

**Conscience and Allegiance: An
Investigation into the Controversy
over Oaths of Allegiance and
Supremacy during the Reign of
William III and II, 1689-1702.**

Ph.D. History, 2016.

Jeffrey Alexander John Chambers

**University of Dublin, Trinity
College.**

Declaration

I declare that this thesis has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university and it is entirely my own work.

I agree to deposit this thesis in the University's open access institutional repository or allow the library to do so on my behalf, subject to Irish Copyright Legislation and Trinity College Library conditions of use and acknowledgement.

Jeffrey Alexander John Chambers

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Robert Armstrong, for his great help, advice and support over the years. The Irish Research Council, Government of Ireland Postgraduate Scholarship funded my Ph.D. and I am grateful for this blessing. I am thankful for the constant encouragement on this journey from my mum, Liz, and brother, Richard. I would also like to thank all those who have helped me on my journey over the years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: HISTORY AS A GUIDE IN THE INITIAL ALLEGIANCE DEBATES FROM JANUARY 1689.	31
CHAPTER TWO: PASSIVE OBEDIENCE AND NON-RESISTANCE.	62
CHAPTER THREE: CONQUEST THEORIES, 1689-92.	99
CHAPTER FOUR: CONTRACTS, LIBERTIES AND ALLEGIANCE.	134
CHAPTER FIVE: TOLERATION, ESTABLISHED CHURCHES AND ALLEGIANCE.	183
CHAPTER SIX: ALLEGIANCE AND PERCEPTIONS OF CATHOLIC ALLEGIANCE.	228
CHAPTER SEVEN: RIGHTFUL AND LAWFUL: ALLEGIANCE TO <i>DE JURE</i> MONARCHS.	260
CHAPTER EIGHT: PROVIDENTIAL THEORY IN THE LATE 1690s.	315
CHAPTER NINE: ABJURATION: DEFENDING THE ESTABLISHMENT.	348
CONCLUSION	389
APPENDICES	396
BIBLIOGRAPHY	413

Introduction

In the winter of 1688-9 King James II and VII fled Britain and was replaced on the thrones of England, Scotland and Ireland by his son-in-law William of Orange and daughter Mary in events known as the Glorious Revolution. Across the Three Kingdoms bitter public debates erupted over whether subjects could take Oaths of Allegiance to the new monarchs despite having sworn allegiance to James, who was alive and demanding allegiance as the legitimate King. James Hamilton, Earl of Arran's January 1689 speech to Scottish nobles meeting in London highlighted this moral conundrum. Arran hailed William's rescuing the Kingdoms 'from Popery' but that did not allow Arran to 'Violate' his 'Duty' to James; Arran said that he disliked James's 'Popery' but had 'sworn and do owe Allegiance' to James's 'Person.' James was 'the KING' and it was his 'Right' to have subjects' allegiance, making it 'impossible for' Arran to 'sign away' allegiance and offer it to William.¹ In Early Modern Europe Allegiance Oaths were the strongest bonds of loyalty to monarchs. From local to national level these were prerequisites for obtaining political, civil and frequently religious offices. Publicly swearing allegiance bound subjects' consciences to a ruler, allowing governments to claim popular support and legitimacy. This was a big political and moral decision.² Numerous contemporary polemicists described allegiance as crucial to a government's viability and legitimacy; without allegiance there would be chaos. The trust involved in swearing allegiance was 'the Foundation of peace' in a kingdom.³ Debates over paying William allegiance were crucial to the Revolution because without allegiance William's regime and the Revolution settlements would not survive.

¹ James Hamilton, Earl of Arran, *A Short Speech Made by the Right Honourable the Earl of*

² John Spurr, "'The Strongest Bond of Conscience: Oaths and the Limits of Tolerance in Early Modern England,' in Harold E. Braun & Edward Vallance (eds.) *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700* (London, 2004), pp.151-6; Alexandra Walsham, 'Ordeals of Conscience: Casuistry, Conformity and Confessional Identity in Post-Reformation England,' in Braun, Vallance (eds.) *Contexts of Conscience*, pp.34-48; Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1533-1682* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp.17-22; Tim Harris, *Revolution The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2007), pp.16-20; Mark Goldie, 'The Unacknowledged Republic: Officeholding in Early Modern England,' in Tim Harris (ed.) *The Politics of the Excluded, c.1500-1850* (Basingstoke, 2001), pp.153-85.

³ Pierre Allix, *An Examination of the Scruples of those who Refuse to Take the Oath of Allegiance* (London, 1689), p.17; Gilbert Burnet, *An Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs...* (London, 1689), pp.3-4; Sir Robert Howard, *Historical Observations upon the Reigns of Edward I, II, III, and Richard II...* (London, 1689), p.43.

Allegiance Oaths symbolised political legitimacy and public approval of a government. These Oaths as public declarations, and the various public justifications of positions on allegiance, became, according to Steven Pincus and Julian Hoppit, public interpretations of the Revolution.⁴ Given this importance research on post-Revolution Allegiance debates in the Three Kingdoms has been surprisingly limited. Mark Goldie's 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument' is the most influential history of England's Allegiance Controversy and has been cited in numerous histories of the Revolution or of oaths in general. Goldie examined English allegiance pamphlets published between 1689 and 1694 and the frequency of the ideas these polemics employed to either justify or reject allegiance to William as a *de facto* King, a King in possession of the throne. This provided insights into contemporary political thought, public expressions of opinions by the politically involved, on the Revolution.⁵ Goldie and Howard Nenner have said that the justifications of the Revolution and allegiance to William as *de facto* King show the popular wariness of accepting the Revolution and its implications.⁶ Gerald Straka and Charles Mullet also examined the Allegiance Controversy and, like Goldie, considered this mainly in the terms of an English Anglican phenomenon in the first years of William's reign.⁷

Edward Vallance, David Martin Jones, J.P. Kenyon and Kevin Sharpe also examined early-1690s English Allegiance debates as part of broad studies into seventeenth-century loyalty oaths or to explain the changing post-Revolution politics.⁸ However the distinctness of the post-Revolution

⁴ Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (London, 2009), pp.441-2; Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford, 2000), pp.34-6.

⁵ Mark Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument,' *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 83 (1980), pp.473-520; Harris, *Revolution*, pp.358-9 Footnotes 114, 115; Pincus, *1688*, pp.440-1 Footnote 11; Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, p.201 Footnote 2.

⁶ Mark Goldie, 'The English System of Liberty,' in Mark Goldie & Robert Walker (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.40-5; idem 'The Revolution of 1689,' pp.473-5; Howard Nenner, 'The Later Stuart Age,' in J.G.A. Pocock (ed) with the assistance of Gordon J. Schochet & Lois G. Schwoerer *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.196-208.

⁷ Mark Goldie, 'Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium* in the Revolution Debate, 1689-1693,' *Historical Journal*, 20, No. 3 (Sep., 1977), pp.569-86; idem, 'The English System of Liberty,' pp.40-7; Gerald Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962); Charles F. Mullet, 'A Case of Allegiance: William Sherlock and the Revolution of 1688,' *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 10, No. 1 (Nov., 1946), pp.83-103; idem, 'Religion, Politics, and Oaths in the Glorious Revolution of 1688,' *The Review of Politics*, 10, No. 4, (Oct., 1948), pp.462-74.

⁸ Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, pp.193-209; J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (Cambridge, 1990), passim; Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (London, 2013), pp.322-9, 358-70; David

allegiance debates and the importance of the later-1690s allegiance debates to the success of the Revolution are neglected. Only a few historians have examined mid-1690s debates over allegiance to William as *de jure*, rightful and lawful, King while Abjuration oaths are barely mentioned.⁹ This thesis seeks to give the fullest account of allegiance debates in England, Scotland and Ireland. It examines debates over allegiance to William as *de facto* and *de jure* King along with the overlooked late-1690s rhetoric on allegiance, at Abjuration oaths and at public views on allegiance by those outside the Anglican Communion.

Tim Harris convincingly argues that late-Stuart period ideas on allegiance should be considered and examined as part of a British, as opposed to purely English, History of Political Thought. A History of British Political Thought examines the political ideas and public discourse surrounding events, like the Revolution, in the Three Kingdoms. Polemicists across the Kingdoms used common ideas, albeit in circumstances unique to each Kingdom, to justify allegiance.¹⁰ Existing research on post-Revolution allegiance debates in Scotland and Ireland is even more limited than the historiography on the English debates. The few histories of Irish political thought on the Revolution focus mainly on Irish Anglican representations of the Revolution in the subsequent years and decades. Most references to Irish Anglican allegiance polemics refer to their citation of popular Providential or Conquest theories to justify allegiance to William as *de facto* King. J.I. McGuire argues that because Ireland was largely under Jacobite control until 1690-1 Irish Anglicans merely adapted ‘well argued’ English allegiance polemics to Irish circumstances.¹¹ S.J. Connolly and others also argue that English arguments were adapted to Irish circumstances but that Irish Anglicans were less restrained than English

Martin Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (Rochester, 1999); H.T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London, 1977).

⁹ Pincus, *1688*, pp.440-3, 446-7, 450-6, 463-70; Edward Vallance, ‘Loyal or Rebellious? Protestant Associations in England 1584-1696,’ *Seventeenth Century*, 17, Issue 1 (2002), pp.15-8; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.329-33, 347, 404-6, 457-8, 482-94; Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London, 1967), pp.63-5, 87-90.

¹⁰ Tim Harris, ‘In Search of a British History of Political Thought,’ in David Armitage (ed.) *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.98-108; J.G.A. Pocock, Gordon Schochet & Lois G. Schwoerer, ‘The History of British Political Thought: A Field and its Futures,’ in Armitage (ed.), *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory*, pp.10-9.

¹¹ J.I. McGuire, ‘The Church of Ireland and the “Glorious Revolution” of 1688,’ in Art Cosgrove & Donal McCartney (eds.) *Studies in Irish History Presented to R. Dudley Edwards* (Dublin, 1979), pp.137-8.

Anglicans on issues like Passive Obedience after William's authority was established in Ireland.¹² Despite recognising English influence on Irish debates these examinations centring on Irish circumstances, like English historiography, only deal briefly with allegiance and neglect the allegiance debates later in William's reign.

Much of the historiography on post-Revolution Scotland focuses on the religious settlement where Presbyterianism displaced Episcopacy as the Established Church with only passing references to allegiance oaths. The oaths are mainly examined as parts of religious histories of post-Revolution Presbyterian-Episcopalian competition; the oaths are seen as Presbyterian tools to maintain their advantage over Episcopalians.¹³ The few references in political histories of post-Revolution Scotland to allegiance oaths generally treat allegiance oaths, like Abjuration, as means to gain party advantage or advance private interests.¹⁴ These religious and political histories overlook the importance of allegiance in post-Revolution Scottish public discourse. Clare Jackson and Alasdair Raffé are two of the few historians to examine Scottish post-Revolution allegiance debates. Raffé examines and compares post-Revolution Scottish state oaths with Restoration-era Oaths while Jackson briefly examined Scottish polemicists in the 1689-91 period justifying

¹² S.J. Connolly, 'The Glorious Revolution in Irish Protestant Political Thinking,' in S.J. Connolly (ed.) *Political Ideas in Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2000), pp.28-53; Robert Eccleshall, 'Anglican Political Thought in the Century after the Revolution of 1688,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1993), pp.42-53, 57-60; idem, 'The Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland in the 1690s,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Basingstoke, 2001), pp.63, 68-71.

¹³ Jeffrey Stephen, *Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland, 1689-1716* (Farnham, 2013), pp.40-2, 69-80, 139-42, 165-9, 186-203, 244-6, 295-6; T.N. Clarke, 'The Scottish Episcopalians 1688-1720,' (University of Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 1987), pp.21-30, 34-8, 55-9, 65-6, 109-23, 131-6, 176-8, 384-5; idem, 'The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society Records*, XXIV, Part I (1990), pp.48-91; Thomas Maxwell, 'William III and the Scots Presbyterians Part II,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XV, Part III (1965), pp.170-1; D.H Whiteford, 'Jacobitism as a factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland 1689-1690, Part I,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XVI, Part II (1967), pp.129-49; idem, 'Jacobitism as a factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland, Part II The Afflicted Church,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XVI, Part III (1968), pp.185-201.

¹⁴ P.W.J. Riley, 'The Abjuration Vote of 27 June 1702 in the Scottish Parliament,' *Parliamentary History* Vol. 2 (1983), pp.175-90; idem, *King William and the Scottish Politicians* (Edinburgh, 1979), pp.111-2, 118-9, 159-60; Derek J. Patrick, 'Unconventional Procedure: Scottish Electoral Politics after the Revolution,' in Keith M. Brown & Alastair J. Mann (eds.) *The History of the Scottish Parliament Volume II Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1567-1707* (Edinburgh, 2005).

allegiance to William as *de facto* King.¹⁵ This study hopes to redress the neglect of post-Revolution allegiance debates in Scotland and Ireland as part of an examination of such debates across the Three Kingdoms. Debates over allegiance to William or James dominated public discourse in all Three Kingdoms and lasted throughout William's reign. Understanding these public views, the political thought, on William, James and the Revolution through allegiance polemics in the Kingdoms provides new insights into William's reign, Jacobitism and the Revolution settlements' survivability.

This investigation into Allegiance Debates in the Three Kingdoms seeks to answer three important questions. How was allegiance to either William or James justified throughout William's thirteen-year reign is the first question. As Harris points out there were common ideas across the Kingdoms on allegiance and also contradictions.¹⁶ This study examines the key ideas and issues used to justify allegiance in each Kingdom. Ideas on allegiance were contested at every point not only between Williamites and Jacobites but also amongst Williamites.¹⁷ Subjects had to be conscientiously satisfied when giving allegiance. Abednego Seller's *History of Passive Obedience* and the numerous Williamite and Jacobite responses sought to convince subjects what the morally correct action on allegiance was.¹⁸

Historians have examined some of the ideas on allegiance, like Conquest or Providential theories, but mainly in single-kingdom contexts.¹⁹

¹⁵ Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp.191-215, 217-21; idem, 'Revolution Principles, *Ius Naturae* and *Ius Gentium* in Early-Enlightenment Scotland: The Contribution of Sir Francis Grant, Lord Cullen (c. 1660-1729) in Tim Hochstrasser & Peter Schröder (eds.) *Early Modern Natural Law Theories: Contexts and Strategies in the Early Enlightenment* (Dordrecht, 2003), pp.107-12, 118-25; Alasdair Raffae, 'Scottish State Oaths and the Revolution of 1688-90,' in Sharon Adams & Julian Goodare (eds.) *Scotland in the Age of Two Revolutions* (Woodbridge, 2014), pp.173-93.

¹⁶ Harris, 'Search of a British History of Political Thought,' pp.102-3; idem, 'Incompatible Revolutions?: The Established Church and the Revolutions of 1688-89 in Ireland, England and Scotland,' in Allan I. Macinnes & Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.) *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century* (Dublin, 2002), pp.204-25.

¹⁷ Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.5-10, 30-48, 56-60, 88-90. English Whigs and Tories are the most obvious example of inter-Williamite antagonism.

¹⁸ Abednego Seller, *History of Passive Obedience...* (Amsterdam, 1689); Edward Fowler, *A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England...* (London, 1689); Thomas Long, *The Historian Unmask'd...* (London, 1689); Thomas Morer, *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland...* (London, 1690); George Hickes, *A Letter to the Author of a Late Paper, entitled, "A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England, &c"* (n.p., 1689).

¹⁹ Goldie, 'Edmund Bohun and *Ius Gentium*,' pp.569-86; M.P. Thompson, 'The Idea of Conquest in Controversies Over the 1688 Revolution,' *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar., 1977), pp.33-46; Thomas P. Slaughter, "'Abdicate" and "Contract" in the Glorious Revolution,' *The Historical Journal*, 24, No. 2 (Jun., 1981), pp.323-37; Jackson, 'Revolution Principles, *Ius Naturae* and *Ius Gentium*,' pp.107-12, 118-25; Kenneth Padley,

Polemicists on allegiance frequently did not confine themselves to a single idea or issue, although there were times, like in 1702 or early 1689, when certain ideas were more prevalent than others. This is why some pamphlets appear in more than one chapter. It is also why this study takes a thematic and chronological approach with each chapter devoted to a specific idea or issue affecting allegiance debates at certain times in each Kingdom. Chapter One explores how History was used as a guide on allegiance in early 1689. The use of the Anglican doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance from 1689 to c.1692 is explored in Chapter Two while Chapter Three deals with Conquest theories between 1689 and 1693. Ideas about Contracts and Liberties from the mid-1690s are the focus of Chapter Four. Chapter Five deals with allegiance polemics by Protestants who did not conform to the Established Protestant Churches in each Kingdom while Chapter Six examines how Catholic declarations of allegiance affected debates. Mid-1690s' debates over allegiance to *de jure* monarchs are examined in Chapter Seven. Chapter Eight investigates late-1690s use of Providential theories, while Abjuration debates in the twilight of William's reign are examined in Chapter Nine. These ideas impacted on allegiance debates in each Kingdom and by exploring and comparing how these ideas were employed in each Kingdom this thesis aims to construct a History of British Political Thought. In doing so fresh insights into the Revolution and the political thought on it are gained.

As this is a Three-Kingdom study the second question this thesis seeks to answer is whether or not there was a convergence or divergence of the ideas and issues affecting allegiance in the Three Kingdoms. There were common ideas in each Kingdom but understanding whether or not these ideas played out in a similar manner in each Kingdom is important in order to effectively judge the security of William's regime across the Three Kingdoms. Ideas, like Conquest theories, were debated in each Kingdom and each Chapter examines whether or not these common ideas were employed in a similar manner across the Kingdoms.²⁰ Issues and ideas in one Kingdom frequently influenced

'Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution: William Sherlock and William of Orange,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 59, No. 4 (Oct., 2008), pp.680-96.

²⁰ Examples of Conquest theory from each Kingdom are: Sir Francis Grant, *The Loyalists' Reasons For his Giving Obedience, and Swearing Allegiance, to the Present Government...* (Edinburgh, 1689), p.29; Edward Wetenhall, *The Case of the Irish Protestants: In Relation to Recognising, or Swearing Allegiance to, And Praying for King William and Queen Mary, Stated and Resolved.* (London, 1691), p.6; Thomas Bainbrigg, *Seasonable Reflections on a Late Pamphlet entituled A History of Passive Obedience since the*

debates in the other Kingdoms. English Whigs repeatedly cited Scotland's Assurance, which recognised William as *de jure* King years before there was a similar oath in England, when calling for allegiance to William as *de jure* King in England. There was no such oath in England until 1696 showing that alongside this common idea in England and Scotland there was some divergence on the urgent necessity of translating it into a distinct oath.²¹ Exploring the similarities and differences in the Allegiance Debates in each Kingdom provides insights into the reactions to allegiance and the Revolution. This also contributes to the construction of this History of British Political Thought of the Revolution.

The final question this thesis seeks to answer is how and why the nature of allegiance changed over the course of William's reign. It will be argued that there was a gradual change in public views on allegiance, and hence the Revolution, during William's thirteen-year reign. Each chapter shows the changing nature of allegiance. The first three chapters examine the initial justifications of allegiance to William as *de facto* King before the mid-1690s when allegiance tests recognising William as *de jure* King were introduced, as explored in Chapter Seven.²² With a draining war, economic crises and William's perceived failures as King some Williamites chose to withdraw allegiance from William and return it to James.²³ From 1701 the issue of William's successors prompted debates over Abjuration oaths, which renounced the Jacobite claimant and pledged support for the Revolution settlements.²⁴ By examining Allegiance Debates throughout William's reign

Reformation wherein the true Notion of Passive Obedience is settled... (London, 1690), pp.41-3.

²¹ William Atwood, *The Antiquity and Justice of an Oath of Abjuration in Answer to a Treatise, entituled, The Case of an Oath of Abjuration Considered* (London, 1694), pp.5, 9-11, 30-8, 40-7, 49-51, 68-9; Samuel Johnson, *Notes upon the Phoenix Edition of the Pastoral Letter Part I* (London, 1694), pp.8-9, 24; *Some Seasonable Queries, on the Second Head, viz. An Oath of Abjuration, or at Least Declarative of His Majesty's Right* (n.p., 1696), p.2.

²² Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time Volume II...* (London, 1734), pp.169-70; Privy Council of Scotland, *Act for Taking the Oath of Alledgeance and Assurance* (Edinburgh, 1693).

²³ Mark Goldie & Clare Jackson, 'Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites,' in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007), pp.178-86; Robert Ferguson, *Whether the Late Parliament be not in Law Dissolved by the death of the Princess of Orange?*... (n.p., 1695), passim.

²⁴ Burnet, *History of his own Time*, pp.314, 340; Patrick Hume, Earl of Marchmont, 'Memorial concerning some proceeding in the Parliament of Scotland,' 1 July 1702, *A Selection from the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont, in the possession of the Right Honourable Sir George Henry Rose: Illustrative of the Events from 1685 to 1750; in Three Volumes, Volume III* (London, 1831), pp.242-8.

and across the Kingdoms this study aims to give as comprehensive insight as possible into the evolving public reactions of the politically involved on the Revolution. How and why opinions changed is important to understanding the support for the Revolution and whether subjects were prepared to accept it as permanent.

This exercise in the History of British Political Thought provides new understandings of the allegiance debates and the Revolution. It contributes to the limited History of British Political Thought. A History of British Political Thought, the public opinions of the politically involved in the Three Kingdoms, provides insights into the ideas and issues, which fuelled the Allegiance debates across the Kingdoms. Exploring this Political Thought provides new understanding of events, like the Revolution, in the Kingdoms. For centuries examinations of the Revolution and its aftermath in England tended to focus on political, constitutional and religious issues or how radical or conservative the Revolution was.²⁵ Scottish and Irish historiographies also focus on the nature of the Revolution and political, constitutional and religious issues.²⁶ The few examinations of the Revolution in a Three-Kingdom context similarly focus on politics and constitutional issues.²⁷

²⁵ Good overviews of the differing views on the Revolution are given in Lionel K.J. Glassey, 'In Search of the *Mot Juste*: Characterizations of the Revolution of 1688-89,' Gabriel Glickman, 'Political Conflict and the Memory of the Revolution in England, 1689-c.1745,' Stephen Taylor, 'Afterword: State Formation, Political Stability and the Revolution of 1688,' all in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (eds.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013). Notable examples of the debates over the nature of the Revolution in England are: Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France...* (London, 1791), pp.1-32; Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England From The Accession of James the Second Volume I, Volume IV, Volume V*, ed. Charles Harding Firth (London, 1913); George Macaulay Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts* (London, 1965), pp.429-42; W.A. Speck, *The Reluctant Revolutionaries...* (Oxford, 1988); Pincus, *1688*; J.R. Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (London, 1972); Lois Schwoerer, *The Declaration of Rights, 1689* (London, 1981).

