal power.¹⁰⁰ Regardless of Episcopal rationale for failing to organize or participate in the election, the Convention proceeded.

The first order of business once the Convention had been seated was to decide which letter to respond to first: that of King James or that of the Prince of Orange; both had sent an address to the Convention. Even had the Episcopalians been better represented, James left them little room to maneuver. Colin Lindsay, Third Earl of Balcarres, and Viscount Dundee both encouraged James to take a moderate tone and promise that "full satisfaction would be given in matters of religion and liberty."¹⁰¹ Unfortunately for them, Melfort had intercepted their letter to James and instead suggested to the exiled king that he give no quarter to his adversaries. James took Melfort's advice and his address to the Convention proved "arrogant, rambling and full of woolly promises and vague threats," whereas William's was respectful and deferential.¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Cowan, "Church and State Reformed?," 164.

¹⁰⁰ Jane Garrett, *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 16.

¹⁰¹ Linklater and Hesketh, *For King and Conscience*, 156.

The Convention voted to answer William's address rather than James's, the bishops still in attendance voting "no."¹⁰³ The Convention decided against reading James's letter because they feared that it would have dissolved them.¹⁰⁴ The remaining bishops left the Convention shortly thereafter, their behavior having been declared a grievance.¹⁰⁵ The Episcopal community had failed to organize for the elections and the bishops then failed from within the Convention. As Clare Jackson argues, "in their [the bishops] attempts to impede its proceedings, they had ultimately been as unsuccessful as they had been in their personal representations to William before the Convention had opened."¹⁰⁶ The most famous of these personal representations had occurred between William and the Bishop of Edinburgh, Alexander Rose. The Scottish bishops sent Rose to London to meet with the Bishop of London, Henry Compton. Compton advised Rose to meet with William and accept him as king. William led Rose to believe that he would support the Scottish bishops if they would support him, thereby establishing ecclesiastical uniformity

¹⁰² James VII of Scotland, *His Majesties letter to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal Commissioners of Shires and Burroughs assembled, or to be assembled at Edenborough* (Edinburgh, 1689); William III of England, *His Majesties Gracious Letter to the Meeting of the Estates of His Ancient Kingdom of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1689).

¹⁰³ *Great News From the Convention in Scotland, Giving an Account of their Proceedings, In A Letter to a Friend. With Allowance* (n.p., 1689).

¹⁰⁴ Linklater and Hesketh, *For King and Conscience*, 157.

¹⁰⁵ Jon Gordon, *Plain Dealing: Being A Moderate General Review of the Scots Prelatical Clergies Proceedings In the Later Reigns. With a Vindication of the Present Proceedings in Church Affairs* (London, 1689).

¹⁰⁶ Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, 212.

between his kingdoms.¹⁰⁷ At this point Rose is alleged to have said, “Sir, I will serve you as far as law, reason, or conscience shall allow me.”¹⁰⁸ Compton clearly outlined the quandary William was in with respect to the Presbyterians in Scotland, “You see that the King having thrown himself on the water, must keep swimming with one hand. The Presbyterians have joined him closely and offer to support him, and therefore he cannot cast them off unless he see how otherwise he could be served.”¹⁰⁹ These statements capture the tone of the relationship between the crown and the Scottish Episcopacy for the rest of William’s reign.

The man elected to act as Commissioner for the Convention was William, Third Duke of Hamilton. Hamilton had converted from Catholicism to Protestantism and was viewed by many at the Convention as untainted by virtue of his never having served the previous reigns. This, however, was not by his own design, but rather because Charles and James found no use for him. P.W.J. Riley and Magnus Linklater both describe Hamilton as ambitious and opportunistic. Just prior to declaration of support for William, Hamilton had recommended James to come to Scotland and had assured Dundee of his support.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 2.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Roger Davies, *Bishop Nathaniel Spinckes and the Non-Juring Church* (Kent: Royal Stuart Society, 2007), 8.

¹¹⁰ Linklater and Hesketh, *For King and Conscience*, 154; P. W. J. Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1979), 3.

Following the walkout of the bishops and many of the nobles on March 28, it fell to the Convention to decide the fate of the crown. The decisions the Convention made with respect to the monarchy and religion confirm Tim Harris's contention that the Scottish Revolutionaries wished to overturn the restoration settlement.¹¹¹ While the English created a legal fiction to justify the change in monarchs, the Scots did not need one. The Convention declared that James had forfeited the crown due to his bad governance and they declared the throne vacant on April 4.¹¹² Shortly thereafter the Convention issued the *Claim of Right* and *Declaration of Grievances* which outlined the ways in which James had relinquished his right to rule, and the problems the members of the Convention had with the Restoration government including the imposition of Episcopacy. The Convention proceeded to offer William and Mary the throne, but, unlike the English settlement, the Scots made it clear that James had been evicted and that monarchy in Scotland was limited.¹¹³ While the idea of essentially revoking James's right to rule might appear as a bold, new, and almost enlightened assertion of the rights of the governed versus the crown, it was not the case. Bruce Lenman notes that the participants in the Scottish Revolution did not need to find new political theories; in fact, he points out that they looked backwards and relied upon "almost antiquarian"

¹¹¹ Tim Harris, "The People, the Law, and the Constitution in Scotland and England: A Comparative Approach to the Glorious Revolution," *Journal of British Studies* 38, no. 1 (Jan 1999): 30-31.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 46; Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power*, 218.

¹¹³ Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty?*, 248.

theories.¹¹⁴ Medieval Scotland had a tradition of removing kings who failed their subjects, and thus removing James fit within this history. This was not a modernizing revolution.

Allan Macinnes describes the ultimate consequences of the Convention's actions: "In Scotland James was unequivocally deposed by a Convention of Estates in which few Tories remained after a walkout of militant Jacobites. The Whigs were thus given free rein to complement the parliamentary dominance in the State by their establishment of a Presbyterian ascendancy in the Kirk."¹¹⁵ From this time forward the Episcopalians would be helpless as the Convention, soon to be elevated to the level of a full Parliament, sat in judgment on the ecclesiastical future of the kingdom. The Duke of Hamilton tried to secure a moderate church accommodation that would have allowed readmission for Episcopal ministers who were rabbled out of their living and still supported the government; the Convention rejected this.¹¹⁶ On July 2, 1689 the Earl of Annandale introduced a bill that called for the abolition of Episcopacy and offices above presbyter within the Church of Scotland. Parliament passed the bill on July 22, and with this act

¹¹⁴ Bruce Lenman, "The Poverty of Political Theory in the Scottish Revolution of 1688-1690," in *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives*, ed. Lois G. Schworer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 244-245.

¹¹⁵ Allan Macinnes, "Scottish Jacobitism: In Search of A Movement," in *Eighteenth Century Scotland: New Perspectives*, eds. T.M. Devine and J.R. Young (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 1999), 71.

¹¹⁶ Sage, *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland*, 22-24.

and William's reluctant agreement, Episcopacy was abolished in Scotland.¹¹⁷ The acts abolishing Episcopacy and the subsequent establishment of Presbyterianism one year later included the statement that this settlement was "most agreeable to the inclinations of the people and the word of God."¹¹⁸ This statement clarified that Presbytery did not enjoy a divine right to govern the Church of Scotland, but rather had a statutory right to do so as a result of public support. Episcopalians like John Sage and Archibald Campbell recognized its importance of the statement, and they sought to cast doubts Presbyterianism's popularity and its right to govern the church.¹¹⁹ Historians Colin Kidd and Barbara Murison have both recently pointed out that William remained suspicious of the new Kirk and that it remained on "probation" throughout his reign.¹²⁰

Geoffrey Holmes argued that four things made the Revolution and Presbytery successful in Scotland. First, William acted deferentially toward the Convention, while James acted belligerently. Second, an Irish Catholic rising caused fear among the Scotland's Protestants. Third, Jacobites defected from the Convention and therefore

¹¹⁷ Brown (ed.), "Act Abolishing Prelacie," *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/1689/6/36> (accessed July 4, 2013); Cowan, "Church and State Reformed?," 167.

¹¹⁸ Cowan, "Church and State Reformed?," 167.

¹¹⁹ Raffe, "Presbyterians and Episcopalians," 327.

¹²⁰ Colin Kidd, "Constructing a Civil Religion: Scots Presbyterians and the Eighteenth-Century British State," in *The Scottish Churches and the Union Parliament, 1707-1999*, ed. James Kirk (Edinburgh: Scottish Church History Society, 2001), 3; Barbara C. Murison, "Becoming British? Navigating the Union of 1707," *International Review of Scottish Studies* 36 (2011): 42-43.

undermined the ability of their allies to mount a serious challenge to the Revolutionary party. Finally, the Presbyterians were determined to overthrow Episcopacy and organized themselves into a Revolution party for William.¹²¹ William recommended two things to Hamilton – keep the Lords of the Articles and produce a moderate religious settlement. A group of militant Presbyterians and other malcontents known as the Club defeated Hamilton’s efforts toward these measures.¹²² The details of William’s interactions with the Scottish parliament and attempts to moderate the ecclesiastical settlement will be discussed the following chapters.

Meanwhile, in England, the Convention Parliament attempted to settle the religious situation. Anglicans like Daniel Finch, Second Earl of Nottingham, believed that the Church of England should do something for dissenters since the dissenters rallied to the Church of England rather than to James once the Revolution started.¹²³ On February 27 Nottingham introduced two bills, one for comprehension and one for toleration. Nottingham hoped that comprehension would bring moderate dissenters into the Church of England, while toleration would apply to the small number of Protestants that remained outside the established church.¹²⁴ Comprehension had been proposed

¹²¹ Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power*, 219.

¹²² Ibid.; Edward Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution 1688: Britain’s Fight for Liberty* (New York: Pegasus Books, 2008), 204.

¹²³ David Wykes, “Friends, Parliament, and the Toleration Act” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45 (1994): 45.

¹²⁴ G.V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis of Church and State 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 9, 11.

earlier. Even Archbishop Sancroft had considered comprehension as a way to prevent dissenters from joining with Roman Catholics and supporting James's indulgence.¹²⁵ While the terms of comprehension have been generally described as liberal by historians, the actual terms disappointed dissenters. Previous plans for comprehension allowed for recognition of the validity of some Presbyterian orders; they made use of the surplice optional along with making the sign of the cross during baptism; and they made subscription to those articles in the *Thirty-Nine Articles* that spoke to church government optional for comprehended ministers.¹²⁶ This plan made no provision for the validity of Presbyterian orders. Nevertheless, these bills for comprehension and toleration made their way through the usual revisions and committees standard for all Parliamentary bills.

The English comprehension scheme failed for two reasons. While Parliament debated the Comprehension Bill, William inexplicably appeared at the House of Lords and expressed his support for the repeal of the Test Act. Repeal would have removed the legal barriers that prevented non-Anglicans from holding public office. At the same time, news of the treatment of Scotland's Episcopalians circulated in England. These issues panicked the Anglican establishment and led some of them to believe that their church faced the same danger as the Episcopalians in Scotland where they were in the process of

¹²⁵ Ibid.; William Gibson, "Dissenters, Anglicans and Elections after the Toleration Act, 1689-1710," in *Religion, Politics and Dissent, 1660-1832, Essays in Honor of James Bradley*, eds. Robert D. Cornwall and William Gibson (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010), 130.

¹²⁶ Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power*, 358; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 162; Chamberlain, *Accommodating High Churchmen*, 22-23.

being disestablished.¹²⁷ This would not be the last time religious problems in one kingdom would impact the other. Craig Rose has identified at least 150 “Tory Diehards” who could be counted on to protect the Church of England’s interests. He states that the strength of this faction in the Commons became clear when they voted on the wording of the new coronation oath. The phrase chosen by the Whigs with respect to the king’s role in the protection of the Church of England was the church “as **shall be** established by law” as opposed to the church “as established by law.” The Whig phraseology failed 188 to 149.¹²⁸

The Toleration Bill succeeded where comprehension had failed, and the Toleration Act has been called a hallmark in the history of dissent. Protestants who did not wish to accept the liturgy of the Church of England were allowed to worship outside of it undisturbed. They were required to be Trinitarian and to subscribe to all but three of the *Thirty-Nine* Articles; articles concerning infant baptism and church governance were the exceptions.¹²⁹ Catholics remained excluded from the terms of the toleration, since, in the mind of the public, not least among them John Locke, Catholics presented a threat to national security.¹³⁰ The impact of toleration should not be overestimated, since the Test

¹²⁷ Bennett, *The Tory Crisis of Church and State 188-1730*, 11; Chamberlain, *Accommodating High Churchmen*, 22-23; Alasdair Raffe, “Episcopalian Polemic, The London Printing Press and Anglo-Scottish Divergence in the 1690s,” *Journal of Scottish Studies* 26, no. 1 (2006): 37.

¹²⁸ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 164-165.

¹²⁹ Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power*, 351.

¹³⁰ Luisa Simonutti, “Political Society and Religious Liberty. Locke at Cleves and in Holland,” *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 14, no. 3 (2006): 414.

Act remained in place and only dissenters who occasionally conformed to the Church of England were eligible to hold public office.¹³¹ The Toleration Act and the subsequent occasional conformity of England's dissenters impacted Scotland in the late Stuart period in two crucial ways. First, the fact that English Presbyterian dissenters possessed legal toleration presented a stark contrast to Scotland where Episcopal dissenters did not. This provided fodder for critics of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Second, the presence of occasional conformists in England agitated some Anglicans and fostered a fear that the Church of England was in danger. This fear created an environment in England that made many sympathetic to the plight of their Scottish co-religionists and was exploited by the Scottish Episcopalians over the next twenty-five years.

Another feature of the Revolution in England that had a major impact on the Scottish Episcopal community was the division within Anglicanism between jurors who stayed within the Church of England and the Nonjurors who did not take the oaths to William and Mary and were therefore deprived of their livings. Moreover, within the Church of England there developed a high church and low church division over the intrinsic rights of the church to be free from state interference. The Anglican clergy first divided over whether or not to take oaths of loyalty to William, and, unlike Scotland, the overwhelming majority did. According to Geoffrey Holmes seven bishops and almost

¹³¹ James E. Bradley, "The Religious Origins of Radical Politics in England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1662-1800," in *Religion and Politics in Enlightenment Europe*, eds. James E. Bradley and Dale K. Van Kley (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 188.

400 ministers lost their livings because they did not swear loyalty to the new order.¹³²

These Nonjuring ministers made up a large part of the high church movement that supported the bishops in Scotland in defending their *jure divino* claims to govern the church. High churchmen, both those disaffected by the changes of 1688 and those who remained in the Church of England, began to embrace the idea that the church and state were separate divinely ordained societies.¹³³ These ideas will be explored in Chapter 3.

Most members of the Church of England accepted the Revolutionary settlement. This does not mean that they did not take seriously loyalty to the church, loyalty to the crown and the oaths they had previously taken to James. The future Archbishop of Canterbury, John Tilotson explained the gravity involved in oath-taking. He said, “This obligation [an oath] no man can violate but at the utmost peril of the judgment and vengeance of God, for every oath implies a curse upon ourselves in case of perjury... and this was always the sense of mankind concerning the obligation of oaths.”¹³⁴ For men who took the new oaths to William and Mary, William was an instrument of Divine Providence.¹³⁵ William delivered England from the evils of popery just as Charles II had delivered his kingdoms from the evil of Cromwell’s republic. Charles’s return was

¹³² Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power*, 357.

¹³³ Robert Cornwall, “Divine Right Monarchy; Henry Dodwell’s Critique of the Reformation and Defense of the Nonjuror Bishops,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 68, no 1 (1999): 39.

¹³⁴ L.M. Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State: The Problem of the Nonjurors in the English Revolution* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1928), 107.

¹³⁵ Chamberlain, *Accommodating High Churchmen*, 21-22.

extraordinary and could not be explained away in secular terms; only God could have arranged for this, and the same was true for William and the Revolution.¹³⁶ At the same time, some rationalized that the kingdom needed governance, and possession of the crown was sufficient to justify obedience to William. Moreover, they believed that English law would indemnify those who had sworn to obey William in the event James ever returned.¹³⁷ The divisions within Anglicanism created for the Scottish Episcopal community several avenues to pursue for English support. Those who took the oaths could officially lobby William for relief, and those who refused formed an idea of church and state relations that justified their schism without resorting to the Presbyterian two-kingdoms theory. Despite divisions within Anglicanism and Episcopacy, there still existed much common ground. All Anglicans and Episcopalians still believed that the divine right of kings mattered, even if it meant loyalty to different kings, and the disputes between high and low churchmen were less significant than those between low churchmen and dissenters.¹³⁸

Conclusion

Scotland suffered from great upheavals during the Glorious Revolution, none more paramount than the abandonment of the Restoration settlement and its Episcopal

¹³⁶ Scott, *England's Troubles*, 392.

¹³⁷ Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State*, 109.

¹³⁸ William Gibson, *The Church of England: Unity and Accord, 1688-1832*. (London: Routledge, 2001).

establishment. While major ecclesiastical changes usually resulted either from strong support among elites or overwhelming support from below, the religious settlement in Scotland appears to have had neither. Episcopalianism was popular, or at a minimum acceptable, to much of the public and nobility, and in all likelihood had more support than Presbyterianism. This was especially true within the elite ranks.¹³⁹ Even though a committed minority of Presbyterians outmaneuvered the Episcopalians at this crucial juncture, all was not lost for the Episcopal party. Committed Presbyterians might have controlled the government, but they had yet to command the loyalty of the masses.

Although some Episcopalians would prove loyal to the new regime, the actions of parliament in settling the Church of Scotland helped solidify the connection between many Episcopalians and Jacobitism. Parliament displaced the overwhelming majority of the Episcopal clergy, and the new Presbyterian political and religious establishment ignored the political power the Episcopalian Highland clans possessed. The combination of these displaced elements gave the Jacobite movement both its polemical base and its material support. The triumphal ferocity of the Presbyterian party made the connection all the stronger.¹⁴⁰ Presbyterian ministers made up a very small minority of the ministry in the church, and the new Church of Scotland could not survive without ministers who at

¹³⁹ Ryan Frace, "Vice, Virtue, and Industry; The Church of Scotland's Employment of Political Economy, c. 1700-1750," in *Religion in the Age of Enlightenment*, ed. Brett C. McInelly (New York: AMS Press, 2009), 176.

¹⁴⁰ Neil Davidson, *Discovering the Scottish Revolution, 1692-1746* (London: Pluto Press, 2002), 71; Pittock, *Jacobitism*, 38; Stephen Taylor, "Plus ça change ...?: New Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688," *The Historical Journal* 37, no. 2 (June 1994): 468.

some point found Episcopacy acceptable.¹⁴¹ Many Scots found a halfway position between the new church establishment and their desire to remain Episcopalian. In the aftermath of 1688, a communicant in the Church of Scotland was probably served by a minister who was confirmed by a bishop.¹⁴²

Approximately 600 Episcopal clergy would be removed by the Revolutionary settlement.¹⁴³ In comparison, roughly 270 Presbyterians had been displaced by the Restoration settlement.¹⁴⁴ These ministers created a stronger base for a potential future Episcopalian restoration than the Presbyterians had possessed following the Restoration. The Episcopalians had supporters in England, many of whom were inclined to see the Scottish Episcopalians as co-religionists, and a monarch who could not afford to alienate the Scottish nobility.¹⁴⁵ The Scottish Episcopalians believed that they would be restored

¹⁴¹ Michael F. Graham, "Kirk in Danger: Presbyterian Political Divinity in Two Eras," in *The Impact of the European Reformation: Princes, Clergy, and People*, ed. Bridget Heal and Ole Peter Grell (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008), 178; Raffe, "Episcopalian Polemic," 23.

¹⁴² Gavin White, *The Scottish Episcopal Church: A New History* (Edinburgh: Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, 1998), 10.

¹⁴³ Bruce Lenman, "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism," in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 39.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 38.

¹⁴⁵ Graham, "Kirk in Danger," 178.

to their former charges as they were in 1660.¹⁴⁶ With this knowledge, the Episcopalians contested the Presbyterian hold on Scotland's religious life throughout the late Stuart period.

¹⁴⁶ Charles Hefling, "Scotland: Episcopalians and Nonjurors." in *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer A Worldwide Survey*, eds. Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 169.

Chapter 2: The Politics of Loyalty

Introduction

The Episcopal Church possessed significant support in Scotland at the time of the Glorious Revolution. It was especially strong in the north and with the Scottish nobility, and for these reasons its disestablishment in 1689 appears purely political. The Convention settled the fate of the Scottish Episcopalians, when, following a walk out by the bishops and James's most fervent supporters, it had voted the bishops a grievance to the nation. Laws followed quickly that replaced the Episcopal Church government with Presbyteries. However, the Episcopal Church was far from dead, and the ultimate fate of the church would be worked out in the royal court, the Parliaments, and in the court of public opinion. Central to any possible success would be the efforts of those Episcopalians who managed to work with the new regime. Historically, the connection between Jacobitism and Episcopalianism in Scotland has been well established, while, the existence of Episcopalians loyal to the new government has been largely underestimated and overlooked. The Jacobitism of the Episcopalians is far easier to identify. For example, the Episcopal bishops steadfastly remained loyal to James until Anne's reign when Archbishop John Patterson switched allegiance. To isolate them further, the triumphant Presbyterians sought to portray the Episcopalians as uniformly Jacobite while at the same time promoting themselves as the only true friends of the

Revolution.¹ The truth was that throughout the late Stuart period a sizable group of Episcopalians swore allegiance to William and Mary and later Anne.² They did so first in the hope that they might remain in the established church and, later, once it had become clear that that they could not maintain their Episcopalian beliefs within the Church of Scotland, they redirected their efforts to attain toleration for their own church.³

The Episcopal community sought the assistance of prominent sympathizers loyal to the government. While protecting the Episcopalians these men in turn sought to curry favor with William and advance their own careers. A body of clergy also existed that expressed loyalty to William in order to keep the parishes they held under previous monarchs. The number of clergy who expressed loyalty to the government increased throughout the late Stuart period especially after Anne became queen. The loyalty of these Episcopalians afforded them access to high-placed connections who could intercede on their behalf, and provided them with a base of support that defused the Presbyterian accusations of Jacobitism. On the other hand, while the Williamite Episcopal Church provided a form of cover for some Jacobites, Episcopalians loyal to the government worked to ensure the survival of their church and maintained the hope that one day they would be ascendant. Despite the Jacobite problem, the Episcopal Church survived and

¹ Tristram Clarke, "The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland," *Records of the Scottish Church Society* 24 (1992): 33-34.

² See pages 97-101 for the specific number of clergy who swore allegiance to William in order to comply with his various protection schemes.

³ Tristram Clarke, "The Scottish Episcopalians, 1688-1720" (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1987), 423.

constituted a persistent obstacle to the formation of a monolithic Presbyterian Church. The secure ascendancy that the Presbyterian Church of Scotland enjoyed in the eighteenth century would have to wait to take shape until 1715.

The Scottish Parliament

The Scottish parliament served as the body of first recourse for Episcopal ambitions, the nature of which changed fundamentally after the Revolution. The estates that composed the institution had blended into one, and, in the opinion of Goodare, politicians now acted in their own interests rather than in the interest of the group they represented: the nobility, their shire, or their burgh.⁴ Politics were complicated by the religious settlement, which had eliminated one of the four estates. Concurrently, the same time the General Assembly of Church of Scotland rendered the old system of political management, whereby the king's magnate governed in his stead, impossible. The Lords of the Articles had also helped manage Scotland while the Stuart kings lived in England; however, this too was a casualty of the Revolution.⁵ The Scottish parliament

⁴ Julian Goodare, "The Estates in the Scottish Parliament, 1286-1707," in *The Scots and Parliament*, ed. Clyve Jones (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996), 30.

⁵ Geoffrey Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power: Later Stuart and Early Georgian Britain 1660-1722* (London: Longman, 1993), 219; Alasdair Raffe, "Scotland Restored and Reshaped: Politics and Religion, c. 1660-1712" in *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, eds. T.M. Devine and Jenny Wormald (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 259; Edward Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution 1688: Britain's Fight for Liberty* (New York: Pegasus Books, 2008), 204.

that once functioned as a rubber stamp for the king now it acted as an institution with independent power, and as P.W.J. Riley explains, an institution without any sense of corporate responsibility.⁶ For Scotland's last years of independence the nation was governed by self-seeking men like Queensberry, Argyll and the Hamiltons who competed with "political entrepreneurs like Ogilvy (Seafield), Mar, and the Dalrymples of Stair."⁷

Scotland's parliament devolved into party factions. The Club, led by Sir James Montgomery, played a central role in the establishment of Presbyterianism and the abolition of the Lords of the Articles. It drew its membership from radicals among the gentry and burghers.⁸ Men like Montgomery believed that William had inadequately rewarded their services in the Convention. The parliamentary session of 1689 thwarted William's and Hamilton's attempts to create a moderate settlement as the Club flexed its political muscle and managed to block William's supply requests until its demands were met.⁹ The non-Covenanted Presbyterian system forced on Scotland ensured that a national political consensus would be impossible. Episcopalians, Jacobites and

⁶ P. W. J. Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1979), 5.

⁷ Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power*, 309; Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, 3.

⁸ Allan Macinnes, "William of Orange – 'Disaster for Scotland'?", in *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context*, ed. Esther Mijers and David Onnekink (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007), 207.

⁹ Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, 9; Ian Cowan, "Church and State Reformed? The Revolution of 1688-9 in Scotland," in *The Anglo-Dutch Moment Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, ed. Jonathan I. Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 167.

Covenanters had excluded themselves from the government.¹⁰ On first glance it might appear that Scotland possessed its own Whig and Tory parties, with the Presbyterians in the role of the Whigs and the Episcopalians substituting for Tories, but this was not the case. Instead Scotland operated on a Court and Country axis with moderates gravitating toward the court.¹¹ Historians have debated this ideological split. David Hayton and P.W.J. Riley explain the division of Scottish factions as the result of pettiness. Hayton quotes the Earl of Ilay and states that “in short this was politics without issues... a perpetual war and game between magnates.”¹² Riley concurs with Hayton, and he argues that one’s religion corresponded to one’s relationship to power, rather than one’s convictions.¹³ In contrast Raffe, sees ideological issues at the forefront of Scottish politics. Both the Club and Country parties possessed opportunists, but they also developed specific theories about monarchy, the church, and the rights of the subject.¹⁴ This created a complicated parliamentary environment in which the Episcopalians needed to negotiate.

William made this situation worse. While the Scots since 1603 had become accustomed to absentee monarchs who resided in London, William frequently was not

¹⁰ Karin Bowie, *Scottish Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707* (Rochester: Boydell Press, 2007), 14.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² David Hayton, “Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections,” in *The Scots and Parliament*, ed. Clyve Jones, 75.

¹³ Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, 6.

¹⁴ Raffe, “Scotland Restored and Reshaped,” 264.

even in England, spending much of his time on the continent fighting Louis XIV.

William's absence made ministerial management difficult; moreover, he did not trust the his new subjects and chose to rely on his Dutch advisors – in the previous fifty years the English and Scots had beheaded one king and driven another into exile.¹⁵ But William's wars hurt Scotland by more than just depriving it of his presence; they also interrupted trade with the continent and contributed to what the Scots called William's "ill years," a period encompassing the Glencoe massacre, Darien disaster, and a series of bad harvests.¹⁶ These events contributed to the Jacobites' grievances and fueled the growth of their movement.

The Jacobite Conundrum

The most studied subset of the Scottish Episcopal community has been the Jacobites. The exiled Stuarts enjoyed considerable support from the Episcopal clergy, particularly among the bishops. In 1688, even as William prepared to come ashore in England, the bishops busily assured James of their loyalty and at the same time expressed

¹⁵ E.L. Ellis, "William III and the Politicians," in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, ed. Geoffrey Holmes (New York: Macmillan, 1969), 121; Jane Garrett, *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 12.

¹⁶ Bruce Lenman, "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism," in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 43; Raffe, "Scotland Restored and Reshaped," 262.

horror at the prospect of a Dutch invasion. They promised to promote loyalty among the people and prayed that God would, “give such success to your Majesty’s Arms that all who invade your Majesty’s Just and undoubted Rights and Disturb or interrupt the Peace of your Realms, may be disappointed and clothed with shame, so that on your royal Head the Crown may still yet flourish.”¹⁷ The following year, as the Convention unfolded the bishops continued to remain loyal to James, and in so doing they consequently sacrificed their own church establishment.

While the bishops expressed their continued loyalty to James, the Presbyterians seized the opportunity to exact revenge for what they perceived as the repressive religious policies of the Restoration Period. Presbyterian mobs rabbled out (forcibly removed) Episcopal clergy in the west and in parts of the south. With James unable to protect them, the Episcopal clergy appealed for assistance from their brethren in England. As previously discussed, the bishops decided to send Alexander Rose, Bishop of Edinburgh, to London to request help. Rose met with Henry Compton, Bishop of London, and was advised to accept William as King. Compton informed Rose that William by now had realized that the strength of the Presbyterian party in Scotland had been exaggerated and that its membership was of the “inferior sort.”¹⁸ Compton arranged

¹⁷ “Address by archbishops and bishops at Edinburgh to the King, with answer,” [November 1688], CH12/12/1748, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

¹⁸ John Skinner, *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, Volume II: From the 1st Appearance of Christianity in that Kingdom, to the Present Time with Remarks on the Most Important Occurrences, In A Series of Letters to A Friend* (Edinburgh, 1788), 522-524.

a meeting between Rose and William; however, this meeting ended unsatisfactorily for the bishop. William intimated that he was prepared to support the Episcopacy only if the Scottish bishops would support him as their counterparts had in England. Rose could only commit to obey William as far as his conscience would allow, and such response to William's overture was indicative of the support William could expect from the majority of the Episcopal clergy.¹⁹ The best case scenario for William was that the Episcopalians support his rule *de facto* while not accepting it *de jure*. William needed a reliable coalition capable of governing Scotland, and the Episcopalians as a whole could not be counted as reliable.²⁰

Historians confirm this interpretation. Bruce Lenman writes that William would have kept the bishops except that, "It was the intransigent Jacobitism of the Scottish bench of bishops, most authentically conveyed to William by the maladroit Bishop Alexander Rose of Edinburgh, which forced William to hand over control of the Kirk to a minority of dedicated men for whom presbyterianism was an exclusive solution to the problems of ecclesiastical governance."²¹ This is also the view of Keith Brown, who maintains that, "A moderate form of Episcopacy was his [William's] preferred option. However, the Episcopal church's close association with the repressive policies of the Restoration monarchy, and more recently with the Catholic James VII, left his supporters

¹⁹ Andrew L. Drummond and James Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843: The Age of the Moderates* (Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press, 1973), 3-4.

²⁰ Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, 4-6.

²¹ Lenman, "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism," 39.

with little room to maneuver.”²² William Matheison likewise argues that, “William’s desire to maintain the existing church government was defeated by the unexpected fidelity of the bishops to King James.”²³

The Presbyterian party, well aware that William distrusted the Jacobite inclinations of the Episcopalians, reminded him of that connection. The author of an anonymous tract explicitly warned William that the Episcopal party remained disaffected to his government. The Presbyterians had much to be grateful for; they thanked William for assenting to the abolition of the Episcopacy, and hoped that the Jacobite connection would allow them to go further in securing their church and routing their enemies.²⁴ Presbyterian apologist and Principal of Edinburgh University, Gilbert Rule, reminded the public of the disloyalty of the Episcopal party and revealed of the Episcopal author of the *Presbyterian Church in Scotland*: “he must either be strangely bypassed to the one side (and the side that everyone knoweth is not generally inclined to the interest of King William and the United Netherlands, but rather to King James and France) or he is

²² Keith Brown, “Reformation to Union, 1560-1707,” in *The New Penguin History of Scotland: From the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, eds. R. A. Houston and W.W.H. Knox (London: Allen Lane for the Penguin Press, 2001), 260.

²³ William Law Matheison, *Scotland and the Union: A History of Scotland From 1695-1747* (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1905), 13.

²⁴ *To His Grace, His Majesties High Commissioner, and to the Right Honourable, the estates of Parliament, the humble address of the Presbyterian ministers, and professors of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1689).

wonderfully receptive of whatever is told of him.”²⁵ The charge of Jacobitism remained the most effective weapon the Presbyterians employed throughout the late Stuart Period, and was given addition credibility when evidence of an actual plot surfaced. For example, on February 24, 1696 William informed Parliament of a plot to assassinate him, to be followed by a French invasion. In the aftermath of this revelation, the government arrested at least 300 Jacobites.²⁶

Though generally detrimental to the Episcopal cause throughout the late Stuart period, occasionally Jacobites worked with the government and were able to serve the interests of the Episcopal Church. Daniel Szechi maintains that the Jacobites were not monolithic, and divides the Jacobite community into three factions. First, were the Episcopalian Nonjurors; then, the Cavaliers/Tories; finally, there were the adventurers.²⁷ The Episcopalian Nonjurors were those who did not comply with the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The Cavalier/Tory contingent had a range of opinions about a Stuart restoration, and some of these, adamant in their support of the Stuart cause, sought to destroy the new order from within; others were more ambivalent. Some Nonjurors believed they should take oaths to William since they were of little use to their exiled

²⁵ Gilbert Rule, *Just and Modest Reproof of the Presbyterian Eloquence* (Edinburgh: George Mosman, 1693), 38.

²⁶ Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 153.

²⁷ Daniel Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnwath, 1689-1727: A Study in Jacobitism* (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2002), 214.

king out of power and of no use whatsoever if they were imprisoned.²⁸ The adventurers supported James as long as it suited their interests. Some Cavaliers, or “crypto-Jacobites” as Szechi calls them, served in the government and advanced the Episcopal cause.²⁹ This served two interests. As Episcopalians it helped their co-religionists, and as Jacobites and possible Scottish nationalists, any intrusion of the newly formed British Parliament into Scottish affairs that would offend and anger the Presbyterian establishment might confirm its misgivings about the Hanoverian succession and the Union. Paul Monod’s analysis of the English Jacobite movement supports Szechi’s point about Jacobites working within the government to achieve their ends.³⁰ Moreover, politicians at the time wandered between the two camps, leaving plenty of room for what Szechi calls “adventurers” to navigate the political landscape and to go back and forth between parties in order to achieve their larger goals. Riley takes a cynical view of the shifts in Scotland’s political landscape and describes leaders in Scotland as men who reversed positions and changed convictions frequently in the pursuit of power and offices.³¹ The Jacobites to whom Szechi refers were simply acting in the manner normal for Scottish politicians in this period.

²⁸ L.M. Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State: The Problem of the Nonjurors in the English Revolution* (London: George Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1928), 110.

²⁹ Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnwath*, 214-215.

³⁰ Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 270.

³¹ This is a major theme throughout Riley’s *King William and the Scottish Politicians*.

Williamite Episcopalian Sympathizers

Historians have identified several prominent members of William's governments who from time to time proclaimed their willingness to work with the Episcopal community. One of the first was George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, a lawyer and an anti-Cameronian crusader dating to the reign of Charles II. Sir George had defended Charles II's government and the actions it took against the radical Presbyterians.³² In addition to Rosehaugh, another George Mackenzie - the Earl of Cromarty, later Viscount Tarbat reemerged. James Douglas the Duke of Queensbury; John Dalrymple, the Earl of Stair; and finally John Murray, the Duke of Atholl and Earl of Tullibardine all claimed themselves at times capable of assisting Episcopalians.³³ The latter three served as ministers of state at various times during the reigns of William and Anne.

The Episcopal community needed influential advocates. The Bishops were the preferred option, but they supported the exiled James. This left a void for ambitious men to fill.³⁴ Two factors made defending the Episcopalians an attractive opportunity. First, Episcopalianism remained the preferred religion of the Scottish aristocracy, and second, William supported ecclesiastical moderation both out of personal conviction and out of a

³² George Mackenzie, *A Vindication of the Government in Scotland During the Reign of Charles II Against mis-representations made in several scandalous pamphlets* (London: J. Himdmarsh, 1691).

³³ Allan Macinnes, *Union and Empire: The Making of the United Kingdom in 1707* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 253; Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (New York: Penguin Books, 2007), 381.

³⁴ Macinnes, *Union and Empire*, 253.

desire to appease the nobility. George Melville served as William's sole Secretary of State for Scotland, but he refused to rein in the radical Presbyterians. This led William to elevate the more moderate Dalrymple to Senior Secretary of State with the hope that Dalrymple's appointment would appease the Episcopalians.³⁵ Throughout the late Stuart period William and Anne made appointments based on the Episcopal connection; this demonstrated the importance they placed on maintaining good relations with that group. The Episcopalians still boasted significant numbers and their appeasement was desirable as long as it could be accomplished without upsetting the Presbyterians. When Anne needed ministers with connections to the Scottish Cavalier and Jacobite communities, she continued to use William's ministers with Episcopal connections and returned Tarbat and Tullibardine to office.³⁶ Both of these communities had interests that coincided with Episcopal interests.

The above-mentioned men served the government and simultaneously attempted to bring the Episcopalians back into the Church of Scotland. The easiest way to diffuse the religious tensions was to bring the Episcopalians into compliance through a generous comprehension. Shortly after the Revolution, William encouraged the Duke of Hamilton and Viscount Tarbat to support comprehension schemes, and the king attempted to get

³⁵ Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 51; Henry Horwitz, *Revolutionary Politics: The Career of Daniel Finch Second Earl of Nottingham, 1647-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 126.

³⁶ William Ferguson, *Scotland: 1689 to the Present*, vol. 4, *The Edinburgh History of Scotland* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968), 38-39.

both the Scottish and English Parliaments to pass measures aimed at comprehension. This would have allowed for broad participation in the state church by a wide range of Protestant dissenters. Uniformity on only the essential doctrines would have been required, and those Protestants who still remained outside of the established church were to receive legal toleration. Style of worship and those matters considered of little importance would be left for the individual congregations to handle, and church government would be balanced in a compromise that would bring both Episcopalians and Presbyterians together. Tarbat proposed that the Church of Scotland be governed by two synods, one organized along Presbyterian lines, and the other governed by bishops; however, parliament viewed Hamilton as an opportunist and Tarbat as devious, and the measure failed.³⁷ A few years later he joined with Dalrymple in organizing legislation that allowed Episcopalians to keep their parishes provided they took the required oaths. This was accomplished after the broad comprehension schemes had failed to pass parliament, which will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.³⁸

Finally, Scottish politicians who supported the Episcopal cause hoped to gain favor from the English Tories. Since the Tories were established as the party of the Episcopal Church of England, the possibility of a favorable relationship with the English created opportunities for the Scottish Episcopalians. P.W.J. Riley observes the opportunistic use of the Episcopal cause in the behavior of John Murray, the Duke of

³⁷ Hayton, "Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections," 85.

³⁸ Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, 60-65.

Athol and Earl of Tullibardine. He writes, “To the English Tories he (Tullibardine) was a court supporter and the episcopalians’ friend; to the country party he tried to demonstrate that Tullibardine was Tullibardine still notwithstanding of the seal.”³⁹ Men like this publically supported the Episcopal cause in order to gain support from the English, but not to a degree that would alienate the Presbyterians at home. Dalrymple, Tarbat, Tweedale, and Queensbury all used their ties to the Episcopal community in order to strengthen their positions with the English.⁴⁰ The mere appearance of Episcopal sympathies provided an opportunity for ambitious men to build a political base and extend influence, and these men assisted the Episcopalians and wanted to thwart the ambitions of the Presbyterians throughout the late Stuart period. For example, Episcopalians had reasons to hope Queensberry would help them. James had once congratulated Queensbury for his zeal in persuading parliament to pass legislation that persecuted field conventicles, and during the 1680s he had even supported using the liturgy.⁴¹

³⁹ P.W.J. Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1978), 45.

⁴⁰ William Ferguson, *Scotland’s Relations with England: A Survey to 1707* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1977), 211; Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, 85-86.

⁴¹ Alasdair Raffe, “Presbyterians and Episcopalians: The Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715,” *English Historical Review* 125, no. 514 (2010): 593; Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution 1688: Britain’s Fight for Liberty*, 196.

Williamite Clergy

Historians in large numbers have focused on the Jacobite clergy that did not abandon their allegiance to King James; often neglected are their Episcopal brethren who did. One of the most prominent Scottish Episcopalians in William's entourage was Gilbert Burnet, theologian and minister. Burnet proved his loyalty to Episcopacy when he, along with five others, went in to the heartland of the Covenanting movement and preached conformity to the restored Episcopal Church. Burnet later moved to Holland and while he was there James charged with him high treason for resisting royal authority and corresponding with the Duke of Argyll and other convicted traitors.⁴² Burnet provided assistance to his fellow Scottish Episcopal ministers loyal to the government. William rewarded Burnet's service with a bishopric in the Church of England. While some like Burnet abandoned loyalty to James out of conviction, others did so for convenience. Minister James Canaries provided a political theory that explained how ministers could preach non-resistance to James and yet accept William's regime. Canaries argued that if the monarch broke the constitution then resistance was permissible.⁴³ His argument was too Whiggish for most Scottish Episcopalians, others accepted it.

⁴² Ralph Stewart, "Gilbert Burnet's Politics," *International Review of Scottish Studies* 33 (2008): 38, 40.

⁴³ Tim Harris, "The People, the Law, and the Constitution in Scotland and England: A Comparative Approach to the Glorious Revolution," *Journal of British Studies* 38, no. 1 (Jan 1999): 55.

Whatever their reasons, many Episcopalians publically sought accommodation with the new regime. Daniel Urquhart was one such man. Urquhart preached loyalty to James until James fled to France. Once William and Mary established power he changed positions and preached loyalty to the new monarchs.⁴⁴ Urquhart was not alone. After William landed, a series of mob actions designed to chase Episcopal clergy from their parishes occurred throughout Presbyterian strongholds. Presbyterians justified the persecution by accusing the Episcopalians of Jacobitism, a charge that was not always true. Tristram Clarke has uncovered evidence showing that out of the twenty-three ministers questioned by the Privy Council after being charged with Jacobitism, twenty-one claimed to have prayed for William and Mary. Likewise, of twenty-seven ministers charged with not having read the mandatory proclamations for which offence they were interviewed by the Privy Council after they were rabbled or driven from the parishes, twenty-five claimed to have read, or been willing to read, the necessary proclamation. The proclamation in question declared that William and Mary were lawful sovereigns.⁴⁵ Presbyterian persecution of loyal Episcopalians undermined the Presbyterians' own cause, and their indiscriminate attacks allowed the Episcopalians to portray them as radical and unreasonable.

For many Episcopal clergymen who supported William, and later Anne, the aim was not political, but rather to enable them to retain their parishes. For these men the

⁴⁴ Brown, "Reformation to Union, 1560-1707," 261.

⁴⁵ Clarke, "The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland," 40.

issue of who governed Scotland was secondary to the preservation of their parishes and remaining with their parishioners. When the Kirk allowed it, some of these Williamite Episcopalians even conformed to the Presbyterian Church government, which meant submission to the General Assembly and synods of the Church of Scotland.⁴⁶ This should not be seen as unprincipled or as evidence that they lacked commitment to Episcopalianism - the first loyalty of a clergyman was to his parish. The “Anglicanization” of the Scottish Episcopal Church remained several years away, and in the early part of the late Stuart period Episcopalians shared Calvinist doctrines, practices, and liturgies.⁴⁷ Moreover, some Episcopal ministers accepted the Erastian idea that the state could determine the church structure and were willing to sit on the church courts.⁴⁸ Hope for a broad and comprehensive Church of Scotland had not yet evaporated, and proposals for a church with both Episcopal and Presbyterian synods remained viable. The Kirk imposed the biggest impediment to a comprehensive national church in the immediate aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, and it fought to exclude a large number of the Episcopal clergy who supported the government. This intransigent attitude created problems for the Presbyterians and, paradoxically, opportunities for the Episcopalians.

If the Episcopalians wanted access to the Church of Scotland, they needed to display their loyalty to William. To this end twenty Episcopal ministers from Morray petitioned Tweedale and asked him to intervene on their behalf. They protested their

⁴⁶ Harris, *Revolution*, 414.

⁴⁷ Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnwath*, 141.

⁴⁸ Raffae, “Presbyterians and Episcopalians,” 575.

loyalty to William and proclaimed that they, “Do hereby and humbly and sincerely protest and declare to your LL [lordship] that we have not been wanting in this our bound dutie of putting up [of] fervent prayers at all [occasions] for our Glorious Soverigns and particularly on the days of monthly Fasts and Thanksgivings enjoined by Authoritie.”⁴⁹

Loyal expressions of this type were necessary if their conditions were to improve.

Archbishop Tenison reminded the Episcopalians of this in 1695, and his advice confirmed a trend among the Episcopal clergy. Petitions poured into the king and by 1694 the Williamite clergy boasted significant numbers.⁵⁰ Nearly 400 Episcopal ministers prayed publically for William and swore the requisite oath of allegiance, no doubt believing that such actions would allow them to retain their parishes.⁵¹ The 400 made up a significant portion of the total number of clergy eligible for service in the Church of Scotland considering that it comprised of only 926 parishes at this time. Four hundred ministers loyal to the government provided the Episcopal leadership with a powerful retort to the Presbyterian claim that the Episcopal clergy were all Jacobite. The Episcopal ministers of Aberdeen, for example, featured their loyalty when they petitioned

⁴⁹ “Petition by a meeting of Scottish Episcopalian clergy in the diocese of Murray to John Hay, 1st Marquess of Tweeddale, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, and to the Privy Council at Elgin, protesting their loyalty and mentioning the spread of popery because of vacant churches and lack of discipline,” [6 September 1692], MS929-42, Miscellaneous Papers, Lambeth Palace Library, London.

⁵⁰ “Letter from Tenison to Mr. Seton 'and the rest of the Episcopal Clergy who have latelie taken the oathes etc. in Scotland', promising his good offices, having been notified of their Declaration of Allegiance and Loyal Address,” [28 Nov 1695], MS930-190, Miscellaneous Papers, Lambeth Palace Library, London.

⁵¹ “Memorial concerning the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland,” [1694], MS929-10, Miscellaneous Papers, Lambeth Palace Library, London.

William and Mary. Complaining that they had been rabbled unjustly on the pretext that they were Jacobites, the petitioners explained that they had been removed from their livings on false grounds. They even offered to turn over any Jacobites in their ranks to the civil authorities should any such reveal themselves. The petitioners asked William and Mary, whom they deferentially referred to as “supreme Judges under God within these Dominions,” to intervene on their behalf. Specifically they wanted William to guarantee their safety and livings until the next General Assembly could meet to address their grievances.⁵² The Earl of Kintore and the Episcopal synod of Aberdeen had previously attempted to present an address to William that acknowledged him as king and offered to work with their Protestant brethren who disagreed on matters of church government.⁵³

Ministers from the northwest of Scotland joined their brethren, and representatives of the diocese of Ross petitioned William and Mary for similar relief in June 1694.⁵⁴ These petitions were significant because the authors expressly acknowledged William and Mary as sovereigns. No doubt some of the signatories preferred James to William, but petitions of this sort illustrated the willingness of some Episcopalians to shift allegiance to the new order. Their unambiguous language makes

⁵² “Printed Act and Commission by the General Meeting of the Episcopal ministers at Aberdeen for presenting some queries to the committee of the late General assembly relative to church government,” [5-29 June 1694], GD1/451/1, Miscellaneous Small Collections of Family, Business and Other Papers, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁵³ Cowan, “Church and State Reformed?,” 177.

⁵⁴ GD1/451/1, NRS.

clear that they were acting in good faith when they recognized William as sovereign. They signed documents that no sincere Jacobite would have dared to subscribe, with appeals to William and Mary as “supreme Judges under God within their Dominion.” If this phrase had been more ambiguous with respect to William’s legal position even more of the clergy would have signed. The Nonjuring Episcopalian Alexander Monro remarked in a pamphlet he wrote in 1693 on the new found loyalty of his coreligionists. While he declined to speculate on who was or was not truly reconciled to William and Mary, he did notice that a growing number of Episcopalians had taken oaths of loyalty. The pamphlet coincided with an act that in theory allowed loyal Episcopalians to retain their parishes by assuming that Episcopalians who took the oath would be admitted to the ministry by the General Assembly. Presbyterian detractors remarked that the new found loyalty of the Episcopalians was disingenuous and resulted from the realization that James would never return more than from any affection for William, and Monro seemed to accept this as a possible explanation for the increase of juring Episcopalians.⁵⁵ These petitions to King William proved effective. In 1695 William supported the Church Act which gave his formal protection to all Episcopal clergy who still retained their parishes

⁵⁵ Alexander Monro, *An apology for the clergy of Scotland: chiefly oppos’d to the censures, calumnies, and accusations of a late Presbyterian vindicator, in a letter to a friend : wherein his vanity, partiality and sophistry are modestly reprov’d, and the legal establishment of episcopacy in that kingdom, from the beginning of the Reformation, is made evident from history and the records of Parliament : together with a postscript, relating to a scandalous pamphlet intituled, An answer to The Scotch Presbyterian eloquence* (London, 1693), 19-21.

and swore allegiance to him.⁵⁶ (This act will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.) The years from 1692 to 1695 witnessed an increase in the number of Episcopalians who reconciled themselves to the regime. Perhaps the Presbyterians were correct in their claims that this was all connected to their hopelessness over the Jacobite cause, but these reconciliations also directly correspond to the concrete efforts made by William and his pro-Episcopal ministers in the Scottish government to protect loyal Episcopalians.

In the larger scheme the Episcopalians hoped for more. Specifically, they wanted their clergy, who the Presbyterians had unfairly rabbled, restored to their parishes. They also sought eligibility for election to the church courts and General Assembly. William sympathized with these objectives, but stopped short of granting them due to Presbyterian objections. As Gilbert Burnet explained, “Since the Presbyterians are the only party that he had there, the granting of their desires at that time were unavoidable,” but William assured Burnet that he would work to moderate the violence the Episcopal clergy experienced.⁵⁷ Although the Church Act failed to grant all the Episcopalians wanted, on balance it marked an improvement from their condition in the years immediately following the Revolution. This act, combined with the Kirk’s Barrier Act of 1697,

⁵⁶ John Stuart Shaw, *The Political History of Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (London: Macmillan Press, 1989), 90; Keith M. Brown (ed), “Act for settling the quiet and peace of the church,” *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/1693/4/89> (accessed July 4, 2013); “Act concerning the church,” *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/1695/5/186> (accessed July 4, 2013).

⁵⁷ Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion, and War* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 214.

slowed down the attacks on Episcopal clergy and brought over one hundred ministers into the state church.⁵⁸ Ministers who took the oath and presently possessed their parishes could not be removed without serious cause such as heresy or immorality. The Barrier Act provided such a complicated formal process for removing clergy that it effectively halted legal actions against the Episcopalians until after William's death.

The Episcopal clergy loyal to William thus served two important purposes for their larger community. They provided the Episcopal cause with a significant number of ministers who could publically lobby for relief, and at the same time destroyed the idea that Episcopalians were uniformly Jacobite. Williamite clergy also indirectly served the interests of their Jacobite and Nonjuring colleagues. Jacobites and Nonjurors shrewdly pointed out that the Presbyterians persecuted the Williamite clergy. Bishop Alexander Rose of Edinburgh, Alexander Monro, and George Garden all used the plight of the compliant clergy to make the Presbyterians appear to be overly zealous, and Presbyterian religious zeal carried with it memories of the Civil Wars.⁵⁹ For this reason William intervened throughout his reign and gave the clergy additional time to take the oaths. William's preferred method involved suspending the General Assembly of the Church of

⁵⁸ General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, "Barrier Act, 1697," Church of Scotland, http://www.churchofscotland.org.uk/about_us/church_law/barrier_act (accessed July 6, 2013).

⁵⁹ Alexander Cunningham, *Questions Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland* (London, 1690), 25-28; Alexander Monro, *An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland*, 7.

Scotland when he found them to be circumventing his desires.⁶⁰ An unforeseen consequence of this intervention was that it helped the Jacobites within the Episcopal ranks because it gave them more time to entrench themselves in their parishes and find ways to equivocate, if possible, around the oaths.⁶¹

The significant number of Episcopal clergy willing to support the government demonstrates how tenuous the Presbyterian hold on the Church of Scotland was. In 1688 the Church of Scotland consisted of 926 parishes.⁶² If the Episcopal clergy who supported the government retained their parishes, and, had the rabbled Williamite clergy been restored to either their original parishes or to vacant ones, the Episcopalians would have possessed nearly half of the parishes in the church. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland functioned in a bottom up manner. The Episcopalians believed that had they been able to elect representatives to the General Assembly they would have outnumbered the Presbyterians three to one.⁶³ Had this scenario come to fruition the Episcopalians could have voted away the Presbyterian structure of the church and the Scottish

⁶⁰ Clarke, “Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland,” 48.

⁶¹ “Letter from Bishop Alexander Rose, Edinburgh, to Hon. Archibald Campbell,” [20 April 1706], CH12/12/1801, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁶² Drummond and James Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843*, 9.

⁶³ Clarke, “The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland,” 46.

parliament could have only looked on.⁶⁴ In order to prevent this parliament passed the Act of Assembly and the Barrier Act. These acts prevented the Episcopal clergy from sitting church courts or in the General Assembly; control of both was essential if the Presbyterians intended to preserve their hold on the church.⁶⁵

The unique circumstances that had surrounded William's succession to the throne in 1688 meant that many conscientious Episcopalians could never accept him as king. William claimed his throne through conquest, and the man he had displaced lived until 1701. Even if James had passed away in 1688, William was no closer than fourth in the line of succession. Anne, however, as the daughter of James, possessed a legitimacy in the eyes of many Episcopalians that William never held. In addition to legitimacy, Episcopalians took heart in Anne's personal commitment to the Episcopal faith. Many English Tories encouraged the Scots to take advantage of the change in monarch and reconsider their relationship to the state.⁶⁶ As a result the Cavaliers experienced large gains in the 1702 elections.⁶⁷

Episcopalians sensed in Anne's succession an opportunity to secure greater freedom, and they were prompt to demonstrate loyalty to the regime. The Episcopal

⁶⁴ Jeffrey Stephen, "Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland and the Scottish Parliament," *The Scottish Historical Review* 89, no. 1 (2010): 34.

⁶⁵ Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past*, 58-59

⁶⁶ Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, 48; Clarke, *The Scottish Episcopalians, 1688-1720*, 135.

⁶⁷ Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnwath*, 50.

community responded to Anne's succession with two petitions, both asking for protection of their clergy.⁶⁸ Their efforts were enhanced when John Patterson, the deprived Archbishop of Glasgow, ceased being a Nonjuror and publically supported Anne's claim to the throne. The former Archbishop encouraged his fellow Episcopalians to do the same and join him in an address of loyalty. About one hundred members of the clergy did so.⁶⁹ The Earl of Balcarres assisted Patterson's push for petitions and clergy from Fife, Stirling, Angus, Glasgow, Dundee, Aberdeen, and Elgin all sent loyal address to the Queen.⁷⁰

Episcopal aims shifted as the late Stuart period progressed. Throughout William's reign the Episcopalians sought comprehension into the Church of Scotland; however, having failed in this effort, they changed objectives and lobbied for the restoration of lay patronage and full toleration. The restoration of lay patronage would have allowed the local nobility and gentry a greater role in calling ministers to their parishes and so circumvented the Kirk's power over the local clergy. A full toleration would have allowed the Episcopalians to set up their own meeting houses. Together these initiatives would hinder the Church of Scotland from within and without. In order to achieve their goals, the Episcopalians needed Anne to call a new Parliament. If called, the new parliament would have included more Episcopalians than William's parliament,

⁶⁸ Mattheison, *Scotland and the Union*, 190-192.

⁶⁹ Ibid.; Clarke, *The Scottish Episcopalians, 1688-1720*, 135-6.

⁷⁰ Karin Bowie, *Scottish Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707* (Rochester: Boydell Press, 2007), 36.

since more Episcopalians were now reconciled to the government, and therefore eligible for membership. One Episcopal noble who understood this was Alexander Bruce Broomhall, Commissioner for Sanquhar, and future Earl of Kincardine. Broomhall argued that this new parliament would be “to the most for the Honour and Service of the Queen,” and in the event someone questioned his motives he admonished, “that Malice itself may find no objection against my Obedience to the Queen, or my Respect to Her High Commissioner.”⁷¹ He and his supporters waited several years for government restoration of lay patronage and grant of toleration. While they waited, addresses to the queen, and the actions of men like Broomhall, kept the possibility of an Episcopal ascendancy an ongoing threat for the Presbyterians.

Addresses poured in, and their language expressed unambiguous loyalty to the Queen. In 1702 an unsigned petition of Episcopal ministers was sent to the queen with the following address, “Dread Sovereign, We Your Majesties most Dutiful and Obedient Subjects, and most humble Supplicants, being deeply sensible that the Divine Goodness hath Raised Your Majestie to the Throne of Your Royal Ancestors.”⁷² Their choice of words was important. It recognized Anne’s authority *de facto*, and left little doubt of her right to rule *de jure*. The ministers acknowledged that, unlike William, Anne’s authority came from God, not from a Convention, Parliament, or by conquest. “Divine Goodness” placed her on the “Throne of Her Ancestors.” Her claim and right existed beyond

⁷¹ Alexander Bruce Broomhall, *A speech in the Parliament of Scotland, in relation to Presbyterian government* (Edinburgh, 1702), 1.

⁷² *To the Queen’s Most Excellent Majestie, the humble address and supplication of the suffering Episcopal clergy in the kingdom of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1702).

question, and declarations of this kind left no room for equivocation. The petitioners continued, calling Anne a “Nursing Mother to the True Church of God” and reflecting on how her accession to the throne was an act of Providence given the present circumstances of the Episcopal Church in Scotland.⁷³

Such direct language caused problems for the Presbyterians, fervent in their efforts to cast doubt on the sincerity of the Episcopalians’ new found loyalty. Presbyterian minister George Meldrum told the Duke of Queensbury, who at the time served as the Queen’s High Commissioner of Scotland, that the professed allegiance of the clergy did not reflect the attitude of the laity. He argued that these newly qualified ministers angered their patrons, heritors, and parishioners through their support of the government.⁷⁴ The Duke maintained Episcopal sympathies and since the elections returned more Episcopalians to parliament, Meldrum needed to discredit the entire movement.

The Presbyterians also continued to accuse the Episcopalians of disloyalty. Meldrum, for example, claimed that the bishops forced those seeking ordination to swear

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ George Meldrum, *A Sermon Preached in the New Church of Edinburgh, On Sabbath, May 16, 1703. Before his Grace, James Duke of Queensberrie, Her Majesties High Commission; And many of the Nobility, Barons and Burrows, Members of the High Court of Parliament: And the Magistrate of the City of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh: Printed by the Heirs and Successors of Andrew Anderson Printer to the Queen’s Most Excellent Majesty, 1703), 13.

allegiance to the exiled Stuarts.⁷⁵ Not true, Episcopalian Mathias Simson replied, questioning both Meldrum's character and commitment to the truth. He stated, "It seems this Accuser neither regards the Ninth Commandment, nor frequents Episcopal meetings, but takes things upon Trust, else he would not publish horrid Lyers, and as none of them pray for the King, so the most part pray in terminis for the Queen."⁷⁶ Simson claimed that Episcopalians prayed for the queen and all of the royal family, and Episcopalian pamphleteer Robert Calder agreed. Calder argued for toleration for the Episcopal clergy and defended them from charges of sedition. He told his audience that the Episcopalians did not preach against Queen Anne, and informed them that the real threat to the government came from the Presbyterians. He argued that the government ought to pay more attention to the dangerous activities of the Presbyterians living in the old hotbed of Covenanter activity in the west of Scotland, and this accusation was not easily dismissed.⁷⁷ Presbyterian minister David Williamson had warned his readers that, "There is another Sin that is a Token of God's Wrath, from our selves, and that is Covenant-Breaking, a Sin, that some Folk thought a Virtue. They thought it a Virtue in Scotland, Sirs, to burn the Covenant. But, I'll tell you, think of it what you will, I'm

⁷⁵ Mathias Simson, *A Short Character of the Presbyterian Spirit, In so far as it can be gathered out of their own Books; Especially, out of the Letter from a Gentleman to a Member of Parliament, concerning Toleration, the Vindication thereof; and the Remarks upon the Case* (Edinburgh, 1703), 17.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 5, 17-18.

⁷⁷ Robert Calder, *Reasons For A Toleration To The Episcopal Clergie and Objections against it answered* (Edinburgh, 1703), 22-24.

afraid of a Storm of God's Wrath coming upon that Head."⁷⁸ These Presbyterians, Simson stated, threatened the government.⁷⁹ If Presbyterians believed in the Covenant and did not pray for the queen, they certainly comprised bigger problems for the state than the Episcopalians.

Presbyterian James Hodow accused the Episcopalians of exchanging expressions of loyalty for material relief.⁸⁰ Defending the Episcopalians, George Garden attested to the sincerity of those who supported the government and said, "I know those in the Countrey who join'd the Address, and never heard of these Arguments to induce them, but did it in the simplicity of their Hearts, to testify their true Zeal for her Majesty and Her Government: And so far were they from being moved to it from Peoples being wearied to contribute for their Supply, that to this day they never had a Penny."⁸¹ Garden dispelled any rumors that cast aspersions on the honesty of the clergy's support for Anne.

⁷⁸ David Williamson, *Scotland's sin, danger, and duty. Faithfully represented in a sermon preach'd at the West-Kirk, August 23d, 1696. Being a solemn fast-day, upon occasion of the great dearth and famine. By Mr. David Williamson, ... then, taken from his mouth in short-hand; and now, ... publish'd, as a word in season, by Mr. John Williamson* (Edinburgh: Mr. James McEuen and Co.: 1720), 35.

⁷⁹ Calder, *Reasons For A Toleration To The Episcopal Clergie and Objections against it answered*, 22-24.

⁸⁰ George Garden, *The Case of the Episcopal Clergy And those of the Episcopal Perswasion, Consider'd as to the Granting Them A Toleration and Indulgence. Second Edition Revised and Cleared from the Mistakes of a Gentleman's Letter* (Edinburgh, 1703), 23.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

Presbyterian apologist James Ramsay used a different approach to attack the Episcopalians. Rather than join the chorus that accused them of Jacobitism, he accepted their loyalty at face value, and then inquired how Episcopalians could be true to their long held principles and still remain in schism with the national church. Ramsay had few doubts about where Episcopal loyalty truly lay; for him the Episcopalians were *ipso facto* Jacobites. Still he presented an interesting intellectual exercise.⁸² His argument revolved around two points. First, the oath required by the Test Act under Charles II, and, second, the oaths taken that acknowledged Queen Anne. He explained that if the Episcopalians qualified for the ministry during the reign of Charles II and took the oath required by the Test Act, they had sworn to accept royal supremacy on ecclesiastical matters. Ramsay logically argued that no one who took the Test, and also believed that Anne was the legitimate monarch, could remain outside the Church of Scotland since Anne confirmed the Presbyterian Church structure for Scotland. In order to be true to the Test, the Episcopalians were required to conform. If the Episcopalians remained outside the national church, it could only mean that they did not really believe Anne to be the true monarch, and, therefore, her orders could be ignored. Alternatively, the Episcopalians had perjured themselves when they took the Test.⁸³ The Episcopalian George Brown countered Ramsay's argument. He agreed that the Test Act required the acceptance of

⁸² James Ramsey, *Toleration's fence removed : the thoughts concerning the present state of affairs in so far as they respect a toleration considered, and exposed : Plain-dealing with the Presbyterians as it is not found, so not to be expected from prelatial pamphleteers, or, A vindication of a letter from a gentleman to a member of Parliament concerning toleration from all the cavils that have been advanced against it, and the wilfull mistakes about it* (Edinburgh: George Mosman, 1703), 21-24.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 31.

the monarch's religious supremacy, and he believed that Mr. Ramsay had misconstrued the true demands contained in the oath. The Test Act required its subscribers to protect the true Protestant faith and in Brown's opinion this meant protecting Episcopacy.⁸⁴

The Episcopal campaign showed signs of success. Its approaches to the Queen had been well received, and the Episcopalians took full advantage of the favorable considerations she displayed. Anne instructed civil authorities to protect the Episcopal clergy. This encouraged brazen behavior on the Episcopalians' part, which alarmed the Presbyterians. An anonymous letter from 1703 disclosed the perceived threat. The Presbyterian complainant told readers about the explosion of Episcopal activities, and intimated that the queen's instructions to protect the Episcopal clergy provided cover for numerous Episcopal chapels to be set up. The author was careful not to blame the Queen or her Scottish council, but only pointed out how unscrupulous the Episcopalians could be. It seemed clear to the pamphleteer that Anne had only meant to protect those clergy who still held their parish churches; she did not intend to give license to establish new congregations. The author was concerned with more than just the new openness of worship; he worried that these new Episcopal meetings provided cover for illicit activity since the Episcopalians were still Jacobites.⁸⁵ Furthermore, the opening of Episcopal

⁸⁴ George Brown, *Toleration Defended: or the Letter From a Gentleman to a Member of Parliament concerning Toleration Considered, With some Observes or Mr. Meldrum's Sermon* (Edinburgh, 1703), 13.

⁸⁵ "Unsigned letter to -, October 1703, concerning the state of parties in Scotland, and defending the Presbyterian establishment against proposals for toleration of the Episcopal party. Endorsed by Tenison," [1703], MS929-13, Miscellaneous Papers, Lambeth Palace Library, London.

meeting houses created problems for the established Kirk, both in respect to legal jurisdiction over the meeting houses, and to the moral jurisdiction over the congregants of the meeting houses. Essentially, if the Church of Scotland did not control these churches, who was to be responsible for enforcing moral discipline over the congregants? The Kirk raised this very issue after Parliament granted legal toleration to Episcopalians in 1712.

The Presbyterians suffered frustrations in Anne's early years, and not all went well for the Episcopalians. The queen encouraged them with promises of protection, but early in her reign was careful to avoid alienating the Presbyterian establishment. She assured the Presbyterians that their church establishment was secure and that she did not desire its overthrow. Anne reassured the Presbyterians of Scotland to such a degree that English Episcopalians wondered if she would give them similar assurances. Sir John Pinkinton questioned why the queen granted "what further security they think fit for the Religion in Scotland" while not supporting the crusade against non-conformity in England.⁸⁶ The loyalty of Episcopalians improved their overall situation, but there were occasional setbacks.

Indifference or no Harm

The final argument used by the Episcopalians was perhaps their most interesting. Essentially it maintained that they posed no threat to the state, even if they could not

⁸⁶ Sir John Pinkinton, *A Speech for the Bill Against Occasional Conformity* (London, 1703), 4.

swear allegiance to it. An early example of this can be found in the work entitled *The humble representation of the Presbyterians*. The anonymous author did not protest his loyalty, nor did he use poetic language that attested his fidelity to the government. And he did not deny that a large number of Episcopalians were Jacobites. Instead, he argued that Episcopalians had not caused a disturbance or organized an uprising against the government. Therefore they should not be seen as a threat.⁸⁷ The Episcopalian principles of non-resistance and passive obedience rendered them peaceable and no threat to William and Mary. The author reduced the specter of Jacobitism to nothing more than an intellectual exercise for some Episcopalians. Interestingly, this tract was published one year before the government uncovered a major Jacobite plot to assassinate William and use French troops for an invasion.⁸⁸

The approach that stressed the peaceful history of Episcopalians paralleled the approach taken by Alexander Monro in his *Apology for the clergy of Scotland*. Monro responded to the attacks levied by Presbyterians on Episcopalian loyalties. He admitted that he could not speak for every individual's convictions, but he spoke to the treatment that the Episcopal clergy ought to receive from the state, "and such of the Episcopal

⁸⁷ *Some remarks on a scandalous paper entituled, The humble representation of the Presbyterians, to his Grace his Majesties high commissioner, and the estates of Parliament, May 30, 1695 : wherein the disingenuity of the present faction, that oppose episcopacy in Scotland, their inconsistency with their own principles, and cruelty towards all of a different persuasion, are clearly manifested* (n.p., 1695), 13-14.

⁸⁸ David Cressy, "Binding the Nation: the Bonds of Association, 1584 and 1696," in *Tudor Rule and Revolution, Essays for G.R. Elton from his American Friends*, eds. Delloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 227.

Clergy as did come over to King William, ought to be treated with Civility and Protection at least, if it were no more but that their Principles of Government are more agreeable to Reason and more favourable to Monarchy in General, and the Common Peace of Mankind.”⁸⁹ The government should protect Episcopalians for their loyalty, but also because of their peaceable disposition towards monarchy and government.

This logic continued under Anne. In 1703 George Garden recognized that many Episcopalians were not actively for the government, and at the same time posed no menace to the peace of society.⁹⁰ His colleague Brown concurred and pointed out that, even if some Episcopalians were Jacobites, theirs was not a religion of rebellion.⁹¹ Episcopal values rendered them harmless, even in the case of those who wanted James as king. Toleration for the Episcopalians would therefore not endanger the government.⁹² Behind these arguments, in the final years of William’s reign the Episcopalians began a push for toleration, a movement brought to a head after Anne became queen. When

⁸⁹ Alexander Monro, *An apology for the clergy of Scotland: chiefly oppos’d to the censures, calumnies, and accusations of a late Presbyterian vindicator, in a letter to a friend : wherein his vanity, partiality and sophistry are modestly reprov’d, and the legal establishment of episcopacy in that kingdom, from the beginning of the Reformation, is made evident from history and the records of Parliament : together with a postscript, relating to a scandalous pamphlet intituled, An answer to The Scotch Presbyterian eloquence* (London: Jos. Hindmarsh, 1693), 19-20.

⁹⁰ Garden, *The Case of the Episcopal Clergy And those of the Episcopal Perswasion*, 12.

⁹¹ Brown, *Toleration Defended*, 13-14

⁹² Calder, *Reasons For A Toleration To The Episcopal Clergie and Objections against it answered*, 11.

comprehension failed, it became clear that Episcopalians and Presbyterians could not be reconciled into one church. In 1703 a bill that would have granted Episcopal dissenters toleration was debated, but ultimately tabled by parliament at the behest of the Presbyterians.

For the Presbyterians, while Episcopalians might not have presented an imminent threat, people needed to be warned that their true colors would soon be revealed. “But if, as there is all the Reason in the world to believe, they are the Apostles of Passive Obedience, whose Cause this Man advocates, we know what Friend he is to the Government - For if they believe their own Doctrine, they must needs look upon resisting and dethroning the greatest Tyrant as unlawful, and consequently disapprove of what the Nation has done against the late King, may lawfully resist and depose when they have sufficient Force, which that they may attain we need not doubt of their Zeal to buz about their venomous Principles.”⁹³ The Presbyterians argued that the Episcopalians were only biding their time. Episcopal loyalty to James lurked just beneath the surface; it only waited for an opportunity to express itself. The Presbyterian assessment proved correct when in 1715 the Episcopalians rose *en masse* for the Old Pretender, but that event remained in the future. In the meantime, the Episcopalians continued to placate the government; all the while attempting to make the Presbyterians appear bitter.

⁹³ *A Brief and true account of the sufferings of the Church of Scotland occasioned by the Episcopalians since the year 1660: being a vindication of Their Majesties government in that kingdom, relating to the proceedings against the bishops and clergy there: with some animadversions upon a libel intituled, The present state and condition of the clergy and Church of Scotland* (London, 1690), 9.

Conclusion

The impact of Episcopalians loyal to the regime cannot be overstated. Powerful allies in the government had yet to deliver a legal toleration, and the restoration of lay patronage still remained in the future. Loyal Episcopalians gave their coreligionists time to organize, and they used this time to make provisions for themselves and to continue to lobby for English support. The clergy who took the oaths gave cover to those who did not, and they provided a powerful counterpoint to Presbyterian accusations of Jacobitism. As the number of loyalists increased under Anne, the Episcopalians could operate more freely and openly in efforts to advance their cause. The loyal clergy and their allies secured protection from William and Anne, enabling those clergy who so desired to remain in their livings. The larger significance of these acts demonstrates that in this period the Presbyterian establishment had not consolidated its control over religious circumstances. The Episcopal community had shown great resiliency in negotiating with the new order; even those who would have much preferred James as king still could work with the new government. Archbishop Patterson was the best example of this. He supported James at the Convention in 1688 and continued as a Jacobite until 1702, when he finally transferred allegiance to Anne. And one can see in the career of Tarbat an example of a man who served James faithfully until expediency dictated he do otherwise. The Episcopalians managed to survive this period, increase their numbers, and put themselves in a position following the Union to advance their cause. All of this to the great alarm of the Presbyterians.

Chapter 3: Expanding the Fight, Employing the English

Introduction

A majority of Episcopalians were Jacobites, but there existed a significant number of Williamite Episcopalians. The persistent strength of the Episcopal Church in certain segments of Scotland, combined with those clergy reconciled to the government, kept the Episcopal cause active and allowed it to continue in the face of a hostile Presbyterian Church establishment. There was one additional factor that provided significant assistance to the Episcopalians: the English. English support proved crucial to the survival of Scottish Episcopalianism. Prior to the Revolution the only feature shared by the Scottish Episcopalians and the Church of England was their ecclesiastical structure. The Church of England used a prayer book and gravitated toward Arminianism; the Scottish Episcopalians remained less formal and remained doctrinally Calvinist. Despite these significant differences, the Scottish Episcopalians consciously enlisted English help.

The Episcopal community had never been averse to seeking English advice, especially regarding the policies of James II that proved problematic in 1686-87. Prior to the Glorious Revolution, James issued a declaration of indulgence that granted a dispensation from legal penalties for Catholics and Protestant dissenters. The Scottish bishops charged John Patterson, then Bishop of Edinburgh, with the task of consulting

William Sancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury, on how best to handle the problem at hand. After all, James's pro-Catholic policies created similar problems for both the Scottish and English Episcopal communities. The next year, while the outcome of the Revolution remained uncertain, Patterson accompanied Arthur Rose, the Archbishop of St. Andrews, to London and consulted with Sancroft and Henry Compton, the Bishop of London, on how best to manage the deteriorating position of the Scottish Episcopal Church.¹ High level Scottish-Anglo consultation and cooperation were thus well established in advance of the Revolution.

However, after James's flight, the two Episcopal churches found themselves occupying opposite positions. The majority of the Church of England reconciled itself to William's succession while the Scottish Episcopal leadership remained loyal to James. The Jacobitism of the Scottish bishops prevented a direct approach to William for assistance. Conversely, the Church of England's alignment with William allowed the English to implore his help and protection. The Scottish Episcopalians needed the assistance of the Church of England and English Episcopalians in the late Stuart period, and from 1688 until the accession of George I the Scottish Episcopalians continued to seek that support in their struggle with the Presbyterians.²

¹ Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (New York: Penguin Books, 2007), 336, 382-3.

² Jeffrey Stephen, "Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland and the Scottish Parliament," *The Scottish Historical Review* 89, no. 1 (2010): 40.

Throughout this period the Scottish Episcopalians made a conscious effort to engage English public opinion. Through their appeals to London, the Episcopalians hoped that they could influence William's court and gain sympathy from English clerics. The English audience lacked firsthand knowledge of the situation, which allowed the Scots to exaggerate the situation, if need be.³ As the first two chapters have demonstrated, there were Scottish expatriates, specifically Gilbert Burnet and James Canaries, in William's entourage who could make use of the stories that emanated from Scotland.⁴ Moreover, publishing in England was easier than publishing in Scotland, because the Scottish Privy Council was in the midst of centralizing the licensing of books.⁵ Since the Scottish Episcopalians were unlikely to present Scotland's church and political leadership in a positive light, their works would have likely been censored there. They hoped instead that their campaign in England would bring to an end their troubles in Scotland.⁶

The Scots published their troubles in the forms of individual accounts of persecution, personal testimonies about the character and practices of the Scottish

³ Roger Emerson, "The Enlightenment and Social Structures," in *City and Society in the Eighteenth-Century*, eds. Paul Fritz and David Williams (Toronto: Hakkert, 1973), 103; Alasdair Raffe, "Episcopalian Polemic, The London Printing Press and Anglo-Scottish Divergence in the 1690s," *Journal of Scottish Studies* 26, no. 1 (2006): 24.

⁴ Alasdair Raffe, *The Culture of Controversy: Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660-1714* (Rochester: Boydell Press, 2012), 36.

⁵ Raffe, "Episcopalian Polemic, The London Printing Press and Anglo-Scottish Divergence in the 1690s," 28.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 26.

Episcopalians, and sermons about various theological topics. These sermons were cheap and reached a large audience due in part to the ease with which they could be published.⁷ Historians have found insight into people's thoughts on politics and power in this era.⁸ As Tim Harris states, "because publishers had to make a living, what was printed, and especially reprinted, must to some degree represent consumer choice, and therefore tell us something about the values and tastes of the consumers."⁹ Given the fact that these sermons and Episcopalian representations were printed and reprinted in late Stuart England, it is clear that their readership was large.

What the Scottish Episcopalians published was to persuade the English to help them, but their accounts of Presbyterian behavior in Scotland also colored negatively English attitudes about the Presbyterians and dissenters within England.¹⁰ The Scottish campaign for English support focused on four main points: highlighting the similarity of the two Episcopal churches; increasing the liturgical participation of the Scottish Episcopalians; emphasizing the horrors of Presbyterianism, and sending a warning to the

⁷ Tony Claydon, "The Sermon, the 'Public Sphere' and the Political Culture of Late Seventeenth-Century England," in *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature, and History, 1600-1750*, eds. Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 213.

⁸ James Caudle, "Preaching in Parliament: Patronage, Publicity, and Politics in Britain, 1701-60," in *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature, and History, 1600-1750*, eds. Ferrell and McCullough, 235; Claydon, "The Sermon, the 'Public Sphere' and the Political Culture of Late Seventeenth-Century England," 223.

⁹ Tim Harris, "Probematising Popular Culture," in *Popular Culture in England c. 1500-1850*, ed. Tim Harris (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 7.

¹⁰ Raffe, "Episcopalian Polemic, The London Printing Press and Anglo-Scottish Divergence in the 1690s," 36.

English that their own church establishment might not be secure. At the same time the Scots found close ideological allies within England's high church and Nonjuring communities. The Scots used these issues to build common cause with the English and to gain their help in Scottish affairs.

The Commonality Angle

Shortly after the Glorious Revolution the Scottish Episcopalians employed the strategy of emphasizing their shared experiences and common traits with the Church of England. In 1690 an anonymous Episcopal pamphleteer informed his English audience of his admiration for the Church of England, and he assured them that these sentiments were held by the entire Scottish Episcopal community. Indeed, he argued that Scottish Episcopalians would like to see their own church become more like the Church of England, especially in the use of the liturgy.¹¹ At this point the two Episcopal churches shared an ecclesiology, but liturgically, and even doctrinally, some major differences existed. The Church of England used the Book of Common Prayer and embraced Arminianism after the Restoration, while the Episcopalians of Scotland retained Calvinist beliefs and a simpler style of worship. Still, some Arminian ideas had crept into small circles within the Episcopal Church.¹² As discussed in Chapter 1, the Episcopalians in

¹¹ *Author of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, The prelatial church-man against the phanatical Kirk-man, or, A vindication of the author of The sufferings of the Church of Scotland* (London, 1690), 6.

Scotland had more in common doctrinally and stylistically with the Scottish and English Presbyterians than with the English Episcopalians. Despite this, the author was emphatic that the Episcopalians of Scotland preferred to be more like the English in their worship style, but the practical concerns in dealing with the strong Calvinist component in their church prevented them from having done so earlier when they controlled the Church of Scotland.¹³ John Sage, soon to become a Nonjuring bishop, spoke to this Scottish Episcopalian desire for doctrinal conformity. He explained, “I know not so much as one amongst us, who could not live in Communion with your church of England, and subscribe to her Thirty Nine Articles.”¹⁴ In short, these men wrote to establish solidarity between the two Episcopal churches. The Presbyterians were acutely aware of what the Episcopalians were doing, and they in turn attacked the link between the Church of England and Scottish Episcopal Church, arguing that any bond between the Church of England and Scottish Episcopalians was contrived and artificial. Scottish Episcopalians were guilty of “begging and running about with their malicious tattle amongst the Church-of-England Clergy, and others to whom they know such things to be

¹² James K. Cameron, “Theological Controversy: A Factor in the Origins of the Scottish Enlightenment,” in *The Origins and Nature of the Scottish Enlightenment*, eds. R.H. Campbell and Andrew S. Skinner (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1982), 117; Alasdair Raffae, “Presbyterians and Episcopalians: the Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715,” *English Historical Review* 125, no. 514 (2010): 586.

¹³ *Author of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, The prelatial church-man against the phanatical Kirk-man, or, A vindication of the author of The sufferings of the Church of Scotland*, 6.

¹⁴ John Sage, *Account of the Persecution of the Church in Scotland in Several Parts* (London, 1690), 48.

acceptable.”¹⁵ The Presbyterians pointed out that the Church of England’s clergy had accepted William and Mary as sovereigns while their Scottish counterparts had not. Moreover, the complaints the Episcopalians raised to the English must be considered illegitimate in light of the Episcopal treatment of the Presbyterians after the restoration. The Presbyterians were forced to accept royal supremacy and abjure the Solemn League and Covenant; the Episcopalians only had to accept Presbyterianism as the legally established church. They were not required to abjure or deny any of their beliefs.¹⁶

The strategy of establishing commonality continued throughout the late Stuart period. After Anne became queen, men like George Brown argued in favor of toleration for the Episcopalians in Scotland. Brown had been a minister in western Scotland prior to the Revolution. He and his family fled to Edinburgh once the Presbyterian mobs started to purge the parishes of Episcopalians. He appealed to the English and their church by using flattery; he celebrated the Church of England as, “the Glory of the Reformation,” and as the “Bulwark of the Protestant Religion.” Brown’s purpose was to defend the Church of England from George Meldrum’s attacks. Meldrum was a Presbyterian minister who bitterly opposed any relief for the Episcopalians and criticized

¹⁵ *The queries and protestation of the Scots Episcopal clergy against the authority of the Presbyterian General Assemblies and committees : given in to the Committee of the General Assembly at Aberdeen, June 29th, 1694 : together with the Committee’s answer and proceedings, with reflections upon the queries, &c. / by a layman of the Church of Scotland* (London, 1694), A-2,3; Tristram Clarke, “The Scottish Episcopalians, 1688-1720” (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1987), 252.