²⁶ J.G. Simms, *Jacobite Ireland 1685-1691* (London, 1961); idem, 'The Establishment of Protestant Ascendancy 1691-1714,' in T.W. Moody & W.E. Vaughan (eds.) *A New History of Ireland, IV Eighteenth-Century Ireland 1691-1800* (Dublin, 1986); Thomas Bartlett, *The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation: The Catholic Question 1690-1830* (Dublin, 1992); Patrick Kelly, 'Ireland and the Glorious Revolution: From Kingdom to Colony,' in Robert Beddard (ed.) *The Revolutions of 1688* (Oxford, 1991); D.W. Hayton, *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians and Parties* (Woodbridge, 2004), passim; Toby Barnard, 'Ireland, 1688-91,' in Harris & Taylor (eds.) *Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy*, pp.176-87; D.W. Hayton, 'The Williamite Revolution in Ireland, 1689-91,' in Jonathan I. Israel (ed.) *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact* (Cambridge, 2003); Karl S. Bottigheimer, 'The Glorious Revolution and Ireland,' in Lois G. Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.234-40; Robert Paul Barnes, 'Scotland and the Glorious Revolution of 1688,' *Albion*, 3, No. 3 (Autumn, 1971), pp.116-27; Alasdair Raffe, 'The Restoration, the Revolution and the Failure of Episcopacy in Scotland,' in Harris & Taylor (eds.) *Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy*; William Ferguson, *Scotland, 1689 to the Present* (Edinburgh, 1968); Patrick, 'Unconventional Procedure,'

Investigating post-Revolution allegiance polemics gives a new perspective on these questions by discovering how the politically involved, who were generally tendered the oaths, reacted to the Revolution. Allegiance polemics provide insights into what subjects believed about the radical or conservative nature of the Revolution in each Kingdom and the changes the Revolution ushered in, but these views evolved. For example polemics from early in William's reign were more inclined to focus on how the Revolution was a matter of William replacing James as King but without constitutional innovations. Scottish Presbyterian Williamite Sir Francis Grant said that the 'Head only changed;' William became King without significant upheavals. The focus was on allegiance to the monarch's person.²⁸ As time went on there was greater emphasis on allegiance to William as a means of supporting the changes that William's succession was popularly seen as ushering in. Some Williamites who played down the Revolution and denied that William's succession involved anything but William replacing James eventually accepted that William's succession brought other beneficial changes. Henry Compton, the Tory Bishop of London, in reasserting loyalty to William praised the Toleration Act, which he originally opposed, for making Protestant Dissenters into loyal Williamites.²⁹ By the end of William's reign there was even greater emphasis on allegiance supporting the Revolution settlement beyond William's life. Advocates of Abjuration hailed these oaths as allegiance to the Revolution settlement and the changes it ushered in.³⁰

pp.208-11, 227-9; Ian Cowan, 'The Reluctant Revolutionaries: Scotland in 1688,' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *By Force or Default? The Revolution of 1688-1689* (Edinburgh, 1989), pp.163-74; Christopher A. Whatley, *The Scots and the Union Then and Now* (Edinburgh, 2014), pp.2-4, 13-9, 31-9, 44-9, 53-4, 88-91, 103-6.

²⁷ W.A. Speck, 'William III and the Three Kingdoms,' in Mijers & Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III*; 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 (Jan., 1999), pp.28-9; idem, *Revolution*, passim; Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester, 1994), pp.21-4, 30-4, 41, 51-3, 58, 63, 66-8; Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (London, 1980), pp.9-11, 84, 290; John Morrill, 'The Sensible Revolution,' in Israel (ed.) *Anglo-Dutch Moment*, pp.82-6, 98-103; Geoffrey Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power: Late Stuart and Early Georgian Britain 1660-1722* (Harlow, 1993), passim; Alexander Murdoch, *British History, 1660-1832: National Identity and Local Culture* (Basingstoke, 1998), pp.33-9, 44-5; Edward Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution 1688: Britain's Fight for Liberty* (London, 2006).

²⁸ Grant, *Loyalists Reasons*, pp.27-8, 47-8, 57-8, 100, 105-8.

²⁹ Henry Compton, *The Bishop of London's Eight Letter to his Clergy, &c.* (London, 1692), pp.3-5, 8-9, 14-5, 17-9.

³⁰ *Principles upon which the Taking the Oath of Abjuration may be grounded* (London, 1702), pp.15, 18-23; James Webster, *A Letter from one of the Country Party to his Friend of the Court Party* (Edinburgh, 1704), pp.2, 5, 7-9; Marchmont, 'Memorial Concerning Affairs in Scotland... to Anne,' 11 July 1702, *Marchmont Papers*, pp.249-52; John Toland, *I. reasons for*

Rejection of allegiance to William either by political figures or clerics meant that person would be seen as disloyal and liable to retribution.³¹ Paul Monod rightly argues that rejecting allegiance to William, as many Anglican Nonjurors did, indicated public Jacobitism even if they did not actively participate in Jacobite conspiracies.³² Jacobitism has been accepted as a part of eighteenth-century politics in the British Isles but historiography has focused on Jacobite conspiracies and politics.³³ There have been some examinations of the ideas that motivated Jacobites but these studies have mostly been single-kingdom studies and overlook the importance of the allegiance debates in creating and sustaining Jacobitism across the Kingdoms. Many of these investigations have focused on Jacobite adherence to ideas like divine right and hereditary monarchy while some historians isolate Nonjurors' religious ideas from the wider Jacobitism.³⁴ Monod's study of English Jacobitism has pointed

addressing His Majesty to invite into England...the Dowager and the Electoral Prince of Hanover...II Reasons for ...Abjuring the Pretended Prince of Wales... (London, 1702), pp.18-20.

³¹ Those who refused the Oath of Allegiance in the first years of William's reign were liable to expulsion from offices and also double taxation. This is shown in 'News Letter,' 12 November 1689, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William and Mary, 13 Feb. 1689-April 1690*, ed. William John Hardy (London, 1895), pp.318-9. In Scotland rejection of the Oath of Allegiance and Assurance would lead to exclusion from political, civil and religious offices. *Act for Taking the Oath of Alledgeance and the Assurance Edinburgh, the Twentie Third day of May, 1693* (Edinburgh, 1693).

³² Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989), pp.138-9.

³³ J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832 Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 2000), 18, 88-98, 112-22; Éamonn Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766: A Fatal Attachment* (Dublin, 2002), passim; Szechi, *Jacobites*; Lenman, *Jacobite Risings*; Sir Charles Petrie, *The Jacobite Movement* (London, 1959); Eveline Cruickshanks, 'Attempts to Restore the Stuarts, 1689-96,' in Eveline Cruickshanks & Edward Corp (eds.) *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1959).

³⁴ Bruce P. Lenman, 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism,' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759* (Edinburgh, 1982); Murray Pittock, 'Jacobitism Ideology in Scotland and at St. Germain-en-Laye,' in Eveline Cruickshanks & Edward Corp (eds.) *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995), passim; Daniel Szechi, *Jacobitism and the Tory Party, 1710-1714* (Edinburgh, 1984), p.1; idem, 'The Jacobite Revolution Settlement, 1689-1696,' *The English Historical Review*, 108, No. 428 (Jul., 1993), pp.610-28; Paul Monod, 'Jacobitism and Country Principles in the Reign of William III,' *Historical Journal*, 30, No. 2 (Jun., 1987), pp.289-310; Charles-Edouard Levillain, 'Cromwell Redivivus? William III as Military Dictator: Myth and Reality,' in Mijers & Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III*, pp.159-76; Goldie & Jackson, 'Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites,' pp.177-99; John Miller, 'Proto-Jacobitism? The Tories and the Revolution of 1688-9,' in Eveline Cruickshanks & Jeremy Black (eds.) *The Jacobite Challenge* (Edinburgh, 1988), pp.7-19; George L. Cherry, 'The Legal and Philosophical Position of the Jacobites, 1688-1689,' *The Journal of Modern History*, 22, No. 4 (Dec., 1950), pp.309-21; J.H. Overton, *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London, 1902), passim; C.D.A. Leighton, 'The Non-Jurors and their History,' *The Journal of Religious History*, 29, No. 3 (Oct., 2005), pp.241-57.

out that Jacobites employed various ideas, including divine right monarchy and contract theory, but were united by their desire to restore James.³⁵

This thesis studies the diverse Jacobite views because Jacobite propagandists were frequently attuned to the popular ideas on allegiance in the Kingdoms and attempted to exploit these popular moods to urge allegiance to James. For example Charles Leslie's 1692 *Answer* employed many different ideas but the Anglican Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance doctrine was both the main idea in this polemic and was one of the most pressing issues on allegiance in 1692.³⁶ Leslie did not abandon employing this idea but his 1695 allegiance pamphlets gave greater prominence to the popular rhetoric in 1695 about allegiance to *de jure* monarchs and protecting liberties.³⁷ Examining the Three Kingdoms' allegiance debates provides new insights into Jacobitism and what sustained their continued allegiance to James, which in turn gives further insights into contemporary views of the Revolution.

This thesis also provides new understandings of Protestants not conforming to the Established Protestant Churches and of Catholics in the post-Revolution Kingdoms. Historiography for each Kingdom has generally kept examinations of post-Revolution allegiance separate from ideas of religious toleration.³⁸ R. Buick Knox and others have briefly touched on these related issues in Scotland but in what are mainly religious histories focusing on the post-Revolution place of Episcopalians. How the issues of toleration and allegiance impacted on each other in Scottish public discourse are neglected in

³⁵ Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, pp.7, 15-28, 38-9, 44, 51-2, 126-7, 135-6, 145-7, 161-9, 345-8.

³⁶ Charles Leslie, *An Answer to a Book, intituled, The State of the Protestants in Ireland...* (London, 1692), pp.1-2, 8, 27-8, 36-7, 54-9, 113-9, 121-4, 132-3, 143.

³⁷ Charles Leslie, *Querela Temporum; or, The Danger of the Church of England...* (n.p., 1695), pp.30-1; idem, *Remarks on some late Sermons in particular on Dr. Sherlock's Sermons at the Temple, Decemb. 30. 1694. In a Letter to a Friend. The Second Edition with additions* (London, 1695), pp.28-30; idem, *Considerations of Importance to Ireland, In a Letter to a Member of Parliament there; upon Occasion of Mr. Molyneux's late Book...* (n.p., 1698), pp.2-8; idem, *Gallienus Redivivus, or, Murther Will Out, &c. Being a True Account of the De-Witting of Glencoe, Gaffney...* (Edinburgh, 1695), pp.8-11, 13-7, 19-22, 24.

³⁸ J.C. Beckett, *Protestant Dissent in Ireland 1687-1780* (London, 1948), pp.27-35; Toby Barnard, *Irish Protestants Ascents and Descents, 1641-1770* (Dublin, 2004), pp.144-6; Goldie, 'The English System of Liberty,' pp.50-2; Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'Toleration and Religion after 1688,' in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel & Nicholas Tyacke (eds.) *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991), pp.391-6, 406; Nicholas Tyacke, 'The "Rise of Puritanism" and The Legalizing of Dissent, 1571-1719,' in *ibid.*, pp.41-4; Jonathan Israel, 'William III and Toleration,' in *ibid.*, pp.129-37; Clark, *English Society*, pp.36, 81-2.

a historiography more focused on the battle for ecclesiastical supremacy.³⁹ From 1692 with credible French-backed Jacobite plots and with James making overtures to English Dissenters, numerous English Nonconformist and Anglican Williamites hailed Dissenter allegiance to William, which was guaranteed because of the Toleration.⁴⁰ Across the Kingdoms the idea that Protestants not conforming to the Established Churches could have a form of legal protection in exchange for taking an ‘*Oath of Fidelity to the King*’ became part of the wider debates over allegiance.⁴¹

Much of the research into Catholics in the post-Revolution Kingdoms has naturally been Irish-centric but these examinations focus more on Catholics’ legal exclusion, particularly in Ascendancy Ireland.⁴² Some historians have touched on Catholics’ allegiance but generally as part of studies into Catholics’ political thought over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Others have briefly examined proposed oaths of allegiance to William, which would not contradict tenets of Catholicism, but focus more on the Hanoverian period with only a few mentions of the 1689-1702 period.⁴³ There has frequently been an assumption that Catholics were

³⁹ R. Buick Knox, ‘Establishment and Toleration during the Reigns of William, Mary and Anne,’ *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XXIII (1989), pp.334-8, 342-7; Whiteford, ‘Jacobitism as a Factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland, 1689-1714, Part II- The Afflicted Church,’ pp.186-7; Stephen, *Defending the Revolution*, pp.47-8, 187-96, 295-6; Alasdair Raffae, ‘Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics after the Revolution of 1688-1690,’ *Historical Journal*, 53, Issue 2 (2010), pp.322-9; Lionel K.J. Glassey, ‘William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland, 1689-90,’ *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XXII (1989), pp.319-24, 329; Colin Kidd, ‘Religious Realignment between the Restoration and Union,’ in John Robertson (ed.) *A Union for Empire: Political Thought and the British Union of 1707* (Cambridge, 1995), pp.146-58.

⁴⁰ Thomas Percival, *The Rye-House Travestie, or, A True Account and Declaration of the horrid and execrable Conspiracy against his Majesty King William...* (London, 1696), pp.41-2; Daniel Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England’s Loyalty: or, Whiggish Loyalty and Church Loyalty Compar’d* (n.p., 1702), pp.3-4, 7, 21-2, 26-7.

⁴¹ Joseph Boyse, *The Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland, In Reference to a Bill of Indulgence...* (n.p., 1695), pp.4, 8; John MacBride, *Animadversions on the Defence of the Answer to a Paper, Intituled, The CASE of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland, in Reference to a BILL of Indulgence...* (n.p., 1697), pp.35-6, 40-3, 62-3; Sir William Seton, *A Continuation of a Few Brief and Modest Reflections Perswading a Just Indulgence to be Granted to the Episcopal Clergy and People in Scotland...* (n.p., 1703), pp.9-10.

⁴² Geoff Baker, *Reading and Politics in Early Modern England: The Mental World of a Seventeenth-Century Catholic Gentleman* (Oxford, 2010), pp.35, 88-9, 91-2; Trevor-Roper, ‘Toleration and Religion after 1688,’ pp.399-400; Allan I. Macinnes, ‘Catholic Recusancy and the Penal Laws, 1603-1707,’ *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XXIII (1989); Tim Harris, ‘Politics, Religion and Community in late Stuart Ireland,’ in Robert Armstrong & Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin (eds.) *Community in Early Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2006), pp.52-8; Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause*, pp.57-63, 83; Bartlett, *Fall and Rise*, passim.

⁴³ Breandán Ó Buachalla, ‘James Our True King: The Ideology of Irish Royalism in the Seventeenth Century,’ in Boyce, Eccleshall & Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Thought in Ireland since the Seventeenth Century*, pp.11-4, 19-24; John Bossy, ‘English Catholics after 1688,’ in Grell, Israel & Tyacke (eds.) *From Persecution to Toleration*, pp.371-80; Patrick Fagan,

Jacobites because of their Catholicism although Pincus demonstrated that some Catholics were prepared to give William allegiance.⁴⁴ Politically involved Catholics, like other subjects, made public declarations on allegiance to James and William, which they said was based on their faith.⁴⁵ As with Protestants outside the Established Churches, Catholics' public justifications of allegiance became an issue that affected the wider allegiance debates across the Kingdoms.⁴⁶

While Protestants outside the Established Churches and Catholics declared allegiance because of issues surrounding their faith, these polemicists also wrote about the other ideas and issues that were important in the allegiance debates. Catholic Jacobite Alexander Irvine argued that James was owed allegiance because he was *de jure* King while Nonconformist Daniel Defoe used similar reasoning to advocate allegiance recognising William as *de jure* King.⁴⁷

This thesis explores the Allegiance Debates in all Three Kingdoms from the initial debates in January 1689 to the final debates at the twilight of William's reign in 1702. Examining how allegiance to William and James was justified, whether the ideas in each Kingdom were converging and how opinions on allegiance and the Revolution changed provides fresh insights into the Revolution. Williamite and Jacobite arguments on allegiance show what the politically informed, those subjects who were tendered the oaths of allegiance, publicly thought about the Revolution and all that it encompassed

Divided Loyalties: The Question of the Oath for Irish Catholics in the Eighteenth Century (Dublin, 1997), passim; Gabriel Glickman, *The English Catholic Community, 1688-1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge, 2009), pp.1-7, 19-20, 121-7.

⁴⁴ Raymond Gillespie, 'The Irish Protestants and James II, 1688-90,' *Irish Historical Studies*, 28, No. 110 (Nov., 1992), pp.124-5; Steven Pincus, 'The European Catholic Context of the Revolution of 1688-89: Gallicanism, Innocent XI, and Catholic Opposition,' in Allan I. Macinnes & Arthur H. Williamson (eds.) *Shaping the Stuart World 1603-1714: The Atlantic Connection* (Leiden/ Boston, 2006), pp.103-6, 110-3.

⁴⁵ Fr. Edmond Dulaney, *A Sermon Preached before the King, in Christ-Church, Dublin, On Ash-Wednesday 1689* (Dublin, 1689), pp.5-6; Charles O'Kelly *Macariae Excidium, or The Destruction of Cyprus; Being a Secret History of the War of the Revolution in Ireland...*, ed. John Cornelius O'Callaghan (Dublin, 1850), pp.71, 190; Sir D.W., *Some Reflections on the Oaths and Declaration Appointed in an Act past in the first Year of the Reign of King William and Queen Mary, In Reference to the Roman Catholicicks of England* (London, 1695), pp.9-11, 15-27.

⁴⁶ *The Present French King Demonstrated an Enemy to the Catholick as well as Protestant Religion* (London, 1691), 'Epistle to the Jacobites,' pp.1-3, 11-6, 19-22; Sir Richard Cox, *An Essay for the Conversion of the Irish; Shewing That 'tis their Duty and Interest to Become Protestants, In a Letter to Themselves* (Dublin, 1698), pp.1-10, 31-3, 35-8.

⁴⁷ Alexander Irvine, *A Dialogue Between A and B Two Plain Countrey-Gentlemen, Concerning the Times* (London, 1694), pp.3-4, 22-3, 29, 43-4; Daniel Defoe, *The Englishman's Choice...* (London, 1694), pp.5-6, 32, 18-23.

in each Kingdom. Opinions are never static; over the course of William's thirteen-year reign events and ideas impacted on allegiance polemics and this meant that political thought on the Revolution evolved. Historiography on the Revolution for all Three Kingdoms focuses more on constitutional issues and politics, overlooking the political thought that fuelled and sustained the events. This exploration of the Allegiance Debates in each Kingdom attempts to redress this neglect of ideas and provide an understanding of how the Revolution was seen at the time by those affected by it.

I

The allegiance debates were bitter public debates by politically involved subjects in each Kingdom. Political upheavals, like the Revolution, resulted in rival claims to be the Kingdoms' legitimate rulers and positions on allegiance being contested and having to be publicly justified. A History of Political Thought approach involves constructing an account of public discourses by exploring popular political ideas and opinions within their historic contexts to provide new insights into historic events by highlighting the ideas that fuelled them.⁴⁸ This thesis uses a History of Political Thought methodology because it is the most effective way to build a comprehensive account of the Kingdoms' allegiance debates. Allegiance oaths were public statements of loyalty and approval of the notions expressed in the oath. Goldie, Jones and Vallance used this methodology when conducting their investigations into aspects of seventeenth-century allegiance debates. They have described how this involves examining the main forums where allegiance was debated and analysing these primary sources to identify the popular ideas in these forums. They made extensive use of printed polemics because these were one of the most effective ways of influencing politically involved subjects who were tendered the oaths. Religious sermons and parliamentary records were also examined. By analysing these popular ideas within their historic contexts they discerned the popular political reactions, the political thought, to the tumultuous events of the seventeenth century, like the Civil Wars and Revolution, in England. Using this methodology allowed them to identify some

⁴⁸ J.G.A. Pocock, 'What is Intellectual History?', in Juliet Gardiner (ed.) *History Today*, Vol. 35, Issue 10 (1985), pp.52-3; Goldie, 'Revolution of 1689,' pp.473-520.

of the popular political thought at the time of these events and provide fresh insight into these historic events by highlighting the ideas that motivated and sustained these events.⁴⁹ This is the methodology of a History of Political Thought and is the most effective way of examining the allegiance debates and answering this study's three research questions. Using this methodology to analyse the allegiance debates in each Kingdom enables the construction of a History of Political Thought of the Revolution in a Three-Kingdom context during William's reign.

Histories of Political Thought, with their focus on public discourse and popular reactions to political events, have prompted debate amongst historians over the validity of what Habermas dubbed the 'public sphere.' Pincus, Karin Bowie and others have argued that public opinion was increasingly important to late-seventeenth-century and early-eighteenth-century politics in each Kingdom.⁵⁰ However Goldie and Vallance argue that terms like 'public sphere' or 'public opinion' are problematic because it can leave the erroneous impression that every subject was involved in these public political discourses. Vallance prefers the term 'political nation' instead of 'public sphere' when examining seventeenth-century English allegiance debates. He asserts that seventeenth-century allegiance debates show that membership of the English political nation was expanding, with more participants in political debates. However the popularity of ideas in the political nation cannot be necessarily described as representative of popularity

⁴⁹ Goldie, 'Revolution of 1689,' pp.473-95, 500-21; idem, 'English System of Liberty,' pp.40-62, 64-70; Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England*, pp.1-8, 65-6, 225, 232-6, 245, 265-8; Edward Vallance, 'The Kingdom's Case: The Use of Casuistry as a Political Language 1640-1692,' *Albion*, 34, No. 4 (Winter, 2002), pp.557-83; idem, 'Loyal or Rebellious? Protestant Associations in England 1584-1696,' *The Seventeenth Century*, 17, Issue 1 (2002), pp.1-18; idem, *Revolutionary England*, pp.3-4, 217-22.