¹⁶ *Queries and protestation of the Scots Episcopal clergy against the authority of the Presbyterian General Assemblies and committees* (n.p., n.d.), A-2, 3; Clarke, *The Scottish Episcopalians*, 252.

anyone who supported them.¹⁷ He opposed proposals that would have helped the Episcopal clergy. For example, he attacked the restoration of lay patronage as a usurpation of the church's power by the laity and as unscriptural.¹⁸ Lay patronage would have allowed the local heritors, the feudal landholder of a parish, to call clergy to a parish independent of the Presbyterian hierarchy. In theory, this would have allowed for more Episcopalians to infiltrate the Church of Scotland since many heritors were Episcopalians.

Scottish Episcopalians continued this very public admiration and defense of the Church of England throughout the period, and in the face of Presbyterian aggression their rhetoric proclaimed these connections even more forcefully. The idea of schism figured prominently in this defensive discourse. Episcopalians and Presbyterians agreed that only sinful terms of communion justified schism. This conclusion connoted that schism was only permitted when a church required its members to violate expressed commandments of the Bible. Only doctrinal transgressions would allow one to abandon membership in the established church; stylistic and liturgical grievances would not. Both Episcopal and Presbyterian pamphlets from the early 1700s discussed this issue, and their timing was important. As the Episcopalians pushed for toleration, it was important for the Presbyterians to demonstrate that there were no sinful terms of communion within the

¹⁷ George Brown, *Toleration Defended: or the Letter From a Gentleman to a Member of Parliament concerning Toleration Considered, With some Observes or Mr. Meldrum's Sermon* (Edinburgh, 1703), 17; George Meldrum *A Letter From A Friend in the City to a Member of Parliament Anent Patronages* (Edinburgh, 1703).

¹⁸ Meldrum, *A Letter From A Friend in the City to a Member of Parliament*, 3-5.

Church of Scotland that the Episcopalians might utilize in their argument. The Episcopalians, on the other hand, needed to prove that sinful terms existed in order to receive toleration.

Episcopal logic held that there existed no sinful terms of communion at the Restoration, since most Presbyterians conformed to the Episcopal Church at the time. A corollary held that for conforming Presbyterians the issue of church government must have been of no major consequence. They would have preferred Presbyterianism, but Episcopalianism would still have been acceptable. On the other hand, Episcopalians seeking to be admitted to the state church after the Revolution could not dismiss the issue of church government nor treat it as indifferent. To this purpose, they argued that Episcopal church government involved more than just the hierarchy of the bishops; it also included the idea that only ministerial ordination by a bishop was valid.¹⁹ A bishop's authority to ordain clergy came from his status as a successor of the apostles and his ability to trace his ecclesiastical pedigree back to one of the original twelve. Presbyterians did not believe a bishop was necessary in order to ordain ministers.²⁰

George Meldrum defended the validity of the Presbyterian Church and its ministers and argued that the Episcopalians must conform to the Church of Scotland or else be guilty of schism. John Sage capitalized on Meldrum's criticism of the Scottish Episcopalians and expanded it into a condemnation of all church government by bishops,

¹⁹ Raffe, "Presbyterians and Episcopalians: the Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715," 578, 588.

²⁰ It is likely that some lay Episcopalians did not believe this either.

including the Church of England. He informed his readers that “He [Meldrum], will I hope, allow the Orders (if not the Romish, yet) of the Greek and English Churches to be Valid, and yet I doubt if he is much for Communion with either.”²¹ Sage’s point was twofold: first, any attack on the validity of the Scottish Episcopalian orders must be an attack on the orders of the Church of England since they both derived from the same authority, and, second, if Meldrum accepted the validity of the Church of England’s orders, then he should be willing to be in communion with it. Since he was not in communion with the Church of England, then the Episcopalians in Scotland could not expect to be in communion with the Presbyterian Church.

As the Church of England came to the assistance of the Scots, they were duly grateful. Throughout the early 1700s the English Episcopalians organized collections of prayer books and sent them to their Scottish brethren. (The nature and impact of the collections will be discussed in the following sections.) The support of the English Episcopalians in the post-union Parliament was likewise instrumental in finally securing legal toleration for the Scottish Episcopalians, and the English also secured the restoration of lay patronage which allowed heritors to select their own clergy free from the Church of Scotland’s interference.²² By 1712, the admiration of the Church of England, palpable in 1689, had grown substantially. As Patrick Dunbreck of Aberdeen

²¹ John Sage, *A brief examination of some things in Mr. Meldrum's sermon preach'd May 16 against a toleration to those of the Episcopal persuasion / in a letter to a friend* (London, 1690), 3.

²² Geoffrey Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power: Later Stuart and Early Georgian Britain 1660-1722* (London: Longman, 1993), 317.

told Bishop Archibald Campbell, “I was ever a great admirer of the Church of England, but now a greater than ever.”²³

Common Worship

By the early 1700s it appeared that William’s comprehension scheme had failed, and so the Episcopalians had to seek a distinct identity, an identity that generated English sympathy and solidarity.²⁴ Large numbers of Episcopal clergy had been retained within the Church of Scotland (discussed in Chapter 3), but the inability of the Episcopal clergy to advance their way through the Presbyterian hierarchy and sit in the General Assembly prevented them forcing ecclesiastical change from within the church. An independent Episcopal Church in Scotland became the new goal, and at this point the Episcopal Church of Scotland began to take on a more visibly English character.

The link between the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church of England strengthened after 1688. Episcopal congregations in Scotland gradually adopted the Book of Common Prayer in their services, and this marked a significant break with the

²³ Patrick Dunbreck , “A Letter to Bishop Archibald Campbell” [1712], CH12/12/450, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

²⁴ David Hayton, “Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections,” in *The Scots and Parliament*, ed. Clyve Jones (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996), 85; P. W. J. Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1979), 60-65.

worship traditions of their church.²⁵ Charles I had introduced prayer books into the Scottish Church in the late 1630s, a move that led immediately to the creation of the National Covenant and the outbreak of the Bishops' Wars. The bishops chose not to reintroduce the prayer books after the Restoration in order to avoid a repeat of the events of the 1630s, and to bring moderate Presbyterians into the reestablished Episcopal Church. Some clerics used the Prayer Books for their private worship, but their number was not large.²⁶

As early as 1693 the new liturgical outlook of the Episcopalians in Scotland was on display, and, predictably, the Presbyterians responded negatively.²⁷ Years later, Presbyterian minister and apologist James Webster expressed alarm over the increasingly liturgical nature of Episcopalian worship. Webster rallied Presbyterian public opinion and informed his co-religionists that the Episcopal Church had in a matter of only a few years become dependent on the Church of England. The Episcopalians accepted material assistance from the English and relied on them for support in Parliament. Worse than this, the Scottish Episcopalians now imitated the Church of England's style of worship. The use of the Book of Common Prayer was not limited to Episcopal strongholds in the north; it seemed to Webster that the prayer books were also in the cities. This was surely

²⁵ Raffe, "Presbyterians and Episcopalians: the Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715," 581.

²⁶ *Author of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, The prelatial church-man against the phanatical Kirk-man, or, A vindication of the author of The sufferings of the Church of Scotland*, 6.

²⁷ Stephen, "Defending the Revolution," 45.

a major innovation. Webster reminded his readers that the prayer book had been so unpopular in Scotland that it caused a civil war when Charles I introduced it in 1637, and that the Episcopalians dared not force it on the Scottish public following the Restoration.²⁸

Webster's observations exhibited three crucial issues related to prayer book usage. First, he claimed the prayer books were widely used in Scotland's cities. "Yea, do we not actually see the English Worship already set up in the Metropols of this nation?"²⁹ This had not been historically true, suggesting an increase in Episcopal feeling. Public use of the liturgy in an area considered favorable to Presbyterianism revealed a more brazen piety on the part of the Episcopalians. Webster might expect the Episcopalians to be openly worshiping in the north, but their open worship in the cities was unexpected. By their highly visible use of the prayer book, it appeared as if the Episcopalians hoped to be noticed and attacked. If the Presbyterians attacked the Episcopalians for their use of the English *Book of Common Prayer*, the English body politic would certainly intervene to protect their co-religionists. The Episcopalians never shied away from playing the victim, and they performed the role well throughout the late Stuart period.

Second, Webster raised the issue of innovation in worship. As mentioned above he reminded the reader that Charles I's previous attempt to impose the prayer book on the

²⁸ James Webster, *Essay Upon Toleration By a Sincere Lover of Church and State* (n.p., 1703), 19-20.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

Scots had led to the Bishops' Wars and subsequently to the Civil War. He portrayed this new liturgical trend among the Episcopalians as the worst part of their history. He commented on what happened the last time the prayer book had been introduced in Scotland, "Tho a Worship [prayer books] so contrary to the Natural Genius of this Land, that to preclude it, they entered into a Civil War."³⁰ Moreover, Webster told his audience that the Episcopalians had reverted since the Glorious Revolution; they were bad enough before the Revolution, and their current use of the liturgy harkened back to the time right before the civil war. Several years later, after the union, when prayer book use had expanded throughout the country, the Presbyterians at Perth echoed Webster's sentiments. They complained about how the Episcopalians worshiped outside the established church, and they also complained of the usage of the prayer books, which was "contrary to the constant practice of this Church, yea and which was not so much as attempted during the late prelacy."³¹

Third, Webster raised the specter of the Episcopalians' relationship with the English. He accused the Episcopalians of taking religious cues from the English and depending on them for support. Throughout he associated the Episcopalians with the English, that is, a foreign nation. His underlying point was that the Episcopalians were, now more than ever, foreign. Webster clearly suspected that the desire for English support animated the use of the *Book of Common Prayer*, and he remained suspicious

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ "Libel by presbytery of Perth against W Smith at Moneydie, now in Methven, for reading the funeral service and baptizing," [1710], CH12/12/458, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

about English influence on Scottish ecclesiastical affairs. In 1703, while the Scottish Episcopalians sought toleration, Webster accused the English Parliament of “endeavoring to take away the Liberty that the Presbyterian Dissenters had by law.”³² Webster was at best skeptical of the union, which suggests some degree of Anglophobia on his part.³³ His deep concern over the influence of the English in Scotland’s ecclesiastical affairs offered additional evidence of how successful Episcopalians had been at employing the English to their advantage. David Hayton observes that greater identification between the Tory and Scottish Episcopal interests coincided with the use of the *Book of Common Prayer*, thus lending credence to Webster’s fears of undue English influence.³⁴

The liturgy made slow progress through the Episcopal congregations. The liturgy had not been in use in the Scottish church, and some Episcopalians no doubt resisted its introduction. For this reason, the bishops and their English benefactors needed to proceed with caution when encouraging the use of the prayer books. Regardless of clerical enthusiasm, pragmatism was necessary in order to avoid upsetting the sensibilities of some of the Episcopal laity.³⁵ Therefore the clergy elected to introduce the prayer book gradually. Conditions became increasingly amenable to prayer book use

³² Webster, *Essay Upon Toleration*, 22.

³³ Christopher Whatley, *The Scots and the Union* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 288.

³⁴ Hayton, “Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections,” 88.

³⁵ Andrew L. Drummond and James Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843: The Age of the Moderates* (Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press, 1973), 17.

throughout the late Stuart period as evidenced by Bishop Haliburton of Aberdeen's decision to follow his lay advisors who supported the introduction of the English liturgy.³⁶

The collections and distribution of prayer books presented an opportunity for the Scottish Episcopal Church to test the commitment of their English counterparts and discover whether the English would back their verbal support with material support. At the same time it provided the English an opportunity to prove their commitment to their co-religionists. The distribution of prayer books created a shared liturgical experience for all juring Episcopalians, those loyal to the government and those who were not. A letter to George Middleton, the Principal of King's College in Aberdeen, reveals the progress that the prayer book had achieved. The authors of the letter advised Middleton how to distribute the prayer books. The signatories included James Greenshields, an Episcopal minister who achieved fame when he successfully humiliated the Kirk after Parliament overturned his conviction for having used the prayer book in Edinburgh. These men knew that the distribution of the prayer book would generate controversy because the book would certainly be distributed to jurors and Nonjurors alike. In fact, Nonjuring brothers, George and James Garden, were at this time in Aberdeen encouraging the use of

³⁶ "Original and typescript copy of list of the episcopal ministers of the four districts of the diocese of Aberdeen, under Bishop George Haliburton," [1712], CH12/12/6a, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

the prayer book.³⁷ Greenshields and his compatriots asked Middleton to include in the distribution a man named Mr. Hadderwicks. Hadderwicks had complied with all of the laws and taken the necessary oaths in order to legally practice the Episcopal faith.³⁸ As a result, he would have been above reproach and able to deflect criticism from the Presbyterians.

The liturgy served many purposes for the Episcopal community. First, it established a bond between the Church of England and the Scottish Episcopalians. Second, it served to unify the Episcopal Church. Third, it attracted followers to the Episcopal congregations by making the differences between them and the Presbyterians more practically and symbolically apparent. Prior to the adoption of the prayer book the worship styles of the Episcopalians and Presbyterians were nearly identical, and, if a person was not firmly committed to the Episcopal polity or to Jacobitism, no reason existed for a person not to conform to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The use of the prayer book, however, established a substantive, non-political, division between the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches. Its usage created a clear division between the two churches in terms of styles of worship. A person could claim that he preferred the

³⁷ William Reginald Ward, "Anglicanism and Assimilation; or Mysticism and Mayhem in the Eighteenth-Century," in *Crown and Mitre: Religion and Society in Northern Europe Since the Reformation*, eds. W. M Jacob and Nigel Yates (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993), 85.

³⁸ Richard Longworth, James Greenshields, and James Gray, "A Letter to George Middleton, Principle of King's College Aberdeen – January 24th," [1712/13], CH12/12/8, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

Episcopalian liturgy over the simpler Presbyterians style and therefore did not want to conform to the Church of Scotland.

Two letters written by Patrick Dunbreck, an Episcopal clergyman from Aberdeen, confirm the positive effect of the prayer books on the Episcopalians. Dunbreck observed that, after the adoption of the liturgy, the Presbyterians had stopped intruding into Episcopal congregations in efforts to shut them down.³⁹ Dunbreck was unsure as to whether this was due to the popularity of the liturgy with the masses or from Presbyterian fears of an English reprisal. At the same time, the liturgy provided a sense of community for the Episcopalians. Dunbreck informed Bishop Archibald Campbell that his Aberdeen congregation had become famous as a result of its use of the prayer book. An unnamed man, identified only as a “worthy gentleman,” told Dunbreck about a recent trip he had taken to London. While in London he met with a female relation who had lived in Scotland, presumably around Aberdeen. As a woman of the “Romish religion,” she complained that since Dunbreck had installed his chapel, which used the prayer book, Catholicism in the region had suffered. She commented that “he [Dunbreck] has done us more hurt in this place than all that the Presbyterians have done us since the Revolution.”⁴⁰ Dunbreck also implied that, from the time of the Glorious Revolution until the adoption of the prayer books in the early 1700s, Catholicism had been on the rise. The Episcopal prayer book congregations provided a place for disaffected Presbyterians

³⁹ Patrick Dunbreck , “A Letter to Bishop Archibald Campbell,” [1712], CH12/12/450, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

to turn as an alternative to Catholicism. Typically, Dunbreck concluded his letter with praise for the English and confessed his admiration for the Church of England to Campbell.

The Rabblings

The Episcopal literature aimed at English audiences highlighted the persecution received at the hands of the Presbyterians. In particular, it addressed the plight of clergy whom Presbyterians had “rabbed,” or extra-judicially displaced. The problem of rabbling began with the Revolution and continued throughout the late Stuart period. The exact number of Episcopal ministers forced out of their livings is difficult to ascertain, but the violence and practices of the Presbyterian mobs in the areas where they held numerical superiority were consistent.⁴¹ Stories portraying barbaric acts circulated among the English, so these tales served a purpose. John Sage recounted several instances of Presbyterian brutality in detail. Sage wrote his account in 1690 as the Presbyterians attempted to consolidate their control over Scotland’s ecclesiastical affairs. Since the Episcopalians were required to comply with the newly established Presbyterian Church in order to maintain their parishes, these early stories were designed to elicit sympathy and alert the English to the plight of their coreligionists in Scotland. Sage and his fellow Scottish Episcopalians informed their readers that the Presbyterian mobs knew no limits, that Presbyterian fanaticism and mercilessness even allowed them to attack

⁴¹ Harris, *Revolution*, 376, 378.

clergy on Christmas. He wrote about a Presbyterian mob that visited Mr. Gabriel Buffet of Govean. The mob “beat his Wife, his Daughter, and himself too, so inhumanely, that it had almost endangered his Life; carried off the Poor’s Box, and other utensils of the Church, and threatened peremptorily, if he should ever offer, after that, to preach there, he might assure himself of more severe Treatment.”⁴² The rabblings all followed the same pattern. Sage included the stories of Mr. Finie of Catheart and Mr. Buyd of Carmunnock who were attacked on Christmas Day. Their stories were similar: the mobs roughed them up along with their wives and children and chased them out of their parishes. In some cases the violence was accompanied with robbery, vandalism, and verbal abuse over perceived historical grievances, specifically the breaking of the National Covenant. Furthermore, the Presbyterian leaders’ refusal to condemn the actions of the mobs added fuel to the fire. Sage noted, “not one Presbyterian Preacher, had ever been heard condemn these Methods from his Pulpit. On the contrary, I could name more than two or three, who actually approved them, commended the Zeal that put People upon them; encouraged them to proceed.”⁴³ Presbyterian leaders attempted to have it both ways; they condemned the crown, but at the same time justified their actions by comparing them to those of the Episcopalians during the Restoration.⁴⁴ In the minds

⁴² Sage, *Account of the Persecution of the Church in Scotland*, 16.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁴⁴ Alasdair Raffae, “Propaganda, Religious Controversy, and the Williamite Revolution,” *Dutch Crossing* 29, no. 1 (2004): 32.

of the Episcopalians, the rabblings only confirmed their belief that the Presbyterians were modern day Covenanters.

Presbyterian justification for the rabblings focused on possible Jacobitism among the Episcopal clergy, but the fact that Presbyterians indiscriminately rabbled both juring and Nonjuring clergy alike undermined this claim. Some clergy claimed that they had not been given enough time to comply with the new oaths; others complied only to be rabbled out anyway. Sage cited the case of a minister in Murray who publically prayed for William and Mary and offered to read any proclamation or declaration of support for the new monarchs that the law required in order to retain his post. The minister, though he preferred Episcopacy, had no qualms about the legitimacy of Presbyterianism and was willing to remain in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland if the Presbyterians would allow it. This did not happen, since the minister in question was the son of a former bishop. Sage described five or six other clergy in Edinburgh who took the required oaths only to have the local magistrates harass them for their private worship utensils.⁴⁵ The fact that juring clergy were rabbled alongside Jacobites strengthened Episcopal claims of Presbyterian barbarity.⁴⁶ The author of the “Memorial concerning the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland” requested the help of the English in placing some of the 200 rabbled

⁴⁵ Ibid., 51-52.

⁴⁶ Raffe, “Propaganda, Religious Controversy, and the Williamite Revolution,” 34; “Presbyterians and Episcopalians: the Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715,” 581.

ministers, upon their taking oaths, into new livings.⁴⁷ His plan was to provide new opportunities for those clergy who had complied, and at the same time offer an extended opportunity to achieve compliance for those clergy who might still be persuaded into taking the oaths.

These complaints compelled William to respond in 1695 with the Church Act, which gave his formal protection to all loyal Episcopalians who still retained their parishes. Despite this, the Presbyterians violated his orders by continued attacks on Episcopal clergy. Presbyterians persisted in removing qualified clergy and refused to admit them into the Church of Scotland. Such abuses led William to make one last effort at comprehension.⁴⁸ This endeavor, like the efforts to stem the violence against the clergy, failed and the rabblings continued.

One attack occurred in 1704 near Edinburgh when a Presbyterian constable harassed an Episcopal minister named Robert Moor. Moor, aged sixty, had traveled into Edinburgh to receive “relief.” English Episcopalians donated food, medicine, money, and prayer books to their Scottish counterparts in the late Stuart Period. It is unclear what specific relief Moor sought in Edinburgh, and, regardless, he apparently received nothing and attempted to return home. A Presbyterian constable intercepted him and

⁴⁷ “Memorial concerning the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland,” [1694], MS929-10, Miscellaneous Papers, Lambeth Palace Library, London.

⁴⁸ Kieran German, “Scots Episcopalians after Disestablishment, 1689-1723,” in *Institutional Change and Stability: Conflicts, Transitions and Social Values*, eds. Andreas Gemes, Florencia Peytou, and Iannis Xydopoulos (Pisa: Edizioni Plus Pisa University Press, 2009), <http://www.clioheres.net/books4/1/04.pdf> (accessed February 20, 2013), 54-55.

accused the sickly old man of being drunk. It seemed to the author of this account that Moor was merely ill, and he remarked, “but the fiery spirit of Presbyterianism never cools, but even still turns more implacable and relentless to those who differ from them.”⁴⁹ The constable temporarily deposited the cleric at his home while he gathered other men to assist in his arrest. Shortly after his capture, Moor died. For the Episcopal community this episode illustrated the cruelties of the Presbyterians’ fervor, which by 1705, when this account was written, had become a national scandal. “What inhuman cruelties and barbarities the Presbyterians have done to the Episcopal Clergy, especially at the Revolution, and ever since, is so well known over the whole nation.”⁵⁰ To the Episcopal community More’s case stood as symbolic of the pattern of mistreatment its co-religionists had faced since the Glorious Revolution. The anonymous author concluded his account with a damning indictment of the Presbyterians and their behavior. Presbyterian regret over the death of Moor was forthcoming, not because a terrible act had been committed against an old man, but only because the incident reflected badly on its perpetrators. The author concluded, “He died to the great concern and consternation of those who brought him thither, not for the murder they had committed but y(e)t they have missed of their designs and yet their malice and wickedness which they had clothed under Religion did plainly and definitely appear to the whole world.”⁵¹

⁴⁹ “Account of the inhumane treatment of Mr R More, a starving episcopal minister in Edinburgh, by the town guard of Edinburgh” [1705], CH12/12/574, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.

Not all evictions were violent; some were handled through legal process. In cases in which the Presbyterians proceeded with legal action against the Episcopal clergy, it always helped the Episcopal cause to substantiate the arbitrary nature of the proceedings against them.⁵² A local Presbytery wanted to remove John Keith from his parish near Deer. To displace Keith the Presbyterians needed him brought up on theological crimes three times in order to disqualify him from the ministry. The Presbyterians had cited Keith twice earlier in his career. The exact nature of the citations is unclear, but one more charge would secure his legal eviction. It is unlikely that Keith was accused of Jacobitism since, had he not taken the necessary oaths, he could not legally possess a parish under any circumstances.

Alexander Moore, a fellow Episcopal minister, wrote about Keith's final ordeal, telling his readers that the Presbyterians had charged Keith with intrusion, ignorance, and idolatry. If the ecclesiastical court convicted him, he was dismissed from the ministry. His accusers entered into his bedroom in order to inform Keith of the charges filed against him. According to Moore, the charges were weak: "The idolatry was, that befor[e] a drink which he offered the presbytery he said such words as there, we look for a blessing from the Heavens and from Him that made them. And his ignorance, Its known he can enter the lists in Learning with the presbytery, and they never conversed him upon Theologicall matters so that ye sees things goes very high against us."⁵³ It

⁵² Raffe, "Propaganda, Religious Controversy, and the Williamite Revolution," 34.

appears that Keith's crime was simply to ask for a blessing over a drink. As for theological errors, none were cited. Moore said that Keith did not talk about theology with the Presbyterians, a smart choice given the fact that they constantly looked for evidence against him. Moore concluded his account with a warning, "and if there be no stop putt to it we shall all in a minute be so ruined and abused."⁵⁴ Presbyterians were not reluctant to intrude into the residence of an Episcopal minister. Once the mob had secured its target, the members took him to a public place in the village or town and proceeded by either charging him with a crime or intimidating him in order to make him leave. Only a resolute minister with dedicated supporters could hope to defend himself.⁵⁵

Presbyterians used this violent pattern against all of their enemies. William Maxwell described the Presbyterian attack on the family of the Earl of Nithsdale in Terregles, Dumfrieshire. The Nithsdales were not Episcopalians, nor were they reconciled to the government. Rather they were Catholic Jacobites, at time where anti-Catholic feeling was on the rise. William's wars had made Catholic France an enemy,

⁵³ "Account supplied by Mr. Alexander Moore, episcopal minister, of the deposition of Mr John Keith from the parish of Deer by the presbytery," [1710/11], CH12/12/5, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ John Sage, *The case of the present afflicted clergy in Scotland truly represented to which is added for probation the attestation of many unexceptionable witnesses to every particular, and all the publick acts and proclamations of the convention and Parliament relating to the clergy / by a lover of the church and his country* (London: J. Hindmarsh, 1690), 1.

and Presbyterian concerns over Catholicism in the area had been growing.⁵⁶ Presbyterian concerns were not misplaced, as the pope had sent Thomas Nicholson to Scotland as Vicar Apostolic in 1694 and Peter Fraser would be ordained a priest in Scotland soil in 1704.⁵⁷ The treatment the Nithsdale's received at the hands of the Presbyterian mobs speaks to the ferocity of these rabblings. Under the cloak of darkness, typical for a rabbling, a group of sixty attacked the Earl's home in the hope of finding a Catholic priest. When the mob arrived, the Earl was not home and his wife faced the crowd alone. The young woman had recently recovered from an illness and was forced out in the cold night air without being given time to add extra clothing or take any other provisions. The mob proceeded to search the house and broke into the Earl's study and ransacked his papers. They found nothing. The family eventually escaped to Edinburgh.⁵⁸ The Presbyterians, the Episcopalians claimed, showed no respect for nobles, or for women, as evidenced by the way they treated the Earl's wife. Nobody was safe from their religious fervor. Claiming to act on God's behalf, the mobs did whatever they liked to whomever they chose. The Episcopalians insisted that the behavior of the mobs was reminiscent of that of the Covenanters of the 1630s, as detailed in the following section.

⁵⁶ Karin Bowie, *Scottish Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707* (Rochester: Boydell Press, 2007), 39-40; Derek J. Patrick, "The Kirk, Parliament, and the Union, 1706-7," *The Scottish Historical Review* 87, Supplement (2008): 97.

⁵⁷ Brian M. Halloran, "Scandal or Repentance? John Gordon of Glencat," *Innes Review* 55, no. 2 (2004): 206.

⁵⁸ "True narrative of the violence done to the Earl of Nithsdale's family by the presbyterian minister at Terregles, Dumfriesshire," [24 December 1703], CH12/12/752, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

The cases of Moor and the Catholic Nithsdales were not the only examples of the Presbyterians' lack of humanity towards their victims. Shortly after the Union of Scotland and England an attempted rabbling at Tyrie nearly turned fatal. A young man aged sixteen or seventeen interrupted an Episcopal service, and the minister, James Farquhar, refused to continue until he departed. Sometime later a mob arrived. When the congregation attempted to protect their minister, one of the rabblers fired a pistol into the crowd, hitting a woman and then without explanation stepped on her. The woman fortunately survived, and Episcopalians used incidents like this to portray the Presbyterians as cruel and irrational.⁵⁹

The Episcopal clergy and its supporters wrote to raise the profile of these rabblings in the hope that they might gain relief. Their first place of recourse was the Scottish Parliament. Alexander Bruce Broomhall, future Earl of Kincardine, addressed that body of the condition of the clergy. "The Misery of these poor Gentlemen, and their Starving Families at Home, or their Wanting in Want over the world, had brought a Reproach on our Country; and it is but a very different Charm to Invite any Country in the World to Unite with Us, while we are in this Situation."⁶⁰ The condition of the Episcopal clergy stained Scotland's honor, and Broomhall advanced the possibility that England might not want to join with a nation that treated Episcopalians in this way. The Scottish parliament had an opportunity to intervene on the Episcopalians' behalf, and in

⁵⁹ "Account of Mr. James Farquhar, minister of Tyrie," [1708-09], CH12/12/21, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁶⁰ Alexander Bruce Broomhall, *A speech in the Parliament of Scotland, in relation to Presbyterian government* (n.p., 1702), 2.

the 1702-03 sessions the pressure to act was on them. The Episcopalians petitioned parliament for protection from the Presbyterian mobs, and their language made it clear that if parliament did not act the Episcopalians would seek assistance from the English.⁶¹ The option also remained for the Episcopalians to appeal to the devout Anglican Queen Anne to intercede in Scottish affairs. When the Scottish Parliament failed to act and put an end to the rabblings and persecutions, the Episcopalians needed to create a sense of urgency and to prove the evictions as truly unjust in order to secure help from the English.

The Presbyterians continued to attack. They recognized the Episcopal strategy of appealing to English public opinion and attempted to construct a counter-narrative of events. Presbyterian leader, minister, and apologist George Meldrum cast doubts on Episcopal claims of mistreatment and argued that the Episcopalians exaggerated their plight. In response, Episcopalian George Brown assailed the Presbyterians and their claims of moderation. Brown cited John Park, one of the ministers held unjustly in the old Edinburgh prison, the Tollbooth, as a non-Jacobite clergyman who was a victim of the rabblings. If the Presbyterians exercised discretion in their rabblings and arrests, why

⁶¹ James Hodow, *The Case of the Episcopal Clergy And those of the Episcopal Perswasion, Consider'd as to the Granting Them A Toleration and Indulgence. Second Edition Revised and Cleared from the Mistakes of a Gentleman's Letter* (n.p., 1703), 3.

then was the Edinburgh Tollbooth occupied by as many juring Episcopalians as Nonjuring? ⁶²

Park's incarceration was not an isolated incident as Presbyterians continued to attack legitimate, loyal clergy along with the Jacobites. One of these was John Skinner. His congregation had selected him, and Skinner had supported the government since the Glorious Revolution. This should have qualified him for the ministry; nevertheless, local Presbyterians brought him up on charges that he had intruded into his parish, that is, occupied the ministry in a parish without legal right. The Presbyterian courts in turn found Skinner guilty, but the Scots Privy Council overturned his conviction on appeal. ⁶³

Bishop Alexander Rose worked to exploit the problems that the Presbyterians had created for themselves through their persistent attacks, thereby jeopardizing their own standing. Rose organized an appeal for help with the future Bishop Archibald Campbell, and complained that the Presbyterians were out to destroy the entire Episcopal community, both those who complied with the government and those who did not. He urged his colleague to write the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London and seek

⁶² George Brown, *Toleration Defended: or The Letter From a Gentleman to a Member of Parliament concerning Toleration Considered, With some Observes on Mr. Meldrum's Sermon* (Edinburgh, 1703), 4-5.

⁶³ "Representation of the case of Mr. John Skinner, minister of Brechin," [1710], CH12/12/250, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

their assistance in protecting the Episcopal community.⁶⁴ Finally, Rose beseeched Campbell to make sure that the English knew that the Presbyterians attacked Scots for using the English liturgy, and to inform them about the inhumane events surrounding the rabblings⁶⁵ His letter makes clear that the Scottish Episcopalians intended to use the harsh treatment they received at the hands of the Presbyterians for the increased use of the liturgy to gain English sympathy and support. Throughout the period accounts of the persecution of the Scottish Episcopalians were printed in England. Rose hoped persecution of Episcopalians who used the English prayer book would in turn inspire sympathy among the English and encourage them to view the Scottish Episcopalians as their true coreligionists.

A Warning to the English

Throughout the late Stuart period the Episcopalians engaged in a smear campaign against the Presbyterians which dwelled on the Presbyterians' radical past.⁶⁶ The

⁶⁴ Alexander Rose, "A Letter to Archibald Campbell about the persecution of the both qualified and unqualified Episcopal clergy," [1706], CH12/12/1801, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Colin Kidd, "Constructing a Civil Religion: Scots Presbyterians and the Eighteenth-Century British State," in *The Scottish Churches and the Union Parliament, 1707-1999*, ed. James Kirk (Edinburgh: Scottish Church History Society, 2001), 5; "The Kirk, the French Revolution, and Burden of Scottish Whiggery." in *Religious Change in Europe 1650-1914 Essays for John McManners*, ed. Nigel Aston, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 214.

Scottish Episcopalians warned the English not to be complacent about the condition of their coreligionists, and admonished the English Episcopalians that the Presbyterians posed a threat to the Church of England. Leaders of the Church of England might believe their church establishment secure, but so had the Scottish Episcopalians prior to the Glorious Revolution. Could England be sure the same thing would not happen to them? By inspiring a certain paranoia and concern among the church leadership, the Scots hoped to establish the specter of a common enemy and to stoke animosity towards English dissenters.

In this undertaking, the Scottish Episcopalians manipulated history. They held Presbyterians responsible for the deaths of two monarchs, Mary, Queen of Scots, and Charles I.⁶⁷ In the 1630s during the two Bishops' Wars the Presbyterians had won control of the Church of Scotland, and once in power, they expanded their religious revolution south. They joined forces with the English enemies of Charles I, many of whom became Presbyterians, and formed the Solemn League and Covenant. Together they defeated Charles and proceeded to dismantle Episcopalianism in England. John Sage reminded the English: "Considering the Great Charity which the Scotch Presbyterians have for the Church of England, as you have hear[d]; and their Intention of visiting them again (which the Author has threatened) as they did in the year 39."⁶⁸ The Civil War and in particular the death of Charles I had become major religious as well as

⁶⁷ Michael G. Finlayson, *Historians, Puritanism, and the English Revolution: The Religious Factor in English Politics Before and After the Interregnum* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983), 132.

⁶⁸ Sage, *Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland Truly Represented*, 106.

political events in England. Ministers identified Charles with Jesus who died for the sins of his people.⁶⁹ Invocation of Charles's name served as a powerful reminder of the radical Presbyterian past.

Covenanted Presbyterians used menacing language when discussing the Church of England, and those who subscribed to the Covenant were required by oath to reform all of Britain, not just Scotland. Sage pointed this out about the Presbyterians, their oath, and its consequences for England, "Which Oath will certainly bind them to overthrow Episcopacy in England more industriously, when England by the Union becomes a part of their native Countrey."⁷⁰

People and institutions that supported the Episcopalians and their cause expected the Presbyterians' enmity. The Covenanting history of the Presbyterians demonstrated that they could not, and would not, cooperate with uncovenanted people or monarchs. Sage warned William that his occasional conformity and refusal to rid all of his dominions of Episcopalianism earned the Presbyterians' ire. He asked, "What Loyalty he can expect from those who think him to be an Idolater, as they think all to be who communicate according to the Church of England, whose Liturgy they call the Mass in English?"⁷¹ For the radicals mentioned by Sage, Episcopalianism was not just another denomination; it was idolatry and needed to be destroyed quickly and thoroughly. If the

⁶⁹ John Seed, *Dissenting Histories: Religious Division and the Politics of Memory in Eighteenth-Century England* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), 88-89.

⁷⁰ *Memorial for the Prince of Orange* (n.p., 1689), 8.

⁷¹ Sage, *Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland Truly Represented*, 107.

Presbyterians succeeded in ridding Scotland of this scourge, perhaps it would inspire their co-religionists in England to attempt the same. It served Scottish Episcopal interests if the Church of England believed a Presbyterian ecclesiastical revolution was imminent. Sage let the English know that many dissenters in England had come to look to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland as their mother church.⁷² The front against a Britain-wide Presbyterian takeover was in Scotland; either all Episcopalians joined forces or England was next to fall.⁷³

The Scottish Episcopalians worked to portray the Presbyterians as intolerant and unaccepting of all other churches.⁷⁴ If the Presbyterians did not concede the validity of other churches' polities, what would prevent them from overthrowing them? Those English Episcopalians who helped the Scots needed only to look at Scotland to see the Presbyterian character on full display. Irish Nonjuror Charles Leslie responded to Daniel Defoe's claims of Presbyterian moderation by asking how a church could claim to be moderate and at the same time destroy the established order and displace the bishops?⁷⁵ Leslie played a pivotal role in the Nonjuring propaganda campaign. Ian Higgins states

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion, and War* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 217.

⁷⁴ William Setton, *Continuation of a Few Brief and Modest Reflexions Perswading a Just Indulgence To be Granted to the Episcopal Clergy And People in Scotland Together With Postscript Vindicating the Episcopal Doctrine of Passive Obedience, and the Archbishop of Glasgow's Sermon Concerning It* (Edinburgh, 1703), 5.

⁷⁵ Charles Leslie, *Reflections Upon a Late Scandalous and Malicious Pamphlet Entitul'd The Shortest Way with the Dissenters; or Proposals for the Establishment of the Church To which the said Pamphlet is prefix'd entire by itself* (London, 1703), 4.

that “Leslie is one of the pamphleteering genre’s great masters and the most visible, vitriolic and vilified of all Jacobite writers. His pamphlets display an array of rhetorical resources: arresting titles, diatribe and exaggeration, violent imagery and sardonic jokerie, irony, parody, obliquity and innuendo, ambiguity and paradox.”⁷⁶ Leslie lamented the condition of the Scottish Church, but his words also carried an optimistic tone. The Presbyterians acted like their victory was irrevocable, but he hoped they were mistaken. For Leslie, the Presbyterians had overplayed their hand and the Episcopal Church could possibly rise again.

The strategy of Scottish Episcopalians was to make their problems the problems of the English. The connection between the Presbyterians and the Covenanters helped the English understand that the dangers Episcopalians faced in Scotland could soon emerge in England. The Episcopal strategy purposefully misrepresented important segments of the Presbyterians, not all of whom supported the old Covenant. The most radical of the Covenant supporters, the Cameronians, had little use for the Church of Scotland, which they believed served the state rather than God. But these are distinctions the Episcopal community ignored when depicting a unified Presbyterian front of radicalism.⁷⁷ But the accusations they levied against the Presbyterians still contained a considerable element of truth. The Church of Scotland did not renew the Covenants at

⁷⁶ Ian Higgins, “Jonathan Swift and Charles Leslie,” in *Loyalty and Identity Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, eds. Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 151.

⁷⁷ Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland’s Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 53.

the Revolution; however, many Scots still saw them as binding on the nation and the United Societies would choose to renew them in 1712.⁷⁸ Colin Kidd is direct in stating that another Covenanting rebellion was not out of the question in the late Stuart period.⁷⁹

The clergy and laity of the Church of England reacted fearfully to the growth of dissent in England, which coincided with the Scottish Episcopalians' propaganda campaign. In 1701, after the Church of England's Convocation failed to address the concerns of the lower clergy with respect to heresy and non-conformity, the Tories quickly seized on the slogan 'the church in danger'. The root of this insecurity went back to the Revolution settlement itself when Trinitarian Protestant dissenters had secured the right to meet in licensed meeting houses for worship. Between 1689 and 1710, 3,614 such meeting houses were granted licenses. The Test Act still required office holders to receive communion within the Church of England, but, once dissenting worship had been tolerated, the practice known as occasional conformity increased. An office holder would take communion occasionally in the Church of England and then worship regularly with a dissenting congregation. It appeared that the Church of England was losing ground to dissent. Although the Church of England's establishment was never really under a serious threat, Barry Coward has observed: "What appeared to be the truth

⁷⁸ Alasdair Raffe, "Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics After the Revolution of 1688-1690," *The Historical Journal* 53, no. 2 (2010): 324; Valerie Wallace, "Presbyterian Moral Economy: The Covenanting Tradition and Popular Protest in Lowland Scotland, 1707-c.1746," *The Scottish Historical Review* 89, no. 1 (2010): 56.

⁷⁹ Colin Kidd, "Conditional Britons: The Scots Covenanting Tradition and the Eighteenth-Century British State," *English Historical Review* 117, no. 474 (Sep 2002): 1150-1151.

was more important than the truth itself.”⁸⁰ The English still feared renewed Scottish religious imperialism despite their ability to resist it.⁸¹

Not coincidentally, the fear that the Church of England was in danger was concomitant with the Scottish Episcopalians’ presentation of the possibility of a Presbyterian takeover of all of Britain’s ecclesiastical establishments. Philosophically this age found the Church of England confronted by new challenges from science and increasingly deistic and rational attitudes towards religion. What alarmed the lower clergy and the laity was that it seemed that the latitudinarian bishops supported these ideas, or were not willing to confront them. This tension between the bishops and the lower clergy caused Archbishop Thomas Tenison to prematurely adjourn Convocation in 1701.⁸² The political impact of the high churchmen’s fears over the challenges that the Church of England faced will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

Philosophically, the late Stuart period witnessed a widening of the division between high churchmen and low churchmen within the Church of England, and this due to the Glorious Revolution and the subsequent deprivation of the clergy who did not support William. Did the state possess the right to interfere with the internal management of the church, or had it overstepped its limits? Nonjurors answered in the

⁸⁰ Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714* (Harlow: Longman, 1994), 392-393.

⁸¹ Brian P. Levack, *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union, 1603-1707* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 116.