⁵⁰ Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2000), p.29; Steven Pincus, "'Coffee Politicians Does Create:": Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture,' *The Journal of Modern History*, 67, No. 4, (Dec., 1995), pp.807-11, 819-21, 831-4; Peter Lake & Steven Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England,' in Peter Lake & Steven Pincus (eds.) *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2007), p.13; Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge, 1987), pp.27-9; Barry Coward, *The Stuart Age England 1603-1714* (Harlow, 2003), Preface; Karin Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion and The Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.6-28, 32-3; S.J Connolly, *Divided Kingdom Ireland 1630-1800* (Oxford, 2008), pp.161-3; Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2003), pp.26, 54-66, 83-97; David Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton, 2000), pp.13, 227-8; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.206-11, 505-6.

in the wider English nation.⁵¹ In the late seventeenth century subscribing to the oath of allegiance was a prerequisite for membership of the political nation. This consisted of civil, political, legal and military officeholders at local and national level and clergymen. These were the politically informed and involved subjects.⁵² It was their public political support that would ensure the success or failure of the Revolution settlements. Their public pronouncements in these allegiance debates in each Kingdom is the political thought on the Revolution this thesis explores and not the opinions, if any of every group making up the Three Kingdoms' population. Therefore any reference to public opinion or public views or public debate refers to the public debates of the politically involved subjects and not the entirety of the Three Kingdoms' population.

Daniel Defoe wrote in 1700 that public debates, 'Civil Feuds,' 'disturb' England more 'Than all our Bloody Wars have done before.'⁵³ Public political debate was crucial to politics. It was primarily conducted and played out in printed pamphlets and polemics, religious sermons, parliamentary debates and legislation. These were the main forums in which allegiance was debated between 1689 and 1702 in each of the Kingdoms and are the primary sources this thesis examines. A History of Political Thought methodology involves studying these primary sources and analysing the ideas, rhetoric and trends in them throughout William's thirteen-year reign. This allows for the identification of the arguments on allegiance that were popular and influential amongst the politically involved subjects who had to deal with this question of allegiance following the Revolution. Identifying these popular arguments and ideas on allegiance is how this study answers its research questions and provides a History of Political Thought of the Revolution in each Kingdom.

Printed pamphlets and polemics are the main primary sources for this thesis. Across the Kingdoms, with rising literacy-levels and the increasing ineffectiveness of previous censorship controls (English press controls expired in 1695), printed polemics were the most effective means of influencing the widest possible audience in the political nations. This allowed Williamites and Jacobites great freedom when describing the Revolution in their arguments on

⁵¹ Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, pp.217-22; Goldie, 'Revolution of 1689,' pp.473-95, 518-21.

⁵² Goldie, 'Unacknowledged Republic,' pp.153-85; Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, pp.17-22; Walsham, 'Ordeals of Conscience,' pp.34-48; Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance*, pp.1-16, 64-8, 170-84, 199-205.

⁵³ Daniel Defoe, *The True-Born Englishman. A Satyr* (London, 1700), p.1.

allegiance.⁵⁴ Goldie, Jones and Vallance, amongst other historians, describe how analysing numerous pamphlets and noting how frequently certain ideas were employed in these pamphlets provides an insight into the reception of these views and the popular political thought.⁵⁵ Pamphleteers at the time recognised that their pamphlets had enormous influence on their audiences, who formed part of the political nation, and on the course of political debate. The numerous pamphlets commenting on allegiance testify to the value Williamites and Jacobites placed on this media in persuading subjects to either take or reject the new allegiance oaths. One Williamite pamphlet noted the numerous printed polemics ‘offering’ subjects ‘all the Arguments they could think of’ to persuade them of the righteousness of a position on allegiance.⁵⁶ The Whig clergyman Gilbert Burnet in his *Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs* said that he wrote this pamphlet ‘with all possible plainness’ to ‘convince’ his readers to give William allegiance.⁵⁷ Other polemicists similarly stated that their printed pamphlets would help subjects decide whether or not they could conscientiously give William allegiance.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Lois G. Schwoerer, ‘Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89,’ *The American Historical Review*, 82, No. 4 (Oct., 1977), pp.843-4, 871; Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England 1640-1660* (London, 1994), pp.1-2, 24-31; Raymond Gillespie, *Reading Ireland: Print, Reading and Social Change in Early Modern Ireland* (Manchester, 2005), pp.4-7, 115; Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2003), pp.26, 54-66, 83-97, 179-81; Ian Atherton, ‘The Press and Popular Political Opinion,’ in Barry Coward (ed.) *A Companion to Stuart Britain* (Oxford, 2003), pp.91-8; Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (Guilford, 2000), p.58; Paul Monod, ‘The Jacobite Press and English Censorship 1688-95,’ in Cruickshanks & Corp (eds.) *The Stuart Court in Exile*, pp.136-42; Geoff Kemp, ‘Suppressing Jacobitism,’ in Geoff Kemp (ed.) *Censorship and the Press, 1550-1720 Volume 3, 1660-1695* (London, 2009), pp.391-2; Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union*, pp.45-64.

⁵⁵ David Armitage, ‘Introduction,’ in David Armitage (ed.) *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.1-2, 5-9; J.G.A Pocock, Gordon Schochet & Lois G. Schwoerer, ‘The History of British Political Thought: A Field and its Future,’ in *Ibid*, pp.10-6; J.G.A. Pocock, ‘What is Intellectual History?,’ in Juliet Gardiner (ed.) *History Today*, Vol. 35, Issue 10 (1985), pp.52-3; Goldie, ‘Revolution of 1689,’ pp.473-520; Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England*, pp.1-8, 220-5, 232-6, 245, 265-8; Edward Vallance, ‘The Kingdom’s Case: The Use of Casuistry as a Political Language 1640-1692,’ *Albion*, 34, No. 4 (Winter, 2002), pp.557-83; *idem*, ‘Loyal or Rebellious? Protestant Associations in England 1584-1696,’ *The Seventeenth Century*, 17, Issue 1 (2002), pp.1-18; *idem*, *Revolutionary England*, pp.3-4, 217-22; Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2006), pp.4-18, 22-30, 41-57, 182-5, 255-6.

⁵⁶ A.B., *Allegiance Vindicated: or, The Takers of the New Oath of Allegiance to K. William and Q. Mary Justified...* (London, 1689), p.1.

⁵⁷ Burnet, *Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs*, pp.3-4.

⁵⁸ Edward Fowler, *A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England, who have Sworn Allegiance to K. William and Q. Mary...* (London, 1689), pp.3-6; *Melius Inquirendum: Or a Further Modest and Impartial Enquiry into the Lawfulness of Taking the New Oaths of Allegiance...* (London, 1689), ‘Preface.’

Controversial pamphlets often provoked numerous more pamphlets in response. Scottish Episcopalian Jacobite Alexander Monro said that he would ‘deal with’ Williamite polemics by trying to ‘oblige them publickly to recant their Calumnies and Aspersions....’ He had ‘to fight them with their own Weapons, and to expose them to the World in their true Colours....’ Monro hoped that his pamphlets would ensure that ‘the unwary and undiscerning Multitude may not’ accept Williamites’ ‘malicious Lies and Calumnies.’⁵⁹ These responses provide further insight into what ideas resonated with the politically involved subjects when constructing a History of Political Thought on the Revolution. Pamphlets were the principle means of debate for the allegiance debates in each Kingdom and so are the main primary sources for this thesis. Plays, poems and other literary publications were frequently political in nature and can be said to form part of the contemporary public opinions. However this study does not examine plays or other literary publications because those artistic publications take away from the explicit discussions on allegiance, which is the primary focus of this thesis.⁶⁰ Measuring the influence of political arguments in the wider nations, beyond the politically involved subjects, would also distract from the focus on the allegiance debates. Some poems have been examined as part of this study but only where they explicitly deal with the question of allegiance. One English Williamite poet said that their poem was designed to show ‘What Notion Loyal, what Disloyal makes’ in urging subjects to remain loyal to William, who had ‘the Rightful Title of a King.’⁶¹ This is an example of the poems that are examined in this study.

Religious sermons were another means that were extremely influential in the Kingdoms’ political discourses and contributed to the contemporary political thought. Clerics, especially the Anglican and Episcopalian Nonjurors, had a tremendous impact on the course of the allegiance debates. They were part of the political nations and were tendered the oaths of allegiance. Religious services with a sermon frequently had a greater attendance than those

⁵⁹ Alexander Monro, *A Letter to a Friend Giving an Account of all the Treatises that have been Publish’d with Relation to the Present Persecution against the Church of Scotland* (London, 1692), p.8.

⁶⁰ Armitage, ‘Introduction,’ pp.1-9, Pocock, Schochet & Schwoerer, ‘History of British Political Thought,’ pp.10-9

⁶¹ *The Poet’s Address to his Majesty King William. Occasion’d by the Insolence of the French King, in Proclaiming the Sham Prince of Wales, King of England, Scotland and Ireland* (London, 1702), p.9.

without and popular sermons were often printed to give that sermon a wider audience than those present in a church.⁶² One Irish printer said that he was printing two Dissenters' sermons eulogising the recently deceased Queen Mary because he believed that a wider audience than those who heard it at the church needed to hear their messages.⁶³ Numerous English and Irish Anglican sermons discussed the nature of allegiance following Mary's death and these were an important part of the allegiance debates and with it the political thought on the Revolution.⁶⁴ This influence makes printed editions of sermons and comments on sermons in diaries and other private sources important primary sources for this thesis.

Parliamentary records from each Kingdom are other primary sources that have been examined as part of this history of political thought. The parliaments in each Kingdom were another important part of the public discourse on allegiance. Parliaments gained a more influential role in public debate in the late seventeenth century and parliamentary proceedings, like religious sermons and printed polemics, were important in the developing and evolving political thought on the Revolution. These parliaments could not be considered representative of the entire population but did reflect the views of politically involved subjects.⁶⁵ Members of the parliaments in the Three Kingdoms were members of the political nations. As such their speeches and legislation complemented and reflected the views that were aired in the wider public discourse of the political nations outside of parliament, especially

⁶² Joris Van Eijenatten, 'Reaching audiences: Sermons and orators in Europe,' in Stewart J. Brown & Timothy Tackett (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Christianity Volume 7* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.130-3; Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996), pp.83-5; idem, 'The Sermon Culture of the Glorious Revolution: Williamite Preaching and Jacobite Anti-Preaching, 1685-1702,' in Peter McCulloch, Hugh Adlington & Emma Rhatigan (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2014), pp.480-92.

⁶³ *Two Sermons Preach't on a Day of Fasting and Humiliation, Kept by the Protestant Dissenters in Dublin, on the Sad Occasion of the Death of our Late Gracious Queen* (Dublin, 1695), 'The Publisher to the Reader.'

⁶⁴ Thomas Ken, *A Letter to the Author of a Sermon, entitled, A Sermon Preach'd at the Funeral of her Late Majesty Queen Mary* (n.p., 1695), pp.3-8; William Sherlock, *A Sermon Preached at the Temple-Church, December 30 1694, Upon the Sad Occasion of the Death of our Gracious Queen* (Dublin, 1695), p.14; Gilbert Burnet, *An Essay on the Memory of the late Queen... Second Edition* (London, 1696), p.33; Charles Leslie, *Remarks on Some Late Sermons: And in Particular on Dr. Sherlock's Sermon at the Temple, Decemb. 30 1694... The Second Edition with additions* (London, 1695), pp.7, 20, 28-9.

⁶⁵ Vallance, 'Decline of Conscience,' pp.78-9; idem, 'Loyal or Rebellious? Protestant Associations,' pp.14-8; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.405-6, 510-4; Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, pp.154-9, 195-205, 372-80; Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union*, pp1-10, 13-26, 45-64; Derek John Patrick, 'People and Parliament in Scotland 1689-1702' (University of St. Andrews Ph.D. thesis, 2002), pp.144, 379-84.

printed material.⁶⁶ Scottish Jacobite George Lockhart recorded how the 1702 Scottish Parliament ‘met peaceable and calmly within doors’ until the Williamite Earl of Marchmont proposed an Abjuration Oath. Marchmont’s proposal created a big impact in Scotland’s wider allegiance debates in 1702.⁶⁷ In 1698 the English House of Commons expressed concern that William Molyneux’s *Case of Ireland* pamphlet could be promoting disloyalty to William in Ireland.⁶⁸ Anchitell Grey recorded events and speeches in the Commons during the English Convention debates. He chronicled numerous comparisons between the Revolution and Richard II’s reign. Sir Robert Howard, a Whig Convention member, made these comparisons in parliament and expanded on this in his pamphlet *Historical Observations*. This shows that parliament and printed polemics had similar expressions on allegiance.⁶⁹

Not every politically involved subject liked the way public discourse was being conducted inside and outside parliaments. Scottish Revolutioner Sir Archibald Sinclair lamented how post-Revolution politics was conducted in an increasingly public manner. Sinclair said that the ‘warm Debates’ in Scotland’s Parliament, the ‘Thundering Declarations from the Pulpits, and the sweating labours of the Press’ were evidence that ‘our Body-Politick’ laboured under a ‘dangerous Distemper....’ This had ‘corrupted’ so many subjects, resulting in ‘the ferment of these Bad Humours which has so much impaired our Health, and weaken’d our Sound Constitution.’ Sinclair hoped these ferments would be addressed but his complaint, ironically coming in pamphlet-form, shows that the public views of the politically informed, as represented in print, religious sermons and parliament, were central to post-Revolution politics.⁷⁰ Contemporary sources, like Sinclair’s pamphlet, show that pamphlets, sermons

⁶⁶ D.W. Hayton, ‘Constitutional Experiments and Political Expediency, 1689-1725,’ in Steven G. Ellis, Sarah Barber (eds.) *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725* (Harlow, 1995), pp.280-1; David L. Smith, *The Stuart Parliaments 1603-1689* (London, 1999), pp.19-30; Atherton, ‘Press and Popular Political Opinion,’ pp.99-103; Patrick, ‘Unconventional Procedure,’ pp.208-11, 227-9.

⁶⁷ George Lockhart, ‘*Scotland’s Ruine*’ *Lockhart of Carnwath’s Memories of the Union*, ed. Daniel Szechi (Aberdeen, 1995), p.15.

⁶⁸ ‘House of Commons Journal Volume 12: 30 June 1698,’ *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 12: 1697-1699* (1803), pp.336-8. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=39667>. Date accessed: 11 August 2014.

⁶⁹ Anchitell Grey, ‘Debates in 1689: January,’ *Grey’s Debates of the House of Commons: Volume 9*, ed. Anchitell Grey (London, 1769), pp. 2-39 <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/greys-debates/vol9/pp2-39> [accessed 1 March 2015]; Sir Robert Howard, *Historical Observations upon the Reigns of Edward I, II, III, and Richard II...* (London, 1689), pp.33-5.

⁷⁰ Sir Archibald Sinclair, *Some Thoughts on the Present State of Affairs: Humbly offered to the High Court of Parliament. By a Lover of his Queen and Country* (n.p., 1703), p.2.

and parliament were where issues, like allegiance, were debated at the time. These are the main primary sources for a History of Political Thought methodology, which has the primary aim of reconstructing political discourses, and so the best way of examining the allegiance debates in each Kingdom. Goldie and other historians have provided new insights into events, like the Revolution, and this study hopes to build on their work by using the same methodology. By examining this range of sources over the course of William's reign the popular ideas used to justify allegiance to the rival monarchs are identified along with the reasons as to how and why the views on allegiance and the Revolution changed.

Occasionally other primary sources like private letters, diaries or official papers have been consulted but only to shed further light on the public allegiance debates and not to explore any private grief about allegiance.⁷¹ For example, the English Tory Humphrey Prideaux's letters contain commentary on the public debates over allegiance to William as *de jure* King.⁷² Diarists, like John Evelyn, and chroniclers, like Narcissus Luttrell, frequently describe subjects subscribing to oaths of allegiance and comment on the allegiance debates in all Three Kingdoms. Evelyn commented on the popular fears of Jacobite plots in 1693, the popular subscription to the Association in 1696 and the worries about the succession in 1701. Luttrell chronicled the news during the late-Stuart period and, like Evelyn, frequently recorded the public attitudes to allegiance in the Kingdoms. He recorded details of the Irish debates over the Association in 1697 and Irish Catholics' public expressions of loyalty to the Pretender as the legitimate successor in 1701-2. These sources' comments on public debates and expressions of loyalty provide further knowledge of the public debates and the contemporary political thought, the main focus of this thesis.⁷³

⁷¹ There were, according to Tim Harris, numerous political figures that could be termed 'fire-insurance' Jacobites. Tim Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715* (Harlow, 1993), pp.208-10. However the exploration of private feelings or contacts with the exiled court takes away from the public debates and figures publicly declaring their support for either William or James by accepting or rejecting the Oaths of Allegiance to William, which is the primary focus of this thesis.

⁷² Humphrey Prideaux, 'Norwich, December 4, 1693,' *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux Sometime Dean of Norwich to John Ellis, Sometime under-Secretary of State, 1674-1722*, ed. Edward Maunde Thompson (London, 1875), pp.157-9.

⁷³ John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn, Volume V Kalendarium, 1690-1706* E.S De Beer (ed.) (Oxford, 2000), pp.140, 242-3, 420-1; Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs From September 1678 to April 1714 Volume IV* (Oxford, 1867), pp.261, 264; idem, *A Brief*

This exercise in the History of Political Thought examines allegiance debates in the Three Kingdoms. In order to answer whether there was a convergence or divergence on allegiance issues and ideas across the Kingdoms it is necessary to combine the History of Political Thought methodology with a comparative or ‘British,’ Three-Kingdom approach. For decades J.G.A. Pocock has been calling for the construction of Three-Kingdom histories. However historians of the later seventeenth-century, with notable exceptions like Tim Harris, have been slow to take up this call. Advocates of histories of British Political Thought have highlighted how ideas and events affected all Three Kingdoms and the similarities in public debates across the Kingdoms. However many of these exercises focus on state-formation and ideas about the concept of Britain in the lead up to the 1707 Union or the inter-Kingdom relations amidst tumults like the Revolution.⁷⁴ Harris rightly argues that issues previously considered English are actually British and that conducting exercises in the History of British Political Thought increases our understanding of events like the Revolution. Issues, like allegiance, were debated in all Three Kingdoms. The methodology of a History of British Political Thought involves using the History of Political Thought methodology, outlined above, to explore the political thought, as expressed in the allegiance debates, in each Kingdom. This involves comparing the debates and examining the common ideas and influences in each Kingdom. Harris convincingly argues that a History of British Political Thought would be hugely beneficial but there has still been no detailed examination of post-Revolution allegiance debates in a Three-Kingdom context, which this study will redress.⁷⁵

Some historians have raised concerns about any kind of British histories being Macaulay-style histories of England with brief mentions of

Relation of State Affairs From September 1678 to April 1714 Volume V (Oxford, 1867), pp.93-4.

⁷⁴ J.G.A. Pocock, ‘Two Kingdoms and Three Histories?’, in J.G.A. Pocock (ed.) *The Discovery of Islands Essays in British History* (Cambridge, 2005), pp.75-6; 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 (January, 1999), pp.28-9; David Armitage, ‘Introduction,’ in David Armitage (ed.) *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.1-2, 5-9; J.G.A Pocock, Gordon Schochet & Lois G. Schworer, ‘The History of British Political Thought: A Field and its Future,’ in *Ibid*, pp.10-9; John Morrill, ‘Thinking about the New British History,’ in *ibid*; Colin Kidd, ‘The Matter of Britain and the Contours of British Political Thought,’ in *ibid*, pp.47-51, 63; Nicholas Canny, ‘The Intersections between Irish and British Political Thought of the Early-Modern Centuries,’ in *ibid*, 24-31, 42-3.

⁷⁵ Tim Harris, ‘In Search of a British History of Political Thought,’ pp.89-95, 98-102, 107-8.

Scotland and Ireland.⁷⁶ This study will not be Anglo-centric because it recognises that in the aftermath of the Revolution allegiance was bitterly contested in each Kingdom and examines how common issues influenced the debates in the Kingdoms. It recognises the unique circumstances in each Kingdom while taking account of the similarities and differences to prevent this study from being Anglo-centric and to build the fullest account of political thought in the Kingdoms on the Revolution. This study examines the allegiance debates in the Three Kingdoms to explore the public political support for the Revolution settlements and tries to give equitable attention to each Kingdom. Without public political support for the Revolution in each Kingdom, which was solemnly given by subscribing to the different oaths of allegiance, the settlements could not survive. The potential loss of the Revolution settlement in one Kingdom had the potential to threaten the Revolution settlement in the other Kingdoms.

Ideas and publications did not stop at borders especially when events, like the Revolution, affected all Three Kingdoms.⁷⁷ As Harris has said, common and popular ideas about allegiance, like Non-Resistance ideas, were important to the public discourse on allegiance in each Kingdom.⁷⁸ This History of British Political Thought approach is not only warranted by the common ideas across the Kingdoms but also by the Three-Kingdom nature of many primary sources. Many pamphlets, like William Sherlock's *Case of Allegiance*, were published in all Three Kingdoms indicating some

⁷⁶ Keith Brown, 'British History: a Sceptical Comment,' in Ronald G. Asch (ed.) *Three Nations- A Common History? England, Scotland, Ireland and British History c.1600-1920* (Bohun, 1993), pp.117-27; Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.4, 214; Tim Harris, 'Restoration Ireland: Themes and Problems,' in Coleman A. Dennehy (ed.) *Restoration Ireland: Always Settling and Never Settled* (Dublin, 2008), pp.6-7.

⁷⁷ Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth-Century Essays* (London, 1987), 'Introduction,' p. viii; Harris, 'In Search of a British History of Political Thought,' pp.89-95; Jane Ohlmeyer, 'Introduction,' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.) *Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland: Kingdom or Colony* (Cambridge, 2000), pp.1-2, 17-9.

⁷⁸ Chapter Two examines how the Anglican and Episcopalian doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance impacted the Allegiance debates in the Three Kingdoms. Williamites in each Kingdom argued that the doctrine obliged allegiance to William as *de facto* King while Jacobites argued that it obliged allegiance to James. Examples of Williamites in each Kingdom using this doctrine are: Edward Fowler, *A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England...* (London, 1689); Thomas Long, *The Historian Unmask'd...* (London, 1689); Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative Considered in a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to his Friend, upon his being chosen a Member of the Meeting of States in Scotland...* (n.p., 1689); William King *The State of the Protestants of Ireland...* (London, 1691). Jacobite polemics using this doctrine: Jeremy Collier, *The Desertion Discuss'd...* (London, 1689); Thomas Morer, *An Account of the Present Persecution...* (London, 1690); Charles Leslie, *An Answer to a Book, intituled, The State of the Protestants in Ireland under the Late King James's Government...* (London, 1692).

commonality across the Kingdoms on allegiance ideas.⁷⁹ Some pamphlets that appear specific to one Kingdom were actually published in another. Alasdair Raffe has highlighted how several Scottish Episcopalians published their pamphlets in London because they believed it would be more effective in lobbying William for concessions and to circumvent print restrictions in Edinburgh.⁸⁰ Scottish Episcopalian Jacobite John Sage's *Principles of the Cyprianic Age* was published in London while the Williamite Gilbert Rule's response to Sage was published in Edinburgh.⁸¹ This shows how allegiance was a Three-Kingdom debate even when the pamphlets themselves were focused on events in a single Kingdom and further justifies examining allegiance debates as part of a History of British Political Thought.

Some polemicists used events in all Three Kingdoms to justify their arguments on allegiance and appealed to subjects in all Three Kingdoms. Jacobites Sir James Montgomery, Charles Leslie and Robert Ferguson cited events in each Kingdom and used ideas that resonated across the Kingdoms to urge allegiance to James. In one pamphlet Ferguson repeatedly referenced how the Revolution affected 'these *Kingdoms*' and he objected to William's claim to be 'our *British King*.'⁸² Although circumstances were different in each Kingdom, and this thesis takes these differences into account, there were enough similarities and common ideas in the Kingdoms for Montgomery, Leslie and Ferguson to make arguments appealing to all Three Kingdoms.

Events in one Kingdom frequently influenced the allegiance debates in the other Kingdoms. Scottish-born but English-based Whig James Welwood's response to King James's 1693 Declaration was published in all

⁷⁹ William Sherlock, *The Case of Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers, stated and Resolved according to Scripture and Reason* (London, 1691); idem, *The Case of Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers...* (Edinburgh, 1691); idem, *The Case of Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers...* (Dublin, 1691).

⁸⁰ Alasdair Raffe, 'Episcopalian Polemic, The London Printing Press and Anglo-Scottish Divergence in the 1690s,' *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 26 (2006), pp.26-9.

⁸¹ John Sage, *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age...* (London, 1695); Gilbert Rule, *The Cyprianick-Bishop examined, and found not to be a diocesan, nor to have superior power to a parish minister, or Presbyterian moderator being an Answer to J.S. his Principles of the Cyprianick-Age...* (Edinburgh, 1696).

⁸² Sir James Montgomery, *Great Britain's Just Complaint...Second Edition* (Oxford, 1692), pp.25-6, 28-35, 41, 44-6, 48-9, 53-61; Charles Leslie, *An Answer to a Book, 'To the Reader,'* pp.10-1, 45-7; idem, *Gallienus Redivivus, or, Murther Will Out, &c. Being a True Account of the De-witting of Glencoe, Gaffney, &c* (Edinburgh, 1695), pp.8-11, 13-22; Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Account of Some of the Late Incroachments and Depredations of the Dutch upon the English and of a few of those many advantages which by fraud and violence they have made of the British Nations since the Revolution...* (n.p., 1695), pp.1-3, 20-4, 52-65, 69-71.

Three Kingdoms.⁸³ Welwood hailed the Scottish Parliament for imposing the Assurance on every officeholder and believed that a similar allegiance test should be introduced across the Kingdoms to give William's regime and the Revolution settlements better security.⁸⁴ Other English and Irish Williamites hailed this Scottish allegiance initiative and wanted to replicate it in their respective Kingdoms.⁸⁵ Similarly in 1702 the Scottish Williamite Marchmont wanted Scotland to replicate England's Abjuration Oath. Marchmont saw this as protecting the Revolution by securing subjects' allegiance to the Revolution settlement and ensuring a consistent allegiance across the Kingdoms.⁸⁶ At times polemics in one Kingdom prompted concern in the other Kingdoms. For example William Molyneux's 1698 *Case of Ireland* touched on allegiance; this prompted pamphlets by Jacobites and some English Williamites who believed that Molyneux was disavowing allegiance to William.⁸⁷

The nature of the post-Revolution allegiance debates with common ideas and influences, events in one Kingdom being cited in another, and the Three-Kingdom nature of many polemics, justifies using a History of British Political Thought approach. This methodology, as Harris described, involves examining and comparing the political thought in each Kingdom. By comparing the ideas and the evolving popular political thought, as expressed in polemics on allegiance, in each Kingdom a fuller understanding of the Revolution and what sustained it in each Kingdom is gained.

The History of Political Thought and the History of British Political Thought methodologies outlined here are the most effective way to construct the fullest picture of the allegiance debates. This enables the research questions

⁸³ James Welwood, *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration dated at St. Germain, April 17 1693* (Dublin, 1693); idem, *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration dated at St. Germain, April 17 1693* (Edinburgh, 1693); idem, *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration dated at St. Germain, April 17 1693* (London, 1693). See Chapter Seven.

⁸⁴ James Welwood, *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration dated at St. Germain, April 17 1693* (Dublin, 1693), pp.3-8.

⁸⁵ Atwood, *The Antiquity and Justice of an Oath of Abjuration*, pp.5, 9-11, 30-8, 40-7, 49-51, 68-9; Johnson, *Notes upon the Phoenix Edition*, pp.8-9, 24; *Some Seasonable Queries, on the Second Head, viz. An Oath of Abjuration*, p.2; John MacBride, *Animadversions on The Defence of the Answer to a Paper, Intituled, The Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland...* (n.p., 1697), pp.35-6, 40-3, 58-9, 62-3; Joseph Boyse, *The Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland... Vindicated from the Exceptions alleg'd against it, in a late Answer* (Dublin, 1695), pp.4, 8.

⁸⁶ Marchmont, 'Memorial,' 1 July 1702, *Marchmont Papers*, pp.243-4.

⁸⁷ Leslie, *Considerations of Importance to Ireland*, pp.2-8; William Atwood, *The History and Reasons of the Dependence of Ireland upon the Imperial Crown of the Kingdom of England rectifying Mr. Molyneux's State of the Case...* (London, 1698), pp.11-6, 31-5, 69-73, 79-85, 109, 213-6; John Cary, *An Answer to Mr. Molyneux his Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England...* (London, 1698), pp.63, 66-7, 100-1, 119-22.

of this thesis to be answered and provides an insight into the political thought, the public reaction of politically involved subjects, on the Revolution and how these views evolved.

II

This thesis follows a thematic and chronological narrative with each chapter devoted to specific issues and ideas that impacted on the Allegiance Debates at different points during William's reign. *De facto* theory, which recognised William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs, has been described as the triumphant attitude to allegiance in the Kingdoms during the early years of William's reign.⁸⁸ However this theory partly emerged in the early months of 1689 after Williamites and Jacobites scoured History for precedents that would be suitable guides on what subjects should do regarding their allegiance. Chapter One explores how amidst a sea of different ideas and arguments on allegiance, using History as a guide on allegiance was a particularly popular theme in early-1689 allegiance polemics. This set the tone for the next few years of allegiance debates with different ideas becoming more important at different times in a bitter contest over the validity of the new oaths of allegiance recognising William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs.

Anglicanism, combined with its sister Scottish Episcopalian Church, was the denomination with the largest number of adherents in the Three Kingdoms. Therefore Anglican and Episcopalian clerics and subjects had to be satisfied that the new oaths of allegiance did not violate their Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance doctrine. This doctrine said that any resistance to the divinely ordained monarch was sinful and was one of the most pressing issues in allegiance debates from summer 1689 to around 1692 and is the focus of Chapter Two. Jacobites and Williamites disputed whether the doctrine obliged allegiance to William, the *de facto* King, or James, the *de jure*, rightful, monarch.

While Williamite reasoning on Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance satisfied many Anglicans, other Anglican and Non-Anglican Williamites believed that Conquest theories offered a better justification of

⁸⁸ Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.21-33; Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.191-215, 217-221; Eccleshall, 'Anglican Political Thought in the Century after the Revolution of 1688,' pp.42-53.

allegiance to William. Chapter Three examines how from 1689, especially after William's military triumph in Ireland, the notion that William became *de facto* King after having Conquered James was popular in each Kingdom. However from 1692-3 skilful Jacobite responses to Williamite Conquest arguments and the fact of Jacobites also employing this theory to justify a potential Jacobite restoration and allegiance to James prompted a change of emphasis in Williamite polemics. Williamites in each Kingdom were increasingly concerned that advocating allegiance to a Conqueror could undermine subjects' liberties.

This led to a greater emphasis on subjects' liberties in justifying allegiance from 1693. Whereas the allegiance polemics examined in Chapters One through Three focused on allegiance to the monarch's person, the greater emphasis on liberties led to polemicists exploring the type of governments that allegiance to the rival monarchs supported. For years Whig polemicists had argued that allegiance to the monarch was dependent on protection of liberties in a Contractual relationship. Chapter Four examines how these ideas of allegiance as related to monarchical protection of subjects' liberties became more popular in the mid-1690s. Other polemicists who traditionally baulked at the idea of Contractual resistance arguments increasingly used language describing their allegiance as related to monarchical protection of subjects' liberties. This change of emphasis was partly fuelled by the Country and Court platforms that emerged in the mid-1690s in each Kingdom and shows the evolution of views on what the Revolution was.

Whether or not these liberties were granted to Protestants not conforming to the Established Churches is examined in Chapter Five. Allegiance was central to Toleration measures and the introduction of legal protection for Protestant Williamites not subscribing to the Established Churches also affected allegiance polemics by members of the Established Churches. These mid-1690s allegiance polemics show the evolving public views on the Revolution by Protestants inside and outside the Established Churches.

While increasing numbers of Williamite polemicists were prepared to grant liberties to Protestant Williamites not conforming to the Established Churches, these liberties were not extended to the Kingdoms' Roman Catholic subjects. Catholics' allegiance had always been popularly seen as suspicious

and this resulted in penal laws excluding Catholics from political roles. However this did not stop Catholics publicly expressing views on allegiance and the Revolution. Chapter Six focuses on how post-Revolution Catholic public declarations of allegiance impacted on the wider Allegiance Debates. The overwhelming majority of the Three Kingdoms' Catholics were Irish and therefore this chapter is more weighted towards Ireland, but maintains a Three-Kingdom approach. English and Scottish Catholics were a tiny minority in their respective Kingdoms but they and their allegiance still influenced the wider Allegiance Debates, especially from the mid-1690s when there was greater emphasis on the Revolution as transformative.

One issue that Catholic polemicists were particularly exercised about was whether subjects could withdraw allegiance from James the rightful King. Chapter Seven examines the largely overlooked mid-1690s public debates over whether or not William could be given allegiance as *de jure* King thus giving his reign greater legitimacy and stability. Pre-Revolution Oaths of Allegiance to Charles II and James specifically recognised them as *de jure* monarchs; the oaths contained these words in order to preserve the constitutional and lawful order in the Kingdoms. William's extra-lineal succession was why the 1689 Oaths of Allegiance did not recognise him as *de jure* King. Jacobite propagandists exploited this and argued that this showed that most subjects believed the Revolution would soon be overturned. With these vocal Jacobite denunciations and credible Jacobite plots being uncovered, growing numbers of Williamites publicly called for a stronger allegiance to William which would recognise him as *de jure* King in some form. This would mean subjects publicly acknowledging that William had a greater legal entitlement to rule the Kingdoms than James did, thereby showing greater public acceptance of the Revolution as permanent. The views of the politically involved in each Kingdom were continuing to evolve.

Many Williamites had employed Providential theory to justify this new stronger allegiance to William. Several historians have highlighted how Williamites, especially in the early 1690s, justified allegiance to William by using a providential theory, which said that God had placed William on the throne. However late-1690s Williamite allegiance polemics using providential

theory have been largely overlooked.⁸⁹ Chapter Eight explores how events like the 1697 Ryswick Treaty, ending the war with France, and the Darien catastrophe were presented by Williamites as providential interventions that showed William's reign was permanent. Williamites believed these interventions should end the allegiance debates in each Kingdom but Jacobites also used providential theory to justify their allegiance to James even with what seemed like their ultimate defeat in 1697. However the popular Williamite belief that debates over allegiance and the Revolution were now settled would soon be quickly dashed.

William's sister-in-law Anne was to succeed William but the death of her heir, the Duke of Gloucester, in 1700 meant that without an obvious heir after Anne a Jacobite restoration was a real possibility. This greatly enthused Jacobites who became more vocal in asserting their allegiance. James's death in September 1701 allowed Jacobites to present James Francis Edward as the legitimate King who should reign when he came of age. Chapter Nine investigates the revitalised allegiance debates in the twilight of William's reign when many Williamites became committed to preserving the Revolution settlements into the future beyond William's own life. Abjuration Oaths were presented as allegiance to the Revolution settlements by renouncing Jacobite claimants and their efforts to overturn the Revolution. Justifications of Abjuration or allegiance to the Pretender were very different from the allegiance arguments in 1689. These final allegiance debates of William's reign played out differently in each Kingdom but showed how the political thought, the public views of the politically involved, on the Revolution and the competing monarchs had evolved since 1689. In each Kingdom advocating Abjuration oaths as a means to preserve the Revolution settlements, which were very different to what a Jacobite restoration offered, put greater emphasis on the Revolution having been a monumental event. This was a marked change in the popular rhetoric in the Kingdoms from 1689 when there was a popular hesitance to accept William and the Revolution as the allegiance to him as *de facto* King showed. Opinions are never static and exploring the Allegiance

⁸⁹ Padley, 'Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution,' pp.680-96; Gerald Straka, 'The Final Phase of Divine Right in England, 1688-1702,' *The English Historical Review*, 77, No. 305 (Oct., 1962), pp.638-58; Mullet, 'A Case of Allegiance: William Sherlock and the Revolution of 1688,' pp.83-103; McGuire, 'The Church of Ireland and the "Glorious Revolution,"' pp.138-46.

Debates from 1689 provides new insights into these changing views on the Revolution and what that meant in the Kingdoms at the time.

Chapter One: History as a Guide in the Initial Allegiance Debates from January 1689.

In late 1688 James II and VII fled his Kingdoms after William of Orange landed in England. James's flight meant there was no government; this caused anxiety amongst many in the political classes about potential disorder across the Three Kingdoms.¹ Rumours of William being offered the Crown to fill this void horrified the English Earl of Clarendon because it violated subjects' allegiance to James.² Scottish nobleman James Hamilton, Earl of Arran's January 1689 speech to Scottish nobles in London publicly praised William for delivering the Kingdoms 'from Popery' but refused to break allegiance to James.³ The English and Scottish Convention parliaments recognised these problems when enthroning William and Mary. They introduced new oaths of allegiance recognising William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs without mentioning legitimacy as previous oaths of allegiance did.⁴ *De facto* theory, where William and Mary were given allegiance as *de facto* monarchs, monarchs possessing the government, has been described as the prevailing English and Scottish reactions to the allegiance question.⁵ Subjects, in a moral conundrum over whether allegiance could be given to William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs or monarchs in possession of the throne, scoured

¹ Edmund Bohun, *The History of the Desertion* (London, 1689), pp.107-9; Gilbert Burnet, *A Sermon Preached before the House of Commons, on the 31st of January, 1688 being the Thanksgiving-Day for the Deliverance of his Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power, by his Highness the Prince of Orange's means* (London, 1689), pp.1-2; Sir John Reresby, *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby* (London, 1813), pp.384-8; Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative Considered in a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to his Friend upon his being chosen a Member of the Meeting of States in Scotland* (n.p., 1689), pp.6-7.

² Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, and his brother Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester: with the Diary of Lord Clarendon from 1687 to 1690... Volume II* (London, 1762), pp.145-7.

³ James Hamilton, Earl of Arran, *A Short Speech Made by the Right Honourable the Earl of Arran to the Scottish Nobility and Gentry, met together at the Council Chamber in White-hall, on the Eight of January 1689 about an Address to His Highness the Prince of Orange, to Take upon him the Government of the Kingdom of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1689).

⁴ 'William and Mary, 1688: Act for Abrogating the Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance,' *Statutes of the Realm Volume 6: 1685-1694*, ed. John Raithby (London, 1820), pp.57-60. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46294>. Date Accessed: 24 March 2013; *The Declaration of the Estates of the Kingdom of Scotland, Containing the Claim of Right, and the Offer of the Crown to their Majesties, King William and Queen Mary: Together with the Grievances Represented by the Estates; and Their Majesties Oath at Their Acceptance of the Crown* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp.4-7. For the full wording of the Oaths of Allegiance to William and Mary and a comparison with the previous Oath of Allegiance see Appendix I.

⁵ J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (London, 1990), p.21; Charles F. Mullet, 'Religion, Politics, and Oaths in the Glorious Revolution,' *The Review of Politics*, 10, No. 4 (October, 1948); Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690 Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp.201-3.

History for similar successions. These episodes were used as guides to publicly justify allegiance in early 1689.

This chapter explores the initial Allegiance Debates in early 1689 when History was prevalent in justifying allegiance to James and William. Seventeenth-century polemicists repeatedly used History to justify or denounce any political position and as a political and moral instruction manual. Events, like the Revolution, were justified by relating it to the past.⁶ Kevin Sharpe says that histories written from 1689 were ‘vital’ to subjects publicly accepting William; Whigs and other polemicists frequently embedded histories with Contractual and other ideas.⁷ History was crucial to the Allegiance Debates. Several earlier seventeenth-century allegiance arguments, like those of Sir Edward Coke or Engagement Controversy pamphlets, were republished in 1689. Historians who have examined Allegiance Debates describe how polemicists used History to support partisan positions or combined with, or to justify, ideas like Providence, Conquest and Contract.⁸ While History could justify various positions Colin Kidd argues that History was the ‘backbone of political argument’ and often a standalone idea in political discourse.⁹ Some writers on allegiance, like English Convention Whig member Sir Robert Howard, noted that History was of ‘most use’ in deciding allegiance in 1689.¹⁰

History, whether used to support another idea or a standalone idea, was one of the most prominent features of early-1689 allegiance polemics from

⁶ Quentin Skinner, ‘History and Ideology in the English Revolution,’ in Quentin Skinner (ed.) *Visions of Politics Volume 3: Hobbes and Civil Service* (Cambridge, 2002), p.238; H.T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London, 1977), pp.24-5, 61-5. Various essays in Paulina Kewes (ed.) *The uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, 2006) explored how History was used in public discourses: Mark Knights, ‘The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties,’ pp.348-55; Paulina Kewes, ‘History and Its uses,’ p.1; Daniel Woolf, ‘From Hystories to the Historical,’ pp.51-2; Blair Worden, ‘Historians and Poets,’ p.75.

⁷ Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy 1660-1714* (London, 2013), pp.397-9.

⁸ David Martin Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (Rochester, 1999), pp.205-16; Edward Vallance, ‘State Oaths and Political Casuistry in England: 1640-1702,’ (Oxford University D.Phil thesis, 2000), pp.250-80; idem, ‘The Decline of Conscience as a Political Guide: William Higden’s View of the English Constitution (1709),’ in Harold E. Braun & Edward Vallance (eds.) *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700* (London, 2004), pp.70-3; Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.5-32; Dickinson, *Liberty and Property*, pp.21-37, 64-73; Mark Goldie, ‘The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument,’ *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 83 (1980), pp.479-91; Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.192-203.

⁹ Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland’s Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge, 1993), p.27.

¹⁰ Sir Robert Howard, *Historical Observations upon the Reigns of Edward I, II, III, and Richard II...* (London, 1689), pp.1-2, 31.

diverse political and religious backgrounds but has been frequently overlooked in historiography. Historiography on the Convention parliaments and early 1689 generally focuses on the nature of the Revolution and constitutional change across the Three Kingdoms even with Jacobite control of Ireland.¹¹ The few examinations of English Allegiance Debates describe these debates as beginning after the decision to enthrone William and Mary.¹² However debates over enthroning them, which began in January 1689, also involved whether or not allegiance could be given to what were described in many polemics as either *de facto* monarchs or monarchs in possession. History was the prevalent theme in these early-1689 arguments on allegiance. Arguments either advocating or opposing allegiance to William compared his succession to other historic episodes when there were disputed successions and allegiance given to *de facto* monarchs or monarchs in possession. English Whig John Somers, like Howard, published a history in early 1689 which he said would ‘safely direct’ his readers’ opinions on allegiance.¹³ This chapter examines the prevalent use of History in early 1689 at the beginning of allegiance debates across the Kingdoms to either justify or condemn allegiance to what were *de facto* monarchs. Examining allegiance polemics from January to around May 1689 provides insights into the initial public reaction of the politically involved to the Revolution across the Kingdoms.