⁸² *Ibid.*

negative and many juring high churchmen shared their concern for the independence of the church. Supporters of Episcopacy had previously billed it as the perfect Erastian solution for the state with their adherence to the one-kingdom model, but the state had consistently overreached and violated the prerogatives of the church. James's indulgences, the deprivation of the Nonjurors, and the perceived failure of the state to take seriously the growth of dissent and occasional conformity were evidence of the state's failure to respect church prerogatives.⁸³ High churchmen and Nonjurors needed a new ideology to rationalize the intrinsic right of Episcopacy to govern the church and establish its relationship to the state. For this they turned to the past.⁸⁴

High churchmen looked past the Reformation to uncover the ancient structure of the church. The Reformation had corrected some doctrinal errors that resulted from the period of Roman domination; the Reformation also freed the church from papal control. Unfortunately, it yoked them to the state and subjected them to caesaropapalism.⁸⁵ Charles Leslie complained that too many clergy were only interested in Dutch and German systems of the theology and had overlooked the primitive church, which led the Nonjuring scholar, Henry Dodwell, to search Christian history in order to restore the

⁸³ Mark Goldie, "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy," in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 20; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 172.

⁸⁴ Finlayson, *Historians, Puritanism, and the English Revolution*, 131.

⁸⁵ Robert D. Cornwall, "Divine Right Monarchy; Henry Dodwell's Critique of the Reformation and Defense of the Nonjuror Bishops," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 68, no. 1 (1999): 48, 50.

church to its original state.⁸⁶ St. Cyprian, the third-century bishop of Carthage, became the authority on the role of the bishop for high church historians.⁸⁷ Nor was their use of history limited to just the church fathers. Writing in the eighteenth-century, Thomas Carte argued that the Druid world resembled a church governed by priests in dioceses, not by a strong centralized polity. It seemed that even Britain's pre-Christian history pointed toward Episcopacy.⁸⁸ The high churchmen's study of history placed a strong emphasis on divine right Episcopacy, divine right monarchy, and the authority of the church fathers.⁸⁹ The challenge they now faced was how to reconcile these beliefs without embracing the Presbyterian two-kingdom theory of church-state relations.

Resolution for their intellectual quandary lay in the two-societies theory. Leslie explained the concept: "the sacred and civil powers were like two parallel lines, which

⁸⁶ Robert D. Cornwall, "The Search for the Primitive Church; The Use of the Early Church Fathers in the High Church Anglican Tradition, 1680-1745," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 59, no. 3 (1990): 307; C.D.A. Leighton, "Anciennete Among the Non-Jurors: A Study of Henry Dodwell," *History of European Ideas* 31, no. 1 (2005): 12; C.D.A. Leighton, "The Non-Jurors and Their History," *The Journal of Religious History* 29, no. 3 (2005): 257.

⁸⁷ Goldie, "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy," 23.

⁸⁸ Paul Monod, "Thomas Carte, the Druids and British National Identity," in *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, eds. Monod, Pittock, and Szechi, 141.

⁸⁹ Gordon Hammond, "High Church Anglican Influences on John Wesley's Conception of Primitive Christianity, 1732-1735," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 78, no. 2 (2009): 175.

cou'd never meet, or interfere; for these two authorities lie in distinct channels.”⁹⁰ He argued against the one-kingdom, or Erastian model, because the church had not surrendered its intrinsic powers to the state. In the two-societies theory, the church and state still allied with one another, but each needed to respect the other's divinely ordained right to rule in its distinct society. For a peaceful church-state relationship, each side needed to refrain from overstepping its limits and violating the other's realm.⁹¹ This theory sounds similar to the Presbyterians' two-kingdom model, but it is significantly different in that the religious and civil worlds were truly independent. Leslie compared the church's right to excommunicate and the state's right to civil punishment. The state might pardon one for his or her crimes, but it lacked the right to demand the church lift any spiritual penalties it might have imposed. At the same time the church might lift an excommunication, but it lacked the right to demand any corresponding civil penalties be pardoned. Most important, throughout Christian history emperors and kings had claimed the right to appoint bishops, while, at the same time, popes claimed the right to depose emperors. According to Leslie, both were wrong.⁹² The Presbyterians had argued that religion could justify resistance to secular authority, a position that James Canaries

⁹⁰ Robert D. Cornwall, “Charles Leslie and the Political Implications of Theology,” in *Religious Identities in Britain, 1660-1832*, ed. William Gibson and Robert G. Ingram (Burlington: Ashgate, 2005), 34.

⁹¹ Robert D. Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High-Anglican and Non-Juror Thought* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993), 76, 80-81; Cornwall, “Divine Right Monarchy,” 51, 56.

⁹² Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic*, 79-80.

likened to that of Catholics.⁹³ The crucial difference between the high church theory and the Presbyterian theory was that non-resistance with respect to secular authority remained important for high churchmen.

Not all Anglicans and Episcopalians had adopted this new theory and thus the Church of England had split into high church and low church constituencies. The low churchmen and bishops who sat in the upper house of the Church of England's Convocation, the syndical body of the church convened at the monarch's discretion, constantly opposed moves from the high churchmen in the lower house to free the church of the latitudinarians and efforts from the lower house to embarrass low-church divines. One such example of this division occurred in June 1701 when the lower house sought to censure Gilbert Burnet's *Exposition on the Thirty-Nine Articles*. The high churchmen argued that his book "tends to introduce a Latitude and Diversity of opinions as the Articles were form'd to avoyd." The Upper House responded to this charge by claiming that the lower house did not have the power to censure books. Moreover, the bishops needed to approve of any such action.⁹⁴ This split in the broader Episcopal community impacted the Scottish Episcopalian community. Men like high churchman Charles Leslie and a low churchman like Gilbert Burnet did not get along, and still both sides assisted the Scottish Episcopal community. While Leslie, as a Nonjuror, could not provide any

⁹³ Tim Harris, "The People, the Law, and the Constitution in Scotland and England: A Comparative Approach to the Glorious Revolution," *Journal of British Studies* 38, no. 1 (Jan 1999): 56.

⁹⁴ Pedro Thomas Meza, "The Question of Authority in the Church of England, 1689-1717," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 42 (1973): 68-70.

legal assistance, his ideas helped justify the schism between the Episcopalians and the state church. Juring high churchman used their common Episcopalianism to provide legal relief to their Scottish co-religionists, especially in the reign of Anne and following the union. At the same time, low churchmen, like Burnet, opposed Jacobitism and as such did not want to assist disloyal Episcopalians, but still lobbied for placement and protection for those loyal to the Revolutionary settlement.

Conclusion

The English responded to the Scottish Episcopalians' calls for assistance, and Anglicans from across the ideological spectrum assisted. Low churchmen, such as the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Tenison, who supported the Revolution, but also believed in Episcopacy and did not support its disestablishment in Scotland, interceded on behalf of Williamite Episcopalians.⁹⁵ Archbishop Tenison reminded James Johnstone, Secretary of State for Scotland, that William did not want the Episcopalians to be excluded from the church, but still wanted assurances of their loyalty.⁹⁶ Tenison protected and helped secure livings for Scottish clergy, but only after they swore

⁹⁵ F.W. Schneider, "Scottish Episcopalians and the English Politicians: The Limits of Toleration," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 45 (1976): 279.

⁹⁶ Thomas Tenison, "A Letter to James Johnstone, Secretary of State in Scotland, expressing concern that the Scottish Episcopal clergy should demonstrate their loyalty, for the King does not wish to inflict hardship on them," [20 August 1695], MS930-205, Miscellaneous Papers, Lambeth Palace Library, London.

allegiance to William.⁹⁷ High churchmen like the future Archbishop of York, John Sharp, gave Episcopalians what help he could, although he was pessimistic about their long-term chances of reclaiming the Church of Scotland. Some high churchman, such as Henry Compton, raised money and offered Scottish Episcopalians foreign employment.⁹⁸

Sometimes the English advised cooperation with the Presbyterians in the hope that the two parties could form a comprehensive church with both bishops and presbyteries. William advocated this potential solution for both England and Scotland soon after he arrived. A committee consisting of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Earl of Nottingham, and the Marquis of Carmarthen recommended that the Episcopalians make an address to William and agree to submit to the church government as presently constituted by law. This advice should come as no surprise as these men were prominent supporters of the comprehension scheme described in Chapter 1. Additionally, they were instructed to subscribe to the catechisms and confession of faith.⁹⁹ This would allow the Episcopalians to participate fully in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and later get

⁹⁷ Thomas Tenison, "A Letter to Mr. Seton 'and the rest of the Episcopal Clergy who have lately taken the oaths etc. in Scotland', promising his good offices, having been notified of their Declaration of Allegiance and Loyal Address" [28 November 1695] MS930-190, Miscellaneous Papers, Lambeth Palace Library, London.

⁹⁸ Schneider, "Scottish Episcopalians and the English Politicians," 279.

⁹⁹ "Copy Letter [unsigned and unaddressed but probably to episcopalian ministers] 'on Saturday last there was a meeting of our best English friends and the two Scottish Secretaries with some others appointed by the King for conserting all affaires concerning yow and the presbyterianes'. Gives measures decided on by the meeting," [ca. 17th Century], GD26/13/248, Papers of the Leslie family, Earls of Leven and Melville, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

elected to the synods and assemblies as presently constituted. The key phrase in these recommendations was “presently constituted by law.” The present church government of Scotland was a legal, not divine creation. If Presbyterianism could be established by law, it could be disestablished by law as well, and the Episcopalians simply had to bide their time and earn the confidence of the king until they could affect a coup from within. Furthermore, subscription to the Presbyterian catechisms was not a theological challenge, since the Presbyterians and Episcopalians of Scotland were both Calvinist. The Confession of Faith, provided it was only a question of content and not substance, could also be accepted by the Episcopalians since only the meaning assigned to the words by the Presbyterians gave the Episcopalians pause.

In the 1690s the English did much to assist the Episcopalians of Scotland. The English successfully pressured William into efforts at comprehension, bringing Episcopalians into the National Church. Bishops in the Church of England held a conference with members of the Scottish nobility in order to help the Episcopal clergy hold their parishes. The English also helped place thirty deprived Williamite ministers in English and Irish Episcopal establishments.¹⁰⁰ The intervention of the English earned the contempt of the Presbyterians and caused one of them to remark that since the Scots did not interfere in the religious matters of England, perhaps the English should stay out of Scotland.¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ Clarke, *Scottish Episcopalians*, 49, 179.

The Presbyterians understood the Episcopalians' actions and fought against any movement toward leniency. Presbyterian apologist George Ridpath understood the difficulty English public opinion created for the Presbyterians in dealing with William and the Episcopalians, "But notwithstanding of all this favourable Proceedure towards our Scots Prelatists, yet their Clamour does not cease, and particularly against those Ministers of State to whom his Majesty entrusted the Management of Affairs; though it be evident, that if any Party be abridged by the Act, it is the Presbyterians, who are now obliged by Law to receive the Prelatical Clergy on such and such Terms; with certification, if they refuse, that the Episcopal Clergy shall have their Majesties Protection."¹⁰² William came through for many Episcopalians in 1695 when he made a final request for comprehension, and 116 Episcopal ministers accepted his terms and joined the state church.¹⁰³ The Presbyterians had to admit these ministers into the church, but they successfully fought their integration into the General Assembly.

¹⁰¹ *The queries and protestation of the Scots Episcopal clergy against the authority of the Presbyterian General Assemblies and committees : given in to the Committee of the General Assembly at Aberdeen, June 29th, 1694 : together with the Committee's answer and proceedings, with reflections upon the queries, &c. / by a layman of the Church of Scotland* (London 1694).

¹⁰² George Ridpath, *The Scots episcopal innocence, or, The juggling of that party with the late King, His present Majesty, the Church of England, and the Church of Scotland demonstrated: together with a catalogue of the Scots Episcopal clergy turn'd out for their disloyalty ... since the revolution : and a postscript with reflections on a late malicious pamphlet entituled The spirit of malice and slander ... / by Will. Laick.* (London, 1694) 11.

¹⁰³ German, "Scots Episcopalians after Disestablishment, 1689-1723," 54-55.

Once Anne assumed the throne, the English provided the Scottish Episcopalians with material relief and prayer books. As the prospect of Union between Scotland and England inched closer, it became more difficult for the English to openly advocate for the Scottish Episcopal cause out of fear that it might frighten the Presbyterians away. Once the Union had been completed, sympathetic English Episcopalians could undermine the Presbyterians through a new parliament consisting of English and Scots, and dominated by Episcopalians. Until then, they helped preserve the Scottish Episcopal cause for the foreseeable future.

Chapter 4: Royal Policy in Scotland

Introduction

Between 1689 and 1707 the Episcopal Church survived in the face of Presbyterian persecution. Its community still possessed significant numbers and maintained a strong regional base in the north, and the monarchy could not afford to ignore them completely or to alienate them. William and Anne, in fact, protected the Episcopalians, which in turn allowed them to remain numerically strong enough to challenge the Presbyterian legal monopoly on public worship after passage of the Act of Union in 1707. Politically William needed to offer protection to the powerful Episcopal aristocracy, but, at the same time, he had to avoid alienating his Presbyterian supporters. Anne continued William's policies and retained many of his ministers who claimed to support her co-religionists. She, however, had to balance her support for the Episcopalians with her goal of obtaining Presbyterian support for the Act of Union. This chapter examines why and how William and Anne attempted to protect the Episcopalians.

William III's Role

Historians often debate William's role in Scottish ecclesiastical matters. Did he seek to disestablish the Episcopal Church of Scotland and replace it with one organized on Presbyterian lines? It is easy to assume so in light of William's Calvinist upbringing,

the strong support he had received from the Presbyterians, and the fact that the Presbyterians secured William's assent to their new order.¹ The triumphant Presbyterians promoted his image as Presbyterian advocate and hero. The Presbyterian historian and cleric Robert Wodrow wrote that William had promised to establish Presbyterianism in the Church of Scotland well in advance of the Glorious Revolution. In 1687 William allegedly told the Presbyterian minister, Patrick Warner, who at the time was in exile in Holland, that he would establish the Presbyterian Church in Scotland if given the opportunity. According to Wodrow, William assured Warner and explained to him, "I have been educated in that persuasion, and hope to continue in it; and I assure you, if ever it be in my power, I shall, make the Presbyterian church-government, the established church-government of that nation; and of this you may likewise assure your friends, as in prudence you shall find convenient; and because my wife has not been so bred, you may possibly be jealous of her, yet I can give you the same assurances for her as for myself."² While convenient for Presbyterians, it is difficult to believe William could have made such a statement. Historian Lionel Glassey dismisses it as a Presbyterian polemic. For it to have been true, William would have had to envision a year before the Glorious Revolution his constitutional status in what would become his new British kingdoms. The quotation also suggests that he was aware that he would need to keep Mary out of

¹ Carla Gardina Pestana, *Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 142.

² Robert Wodrow, *The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland From the Restoration to the Revolution* (Glasgow: Blackie and Son, 1832), 4:436.

religious politics, and would have the authority to do so.³ In 1687, if James had died or been deposed, Mary, not William, would have assumed the thrones of Scotland and England. There was no way William envisioned the joint monarchy.

Once he arrived in England William's actions and policies and the ministers he placed in Scotland suggested a different attitude and approach to Scotland's religious settlement. In fact, Gilbert Burnet recorded in his memoir that William had promised to protect the Episcopal establishment. Burnet recalled that when he introduced the Dean of Glasgow to the Stadholder, William assured the dean that "he would do all he could to preserve them, granting a full Toleration to the Presbyterians."⁴

William's actual behavior indicated a willingness to support and protect Episcopal interests and more closely conformed to Burnet's recollections than those of Warner. The tolerant nature of his personal religious beliefs, his Erastian attitude concerning church-state relations, and his interest in maintaining the support of English public opinion led him to pursue policies to protect Episcopalians. William selected some of his Scottish ministers on the basis of how well they could work with the Episcopalians.

³ Lionel Glassey, "William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland, 1688-1690," *Records of the Scottish Church Society* 23 (1989), 320.

⁴ Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time Volume II: From the Revolution to the Conclusion of the Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne* (London, 1734), 23.

William's Personal Beliefs

Beginning with William's father, the House of Orange had assembled a governing coalition that united the Dutch army and the Reformed Church into a coherent and unified interest.⁵ With his family's connection to the church, William was reared a Calvinist and was personally committed to Calvinism. The church in Holland supported the House of Orange, and William had been educated to believe firmly in predestination.⁶ His earliest education focused on religion. The Dowager-Princess, who took care of William in the absence of his mother, appointed the Reverend Cornelius Trigland as his chaplain. Trigland's objective was to produce a God-fearing prince who attended church regularly, read the Psalms and even wrote his own prayers for private use.⁷ Trigland was a militant Calvinist and a follower of Gisbert Voetius, who had fought to keep the Dutch church steeped in orthodox Calvinism and to expel the Arminians from it.⁸ Trigland's influence over William was reflected in the fact that his church attendance increased to twice daily.⁹ An early twentieth century biographer, Henry Duff Traill, concluded that William's belief in predestination was genuine and quite personal, to the extent that he

⁵ Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (New York: Vintage Books, 1997), 65.

⁶ John Miller, *The Life and Times of William and Mary* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974), 19.

⁷ Henri and Barbara Van Der Zee, *William and Mary* (New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1973), 18.

⁸ Wout Troost, *William III, the Stadholder-King* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 34-37.

⁹ Van Der Zee, *William and Mary*, 21.

believed through providential design great things awaited him.¹⁰ By the time William married Mary, his Calvinism was sufficiently strong that it caused Mary's chaplain to be concerned that it might dilute Mary's "pure Anglicanism."¹¹

The strength of William's religious convictions did not result in intolerance or inspire persecution of those who disagreed with him. He believed that no Christian should be persecuted on the grounds of his or her religion. For William a person's conscience was between the individual and God. He had observed that Catholics, not Protestants, persecuted other Christians, for their consciences.¹² According to Tony Claydon, William showed a lifelong commitment to religious toleration that included Catholics, thereby making it possible for him to fight wars alongside the Catholic Hapsburgs in Spain and the Holy Roman Empire.¹³

Holland possessed a more religiously tolerant environment than the rest of Europe, and by the seventeenth century was home to many different religions. The fact that the Reformation had been a popular movement and not imposed from above led to a

¹⁰ Henry Duff Traill, *William the Third* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1911), 5.

¹¹ Miller, *The Life and Times of William and Mary*, 55.

¹² Tony Claydon, *William III: Profiles in Power* (London: Longman, 2002), 99; Alexander Adam Seaton, *The Theory of Toleration Under the Later Stuarts* (New York: Octagon Books, 1972), 231, 278-79.

¹³ Tony Claydon, "Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689-1697," in *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King- Stadholder in International Context*, eds. Esther Mijers and David Onnekink (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007), 127.

division of church and state.¹⁴ The Dutch civil authorities concerned themselves with maintaining peace and the well-being of the state, not with the enforcement of the church's moral codes. Many times devout Calvinists in Holland found themselves frustrated by the relaxed attitude civil authorities displayed about their concerns.¹⁵ Over time the church and state relationship evolved into a more cooperative one. The Dutch church possessed the church buildings and held a monopoly on public worship, but the civil authorities provided salaries for ministers and therefore made them dependent on the state and not their congregations. While the state provided for the public church, it did not grant a monopoly on all worship. People in Holland could leave the church without incurring a penalty.¹⁶

The religious toleration present in Holland had an impact on Mary. She went to services presided over by her Church of England chaplains and attended others where William's Calvinist Presbyterian ministers presided. According to Steve Pincus her experience in Holland led her toward religious toleration.¹⁷ She noted that Presbyterianism did not seem to have hindered the overall piety of the Dutch people, and,

¹⁴ Wiebe Bergsma, "The Low Counties" in *The Reformation in National Context*, eds. Bob Scriber, Roy Porter, and Mikulas Teich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 76-78.

¹⁵ Graeme Murdock, *Beyond Calvin: The Intellectual, Political and Cultural World of Europe's Reformed Churches* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 120.

¹⁶ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation: A History* (New York: Viking, 2003), 362-363.

¹⁷ Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 411.

upon her return to England in 1688, Mary remarked on the differences between the two nations. “I was come into a noisy world of vanity; from having publick prayers four times a day, to have hardly leisure to go twice, and that in such a crowd, with so much formality and little devotion, that I was surprised.”¹⁸ The style of worship, non-ceremonial, to which she had become accustomed in the Hague closely resembled that of the English low churchman, who advocated for toleration. Mary found herself at odds with the more ceremonial high churchmen whom she suspected of needlessly finding things they did not like about her simpler style of worship.¹⁹

William’s Beliefs in Practice

William’s experience in the Netherlands clearly shaped his policies in Scotland and England, specifically, those of comprehension and toleration. Comprehension was designed to allow as many Protestants as possible to remain in communion with the state church. Comprehension schemes required agreement on only essential matters of dogma and practice, and left a great deal of latitude for deviation on ideas deemed less important, such as clerical vestments or adherence to the liturgy. In theory comprehension would significantly reduce the number of people outside the state church,

¹⁸ Mary II (Queen of England), *Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England, (1689-1693) Together with her Letters and Those of Kings James II and William III to the Electress Sophia of Hanover* (Lexington: University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, 2012), 11. Original printed in 1886.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 24.

and thus fewer Protestants would need to be granted toleration. William pursued this policy in both Scotland and England.

Prior to the Glorious Revolution William responded favorably to James's attempts to secure religious toleration through Parliament. At the time, James realized that any success he achieved passing religious toleration might be futile in the long term, if William did not agree with these policies. James had no son at the time, and therefore Mary, along with William, would have succeeded him to the throne. William and Mary could rescind James's policies. William expressed reservations about allowing Catholics to serve in government, in all likelihood to keep favor with the public and Parliament.²⁰ His earlier behavior towards Catholics in Holland was in keeping with this position. William fought to keep religious factions balanced within his own church and, as a practical matter, he could not afford to be intolerant.²¹ In all of his dominions he needed people of different religions to cooperate in the battle against his chief enemy, the French. William needed Protestants of all denominations to fight alongside Catholic Spain and his own Catholic subjects in a coalition against Louis XIV.²² Religious toleration was therefore essential to his paramount objective of protecting Holland from France. In order to motivate Protestants to fight alongside Catholics, Williamite propaganda

²⁰ Seaton, *The Theory of Toleration Under the Later Stuarts*, 278-79.

²¹ Troost, *William III, the Stadholder-King*, 176.

²² Claydon, *William III*, 99.

attributed the cruelty of Catholics forces, which Protestants despised, to the French, not because they were Catholic *per se*, but rather because they were French.²³

William's Erastianism

Despite William's fondness for the Calvinist Presbyterianism of Holland, he did not try to impose it on his new subjects in Scotland and England. He instead resorted to and employed another important tradition of his old church, Erastianism.²⁴ As far back as Thomas Beckett in the twelfth century religious interference had posed a threat to the state, and, much more recently the Covenanters had excommunicated Charles II. For Erastians this historical evidence proved that the church ought to be subordinated to the state. In essence, this position is very close to the "one-kingdom" model discussed in Chapter 1. The church and state occupied separate spheres, but the state acted as the senior partner.

Integral to the "one-kingdom" Erastian model of the church and state relationship was the assertion that the state must have complete control over the population, and this control needed to be free from outside influence.²⁵ The Dutch church was structured

²³ Claydon, "Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689-1697," 134.

²⁴ Glassey, "William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland, 1688-1690," 318.

²⁵ Tony Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 70.

along Presbyterian lines and preached Calvinist doctrines, but the salaries of its clergy came from the state and not from the independent wealth of a church. In this way, the Dutch state ensured that the church served its needs. In Scotland the bishops accepted royal supremacy; the Presbyterians did not. Presbyterians believed that their church was divinely instituted and did not answer to secular authorities. William, on the other hand, no matter how personally committed to Calvinism, believed in the subordination of church to state. His Erastian position became clear when he confronted the prospect of a Presbyterian settlement in Scotland. William reacted negatively to the language of the new constitution presented by the Presbyterian Church establishment. Glassey notes that “William toned down some expressions: for example the words ‘only government of Christ’s church in this kingdom’ were to be rephrased as ‘the government of the church in this kingdom established by law.’”²⁶ By his choice of phrasing, William made it clear to the Presbyterian establishment that his rule was based on secular law, not *jure divino*, which the Presbyterians preferred. When the General Assembly pressured William again in 1690 to recognize the divine right of Presbyterianism, he once again refused.²⁷ Furthermore, William never consented to a repeal of the Rescissory Act of 1661 which had overturned wholesale all Scottish Ecclesiastical laws passed after 1633, nor did he repeal the Act of 1662 which outlawed the Covenants.²⁸ This demonstrated his Erastian

²⁶ Glassey, *William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland*, 326.

²⁷ Alasdair Raffé, “Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics After the Revolution of 1688-1690,” *The Historical Journal* 53, no. 2 (2010): 327.

commitment to maintaining control over the church because the Covenants rejected state control over the church. Given his Calvinist background what settlement would have best fit William's desire for a church subordinate to the state?

For William, as king of both Scotland and England, the Episcopal Church represented the pragmatic option. The bishops faithfully obeyed the monarch. The Episcopalians at that time still believed in the old Erastian church-state relationship that had existed since the Restoration. They also accepted the "one-kingdom" model, in which the monarch exercised authority on behalf of God over all people and institutions within the kingdom, including the church.²⁹ The bishops accepted royal supremacy even when it was not in their best interest to do so. For example, they supported James even as he destroyed their religious monopoly by his indulgence. The one-kingdom model and Erastianism were virtually identical. James I realized this once he ruled in his own right, and he restored the bishops as a result. Colin Kidd concludes that the bishops suited William's "erastian pragmatism." The church would be tolerant and latitudinarian, but at the same time organized along Episcopal lines.³⁰ The Scottish bishops' adherence to the "one kingdom" model made them ideal.³¹ Bruce Lenman and William Mathieson both

²⁸ Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 52.

²⁹ Julian Goodare, *State and Society in Early Modern Scotland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 198.

³⁰ Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past*, 51.

³¹ P.W.J. Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1978), 4.

argue that William viewed the bishops as “convenient servants of the crown” and thus preferred to keep them³²

William’s Early Actions in Scotland

What William sought from an Erastian policy was a religious settlement that kept the peace and maintained royal supremacy. Historians agree that his primary motivation was keeping the peace, not advancing his personal religious preferences. Glassey assesses William’s motivation and states that, “all [his actions] point to the same non-committal opportunism that he applied to the secular and ecclesiastical politics of England at the same period.” William wanted a church settlement that did not cause problems. If he had committed to a Presbyterian polity, a substantial part of Scotland’s population would have reacted negatively. Glassey continues, “William simply did not have enough reliable information about Scotland to enable him to adopt an attitude that he could be sure of being able to stick to.”³³ For this reason he moved cautiously and

³² Bruce Lenman, “The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism,” in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 39; William Law Matheison, *Scotland and the Union: A History of Scotland From 1695-1747* (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1905), 13.

³³ Glassey, “William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland,” 322.

slowly, in order to gauge what best suited his interests. By late 1688 the strength of the Episcopal party was clear to William.³⁴

Convinced of the viability of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, William moved to effect a comprehensive church settlement. Here we see how William maneuvered to avoid conflict. William stated in his call for a Convention of the Estates that they should “bring matters to a happy and desirable Settlement, that they will live peaceably together, and without disquieting or molesting one another; enjoy their Several Opinions, and Forms of Worship, whether according to this Law or other ways, with the same freedome, and in the same manner in which they did enjoy them in the month of October last, till such Time, as by Regular and Legal methods, a due temper may be fallen on, for composing & settling thos differences.”³⁵ The implication was that, failing a comprehensive church settlement, the situation with respect to religious freedom should maintain the pre-Revolutionary status quo which would have been governed by James’s Indulgence. This meant that the Church of Scotland would remain organized along Episcopal lines and that other Christians would be tolerated. Interestingly this would have included Catholics, a fact that lends greater credence to William’s pronouncements in favor of religious liberty. At the same time, it also showed his shrewdness, since any revived attack on Catholics might have played into Louis XIV’s hands and helped

³⁴ Andrew Drummond and James Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843*, (Edinburgh: St. Andrews Press, 1973), 5.

³⁵ “William’s Declaration to the Scots Calling A Meeting of the Estates,” [1689], CH12/12/1957, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

undermine William's multi-religious alliance.³⁶ If Scotland maintained the status quo, William would have exercised royal supremacy over the Episcopal Church of Scotland, which adhered to a "one-kingdom" model. This made for a perfect Erastian settlement.

William and the English

Another reason William supported the Episcopalians and was reluctant to embrace the Presbyterians was his interest in maintaining religious union between Scotland and England. If William abandoned the Scottish Episcopalians, it would adversely affect his relationship with the Church of England; his overtures to the English dissenting community and his support for religious toleration had already caused sufficient alarm for his Anglican Tory subjects.³⁷ As discussed in Chapter 3, high church Anglicans became increasingly paranoid about their position. The years between 1689 and 1714 witnessed a consistent Tory campaign that proposed to protect the "church in danger." Whatever William did in Scotland would reverberate in England. To lash out against Episcopal interests in Scotland, or to appear to be unconcerned about their sufferings, risked his position in England.

At their core, William's policies in Britain were designed to secure England's support for his war against France. In the spring of 1688 Louis XIV's designs on the

³⁶ Seaton, *The Theory of Toleration Under the Later Stuarts*, 278-279.

³⁷ Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 151.

Palatinate again led Europe toward war. William resolved to form a pan-European alliance in order to protect the Netherlands from sharing a border with France. He feared that James had become so unpopular that he might be overthrown in favor of a republic, and he remembered that a Republican England had challenged Holland under Oliver Cromwell in the 1650s. William wanted England to embrace an anti-French alliance, and to do so required that he invade.³⁸ Moreover, he needed to protect Mary's place in the succession, because the birth of James Francis Edward not only meant the possibility of a Catholic dynasty, but also the exclusion of Mary from the throne. According to Wout Troost, his interest in Scotland was "nil."³⁹ Beyond the religious struggle in which he intervened often, William largely ignored Scotland, which no doubt inspired Troost's assessment. William wanted a stable administration in Scotland that would not interfere in his larger goals, and he never possessed a full understanding of the intricacies of Scottish politics. Nor did he ever bother to visit his northern kingdom, rather he used it as a source of troops for his continental wars.⁴⁰ He appeared to be callous, or at best unaware of what was happening in his northern kingdom. Henry Horwitz writes that as late as November 10, 1695 William claimed to have never heard of the Scottish East India Company.⁴¹ Then, when the Darien disaster struck in 1699-1700, he angered the Scots by supporting English and Spanish claims in Central America that were opposed to

³⁸ Van Der Zee, *William and Mary*, 228-9, 237.

³⁹ Troost, *William III*, 266, 269.

⁴⁰ Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, 1, 2, 7.

⁴¹ Henry Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1977), 203.

those of Scotland. At the same time Scotland had experienced a series of poor harvests, all of which led to what contemporaries labeled, “King William’s Seven Ill Years.”⁴² If the Scots had little reason to like William, the feeling became mutual, as he came to believe that Scotland was ungovernable and that union with England was this best option from a managerial perspective.⁴³ Scotland’s role in William’s long term plan was simply not to upset English politics, while England’s role was not to upset his ambitions on the continent. By changing the religious order in Scotland, William realized he would only destabilize the kingdom politically.

Scottish political factions attempted to ally themselves with the English. With William focused primarily on England, the Scots used the English to influence William’s policies in Scotland. Unlike the English Whigs and Tories, the Scots tended to divide into court and country factions. The Whigs are often confused with the court or Presbyterian faction since both fervently supported the Revolution. At the same time, the English Tories treated the Scottish Episcopalians as their equals because they both were committed to the Episcopal cause. Yet these too simplistic connections are misleading. The Scottish court party supported the Revolution, like the Whigs, but unlike them, they also supported a strong monarchy. The Scottish Episcopalians supported the bishops, but they possessed a significantly higher proportion of Jacobites than their English

⁴² Ibid., 264; Lenman, “The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism,” 43-44.

⁴³ Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, 7.

counterparts.⁴⁴ In order to appease the English Tories, William had to maintain the appearance of working with the Scottish Episcopalians. As discussed in Chapter 2, Scotland provided no shortage of men willing to fill this role. Affirming religious beliefs more out of convenience than conviction, men like Queensbury and Tarbat competed to be seen as defenders of the Episcopalians throughout the late Stuart period.⁴⁵ William's latitudinarian clergy in England, like Archbishop Tenison and Bishop Burnet, pressed the cause of Williamite Episcopalians early in his reign; the Church of England's convocation demanded redress for the Scots in exchange for considering William's comprehension scheme; and, later, the high churchmen in the Convocation and Tory party would lead the effort for the relief of Scottish Episcopalians. The support of England's Episcopalians helped keep pressure on the Scottish Presbyterians to comprehend the Episcopalians there.⁴⁶

William and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland

William preferred a moderate church establishment that would include both Episcopalians and Presbyterians as indicated by his instructions to the Duke of Hamilton

⁴⁴ Neil Davidson, *Discovering the Scottish Revolution, 1692-1746* (London: Pluto Press, 2002), 112-113.

⁴⁵ Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, 10, 45.

⁴⁶ Tristram Clarke, "The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland," *Records of the Scottish Church Society* 24 (1992): 40, 44-45.

and in his call for a meeting of the Convention of Estates.⁴⁷ He wanted a peaceful resolution to the religious question that included toleration for those who were excluded from the national church. His early efforts for a comprehensive church settlement were thwarted by the strong Presbyterian contingent within the convention. William finally unhappily accepted that he had to approve a Presbyterian establishment, and he instructed George Melville to accept the disestablishment of Episcopacy. At the same time, William reached out to the bishops.⁴⁸ He proposed that the Episcopalians be granted the same legal rights that dissenters in England enjoyed from 1689-90, which would include toleration.

Both before and after the convention William attempted to protect the Episcopal clergy, especially those who supported his government. Following the Duke of Hamilton's abortive effort at religious comprehension, William deliberately avoided becoming a tool of any party and the risk of becoming an instrument of religious persecution and intolerance.⁴⁹ His efforts in England were mirrored in Scotland; in both kingdoms he stated his desire for comprehension and toleration for those who remained outside the church. The Duke of Hamilton sought to create such a church in Scotland, one that encouraged the Presbyterian establishment to accommodate those Episcopal

⁴⁷ "William's Declaration to the Scots Calling A Meeting of the Estates," [1689], CH12/12/1957, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁴⁸ Clarke, *The Williamite Episcopalians*, 38.

⁴⁹ Glassey, "William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland," 326.

clergy prepared to conform to the Presbyterian Church structure.⁵⁰ The Presbyterians rebuffed this effort, and William had to proceed with caution and moderation. P.W.J. Riley concludes that in 1690 Scotland's political considerations determined policy: "Zealots, filled with exaltation at the prospect of doing the Lord's work, were then able despite William's disapproval, to purge the church by devious and underhand means."⁵¹ William's desired comprehension and toleration failed, but it sent a signal to the Scottish political nation that he would not be a tool of one party.

William was determined to remain above political faction. The Whigs had supported William since the Duke of Monmouth's death in 1685, and they believed that they had been responsible for making the Dutchman king. Nevertheless, William refused to reward the Whigs with exclusive control over the ministry, even after that party had won general elections in 1689 and 1695. Instead, he chose to form a coalition government that favored the Tories.⁵² This demonstrated that William would balance factions as he saw fit without regard to the previous support a group may have shown him. In Scotland, the Presbyterians, like the English Whigs, could not expect William's support merely because they had previously supported him. E.L. Ellis writes that within England William wanted, "the maximum amount of national unity as the best foundation for the successful war abroad; he was not seriously interested in Englishmen's domestic

⁵⁰ Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, 9; Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (New York, Penguin Books, 2007), 407; Glassey, *William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland*, 326.

⁵¹ Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, 9.

⁵² Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III*, 108-109.

concerns, nor their personal and party feuds, except in so far as these promoted or hampered the military effort.”⁵³ The king engaged in a policy known as “trimming” wherein he tried to minimize partisan hostilities by not fully supporting one group over the other. For this reason, he relied on mixed ministries. When the Tories, under the Earl of Nottingham, were pessimistic about being able to raise the necessary funds for William’s wars, he began to replace them with members of the Whig Junto.⁵⁴ Eventually popular displeasure with the Junto and the practical consequences of William’s wars, the need for a standing army and high taxes, led to a revival in Tory fortunes.⁵⁵ This revival would be accompanied by the use of the “Church in Danger,” campaign, which will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

William was firm with the Presbyterian establishment when possible. He resisted parliament’s efforts to repeal the Act of Parliament of 1669, a critical piece of legislation that asserted the King’s supremacy over ecclesiastical matters. He also resisted efforts to restore those ministers who had been deprived of their parishes by the Restoration settlement. Repeal would have eliminated William’s supremacy over the church, which

⁵³ E.L. Ellis, “William III and the Politicians,” in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, ed. Geoffrey Holmes (New York: Macmillan, 1969), 117.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 120; Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 150; Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III*, 108-109. The members of the Whig Junto were Charles Somers, Charles Montagu (Earl of Halifax), Thomas Wharton (Later a Marques), and Edward Russell (Earl of Orford).

⁵⁵ Gary Stuart De Krey, *A Fractured Society The Politics of London in the First Age of Party 1688-1715* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 202; Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty?*, 156.

was contrary to an Erastian arrangement in which the church was subject to the king. William vehemently opposed any plans that would remove the power of the monarch over the church.⁵⁶ The restoration of the ministers would have created further disturbances by the displacement of more Episcopal clergy, and those to be restored were not moderates; they were men who refused to conform to the Restoration settlement out of commitment to either the Covenant or the independence of the church from the state. Whatever William's reasons the Presbyterian party in the Scottish parliament did not share them. Indeed, Presbyterian members wrote William to criticize him for his refusal to approve these and other non-religious acts. They reminded William, that while they understood his desire for more funds, they considered him adequately funded until their demands had been fulfilled.⁵⁷ William lost this battle and met their demands. The year 1690 was a difficult one for William; he was at war and seriously in need of additional funds and domestic tranquility. Despite the fact that the larger diplomatic scene placed William at the mercy of parliament, he on occasion risked losing its financial support by opposing the Presbyterians. This was a pattern, his refusal to yield to the Presbyterians, despite financial urgency, that repeated itself throughout his reign.⁵⁸

William's coronation oath called on him to "root out all heretics and enemies of the true worship of God;" however, he made it clear that he would not be an instrument

⁵⁶ Claydon, *William III*, 175.

⁵⁷ Address Sign'd by the greatest part of the Members of Parliament of Scotland, And Deliver'd to His Majesty (Glasgow: 1689), 4-5.

⁵⁸ Harris, *Revolutions*, 407.

of persecution.⁵⁹ William insisted that those charged with purging the church of Nonjurors and scandalous clergy were moderate men who had been approved by both the General Assembly and his commissioners. William was personally opposed to radical religious policies and persecution; moreover, it was not in his political interest to carry out such policies because he risked alienating further the Scottish Episcopal community. There were too many Episcopalians in the ranks of the aristocracy, and he did not want to frighten the Church of England. Tristram Clarke believes that William's refusal to persecute sent a signal to the Episcopalians that, "he would not abandon them."⁶⁰

Whether one chooses to read into William's attempts to restrain the Presbyterians altruistic or cynical motivation, the fact that William failed to consent to all that the Presbyterian establishment requested made clear to the Episcopal community they still enjoyed his protection regardless of his personal feelings toward them. Glassey describes William's interventions, especially on the matter of persecution as, "less a spontaneous expression of William's latitudinarian beliefs, than a premeditated signal to the Scottish Presbyterians that, while William was prepared to sacrifice episcopacy, he was not prepared to drive the substantial Episcopal party into the political wilderness with no hope of redress for the future."⁶¹

⁵⁹ Drummond and Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843*, 5.

⁶⁰ Clarke, "Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland," 39.

⁶¹ Glassey, "William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland," 325.

William's initial choice to manage Scotland's religious affairs was the Presbyterian George Melville, who oversaw the creation of the new Presbyterian Church of Scotland. This church was to be inclusive and tolerant, similar to the one William had instructed the Duke of Hamilton to create earlier. The Presbyterian nature of the Convention, coupled with the Claim of Right (1689), which had declared Episcopacy a grievance, made it clear to William that Episcopacy had to be abandoned. Still, William insisted that Episcopal clergy were to be protected if they were loyal to him. He allowed Melville to concede to the Conventions' demands for a Presbyterian establishment, but the church was not to be so rigid as to exclude Episcopalians who could live under Presbyterian Church government nor persecute those who could not.⁶² While William promised to protect all clergy loyal to him, it was Melville who failed to restrain the Presbyterian zeal of the Convention.

William placed John Dalrymple, Master of Stair and later Earl, in government, first as Lord Advocate and then as Secretary of State, to appease the Episcopalians and others increasingly concerned with Scottish affairs and the plight of their co-religionists.⁶³ Dalrymple persuaded William that he could produce a comprehensive church settlement and thereby appear the protector of the Episcopalians. William's policies made clear to the Presbyterians that his patience could be exhausted. Kidd remarks, "Presbyterians had to walk a fine line; resistance to the King's desire to dilute their establishment was necessary, but should not be so vigorous that it drove William

⁶² Harris, *Revolutions*, 407.