I

¹¹ John Miller, ‘Proto-Jacobitism? The Tories and the Revolution of 1688-9,’ in Eveline Cruickshank & Jeremy Black (eds.) *The Jacobite Challenge* (Edinburgh, 1988); Robert Beddard, ‘The Guildhall Declaration of 11 December 1688 and the Counter-Revolution of the Loyalists,’ *The Historical Journal*, 11, No. 3 (1968); George Cherry, ‘The Legal and Philosophical Position of the Jacobites, 1688-1689,’ *The Journal of Modern History*, 22, No. 4 (Dec., 1950), pp.309-21; Howard Nenner, ‘Pretense and Pragmatism: The Response to uncertainty in the Succession Crisis of 1689,’ in Lois G. Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993); Ian Cowan, ‘Church and State Reformed? The Revolution of 1688-9 in Scotland,’ in Jonathan I. Israel (ed.) *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact* (Cambridge, 2003), pp.163-83; Derek J. Patrick, ‘Unconventional Procedure: Scottish Electoral Politics after the Revolution,’ in Keith M. Brown & Alistair J. Mann (eds.) *The History of the Scottish Parliament Volume II Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1567-1707* (Edinburgh, 2005); Tim Harris, ‘Reluctant Revolutionaries? The Scots and the Revolution of 1688-89,’ in Howard Nenner (ed.) *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain, Essays Presented to Lois Green Schwoerer* (Rochester, 1997), p.110.

¹² Goldie, ‘The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument,’ p.477; Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance*, pp.202-5.

¹³ John Somers, Baron Somers, *A Brief History of the Succession of the Crown of England, &c. Collected out of Records, and the most Authentick Historians written for the Satisfaction of the Nation* (London, 1689), p.1.

In 1689 the last wholesale withdrawal of allegiance from the rightful monarch in the Three Kingdoms, and most obvious precedent, was the 1640s when Charles I was deposed, executed and replaced by Cromwell's Commonwealth.¹⁴ During the mid-century Civil Wars and Engagement Controversy many subjects gave Cromwell allegiance to Cromwell as *de facto* ruler. However during the Restoration those supporting the Commonwealth, and everything associated with it, became universally despised across the Kingdoms.¹⁵ Paul Monod and Charles-Edouard Levillain have noted that comparing William and the Revolution with Cromwell was popular with English Jacobites from 1688 throughout the 1690s.¹⁶ In early 1689 comparing the Regicide with 1688-9 was widely used in Jacobite polemics across the Kingdoms to urge continued allegiance to James, the rightful King, even though he did not possess the government in England and Scotland.

Before Scotland's Convention met, St. Andrews University's faculty published a public letter warning that removing James and transferring allegiance to another ruler would be re-enacting the mid-century civil wars.¹⁷ Clare Jackson has said this address promoted support for James while defending his 'absolute... freedom of action' to preserve order.¹⁸ Preserving order was important but this document was also important in the initial Scottish Allegiance debates. One of this document's main features was how it used History to justify continued allegiance to James.¹⁹ James's family history, a Stuart 'of the Native and Royal Blood,' was an important part of allegiance in hereditary monarchies.²⁰ Recent history showed the dangers of breaking allegiance. 'The sad experience of our late Miseries and convulsions has left us sufficient marks and indications what rocks to shune....'²¹ 1688-9 saw the

¹⁴ Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance*, pp.146-69; Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant* (Woodbridge, 2007), p.162.

¹⁵ Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, passim; J.G.A Pocock, 'The Fourth English Civil War: Dissolution, Desertion, and Alternative Histories of the Glorious Revolution,' in Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689*, pp.52-6; Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.4, 45-6; Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, passim; S.J Connolly, 'The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr: Regicide and Revolution in Anglican Political Thought c. 1660-1745,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54, No. 3, (July, 2003), pp.489-91.

¹⁶ Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989), pp.51-3; Charles-Edouard Levillain, 'Cromwell Redivivus? William III as Military Dictator Myth,' in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007), pp.159-76.

¹⁷ *The Address of the University of St. Andrews to the King...* (London, 1689), passim.

¹⁸ Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.135-6.

¹⁹ *The Address of the University of St. Andrews to the King*, p.5.

²⁰ *Ibid*, p.4

²¹ *Ibid*, pp.4-5.

reappearance of the rhetoric of Presbyterianism and ‘Pretended Fears of Arbitrary Government,’ which established ‘the most execrable Villanes on the ruins of One of the best and Most Religious Kings,’ Charles I. Williamites had accused James of tyranny.²² The St. Andrews’ faculty compared William and the Revolution with the mid-century hardships under Cromwell and ‘Phanatick creatures of Sedition.’²³ Unlike James’s enemies, the faculty would ‘in the face of what ever hazards’ maintain ‘their love and obedience’ and not shake ‘off all Tyse and Principles as well as Honour and Duty.’²⁴ They promised James their ‘service to Dissipate the clouds of ignorance or Prejudice’ and remind subjects of the ‘Reasonable Foundation of their Allegiance’ to James. William’s Revolution, like Cromwell’s, would overthrow the constitution and so the faculty reasserted their ‘Fidelity and Affection’ to the ‘most Ancient and Royal Government of’ Scotland under James.²⁵ St. Andrews University, a centre of Episcopacy, primarily used Scotland’s monarchical history, especially the horrific Interregnum, as a guide on allegiance. Transferring allegiance from James was like giving allegiance to Cromwell and repeating the mid-century horrors in Scotland.

In May 1689 James, still controlling most of Ireland, convened a parliament in Dublin. This Catholic-dominated parliament passed the *Act of Recognition* condemning the English Convention for acting like the 1649 Regicides by violating allegiance to James, contrasting the English ‘usurpation’ with Irish loyalty. England’s Convention, with their ‘abusive and unknown name and authority,’ showed ‘unparalleled’ disloyalty in declaring the throne vacant.²⁶ William’s enthronement happened ‘in such a horrid manner and odious circumstances’ similar to ‘the barbarous murder of’ Charles I. Like St. Andrews University, the Irish Jacobite Parliament depicted the Revolution as history repeating with ‘these late traitors’ having ‘borrowed and revived’ the ‘desperate antimonarchic principles’ of the 1640s to justify the Revolution.²⁷ English subjects were ‘perfidious criminals’ and guilty of a breach of ‘faith to God and their natural sovereign....’ Having broken their

²² Ibid, p.5; *Declaration of the Estates of the Kingdom of Scotland, Containing the Claim of Right*, p.3.

²³ *Addres of the University of St. Andrews*, pp.3-5.

²⁴ Ibid, pp.3-4.

²⁵ Ibid, p.9.

²⁶ ‘(Irish) Act of Recognition, 1689,’ *English Historical Documents, 1660-1714*, ed. Andrew Browning (London, 1953), pp.747-9.

²⁷ Ibid, pp.747-9.

‘oaths of allegiance and supremacy’ with ‘their own usurped authority’ they ‘invented new and impious assurances of fidelity to the usurpers.’ This brought ‘a most insupportable shame and infamy’ on ‘millions of Your Majesty’s subjects no wise guilty of this treason’ in England unlike the ‘dutiful and loyal’ Irish subjects. Ireland’s Parliament ‘with a true sense of our duty’ condemned ‘the late usurpation of the said Prince of Orange and the most unparalleled treason and perfidiousness of such of Your Majesty’s subjects as have by their defection... promoted the same....’²⁸ Again recent history was used to justify maintaining allegiance to James because transferring allegiance to William was to return the Kingdoms to a horrifying 1640s-style situation.

Irish Catholic Jacobites repeatedly justified continued allegiance to James by denouncing William as another Cromwell. Catholic priest Edmond Dulaney’s February 1689 sermon cited the mid-century wars and Biblical history to urge continued allegiance to James. Dulaney condemned English and Irish Protestants as a ‘thrice Perjured people seduced by a Nobility... poyson’d with the venom of Disloyalty and Rebellion....’ The ‘thrice Perjured people’ refers to the three notable violations of allegiance in recent history: Charles I’s execution, Charles II being exiled until 1660 and the rebellion against James.²⁹ Éamonn Ó Ciardha highlighted Dulaney’s use of nationalism, anti-Protestantism and providential ideas.³⁰ History also flowed through Dulaney’s sermon. Williamites had set up a ‘Mimick King, under the Royal Canopy to receive homage from Vassals, tribute from Subjects....’ In 1689, like the 1640s, those giving allegiance to this ‘Usurping Tyrant’ threatened ‘Totall Ruine.’³¹ Gaelic Irish Catholic David Ó Bruadair’s poems during the 1687-89 period also capture this fear of challenges to James’s authority as being a repeat of recent historic attacks on Catholicism. The prospect of history being recreated terrified Irish Catholics and was why Ó Bruadair advocated loyalty to James in 1687-9.³² Many Irish Catholic polemicists saw parallels between

²⁸ Ibid, pp.747-9.

²⁹ Fr. Edmond Dulaney, *A Sermon Preached Before the King, in Christ-Church, Dublin, on Ash Wednesday 1689* (Dublin, 1689), p.16.

³⁰ Éamonn Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766 A Fatal Attachment* (Dublin, 2002), pp.65-6.

³¹ Dulaney, *A Sermon Preached Before the King, in Christ-Church*, pp.16, 19-20.

³² David Ó Bruadair’s ‘The Triumph of James II, 1687,’ *Duanaire Dháibhidh Uí Bhruadair: The Poems of David O Bruadair Part III*, ed. John C. Mac Erlean (London, 1917), pp.91-3 although written in 1687 describes any challenge to James’s authority as being akin to Cromwell’s actions. In his other poems from 1687-9 he also describes how Irish Catholics fighting for James were also fighting for their Church. This can be seen in his poems ‘Driving

William and Cromwell and they used this History to urge subjects to remain loyal to James and avoid repeating the mid-century horrors.

English Jacobites, like their Irish and Scottish counterparts, equated allegiance to William with allegiance to the historic villain Cromwell. Some pamphlets from the 1649-50 Engagement Controversy were reprinted in 1689. The significance of these republications was not lost on the readers.³³ Many of these tracts, like Presbyterian Edward Reynolds's *Humble Proposals*, rejected allegiance to Cromwell, a *de facto* ruler of England. The 1689 edition had a preface comparing Reynolds's actions and Jacobites' actions. 'It was then the *Covenant* and *Engagement*. Now it is the Old, and New Oath of Fealty and Allegiance; and what was said so well by way of Apology in that Case, may in a great measure pass for such in this.' Subjects may not have liked the previous government but they were bound by their sworn allegiance to that government.³⁴ Reynolds denied Cromwell allegiance because it would make subjects 'breakers of our Oaths and Covenants' and show them to be 'men of ductile spirits and prostituted Consciences, led by principles of fear or interest....'³⁵ It was a Christian duty to avoid causing 'others to think we esteem Oaths as changeable as opinions....'³⁶ This republication of Reynolds was clearly using allegiance to Cromwell through the Engagement as a metaphor for allegiance to William in order to persuade subjects to remain loyal to James. It was reminding subjects of the strains on consciences caused by the last attempt to get subjects to violate their allegiance.

Jeremy Collier was one of the most formidable English Jacobite pamphleteers.³⁷ In early 1689 he compared James's flight with Charles II's escape after the Battle of Worcester; both fled for their own safety. Collier noted 'I believe, no Mortal ever urged this as an Argument against' Charles's 'Restauration....' Collier used the popular attitudes to Charles's flight and those who maintained allegiance to him; Collier presented 1688-9 as a repeat

all the Foes before him, June 1689,' *Poems of David O Bruadair Part III*, p.125; 'The Triumph of Tadhg,' in *ibid*, pp.127-41; 'In this Year of Storm, March 1688/9,' in *ibid*, pp.121-5; 'Instead of the Mocking, February 1689,' in *ibid*, pp.117-21; 'The People have turned their backs, 26 December 1688,' in *ibid*, p.115. See Chapter Six for more on Ó Bruadair's positions on allegiance.

³³ Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance*, pp.205-16; Vallance, 'State Oaths and Political Casuistry,' pp.250-80.

³⁴ Edward Reynolds, *The Humble Proposals* (London, 1689), 'To the Reader.'

³⁵ *Ibid*, pp.3-4.

³⁶ *Ibid*, pp.3-4.

³⁷ Lois G. Schwoerer, *The Declaration of Rights, 1689* (London, 1689), pp.145-7.

of the 1640s-1650s to persuade subjects to remain loyal to James.³⁸ Irish-born Anglican Henry Dodwell also compared allegiance in 1689 with the Engagement Controversy, ‘the last Case’ when allegiance was widely debated amidst political upheaval. In the 1650s allegiance to ‘*Cromwell*’ was debated. However ‘it seems plain, that our Brethren then thought their Oaths to the Royal Family obliged them to be Active’ in allegiance to the Stuarts against usurpations and these actions should be imitated.³⁹ In 1689 the soon-to-be infamous Anglican cleric William Sherlock still supported James. Sherlock denounced the Revolution as Dissenters and ‘*Common-swealth*’ men subverting the monarchy as they had done in the 1640s-1650s. Like Dodwell and Collier, Sherlock equated supporting William with supporting the Regicide.⁴⁰ English Convention members opposed to enthroning William made similar arguments by highlighting how enthroning William was breaching allegiance in a manner similar to the 1640s and 1650s.⁴¹ Williamite Whig and Nonconformist diarist Roger Morrice described these as particularly effective arguments against the validity of the Convention and its prerogative.⁴²

The effectiveness of this Jacobite argument can be seen in the reaction to *A Short History of the Convention*. This broadside condemned the English Convention for exploiting fears over Protestantism and rights to induce subjects to act against the King as happened in 1648-9. During ‘the Usurpers days, some secret Priests were willing to disown’ the King but at the Restoration ‘every Body repented’ for supporting Cromwell. An ‘Anniversary Fast’ was held on 30 January to commemorate Charles I and ensure that subjects never embraced such ideas again.⁴³ Most Convention members ‘abandoned their Loyalty’ to James in a way that, according to the author, was reminiscent of the Regicide.⁴⁴ A reward was issued for the arrest of the author

³⁸ Jeremy Collier, *The Desertion Discuss’d in a Letter to a Country Gentleman* (n.p., 1689), pp.6-7.

³⁹ Henry Dodwell, *Concerning the Care of Taking the New Oath of Fealty and Allegiance with a Declaration...* (n.p., 1689), p.2.

⁴⁰ William Sherlock, *A Letter to a Member of the Convention...* (n.p., 1689), pp.1-4.

⁴¹ ‘King James’s Parliament: The Second Convention – begins 22/1/1689,’ in *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume 2, 1680-1695 Chandler’s* (London, 1742), pp.199-255. URL: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol2/pp199-255>. Date Accessed: 1 March 2015.

⁴² Roger Morrice, *The Entering Book of Roger Morrice: Volume V: The Reign of William III*, ed. Mark Knights (Woodbridge, 2007), Q.475, p.9.

⁴³ *A Short History of the Convention; or, New Christned Parliament* (n.p., 1689), p.1.

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, p.1.

and publishers of this paper.⁴⁵ In the Commons Williamite Whig Hugh Boscawen condemned pamphlets like *A Short History* because they ‘disturb the peace of the Nation, and invite people to stir up in arms’ against William.⁴⁶ Presbyterian Whig Williamite Richard Hampden worried that ‘These Papers are still printing, and there are copies of them abroad.’ The outrage caused by *A Short History* led to the Commons ordering the hangman to publicly burn copies of it. This action shows how sensitive Whigs were about allegiance to William and the Revolution being associated with the Regicide.⁴⁷ Subjects would not give William allegiance if they believed it was repeating the Regicide.

John Evelyn’s diary records that the January 30 commemorations of 1689 were toned down. Evelyn said that ‘in all public offices and pulpit prayers, the collects, and litany for the King [James] and Queen were curtailed and mutilated.’⁴⁸ John Sharp, Dean of Norwich, caused controversy during James’s reign for preaching against popery.⁴⁹ Evelyn records that Sharp gave a sermon to the Commons ‘but was disliked, and not thanked for his sermon.’ This further shows the difficulties Williamites had in urging subjects to end allegiance to James; the parallels between 1689 and 1649 were obvious.⁵⁰ During the Restoration the rebellions against Charles I, and breaking allegiance to him, were almost universally condemned. This resulted in portrayals of William as a Cromwell-style usurper becoming a notable feature of early-1689 Jacobite polemics. Across the Kingdoms in early 1689 Jacobites used recent history to condemn the Revolution as repeating the horrors of the mid-century in order to urge subjects to maintain allegiance to James.

Williamite Whig Daniel Defoe robustly denied that 1688-9 and 1648 were alike. Defoe said that ‘no body that can either consider, or compare, can think the Causes of 1648 and 1688 Parallel.’ The ‘Causes and Occasions of

⁴⁵ *By the King and Queen, a Proclamation. William R... Whereas there hath been lately printed and published a treasonable... libel, intituled, A Short History of the Convention, or new Christened Parliament...* (London, 1689).

⁴⁶ Anchitell Grey, ‘Debates in 1689: April 24th-30th,’ in *Grey’s Debates of the House of Commons: Volume 9*, ed. Anchitell Grey (London, 1769), pp.226-34. URL: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/greys-debates/vol9/pp.226-234>. Date Accessed: 15 March 2015.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn 1677-1706 Volume III*, ed. Austin Dobson (London, 2006), p.255.

⁴⁹ W.A Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford, 1988), p.160.

⁵⁰ Evelyn, *Diary of John Evelyn 1677-1706*, p.255.

those two great Revolutions in 48, and 88, were not more distant than their Designs and Ends were....' 1688 was about 'the Establishment and Preservation of' Protestantism whereas 1648 sought the 'Subversion' of it.⁵¹ Others supporting William and Mary's enthronement and some of form of allegiance to them tried to turn these historic examples against those urging continued allegiance to James. Gilbert Burnet's *History* records that many Whigs in the English Convention argued that the 1689 Convention had the same authority to act as the 1660 Convention did when it restored Charles II.⁵² Other accounts of the 1689 English Convention record Williamite members making similar comparisons. They argued that the Revolution was, like the 1660 Restoration, restoring the traditional monarchy and order in the Kingdoms.⁵³ Other Williamites expanded on this argument in print to urge allegiance to William as a King possessing power and to counter the strong Jacobite allegiance polemics.

Tory Williamite Edmund Bohun published his *History of the Desertion* in April 1689. Gerald Straka has noted that Bohun's *History* supported the Revolution while denying that it involved resistance or constitutional change.⁵⁴ This polemic also used the history of the Restoration to justify allegiance to William. Bohun said that 11 December 1688 was the moment when subjects 'were legally discharged of our Allegiance to *James* the Second....'⁵⁵ He decried attempts by 'the Popish party' to portray Williamites as 'Rebels.' To Bohun the Revolution was not a rebellion but like 'the Restitution of *Charles* the Second.'⁵⁶ Charles II 'had done nothing to forfeit his right, and was ready to have done any thing to assure his subjects of theirs....' James had 'violated the rights of his Subjects above any Prince that ever swayed this Scepter, and would rather throw up the Government, than suffer a Parliament to meet to redress' subjects' grievances. Subjects were discharged

⁵¹ Daniel Defoe, *Reflections upon the Late Great Revolution written by a lay-hand in the Country for the satisfaction of some Neighbours* (London, 1689), pp.65-7.

⁵² Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History of his Own Time Volume II...* (London, 1734), pp.5-6.

⁵³ Roger Morrice, *Entring Book Volume V*, Q.475, p.9; Anchitell Grey, 'Debates in 1689: February 13th-20th,' *Grey's Debates of the House of Commons: Volume 9*, ed. Anchitell Grey (London, 1769), pp.83-106. URL: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/greys-debates/vol9/pp83-106>. Date Accessed: 1 March 2015.

⁵⁴ Gerald Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962), pp.32-4.

⁵⁵ Edmund Bohun, *The History of the Desertion, or An Account of all the Publick Affairs in England, From the beginning of September 1688 to the Twelfth of February following. With An Answer to a Piece Call'd The Desertion Discuss'd...* (London, 1689), 'To the Reader.'

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 'To the Reader.'

of allegiance to James.⁵⁷ James's absolutism was like Cromwell's but William's succession, like Charles's, restored the traditional monarchy. This partially justified allegiance to William because he possessed the government and could provide the traditional monarchical government protecting Protestantism and liberties.⁵⁸

Thomas Long, another Tory, also equated allegiance to James with allegiance to Cromwell because both usurped traditional English monarchy. Long condemned Jacobites who were 'so tender of committing any act of Disloyalty against King *James* the Second' that they were effectively approving 'of what was done against King *Charles* the First....'⁵⁹ Charles I, 'a well-resolved Protestant,' was 'extreamly different' to James, 'a seduced Papist.' 'Usurpers' attacked Charles I; James's actions imitated those 'Usurpers.'⁶⁰ This satisfied Long that William and Mary's enthronement did not radically alter English constitutional norms. Long used this historic episode and several other ideas, including Conquest, to justify allegiance to William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs who possessed the throne. William and Mary could be given allegiance as *de facto* monarchs because, like Charles II's Restoration, their succession protected the traditional monarchy from James's usurping innovations.⁶¹ The Revolution did not overthrow things like 1648-9 did; William and Mary replaced James within existing constitutional arrangements.

Williamites across the Kingdoms tried to use the recent past as effectively as Jacobites did in justifying allegiance. Ireland, unlike other Kingdoms, remained largely under Jacobite control between 1688 and 1690 because the Lord Lieutenant, the Earl of Tyrconnell, ensured that the government of Ireland remained in the hands of those loyal to James. Many Irish Protestants saw Tyrconnell's actions as precipitating a repeat of the 1641 massacres. Enniskillen and Derry declared for William as *de facto* King of England because of the popular fears of 1641. Several accounts of events in Ireland, although published in 1690, provide insights into the apparent public reactions in Ireland in 1689. Andrew Hamilton, a Protestant at Enniskillen, said

⁵⁷ Ibid, pp.50-4, 'An Answer to the Desertion Discuss'd' pp.150-2, 158-64.

⁵⁸ Ibid, pp.164-8.

⁵⁹ Thomas Long, *A Resolution of Certain Queries Concerning Submission to the Present Government* (London, 1689), p.60.

⁶⁰ Ibid, pp.60-1.

⁶¹ Ibid, pp.39-40, 44-6, 60-1.

that fears of 1641 being repeated justified their acts and their declaring for William in early 1689 because as *de facto* King of England only he could prevent such a massacre.⁶² William's 1688 *Declaration* said that 'daily fears' of massacres in Ireland partially justified William's intervention in the Kingdoms.⁶³ Many Irish and English Williamite pamphlets expressed similar statements about loyalty to William as *de facto* King of England and how he would prevent a repetition of 1641.⁶⁴ This minority of Irish Protestants advocating allegiance to William in early 1689 believed that to prevent history being repeated allegiance was owed to William as *de facto* King of England.

Some Scottish supporters of the Revolution also used the recent past to justify their position by comparing James with Cromwell. James Canaries, a Whig Williamite Episcopalian minister, did this in a 30 January sermon, subsequently published, urging subjects to end their allegiance to James.⁶⁵ Jackson and Tim Harris have focused on Canaries promoting *de facto* theory and resistance *in extremis*.⁶⁶ However Canaries's sermon, coming before the Scottish Convention met, was cautious; his sermon aired the popular hostility to Cromwell and the mid-century wars. Canaries condemned the re-emergence of the 'malignant Ingredients' used to justify the 'Rebellion against our Holy Martyr,' which was 'as terrible a Crime as ever a Nation was guilty of.'⁶⁷ However like Thomas Long, Canaries denounced James's usurpations. James's Catholicism usurped the traditional Protestant monarchy similar to the way Cromwell, while not Catholic, usurped the traditional monarchy. The 1640s usurpation was a time of 'National Wickedness' and this 'Wickedness'

⁶² Andrew Hamilton, *A True Relation of the Actions of the Inniskilling Men* (London, 1690), p.8.

⁶³ *The Declaration of His Highness William Henry, by the Grace of God, Prince of Orange &c. of the Reasons inducing him, to appear in Armes in the Kingdom of England, for preserving of the Protestant Religion, and Restoring the lawes and liberties of England, Scotland and Ireland* (n.p., 1688), p.5.

⁶⁴ Edmund Bohun, *The History of the Desertion*, pp.44-5; Sir Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana...Part II* (London, 1690), 'To the Reader;' *A Letter from a Gentleman in Ireland, to his Friend in London, upon occasion of a Pamphlet, Entituled, A Vindication of the Present Government of Ireland, under his Excellency Richard Earl of Tyrconnel* in *Fourteen Papers* (London, 1689), pp.1-2.

⁶⁵ James Canaries, *A Sermon Preached at Edinburgh, in the East-Church of St. Giles, upon the 30th of January, 1689. Being the Anniversary of the Maryrdome of King Charles the First* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp.14-5. See Chapter Two for his use of the Non-Resistance doctrine, Chapter Three for his use of Conquest theory and Chapter Eight for his use of providential theory.

⁶⁶ Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.200-2, 220; Tim Harris, 'Reluctant Revolutionaries? The Scots and the Revolution of 1688-89,' in Howard Nenner (ed.) *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain, Essays Presented to Lois Green Schworer* (Rochester, 1997), pp.109-10.

⁶⁷ Canaries, *A Sermon*, pp.86-7.

reappeared in 1689; what happened in ‘*Cromwells time*’ was in ‘these last days... sadly palpable to all considering Men.’ The main difference between 1689 and the 1640s-1650s was that James, not the subjects, usurped traditional authority. Allegiance to a Catholic absolutist was like allegiance to Cromwell.⁶⁸ With the absence of James’s authority subjects could support someone who rid them of these ‘incroaching usurpations.’⁶⁹ He did not specifically mention William but he did say allegiance could not go to James for the reasons he outlined; James had no authority in Scotland at this time so someone, other than James, had to provide that authority. Again historical comparisons were used as a guide for what to do on allegiance. Canaries essentially advocated allegiance to *de facto* rulers.

Williamite Episcopalians, like Canaries, were a minority of the Episcopalian clergy.⁷⁰ However *Allegiance and Prerogative Considered* was another Episcopalian polemic that employed recent history as one reason justifying allegiance to William. The author said this tract, published before the Scottish Convention enthroned William, was to answer the question of ‘*how far we are now tyed by our Allegiance*’ to James.⁷¹ This author said that the ‘Fondness of this Nation, for the Restoration of K. *Charles the Second*’ led Scotland to unwittingly accept absolutism but William had restored the traditional limited Scottish monarchy.⁷² A republication in London indicates some public support for this pamphlet.⁷³ Recent history was employed to demonstrate that rather than upending traditional monarchy William’s enthronement, and allegiance to him, preserved the traditional order. This Revolution was a personnel change that prevented James’s radical changes. The author ‘applauded’ England’s Convention for enthroning William and wanted Scotland’s Convention to follow suit. While recent history justified allegiance to William, the author also said that ‘the *Histories* of past Ages teach us’ that Scots being ‘unanimous in their Allegiance’ to maintain a King ‘against all the Efforts of *England*’ generally ended badly. Maintaining

⁶⁸ Long, *Resolution of Certain Queries*, pp.60-3; Canaries, *A Sermon*, pp.54-5, 59-61, 76-7, 83-8.

⁶⁹ Canaries, *A Sermon*, pp.23-5, 46-7.

⁷⁰ T.N. Clarke, ‘The Scottish Episcopalians 1688-1720,’ (University of Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 1987), p.35.

⁷¹ Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative Considered in a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to his Friend upon his being chosen a Member of the Meeting of States in Scotland* (n.p., 1689), p.3.

⁷² Ibid, pp.7-8.

⁷³ Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative ...*(Edinburgh & London, 1689).

allegiance to James would also ensure the ‘ruine of the true *Reformed Religion*.’⁷⁴ This author believed that recent and more distant Scottish history showed that allegiance was owed to William. The new political reality was that William possessed authority in England and Scotland should follow England’s lead. Like *Allegiance and Prerogative*, Williamites across the Kingdoms found history outside the recent past easier to use when advocating allegiance to William as *de facto* King. This became a more common feature of early-1689 Williamite polemics than citing the recent past.

II

In 1689 Robert Ferguson was a radical Scottish Williamite Whig who also cited the Restoration and other historic examples of allegiance to monarchs with contested successions in his pamphlets. He lambasted Jacobites ‘endeavouring to restore King *James*’ and their denunciations of Williamites as ‘Republicans.’ William, not James, was a King who could secure Scotland and England ‘from the Common-wealths Men, and from all Republican Principles....’⁷⁵ Ferguson’s 1689 works for Scottish and English audiences clearly used Contract ideas to promote allegiance to William.⁷⁶ However a strong sense of History was also evident and this was not just to support his Contract theories. Ferguson referenced numerous historic examples that showed the regularity of subjects giving allegiance to monarchs whose only entitlement to allegiance was that they possessed monarchical authority. He argued that in Scotland every Stuart monarch ‘after *Robert the First*’ had their rule confirmed by Scotland’s Parliament as *de facto* monarchs ‘in prejudice and preclusion of these of the Ligitmate and right Line.’ Therefore there was no reason not to support William. The English Parliament’s enthroning William was similar to Elizabeth and James I’s successions in England and they were given allegiance.⁷⁷ History beyond Cromwell and the Regicide provided Williamites in England and Scotland more examples to justify

⁷⁴ Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative...* (n.p., edition, 1689), pp.4-8.

⁷⁵ Robert Ferguson, *The Late Proceedings and Votes of the Parliament of Scotland contained in an Address delivered to the King...* (Glasgow, 1689), pp.11-2.

⁷⁶ Melinda Zook, ‘Turncoats and Double Agents in Restoration and Revolutionary England: The Case of Robert Ferguson, The Plotter,’ *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 42, No. 3 (2009), pp.369-74.

⁷⁷ Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Justification of the Prince of Orange’s descent into England...* (London, 1689), pp.25-7.

allegiance to monarchs who were not necessarily the rightful monarch but did possess authority in the Kingdoms in 1689.

Other Scottish writers also cited contested successions beyond recent history to justify allegiance to William because he possessed the throne. *A Short Historical Account, Concerning the Succession to the Crown of Scotland* cited the reigns of Fergus I, the first King of the Scots, and Robert the Bruce. As with events in 1689 these non-linear monarchs had their succession confirmed by parliamentary-style gatherings before subjects ‘swore Allegiance to their new King....’ Contract theories were part of this pamphlet but like other pamphlets the author deliberately compared William’s succession through a parliamentary decision with previous successions. These historic episodes should be followed and justified allegiance to William, an extra-linear King, whereas Contract elements mainly dealt with ending allegiance to James. This pamphlet dealt with William becoming King but described this succession as happening without constitutional change.⁷⁸ Some Scottish polemicists defending the Revolution were influenced by the Contract ideas in George Buchanan’s histories.⁷⁹ Buchanan’s histories, republished in 1689 and 1690, also provided a historical basis for transferring allegiance, mainly with Contract theory. However these republications can be seen as supporting the Revolution and allegiance to an extra-linear monarch possessing authority by highlighting successions where the monarch did not inherit the Crown.⁸⁰

Contract and Conquest theory polemics naturally referenced historic examples to support their arguments. Henry VII’s succession was a common example amongst English Williamite polemics especially in Conquest theory polemics.⁸¹ In early 1689 a common theme across English and Scottish Williamite pamphlets was comparing 1688-9 with Historic contested successions. Some combined and used this alongside Conquest or Contract

⁷⁸ *A Short Historical Account, Concerning the Succession to the Crown of Scotland: And the Estates disposing of it upon Occasion as they thought fit* (n.p., 1689), pp.1-4. See Chapter Four for more on Contract and Liberties.

⁷⁹ Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland’s Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.15, 26-9, 66; idem, *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800* (Cambridge, 1999), pp.35, 99-102, 125-33.

⁸⁰ George Buchanan, *The History of Scotland written in Latin by George Buchanan: faithfully rendered into English* (London, 1690), pp.103, 250; idem, *A Detection of the Actions of Mary Queen of Scots concerning the Murther of her Husband, and her conspiracy...* (London, 1689), ‘To the Reader,’ pp.4-8.

⁸¹ Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, pp.53-4; Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603-1714* (London, 1995), pp.201-3.

ideas while others focused purely on comparing 1688-9 with previous contested successions often without employing these ideas. Across early-1689 polemics by Williamites from diverse backgrounds a unifying theme was comparing allegiance to William, the ruler who possessed power, with previous examples of allegiance to *de facto*-style rulers.

Gilbert Burnet was a moderate Scottish-born Whig and Anglican cleric who made his career in Scotland and England before political exile and returning as part of William's expedition. Historians have examined his use of Contract and Conquest ideas.⁸² Burnet's *Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs* partially justified allegiance to William with Contract and Conquest theories while citing Edward II and Richard II as examples of parliament altering succession similar to 1689.⁸³ Mark Goldie has highlighted how William's government used moderate language focusing on William's possession of the throne to appeal to as many subjects as possible.⁸⁴ Burnet's 1689 pamphlets frequently highlighted examples of allegiance to monarchs in possession or *de facto* monarchs, which should be emulated. However he often used more moderate language by emphasising historic examples to follow without heavily coating his argument and examples in Contract or Conquest ideas. 31 January 1689 was a thanksgiving day for William's incursion and Burnet preached before the Commons that the history of Christianity in England justified allegiance to William. He argued that during the Roman Empire Britons were forced into an allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church.⁸⁵ This allegiance should have been 'at an end' when the Roman Empire fell. However with 'Usurped Authority' the Catholic Church forced adherence to Catholicism until Elizabeth introduced Protestant Christianity. This switch in obedience showed that transferring allegiance was permissible.⁸⁶ He paralleled Rome's usurpation with James usurping traditional authority. James 'going out' of England meant he no longer possessed the government. William, in the mould of Israel's King David, possessed the government securing England

⁸² Martin Greig, 'Burnet, Gilbert (1643-1715),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; Online edn, Sept 2013 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4061, accessed 13 April 2014]; Goldie, 'Revolution of 1689,' pp.503-17, 535.

⁸³ Gilbert Burnet, *An Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs...* (London, 1689), pp.6-8, 11-3.

⁸⁴ Goldie, 'English System of Liberty,' pp.43-4; idem 'Revolution of 1689,' pp.487-8.

⁸⁵ Gilbert Burnet, *A Sermon Preached before the House of Commons, on the 31st of January, 1688 being the Thanksgiving-day for the Deliverance of this Kingdom from the Popery and Arbitrary Power, by his Highness the Prince of Orange's means* (London, 1689), pp.9-11.

⁸⁶ Ibid, pp.11-6.

from turmoil and this justified allegiance to William.⁸⁷ In Burnet's early-1689 polemics there is evidence of this more moderate language through his many references to historic episodes when subjects gave allegiance to what were authorities in possession of power or *de facto* rulers.

Burnet's *Pastoral Letter* provides the best example of this; it was originally written to persuade his new diocese's clerics to give William allegiance. It was soon published in London and Edinburgh to convince as many English and Scottish subjects to give William allegiance because he was 'in Possession' of the government.⁸⁸ Some historians describe Burnet's *Letter* as a Conquest polemic. In 1693 some Whigs condemned Burnet's *Letter* for promoting *de facto* theory with some Tories attacking it for supporting extra-lineal successions.⁸⁹ However Conquest theory was only one element of this pamphlet; in early 1689 History was also a prevalent feature in its own right to justify allegiance to William as a King in 'Possession.' To Burnet 'the whole History of the Old Testament' showed that in 'any Revolution' during 'the History of the Ten Tribes, the People acquiesced always in the Possession....' These subjects were never 'required... to return back to those Prince, or Families which they had shaken off.'⁹⁰ The people of Judah gave allegiance to Athaliah despite 'her unjust and bloody Usurpation' because Athaliah possessed the throne, providing protection.⁹¹ This was the foundation for the Jewish Covenants and the Roman Military Oath that evolved into Oaths of Allegiance during feudal times.⁹² Israelite actions against the Syrians and early Christians' obedience to Roman Emperors were other examples of allegiance to those who possessed power but without references to a Conquest.⁹³ Subjects 'must give their Allegiance to him that protects them;' in 1689 that was William.⁹⁴ This shows that Burnet's 1689 polemics, especially *Pastoral Letter*, sought to appeal to as many subjects as possible. While parts of his polemics used Conquest and Contract ideas, it was clear that much of his polemics were

⁸⁷ Ibid, pp.34-5.

⁸⁸ Gilbert Burnet, *A Pastoral Letter writ by Right Reverend Father in God Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum, to the Clergy of his Diocess, concerning the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy to K. William and Q. Mary* (London, 1689); idem, *A Pastoral Letter...* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp.2, 4, 6.

⁸⁹ Harris, *Revolution*, p.361; Nenner, *Right to be King*, p.225; Greig, 'Burnet, Gilbert,' *ODNB* entry.

⁹⁰ Burnet, *Pastoral Letter...* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp.2-4.

⁹¹ Ibid, p.3.

⁹² Ibid, p.3.

⁹³ Ibid, pp.5-7.

⁹⁴ Ibid, pp.5-7.

merely presenting examples from history when allegiance was given to monarchs 'in Possession' or *de facto* monarchs. Burnet wanted subjects to follow these examples in 1689 and many of these examples did not mention Conquest or Contract ideas in describing how these rulers were enthroned.

The author of *The Case of the People of England*, like Burnet, wanted subjects in 1689 to emulate examples from religious history when subjects gave allegiance to what were *de facto* rulers. Early Christians' allegiance to Roman Emperors was cited as an example of allegiance being given to rulers on the basis that they possessed power.⁹⁵ In Scotland Presbyterian Williamite lawyer Sir Francis Grant also cited early Christians' allegiance to Roman Emperors who possessed power in urging allegiance to William as *de facto* King.⁹⁶ Jackson has said that Grant's *Loyalists Reasons* mainly used Conquest theory to justify allegiance to an extra-lineal *de facto* monarch.⁹⁷ However like Burnet's *Pastoral Letter*, there were parts of this polemic that used Conquest theory but other parts of Grant's pamphlet cited Historic examples of allegiance to monarchs possessing power who did not necessarily obtain power through Conquest. He wanted Scots 'to parallel the piety of Noble *Romans*' and '*Cappadocians*' who gave allegiance to *de facto* authorities when necessity arose and in the absence of the normal authority. These examples of allegiance to rulers in possession should be imitated because 'we found the same most necessary for our safety and happiness....'⁹⁸ James's 'Desertion' meant he no longer possessed power thus subjects were 'freed Antecedently by the P. [Prince of Orange] and K.J.'s [James's] own facts, from his debt of Allegiance to K.J....'⁹⁹ Other examples mentioned were from Biblical history, like Solomon, and medieval times when Henry III of England 'was Crowned in his Father's lifetime' and Henry VI was given allegiance after he 'chased out' Edward IV.¹⁰⁰ Cicero and Florius were also cited to show that allegiance was owed to rulers who possessed authority when it was clear that the 'Head only

⁹⁵ *The Case of the People of England in their present Circumstances considered; shewing, How far they are, or not obliged by the Oath of Allegiance* (London, 1689), pp.3-9, 15-9.

⁹⁶ Sir Francis Grant, Lord Cullen, *The Loyalists Reasons for his giving Obedience, and Swearing Allegiance, to the Present Government...* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp.107-8.

⁹⁷ Clare Jackson, 'Revolution Principles, *Ius Naturae* and *Ius Gentium* in Early-Enlightenment Scotland: The Contribution of Sir Francis Grant, Lord Cullen (c.1660-1729),' in Tim Hochstrasser & Peter Schröder (eds.) *Early Modern Natural Law Theories: Contexts and Strategies in the Early Enlightenment* (Dordrecht, 2003), pp.109-12.

⁹⁸ Grant, *Loyalists Reasons*, pp.27-8, 44-5.

⁹⁹ *Ibid*, pp.47-8.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, pp.57-8, 100, 105-6.

changed.’¹⁰¹ There were no changes to the institute of the monarchy, traditional order was maintained with William replacing James as King. These examples justified allegiance to rulers who, like William, did not inherit the throne but possessed authority. Subjects owed William allegiance in recognition of his rule as *de facto* King just as people had done on numerous occasions in history.

Medieval history was far enough removed for the righteousness and judgements on these events to be cemented in the popular consciousness while relevant to the immediate allegiance problems. Those with difficulties over the Revolution and allegiance to William found medieval history useful in justifying allegiance to monarchs in possession. Scottish Episcopalian Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh loyally served James and Charles for decades. Mackenzie opposed dethroning James throughout the Convention and fled to England after Presbyterians came to dominate Scotland.¹⁰² However after the Scottish Convention enthroned William, Mackenzie wrote to Lord Melville, one of William’s Scottish advisors, promising not to be ‘troublesom’ to William. Mackenzie accepted William’s authority in Scotland and England and said that he was probably ‘as sincere’ as any in affections towards William and his letters refer to William as ‘the King.’¹⁰³ This contrasted with firm Jacobites like Jeremy Collier who generally called William ‘the Usurper,’ not a King.¹⁰⁴ In 1689 Mackenzie with his cousin George Mackenzie, Viscount Tarbat, wrote a pamphlet urging William to maintain Episcopacy because Presbyterians, unlike Episcopalians, were noted for historic disloyalty.¹⁰⁵ Apart from citing historic Presbyterian disloyalty this pamphlet did not use history as much as other pamphlets but did acknowledge William’s authority in Scotland in early 1689.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰¹ Ibid, p.106.

¹⁰² Clare Jackson, ‘Mackenzie, Sir George, of Rosehaugh (1636/1638-1691),’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2007 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17579, accessed 17 May 2012].

¹⁰³ Sir George Mackenzie, ‘Sir George Mackenzie to Lord Melville,’ May 1689, in *Leven and Melville Papers. Letters and State Papers Chiefly addressed to George Earl of Melville, Secretary of State for Scotland 1689-1691*, ed. W.L. Melville, The Bannatyne Club, (Edinburgh, 1843), p.32; idem, ‘Sir George Mackenzie to Lord Melville, Jun. 1689,’ in *Leven and Melville Papers*, p.128; Sir George Mackenzie, ‘Sir George Mackenzie to Lord Melville,’ 29 June 1689, in *Leven and Melville Papers*, p.107.

¹⁰⁴ Jeremy Collier, *Animadversions upon the modern explanation of 11 Hen.7. Cap. I, or, A King De Facto* (n.p., 1689), p.4.

¹⁰⁵ Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh & Sir George Mackenzie, Viscount of Tarbat, *A Memorial for his Highness the Prince of Orange in relation to the Affairs of Scotland; together with the address of the Presbyterian-party in that Kingdom to his Highness...* (London, 1689), pp.3-4, 7-8.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, pp.3-4, 7-8.

Another pamphlet published in Mackenzie's name provides more evidence of him, or his influential name being used for, publicly justifying allegiance to monarchs in possession by highlighting similar examples from history. This was an English translation of a 1320 letter from Scottish nobles to the Pope concerning Robert the Bruce's succession. Audiences in 1689 would have noticed the parallels. The title page labelled Bruce 'the Restorer of Safety, and Liberties of the People, and as having the true Right of Succession.'¹⁰⁷ Bruce's authority restored stability to Scotland, entitling him to allegiance. 'To him we are obliged, and resolved to adhere in all things, both upon the account of his right, and his own merit, as being the person who hath restored the people's safety, in defence of their Liberties.'¹⁰⁸ Similar rhetoric was used in William's Scottish *Declaration*, which said William's intervention would preserve Protestantism and restore the liberties 'of the ancient Kingdom of Scotland.'¹⁰⁹ The *Claim of Right* also described William as a ruler who preserved subjects 'from the Violation of their Rights... and from all Attempts upon their Religion, Laws and Liberties.' Allegiance to James was declared void and subjects were to be tendered the new allegiance oath recognising William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs.¹¹⁰ The 1320 letter defended Scots giving allegiance to an extra-lineal monarch possessing the government but with a rule confirmed by a national assembly. Mackenzie, or someone acting in his name, used history at its most raw, a primary source, to show allegiance could be given to what were *de facto* monarchs. He did not want to break allegiance to James but his 1689 publications can be seen as acknowledging and accepting allegiance to William as a monarch who possessed power.¹¹¹

While there are ambiguities about Mackenzie's loyalty from 1689 other subjects in the Kingdoms firmly publicly declared that monarchical history obliged continued allegiance to James. Irish Williamite Sir Richard

¹⁰⁷ Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, *A Letter from the Nobility, Barons & Commons of Scotland, in the Year 1320, yet extant under all the Seals of the Nobility: Directed to Pope John: Wherein they declare their firm Resolutions, to adhere to their King Robert the Bruce, as the Restorer of the Safety, and Liberties of the People...*(Edinburgh, 1689).