⁶³ Troost, *William III*, 273.

into the arms of the Episcopalians, with whom he maintained channels of negotiation.”⁶⁴ Raffe concurs and writes that a major problem between William and the Presbyterians was their treatment of the Episcopalians.⁶⁵ Until 1695, William wanted the Episcopalians comprehended in the Church of Scotland. For example, in 1691 the General Assembly ejected five Episcopalian ministers for denying the authority of the Presbyteries, and William responded from Holland by demanding they stop harassing the Episcopal clergy.⁶⁶ William anticipated Dalrymple creating the comprehensive church the king desired and envisioned. Clearly, Dalrymple’s primary concern was his own political advancement, and he allied himself with the Episcopal faction to gain its support and increase tension with Melville, all in the hope that William would reorganize his Scottish ministry. Dalrymple supported William’s comprehension program, but could not get parliament to act.⁶⁷

In 1691 William had offered a pardon to the highland clans involved in Jacobite conspiracies provided they swore allegiance to him by the end of that year. Alastair MacIan of the MacDonald clan arrived at Inverlochry in Lochaber just before the January 1 deadline, but, unfortunately for him, Inverlochry was a garrison town and not the county seat. He then was directed to Inveraray to make his declaration to the sheriff. By the

⁶⁴ Kidd, *Subverting Scotland’s Past*, 52.

⁶⁵ Raffe, “Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics After the Revolution of 1688-1690,” 328.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, 63-66.

time of his arrival, MacIan had missed the deadline by five days, a failure that served as the government's pretext for action. On February 13, 1692, the Earl of Argyll's regiments attacked the MacDonalds and killed approximately 38 members of the clan.⁶⁸ Macinnes writes that Stair's motivations for authorizing the massacre were political. Stair had earlier served James and was only now a Whig by convenience. He wanted desperately to prove to William that he was capable of managing Scotland on the king's behalf.⁶⁹ The episode, however, compromised his leadership and doomed any possible future success he might have had in developing a comprehension scheme.

William's sympathy for the Episcopal clergy is reflected in his treatment of the obstinate General Assembly. He informed them early in his reign that "Moderation is what religion requires, neighboring churches expect from you, and we recommend to you."⁷⁰ In 1691 he adjourned the assembly because their continued purges of the clergy and university violated his orders for moderation.⁷¹ William continued to push for relief

⁶⁸ Allan I. Macinnes, "William of Orange – 'Disaster for Scotland' ?," in *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context*, eds. Esther Mijers and David Onnekink, 208.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 210-211.

⁷⁰ William quoted in Henry Sefton, "'Neu-lights and Preachers Legall': Some Observations on the Beginnings of Moderatism in the Church of Scotland" in *Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929*, ed. Norman Macdougall (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers LTD, 1983) 186.

⁷¹ Ian B. Cowan, "Church and State Reformed? The Revolution of 1688-9 in Scotland," in *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, ed. Jonathan I. Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 180-181.

and comprehension, and in 1692 he had the Earl of Lothian propose a measure that would have comprehended a significant number of the 180 Episcopalian ministers who supported the government by receiving the into the Church of Scotland. Of all who applied, the General Assembly admitted only one, widening the breach between the king and the Presbyterians. William responded once again by suspending the assembly.⁷² Presbyterian intransigence created a stalemate that lasted several years. William refused to allow the General Assembly to meet for nearly two years.⁷³ Though not supreme in Scotland's ecclesiastical matters, the king intended to use his legal power to control the religious situation as he deemed necessary.

In late 1692 William appointed James Johnston, a Presbyterian latitudinarian, as co-joint Scottish secretary. As Clarke points out, William's vision for legislation that would have created a comprehensive church was thwarted by the fallout from the Glencoe Massacre.⁷⁴ Still, Johnston's proposed comprehension paved the way for the Church Act of 1695 that provided significant protection to the Episcopal clergy. Johnston's 1693 proposal called for the Episcopal clergy to take oaths in support of the government and then apply for admission to the Church of Scotland. All who complied would receive the crown's protection. If the Church of Scotland refused to admit them, the Episcopalians could establish their own synods. The proposal served two purposes: first, it identified any Jacobites within the Episcopal ranks, and second, it forced the

⁷² Clarke, "Williamite Episcopalians," 48; Raffe, "Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics After the Revolution of 1688-1690," 328.

⁷³ Cowan, *Church and State Reformed?*, 180-181.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

Presbyterians towards moderation if they wished to retain their legal monopoly on worship. Ultimately, only thirty clergy complied because the oath required the Episcopalians to accept the Presbyterian Church government as being ordained by God rather than the state.⁷⁵ Conversely, the Presbyterians did not want to dilute their church establishment and admit Episcopalians to the church government.⁷⁶

William met with greater success in 1695. Parliament's initial support of the Presbyterian campaign to eradicate Episcopacy had yet to succeed, and the persecution had strengthened the connection between Episcopacy and Jacobitism in some areas. The government naturally desired to reduce this connection and any instability it might cause. At the same time, the political fallout from the Glencoe Massacre required some action be taken to appease the Episcopal nobility and highland clans.⁷⁷ This time 116 Episcopal ministers took the oaths necessary to retain their parishes. Under the terms of the Church Act any minister taking the loyalty oaths could keep his living and receive the crown's protection. A significant difference between the 1695 act and its predecessors was that it did not require the Episcopal clergy to submit to the Presbyteries or acknowledge Presbyterianism as the only form of church government in agreement with the

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Jeffrey Stephen, "Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland and the Scottish Parliament," *The Scottish Historical Review* 89, no. 1 (2010): 34.

⁷⁷ Kieran German, "Scots Episcopalians after Disestablishment, 1689-1723" in *Institutional Change and Stability: Conflicts, Transitions and Social Values*, ed. Andreas Gemes. Florencia Peytou, Iannis Xydopoulos (Pisa: Edizioni Plus Pisa University Press, 2009), <http://www.cliohres.net/books4/1/04.pdf> (accessed February 20, 2013), 54-55.

scriptures.⁷⁸ The issue of Episcopalians sharing in church government was then left to the individual clergyman's choice and the General Assembly's approval. Since it was unlikely that the General Assembly would accommodate any Episcopalians, this set in motion a push for toleration not achieved until 1712. Thomas Tenison, the Archbishop of Canterbury, interceded on behalf of the Scottish Episcopalians in 1695. He wrote to Johnston urging him to encourage the Episcopalians to take the oaths and reminding him that the king desired a peaceful resolution to Scotland's religious problems.⁷⁹ The Church Act of 1695 ultimately succeeded because it did not require Episcopalians to accept Presbyterian Church government as divinely ordained. Oath-takers needed only to maintain loyalty to William and accept the Westminster Confession of Faith. The act, however, did not require the Presbyterians to share governance of the church with the Episcopalians.

The Church Act finally provided a degree of legal protection for loyal Episcopalians. William had not achieved the comprehension scheme he sought, but he had secured the rights of the Episcopal clergy to keep their parishes and ended any legal grounds for persecution on the grounds of ecclesiology. In 1697 the General Assembly passed the Barrier Act. This statute prevented actions being taken against clergy without

⁷⁸ Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 9; Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion, and War* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers LTD, 1999), 217.

⁷⁹ "Letter from Tenison to James Johnstone, Secretary of State in Scotland, 20 August 1695, expressing concern that the Scottish Episcopal clergy should demonstrate their loyalty, for the King does not wish to inflict hardship on them," [1695], MS930-205, Miscellaneous Papers, Lambeth Palace, London.

first resort to presbytery approval. This act further stabilized Scotland's religious situation.⁸⁰ By protecting Episcopal ministers in the north, it helped prevent the region from becoming an immediate problem for the government. People in the south wanted an end to the religious instability and theological disputes that had been common since 1688, and the act helped secure the status quo for the rest of William's reign.⁸¹

Episcopal ministers still remained strong in the north, and William's policies and their administration helped preserve the Episcopal cause into the reign of Anne with the status of the Episcopal clergy remaining unchanged during Anne's early years. The clergy who had taken the requisite oaths were allowed to retain their parishes and continued to benefit from the government's protection.⁸² The Barrier Act ensured that Episcopal minister had access to the church's legal system if any clergy were to be removed. This protected the Episcopal ministers, although, as described in Chapter 3, the Presbyterians still charged Episcopalians with Jacobitism and heresy in order to have them evicted. At any rate, Anne's elevation to the throne increased the hopes of Episcopalians for even greater legal protection and full toleration.

⁸⁰ Cowan, *Church and State Reformed?*, 182.

⁸¹ Drummond and Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843*, 12.

⁸² Alasdair Raffe, "Presbyterians and Episcopalians: The Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715," *English Historical Review* 125, no. 514, (2010): 588.

The Reason for Hope

Episcopalians found in Anne a reason for hope. Although the Barrier Act had placed significant restrictions on purging clergy, early in Anne's reign the Episcopal clergy complained once again about their treatment at the hands of the Presbyterians. Scottish Episcopalians and high church Anglicans believed they had a sympathetic monarch in the queen, and they were quick to publicize any complaints in the hope that Anne would redress their grievances.⁸³ Episcopalians had three reasons to be optimistic. The first reason was Anne's personal religious convictions. The second was that Anne was a legitimate Stuart. And finally, the queen carefully manipulated many Jacobites into believing that she supported their cause.

Anne's Early Reign

Anne's early spiritual mentor was the Bishop of London, Henry Compton. Compton was a committed Anglican, equal parts anti-Catholic and anti-dissenter. He had developed a reputation as a great Anglican apologist. For Compton the episcopally organized Church of England was the one true church, and he persuaded Charles II to let his niece be confirmed in the Church of England over her father's objections, and Anne retained her Protestant faith despite her father's embracing of Catholicism.⁸⁴ In 1686 a

⁸³ Geoffrey Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power: Later Stuart and Early Georgian Britain 1660-1722* (London: Longman, 1993), 362.

⁸⁴ Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 15-18.

rumor had circulated that James wanted to exclude Mary from the throne; if true, this meant that Anne was now next in the line of succession. Mary was to be excluded in favor of Anne due to James's belief that his younger daughter could be more easily converted to Catholicism than her sister. When Mary received reports of this rumor in Holland, she enquired of her sister her true opinion of Catholicism. Anne informed her that, "I must tell you that I abhor the principles of the Church of Rome... the doctrine... is wicked and dangerous, and directly contrary to the Scriptures and their ceremonies – most of them – plain, downright idolatry."⁸⁵ These were the words of a fervent Episcopalian. William's affiliation with the Church of England had been one of convenience; Anne's was out of conviction.

Appealing to Anne's strong religious beliefs, the Episcopal clergy stressed the severity of their situation since 1688. They told the queen, "some years after the late Suppression of the Truly Ancient and Apostolick Government of the Church by Bishops were deprived of; and put from the Exercise of their Sacred Offices, and Possession of their Livings and thereby they have been reduced to Extremity and Want."⁸⁶ The Scottish Episcopalians knew of Anne's sympathies and attempted to take advantage of them. They called her a "Nursing Mother to the True Church of God."⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Van Der Zee, *William and Mary*, 212.

⁸⁶ *To the Queen's Most Excellent Majestie, the humble address and supplication of the suffering Episcopal clergy in the kingdom of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1702).

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

Their address and petition also included language that acknowledged Anne as a legitimate Stuart. William had ruled by conquest, regardless of whatever he had claimed, and not by hereditary right, and the Episcopalians recognized this. These petitioners believed that “Divine Goodness” had placed her on the throne of “Royal Ancestors.”⁸⁸ The deprived Archbishop of Glasgow, John Patterson, followed this address with one of his own and recognized Anne’s right to rule - she was a legitimate Stuart as the daughter of James II.⁸⁹ Patterson hoped that this would allow some of his fellow Nonjurors to become reconciled to her government. Lord Balcarras assisted Patterson’s petition, and in the end it included clergy from Fife, Stirling, Angus, Glasgow, Dundee, Aberdeen, and Elgin.⁹⁰ Thus, as both true Stuart and Episcopalian Anne increased the hopes of her Scottish co-religionists.

Anne’s relationship with the Episcopal community was also helped by her subtle overtures to the Jacobites among them. The Jacobites believed that Anne’s Anglican and Tory attitudes would make her amenable to reversing as much of the Revolutionary settlement as possible.⁹¹ This would include the restoration of the Episcopal Church. Moreover, throughout her reign Jacobites returned to Britain believing the restoration of

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Alexander Rose, “A Letter to Archibald Campbell about the persecution of the both qualified and unqualified Episcopal clergy” [1706], CH12/12/1801, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁹⁰ Karin Bowie, *Scottish Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union, 1699-1707* (Rochester: Boydell Press, 2007), 36.

⁹¹ Mathieson, *Scotland and the Union*, 74.

James Francis Edward was only the death of Anne away from realization, a belief she deliberately cultivated. The Oxford ministry, between 1710 and 1714, pardoned Jacobites, causing concern for the Hanoverians about their future succession.⁹² Jacobite Episcopalians could hope for the Old Pretender's restoration in Scotland as long as Scotland was an independent nation and this among other reasons led many of them to oppose the Union.⁹³ The Duke of Queensbury tried to win Episcopalian and Jacobite support for the Union by asserting that after the Union the Presbyterians would be abandoned in favor of a restored Episcopal Church, and the newly restored church would work for James's succession after Anne died.⁹⁴ Anne's religion and familial line seemed to possess everything an Episcopalian could want.

Toleration

With an Episcopal queen on the throne, her Scottish co-religionists asked for an indulgence. Like William, Anne supported toleration. William supported it because he did not believe in persecution and because it avoided instability, Anne because it was to the advantage of her co-religionists.⁹⁵ The first step in the process of realizing an act of

⁹² Gregg, *Queen Anne* 363.

⁹³ Drummond and Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843*, 16.

⁹⁴ Christopher Whatley, *The Scots and the Union* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 280.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 36.

toleration was to dissolve the Convention parliament. Anne removed some of the Whigs and Presbyterians from the Privy Council, allowing room for Episcopalians and crypto-Jacobites to enter into the government. This move inspired the Episcopalians to present their case for relief to the queen. They asked her to protect them in the parishes where the congregations were inclined towards Episcopacy, and they asked her for material support for the dispossessed clergy. Anne responded favorably and instructed her new ministers to protect the Episcopal clergy both in and out of parishes.⁹⁶ She told the petitioners, “I take this Expression of your Duty and Loyalty very kindly, and ye may be assured of my Protection, and Endeavours to supply your Necessities, as far as conveniently I can: and doubt not but ye will continue in your Duty. And I recommend to you to live in Peace and Christian Love with the Clergy who are by Law invested with the Church Government of that our Ancient Kingdom.”⁹⁷ According to Karin Bowie Anne’s protection amounted to *de facto* toleration; still the former Bishop of Edinburgh Alexander Rose urged his Episcopal clergymen to exercise discretion and caution in their ministries.⁹⁸ In addition to protection, Anne wrote to her Scottish Privy Council and issued an indemnity for political crimes committed since 1689.⁹⁹ This created an opportunity for Jacobites, who were overwhelmingly Episcopalians, to return home.

⁹⁶ Mathieson, *Scotland and the Union*, 190.

⁹⁷ *To the Queen’s Most Excellent Majestie, the humble address and supplication of the suffering Episcopal clergy in the kingdom of Scotland.*

⁹⁸ Bowie, *Scottish Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707*, 37.

⁹⁹ Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, 49.

In light of these favorable signs from Anne, the Episcopal polemicists pushed for toleration in 1702-03. The Church Acts of 1693 and 1695, along with the Barrier Act of 1697, had allowed some Episcopalians to retain their parishes and provided due process in the event the General Assembly wished to have them removed, but full toleration offered greater security from intrusions by the Presbyterians. Providing the clergy had taken the necessary loyalty oaths, the Episcopalians would effectively have their own independent church as did the dissenters in England and Holland. Trinitarian dissenters achieved toleration in England in 1689 and had been tolerated in Holland for much longer. Neither England nor Holland had suffered from increased irreligion or immorality as a result of the state church having lost its monopoly, although some Presbyterians suggested that would happen in Scotland if religious pluralism were accepted. George Garden directly challenged the Presbyterians on these points. If English Presbyterians were to be tolerated by English Episcopalians, then Scottish Episcopalians should be tolerated by Scottish Presbyterians.¹⁰⁰ Garden queried, “I ask, if a Toleration in England has brought along with it greater inconveniencies [immorality], than when they wanted it? Whether Vice and Immorality, Hatred and Lying, Backbiting, Strife and Envy, do abound more in the States of the United Provinces, where the Toleration is so general, than in this Nation, or elsewhere? Or if they fear’d least the

¹⁰⁰ George Garden, *The Case of the Episcopal Clergy And those of the Episcopal Perswasion, Consider’d as to the Granting Them A Toleration and Indulgence. Second Edition Revised and Cleared from the Mistakes of a Gentleman’s Letter* (Edinburgh, 1703), 17; William Setton, *A continuation of A few brief and modest reflexions perswading a just indulgence to be granted to the Episcopal clergy and people in Scotland together with a postscript vindicating the Episcopal doctrine of passive obedience, and the Archbishop of Glasgow’s sermon concerning it* (Edinburgh, 1703)

Toleration granted them by the late K. James should be a Door opened to all Scandals, Immorality, and Errors, and destroy Church Discipline and therefore did not embrace it.”¹⁰¹

Throughout parliament’s 1703 session Anne issued instructions to protect the Episcopal clergy. In order to make this more palatable to the Presbyterians, Anne offered her assurance that the Presbyterian government of the Church of Scotland was secure. In a letter to the Earl of Seafield, her commissioner to the General Assembly, she instructed him to, “hinder the turning out of those Ministers [Episcopalians] out of their Churches who have qualified themselves according to the Law by taking Oaths to Us.” But first the queen expressed her desire that Seafield, “give the assembly all assurances of our Resolution to maintain the Presbyterian government in the Church of Scotland.”¹⁰² Anne repeated this pattern of instructions when she wrote to the Duke of Queensbury with respect to toleration. She authorized the duke to have parliament pass an act that allowed “the Episcopal Ministers to preach in meeting houses in such towns as the Parliament shall propose, they always qualifying themselves by taking the Oath of Allegiance and

¹⁰¹ Garden, *The Case of the Episcopal Clergy*, 17-18.

¹⁰² “Instructions to James, Earl of Seafield, Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 5 February 1703” in Beatrice Curtis Brown, ed. *The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne* (London: Cassell and Company, 1968), 113-114.

signing the Assurance.” Once again the instructions of tolerance were followed by reassurances to the Presbyterians.¹⁰³

The Presbyterians fought against toleration. George Meldrum, in a sermon before the Duke of Queensbury, reminded the duke that God blessed those who protected His true religion and punished those who did not. He warned the duke, “Do not wrong and weaken, but support and encourage the Established Government of the Church; for it is that which Christ himself hath institute, and beware to harken to any Motions ... and beware of anything that may weaken its Authority, or obstruct its exercise; or tend to reintroduce Prelacy.”¹⁰⁴ This clearly referred to the Episcopal push for toleration. Meldrum insisted that toleration would only be the first step demanded by the Episcopalians, and he accused them of deception in their approach. He explained to Queensbury that the Episcopalians intended to reintroduce Episcopacy incrementally. After toleration they would demand the restoration of lay patronage and finally the full restoration of the Episcopal Church structure.¹⁰⁵ Other Presbyterians also argued that toleration was unnecessary, since the Church Acts already allowed Episcopal ministers to hold onto their parishes provided they were loyal to the government, not scandalous in their private lives, nor heretical in their teachings.

¹⁰³ “Instructions to the Duke of Queensbury, April 1703’ in Brown, ed. *The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne*, 113.

¹⁰⁴ George Meldrum, *A sermon preached in Edinburgh at the opening of the General Assembly of this National Church of Scotland, upon the 10th day of March 1703* (Edinburgh, 1703), 10.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

Robert Calder countered these Presbyterian arguments. He explained that a minister could not be a member of the Church of Scotland and at the same time remain committed to the principles of church government by bishops. Membership in the Church of Scotland required at least a tacit acknowledgement of the legitimacy of the Presbyterian Church structure. Therefore, an Episcopalian in good conscience could not have conformed to the established church. It was a matter of conscience, and the Presbyterians required canonical oaths of their ministers. Moreover, Calder complained that even if an Episcopalian joined the Presbyterian Church he would still be barred from a share in the church government. Finally, he pointed out that the Presbyterians did not say the *Our Father* and therefore the two churches differed in terms of worship.¹⁰⁶ All of these reasons Calder argued provided Parliament with sufficient cause to grant toleration to the Episcopalians.

The Presbyterian James Ramsey took a different view and argued that the Church Acts were a sufficient means of toleration. If an Episcopal minister was refused admission to the church or deprived of his living, or refused to join, this indicated that he was scandalous, heretical, or a Jacobite.¹⁰⁷ According to Ramsey, ministers such as these did not merit toleration. Toleration, beyond what already existed, would have led to Episcopalians “intruding” on congregations or setting up their own meeting houses which

¹⁰⁶ Robert Calder, *Reasons for a toleration to the Episcopal clergie; and objections against it answer'd* (Edinburgh, 1703), 25-27.

¹⁰⁷ James Ramsey, *Toleration's fence removed: the thoughts concerning the present state of affairs in so far as they respect a toleration considered, and exposed: Plain-dealing* (Edinburgh, 1703), 21-22.

would have “distracted” and “divided” the people.¹⁰⁸ Other Presbyterians like James Hodow suspected that the real motivation behind the desire for toleration was to cause trouble. Specifically Hodow suggested that the Episcopalians used toleration to cover their Jacobitism. He pointed out that many Episcopalian ministers had been involved with Dundee’s rising in 1689, when Viscount Dundee left the Scottish Convention and raised a fighting force for James II.¹⁰⁹ After some initial successes he died in battle, and his rising failed. Hodow claimed that the Episcopalians who supported the rebellion remained unreconciled to the government. He also took issue with a claim some Episcopalians made, that they had been peaceable under the “last” government. The fact that they chose to use the word “last” rather than “late” indicated to Hodow that the Episcopalians remained Jacobites. Had they used the word “late” it would have indicated that they were loyal under William’s government. In his opinion the use of the word “last” provided the Jacobites linguistic cover and enabled them to refer back to the reign of James II, the last government that they would have considered legitimate. Hodow’s ultimate contention was that toleration would simply provide greater legal cover for rebels.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ James Hodow, *Remarks upon the case of the Episcopal clergy and those of the Episcopal persuasion : considered as to granting them toleration and indulgence : in a letter from a freind [sic] to a Member of Parliament* (Edinburgh, 1703), 15, 22; “Unsigned letter concerning the state of parties in Scotland, and defending the Presbyterian establishment against proposals for toleration of the Episcopal party. Endorsed by Tenison,” [October 1703], MS929-13, Miscellaneous Papers, Lambeth Palace, London.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

Parliament failed to pass a toleration bill in 1703 and it would be another nine years before one would pass. It failed at the time for several reasons. First, some evidence seemed to support the argument of Presbyterians like Hodow and justified their fear of Jacobitism. Some Episcopalians had asked for an indulgence, and, if granted, an indulgence, unlike toleration, would have protected the Jacobites in the Episcopal ranks.¹¹¹ Toleration required taking loyalty oaths; an indulgence might have required nothing. Theoretically, the queen could impose any terms she liked on the recipients of the indulgence, but the Episcopalians would surely urge that the terms be minimal. The condition attached to the indulgence issued by James VII still required that those who accepted his indulgence recognize his absolute authority.

At this time the Duke of Queensbury changed his mind about toleration. He had initially embraced the Cavalier faction in parliament and hoped to include the Episcopalians in his governing coalition. He and his supporters had just fought a hard campaign against Argyll and his slate of candidates, and Queensbury needed to form a governing coalition. Since Anne's succession encouraged many Jacobites to reconsider their relationship with the government, the Cavaliers experienced large gains in the election.¹¹² Moreover, Anne's English ministers wanted Queensberry to work with

¹¹¹ *To the Queen's Most Excellent Majestie, the humble address and supplication of the suffering Episcopal clergy in the kingdom of Scotland.*

¹¹² David Hayton, "Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections," in *The Scots and Parliament*, ed. Clyve Jones (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996), 79; Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland*, 48; Clarke, *The Scottish Episcopalians, 1688-1720*, 135.

Tarbat, Atholl and the Cavaliers. He went so far as to introduce a petition that outlined Episcopal grievances, but the partnership between Queensbury and the Cavaliers lasted only one session.¹¹³ In the end, however, the duke calculated that he could not alienate the Presbyterians completely if he wished to command a majority in parliament, and withdrew his support for toleration.¹¹⁴ Queensbury then switched to the Squadrone, a group that had split from the Country party, and held Presbyterian sympathies and a Whiggish political ideology.¹¹⁵ Finally, toleration failed in 1703 as the need for Scottish union with England became more urgent. The queen knew that she would need Presbyterian support if the Scottish parliament was ever to pass an act of union.¹¹⁶ The rejected Cavaliers now joined the Country party under the leadership of the Fourth Duke of Hamilton, James. The Country party consisted of disappointed colonial adventurers like John Hamilton, Second Lord of Belhaven, political reformers like Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun, who wished to limit the power of the court and monarch, and now reinvigorated Jacobites including men like George Lockhart who sought to convert

¹¹³ Hayton, "Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections," 85-86.

¹¹⁴ Bowie, *Scottish Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707*, 16; Riley, *Union of England and Scotland*, 50.

¹¹⁵ Hayton, "Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections," 85-86. The key members of the Squadrone were Sir Andrew Hume, (Later) First Earl of Marchmont; John Hay, Second Marquess of Tweeddale; John Kerr, First Duke Roxburghe, John Roxburghe, Ninth Earl of Rothes, and John Graham, First Duke of Montrose were part of the Squadrone.

¹¹⁶ Drummond and Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843*, 16.

national grievances into support for the exiled Stuarts.¹¹⁷ During its last years, the Scottish parliament enjoyed its highest levels of participation. Between 1703 and 1706 the parliament's average attendance was 226 members; only twice since the Restoration had there been more than 190 members present.¹¹⁸

The Union and Religion

The Act of Union would be the centerpiece of Anne's reign. The prospect of union had been a Stuart dream dating back to James VI and was briefly achieved under Cromwell's commonwealth. Despite careful overtures to the Jacobites, the true purpose of the union was to protect the Protestant succession. For all practical purposes the Union of the Crowns in 1603 compromised Scotland's full independence. The Scots retained their own parliament and privy council but lost control over their foreign policy. In theory, they still controlled their economy, but William's wars had hurt Scottish trade with the continent because English foreign policy objectives always took precedent over Scottish commercial interests, as was true of Darien disaster. For this reason many Scots did not regard their parliament as an embodiment of Scottish identity, rather they found their "Scottishness" in the institutions beyond the control of London interests: their independent education system, their independent legal system, and most importantly,

¹¹⁷ Macinnes, "William of Orange – 'Disaster for Scotland' ?," 222.

¹¹⁸ Charles Sanford Terry, *The Scottish Parliament: Its Constitution and Procedure 1603-1707* (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1905), 3.

their independent Kirk.¹¹⁹ The Kirk was Scotland's only institution that possessed the power to mobilize public opinion against the Union.¹²⁰ Therefore, in order to secure passage of the act Anne promised to protect the church establishment. Many Presbyterians feared the possibility of an incorporating union, one in which Scotland and England would cease to have separate parliaments.¹²¹ Scotland would be the junior partner in a new British parliament and outnumbered in both the Commons and Lords. More important, from the Presbyterian standpoint, this type of union meant being dominated by an Episcopal majority in Parliament and one in which the Church of England's bishops would hold seats. An incorporating union posed a direct threat to the Presbyterian establishment. Presbyterian concerns were reasonable given that they had only made limited progress north of the Tay and where many Episcopalian ministers still held their churches and stipends, both legally and illegally. Union with England threatened to bring about the restoration of Episcopacy.¹²²

The Presbyterians understandably sought reassurance from the queen that any new British Parliament would not "disestablish" or undermine the Presbyterian Church of

¹¹⁹ T.M. Devine, "The English Connection and Irish and Scottish Development in the Eighteenth Century," in *Ireland and Scotland 1600-1850*, ed. T.M. Devine and David Dickson (Edinburgh: John Donald Press, 1983), 13; Christopher Harvie, *Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics, 1707-1977* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1977), 29.

¹²⁰ Derek J. Patrick, "The Kirk, Parliament, and the Union, 1706-7," *The Scottish Historical Review* 87, Supplement (2008): 96.

¹²¹ Colin Kidd, *Union and Unionisms: Political Thought in Scotland, 1500-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 219.

¹²² Patrick, "The Kirk, Parliament, and the Union, 1706-7," 97.

Scotland. The Presbyterians wrote to Anne regarding the selection of the commissioners who would negotiate the Act of Union, and, insisted the commissioners be pro-Presbyterian as William had promised if the union was to have occurred during his reign. The Presbyterians explained to the queen, “It fell under our consideration that when the Meeting of the Estates at the Late King’s Accession to the Throne Nominat[e] Commissioners for the [likely] Treaty they expressly reserved Our Church Government as it should be established at the time of the Union.” They continued and reminded Anne of her past assurances, “But the Presbyterian Government being founded in the Claim of Right with Our [e]ntire Confidence in the full Assurance Your Majest[y] had been pleased to give us that you are firmly resolved to protect and maintain [tis] in the full Possession of the Presbyterian Government of the Church as at present established are Our satisfying security.”¹²³ Anti-Union petitions poured into Edinburgh with fifteen of the thirty-three shires and twenty-one of the sixty-seven royal burghs petitioning against it.¹²⁴ Religion featured heavily in the anti-Union literature.¹²⁵ In the fall of 1706 popular protests broke out in Glasgow and the southwest, the rioters complaining that the Scottish commissioners had not done an adequate job in securing Presbyterianism.¹²⁶

¹²³ “Act enabling Her Majesty to appoint Commissioners to Treat for an Union betwixt the two Kingdoms of Scotland and England,” [June 25th 1702], MS942-172, Miscellaneous Papers, Lambeth Palace, London.

¹²⁴ Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 125.

¹²⁵ Brian P. Levack, *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union, 1603-1707* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 121.

¹²⁶ Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power*, 314.

However, once the Act for Securing the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church Government had been passed the Presbyterian protests stopped. The act declared that Scotland's religious settlement and legal system were outside of the authority of the new British Parliament.¹²⁷ While this did not mitigate all of the Presbyterian concerns, the opposition complained rather than agitated from this time forward. Though the Act for Securing the Protestant Religion, which passed on November 12, 1706, was not a part of the final treaty, the act secured the support of enough ministers to secure the passage of the Union which passed on January 16, 1707.¹²⁸ Jeffrey Stephen describes accurately the act at "the most the government could give and the least the church would accept."¹²⁹

Episcopalians had their own objections to the Union. The Church of England was not enthusiastic about being united with a Presbyterian church. The Church of Scotland had been granted an Act of Security while the Church of England had none. Though numerically impossible for the Scots or Presbyterians in the British Parliament to undermine the Church of England's establishment, this did not stop the "church in

¹²⁷ Richard Sher, "Scotland Transformed: The Eighteenth Century," in *Scotland: A History*, ed. Jenny Wormald (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 184.

¹²⁸ Davidson, *Discovering the Scottish Revolution*, 71; Murray Pittock, *Jacobitism* (London: Macmillan Press, 1998), 147; Patrick, "The Kirk, Parliament, and the Union, 1706-7," 95. Keith Brown (ed.), "Act ratifying and approving the treaty of union of the two kingdoms of Scotland and England," *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/1706/10/257> (accessed July 4, 2013).

¹²⁹ Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union*, 73.

danger” movement, mostly, though not exclusively, Tory, from raising the issue.¹³⁰

Raffe writes that part of the English hostility to the union resulted from the literature of the Scottish Episcopalians from the 1690s.¹³¹ The Archbishop of York, John Sharp, opposed the Union despite the queen’s requests. The only action that could have secured the support of this faction was for the English Parliament to have passed a bill that protected the Church of England after the Union as well.¹³²

There were, however, other Scottish Episcopalians who supported the Union. The Earl of Cromarty supported it, and, as a juring Episcopalian, he believed that an incorporating union with a sovereign parliament could only be a good thing.¹³³ From an Episcopal standpoint a future British Parliament could always override the Act of Security and provide relief for the Episcopalians, if not actually overturn, the Scottish church establishment.¹³⁴ This, in addition to the economic benefits union brought. The queen’s physician, John Arbuthnot, also supported the Union. Arbuthnot was a Scottish Episcopalian who encouraged Anne to pursue the union of her kingdoms and he issued a

¹³⁰ Alasair Raffe, “Scotland Restored and Reshaped: Politics and Religion, c. 1660-1712” In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, eds. T.M. Devine and Jenny Wormald (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 261.

¹³¹ Alasdair Raffe, “Episcopalian Polemic, The London Printing Press and Anglo-Scottish Divergence in the 1690s,” *Journal of Scottish Studies* 26, no. 1 (2006): 24.

¹³² Gregg, *Queen Anne*, 239.

¹³³ Kidd, *Subverting Scotland’s Past*, 51; Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union*, 14.

¹³⁴ Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union*, 20.

pamphlet that outlined his reasons for supporting the Union.¹³⁵ Mixed into his commercial arguments he highlighted England's tolerant religious policies.¹³⁶ The implication was that these policies could be replicated in Scotland after the Union.

The Act for Securing the Protestant Religion notwithstanding, some Presbyterians still feared for the future of their church. James Webster complained that the new Parliament with its English and Episcopal majorities could easily destroy the Presbyterian dominance in Scotland. He told his readers, "Now without all doubt these [English dissenters] will use their influence and interest with the British Parliament and the Government, for establishing Toleration in Scotland which will be the source and fountain of immeasurable mischief."¹³⁷ William Wylie shared this concern. He noted that neither the Act of Union nor the Act for Securing the Protestant Religion contained language that precluded Parliament from enacting legislation that granted Episcopal toleration. He reminded his audience of the reasons the General Assembly had opposed toleration in 1703: "Enacting a Toleration in Favours of Prelatists, would be to Establish Iniquity by a Law; yet by the Articles of Union, there is no Provision against the

¹³⁵ Ibid., 38.

¹³⁶ John Arbuthnot, *A Sermon Preached to the People at the Mercat Cross of Edinburgh on the Subject of Union* (Edinburgh, 1707), 18-19.

¹³⁷ James Webster, *The Author of the Lawful Prejudices Against An Incorporating Union with England, Defended In Answer to a Pamphlet Entitled, The Dissenters in England Vindicated, from some Reflexions, in a late Pamphlet Entitled; Lawful Prejudice & c.* (Edinburgh: 1703), 10.

same.”¹³⁸ He plausibly reasoned that these problems still existed even with the Act of Security protections.

Wylie raised yet another concern. He was convinced that the English bishops thought so little of Presbyterianism that they did not regard the Presbyterian ordinations as valid and that Scots would not be able to hold office in England. At the same time, English Episcopalians could serve in Scotland. The English had the Test Act statutorily requiring at least occasional conformity to the Church of England while in Scotland nothing existed to require occasional conformity to the Church of Scotland.¹³⁹ Sir Francis Grant, a Presbyterian, argued instead that this situation was not inevitable. He stated that both churches possessed valid ordinations and biblical forms of church government; both originated from divine right. He was confident an understanding between the two was possible.¹⁴⁰

Conclusion

Both William and Anne did their best to protect the Episcopalians in Scotland. Their efforts enabled the Episcopalians to survive from 1688 to 1707. Politically, both monarchs were limited in terms of what programs they could actually pursue. In order

¹³⁸ Robert Wylie, *Letter from a Member of the Commission of the late General Assembly, to a Minister in the Country Concerning Present Danger* (Edinburgh, 1707), 6.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹⁴⁰ Sir Francis Grant, *An Essay, for Peace by Union in Judgment; About Church-Government in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, Printer to the Queen, 1703), 5.

for comprehension to succeed, both Episcopalians and Presbyterians needed to work together and this was not the case. Episcopalians did not want to recognize the Presbyterian establishment as legitimate and the Presbyterians did not want Episcopalians in their ranks. Protection of Episcopal ministers was the most that could be accomplished. Both William and Anne were held hostage by the larger political controversies of their reigns. William needed money and stability in Scotland, while Anne needed to bring the Act of Union to fruition in order to achieve the stability that had eluded both William and her. In order to accomplish these objectives both monarchs had to compromise on matters of religion. While the Episcopalians did not receive all they wanted, first William and then Anne protected them long enough to change Scotland's religious status quo in 1707. Ultimately, the Presbyterian detractors and forewarners of Union were proved correct when in 1712 the British Parliament laid aside the Act for Securing the Protestant Religion and passed an act granting Episcopalians in Scotland toleration.

Chapter 5: The Church After the Union

Introduction

The fortunes of the Scottish Episcopal Church improved significantly following the Union of 1707 and until the Jacobite rebellion of 1715. The troubles of the previous eighteen years prepared the church for a final push to regain its legal status, and several factors contributed to improved circumstances. Despite the persecution by the Presbyterians, both legal and extra-legal, the Episcopalians avoided complete elimination; they were able to do so, in the period between the Glorious Revolution and the Act of Union, because the Episcopal Church redefined itself. Most importantly, it created substantive differences between the Episcopal style of worship and that of its rivals as the relationship between the Scottish Episcopalians and English high churchman and Nonjurors grew stronger. While Calvinism remained strong within the Episcopal community, Arminianism had begun to make progress. The large scale adoption of the English *Book of Common Prayer* further distinguished Episcopal worship from its Presbyterian counterparts; eighteen years earlier the two practiced nearly identical faiths. The adoption of the prayer books and Arminianism made it impossible for the Episcopalians to be comprehended into the Church of Scotland and required them to have their own independent church, outside of the Kirk's purview. The examples of the rabbled clergy and the clergy loyal to the government, combined with an aggressive

public relations campaign in England created a political climate favorable to their Scottish brethren. After 1707, the new British Parliament offered greater power of assistance.

The Scottish Episcopalians and their supporters had many objectives they wished to achieve between 1707 and Queen Anne's ultimate demise. For most, the restoration of James III took primacy. For others the dissolution of the Union needed to be accomplished first, and all agreed that legal toleration for the Episcopal Church was imperative. All of these things seemed achievable. The Archbishop of Cambrai and the Duke of Beauvilliers in France reported favorably on the exiled king and gave assurance that James was ready to rule. They described him as a man of "solid Judgment, Sweetness of Temper, Equanimity, and Prudence," possessing "a quick Apprehension of Truth, a sincere Love for it and all perfect Relish of that divine Virtue which is founded upon a Submission to Providence. This seems to be the governing principle of his life."¹ While this was obviously Jacobite propaganda, it reflected what his supporters in Scotland and England believed. Moreover, since these men had the ear of Louis XIV, it was hoped they might convince their king to place an army at James's disposal. Such French support did not materialize, but the optimistic attitude in Scotland was apparent. As the 1710 election approached, conditions in both England and Scotland converged to allow the Episcopal Church to improve its condition. In England, the Tories won a decisive victory that ensured the Scottish Episcopalians would have a majority of support

¹ "Archbishop of Cambrai (France) to the Duke of Beauvillier" [15 November 1709], CH 12/13/14, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

on the government's benches, with the assistance of men elected to end the war with France and protect the Church of England. At the same moment in Scotland, many Jacobites agreed to take the oaths necessary to hold office in order to help James's cause in Parliament, posing as Tories to mask their true objectives.² At the local level, where political and religious issues were interchangeable, the conflict between the political parties was synchronized to the division between Episcopalians and Presbyterians.³ They failed to do much for the Pretender, but they worked with the English Tories and succeeded in undermining the Presbyterian establishment.

The final years of the late Stuart era witnessed some of the same setbacks that earlier had plagued the Episcopal Church. The Presbyterians continued to push for religious conformity and harass the Episcopal clergy and laity. The arrest of Mr. Keith in the middle of the night, accused of intrusion into a parish, and the armed disruption of James Farquhar's meeting house where a woman was shot in the ensuing melee, served to clarify the challenges facing the Episcopalians in Scotland.⁴ Desperate for relief, Episcopalians continued to send petitions to the queen seeking redress for those "who adhere to the Doctrine and worship of the Church of England in opposition to all

² Neil Davidson, *Discovering the Scottish Revolution, 1692-1746* (London: Pluto Press, 2002), 194. Daniel Szechi, "The Politics of 'Persecution': Scots Episcopalian Toleration and the Harley Ministry, 1710-12," in *Studies in Church History, Number 21: Persecution and Toleration*, ed. W.J. Sheils (Padstow: T.J. Press Ltd, 1984), 279.

³ David Hayton, "Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections," in *The Scots and Parliament*, ed. Clyve Jones (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996), 90.

⁴ Chapter 3, pages 142-144.

Antimonarchicall and Seditious principles and practices, And that this our Misery is occasioned by phanatical fury and Tyrannical usurpation of the presbyterian party over our persons and Consciences who after the disappointment of all their sinistrous and wicked designs to engross and betray us into compliance with their prevailing and detestable schism.”⁵ The hopes and desires of the petitioners, like those from Baniffshire, began to be realized after 1710. Several events and trends reveal an improvement in the status of Episcopalians. Particularly important are the Greenshields case, a number of Parliamentary acts, and the Episcopal charity controversy. From the perspective of the Scottish Episcopalians, these events all had the good fortune of occurring at a time when England was gripped by the fear of the “Church in Danger” campaign.

It is important to note that the Church of England was not of one mind on issues of action against occasional conformists and legislative assistance to the Scottish Episcopalians. The high and low church division among the clergy manifested itself throughout the era. The bishops, under the leadership of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Tenison, served as a critical part of the Whig Junto’s voting bloc in the House of Lords.⁶ These latitudinarian bishops still supported toleration of dissent.⁷ After the

⁵ “Copy address to Queen Anne by the clergy and laity of Baniffshire complaining of tyranny of presbyterians” [c.1710], CH12/12/1853, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁶ Clyve Jones, “The Parliamentary Organization of the Whig Junto in the Reign of Queen Anne: The Evidence of Lord Ossulston's Diary,” *Parliamentary History* 10, no. 1 (May 1991), 184.

Union the Squadrone became associates of the Junto. Prior to the Union the two factions had been in communication, but the Squadrone remained suspicious of the Junto and suspected that its members merely wanted them to fall into line as part of the Junto. The two found a common cause after the Union when they worked together to eliminate Scottish Privy Council, as this in turn had the effect of undermining the Duke of Queensbury and his supporters. As time passed the Squadrone and Junto came to share a commitment to the Hanoverian Succession, support for war with France, and the interest in the Presbyterian establishment in Scotland.⁸

The Church in Danger, Sacheverell, and the Act Against Occasional Conformity

The Tory high churchmen routinely used religious anxiety as part of their campaigns against the Whigs, and with good reason. The idea of the “church in danger” captured the public mood. At the heart of this “church in danger” campaign was the belief that the Church of England was under attack as a result of religious dissent and a practice known as occasional conformity. The Toleration Act allowed Trinitarian dissenters to worship outside of the Church of England, provided they met certain doctrinal tests for orthodoxy; however, given that the Test Act remained in force, they still should have been excluded from holding office. The Test Act required that all office

⁷ R.K. Webb, “From Toleration to Liberty,” in *Liberty Secured? Britain Before and After 1688*, ed. J.R. Jones (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 166.

⁸ Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London: The Hambleton Press, 1987), 242-243.

holders receive communion in the Church of England at least once a year. Dissenters circumvented this law by taking communion in the Church of England once a year while attending their own services the rest of the time, a practice noticed by dissenting polemicist Daniel Defoe.⁹ Occasional conformity alarmed Defoe who believed it to be an unscrupulous practice.¹⁰ High church Tories made three unsuccessful attempts to end occasional conformity in parliamentary sessions of 1702-3, 1703-4 and 1704-5. The Lords defeated or blocked each of these bills by a coalition of low church bishops and Whigs.¹¹ The growth of dissent and occasional conformity, along with the unwillingness of the low churchmen and Whigs to do anything about it, continued to feed fears of the high churchmen. Jonathan Swift feared the worst would happen if occasional conformity was not stopped: “Nor do I think it wholly groundless, or my Fears altogether imaginary: that the Abolishing of Christianity may perhaps bring the Church in Danger; or at least put the Senate to the Trouble of another Securing Vote. I desire, I may not be mistaken; I am far from presuming to affirm or think, that the Church is in Danger at present, or as Things now stand; but we know not how soon it may be so, when the Christian religion is abolished.”¹²

⁹ John Flaningham, “The Occasional Conformity Controversy: Ideology and Party Politics, 1697-1711,” *Journal of British Studies* 17, no. 1 (1977): 40, 43.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Knights, “Occasional Conformity and the Representation of Dissent,” 43.

¹² Ian Higgins, “Jonathan Swift and Charles Leslie,” In *Loyalty and Identity Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, eds. Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 153.

The watershed moment that led to the triumph, albeit a temporary one, of the high church Tories came in 1709 when Dr. Henry Sacheverell preached a fiery sermon on the anniversary of William's landing at Torbay. Entitled "The Perils of False Brethren in Church and State," the sermon was not Sacheverell's first foray into public controversy; in 1701 he had delivered a sermon entitled, *The Character of a Low Churchman*, in which he accused the low church party in the Church of England of being apathetic to true religion and indolent.¹³ Sacheverell's characterization of low churchmen fit nicely with the view that high churchmen had of Whigs in general. The Whigs were men who believed that the greatest sin was that of not being a good patriot, that is, not supporting the Revolutionary settlement.¹⁴ In his 1709 sermon, Sacheverell attacked occasional conformity and the Whig interpretation of the Glorious Revolution, specifically the idea that Anne owed her title as queen to the consent of Parliament and the Whig belief that the Revolution had given people the right to resist unpopular monarchs. Moreover, he

¹³ James Caudle, "Preaching in Parliament: Patronage, Publicity, and Politics in Britain, 1701-60," in *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature, and History, 1600-1750*, ed. Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 235; Jeffrey S. Chamberlain, *Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex, 1700-1745* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 27.

¹⁴ Mark Goldie, "Civil Religion and the English Enlightenment," in *Politics, Politeness, and Patriotism: Papers Presented at the Folger Institute Seminar "Politics and Politeness: British Political Thought in the Age of Walpole," Directed by N.T. Phillipson*, eds. Gordon Schochet, Patricia E. Tatspaugh, and Carol Brobeck (Washington D.C: The Folger Institute, 1993), 45.

attacked the dissenters for taking more religious liberty than the Toleration Act allowed.¹⁵

In his fiery rhetoric and its enthusiastic reception, Sacheverell had revealed the power of sermons in the late Stuart period.¹⁶ The Lord Mayor of London had Sacheverell's sermon published and more than 100,000 copies were sold.¹⁷ The Whigs responded to his far reaching messages by attempting to impeach him. Despite his notoriety, and the tenor of his sermons, at his trial he appeared humble and orthodox in his views.¹⁸ Nevertheless, the House of Lords convicted him and suspended him from preaching for three years, while his sermons were to be burned by the public hangman.¹⁹ Despite the outcome of the trial, the Tories and the public rallied to protect the political freedoms of the Church of England's clergy. The Sacheverell trial produced ninety-two petitions promising to elect members of Parliament loyal to the Church of England while only fifteen Whig petitions resulted.²⁰ A partisan of the Duke of Hamilton reported that

¹⁵ Tony Claydon, "The Sermon, the 'Public Sphere' and the Political Culture of Late Seventeenth-Century England," in *The English Sermon Revised* eds. Ferrell and McCullough, 223.

¹⁶ Caudle, "Preaching in Parliament," 235.

¹⁷ Geoffrey Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power: Later Stuart and Early Georgian Britain, 1660-1722* (London: Longman, 1993), 350.

¹⁸ Brian Cowan, "The Spin Doctor: Sacheverell's Trial Speech and Political Performance in the Divided Society." *Parliamentary History* 31, no. 1 (Feb. 2012): 33.

¹⁹ William Gibson, *The Church of England: Unity and Accord, 1688-1832* (London: Routledge, 2001), 78.

²⁰ Knights, "Occasional Conformity and the Representation of Dissent," 126.

the Sacheverell matter made the Whigs and their Scottish allies, the Squadron, unpopular. The matter had rendered them “most despicable.”²¹ The next year the Tories parlayed the Sacheverell case into a major electoral victory when they won in a landslide, they dominated the House of Commons, 329 to 168, and out of the 271 members who supported Sacheverell’s conviction, only 126 were returned to Parliament.²² In Anne’s later years the high churchmen won a series of battles against the Whigs and low churchmen over the matters of occasional conformity and dissenting schools.²³

In 1711 the Tory Parliament passed the Act Against Occasional Conformity, which prohibited the practice of infrequent communion within the Church of England.²⁴ The key to the bill’s victory lay with new found support among the Whig Lords. The Tory Earl of Nottingham managed to form a temporary alliance with the Whigs when he promised to deliver Tory votes against making peace with France in exchange for Whig votes in favor of the act.²⁵ In the end, the Whigs betrayed their dissenting constituents

²¹ Hayton, “Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections,” 89.

²² Gibson, *The Church of England*, 137; Webb, “From Toleration to Liberty,” 164.

²³ Robert E. Sullivan, “The Transformation of Anglican Political Theology, c. 1716-1760” in *Politics, Politeness, and Patriotism* eds. Schochet, Tatspaugh, and Brobeck, 48.

²⁴ Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 297-298.

²⁵ Henry Horwitz, *Revolution Politicks: The Career of Daniel Finch Second Earl of Nottingham 1674-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 232; Flaningham, “The Occasional Conformity Controversy,” 59.

and voted for the bill.²⁶ The final high church victory came shortly before the queen's death when Parliament passed the Schism Act, which required that anyone wishing to start a school or to serve as a tutor must have first obtained a license from his local bishop. The Schism Act was inspired by the perceived preponderance of dissenting academies since the Toleration Act; in reality the net increase in dissenting schools from the Glorious Revolution to 1714 was only ten.²⁷

The high churchmen's perception that their church was under siege gave the Scottish Episcopalians additional grounds for building a common cause. Ever since the Revolution Scottish Episcopalians had stirred religious controversy in England against Presbyterians and non-conformists and had managed to convince Parliament that they were victims of anti-Episcopalian bigotry.²⁸ As the English high churchmen enjoyed a string of successes, the Scottish Episcopalians were likewise able to take advantage of the Tory majority in the Westminster Parliament and to alleviate their own sufferings.

²⁶ David Wykes, "Religious Dissent, the Church, and the Repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts, 1714-19," in *Religion, Politics and Dissent, 1660-1832: Essays in Honor of James Bradley*, ed. Robert D. Cornwall and William Gibson (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010) 165.

²⁷ Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power*, 354-355; Gibson, *The Church of England*, 137; Webb, "From Toleration to Liberty," 83.

²⁸ Bruce Lenman, "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism," in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 45; Alasdair Raffe, "Episcopalian Polemic, The London Printing Press and Anglo-Scottish Divergence in the 1690s." *Journal of Scottish Studies* 26, no. 1 (2006): 36, 39.

The Greenshields Case

The trial of James Greenshields represented a watershed in the Scottish Episcopalian struggle for survival. The House of Lords acquitted Greenshields after the Scottish Court of Session had convicted him for his use of the *Book of Common Prayer*. This legal battle shifted the religious dynamic in Scotland in favor of the Episcopalians. His case gave the Episcopalians an opportunity to capitalize on their efforts over the previous twenty years. It demonstrated the extent of Presbyterian fanaticism and it provided another opportunity for the Episcopalians to assure people of their loyalty to the state and their close connection to the English Church. By 1712 the Episcopal community, emboldened by Greenshields's acquittal, strengthened its campaign for legal toleration. The Greenshields case also exposed the judicial weakness of the Church of Scotland within the union. With the merger of the two kingdoms, Scotland no longer possessed its own Privy Council. This meant that for someone to appeal a sentence passed by the Court of Session in Edinburgh, he or she must seek redress from the House of Lords in London. In 1708, Lord Primrose tested this new arrangement when he appealed to the Lords about the rather mundane issue of fishing rights in the Cramond, near Edinburgh.²⁹ The appeal of the Greenshields case, however, exposed Scotland's deepest division, religion.

²⁹ Allan Macinnes, *Union and Empire: The Making of the United Kingdom in 1707* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 322; Mangus Magnusson, *Scotland: The Story of A Nation* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2000), 557.

A native of Scotland, Greenshields was ordained a minister in 1694 by the deprived Bishop of Ross, James Ramsay, who allegedly administered the Rite of Ordination found in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Since Greenshields could not find a position in Scotland, he moved to Ireland where he served a parish in the Diocese of Armagh. He worked there for many years and made the necessary demonstrations of loyalty to the queen and government. In 1709 he returned to Edinburgh to serve the Englishmen who had moved to Scotland since the Union to work for the government.³⁰ He was not the only minister who used the English liturgy. David Hayton describes the liturgy as having been in “great vogue” in places like Edinburgh where the magistrates called as many as seventeen ministers before them to explain themselves for having used it.³¹ Greenshields’s predicament resulted from his choice of location for his meeting house, a site Matheison contended was selected purposely to create a controversy.³² Matheison was in all likelihood correct given that, of all the places Greenshields might have chosen for worship, he decided to open his meeting house across from St. Giles Cathedral. St. Giles, also known as the “high kirk” of Scotland, had initiated the protest against Charles I’s prayer books in 1637. This protest led to the National Covenant, the Bishops’ Wars, and the Civil Wars. The church had a special place in Presbyterian

³⁰ *The case of Mr. Greenshields: fully stated and discuss’d in a letter from a commoner of North Britain to an English peer* (London, 1711) 8-9.

³¹ Hayton, “Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections,” 88, 91; Gavin White, *The Scottish Episcopal Church: A New History* (Edinburgh: Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, 1998), 33.

³² William Law Matheison, *Scotland and the Union: A History of Scotland from 1695-1747* (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1905), 195-196.

sentiments. It was there that his landlord raised objections to his use of the *Book of Common Prayer* and informed the local authorities. Greenshields was ordered by the local Presbytery to stop; he refused to acknowledge their jurisdiction, and was subsequently imprisoned in the Tollbooth.³³ The Court of Session in Edinburgh upheld the action of the Presbytery.³⁴ While in prison Greenshields appealed to the House of Lords, who heard his case in 1711.

The magistrates of Edinburgh defended their actions and argued that Greenshields had not been validly ordained by Bishop Ramsay, since he had been previously deprived of his Episcopal office. Furthermore, they argued, Greenshields had illegally used the *Book of Common Prayer*. Greenshields's advocates responded to these charges and noted that, even though Ramsay no longer served as a bishop in the Church of Scotland, his powers to ordain were not contingent on office holding. A man might be deprived of his office, but the spiritual power he received at his consecration remained valid even in retirement. Moreover, if a pastor required ordination by an active office holder, did that not mean that all of the Presbyterian ordinations during the Restoration era were also invalid? If this were true, it would mean that many Presbyterians were also preaching illegally. His supporters also defended Greenshields's use of the *Book of Common Prayer* and reminded his accusers and the Lords that most of his congregants were, in

³³ F.W. Schneider, "Scottish Episcopalians and the English Politicians: The Limits of Toleration," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 45 (1976): 279.

³⁴ Andrew L. Drummond and James Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843: The Age of the Moderates* (Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press, 1973), 17-18.

fact, English.³⁵ Regardless, the larger problem with forbidding, even imprisoning, someone for use of the English liturgy was that it was not a crime under Scottish law. The brief Greenshields filed with the House of Lords raised this very point: “though Presbytery is the Legal Established Church Government in Scotland; yet there is no Law there, of Conformity, which obliges the Laity to be of their Communion nor any Law which prohibits the Ministers of the Communion of the Church of England to Exercise their Function, or the Laity to join in the Worship with them in a private manner, or which gives the Magistracy any Jurisdiction to (inflict) Penalties on such Ministers or Laity.”³⁶ The brief highlighted a major difference between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England. The latter had an Act of Uniformity that required dissenters in England to comply with all but three of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Faith. Dissenting ministers had to apply for licenses to possess meeting houses and the Test Act required office holders in England to receive the sacrament at least once a year in accordance with Church of England rites. Scottish ecclesiastical law did not require membership in the

³⁵ *A true state of the case of the Reverend Mr. Greenshields, now prisoner in the Tolbooth in Edinburgh : for reading the Common-Prayer, in a Episcopal congregation there tho' qualify'd by taking the oaths, and praying for the Queen and Princess Sophia : with copies of several original papers relating to his accusations, defence, imprisonment and appeal, first to the Lords of the Session in North-Britain, and since to the House of Lords* (London: Jonah Bowyer, 1710), 9-11.

³⁶ James Greenshields, *The case of Mr. James Greenshields, as it was given in to the Right Honourable the House of Lords* (n.p., 1710).

Church of Scotland, nor did it apply to those who remained outside of the state church. The Kirk simply assumed that all Scots were under its jurisdiction. Under such circumstances, Greenshields could not have been guilty of breaking a law that did not exist.

The magistrates also raised the issue of jurisdiction and argued that the only course for an appeal of an ecclesiastical sentence was through the Court of Session. The state, in their estimation, was obliged to support the church, and, unless the church had overstepped its authority, which its leaders insisted it had not, there could be no higher appeal. At stake was the basic principle of whether the state was endowed with control over the church. “Because of the happy UNION of the Nations, it was never known that any appeal from the Ecclesiastick Judiciary of the Church, lay properly or regularly to the Parliament of Scotland, nor can any Precedent be produced of such Appeals brought.”³⁷ Local magistrates were to support the church, and Parliament had no place in the process. The jurisdiction argument bordered on a *jure divino* case for the church’s authority. “There is no Place for this Appeal from the Sentence of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, because the Presbytery is only a subordinate Ecclesiastick Judiciary, from which, Appeals in course lie to the superior Jurisdictions of the Provential Synod, and Assembly.”³⁸ Thus, the church only answered to itself. Either forgotten or ignored was

³⁷ Edinburgh Town Council, *The defence of the magistrates of Edinburgh, and Lords of the Session, against the appeal and complaint of Mr. James Greensheilds, clerk / James Greenshields, clerk, appellant; the magistrates of Edinburgh, respondents; the respondents case* (n.p., 1710).

³⁸ *Ibid.*

that fact that William II had expressly rejected this line of thinking when he agreed to an erastian Presbyterian Church.³⁹

Greenshields's defenders seized this opportunity to once again portray the Presbyterians as unreasonable zealots. Imprisoning a man for his use of the English liturgy was akin to the intolerance demonstrated by Roman Catholics: "Had this Sentence been the Result of a Popish Inquisition, under a Popish Government, it would have been no more than what we should have had reason to expect from Persons whose avowed Principle it is not to tolerate any who dissent from the Communion of the Church of Rome."⁴⁰ The Presbyterians attacked dissent in Scotland at a time when dissenters in England were under siege. In line with this feeling, Greenshields's advocates asked, "what Addition of Strength the Dissenters in England may hope to acquire to their Interest and Party, if their Brethren in Scotland can do them that Service to crush and extirpate all those in the Northern Parts, who still adhere to the Episcopal Communion, and are Favourers of the Constitution of the Church of England."⁴¹ If Presbyterians in Scotland persecuted people for essentially worshiping as a part of the Church of England, what could they hope for their brethren in England? Indeed, Greenshields was only one of many in Scotland who used the *Book of Common Prayer*, and, if the Lords upheld his conviction, it might embolden Presbyterians to attack the others who did the same.

³⁹ See pgs. 71-72, 173.

⁴⁰ *The case of Mr. Greenshields*, 4.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

Clearly, Greenshields and his supporters relied on identifying their cause with the Church of England. Greenshields was, after all, imprisoned because he used the *Book of Common Prayer* when he led worship for a congregation of Englishmen who lived in Scotland.⁴² But what about the rest of the Episcopalians in Scotland? What did they think of the English liturgy? Greenshields's supporters made it clear that they were of one mind. They insisted that "the greatest Part of the Inhabitants of this United Kingdom are true Members of the Church of England," and not members of an independent Scottish Episcopal Church.⁴³ They belonged to the same Episcopal establishment as existed in England. The outcome of the Greenshields appeal would be determinative. If the House of Lords upheld his conviction, affirmed the judicial process of the Presbyterians and confirmed their assertion that Parliament had no jurisdiction over their actions, they could then go about shutting down the rest of the Episcopal meeting houses. If, however, the House of Lords overturned his conviction, it would obviously encourage others to set up meeting houses and use the English Liturgy.

In the end Greenshields was vindicated by the Lords. One Scottish Episcopalian wrote a friend in London that, "Mr. Greenshields Appeal proved very agreeable to those of the Episcopal Persuasion, because for the future they expected to be delivered from the Tyranny and Oppression of the Presbyterians, and not to be Disturbed in their

⁴² Alasdair Raffe, "Episcopalian Polemic, The London Printing Press and Anglo-Scottish Divergence in the 1690s," 28; "Presbyterians and Episcopalians: the Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715," *English Historical Review* 125, no. 514 (2010): 596.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

Worshipping of God after the Manner of their Consciences did direct, that is, according to the Lyturgy of the Church of England.”⁴⁴ Once the House of Lords ruled that no legal grounds existed under which a person could be prosecuted for use of the English liturgy, others could be open in their worship fearing no legal consequences.

The Greenshields case brought to the forefront the issue of Episcopal clergy loyal to the government. He had by all accounts been reconciled to the government, and this made him the ideal person from the standpoint of the Episcopalians to have made such an appeal and gain attention for their cause. But even if his loyalty was suspect, as suggested by Matheison, he was willing to publically profess it.⁴⁵ To counter such professions of loyalty, one of the best weapons the Presbyterians employed was to question Episcopalian loyalty to the regime and portray them all as committed Jacobites. An unnamed Greenshields partisan undertook an effort to dispel that notion. He explained that the Presbyterians had unjustly portrayed the Episcopalians as unreconciled to the Glorious Revolution and as enemies of both William’s and Anne’s governments. And while the writer acknowledged that these charges were not without some truth, he stated that the cause of any disaffection toward the Government was the result of the treatment meted out by the Presbyterians on the Episcopal clergy in the form of rabblings and other legal processes which they had employed to purge the clergy. He added that William had been misinformed about the religious situation and the causes of the

⁴⁴ *A letter from a gentleman in Edinburgh to his friend in London: giving an account of the present proceedings against the Episcopal clergy in Scotland for using the English lyturgy there* (Edinburgh, 1711), 4.

⁴⁵ Matheison, *Scotland and the Union*, 195-196.

Episcopal discontent which again was the fault of the Presbyterians who attacked Episcopalians, both clergy and laity.⁴⁶ His point was not that the Scottish Episcopalians had been loyal all along to the government of William and then Anne, but rather that the reason for the mutual suspicion between the Episcopalians and the state was the fault of the Presbyterians who exaggerated the Episcopal level of discontent.

In fact, Greenshields's supporters offered up a rose-colored interpretation of events over the past twenty years. While it is true that some Episcopalians had been loyal to William and even more so to Anne (see Chapter 2), this account failed to mention the fact that William had wanted to support the bishops in Scotland, requiring only their support in return. Clearly, at least part of the blame lay with the Episcopalians. Despite the difficult relationship between the state and Scottish Episcopalians since 1688, the author insisted that things would change if the government acquitted Greenshields. "Your Lordships have it now in your Power, to put an effectual Stop to this Abuse, and to make all the People Easie for the Future. And that the general Disaffection which appeared to be among the Episcopal Party of Scotland, during the last Reign; did not so much from any Aversion to the Revolution, as from the cruel Treatment which they Received from the Presbyterians, is very Plain, from the Readiness they shewed to Submit to the government of Her present Majesty, upon her Accession to the Throne."⁴⁷

⁴⁶ *The case of Mr. Greenshields*, 5-8.

⁴⁷ *Ibid*, 7-8.

When the House of Lords overturned the Greenshields conviction, Scottish Episcopalians were naturally emboldened and meeting houses soon began to spread. One Episcopal gentleman reported that, “the Church Party managed and improved their Affairs as prudently as possible, the Episcopal Clergy being invited by the latter, did accordingly erect a great many Meeting-houses in Edinburgh, and in most of the Towns on the North-side of the River Ferth, to which the Numbers of People (resorted) praising God for the happy Effect of the Union, that now they were allowed in Peace and without Danger to worship Him after the Manner which they believed Orthodox and Primitive, and during these last, preceding six Months, the Church Party in Scotland have enjoy’d more Ease and Security, than they have done Twenty years before.”⁴⁸ While this letter is obviously an Episcopalian polemic, the correspondence of Robert Wodrow corroborates the element of truth it contained. He viewed the Greenshields case as a major turning point for the Scottish Episcopalians. It had established two major precedents: first, the Parliament in London held primacy over the Church of Scotland and could intervene in its ecclesiastical affairs; second, the Church of Scotland lacked jurisdiction over anyone not of its communion.

Toleration and the Restoration of Lay Patronage

Now Scottish Episcopalians and their supporters in Parliament sensed that the time was right to push for a toleration bill. In this endeavor men like George Lockhart, Lord Balmerino and Earl of Eglinton capitalized on the Greenshields case. Arguing how

⁴⁸ *A letter from a gentleman in Edinburgh to his friend in London*, 4.

his treatment demonstrated yet again how poorly the Presbyterians behaved, they played to the English assumption that Presbyterians were motivated by an anti-Episcopalian bigotry. These men sought out the English Bishops and Tory high-flyers in an effort to bring legal recognition to the Episcopal congregations.⁴⁹ The increased number of the congregations that followed Greenshields's acquittal put the Church of Scotland in a difficult position; if it continued to shut down the meeting houses, it risked further English intrusion into its religious affairs if the Episcopalians appealed for help.

Wodrow understood the danger. He was the son of a divinity professor, minister, and historian. His fellow minister, Hugh Maxwell, who preached in Tealing, north of the Tay, contacted Wodrow and sought his advice. Maxwell was concerned with the "prevalency of the English service" and reported that it attracted "noblemen, gentlemen, and people of a better rank" who had the potential to influence the rest of the community.⁵⁰ Wodrow advised his colleague to exercise caution in order to win the elites over to Presbyterianism. He did not desire any further confrontation, and appreciated how momentum had swung in favor of his adversaries during the Greenshields case. Wodrow did not trust the Scottish politicians at Westminster. He reminded Maxwell that "We all know what a set of people are at present in the council,

⁴⁹ Daniel Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnwath, 1689-1727: A Study in Jacobitism* (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2002), 88; *Jacobitism and Tory Politics* (Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers LTD, 1984), 86-87.

⁵⁰ Thomas M'crie, ed., *The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow, Minister of Eastwood, and Author of the History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842), 1:243, 245-246.

how little any Scotsmen have either skill or will to appear for the purity of worship, and there is none in council but what have occasionally, or rather constantly, once they were in England, conformed to that worship.”⁵¹ It seemed that Presbyterian politicians ceased to act as Presbyterians in England, and with a Tory dominated government he suspected they would be even more likely to favor the Episcopalians. In light of this situation, Wodrow argued against making an issue over the new Episcopal meeting houses. In a letter to the Lord Advocate of Scotland he reasoned that, “If we should represent, and nothing be done, you know the consequences better than I; the party would take it as good as a standing law for them, and turn more uppish, if they can be so, than they are.”⁵² Given what had occurred in the Greenshields case, Wodrow feared that a second rebuke from London would only further embolden the Episcopalians. Moderation was needed until a different course of conduct seemed advisable.

Unfortunately for Wodrow, moderation was not the course other Presbyterians chose. In 1708, James Stuart of Goodtrees, Lord Advocate of Scotland for nearly the entire late Stuart period, had received instructions from the queen to close down all of the Episcopal meeting houses and remove any disaffected clergy in 1708.⁵³ At the time, such instructions made a great deal of sense; the union was new and it was important for Anne to keep the Presbyterians happy, especially coming on the heels of an abortive Franco-

⁵¹ Ibid., 249.

⁵² Ibid., 250.

⁵³ “Letter to James Stuart, Lord Advocate of Scotland, 1708” in Beatrice Curtis Brown, ed., *The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne* (London: Cassell and Company, 1968), 259.

Jacobite invasion. When, after a brief hiatus, Stuart returned to his post in 1711 circumstances had changed. The Whig ministry had been replaced by a Tory one, and the Greenshields decision made it clear that using the English liturgy in Scotland was not a crime. Therefore, when Stuart renewed attempts at closing down Episcopal meeting houses, he was plainly breaking the law. Lockhart and his cohorts used this fact to push Parliament into finally considering a toleration bill for the Scottish Episcopalians.⁵⁴

On the surface it looked as if toleration would easily become law. The House of Commons had a strong Tory majority; the House of Lords had recently acquitted Greenshields; and Queen Anne maintained strong Episcopal sympathies. These facts notwithstanding, the bill encountered problems even before it was introduced. A rumor spread that the complete undoing of Scotland's religious settlement was imminent; this caused a panic within the Presbyterian ranks both in and out of Parliament. The only thing that avoided a major catastrophe was that Tory leader Robert Harley was able to persuade the queen to ask the Episcopalians to wait before introducing their bill. Once the situation in Scotland calmed down, Harley, now Earl of Oxford, turned his attention to achieving a peace that would bring the War of Spanish Succession to an end. In his struggle to do so, a door opened for the supporters of toleration. Oxford needed their support for the proposed peace treaty and in exchange he needed to support toleration.⁵⁵ Once Oxford's delaying tactics were no longer needed, there followed a series of legislative disasters for the Church of Scotland. The General Assembly responded with

⁵⁴ Matheison, *Scotland and the Union*. 199.

⁵⁵ Szechi, "The Politics of Persecution," 281-2.

concern, and the queen dispatched the Duke of Atholl, who served as Commissioner to the assembly in an attempt to mitigate the damage. His instructions were to keep the assembly from calling a national fast to protest the proposed toleration by any “proper means” short of dissolving the body.⁵⁶

In January 1712 the bill was introduced in Parliament. The onlooking Scottish Episcopalians and Presbyterians debated whether or not such an act would violate the terms of the Act of Union and whether or not Parliament had the authority to interfere in these Scottish matters. For some Presbyterian Scots the matter was settled. Son of a covenanting minister and sometime religious exile during the reigns of Charles II and James II, William Carstares, now moderator of the General Assembly, asked whether or not the toleration bill would weaken the union by taking away many of the exclusive prerogatives of the Church of Scotland such as baptisms and marriages? At the same time he politely enquired about why the Church of Scotland had not been consulted about a matter that “so nearly affects the Established Church of Scotland in her Rights and Privileges.”⁵⁷ The matter of tolerating Episcopalians went against more than just the union; it struck at the heart of the Revolutionary settlement in Scotland, the Claim of

⁵⁶ ‘Additional Instructions to the Duke of Atholl, Commisioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland,’ in Brown (ed.), *The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne*, 370.

⁵⁷ William Carstares, *Some queries humbly propos’d, upon the bill now depending before the Honourable House of Commons, for a toleration to the episcopal dissenters in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1712), 2-3.

Right.⁵⁸ Carstares explained, “allowing Meeting Houses to none but those who are Episcopally Ordain’d, seems to me inconsistent with the Union, which ratifys this Article of our Claim of Right, viz. That Prelacy and the Superiority of any Office in the Church above Presbyters, is and hath been a great and insupportable Grievance and Trouble to this Nation &c. and therefore ought to be abolish’d.”⁵⁹

In its petition to the queen, the General Assembly addressed the persecutions that had led the Episcopalians to demand action. In their defense the members of the assembly stated that “if it had not been for that woful Seed of Disaffection to the Revolution, and your (Majesty’s) Government as thereby establish’d and which indeed had been the principal, if not the only Cause of these few Prosecutions, that occasuion’d so loud and unjust a Clamour.”⁶⁰ The assembly acknowledged some persecutions of the Episcopal clergy which they portrayed as a sign of loyalty to her and the Revolution. Essentially they argued that, had they not weeded out those disaffected to the queen’s government, there would never have been a controversy and the Church of Scotland would not be faced with an imposed toleration. The petition went on to address the

⁵⁸ See pgs. 70-71.

⁵⁹ William Carstares, *The Scottish toleration argued, or, An account of all the laws about the Church of Scotland ratify’d by the Union-Act / in a letter from a Scots gentleman to a member of Parliament* (London: S. Popping, 1712), 19.

⁶⁰ “The Act for Securing the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church-Government: With the Statutory Act. Which were Ratofy’d by the Touch of the Royal Scepter at Edinburgh, the 16 January, 1707,” in *A collection of papers against the Scots toleration and patronages, That Have been Printed or Presented to Her Majesty, and the Two Houses of Parliament. To which is added, the Abjuration oath, with an Introductory Letter, containing Some Remarks upon it* (London, 1712), 7.

matter of the union and the Act for Securing the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church Government, the whole purpose which was to have prevented precisely the present situation, in which a London based, Episcopalian dominated Parliament could legislate on Scotland's internal religious affairs. The Scottish parliament had passed the Act of Security in advance of the union in order that Scotland's religious affairs be expressly kept outside of the jurisdiction of the new British Parliament. As far as the Presbyterians were concerned the act was implicitly part of the Union treaty which had been ratified by the English Parliament. Any attempt of the new union Parliament to meddle in Scotland-specific ecclesiastical matters directly violated the terms of the union.⁶¹

In contrast, the Episcopalians and their English supporters maintained the supremacy of the new Parliament. The Earl of Cromarty bluntly told critics of toleration that, "If there be one Legislative in Britain it seems foolish, to contend, that they cannot make Laws or alter Laws."⁶² There must be a body capable of modifying and repealing laws, and, since the Scottish parliament no longer existed, it fell to its successor, the British Parliament in London, to make changes when and where needed. Cromarty further argued in favor of toleration on the grounds that Episcopalianism continued to be popular in Scotland. He estimated that there were two supporters of Episcopacy for

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Earl of Cromarty, *The Scottish toleration truly stated in a letter to a peer* (London, 1712), 9.

every one of Presbyterianism.⁶³ Toleration, he claimed, was therefore in the interest of most of the people of Scotland. Regardless of its popularity or whether it violated the terms of the union (which it had), Parliament had deemed it within their powers to interfere in Scottish religious matters by passing a toleration bill, just as it had earlier in the Greenshields case.⁶⁴

Unable to win the argument on procedure, Carstares pointed out that if the toleration bill passed the Episcopal dissenters of Scotland would have an advantage over the Presbyterian dissenters of England. “[Since] it [the toleration] forbids any Disability or Incapacity upon such as resort to Episcopal Meetings; whereas those who resort to Dissenting Meetings in England are made incapable of publick Posts by thee Test Act, and that against Occasional Conformity, tho the English Dissenters are known to be firm to the Establish’d Government and the Hanover Succession, which cannot be said of the Episcopal Dissenters in Scotland.”⁶⁵ This was a plain inequity, and it placed the Church of Scotland at a disadvantage against the Church of England. The Church of England could ensure through the Test Act that only communicants of its church could hold office; the Church of Scotland could not do the same.

⁶³ Ibid., 8.

⁶⁴ Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland’s Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 72-73; *Union and Unionisms: Political Thought in Scotland, 1500-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 221.

⁶⁵ Carstares, *The case of the Church of Scotland*, 2-3.

The bill as passed was nearly a complete victory for the Episcopalians.⁶⁶ It repealed virtually all of the ecclesiastical laws passed by the Scottish parliament since the Revolution. Episcopal ministers regained the right to perform marriages and baptisms, provided they subsequently registered them with the parish church.⁶⁷ They could peaceably assemble for worship wherever they chose, and celebrate the sacraments without incurring any civil penalty. And, they did not have to answer to the Church of Scotland courts. In fact, the only conditions placed on the Episcopalians were that they had to use the *Book of Common Prayer*; their ministers had to be ordained by Protestant bishops (Church of England or Ireland); they could not use the parish churches for worship; and they would be required to take an abjuration oath.⁶⁸

Carstares and his fellow Presbyterians recognized these reforms as he noted that “the first Clause allows the Episcopal Dissenters to set up Congregations for Worship in their own Manner.”⁶⁹ Episcopal ministers could set up meeting houses and use the English liturgy wherever they pleased; moreover, Carstares observed that the law, “requires all Magistrates to protect, aid and assist such Ministers, and those of their

⁶⁶ National Archives, “The Act for Securing the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church Government, 1706,” <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/apgb/Ann/10/10/contents> (accessed July 10, 2013).

⁶⁷ John Stuart Shaw, *The Political History of Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1989), 90-91.

⁶⁸ The abjuration oath required de jure recognition of Anne’s title as well as a renunciation of the Old Pretender.

⁶⁹ Carstares, *The case of the Church of Scotland*, 1.

Communion, in their Assemblies in any Town or Place in Scotland.”⁷⁰ The key phrase here was “requires all Magistrates to protect.” The new Episcopal Church of Scotland had not only the sanction of the state, but the law required that the magistrates protect and assist it in its operation.

Carstares was not alone in his observations, as other Presbyterians quickly concluded that the Toleration Act had in fact, although not in law, established a parallel church in Scotland. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland retained its rights to the parishes and the tithes, but the Episcopal Church of Scotland shared with the Presbyterians every other right and protection under the law. An anonymous pamphleteer commented on this near parity and suspected it was only the beginning. He noted, “But I find it is rather for the establishing of another Church in Scotland by law, upon almost an equal footing with the establish’d Kirk, and most People of all sorts will reckon it as an Introduction to the abolishing of Presbytery in Scotland.”⁷¹ Unlike the dissenters in England who had to register with their local Church of England bishop in order to exercise their ministry - and thus submit to some basic guidelines and supervision - the Episcopalians in Scotland were free from any legal interference from the established church.

The bill had freed the Episcopal congregations from oversight by the Church of Scotland. In addition to the fact that Presbyterians lost authority over the Episcopalians,

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ *A letter from a gentleman in Scotland to his friend at London*, 3-4.

Carstares also lamented a loss of control over personal conduct that he claimed would lead to national moral decline. “In the last place I can’t but take Notice, that the Toleration Scheme propos’d, seems to be very defective in providing against Immoralities and Blasphemy; for by exempting those of the Episcopal Communion from the Censures of our Church, and proposing no other in their stead, as indeed they can’t, without being in breach of the Union, those People will be under no Church Government, and so become Freebooters both in Religion and Morals, as ‘tis known that many of ‘em are already, so that our present Acts against Profaneness, which are very good, may be eluded by those who think fit to decline the establish’d Communion.”⁷² At stake, he argued, was the public good of the Scottish people. A major unforeseen problem with the new freedom of the Episcopalians was therefore their freedom from the moral strictures of the Presbyterian courts. Since the Presbyterian courts could not prosecute anyone not of their communion, all that was needed to avoid punishment was to claim to be an Episcopalian.

Carstares somewhat naively suggested that the Episcopal Church would be without a church government in Scotland, since bishops were abolished at the Revolution and therefore no one would be able to keep moral order amongst the Episcopal congregants. Carstares’s colleagues, Robert Wodrow and James Hart, knew that the Episcopal clergy met with the Bishop of Edinburgh. Hart told Wodrow of one such meeting where they discussed how they should proceed with the Toleration Act, “but it seems they were not of one mind about this [praying for the Queen and the Hanoverian

⁷² Carstares, *The Scottish toleration argued*, 21-22.

succession]; some were for complying with what was proposed, others for taking it into consideration, and a third sort for refusing it altogether, who seemed to act most agreeably to their principles, but what they will centre in is yet uncertain, for this night, I understand they meet again.”⁷³ This account of their meeting demonstrated that the Episcopal clergy of all political stripes, juring and Nonjuring, were still in consultation with their bishop, an indication of the persistence of Episcopal control over the church.

At this point, the only thing that could have slowed the Episcopalian momentum was the application of the abjuration oath, but even this did little to slow the growth of Episcopalian congregations by requiring the swearer not only to state his allegiance to Anne, but also to disavow the “pretended” Prince of Wales, James Francis Edward Stuart, known to his more committed supporters as James III. The abjuration oath had been intended to disqualify many Jacobite Episcopal ministers and therefore mitigate the damage to the Church of Scotland; instead it placed many Presbyterian ministers in a difficult situation, not because they were Jacobites, but rather because they resented the intrusion of the state in the church. The Episcopal sponsors of the toleration had carefully reworded the abjuration oath in order to create problems for the Presbyterians.⁷⁴ Their plan succeeded, the new wording creating a confusion which meant that few people of either persuasion ever took the oath.

⁷³ M'crie, *The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow*, 1:436.

⁷⁴ Szechi, “The Politics of Persecution,” 284-285.

Carstares initially expressed his support for the addition of the abjuration oath while Parliament considered the toleration bill. He argued that the Episcopal ministers should have to qualify themselves for the legal ministry by doing the same thing the Presbyterian ministers had to do. Specifically, they “should be expressly required to take the Oath of Allegiance to the Queen, and sign the Assurance that she is the Queen *de Jure* as well as *de Facto*.” If it was good enough for the Presbyterians, it should be good enough for the Episcopalians. Episcopal ministers should have to expressly acknowledge the queen’s right to rule.⁷⁵

Some Presbyterian ministers had experienced problems with taking oaths in the past. Wodrow explained that some ministers refused to swear an earlier oath because it “obliges the takers to maintain the present establishment of England, both in church and state, as they are established by law.”⁷⁶ Wodrow and ministers like him hoped to make matters easier for their colleagues by pointing out that oaths like this only applied to matters concerning England and that they were only promising to support Episcopacy in England, not re-introduce it into Scotland.⁷⁷ But many Presbyterians saw the abjuration oath as a trap intended to somehow undo the Presbyterian establishment. Prominent men in the General Assembly spelled out the Episcopal strategy: “Tis likewise very well known, That the Enemies of the Church of Scotland, and of the Hanover Family, conceiv’d very great Hopes, that the End of imposing this Oath, would be frustrated, and

⁷⁵ Carstares, *Some queries humbly propos’d*, 3.