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid*, p.5.

¹⁰⁹ *The Declaration of His Highness William Henry, By the Grace of God, Prince of Orange, &c. Of the Reasons inducing him to appear in Arms for preserving of the Protestant Religion, and for Restoring the Laws and Liberties of the ancient Kingdom of Scotland* (n.p., 1689), pp.1-3.

¹¹⁰ *The Declaration of the Estates of the Kingdom of Scotland, containing the Claim of Right, and the Offer of the Crown to their Majesties, King William and Queen Mary...*(Edinburgh, 1689), pp.6-7.

¹¹¹ Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, *A Letter from the Nobility*, *passim*.

Cox's 1690 sequel to his 1689 *Hibernia Anglicana* responded to unidentified Jacobite histories and critiques of his original pamphlet. This provides insight into how Irish Jacobites publicly justified allegiance in 1689 using history. Cox described how in 1689 Irish Jacobites were 'excited by an unparallel'd *Loyalty* to their *Ancient Monarchy*, to resist and endeavour to shake off the Violences and Usurpations of *England*.'¹¹² They believed maintaining allegiance to James was '*in Imitation of their Godly and Worthy Ancestors*;' their history obliged continued allegiance to James. The Stuarts also had '*Sacred Blood the Irish Nation hath contributed*, whose Pedigree is founded on the *Famous Irish Milesian Princes*.'¹¹³ Breandán Ó Buachalla has shown that there was a tradition of Irish Catholic loyalty to Stuart monarchs throughout the seventeenth century.¹¹⁴ Cox's criticism shows that in 1689 the Stuarts' Irish ancestry and a history of Irish Catholic loyalty to the Stuarts publicly influenced many to maintain their allegiance to James and fight for him.

Many of Jeremy Collier's early-1689 pamphlets also used history beyond the recent past to attack polemics advocating allegiance to William as *de facto* King.¹¹⁵ To Collier Williamites were 'Disputing and Printing against the freedom of their Country;' by advocating allegiance to William 'they are pleased to ratify their Slavery with an Oath.'¹¹⁶ Collier's *Vindicae Juris Regnii* challenged Burnet for citing examples from the early Christians to James I and believing that 'he can discharge himself of his Allegiance when he pleases....'¹¹⁷ Historically and constitutionally English monarchs possessed the crown 'immediately upon the Death of their Predecessors, and therefore King *John*, *Edward* the First, and *Henry* the Fifth, had Allegiance Sworn to them before their Coronation.'¹¹⁸ Some subjects gave William allegiance but this did not make him a King.¹¹⁹ Collier repeatedly denounced the Revolution and Williamites using history to justify allegiance to *de facto* monarchs. His

¹¹² Sir Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana: Or, The Second Part of the History of Ireland...* (London, 1690), p.1.

¹¹³ Ibid, pp.1-2.

¹¹⁴ Breandán Ó Buachalla, 'James Our True King: The Ideology of Irish Royalism in the Seventeenth Century,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1993).

¹¹⁵ Collier, *Animadversions*, passim; idem, *Vindiciae juris Regii, or Remarques upon a Paper, Entitled, An Enquiry into the measures of submission to the supream authority* (London, 1689), pp.22, 43; idem, *The Desertion Discuss'd*, p.5.

¹¹⁶ Collier, *Animadversions*, p.1.

¹¹⁷ Gilbert Burnet, *An Enquiry into the Measures of Submission to the Supream Authority...* (London, 1689), pp.4-9, 14-6; Collier, *Vindiciae Juris Regii*, p.18.

¹¹⁸ Collier, *Vindiciae Juris Regii*, pp.12-3.

¹¹⁹ Ibid, pp.12-3.

Animadversions took issue with Williamites citing Henry VII and the Wars of the Roses to justify allegiance to a ‘King *de Facto*,’ to Collier there was no historical or legal precedent to justify transferring allegiance in 1689.¹²⁰

Collier repeatedly and skilfully denounced Williamites for misrepresenting history to justify allegiance to William. James was the King subjects had sworn allegiance to. History did not vindicate allegiance to William and the English Convention’s ‘pretended Necessity’ in enthroning William.¹²¹ Favoured Williamite precedents like Edward II and Richard II were inappropriate in 1689. In both cases subjects ‘did not renounce their Allegiance, and declare the Throne void, till they had a formal Resignation under the Hands of both those unfortunate Princes.’¹²² Collier demanded that Burnet ‘produce such a Resignation from’ James.¹²³ Numerous contested English successions were examined by Collier to show that allegiance could not be withdrawn from James even after James’s flight. During the War of the Roses when Edward IV fled whether ‘he deputed any Persons to Represent him, our Histories don’t give us the least Imitation....’ Subjects had not ‘Objected at his return, that he had Abdicated the Government, by omitting to Constitute a Regent.’¹²⁴ If Williamite logic were followed in the past then neither Edward IV nor Charles II would have reigned nor would they have had subjects’ allegiance. James was owed allegiance because he was in the same situation as his brother and Edward.¹²⁵ Subjects had ‘no Grounds... to pronounce the Throne void....’¹²⁶ Collier argued that History provided no parallels to 1689 or justification of allegiance to *de facto* monarchs. The strength of Collier’s argument can be seen by Bohun’s response to Collier where Bohun admitted that he could not respond to Collier’s historical arguments on contested successions, especially the examples of Edward II and Richard II. Bohun described Collier as ‘a person for whom I have a great esteem’ because ‘of his profession, and of his personal worth, learning and

¹²⁰ Collier, *Animadversions*, pp.2-5.

¹²¹ Collier, *The Desertion Discuss’d*, pp.1-5.

¹²² *Ibid*, p.4.

¹²³ *Ibid*, p.4.

¹²⁴ *Ibid*, p.7.

¹²⁵ *Ibid*, pp.7-8.

¹²⁶ *Ibid*, p.6.

sobriety....'¹²⁷ Collier was one of the most skilled Jacobite polemicists employing History to undermine Williamite justifications of allegiance.

Other supporters of James used arguments similar to Collier's. James's supporters in the English Convention also challenged the way Williamites used historic episodes to advocate enthroning William and giving him allegiance. The Jacobite Earl of Clarendon claimed that Richard II, a favoured Williamite precedent, was irrelevant in 1689 because Richard, unlike James, 'resigned, renounced, or (call it what you please) abdicated in Writing under his own Hand....'¹²⁸ Clarendon also highlighted how some subjects viewed the Earl of March as the legitimate King after Henry IV's usurpation. These historic episodes meant that allegiance to James should be maintained and 1688-9's 'Usurpation condemned and repealed.'¹²⁹ Bishop Francis Turner of Ely also denounced enthroning William as breaking allegiance to James. Turner acknowledged previous interruptions in the lineal succession but this did not vindicate the Convention acting disloyally. Every 'breach of the first Contract' did not 'give us power to dispose of the lineal succession....' To Turner 'the statutes of queen Eliz. and King James I that have established the Oath of Allegiance to the king, his heirs, and successors, the law is stronger against such a deposition....'¹³⁰ Without James's assent the Convention had no authority to deprive James of allegiance and his kingship.¹³¹ However the English Convention contained Tories who agreed with Clarendon and Turner's views on History showing that allegiance could not be broken and opposed notions of resistance but who were prepared to compromise. Tories who became Williamites would use History to justify their pragmatism in accepting and advocating allegiance to what were *de facto* monarchs.

Daniel Finch, Earl of Nottingham, one of the most influential Tories, opposed dethroning James for much of the Convention.¹³² Nottingham disputed historical precedents justifying James's dethronement. Like Collier, he was recorded as saying that '*Edward II and Richard II were express solemn*

¹²⁷ Edmund Bohun, *The History of the Desertion*, 'An Answer to the Desertion Discuss'd,' pp.158, 150.

¹²⁸ *Chandlers*, pp.239-40. URL: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol2/pp199-255>.

¹²⁹ *Ibid*, pp.239-41.

¹³⁰ *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England Volume V* (London, 1809), cols.74-6.

¹³¹ *Ibid*, cols.74-6.

¹³² Henry Horwitz, *Revolution Politicks: The Career of Daniel Finch Second Earl of Nottingham, 1647-1730* (Cambridge, 1968), pp.64-79.

renunciations' whereas James did not renounce his entitlement to allegiance.¹³³ Other accounts of the English Convention also record Nottingham disputing historical precedents to justify enthroning William. *Chandler's* records Nottingham's 22 January speech where he contested Williamites using Henry IV, Richard II, Richard III and Henry VII but also showed a willingness to comprise that was absent from arguments by Collier, Clarendon and Turner. Nottingham accepted that previous extra-lineal successors were accepted but the 'force of the Laws' in England meant that 'the Usurpers would not take' the throne 'unless they had some specious pretence of an Hereditary Title to it.' This overlooked passage is significant because it shows Nottingham, who opposed breaking allegiance to James, saying that he could work with an 'Usurper' who had 'some pretence of an Hereditary Title.'¹³⁴ Mary gave William a hereditary claim and many Williamite Tories used her position to justify their supporting William.¹³⁵

Nottingham believed a government was needed to prevent anarchy and William, possessing the government, could provide this. He was one of the main advocates of the idea that William could reign as a regent in James's name.¹³⁶ In advocating regency Nottingham also cited historical episodes, like John's regency under Richard I. Nottingham believed this would prevent allegiance becoming a problem.¹³⁷ When regency was rejected and William and Mary were offered the Crown Nottingham accepted this but led the push for the new oaths of allegiance that recognised them as *de facto* monarchs. This was only slightly different to regency because it accepted William as possessing the government while denying that he was a rightful King. Like other Tories, Nottingham was willing to work with William but would not give him the same allegiance James received because William had no right to this. The new oaths were to support William as a *de facto* King who would protect subjects from disorder.¹³⁸ This was like Mackenzie's 1689 publications that

¹³³ *Cobbett's*, cols.82-3.

¹³⁴ *Chandler's*, pp.250-4, URL: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol2/pp199-255>.

¹³⁵ W.A. Speck, 'William - and Mary?', in Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives*, pp.131-45.

¹³⁶ Horwitz, *Revolution Politicks*, pp.71-2, 76-8.

¹³⁷ *A Kingdom without a King: The Journal of the Provisional Government in the Revolution of 1688*, ed. Robert Beddard (Oxford, 1988), pp.161-2.

¹³⁸ Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC) *The Manuscripts of the House of Lords Volume II 1689-90* (London, 1889), pp.53-4; Henry Hyde, *Clarendon Diary*, pp.165-6; Sir John Reresby, *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby* (London, 1813), pp.393-6.

accepted William and Mary as possessing the government within existing constitutional norms and in the absence of James's authority.¹³⁹ Those reluctant to accept the Revolution used History to justify allegiance to William who could provide a government following James's absconding. The focus was on William and James's persons: William was in Britain and could provide a traditional government whereas James's flight meant he could not.

In December 1688 Morrice's *Entring Book* recorded how allegiance was based on possession and that in 1688-9 subjects should use Henry VII's reign as a guide; it showed that subjects could not be punished for loyalty to *de facto* monarchs. A ruler that 'Assumes the Crown and possesseth it is King by Common Law and *de facto*....' Subjects who acted 'in obedience to, or fights for the King *de facto*,' even against the rightful King, were 'indemnified by Law, and this was the very Case when that Act of Henry the 7 was made.'¹⁴⁰ A deluge of early-1689 pamphlets urged subjects to follow historic examples of subjects giving allegiance to *de facto* monarchs by declaring allegiance to William.¹⁴¹ The toppling of Edward II and Richard II were repeatedly cited in England's Convention to justify transferring allegiance to William.¹⁴² Howard's *Historical Observations* presented these episodes as suitable guides to follow in 1689. 'The examples are no where to be found more close than in the Reigns of *Edward* the Second and *Richard* the Second.'¹⁴³ Contract ideas were part of Howard's polemic but he also depicted successions where parliament enthroned monarchs, like in 1689, Edward and Richard's reigns, as natural occurrences in English history, which subjects should support with allegiance.¹⁴⁴ As another author said in justifying allegiance to William 'the short Reign of *James* the Second' was 'much like that which was spoken of *Richard* the Second.'¹⁴⁵ When monarchs were perceived as abandoning their

¹³⁹ Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, *A Letter from the Nobility*; Mackenzie & Mackenzie, Tarbat, *Memorial for his Highness the Prince of Orange in relation to the Affairs of Scotland*, pp.3-4, 7-8.

¹⁴⁰ Roger Morrice, *The Entring Book of Roger Morrice 1677-1691 Volume IV The Reign of James II 1687-1689*, ed. Stephen Taylor (Woodbridge, 2007), Q.394, p.436.

¹⁴¹ Long, *Resolution of Certain Queries*, pp.29-30; Defoe, *Reflections*, pp.50, 62-3; Francis Fullwood, *Obedience due to the Present King, notwithstanding our oaths to the former written by a divine of the Church of England* (London, 1689), p.5.

¹⁴² Anchitell Grey, *Grey's... Volume 9*, pp.20-4; *Cobbett's*, 28 January 1689, cols. 40-2, 61-3.

¹⁴³ Howard, *Historical Observations*, pp.33-4.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid*, pp.43, 161, 168-9.

¹⁴⁵ *Quadriennium Jacobi: or, The History of the Reign of King James II. From his First Coming to the Crown to his Desertion. The Second Edition* (London, 1689), p.258.

kingships in some form then subjects could give allegiance to a new monarch who possessed authority in the Kingdoms as *de facto* King.

John Somers's *Brief History of the Succession*, originally published during the Exclusion Crisis to support Whig attempts to prevent James's succession, was republished in 1689. It cited disputed English successions as far back as King Egbert to defend parliament's altering the succession and allegiance. Again Henry VII was cited as an example of parliament confirming a succession, which also involved a Conquest, with new allegiance oaths to Henry as *de facto* monarch.¹⁴⁶ Elizabeth and James I's successions and allegiance to them were also cited to show that it was the 'Fundamental Law of the Land' to give allegiance to monarchs who possessed the throne.¹⁴⁷ More radical Whigs, like Samuel Johnson and Pierre Allix, claimed that these examples justified allegiance to William as something more than a *de facto* King and that James should be deprived of all his rights.¹⁴⁸ However this was a minority opinion in 1689 with most polemics advocating allegiance to William as *de facto* King.¹⁴⁹ In early 1689 English Williamites repeatedly cited historic examples of subjects giving allegiance to what were described as *de facto* rulers in some form to support allegiance to William. These pamphlets frequently had different ideas on how William became King. Conquest and Providential theories were popular explanations but the pressing issue in early 1689 was whether or not subjects could support *de facto* regimes.¹⁵⁰ This was why History was the dominant theme in English Williamite Whig and Tory polemics from January 1689. They used similar historic examples to justify allegiance to William as *de facto* King. As in Bohun's *History of the Desertion* Williamites tried to deal with the recent past, like the Restoration, but generally found events like the War of the Roses more useful.¹⁵¹ History was also prevalent in Scottish allegiance polemics with Presbyterian and Episcopalian Williamites using historic examples to promote allegiance to William as *de*

¹⁴⁶ John Somers, Baron Somers, *A Brief History of the Succession of the Crown of England, &c. Collected out of Research, and the most Authentick Historians. Written for the Satisfaction of the Nation* (London, 1689), pp.3-4, 8-11.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp.12-6.

¹⁴⁸ Samuel Johnson, *Reflections on the History of Passive Obedience* (London, 1689), passim; Pierre Allix, *An Examination of the Scruple of those who Refuse the Oath of Allegiance* (London, 1689), pp.6-7.

¹⁴⁹ Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.32-4; Goldie, 'Revolution of 1689,' pp.490-9, 507-8, 520-1; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.400-6. See Chapter Seven for more on *de jure* allegiance.

¹⁵⁰ See Chapters Three and Eight for Conquest and Providential theories.

¹⁵¹ Bohun, *History of the Desertion*, pp.163-4.

facto King. Scottish and English Williamites deliberately compared 1688-9 with historic events to induce allegiance to William as *de facto* King.

While some Irish Protestant Williamites used 1641 to advocate allegiance to William, the continuing Jacobite control of Ireland made things more difficult for them than Williamites in England and Scotland. This meant there were fewer Irish Williamite pamphlets in early 1689. English and Scottish Williamites could point to William's clear personal possession of power in England and Scotland but William did not control Ireland. Sir Richard Cox, an Anglican and one of Ireland's foremost lawyers, fled to England in 1688 and produced two of the few early-1689 Irish Williamite polemics, which were similar to early-1689 English and Scottish Williamite polemics. The first part of Cox's *Hibernia Anglicana* and *Aphorisms* argued that Irish history showed that Ireland was a territory of the English Crown. Therefore subjects in Ireland owed allegiance to the *de facto* King of England regardless of who actually controlled Ireland.¹⁵² S.J. Connolly and Jacqueline Hill have characterised Cox's argument as defending the Revolution as a necessary rebellion and even 'Hobbesian.' However both examined Cox's work as part of Irish Anglican justifications after Jacobite rule in Ireland ended.¹⁵³ These approaches do not take into account how circumstances changed after the war from when Cox wrote and published his pamphlets in early 1689. In these pamphlets Cox defended William's enthronement in England but his authority had not yet reached Ireland.¹⁵⁴ Cox used historic episodes, mainly from the Middle Ages, to show that Irish Protestants could give William allegiance as *de facto* King of England even with Ireland under Jacobite control.¹⁵⁵

He went back to 1169 when Irish nobles first took oaths of fealty to English monarchs. All subjects in Ireland since then had 'been born and bred

¹⁵² Sir Richard Cox, *Aphorisms Relating to the Kingdom of Ireland, Humbly submitted to the Most Noble Assembly of Lords and Commons at the Great Convention at Westminster* (London, 1689), pp.1-2.

¹⁵³ S.J. Connolly, 'The Glorious Revolution in Irish Protestant Political Thinking,' in S.J. Connolly (ed.) *Political Ideas in Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2000), pp.28-9, 40-2, 48-51; Jacqueline Hill, 'Politics and the Writing of History,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Basingstoke, 2001), pp.224-5, 228-9.

¹⁵⁴ Cox, *Aphorisms*, pp.1-2.

¹⁵⁵ Sir Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana, or the History of Ireland, from the Conquest thereof by the English, to this Present Time with an Introductory Discourse...* (London, 1689), 'To the Reader.'

under the Allegiance of the Kings of *England*.¹⁵⁶ Ireland ‘is a subordinate Kingdom to *England*... therefore whoever is the King of *England*, is, *ipso facto*, King of *Ireland* as much as of the Isle of *Sheppy*, or the Isle of *Wight*....’¹⁵⁷ In *Aphorisms* he described how ‘the Crown of *England* hath good Title to *Ireland*....’ This was ‘Not only by Descent from *Eva*, Daughter of *Dermond Mac Morough*, King of *Leinster*, whose Ancestors were Monarchs of *Ireland*’ but also through ‘repeated Oaths and voluntary Submissions of the Irish Potentates and Gentry in all Ages....’¹⁵⁸ Therefore decisions in England on succession and allegiance were binding in Ireland; if England decided to give allegiance to a *de facto* monarch Ireland had to give allegiance to that same *de facto* monarch. This was ‘what may be collected from the Statute of 11 *Hen. 7*. Of paying Obedience to the King of the time being; it was so at Common Law, and cannot be otherwise in Reason....’ Subjects in Ireland had to give allegiance to *de facto* Kings of England; there was a ‘cor-relation between Protection and Allegiance, that they must stand and fall together....’ There was ‘no difference’ between Ireland and ‘any other part of the Dominions of the Crown of *England*’ because William offered protection to all subjects of the English Crown, including those in Ireland.¹⁵⁹

Like English Williamites, Cox emphasised how the case of Henry VII demonstrated that Irish subjects owed allegiance to *de facto* monarchs; it was a perfect analogy for Irish Williamites in 1689. Henry was not the rightful heir but obtained the English throne; his marriage gave some hereditary claim, which aided in establishing his rule in England from 1485 but House of York factions held out longer in Ireland.¹⁶⁰ Some Irish nobles took an oath of allegiance to Henry but a pretender, claiming to be Richard IV, briefly established himself in Ireland. In the late fifteenth century, as in the late seventeenth century, there were some Irish subjects who gave allegiance to the *de facto* King of England rather than to who actually controlled Ireland. Cox provided other examples of Irish subjects giving allegiance to *de facto* monarchs of England. In England Henry VII and Edward III proved that English subjects’ allegiance was owed to ‘no other than the King *de facto* who is trusted by the Law with the executive Power thereof, and who alone doth or

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid*, p.8.

¹⁵⁷ Cox, *Aphorisms*, p.1; Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana*, p.298.

¹⁵⁸ Cox, *Aphorisms*, p.1.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid*, p.1.

¹⁶⁰ Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana*, pp.176-80.

can give the People actual Protection.¹⁶¹ To Cox the Anglo-Irish constitutional connexion meant that whoever was *de facto* King in England was automatically owed the same allegiance from subjects in Ireland as was given by subjects in England. While Cox, and some Ulster Protestants, advocated allegiance to William as *de facto* King of England most Irish Protestants did not produce polemics advocating allegiance to William in early 1689 with James still controlling much of Ireland.