⁷⁶ M’crie, *The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow*, 1:154.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 155.

their Friends exempted from taking it, because they flatter'd themselves that the Scot's Presbyterian Ministers wou'd refuse it upon those Scruples.”⁷⁸

Despite the straightforward support of the oath on the part of the General Assembly's leadership, many Presbyterian ministers refused to take it. Those who did take the oath did so with reservations and by adding an illegal preamble, since the oath was to be taken without reservations, additions, or equivocations. A gentleman in Edinburgh told a friend how the Presbyterians took the oath. The author established his credentials as a neutral bystander and one indifferent to the ecclesiological battle between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, but he observed the juring Presbyterians added qualifiers to the express meaning of the words of the oath. He went on to compare the linguistic juggling of the Presbyterians to that of the dreaded Jesuit; a damning indictment for any Protestants to have levied against them.⁷⁹

Ultimately, very few Episcopalians and Presbyterians took the abjuration oath.⁸⁰ There were therefore few prosecutions and Episcopal meeting houses continued to flourish in light of the toleration. The success of the toleration in turn led Parliament to

⁷⁸ *A collection of papers against the Scots toleration and patronages, That Have been Printed or Presented to Her Majesty, and the Two Houses of Parliament. To which is added, the Abjuration oath, with an Itrductory Letter, containing Some Remarks upon it* (London, 1712), 12.

⁷⁹ “A letter from a gentleman in Edinburgh, to his friend in the country, concerning the way and manner in which the abjuration oath was sworn by the ministers, in the shire of Edinburgh,” [c.1713], CH12/12/1532, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁸⁰ Szechi, “The Politics of Persecution,” 285.

make one last attack on the Church of Scotland Establishment by passing a bill that restored lay patronage to the Scottish Church. This meant that the old heritor could nominate the new minister and the Presbyteries could not intervene in the heritor's choice. To pass this bill was to strike at the core of the Kirk's power in the parishes. Once again the state encroached on the powers of the church.⁸¹ James Bradley explains that at least part of the state's rationale with the bill was to break the connection between the landed classes and Jacobitism by restoring to them some of the power they had lost as result of the Glorious Revolution.⁸² Carstares informed Oxford of the danger this bill posed to the Church of Scotland's establishment and how lay patronage was abolished by the Scottish parliament in 1690. Its restoration would violate the terms of the union.⁸³ But it was not only the Episcopalian land owners who wanted the restoration of lay patronage; it was also moderate Presbyterian landowners who wished to wrestle some of their old power from the Kirk.⁸⁴ Oxford assured Carstares that the bill would not pass, but, on May 12, 1712, Parliament voted to restore lay patronage.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Valerie Wallace, "Presbyterian Moral Economy: The Covenanting Tradition and Popular Protest in Lowland Scotland, 1707-c.1746," *The Scottish Historical Review* 89, no. 1 (2010): 58.

⁸² James E. Bradley, "The Religious Origins of Radical Politics in England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1662-1800," in *Religion and Politics in Enlightenment Europe*, eds. James E. Bradley and Dale K. Van Kley (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 206.

⁸³ *A collection of papers against the Scots toleration and patronages*, 73-74.

⁸⁴ Richard Sher, "Scotland Transformed: The Eighteenth Century," in *Scotland: A History*, ed. Jenny Wormald, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 179.

⁸⁵ Matheison, *Scotland and the Union*, 209.

Parliament's actions with respect to toleration and lay patronage greatly benefitted the Scottish Episcopalians. The Act of Toleration and restoration of lay patronage would not have passed Parliament were it not for the strong presence of the Tory high churchmen, and this was a result of the "church in danger" campaign.⁸⁶ The toleration, despite the abjuration oath, encouraged the growth of Episcopal meeting houses throughout the country. Even Presbyterian strongholds like Glasgow witnessed an Episcopalian revival.⁸⁷ Lay patronage only indirectly benefitted the Episcopalians, since they could no longer hold parish churches under the Toleration Act. Still, it significantly reduced the power of the Church of Scotland because it restricted its ability to name ministers and left open the possibility that some heritors would choose to violate the law by appointing Episcopalian clergy to parish churches.

The years between 1710 and 1712 proved therefore to be crucial for the Episcopal Church. It was in this period that they achieved their greatest legal victories since the Glorious Revolution. However, in the background of their Parliamentary victories was a controversy that surrounded their charitable relief fund. Since the Revolution, the Scottish Episcopalians had appealed to their English supporters for material relief, because the Scottish Parliament made no provision for them once they had been expelled from their livings. The Episcopalians pointed out how they had been treated worse than the Catholics in the early years of the Scottish Reformation; the state still allowed

⁸⁶ Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power*, 317.

⁸⁷ Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2006), 68.

Catholics to collect a portion of their old revenues from church lands. As an aid, English benefactors had entrusted money to a relief fund for the support of deprived clergy.

The George Barclay Controversy

The controversy involved Mr. George Barclay. Barclay had been an Episcopal minister in the Church of Scotland until the Presbyterians purged him from the church. This entitled him to a share of the relief money collected for the clergy. He remained on the charity rolls until 1703 when the Bishop of Edinburgh, the Nonjuring Alexander Rose, and the other administrators of the charity decided to remove him. Barclay contended that they acted against him because he supported Queen Anne, while other ministers, presumably Jacobites, were undeservedly provided for from the fund.⁸⁸ The anti-Episcopalian press presented Barclay's case to the nation. On February 12, 1712, *The Flying Post or The Post Master* wrote, "In order to set the disloyal and persecuting Temper of the Chief of the Episcopal Party in Scotland in a true light: tis thought proper to insert the following Complaint exhibited lately against them to the Judges there, by a Minister of their own way, to whom, and others, they refuse any part of the Charity-Money given 'em by well disposed people, meerly because they pray'd expressly for the Queen in their meeting Houses."⁸⁹ For the Presbyterians, the case seemed too good to be

⁸⁸ "Note in Bishop Alexander Rose's hand concerning the clergy charity fund and George Barclay," [1712], CH12/12/1845, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁸⁹ "The Flying Post or The Post Master" George Barclay's case against the administrators of the clergy charity fund. [12 February 1712], CH12/12/382/9, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

true. Barclay's story confirmed their suspicions about the Episcopal clergy. Despite the occasional Episcopalian who was loyal to the Revolutionary Settlement, here was evidence that the church was run by Jacobites and for Jacobites. The Barclay case also suggested that the Episcopal Church mistreated those within their ranks who did not support its political agenda. What happened to Barclay, the Presbyterians believed, indicated the larger problem posed by the Episcopalians. Moreover, for the Presbyterians the timing of this controversy could not have been better. They had just been defeated in the case of James Greenshields and were facing the prospects of Parliament imposing a toleration bill on Scotland. For the Presbyterians, this negative publicity against the Episcopalians came at a crucial time. The hope of using Barclay as an example of the disloyalty of the Episcopalians was countered by Bishop Rose's aggressive counterattack.

For two years Rose and his supporters responded to Barclay's charges.

According to the charity's administrators Barclay was removed from the roll because "the circumstances of his fortune changed."⁹⁰ The charity had established an eligibility threshold of £26 a year in income. As long as the recipient did not earn more than this amount, he could continue to receive assistance. Barclay was employed by a meeting house during the period 1700-1703 and the congregants then offered to pay him a salary of 700 merks, roughly £40 per year for his services. At the same time, his wife earned

⁹⁰ "Memorial for Bishop of Edinburgh and Clergy and other trustees and administrators of the episcopal clergy charity fund, by Mr George Barclay" [August-December 1713], CH12/12/381, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

extra income by renting out spare rooms in their house.⁹¹ It was the feeling of the officials that Barclay was doing well financially and charitable resources could have been better used elsewhere. The Barclay matter was a simple case of a man who no longer required extra help, and in the words of the Bishop's apologist, "whose fault is it but his own, did he not refuse from his hearers £50 a year."⁹² The sum of the offered payment had inexplicably increased £10 between the start and finish of the account. Barclay's supporters countered this charge and claimed that if a congregation had been willing to pay him £50 a year, he was never made aware. He admitted that he had other, less lucrative offers for employment, but did not take the jobs because he feared that he would never actually be paid, and he was concerned that the congregants were not loyal to Queen Anne.⁹³

The Presbyterians pressed Barclay's case in the hope that they could demonstrate that the Episcopalians were committed Jacobites. The question remains as to why Barclay wanted to expose his co-religionists to this level of scrutiny? Aside from the

⁹¹ "Information for the Administrators of the Charity fund for the Distressed Clergy against Mr. George Barclay" George Barclay's case against the administrators of the clergy charity fund. [1712], CH12/12/383/10, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ *A full answer for Mr. George Barclay minister of the Gospel : To a scurrilous pamphlet published against him, in vindication of the Bishop of Edinburgh, and the other administrators of the money collected; for the releif [sic] of the distressed Episcopal clergy in Scotland. Whereby his complaint, exhibited against them to the Lords of Session, is shewed reasonable; and the malice, folly, and falshood of the vindicator are made appear* (Edinburgh: John Montour, 1712), 9.

money Barclay believed was due him, Rose and his associates speculated that he hoped to become the head of a new relief effort, essentially accusing him of greed. Barclay's behavior throughout this conflict lends some credence to the administrators' beliefs. At one point Barclay attempted to get the Lords of the Court of Session to take action against Rose and re-enroll him on the relief roster in an effort to get a portion of the money collected through almsgiving.⁹⁴ He pressed the matter further when he suggested that any man ought to be able to enroll himself, and that the enrollee should be granted a payment of £100, all of this with little, if any, oversight. Should it become necessary to remove someone from the roll, the person to be dropped should have the reasons explained to them prior to losing any funds.

Barclay's defenders insisted that the charity open its books, perhaps assuming that the bishop would never allow for fear that it might show malfeasance or confirm Barclay's contention that he was put off the role for being a juror: "Therefore if the Fund run lower, it is occasioned by themselves in that they contended so Earnestly against Exhibition of their Books, & c. Which can only shew their Management to have been Candid; Impartial and Regular, and clear them of all Imputations."⁹⁵ The publicity that surrounded the case finally forced the charity to open its books to the outside world, and between 1712 and 1713, the Lords of the Session examined them. During this scrutiny,

⁹⁴ Ibid.; "Memorial for Bishop of Edinburgh and Clergy and other trustees and administrators of the episcopal clergy charity fund, by Mr George Barclay" [August-December 1713], CH12/12/381, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

⁹⁵ *A full answer for Mr. George Barclay minister of the Gospel*, 28.

charity officials were forced to explain some irregularities. Rose mounted a defense and argued that sometimes relief took place off the books. These instances usually involved clergy who were not routine recipients, and implied that they wanted anonymity only due to the embarrassment of having needed charity; not for more nefarious reasons like Jacobitism. The court appeared to have been satisfied with this explanation after finishing its analysis of the charity's books.⁹⁶

The Lords of the Session accepted the charity's trustees' account, perhaps because the charity had been forthcoming with its records. It may also have helped that the charity produced a list of its recipients who had taken oaths of loyalty to Anne. This undercut the main argument of both Barclay and his Presbyterian supporters. Furthermore, the trustees did not claim that they excluded Jacobites or Nonjurors. Any such assertion would have not have been true, and would not have been believed. Bishop Rose was a known Nonjuror at the time, and in three years would declare his support for James during the 1715 rebellion. Clearly Nonjurors were involved in the effort and the charity did not try to hide this. In short, they appeared to be completely honest about its operation.

It was one thing to be honest about the part Nonjurors played in the charity, but it was also important to show that it was not an exclusively Nonjuring charity. From the beginning of this controversy, Rose made sure to publicize recipients of funds who had

⁹⁶ Ibid.; "Note in Bishop Alexander Rose's hand concerning the clergy charity fund and George Barclay," [1712], CH12/12/1845, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

supported the Revolutionary settlement, or had at least come around eventually and supported Anne's government. Barclay's supporters contended that, "he hath made some complying Ministers Sharers. ... If of late some they represent under the Notion of Compliers, have been considered by Him and his Council, being (necessitat) upon to use their Names, in order to pursue some Ends, and answer an Exigence."⁹⁷ This suggested that Rose had decided to give relief to some ministers loyal to the government in order that he might use these ministers as tokens in a public relations campaign. An anonymous supporter of the Bishop responded to Barclay's accusations by saying "But tho' Mr. Barclay never fails to slander his Bishop's Conduct, with respect to those who own Her Majesty's Government, yet this his Kindness to Mr. Barclay is not the only Instance to the contrary; for there are many more of such as pray for the Queen, and have taken the Oaths, whom he made Sharers of the Private Charities put into his Hands." The author then gave names of ministers who received from the charity and were loyal to the government; these included Mr. Greenshields, Mr. Denune, Mr. Peacock, Mr. Stuart, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Moncrief, Mr. Skeen, Mr. Henderson, and Mr. Guthrie among others not listed.⁹⁸

The trustees of the charity had lists of other people on their rolls who were reconciled to the government. They presented a series of form letters in order to give

⁹⁷ *A full answer for Mr. George Barclay minister of the Gospel*, 22.

⁹⁸ *A full vindication of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Edinburgh and the other administrators of the charities there, from the calumnies ... of Mr. George Barclay in his defamatory libel, publish'd in the Flying-Post, no.3181* (Edinburgh: James Watson, 1712).

evidence that they had not shown preference to the Nonjurors. The earliest of these was produced in January 1712. It stated that, “we the undersubscribers being sensible how unjust an assertion this is, as in our several Compliance with or owning of the Civil Government, which we all do yet upon our first application to the administrators for a share of the fors’d charity we were presently admitted, and have so been continued in the Rolls of such as are to partake thereof...”.⁹⁹ This was subscribed by roughly a dozen signatories. Others followed, many of these the widows of clergy who were either themselves reconciled to the government or testified that their late husbands had been.¹⁰⁰ These people provided the trustees of the charity with a defense against their accusers. The charity had clearly taken care of the needy, deprived clergy, regardless of its politics.

This was not the only instance of the Scottish Episcopal clergy opening up their charity records to outsiders. The recently consecrated Nonjuring Bishop, Archibald Campbell, wrote to Gilbert Burnett who served as Bishop of Sarum in the Church of England. While Barclay might claim that he was “Ill used in EdE because of his compliance with the Civill Gove [Civil Government],” Campbell invited the bishop to investigate the matter further in order to uncover both Barclay’s character and the honest dealings of the charity.¹⁰¹ Burnett worked as an important agent for the Scottish Episcopalians in England. While he had embraced William II’s cause well before he

⁹⁹ CH12/12/383/11, NRS.

¹⁰⁰ CH12/12/383/8, NRS; CH12/12/12, NRS.

¹⁰¹ Copy letter from Hon Archibald Campbell, London, to Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Sarum [14 July 1713], CH12/12/264, Records of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

landed in England, Burnett as a Scot sympathized with the plight of his former fellow churchmen.

The case of George Barclay was no doubt a nuisance to the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland and a distraction from more important matters that confronted them, such as securing toleration and the restoration of lay patronage. Nevertheless, their successful defense of their charity demonstrates just how secure they had become in society that they could risk this kind of negative publicity. At the same time it revealed how sophisticated their operation had become. Barclay accused them of discriminating against him on account of his loyalty to Anne and their Jacobitism. The potential disloyalty of the Episcopal clergy had proven fatal to their cause in earlier years, yet when these accusations had arisen this time the Episcopalians could produce lists of the loyalists within their ranks. Jurors and Nonjurors alike worked side by side and received aid from the same funds. Nonjurors worked with jurors, like Campbell and Burnett had, in order to protect the Episcopal clergy in Scotland. The ability to show that some within their ranks were reconciled to the government once again made it hard for the whole movement to be tarred with the label of Jacobite. At the same time a known Nonjuror like the Bishop of Edinburgh served at the head of the charity and successfully defended his church. This reveals that by 1713 the Episcopal Church in Scotland was on its way to securing its place in Scottish society and its opponents needed to be careful when they attacked it for they could no longer count on a government compliant with their wishes.

Conclusion

Despite difficulties in the first years that followed the union, at times facing the same problems as they had faced earlier such as rabblings and legal harassment of their clergy, the Scottish Episcopalians had managed by the end of 1712 to almost completely reverse their fortunes. Scotland's merger with England had provided new opportunities for them, especially now having recourse to an Anglican/Episcopalian dominated Parliament. The acquittal of James Greenshields in 1711 provided the spark. It established two major precedents. First, that Parliament had the right to meddle in Scottish ecclesiastical affairs, and, second, that the Church of Scotland's authority was over people who affiliated with it. The latter proposition would be enshrined in the Toleration Act. Greenshields' acquittal opened the door for other Episcopalians to worship openly with the English liturgy and the presence of a Tory dominated government in Westminster provided their ministers with a chance to receive legal recognition. Lay patronage weakened control over the parish churches, and in time might allow Episcopalian ministers to back into the Church of Scotland. Finally, the George Barclay affair highlighted just how far the Scottish Episcopalians had come. As recently as the Greenshields case the Edinburgh magistrates had marched lock-step with the Presbyteries, but fresh off of their victories in Parliament they seem to have given the Episcopalians a fair hearing. For Episcopalians, they believed themselves to be on the cusp of a new Episcopal ascendancy in Scotland. They were obviously better off than they had been prior to the Union, and the Presbyterians, meanwhile, had lost much of the power they thought they possessed.

Conclusion

As the late Stuart period drew to a close the Scottish Episcopal Church experienced a revival of its fortunes. The British Parliament had granted legal status to its meetings and allowed lay patrons to nominate clergy to its parishes. These measures significantly undercut the authority of the Church of Scotland and permitted the Episcopal Church to expand throughout the realm. Despite the challenges of the previous twenty-five years, the Episcopal Church managed not only to survive, but now posed a serious threat to the Presbyterian Church as a result of the Tory majority at Westminster. Both Daniel Szechi and Jeremy Black estimate that approximately forty percent of Scots affiliated with the Episcopal Church at the start of the Hanoverian period.¹ This is an impressive statistic, especially since the Scottish Episcopal Church received no significant state support from 1689 through 1711, and given the prevailing mob violence often directed at Episcopalian meeting houses and clerics during that same time.

In the closing years of Anne's reign the Episcopalians expanded their public presence throughout Scotland. Robert Wodrow wrote about this expansion and

¹ Jeremy Black, *Eighteenth Century Britain, 1688-1783* (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001), 127; Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 24; "The Mainstream of Scottish Jacobitism," in *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, eds. T.M. Devine and Jenny Wormald (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 356.

complained that Episcopal ministers were intruding into parishes.² They were not only setting up meeting houses, in accordance with the toleration granted by Parliament, but actually taking over parish churches, something expressly forbidden by that body. Wodrow provided few details about these intrusions, other than to describe them as “violent and intruding,” and he called them “rabblings,” perhaps not dissimilar to the ones perpetrated by the Presbyterians over the previous twenty-five years. Wodrow continued, “the English Service being set up with so much violence of late, may be attributed to the Union and Toleration, but it must be owned that a Jacobite and Popish party have been the great managers; and these methods have been taken mostly to serve the interests of Bar-le-duc,³ and curry favor with the Highfliers in England, who have had the same design in view.”⁴ The Episcopal Church was expanding, a growth that he saw as part of a Jacobite plot being perpetrated in conjunction with the English. Even George I’s accession to the crown did not provide much hope for Wodrow and his fellow Presbyterians. He assumed that the Tory supporters of the Church of England would continue to complain that their church was under threat from dissenters, as they had in the latter years of Anne’s reign, and would continue to assist the Episcopalians in Scotland. Wodrow assumed that since George was a foreigner and presumably unaware of the religious intricacies in Britain, he would likely side with the Church of England and with

² Thomas M’crie, ed., *The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow, Minister of Eastwood, and Author of the History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland Volume 1* (Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842), 1: 571-572.

³ Bar-le-duc was the French city where the ‘Old Pretender’ maintained his court-in-exile at this time.

⁴ M’crie, *The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow*, 1:571-572.

any political causes they espoused, such as assisting the Scottish Episcopalians. He believed this because the Church of England was the largest religious constituency in the kingdom and George needed to forge political alliances.⁵ For a brief moment it looked as if Wodrow's predictions would prove correct; the council of Dundee, despite not going to the official celebration of George's arrival, still addressed the new king and ordered a "solemnity for the king's ... happy arrival in Britain."⁶ It ordered that a bonfire be lit for him and that the magistrates drink to the new king's health.⁷ Despite this positive start to George's reign, the Scottish Episcopal Church instead experienced an episodic decline over the course of the next several decades, and the numbers of their clergy dropped from over 800 to fewer than 130.⁸ What were the reasons for this, and why did this happen?

The short answer was that the Jacobite character of the Episcopal community blatantly exposed itself in 1715. Anne's death had come unexpectedly to the Jacobite communities. They had spent the previous years hoping that James could be restored to the throne through parliamentary action, and had not developed an alternative should they

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Derek J. Patrick, "Dundee in the Nation c. 1686-1746," in *Dundee: Renaissance to Enlightenment*, ed. Charles McKean, Bob Harris, and Christopher A. Whatley (Dundee: Dundee University Press, 2009), 97.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Andrew L. Drummond and James Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843: The Age of the Moderates* (Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press, 1973), 27-29.

fail to achieve a legal solution.⁹ They now pursued an alternative that resulted in to a poorly planned and executed rebellion led by the Earl of Mar in which virtually all the Episcopal leaders came out for the Old Pretender (James III), including Bishop Rose of Edinburgh. George Garden preached a sermon in favor of the newly arrived Stuart, and his brother James presented the Pretender with an address.¹⁰ The Jacobites sincere convictions were uncoordinated and inadequately supplied.¹¹ Had a better plan been in place, or had the French provided assistance, the Jacobites might have succeeded, and Episcopal support of the rebellion rewarded. Alternatively, if the rebellion had been delayed, the Scottish Episcopal Church could have continued to build on the support it had gathered since 1712. State sanctioned persecution accompanied Jacobite activity. Nevertheless, the Episcopalian clergy endured the persecution that followed the uprising and continued to preach Jacobitism the in Northeast. In May 1716, George I complained that the Episcopal meeting houses still operating in Edinburgh did not pray for him and the royal family by name. As a result, the government closed many meeting houses, and ministers who omitted the mandated prayers faced six months in jail. Once the threat of a

⁹ Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites, Britain and Europe 1688-1788* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 73.

¹⁰ William Reginald Ward, "Anglicanism and Assimilation; or Mysticism and Mayhem in the Eighteenth-Century," in *Crown and Mitre: Religion and Society in Northern Europe Since the Reformation*, eds. W. M Jacob and Nigel Yates (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993), 84.

¹¹ Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 255.

French invasion passed, government action against Episcopacy tended to taper off.¹² It was not until Culloden and the failure of the '45, that the Church of Scotland successfully began to move into the highlands.¹³

Other factors affecting the decline of Episcopalianism in Scotland must also be considered. The first is the degree of change the Episcopal Church of Scotland had undergone doctrinally since the Glorious Revolution. In 1688 little difference existed between Scottish Episcopalians and Presbyterians. Both groups were Calvinists, both subscribed to the Westminster Confession of Faith, and they shared a very simple style of public worship.¹⁴ However, in the years following the Revolution, the two churches moved further apart in terms of belief and practice, as this dissertation has demonstrated. The Episcopal leadership gradually shifted away from Calvinism and instead aligned with of the Arminianism of the English. In addition, the style of worship of the Episcopalians became decidedly more liturgical as the adoption of the *Book of Common Prayer* became widespread. The differences between the churches continued to grow in

¹² F.C. Mather, "Church, Parliament, and Penal Laws: Some Anglo-Scottish Interactions in the Eighteenth Century," *English Historical Review* 92, no. 364 (July 1977): 540-541; Margaret Sankey, and Daniel Szechi, "Elite Culture and the Decline of Scottish Jacobitism 1716-1745," *Past and Present* 173, no. 1 (Nov 2001): 91, 96; F.W. Schneider, "Scottish Episcopalians and the English Politicians: the Limits of Toleration," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 45 (1976): 280.

¹³ Michael Newton, *A Handbook of the Scottish Gaelic World* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000), 267.

¹⁴ Gordon Donaldson, "Covenant to Revolution," in *Studies in the Worship in Scotland*, eds. Duncan Forrester and Douglas Murray (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 68-69.

the years following Anne's death. As the older Scottish bishops died, many were replaced by men who favored the 'usages,' a seemingly Catholic innovation in the church. These prelates favored the use of the sixteenth-century Edwardian *Book of Common Prayer*, or the 1637 Scottish prayer book, and both of these more closely resembled the Catholic service than the 1662 prayer book.¹⁵ The usages consisted of four major practices: first, the mixing of water and wine in the chalice; second, the Prayer for the Descent of the Holy Spirit, also known as the Epiclesis; third, the prayers of oblation over the elements were moved in the order of worship to precede the consecration; and, fourth, the addition of prayers for the dead.¹⁶ These Catholic forms left their practitioners vulnerable to accusations of popery, because at the heart of the usages debate was derivation from the singular authority of scripture. Clerics who supported the usages argued that apostolic tradition also possessed authority, a position maintained by Catholics.¹⁷ Bishop Rose managed to tame the competing theological factions, but, upon

¹⁵ Alasdair Raffe, "Presbyterians and Episcopalians: the Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715," *English Historical Review* 125, no. 514 (2010): 596.

¹⁶ Roger Davies, *Bishop Nathaniel Spinckes and the Non-Juring Church* (Kent: Royal Stuart Society, 2007), 17; Gordon Hammond, "High Church Anglican Influences on John Wesley's Conception of Primitive Christianity, 1732-1735," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 78, no. 2 (2009): 176; Joong-Lak Kim, "The Scottish-English-Romish Book: The Character of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637," in *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland: Essays for John Morrill*, eds. Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 29.

¹⁷ Robert D. Cornwall, "The Search for the Primitive Church; The Use of the Early Church Fathers in the High Church Anglican Tradition, 1680-1745," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 59, no. 3 (1990): 310.

his death in 1720, this balance fell apart.¹⁸ Episcopalians not approving of these new practices could return to the Church of Scotland, which still believed and worshiped in much the same way as it had in 1689.

A closely related second factor was the moderation of the Presbyterians. Much of the support the Episcopalians enjoyed at the time of the Restoration was the result of their fidelity to the crown and the damning connection that existed between the Presbyterians and the execution of Charles I (1649). But the shadow of the Covenant that plagued the Presbyterians after 1660, along with their adherence to the ‘two-kingdom’ theory of church and state was, after 1715, replaced by the treachery of the Episcopalians. The problems caused by the Covenanters, the Bishops’ Wars (1637) and the excommunication of Charles II (1680) now suddenly far in the past. Douglas Ansdell writes regarding the Presbyterian Church, “Having gained much, it began to distance itself from its more violent past and thus the ideals of the Covenanting period found little favour... There was a moderating of Presbyterianism in which the recent past was held at arm’s length and that the Protestant succession was regarded as a fitting conclusion to the Covenanting struggle.”¹⁹ Colin Kidd argues that the post-revolutionary Church of Scotland was now embarrassed by the ultra-Calvinists in its ranks. To the opponents of this new found moderation, it looked as if the Church of Scotland was governed by

¹⁸ Daniel Szechi, *George Lockhart of Carnwath, 1689-1727: A Study in Jacobitism* (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2002), 141-145.

¹⁹ Douglas Ansdell, “The Fluctuating Fortunes of ‘Old Morality’: Identity, Religion and Scottish Society,” in *Religion and National Identity Wales and Scotland c. 1700-2000*, ed. Robert Pope (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2001), 192-193.

“pusillanimous pragmatism.”²⁰ The post-revolutionary Church of Scotland turned Presbyterianism into an ally of monarchy and the social hierarchy and thus removed itself as a threat to those institutions as well as to the Church of England.²¹ Even though some in the Presbyterian leadership chafed under state control, their church adjusted itself to an Erastian establishment in much the same way the Episcopal Church had done prior to the Revolution. After the '15 the Episcopalians became the party of suspect loyalty and the destabilizing influence in Scottish society. The Church of Scotland now entered into the “age of the moderates” and was governed by men who closely associated themselves with the Hanoverian regime and the Enlightenment.²²

The third factor to consider was the absence of a significant body of Scottish Episcopal clerics loyal to George I. While most Episcopalians were not loyal to William

²⁰ Colin Kidd, “The Kirk, the French Revolution, and the Burden of Scottish Whiggery,” in *Religious Change in Europe 1650-1914: Essays for John McManners*, ed. Nigel Aston (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 216.

²¹ Ibid.; Colin Kidd, “Constructing a Civil Religion: Scots Presbyterians and the Eighteenth-Century British State,” in *The Scottish Churches and the Union Parliament, 1707-1999*, ed. James Kirk (Edinburgh: Scottish Church History Society, 2001), 5.

²² David Allan, “Protestantism, Presbyterianism and National Identity in Eighteenth-Century Scottish History,” in *Protestantism and National Identity Britain and Ireland, c. 1650 – c. 1850*, eds. Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 190-191; Ryan Frace, “Religious Toleration in the Wake of Revolution: Scotland on the Eve of Enlightenment (1688-1710s)” *History* 93, no. 311 (2008): 356; Henry Sefton, “Neu-lights and Preachers Legall’: Some Observations on the Beginnings of Moderatism in the Church of Scotland,” in *Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929*: ed. Norman Macdougall (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1983), 187.

III, many parish clerics were. Significant numbers of Episcopalians were loyal to Anne, or at least appeared so outwardly. William had conquered his new realm, and the man he had displaced lived in exile until 1701. William was only fourth in the line of succession at the time of the Glorious Revolution.²³ Anne, however, as the daughter of James, possessed greater legitimacy in the eyes of many. Moreover, Anne was an Episcopalian.²⁴ George was reared a Lutheran and no closer than thirty-ninth in line for the throne when Catholics were factored in, Stephen Taylor puts the number even further away at fifty-ninth.²⁵ This was unacceptable to many Episcopalians, and those who maintained a Stuart loyalty became targets for the regime after the '15.

The fourth and final factor that contributed to the decline of Episcopalianism in Scotland was the collapse of English support. This happened for a number of reasons. First, as this dissertation has demonstrated, much of the public relations campaign in England focused on the “rabblings” and other unfair treatment exhibited by the Presbyterians towards the Episcopalians. As long as the Episcopalians could claim to be the victims of an unfair and bigoted campaign they could count on support from England. After the '15, however, the Presbyterians could legitimately claim that they persecuted the Episcopalians because of their disloyalty to the government. The Hanoverians, eager

²³ The succession in 1688 would have been James Francis Edward, Mary, Anne, and then William. The birth of William Duke of Gloucester to Anne in 1689 would have moved William to fifth in line.

²⁴ Tristram Clarke, “The Scottish Episcopalians, 1688-1720” (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1987), 425.

²⁵ Stephen Taylor, “Plus ça change ...?: New Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688,” *The Historical Journal* 37, no. 2 (June 1994): 460.

to consolidate their power, joined as partners in this endeavor.²⁶ Second, as long as the English saw their own church establishment under threat, they were likely to sympathize with the similarly situated Scottish Episcopalians. Historians agree that the dissenters posed no serious danger to the Church of England, but this was not obvious to the church's Tory defenders at the time. As Geoffrey Holmes has pointed out, "[during] the apogee of the Whigs in the reigns of William III and Anne, at least four-fifths of the parish clergy in England and Wales were convinced that the ruling party, given half a chance, would sell out the Anglican inheritance to dissenters and latitude-men, if not to the enemies of Christianity itself."²⁷ In the early Hanoverian period other issues dominated, especially the fear of a Catholic Stuart restoration. Moreover, the Whig governments gradually made their peace with the Church of England. Robert Walpole decided that the Church of England could be an ally of the Whigs. The anti-clerical and radical religious opinions of some Whigs were jettisoned, and the payoff, an alliance with the church, served the Whigs' best interest.²⁸ Third, the major English benefactors of the Scottish Episcopalians were the Tories, who, after Anne's death the Whigs effectively shut out of power until the reign of George III (1760-1824). For this extended period they were in no position to offer further assistance to their Scottish brethren.²⁹ The half-hearted Scottish Episcopalian effort to remain in communion with the Church of England

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Murray Pittock, *Jacobitism* (London: Macmillan Press, 1998), 33.

²⁸ Justin Champion, *Republican Learning: John Toland and the Crisis of Christian Culture, 1696-1722* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 4.

²⁹ Szechi, *1715*, 71.

provides a fourth reason for the waning of English support for the Scottish church. When asked directly whether or not the Scottish Episcopalians were in communion with the Church of England, Bishop Rose claimed that he could not answer the question. At the same time, some of the Episcopal clergy consorted with the English Nonjurors and attempted to form an alliance with the Eastern Orthodox churches.³⁰ Many believed that the Episcopalians in Scotland were only members of the Church of England at their convenience. Ironically, it was English support, or an example of what Tony Claydon has called, “Tory Internationalism,” that ensured the survival of their religious community under the late Stuarts.³¹ Indeed, as a result of the assistance provided by the English, and in the earlier attempts of the Scottish Episcopalians to ingratiate themselves with them, one can see the beginnings of an Anglican Communion. Although Bishop Rose refused to acknowledge that the Scottish Episcopalians were in communion with the Church of England, the Scottish church began to look like, and believe like, its English counterpart.

What does the experience of the Scottish Episcopalians reveal about late seventeenth-century Scotland and Britain as a whole? This study has described a large Episcopal community in Scotland that continued to exist after the Glorious Revolution through the reign of Anne. After 1688 they persisted in their cause, an effort that culminated in the passage of the Toleration Act. They retained a significant following

³⁰ Drummond and Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843*, 27-29.

³¹ Tony Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 7-9.

and their numbers cast doubts on any claims of a natural Scottish predilection towards Presbyterianism.

The Episcopal community held a providential worldview. It believed in an indefeasible, hereditary, divine right monarchy, and the “two-societies” theory of church and state relations returned to with it earlier ideas of cooperation between the two entities even if the church now claimed *jure divino* in the spiritual realm. Even after the debacle of 1715 and the accompanying demise of Episcopal prestige and influence, this worldview persisted among those who remained Episcopalians. Others carried it with them into the Church of Scotland, and rationalized the successions of first William and later George, in providential terms. They did this in much the same manner as the juring clergy had rationalized the succession of William and Mary.

My conclusions and the evidence on which they are based are consistent with the Revisionist view of Britain in the late Stuart period. I argue for the prominent role of religion in British politics and society, specifically how religion dominated the political discourse of Scotland. The most important political events of the period, like the Act of Union, were matters of great religious significance. For example, for the union of Scotland and England to come about, the Presbyterians demanded an act of security to protect their church establishment. Religion played a significant role in the opposition of many Episcopalians to the union, because it impinged on their hope that the ‘Old Pretender’ would return to Scotland and restore their church. Other Scottish Episcopalians supported the union in the hope that a British Parliament would view their church favorably and act on its behalf. Other factors, including nationalism, clearly

played a role in the union of the two nations, but first and foremost issues of religion governed the outcome. All of this points to a Britain that remained more religious and traditional than secular and modern.

Bibliography

Archives

Lambeth Palace Library, London, United Kingdom.

MS 929 Miscellaneous Papers, 1611-1723.

MS 930 Miscellaneous Papers, 1590-1714.

MS 933 Miscellaneous Papers, 1605-1714.

MS 938 Printed Material, 1662-1710.

MS 941 Miscellaneous Papers, 1603-1715.

MS 942 Miscellaneous Papers, 1522-1705.

National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh, United Kingdom.

CH12/12 Episcopal Chest, 1549-1964.

CH12/13 Records of Bishop Alexander Jolly: Printed Material, 1647-1863.

CH12/16 Records of Bishop Alexander Jolly: Miscellaneous Papers, 1646-1853.

GD1/451 Act by Episcopalian Ministers at Aberdeen, 1694.

GD26/13 Correspondence and General Papers, 1578-1936.

Printed Primary Sources

Arbuthnot, John. *A Sermon Preached to the People at the Mercat Cross of Edinburgh on the Subject of Union*. Edinburgh, 1707.

Broomhall, Alexander Bruce. *A Speech in the Parliament of Scotland, in Relation to Presbyterian Government*. Edinburgh, 1702.

- Brown, Beatrice Curtis (ed.). *The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne*. London: Cassell and Company, 1968.
- Brown, George. *Toleration Defended: or the Letter From a Gentleman to a Member of Parliament Concerning Toleration Considered, With Some Observes on Mr. Meldrum's Sermon*. Edinburgh, 1703.
- Brunet, Gilbert. *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time Volume II: From the Revolution to the Conclusion of the Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne*. London, 1734.
- Calder, Robert. *Reasons For A Toleration To The Episcopal Clergie and Objections Against it Answered*. Edinburgh, 1703.
- Carstares, William. *The Case of the Church of Scotland with Relation to the Bill for a Toleration to the Episcopal Dissenters to Set up Meeting-houses, and Use the English Service in Scotland*. London, 1712.
- . *The Scottish Toleration Argued, or, An Account of All the Laws About the Church of Scotland Ratify'd by the Union-Act / In a Letter from a Scots Gentleman to a Member of Parliament*. London: S. Popping, 1712.
- . *Some Queries Humbly Propos'd, Upon the Bill Now Depending Before the Honourable House of Commons, for a Toleration to the Episcopal Dissenters in Scotland*. Edinburgh, 1712.
- Cunningham, Alexander. *The Divine Right of Episcopacy, Demonstrated from Calvin and Beza Together with a Letter to a Presbyterian Minister From Union*. London: Randal Taylor, 1690.
- . *An Essay Concerning Church Government Out of the Excellent Writing of Calvin and Beza*. London, 1689.
- . *Questions Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland*. London, 1690.
- Defoe, Daniel. *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. Containing The State of the Church of That Nation, From the Time of Queen Mary to the Union of the Two Kingdoms, Being the Space of 154 Years*. London, 1734.
- Edinburgh Town Council, *The Defence of the Magistrates of Edinburgh, and Lords of the Session, Against the Appeal and Complaint of Mr. James Greenshields, Clerk / James Greenshields, Clerk, Appellant; The Magistrates of Edinburgh, Respondents; The respondents case*. n.p., 1710.

- Forrester, Thomas. *A Counter-essay, or, A Vindication and Assertion of Calvin and Beza's Presbyterian Judgment and Principles: Drawn from their Writings, in Answer to the Imputations of a Late Pamphlet, Entitled, An Essay Concerning Church-government ... Attempting to Fasten Upon Them an Episcopal Perswasion ... / by a Minister of the True Presbyterian Church of Scotland, Established by Law.* Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1692.
- Garden, George. *The Case of the Episcopal Clergy And those of the Episcopal Perswasion, Consider'd as to the Granting Them A Toleration and Indulgence. Second Edition Revised and Cleared from the Mistakes of a Gentleman's Letter.* Edinburgh, 1703.
- Gordon, Jon. *Plain Dealing: Being A Moderate General Review of the Scots Prelatical Clergies Proceedings In the Later Reigns. With a Vindication of the Present Proceedings in Church Affairs.* London, 1689.
- Grant, Sir Francis. *An Essay, for Peace by Union in Judgment; About Church-Government in Scotland.* Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, Printer to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, 1703.
- Greenshields, James. *The Case of Mr. James Greenshields, As It Was Given in to the Right Honourable the House of Lords.* n.p., 1710.
- Hodow, James. *The Case of the Episcopal Clergy And Those of the Episcopal Perswasion, Consider'd as to the Granting Them A Toleration and Indulgence. Second Edition Revised and Cleared from the Mistakes of a Gentleman's Letter.* n.p., 1703.
- . *Remarks Upon the Case of the Episcopal clergy and Those of the Episcopal Perswasion: Considered as to Granting them Toleration and Indulgence: in a Letter from a Freind [sic] to a Member of Parliament.* Edinburgh, 1703.
- James VII (King of Scotland). *His Majesties letter to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal Commissioners of Shires and Burroughs assembled, or to be assembled at Edenborough.* Edinburgh, 1689.
- Leslie, Charles. *Reflections Upon a Late Scandalous and Malicious Pamphlet Entitul'd The Shortest Way with the Dissenters; or Proposals for the Establishment of the Church To Which the said Pamphlet is Prefix'd Entire by Itself.* London, 1703.

- Mackenzie, George. *A Memorial for His Highness the Prince of Orange, In Relation to the Affairs of Scotland: Together with an Address of the Presbyterian Party in that Kingdom to His Highness; and Some Observations on that Address*. London: Randal Taylor, 1689.
- . *A Vindication of the Government in Scotland During the Reign of Charles II Against Mis-representations Made in Several Scandalous Pamphlets*. London: J. Hindmarsh, 1691.
- MacKenzie Cromarty, George. *The Scottish Toleration Truly Stated in a Letter to a Peer*. London, 1712.
- Mary II (Queen of England). *Memoirs of Mary, Queen of England, (1689-1693) Together with her Letters and Those of Kings James II and William III to the Electress Sophia of Hanover*. Lexington: University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, 2012.
- M'crie, Thomas (ed.). *The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert Wodrow, Minister of Eastwood, and Author of the History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: Wodrow Society, 1842.
- Meldrum, George. *A Sermon Preached in Edinburgh at the Opening of the General Assembly of this National Church of Scotland, Upon the 10th day of March 1703*. Edinburgh, 1703.
- . *A Sermon Preached in the New Church of Edinburgh, On Sabbath, May 16, 1703. Before his Grace, James Duke of Queensberrie, Her Majesties High Commission; And many of the Nobility, Barons and Burrows, Members of the High Court of Parliament: And the Magistrate of the City of Edinburgh*. Edinburgh: Printed by the Heirs and Successors of Andrew Anderson Printer to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty 1703.
- Monro, Alexander. *An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland, Chiefly oppos'd to the Censures, Calumnies, and Accusations of a Late Presbyterian Vindicator, In a Letter to a Friend. Wherein His Vanity, Partiality, and Sophistry are modestly Reproved, And the Legal Establishment of Episcopacy in that Kingdom, from the Beginning of the Reformation, is made evident from History and the Records of Parliament. Together with A Postscript, relating to a scandalous Pamphlet, Intituled, An Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*. London, 1693.
- Pinkinton, Sir John. *A Speech for the Bill Against Occasional Conformity*. London, 1703.

Ramsey, James. *Toleration's fence removed: the thoughts concerning the present state of affairs in so far as they respect a toleration considered, and exposed: Plain-dealing with the Presbyterians as it is not found, so not to be expected from prelatial pamphleteers, or, A vindication of a letter from a gentleman to a member of Parliament concerning toleration from all the cavils that have been advanced against it, and the wilfull mistakes about it.* Edinburgh: George Mosman, 1703.

Ridpath, George. *The Scots Episcopal Innocence, or, The juggling of that Party with the Late King, His Present Majesty, the Church of England, and the Church of Scotland Demonstrated: Together with a Catalogue of the Scots Episcopal clergy Turn'd out for their Disloyalty ... Since the Revolution: and a Postscript with Reflections on a Late Malicious Pamphlet Entitled The Spirit of Malice and Slander ... / by Will. Laick.* London, 1694.

Rule, Gilbert. *Just and Modest Reproof of the Presbyterian Eloquence.* Edinburgh: George Mosman, 1693.

Sage, John. *Account of the Persecution of the Church in Scotland in Several Parts.* London, 1690.

---. *The case of the present afflicted clergy in Scotland truly represented to which is added for probation the attestation of many unexceptionable witnesses to every particular, and all the publick acts and proclamations of the convention and Parliament relating to the clergy / by a lover of the church and his country.* London: J. Hindmarsh, 1690.

Setton, William. *Continuation of a Few Brief and Modest Reflexions Perswading a Just Indulgence To be Granted to the Episcopal Clergy And People in Scotland Together With Postscript Vindicating the Episcopal Doctrine of Passive Obedience, and the Archbishop of Glasgow's Sermon Concerning It.* Edinburgh, 1703.

Shields, Alexander. *The history of Scotch-presbytery: being an epitome of The hind let loose; with a preface by a presbyter of the Church of Scotland.* London: J. Hindmarsh, 1692.

Simson, Mathais. *A Short Character of the Presbyterian Spirit, In So Far as it Can be Gathered out of Their Own Books; Especially, Out of the Letter from a Gentleman to a Member of Parliament, Concerning Toleration, the Vindication Thereof; and the Remarks Upon the Case.* Edinburgh, 1703.

- Skinner, John. *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, Volume II: From the 1st Appearance of Christianity in that Kingdom, to the Present Time with Remarks on the Most Important Occurrences, In A Series of Letters to A Friend*, Edinburgh, 1788.
- Spottiswoode, John. *The History of the Church of Scotland*. 3 Vols. New York: AMS Press, 1973.
- Webster, James. *The Author of the Lawful Prejudices Against An Incorporating Union With England, Defended In Answer to a Pamphlet Entituled, The Dissenters in England Vindicated, from some Reflexions, in a late Pamphlet Entituled; Lawful Prejudice & c.* Edinburgh, 1703.
- . *Essay Upon Toleration By a Sincere Lover of Church and State*. Edinburgh, 1703.
- William III (King of England). *His Majesties Gracious Letter to the Meeting of the Estates of His Ancient Kingdom of Scotland*. Edinburgh: Andrew Anderson, 1689.
- Williamson, David. *Scotland's Sin, Danger, and Duty. Faithfully Represented in a Sermon Preach'd at the West-Kirk, August 23d, 1696. Being a Solemn Fast-day, Upon Occasion of the Great Dearth and Famine. By Mr. David Williamson, ... Then, Taken From His Mouth in Short-hand; and Now, ... Publish'd, as a Word in Season, by Mr. John Williamson*. Edinburgh: Mr. James McEuen and Co., 1720.
- Wodrow, Robert. *The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland From the Restoration to the Revolution Volume IV*. Glasgow: Blackie and Son, 1832.
- Wylie, Robert. *Letter from a Member of the Commission of the late General Assembly, to A Minister in the Country Concerning Present Danger*. Edinburgh, 1707.
- Address Sign'd by the Greatest Part of the Members of Parliament of Scotland, And Deliver'd to His Majesty*. Glasgow, 1689.
- A Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland Occasioned by the Episcopalians Since the Year 1660: Being a Vindication of Their Majesties Government in That Kingdom, Relating to the Proceedings Against the Bishops and Clergy There: With Some Animadversions Upon a libel intituled, The Present State and Condition of the Clergy and Church of Scotland*. London, 1690.
- The Case of Mr. Greenshields: Fully Stated and Discuss'd in a Letter from a Commoner of North Britain to an English peer*. London: 1711.

A Collection of Papers Against the Scots Toleration and Patronages, That Have been Printed or Presented to Her Majesty, and the Two Houses of Parliament. To Which is Added, the Abjuration Oath, with an Introductory Letter, Containing Some Remarks upon it. London: 1712.

A Full Answer for Mr. George Barclay Minister of the Gospel: To a Scurrilous Pamphlet Published Against Him, in Vindication of the Bishop of Edinburgh, and the Other Administrators of the Money Collected; for the Releif [sic] of the Distressed Episcopal Clergy in Scotland. Whereby His Complaint, Exhibited Against Them To the Lords of Session, is Shewed Reasonable; and the Malice, Folly, and Falsehood of the Vindicator are Made Appear. Edinburgh: John Montour, 1712.

A Full Vindication of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Edinburgh and the Other Administrators of the Charities There, From the Calumnies ... of Mr. George Barclay in His Defamatory Libel, Publish'd in the Flying-Post, no.3181. Edinburgh: James Watson, 1712.

Great News From the Convention in Scotland, Giving an Account of their Proceedings, In A Letter to a Friend. With Allowance. n.p., 1689.

To His Grace, His Majesties High Commissioner, and to the Right Honourable, the Estates of Parliament, the Humble Address of the Presbyterian ministers, and professors of the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1689.

A Letter From a Gentleman in Edinburgh to His Friend in London: Giving an Account of the Present Proceedings Against the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland for Using the English Lyturgy There. Edinburgh, 1711.

A Letter to a Reverend Minister of the Gospel of the Presbyterian Perswasion. Edinburgh, 1689.

Memorial for the Prince of Orange. n.p.,1689.

The Prelatical Church-Man Against the Phanatical Kirk-Man, or, A Vindication of the Author of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland. London, 1690.

To the Queen's Most Excellent Majestie, the Humble Address and Supplication of the Suffering Episcopal Clergy in the Kingdom of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1702.

The Queries and Protestation of the Scots Episcopal Clergy Against the Authority of the Presbyterian General Assemblies and Committees: Given in to the Committee of the General Assembly at Aberdeen, June 29th, 1694: Together with the Committee's Answer and Proceedings, with Reflections Upon the Queries, &c. / by a layman of the Church of Scotland. London, 1694.

Some Remarks on a Scandalous Paper Entitled, The Humble Representation of the Presbyterians, to His Grace His Majesties High Commissioner, and the Estates of Parliament, May 30, 1695 : Wherein the Disingenuity of the Present Faction, That Oppose Episcopacy in Scotland, Their Inconsistency with their Own Principles, and Cruelty Towards All of a Different Perswasion, are Clearly Manifested. n.p., 1695.

A True State of the Case of the Reverend Mr. Greenshields, Now Prisoner in the Tolbooth In Edinburgh: for Reading the Common-Prayer, in a Episcopal Congregation There tho' Qqualify'd by Taking the Oaths, and Praying for the Queen and Princess Sophia : with Copies of Several Original Papers Relating to His Accusations, Defence, Imprisonment and Appeal, First to the Lords of the Session in North-Britain, and Since to the House of Lords. London: Jonah Bowyer, 1710.

Online Archives

General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. *The Church of Scotland*.
http://www.churchofscotland.org.uk/about_us/church_law

National Archives. *Revised and Enacted United Kingdom Legislation 1267 to the Present*, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk>

The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707, Brown, K.M. (ed.) (St Andrews, 2007-2013), <http://www.rps.ac.uk/>

Secondary Sources

Achinstein, Sharon. *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Ahnert, Thomas . "Atlantic Enlightenment and German Responses to the American Revolution, c. 1775 to c. 1800." In *The Atlantic Enlightenment*, edited by Susan Manning and Francis D. Cogliano, 97-112. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing LTD, 2008.

Allan, David. "Protestantism, Presbyterianism and National Identity in Eighteenth-Century Scottish History." In *Protestantism and National Identity Britain and Ireland, c. 1650 – c. 1850*, edited by Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, 182-205. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

- , "What's in a Name": Pedigree and Propaganda in Seventeenth Century Scotland." In *Scottish History The Power of the Past*, edited by Edward J. Cowan and Richard J. Finlay, 147-168. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002.
- Ansdell, Douglas. "The Fluctuating Fortunes of 'Old Morality': Identity, Religion and Scottish Society." In *Religion and National Identity Wales and Scotland c. 1700-2000*, edited by Robert Pope, 186-199. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2001.
- Lord Balfour, Arthur. *An Historical Account of the Rise and Development of Presbyterianism in Scotland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Barry, Jonathan . "The Politics of Religion in Restoration Bristol." In *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, edited by Tim Harris, Paul Seaward, and Mark Goldie, 163-189. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Beddard, Robert. "The Unexpected Whig Revolution of 1688." In *The Revolutions of 1688 The Andrew Browning Lectures 1988*, edited by Robert Beddard, 11-101. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Bennett, G.V. *The Tory Crisis of Church and State 1688-1730 The Career of Francis Atterbury Bishop of Rochester*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Bergsma, Wiebe. "The Low Counties." in *The Reformation in National Context*, edited by Bob Schriber, Roy Porter, and Mikulas Teich, 67-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Black, Jeremy. *Eighteenth Century Britain, 1688-1783*. Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001.
- Bloom, F.J.M. "The Publications of Charles Leslie." *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions* 6, Part 1(1990): 10-36.
- Bosher, J.F. "The Franco-Catholic Danger, 1660-1715." *History* 79, no. 255 (Feb 1994): 491-514.
- Bowie, Karin. "New Perspectives on Pre-Union Scotland." In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, edited by T.M. Devine and Jenny Wormald, 303-319. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . *Scottish Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707*. Rochester: Boydell Press, 2007.

- Bradley, James E. "The Religious Origins of Radical Politics in England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1662-1800." In *Religion and Politics in Enlightenment Europe*, edited by James E. Bradley and Dale K. Van Kley, 187-253. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- Brekke, Luke. "Heretics in the Pulpit, Inquisitors in the Pews: The Long Reformation and the Scottish Enlightenment." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 44, no. 1 (Fall 2010): 79-98.
- Brown, Callum G. *Religion and Society in Scotland Since 1707*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997.
- Brown, Keith M. "British History: a Sceptical Comment." In *Three Nations – A Common History? England, Scotland, Ireland and British History c. 1600-1920*, edited by Ronald Asch, 117-127. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Brockmeyer, 1993.
- . "Reformation to Union, 1560-1707." In *The New Penguin History of Scotland: From the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, edited by R.A. Houston and W.W. J. Knox, 182-275. London: Allen Lane the Penguin Press, 2001.
- Brown, Stewart J. "Religion in Scotland." In *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain: Blackwell Companions to British History*, edited by H.T. Dickinson, 260-270. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2006.
- Broxap, H. "Jacobites and Non-Jurors." In *The Social and Political Ideas of Some English Thinkers of the Augustan Age A.D. 1650-1750 A Series of Lectures Delivered at King's College University of London During the Session 1927-28*, edited by F.J.C. Hearnshaw, 97-111. London: George G. Harrap and Company LTD., 1928.
- Buckroyd, Julia. "Anti-Clericalism in Scotland During the Restoration." In *Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929*: edited by Norman Macdougall, 167-185. Edinburgh: John Donald 27-150. Publishers LTD, 1983.
- . *Church and State in Scotland, 1660-1681*. Edinburgh: John Donald Press, 1980.
- Burns, William E. *An Age of Wonders Prodigies, Politics and Providence in England 1657-1727*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Cameron, James K. "Theological Controversy: A Factor in the Origins of the Scottish Enlightenment." In *The Origins and Nature of the Scottish Enlightenment*, edited by R.H. Campbell and Andrew S. Skinner, 116-130. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1982.

- Caudle, James . "Preaching in Parliament: Patronage, Publicity, and Politics in Britain, 1701-60." In *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature, and History, 1600-1750*, edited by Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough, 235-263. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Chamberlain, Jeffrey S. *Accommodating High Churchmen: The Clergy of Sussex, 1700-1745*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997.
- Champion, Justin. *Republican Learning: John Toland and the Crisis of Christian Culture, 1696-1722*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.
- Clark, J.C.D. *English Society 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology, and Politics During the Ancien Regime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Clarke, Tristram. "Politics and Prayer Books: The Book of Common Prayer in Scotland, c. 1705-1714." *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions* 6 (1992): 57-70.
- . "The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland." *Records of the Scottish Church Society* 24, no. 1 (1990): 33-51.
- Claydon, Tony. *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- . "Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689-1697." In *Redefining William III The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context*, edited by Esther Mijers and David Onnekink, 125-142. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007.
- . "The Sermon, the 'Public Sphere' and the Political Culture of Late Seventeenth-Century England." In *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature, and History, 1600-1750*, edited by Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough, 208-234. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- . *William III and the Godly Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- , *William III: Profiles in Power*. London: Longman, 2002.
- Claydon, Tony and Ian McBride (ed.). *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650- c. 1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

- Conrad, Russell. *Unrevolutionary England, 1603-1642*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1990.
- Cornwall, Robert D. "Charles Leslie and the Political Implications of Theology." In *Religious Identities in Britain, 1660-1832*, edited by William Gibson and Robert G. Ingram, 27-42. Burlington: Ashgate, 2005.
- . "Divine Right Monarchy; Henry Dodwell's Critique of the Reformation and Defense of the Nonjuror Bishops." *Anglican and Episcopal History* 68, no 1 (1999): 37-66.
- . "Politics and the Lay Baptism Controversy in England, 1708-15." In *Religion, Politics and Dissent, 1660-1832, Essays in Honor of James Bradley*, edited by Robert D. Cornwall and William Gibson, 146-163. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010.
- . "The Search for the Primitive Church; The Use of the Early Church Fathers in the High Church Anglican Tradition, 1680-1745." *Anglican And Episcopal History* 59, no. 3 (1990): 303-329.
- . *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High-Anglican and Non-Juror Thought*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993.
- Cowan, Brian. "The Spin Doctor: Sacheverell's Trial Speech and Political Performance in the Divided Society." *Parliamentary History* 31, no. 1 (Feb. 2012): 28-46.
- Cowan, Edward J., Richard Finlay, and William Paul. *Scotland Since 1688 Struggle for a Nation*. London: Barnes and Noble Books, 2000.
- Cowan, Ian B. "Church and State Reformed? The Revolution of 1688-9 in Scotland." In *The Anglo-Dutch Moment Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, edited by Jonathan I. Israel, 163-184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . "Repression and Religious Dissent in Scotland, 1660 – 1689." *International Review of Scottish Studies* 8, (1978): 5-24.
- Cressy, David. "Binding the Nation: the Bonds of Association, 1584 and 1696." In *Tudor Rule and Revolution, Essays for G.R. Elton from his American Friends*, edited by Delloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna, 217-234. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Coward, Barry *The Stuart Age: England 1603-1714*. Harlow: Longman, 1994.

- Curry, Lisa G. *Catholicism and the Clan MacDonell of Glengarry: Religions and Politics in the Highlands of Scotland, 1650-1750*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2007.
- Davidson, Neil. *Discovering the Scottish Revolution, 1692-1746*. London: Pluto Press, 2002.
- Davies, Roger. *Bishop Nathaniel Spinckes and the Non-Juring Church*. Kent: Royal Stuart Society, 2007.
- Davies, Stephen J. "The Courts and the Scottish Legal System 1600-1747: The Case of Stirlingshire." in *Crime and Law: The History of Crime in Western Europe since 1500*, edited by V.A.C. Gatrell, Bruce Lenman and Geoffrey Parker, 120-154. London: Europa Publication Limited, 1980.
- De Krey, Gary Stuart. *A Fractured Society The Politics of London in the First Age of Party 1688-1715*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- DesBrisay, Gordon. "Catholics, Quakers and Religious Persecution in Restoration Aberdeen." *Innes Review* 47, no. 2 (1996):136-168.
- Devine, T.M. "The English Connection and Irish and Scottish Development in the Eighteenth Century." In *Ireland and Scotland 1600-1850*, edited by T.M. Devine and David Dickson, 12-29. Edinburgh: John Donald Press, 1983.
- . *Exploring Scotland's Past: Themes in the History of Scottish Society*. East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 1995.
- . *The Transformation of Scotland: Social Change and the Agrarian Economy, 1660-1815*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994.
- Dickinson, W. Croft. *Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603*. 3rd ed. Edited by Archibald A.M. Duncan. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977, 339.
- Dilworth, Mark. "Roman Catholic Worship." In *Studies in the Worship in Scotland*, edited by Duncan Forrester and Douglas Murray, 127-148. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Donaldson, Gordon "Covenant to Revolution." In *Studies in the Worship in Scotland*, edited by Duncan Forrester and Douglas Murray, 59-72. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- . *Scotland: The Shaping of a Nation*. London: David and Charles, 1974.

- . *The Scottish Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Doran, Wendy. "Bishop Thomas Nicolson : First Vicar-Apostolic, 1695-1718," *Innes Review* 39, no. 2 (Autumn 1988): 109-132.
- Drummond, Andrew L. and James Bulloch, *The Scottish Church, 1688-1843: The Age of the Moderates*. Edinburgh: Saint Andrews Press, 1973.
- Ellenzweig, Sarah. *The Fringes of Belief: English Literature, Ancient Heresy, and the Politics of Freethinking, 1660-1760*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008.
- Ellis, E.L. "William III and the Politicians." In *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, edited by Geoffrey Holmes, 115-134. New York: Macmillan, 1969.
- Emerson, Roger. "The Enlightenment and Social Structures." In *City and Society in the 18th Century*, edited by Paul Fritz and David Williams, 99-124. Toronto: Hakkert, 1973.
- Estabrook, Carl B. "In the Midst of Ceremony: Cathedral and Community in Seventeenth - Century Wells." In *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England Essays Presented to David Underdown*, edited by Susan Amussen and Mark Kishlansky, 133-161. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- Ferguson, William. *Scotland: 1689 to the Present*, Vol. 4 of *The Edinburgh History of Scotland*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968.
- . *Scotland's Relations with England: A Survey to 1707*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers LTD, 1977.
- Finlay, Richard. "Keeping the Covenant: Scottish National Identity." In *Eighteenth Century Scotland: New Perspectives*, edited by T.M. Devine and J.R. Young, 121-133. East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 1999.
- Finlayson, Michael G. *Historians, Puritanism, and the English Revolution: The Religious Factor in English Politics Before and After the Interregnum*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.
- FitzGibbon, Gerald. "Robert Monro, Secular Priest in the Highlands (1645-1704)." *Innes Review* 48, no. 2 (Jan 1997): 165-173.
- Flaningham, John. "The Occasional Conformity Controversy: Ideology and Party Politics, 1697-1711." *Journal of British Studies* 17, no. 1 (1977): 38-62.

- Frace, Ryan. "Religious Toleration in the Wake of Revolution: Scotland on the Eve of Enlightenment (1688-1710s)." *History* 93, no. 311 (2008) 355-375.
- , "Vice, Virtue, and Industry; The Church of Scotland's Employment of Political Economy, c. 1700-1750" In *Religion in the Age of Enlightenment*, edited by Brett C. McInelly, 94-115. New York: AMS Press, 2009.
- Fulbrook, Mary. *Piety and Politics Religion and the Rise of Absolutism in England, Wurttemberg and Prussia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Gardner, Ginny. "A Haven for Intrigue: the Scottish Exile Community in the Netherlands, 1660-1690." In *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period*, edited by Alexia Grosjean and Steve Murdoch, 277-300. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Gardiner, S.R. *The History of England From the Accession of James to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*. Vol. 1. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895.
- . *The History of England From the Accession of James to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*. Vol. 8. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895.
- Garrett, Jane. *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- German, Kieran. "Scots Episcopalians after Disestablishment, 1689-1723" in *Institutional Change and Stability: Conflicts, Transitions and Social Values*, ed. Andreas Gemes, Florencia Peytou, Iannis Xydopoulos. Pisa: Edizioni Plus Pisa University Press, 2009, <http://www.cliohres.net/books4/1/04.pdf> (Last accessed February 20, 2013).
- Gibson, William. *The Church of England: Unity and Accord, 1688-1832*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- . "Dissenters, Anglicans and Elections after the Toleration Act, 1689-1710." In *Religion, Politics and Dissent, 1660-1832, Essays in Honor of James Bradley*, edited by Robert D. Cornwall and William Gibson, 129-146. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010.
- Glasse, Lionel. "William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland, 1688-1690." *Records of the Scottish Church Society* 23, (1989):317-329.

- Goldie, Mark . “Civil Religion and the English Enlightenment.” In *Politics, Politeness, and Patriotism Papers Presented at the Folger Institute Seminar “Politics and Politeness: British Political Thought in the Age of Walpole”* Directed by N.T. Phillipson, edited by Gordon Schochet, Patricia E. Tatspaugh, and Carol Brobeck, 31-46. Washington D.C: The Folger Institute, 1993.
- . “The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy.” In *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks, 15-35. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982.
- . “The Hilton Gang: Terrorising Dissent in 1680s London.” *History Today* 47, no. 10 (1997): 26-32.
- Goodare, Julian. “The Estates in the Scottish Parliament, 1286-1707.” In *The Scots and Parliament*, edited by Clyve Jones, 11-32. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996.
- . “Scotland.” In *The Reformation in National Context*, edited by Bob Scriber, Roy Porter, and Mikulas Teich, 95-110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- . *State and Society in Early Modern Scotland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Graham, Michael F. *The Blasphemies of Thomas Aikenhead: Boundaries of Belief on the Eve of the Enlightenment*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.
- . “Kirk in Danger: Presbyterian Political Divinity in Two Eras.” in *The Impact of the European Reformation: Princes, Clergy, and People*, edited by Bridget Heal and Ole Peter Grell, 167-186. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008.
- Greaves, Richard L. “Conformity and Security in Scotland and Ireland, 1660-85” In *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland, 1550-1700*, edited by Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben, 228-250. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006.
- Gregg, Edward. *Queen Anne*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Halloran, Brian M. “Scandal or Repentance? John Gordon of Glencat.” *Innes Review* 55, no. 2 (2004): 205-223.
- Hammond, Gordon. “High Church Anglican Influences on John Wesley’s Conception of Primitive Christianity, 1732-1735.” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 78, no. 2 (2009): 174-207.

- Harris, Tim. "The People, the Law, and the Constitution in Scotland and England: A Comparative Approach to the Glorious Revolution." *Journal of British Studies* 38, no. 1 (Jan 1999): 28-58.
- . "Probematising Popular Culture." In *Popular Culture in England c. 1500-1850*, edited by Tim Harris, 1-27. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- . *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms*. London: Penguin Books, 2006
- . *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*. New York: Penguin Books, 2007.
- Harvie, Christopher. *Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics, 1707-1977*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1977.
- Hawkins, L.M. *Allegiance in Church and State The Problem of the Nonjurors in the English Revolution*. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1928.
- Hayton, David. "Traces of Party Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Elections." In *The Scots and Parliament*, edited by Clyve Jones, 74-99. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996.
- Hefling, Charles. "Scotland: Episcopalians and Nonjurors." In *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer A Worldwide Survey*, edited by Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck, 166-175. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Herklots, H.G.G. "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Anglican Communion; and 18th Century Version." *The Church Quarterly Review* (1964): 444-449.
- Higgins, Ian. "Jonathan Swift and Charles Leslie" In *Loyalty and Identity Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, edited by Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi, 149-166. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Hill, Christopher. *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1961.
- Holmes, Geoffrey. *The Making of a Great Power: Later Stuart and Early Georgian Britain 1660-1722*. London: Longman, 1993.
- . *Politics, Religion, and Society in England, 1679-1742*. London: Hambledon Press, 1986.
- . *British Politics in the Age of Anne*. London: Hambleton Press, 1987.

- Hoppit, Julian. *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Horwitz, Henry. *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1977.
- . *Revolution Politicks The Career of Daniel Finch Second Earl of Nottingham 1674-1730*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- . "The Structure of Parliamentary Politics" In *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714*, edited by Geoffrey Holmes, 96-114. New York: Macmillan, 1969.
- Hyman, Elizabeth Hannan. "A Church Militant: Scotland 1661-1690." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 26, no. 1 (Jan 1995): 49-74.
- Ingram, Martin. "From Reformation to Toleration: Religious Cultures in England, 1540-1690." In *Popular Culture in England c. 1500-1850*, edited by Tim Harris, 95-124. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Jackson, Clare. *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion, and Ideas*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003.
- Jones, Clyve. "The Parliamentary Organization of the Whig Junto in the Reign of Queen Anne: The Evidence of Lord Ossulston's Diary," *Parliamentary History* 10, no. 1 (May 1991), 164-182.
- Jones, David Lewis. *Parliamentary History of the Glorious Revolution*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1988.
- Jones, Peter. "The Polite Academy and the Presbyterians, 1720-1770." In *New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland*, edited by John Dwyer, Roger A. Mason, and Alexander Murdoch, 156-178. Edinburgh: Humanities Press International, 1982.
- Kemp, Geoff. "The 'End of Censorship' and the Politics of Toleration, from Locke to Sacheverell." *Parliamentary History* 31, no. 1 (Feb 2012): 47-68.
- Kenyon, John Philipps. *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689-1720*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Kidd, Colin. "Conditional Britons: The Scots Covenanting Tradition and the Eighteenth-Century British State." *English Historical Review* 117, no. 474 (Sep 2002): 1147-1176.

- . "Constructing a Civil Religion: Scots Presbyterians and the Eighteenth-Century British State." In *The Scottish Churches and the Union Parliament, 1707-1999*, edited by James Kirk, 1-21. Edinburgh: Scottish Church History Society, 2001.
- . "The Kirk, the French Revolution, and Burden of Scottish Whiggery." In *Religious Change in Europe 1650-1914: Essays for John McManners*, edited by Nigel Aston, 213-235. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- . "Subscription, the Scottish Enlightenment and the Moderate Interpretation of History." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55, no. 3 (2004): 502-519.
- . *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689- c. 1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . *Union and Unionism: Political Thought in Scotland, 1500-2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Kim, Joong-Lak. "The Scottish-English-Romish Book: the Character of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637." In *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland Essays for John Morrill*, edited by Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith, 14-32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Kirk, James. "Royal and lay Patronage in the Jacobean kirk, 1572-1600." In *Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929*: edited by Norman Macdougall, 127-151. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1983.
- Klein, William. "The Ancient Constitution Revisited." In *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, edited Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner, 23-44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Knights, Mark. "'Meer Religion' and the 'church-state' of Restoration England." In *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration*, edited by Alan Houston and Steven Pincus, 41-70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- . "Occasional Conformity and the Representation of Dissent: Hypocrisy, Sincerity, Moderation, and Zeal." *Parliamentary History* 24, no. 1 (Feb 2005): 41-57.
- . *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain Partisanship and Political Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Lee, James. "Preaching and the Politics of Hatred : Catholics, the French and the Development of Englishness in Late Seventeenth-century England." in *Europäische Wahrnehmungen, 1650-1850: Interkulturelle Kommunikation und Medienereignisse*, edited by Joachim Eibach and Horst Carl, 161-184. Hannover: Wehrhahn, 2008.
- Leighton, C.D.A. "Anciennete Among the Non-Jurors: A Study of Henry Dodwell." *History of European Ideas* 31, no. 1 (2005): 1-16.
- . "The Non-Jurors and Their History." *The Journal of Religious History* 29, no. 3 (2005): 241-257.
- . "Scottish Jacobitism, Episcopacy, and Counter-Enlightenment." *History of European Ideas* 35, no. 1 (2009): 1-10.
- Lenman, Bruce. "The Poverty of Political Theory in the Scottish Revolution of 1688-1690." In *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives*, edited by Lois G. Schwoerer, 244-259. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . "The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism." In *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks, 36-48. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982.
- Levack, Brian P. *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union 1603-1707*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Linklater, Magnus and Christian Hesketh. *For King and Conscience: John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee (1648-1689)*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989.
- Lynch, Michael. "The Scottish Early Modern Burgh." In *Scotland Revisited*, edited by Jenny Wormald, 73-81. London: Collins and Brown, 1991.
- Lord Macaulay, Thomas Babington. *The History of England From the Accession of James II*. Vol. 3. New York: AMS Press, 1968.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Reformation: A History*. New York: Viking, 2003.
- MacDonald, Alan R. "The Parliament of 1592: A Crisis Averted?" Edited by Keith M. Brown and Alastair J. Mann. Vol. 2 of *The History of the Scottish Parliament*, ed. Keith M. Brown. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1983.

- MacInnes, Allan I. "Landownership, Land Use and Elite Enterprise in Scottish Gaeldom: From Clanship to Clearance in Argyllshire, 1688-1858." In *Scottish Elites Proceedings of the Scottish Historical Studies Seminar University of Strathclyde 1991-1992*, edited by T.M. Devine, 1-42. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers LTD, 1994.
- . "Scottish Jacobitism: In Search of A Movement." In *Eighteenth Century Scotland: New Perspectives*, edited by T.M. Devine and J.R. Young, 71-89. East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 1999.
- . "William of Orange – 'Disaster for Scotland'?" In *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context*, edited by Esther Mijers and David Onnekink, 201-226. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007.
- . *Union and Empire: The Making of the United Kingdom in 1707*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- MacIntosh, Gillian H. *The Scottish Parliament Under Charles II, 1660-1685*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- Magnusson, Mangus. *Scotland: The Story of A Nation*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2000.
- Mandelbrote, Scott. "The Bible and National Identity." In *Protestantism and National Identity Britain and Ireland, c. 1650 – c. 1850*, edited by Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, 157-181. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Marshall, Gordon. *Presbyteries and Profits: Calvinism and the Development of Capitalism in Scotland, 1560-1707*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Matheison, William Law. *Scotland and the Union: A History of Scotland from 1695-1747*. Glasgow, James Maclehose and Sons, 1905.
- Mather, F.C. "Church, Parliament, and Penal Laws: Some Anglo-Scottish Interactions in the Eighteenth Century." *English Historical Review* 92, no. 364 (July 1977): 540-572.
- Meza, Pedro Thomas. "The Question of Authority in the Church of England, 1689-1717." *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 42 (1973): 63-86.

- Mijers, Esther. "Scottish Students in the Netherlands, 1680-1730." In *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period*, edited by Alexia Grosjean and Steve Murdoch, 277-300. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Miller, John. *The Life and Times of William and Mary*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974.
- . *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Miller, Joyce. "Beliefs, Religions, Fears and Neuroses." In *A History of Everyday Life in Scotland, 1600 to 1800*, edited by Elizabeth Foyster and Christopher A. Whatley, 234-251. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
- Mitchison, Rosalind. *Lordship to Patronage, 1603-1715*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1983.
- Monod, Paul. *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- . "Thomas Carte, the Druids and British National Identity." In *Loyalty and Identity Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, edited by Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi, 132-148. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Murdock, Graeme. *Beyond Calvin: The Intellectual, Political and Cultural World of Europe's Reformed Churches*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Mullan, David George. *Episcopacy In Scotland: The History of an Idea*. Edinburgh: John Donald Press, 1986.
- Murison, Barbara C. "Becoming British? Navigating the Union of 1707." *International Review of Scottish Studies* 36 (2011): 33-65.
- Newton, Michael. *A Handbook of the Scottish Gaelic World*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000.
- Ogg, David. *England In the Reign of Charles II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- . *England In the Reigns of James II and William III*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Patrick, Derek J. "Dundee in the Nation c. 1686-1746." In *Dundee: Renaissance to Enlightenment*, edited by Charles McKean, Bob Harris, and Christopher A. Whatley, 84-110. Dundee: Dundee University Press, 2009.

- . "The Kirk, Parliament, and the Union, 1706-7." *The Scottish Historical Review* 87, Supplement (2008): 94-115.
- Patterson, Raymond Campbell. *A Land Afflicted: Scotland and Covenanter Wars 1638-1690*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1998.
- Pestana, Carla Gardina. *Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.
- Pincus, Steve. *1688, The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- . *England's Glorious Revolution, 1688-1689: A Brief History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford St. Martins, 2006.
- Pittock, Murray G.H. *Jacobitism*. London: Macmillan Press, 1998.
- Prunier, Clotilde. *Anti-Catholic Strategies in Eighteenth-Century Scotland*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2004.
- Raffe, Alasdair. *The Culture of Controversy: Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660-1714*. In *Studies in Modern British History Volume 28*. (eds.) Stephen Taylor, Arthur Burns, Kenneth Fincham, Rochester: Boydell Press, 2012.
- . "Episcopalian Polemic, The London Printing Press and Anglo-Scottish Divergence in the 1690s." *Journal of Scottish Studies* 26, no. 1 (2006): 23-41.
- . "Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics After the Revolution of 1688-1690." *The Historical Journal* 53, no. 2 (2010): 317-337.
- . "Presbyterians and Episcopalians: the Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715." *English Historical Review* 125, no. 514 (2010): 570-598.
- . "Propaganda, Religious Controversy, and the Williamite Revolution." *Dutch Crossing* 29, no. 1 (2004): 21-42.
- . "Scotland Restored and Reshaped: Politics and Religion, c. 1660-1712." In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, edited by T.M. Devine and Jenny Wormald, 251-284. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Reid, David (ed.). *The Party Coloured Mind: Prose Relating to the Conflict of Church and State in Seventeenth Century Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1982.

- Riley, P. W. J. *King William and the Scottish Politicians*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers LTD, 1979.
- . *The Union of England and Scotland*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1978.
- Rose, Craig. *England in the 1690s Revolution, Religion, and War*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers LTD, 1999.
- Rupp, Gordon. *Religion in England 1688-1791*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Russell, Conrad. *Unrevolutionary England, 1603-1642*. London: Hambledon Press, 1990.
- Sankey, Margaret and Daniel Szechi. "Elite Culture and the Decline of Scottish Jacobitism 1716-1745." *Past and Present* 173, no. 1 (Nov 2001): 90-128.
- Schama, Simon. *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*. New York: First Vintage Books, 1997.
- Schneider, F.W. "Scottish Episcopalians and the English Politicians: the Limits of Toleration." *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 45 (1976): 275-295.
- Schochet, Gordon J. "'The Tyranny of a Popish Successor' and the Politics of Religious Toleration" in *Restoration, Ideology, and Revolution Papers Presented at the Folger Institute Seminar "Political Thought in the Later Stuart Age, 1649-1702"* Directed by Howard Nenner, ed. Gordon J. Schochet, 83-104. Washington D.C: The Folger Institute, 1990.
- Scott, Jonathan. *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Seaton, Alexander Adam. *The Theory of Toleration Under the Later Stuarts*. New York: Octagon Books, 1972.
- Seed, John. *Dissenting Histories: Religious Division and the Politics of Memory in Eighteenth-Century England*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.
- . "History and Narrative Identity: Religious Dissent and the Politics of Memory in Eighteenth-Century England." *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 1 (2005): 46-63.

- Sefton, Henry. "‘Neu-lights and Preachers Legall’: Some Observations on the Beginnings of Moderatism in the Church of Scotland." In *Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929*: edited by Norman Macdougall, 186-196. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1983.
- Sharp, Richard. "Our Common Mother, the Church of England’: Nonjurors, High Churchmen and the Evidence of Subscription Lists." In *Loyalty and Identity Jacobites at Home and Abroad*, edited by Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi, 167-179. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Shaw, John Stuart. *The Political History of Eighteenth Century Scotland*. London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1989.
- Sher, Richard. "Scotland Transformed: The Eighteenth Century." In *Scotland: A History*, edited by Jenny Wormald, 177-208. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Simonutti, Luisa. "Political Society and Religious Liberty. Locke at Cleves and in Holland." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 14, no. 3 (2006): 413-436.
- Smart, Ian Michael. "The Political Ideas of the Scottish Covenanters, 1638-88." *History of Political Thought* 1 (1980): 167-193.
- Smout, T. Christopher. *A History of the Scottish People, 1560-1830*. London: Collins, 1970.
- Speck, W. A. *James II: Profiles in Power*. London: Longman, 2002.
- Spellman, W.M. *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660-1700*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993.
- Spurr, John. *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- Starkey, A.M. "Robert Wodrow and The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland." *Church History* 43 (1974): 488-498.
- Steele, Margaret. "Anti-Jacobite Pamphleteering, 1701-20." *The Scottish Historical Review* 60 (1981): 140-155.
- Stephen, Jeffrey. "Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland and the Scottish Parliament." *The Scottish Historical Review* 89, no. 1 (2010): 19-53.

- . *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- Stevenson, David. *The Scottish Revolution, 1637-44: The Triumph of the Covenanters*. London: Trinity Press David and Charles Holdings, 1973.
- Stewart, Ralph. "Gilbert Burnet's Politics." *International Review of Scottish Studies* 33 (2008): 37-60.
- Sullivan, Robert E. "The Transformation of Anglican Political Theology, c. 1716-1760" In *Politics, Politeness, and Patriotism Papers Presented at the Folger Institute Seminar "Politics and Politeness: British Political Thought in the Age of Walpole"* Directed by N.T. Phillipson, edited by Gordon Schochet, Patricia E. Tatspaugh, and Carol Brobeck, 31-46. Washington D.C: The Folger Institute, 1993.
- Sunderman, Jeffrey M. *Orthodox and Enlightenment George Campbell in the Eighteenth-Century*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.
- Szechi, Daniel. *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- . *George Lockhart of Carnwath, 1689-1727: A Study in Jacobitism*. East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 2002.
- . *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe 1688-1788*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.
- . *Jacobitism and Tory Politics*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1984.
- . "The Mainstream of Scottish Jacobitism." In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, edited by T.M. Devine and Jenny Wormald, 355-369. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . "The Politics of 'Persecution': Scots Episcopalian Toleration and the Harley Ministry, 1710-12." In *Studies in Church History Number 21: Persecution and Toleration*, edited by W.J. Sheils, 275-287. Padstow: T.J. Press Ltd, 1984.
- Taylor, Stephen. "Plus ça change ...?: New Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688." *The Historical Journal* 37, no. 2 (June 1994): 457-470.
- Terry, Charles Sanford. *The Scottish Parliament Its Constitution and Procedure 1603-1707*. Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1905.

- Thompson, Willie . “From Reformation to Union.” In *Scottish Capitalism Class, State and Nation from before the Union to the Present*, edited by Tony Dickson, 63-88. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1980.
- Traill, Henry Duff. *William the Third*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1911.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh. *The Invention of Scotland: Myth and History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Troost, Wout. *William III, the Stadholder-King*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.
- Vallance, Edward. *The Glorious Revolution 1688: Britain’s Fight for Liberty*. New York: Pegasus Books, 2008.
- Van Der Zee, Henri and Barbara. *William and Mary*. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1973.
- Wallace, Valerie. “Presbyterian Moral Economy: The Covenanting Tradition and Popular Protest in Lowland Scotland, 1707-c.1746.” *The Scottish Historical Review* 89, no. 1 (2010): 54-72.
- Ward, William Reginald. “Anglicanism and Assimilation; or Mysticism and Mayhem in the Eighteenth-Century.” In *Crown and Mitre: Religion and Society in Northern Europe Since the Reformation*, edited by W. M Jacob and Nigel Yates, 81-91. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993.
- Warrick, John. *The Moderators of the Church of Scotland from 1690 to 1740*. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson, and Ferrier, 1913.
- Webb, R.K. “From Toleration to Liberty.” In *Liberty Secured? Britain Before and After 1688*, edited by J.R. Jones, 158-198. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Whatley, Christopher. *The Scots and the Union*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- . *Scottish Society 1707-1830: Beyond Jacobitism, Towards Industrialisation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- White, Gavin. *The Scottish Episcopal Church: A New History*. Edinburgh: Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, 1998.
- Whyte, Ian D. *Scotland Before the Industrial Revolution: An Economic and Social History, c. 1050-1750*. London: Longman, 1995.

Worden, Blair. "The Question of Secularization." In *A Nation Transformed: England After the Restoration*, edited by Alan Houston and Steven Pincus, 20-40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Wormald, Jenny. "Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929." In *Church, Politics and Society: Scotland 1408-1929*, edited by Norman Macdougall, 65-84. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1983.

Wykes, David. Friends, Parliament, and the Toleration Act. *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45 (1994): 42-63.

---. "Religious Dissent, the Church, and the Repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts, 1714-19" In *Religion, Politics and Dissent, 1660-1832, Essays in Honor of James Bradley*, edited by Robert D. Cornwall and William Gibson, 165-183. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010.

Unpublished Dissertations and Theses

Clarke, Tristram. "The Scottish Episcopalians, 1688-1720." Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1987 .