III

In early 1689 James's flight and William's intervention prompted debate over succession and allegiance. History became one of the most important issues in these early-1689 justifications of allegiance. Many polemicists used history in conjunction with other ideas but in early 1689 paralleling 1688-9 with previous historic events was a notable feature of polemics across the Kingdoms. History, as John Somers wrote, could 'safely direct' subjects on the issue of allegiance.¹⁶² Cromwell and the mid-century crises became almost universally despised during the Restoration in the Three Kingdoms.¹⁶³ Across the Kingdoms Jacobites skilfully employed this recent history of Cromwell and Regicide, to portray the Revolution's extra-lineal succession and allegiance to William as repeating those radical upheavals.¹⁶⁴ This dominated early-1689 Jacobite polemics and would remain a feature, although not as prominent, of Jacobite polemics throughout the 1690s. Williamites knew they could not convince subjects to give William allegiance as *de facto* King or as a King in possession if the politically involved in each Kingdom believed his enthronement was like the Regicide. This led to many Williamites arguing that allegiance to James was like allegiance to Cromwell because both usurped traditional monarchy. Some Williamites argued that William's succession, like Charles II's, ended usurpations to the traditional

¹⁶¹ Ibid, pp.297-8.

¹⁶² Howard, *Historical Observations*, pp.1-2, 31.

¹⁶³ J.G.A Pocock, 'The Fourth English Civil War,' pp.4, 45-6; Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, passim; S.J Connolly, 'The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr,' pp.489-91.

¹⁶⁴ *Addres of the University of St. Andrews*, pp.3-5; '(Irish) Act of Recognition, 1689,' *English Historical Documents*, pp.747-9; Dulaney, *Sermon Preached Before the King, in Christ-Church*, pp.16, 19-20; Collier, *The Desertion Discuss'd*, pp.6-7; Dodwell, *Concerning the Care of Taking the New Oath*, p.2; Sherlock, *Letter to a Member of the Convention*, pp.1-4; *A Short History of the Convention*, p.1.

monarchy and their polemics focused on loyalty to the monarch's person within the traditional constitutional monarchy.¹⁶⁵

However across the Kingdoms Williamites found episodes in the more distant past more useful in advocating allegiance to William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs.¹⁶⁶ Comparing William's succession with other incidents of subjects giving allegiance to *de facto* monarchs, monarchs in possession, and extra-lineal successions allowed Williamites to portray the Revolution as little more than a personnel change. As Scottish Presbyterian Williamite Sir Francis Grant said, when there were historic episodes, like the Revolution, where the 'Head only changed' in the body politic then allegiance was owed to the monarch who possessed power.¹⁶⁷ Goldie and other historians have argued that debate over allegiance in England showed a popular conservatism towards the Revolution, which downplayed its significance and denied any radical innovation.¹⁶⁸ However this conservatism was popular with Williamite polemicists in all Three Kingdoms. These early-1689 Williamite allegiance polemics show that there was an acceptance of William as *de facto* King but popular reluctance at this time to accept any other changes with this succession. Relating 1688-9 with similar historic episodes of extra-lineal successions where subjects gave allegiance to monarchs who possessed power, *de facto* monarchs, allowed Williamites to sell allegiance to William to wary subjects in England and Scotland. These early-1689 Williamite polemics portrayed the Revolution primarily as a change of personnel on the throne.

As time progressed other ideas and issues would dominate the allegiance debates in the Kingdoms and employing history to support an argument would remain a feature of many polemics throughout the 1690s. However in early 1689 the use of history was particularly prevalent in

¹⁶⁵ Defoe, *Reflections upon the Late Great Revolution*, pp.65-7; Burnet, *Burnet's History of his own Time*, p.5; Long, *Resolution of Certain Queries*, pp.60-1; Bohun, *History of the Desertion*, pp.164-8; Hamilton, *A True Relation of the Actions*, p.8; Canaries, *Sermon Preached at Edinburgh*, pp.14-5, 23-5, 46-7, 86-7.

¹⁶⁶ Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, *A Letter from the Nobility*; Mackenzie & Mackenzie, *Tarbat, Memorial for his Highness the Prince of Orange in relation to the Affairs of Scotland*, pp.3-4, 7-8; *The Case of the People of England*, pp.3-9, 15-9; Burnet, *Pastoral Letter*, pp.2-7; idem, *Sermon Preached before the House of Commons, on the 31st of January, 1688*, pp.9-16, 34-5; Ferguson, *Brief Justification*, pp.25-7; Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative*, pp.4-8; Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana* (1689), pp.1, 8, 176-80, 297-8; idem, *Aphorisms*, pp.1-2.

¹⁶⁷ Grant, *Loyalists Reasons*, p.106.

¹⁶⁸ Goldie, 'Revolution of 1689,' pp.473-6, 518-21; Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, pp.38-43, 117-33; Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, passim; Howard Nenner, 'The Later Stuart Age,' in J.G.A. Pocock (ed.) with the assistance of Gordon J. Schochet & Lois G. Schwoerer *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.196-208.

justifying or condemning allegiance to a *de facto* monarch who succeeded in an extra-lineal succession. Frequently different reasons were given to explain how this succession happened but the common focus of early-1689 Williamite allegiance polemics was showing that history permitted subjects to give allegiance to *de facto* monarchs. Whigs, Tories, Anglicans and Presbyterians who advocated allegiance to William as *de facto* King employed this technique. In summer 1689 Anglican cleric Abednego Seller's *History of Passive Obedience* combined history with the Anglican doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance to condemn allegiance to William. Seller's pamphlet had a significant impact on the Allegiance Debates across the Kingdoms. It meant that this Anglican-Episcopalian doctrine would become one of the most pressing issues from summer 1689 when in England and Scotland the new oaths were starting to be widely tendered. With this doctrine becoming the prevalent issue for allegiance from summer 1689 into 1690 it prompted numerous Irish polemics on allegiance and explains why there were comparatively fewer Irish Williamite polemics in early 1689.

Chapter Two: Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.

Across the Kingdoms Historic examples were cited to justify allegiance to William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs in early 1689. In summer 1689 Anglican cleric Abednego Seller's *History of Passive Obedience* was published. This religious history of the Anglican-Episcopalian doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance urged continued allegiance to James.¹ Passive Obedience allowed subjects to refuse rulers' unjust commands but did not allow subjects to break their loyalty to the monarch while Non-Resistance prohibited any act resisting legitimate authority.² Seller condemned allegiance to William because the doctrine meant 'it is not lawful upon any Pretence whatsoever, to take Arms against our Lawful Sovereigns... our Obedience to our Sovereigns is nothing but our Interest.'³ A good pious subject had to be 'true to his Oaths and his Duty;' breaking allegiance to James was sinful resistance.⁴ Seller is only briefly mentioned in historiography, which is surprising considering his influence on allegiance debates around 1689.⁵ Some historians have noted how Williamites argued that refusing allegiance to William as *de facto* King was sinfully resisting God's providence. Historians have focused more on how Williamites circumvented the doctrine with notions that providence enthroned William or William became King following a Conquest.⁶ Gerald Straka, J.C.D. Clark and Kenneth Padley noted how some Williamites argued that this doctrine specifically obliged allegiance to *de facto* monarchs but have, like other historians, overlooked how this developed from the impact of Seller's *History*.⁷ Seller's *History* set the tone of the debate over

¹ Abednego Seller, *The History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation* (Amsterdam, 1689), 'The Preface.'

² Gerald Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962), pp.17, 26-7, 80.

³ Seller, *History of Passive Obedience*, 'The Preface.'

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Two examples of numerous Williamite responses to Seller are Edward Fowler, *A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England: who have sworn Allegiance to K. William and Q. Mary, from the imputations of Apostasy and Perjury, which are cast upon them...in the now publish'd History of Passive Obedience...* (London, 1689); Thomas Long, *The Historian Unmask'd...* (London, 1689).

⁶ Mark Goldie, 'The English System of Liberty,' in Mark Goldie & Robert Walker (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.44-5; idem, 'Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium* in the Revolution Debate, 1689-1693,' *The Historical Journal*, 20, No. 3 (Sep., 1977), p.583.

⁷ Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, pp.26-8, 32, 34-6, 44, 62, 83-7, 127-8; J.C.D. Clark, *English Society, 1660-1832, Religion, Ideology, Politics during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 2000), pp.83-7, 134-6; Kenneth Padley, 'Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution: William

whether allegiance to William violated this doctrine. This chapter examines how Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, partly because of Seller, dominated allegiance debates from summer 1689 to 1692 in the Kingdoms.

Nonjurors, like Seller, used this doctrine to justify denying William allegiance and this fuelled the Nonjuring schism. Taking the Three Kingdoms as a whole, Anglicanism, and its sister Episcopalian church in Scotland, was the largest denomination. Therefore if most subjects were to give William and Mary allegiance as *de facto* monarchs subjects had to be comfortable that doing so did not violate Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, traditional tenets of those churches. Anglican and Episcopalian clerics dominated this important part of the allegiance debates from summer 1689, when the oaths were beginning to be tendered, to 1692 when William possessed authority in all Three Kingdoms. Clergymen were highly influential in politics and public discourse so their support was crucial.⁸ Only four percent of English Anglican clerics became Nonjurors but significantly many senior influential bishops, like Archbishop William Sancroft of Canterbury, became Nonjurors. Many of these were not active Jacobite conspirators but Nonjurors' rejection of William, as Paul Monod argues, meant they were seen as Jacobites.⁹ Different historians have expressed different views on this doctrine and how it affected allegiance. Some, like Steve Pincus, claim that Passive Obedience did not survive 1688-9 and that Tory polemicists who promoted this doctrine were covert Jacobites. J.P. Kenyon says this doctrine was a problem but Williamites circumvented it by using ambiguous language on Non-Resistance and different ideas, including Providential and Conquest theories. J.C.D. Clark, Kenneth Padley and others argue that Williamite use of the doctrine prevented the Revolution being seen as more radical than it was and ensured support for *de facto* theory.¹⁰ This chapter builds on the works by Clark and Padley to show how the doctrine was

Sherlock and William of Orange,' *Journal Of Ecclesiastical History*, 59, No. 4, (Oct., 2008), pp.684-8, 693-4; J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles...* (Cambridge, 1990), p.21.

⁸ Tony Claydon, 'The Sermon Culture of the Glorious Revolution: Williamite Preaching and Jacobite Anti-Preaching, 1685-1702,' in Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington & Emma Rhatigan (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2014), passim.

⁹ Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989), pp.139-42.

¹⁰ Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (London, 2009), pp.412-24, 457-8; Paul Monod, 'The Jacobite Press and English Censorship, 1688-95,' in Eveline Cruickshanks & Edward Corp (eds.) *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995), pp.128-30; David Martin Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (Rochester, 1999), pp.223-4; Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.22, 24-7, 62-5, 88-90; Clark, *English Society*, pp.83-7; Padley, 'Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution,' pp.684-5, 688-96.

crucial to allegiance debates from summer 1689 to 1692. The different views on the doctrine and whether allegiance to *de facto* monarchs was seen as resisting the rightful monarch will be explored here.¹¹

Unlike England, most Scottish Episcopalian ministers became Nonjurors.¹² Scottish historiography briefly mentions how this doctrine contributed to Jacobite ideology but generally focuses on Presbyterian-Episcopalian antagonism, neglecting similarities with the other Kingdoms in employing Non-Resistance.¹³ A Williamite Episcopalian minority, like many English Anglicans, used the doctrine to justify allegiance to William while Jacobites argued that it obliged allegiance to James. Williamite Presbyterians also used the doctrine in the Scottish allegiance debates and this is also explored.

Irish historians, like English historians, generally argue that in Ireland the doctrine was either reinterpreted or ignored or circumvented with Conquest or Providential theories to ensure the doctrine remained part of the Anglican Church. The Nonjuring schism in Ireland has been described as limited except for Charles Leslie's contributions.¹⁴ However the doctrine was central to Irish

¹¹ The issue of *de facto-de jure* allegiance exercised more polemicists in the mid-1690s and is dealt with in Chapter Seven. It was mainly Jacobites raising the issues of *de jure* monarchy in 1689-91 alongside this doctrine but this doctrine was an important issue itself and more prevalent in polemics during 1689-91, which this Chapter focuses on.

¹² Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707* (Edinburgh, 2007), p.3.

¹³ Bruce Lenman, 'Scottish Episcopalian Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759* (Edinburgh, 1982), pp.39-42, 46-7; idem, 'The Scottish Nobility and the Revolution of 1688-1690,' in Robert Beddard (ed.) *The Revolutions of 1688* (Oxford, 1991), p.143, pp.146-7; idem, 'The Poverty of Political Theory in the Scottish Revolution of 1688-1690,' in Lois G. Schworer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.253-5; Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp.56-7, 198-200, 203-4, 208-13.

¹⁴ Robert Eccleshall, 'Anglican Political Thought in the Century after the Revolution,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Thought in Ireland since the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1993), pp.48-9, 52-5; idem, 'Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland in the 1690s' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Basingstoke, 2001), pp.68-9; Philip O'Regan, *Archbishop William King of Dublin (1650-1729) and the Constitution in Church and State* (Dublin, 2000), pp.6-10, 19-26, 31-2, 42-4; J.I. McGuire, 'The Church of Ireland and the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688,' in Art Cosgrove & Donal McCartney (eds.) *Studies in Irish History Presented to R. Dudley Edwards* (Dublin, 1979), pp.140-7; Joseph Richardson, 'Archbishop William King (1650-1729): "Church Tory and State Whig?,"' *Eighteenth-Century Ireland/ Iris an dá chultúr*, 15 (2000), pp.61-7, 70-5; Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis in British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2007), pp.458-61; idem, 'Incompatible Revolutions?: The Established Church and the Revolutions of 1688-89 in Ireland, England and Scotland,' in Allan I. Macinnes & Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.) *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century* (Dublin, 2002), pp.216, 223-4; S.J. Connolly, 'The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr: Regicide and Revolution in Anglican Political Thought c.1660-1745,' *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54, No. 3, (July 2003), pp.489-

allegiance debates between summer 1689 and 1692 after William's authority was established there. Tim Harris argues that because the Revolution played out differently in each Kingdom it was difficult for polemicists to 'articulate a coherent set of revolution principles that could work at the pan-archipelagic level.'¹⁵ Polemics generally spoke to circumstances specific to each Kingdom but on this doctrine there were common ideas about how the doctrine obliged allegiance to either James or William. History had dominated allegiance debates in early 1689 but from summer 1689 to 1692 Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance was one crucial issue in the allegiance debates. The doctrine was extremely important in deciding allegiance to *de facto* monarchs and shaping the political thought on the Revolution.

I

It is first necessary to describe public attitudes to Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance prior to the Revolution. In 1688 Archbishop Sancroft and six other bishops were prosecuted for refusing to promote James's Declaration of Indulgence but after the Revolution Sancroft said Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance justified denying William allegiance. Sancroft believed it was legitimate to not carry out a monarch's immoral orders but that did not justify breaking allegiance to James.¹⁶ His actions in 1688-9 show how important the doctrine was. He ordered the republication of Bishop Overall's 1603 *Convocation Book* to remind Anglicans of the absolute necessity of obedience to the divinely ordained monarch. This was originally published to ensure no resistance to the newly crowned James I and condemned 'Rebellion' as sinful.¹⁷ Overall said that the Fifth Commandment proscribed rebellion because Kings were fathers of their nations. Jesus Christ's 'Render unto Caesar' teaching, accepting the established political authority, and the actions of early Christians were also cited in support of the doctrine. To Overall and Sancroft it was 'apparent, in all the Proceedings of our Saviour Christ' that he 'never'

91; idem, 'The Glorious Revolution in Irish Protestant Political Thinking,' in S.J. Connolly (ed.) *Political Ideas in Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2000), passim.

¹⁵ Harris, 'Incompatible revolutions?', pp.204-25.

¹⁶ William Gibson, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp.76-100, 173-200.

¹⁷ William Sancroft, *The Archbishop of Canterbury's Instructions to the Clergy of the Church of England* (London, 1689), pp.1-2; John Overall, *Bishop Overall's Convocation-Book...*(London, 1690), pp.55-7.

authorised ‘the Resistance of Civil Authority by Force....’¹⁸ Resistance was a sin.¹⁹

Prior to the Civil Wars the Scottish Episcopalian Church declared that subjects ‘by GOD’S Law owe most loyaltie and obedience’ to the monarch.²⁰ After the chaos of the Civil Wars Episcopacy was re-established in all Three Kingdoms and Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance became a more formalised doctrine enshrined in national laws and Church doctrine. Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, with its adherence to superiors in Church and state, was to preserve the monarchy, Church and society from repeating the mid-century anarchical bloodshed.²¹ Restoration pulpits echoed with denouncements of disloyalty as resistance.²² The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, the outline of Anglican doctrine, contained a Non-Resistance oath. Clerics, educators and other influential officials, in addition to Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, had to swear ‘that it is not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take Arms against the King.’²³

Like Overall, Restoration pamphlets expounding Non-Resistance cited the Pauline doctrine of obeying the ‘powers that be’ and Jesus Christ’s teaching about rendering unto Caesar. Subjects who resisted the monarch were resisting ‘the ordinance of God’ and would receive ‘damnation;’ subjects could refuse unjust orders but that did not permit ‘dispensing with our Loyalty.’²⁴

¹⁸ Overall, *Overall’s Convocation-Book*, pp.103-5.

¹⁹ Ibid, pp.142-3.

²⁰ *Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiasticall Gathered and Put in fame, for the Government of the Church of Scotland...*(Aberdeen, 1636), pp.7-8.

²¹ Tim Harris, ‘Incompatible Revolutions?’, p.208; Lois G. Schworer, ‘The Right to Resist: Whig Resistance Theory, 1688-1694,’ in Nicholas Phillipson & Quentin Skinner (eds.) *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.241-3; Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms* (London, 2006), pp.106-9; Clark, *English Society*, pp.57-9.

²² Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.64-5; G.V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford, 1975), pp.5-6, 103-4; Keith Brown, *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603-1715* (Basingstoke, 1992), p.76; Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.53-7, 61, 111-3; Justin Champion, ‘Political Thinking between the Restoration and the Hanoverian Succession,’ in Barry Coward (ed.) *A Companion to Stuart Britain* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 474-8; Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, pp.80-3; O’Regan, *Archbishop William King of Dublin*, pp.6-10, 42.

²³ ‘An Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer, And Service in the Church, and Administration of the Sacraments,’ *The Book of Common-Prayer And Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites & Ceremonies of the Church, According to the Use of the Church of England...*(London, 1662). For the wording of the Non-Resistance Oath see Appendix II.

²⁴ John Bennet, *Constantius the Apostate being a Short Account of his Life and the sense of the primitive Christians about his succession and their behaviour toward him...and the necessity of Passive Obedience...*(London, 1683), pp.44, 58, 65; Thomas Pomfret, *Passive Obedience, stated and asserted. In A Sermon Preached at Ampthill in Bedfordshire, upon Sunday, Septemb. 9. 1683. Being the Day of Thanksgiving For the Discovering and Defeating the Late Treasonable Conspiracy against his Sacred Person and Government* (London, 1683), pp.2-3,

Commemorating Charles I on 30 January and Charles II's restoration on 29 May were seen as promoting the doctrine and loyalty to the established order in Church and state. Any hint of resistance, like breaking allegiance, was publicly decried. During the Exclusion Crisis English Whigs wanted James, then Duke of York, excluded from succession. Sermons and pamphlets denounced this as sinful resistance. The public hostility this preaching generated towards exclusion has been described as a contributory factor to the failure of exclusion.²⁵ No matter what the circumstances subjects had to 'yield a Passive Obedience to our King' because he was 'the Lord's Anointed, and our Native Sovereign.'²⁶ Extreme Whigs, like Anglican cleric Samuel Johnson, denounced this as potentially resulting in the extirpation of Protestantism under a Catholic monarch.²⁷ However most Anglican clerics condemned these sentiments.²⁸ Tory Anglican cleric Thomas Long said 'our Saviour commends *Passive Obedience*, and not *Resistance* as the means to *preserve men's lives*;' the 'Doctrine of *Resistance* and *Rebellion*' had 'destroyed thousands.'²⁹

Mark Goldie and others have highlighted how even after James's succession, especially at Monmouth's Rebellion, Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance was popularly preached in England.³⁰ Similar sentiments were popular in the Irish Anglican and Scottish Episcopalian communions.³¹ Irish Anglican Bishop William Sheridan attacked 'false Teachers' who advocated Protestant rebellion against Catholic monarchs. This sermon was popular and

17, 25-8; Dudley Diggs, *The Unlawfulness of Subjects Taking up Arms Against their Sovereign, in what Case soever...* (London, 1679), pp.11, 51-4, 47-9; Samuel Parker, *Religion and Loyalty...* (London, 1684), pp.57-62.

²⁵ Clark, *English Society*, pp.83-8; Connolly, 'The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr,' passim; Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.64-7.

²⁶ *A Letter from Winchester, In Answer to his Lordship's time and serving Query, 'Whether Passive Obedience is only a Bugbear, and fit for Fools, or a Christian Duty?'* (London, 1681), pp.1-4; Sir Roger L'Estrange, *The Character of a Papist in Masquerade, supported by authority and experience in answer to The Character of a Popish Successor* (London, 1681), pp.71-5; Sir Roger L'Estrange, *A Reply to the Second Part of The Character of a Popish Successor* (London, 1681), pp.2, 22-3; Digges *The Unlawfulness...*, pp.47-9.

²⁷ Samuel Johnson, *Julian the Apostate being a Short Account of his Life, the Sense of the Primitive Christians about his Succession and behaviour towards him...* (London, 1682), 'Preface to the Reader,' pp.54-6, 58-9.

²⁸ Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.64-7.

²⁹ Thomas Long, *A Vindication of the Primitive Christians, in Point of Obedience to their Prince, Against the Calumnies of a Book intituled The Life of Julian...* (London, 1683), pp.14-5.

³⁰ H.T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London, 1977), pp.18-21; Mark Goldie, 'The Damning of King Monmouth: Pulpit Toryism in the Reign of James II,' in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (eds.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013), passim.

³¹ O'Regan, *Archbishop William King*, pp.6-7; Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, passim.

went through two Dublin editions and a London edition.³² Scottish Episcopalian James Canaries, recalling the horrors of the Civil Wars, said there was ‘Never One Syllable’ in Scripture to ‘be found for taking up Arms.’ Subjects had to be obedient to God’s ‘Vicegerent.’³³ Throughout the 1680s any hint of rebellion or breaking allegiance to the monarch brought a popular avalanche of polemics using Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance to urge continued allegiance. Anglicans and Episcopalians advocating allegiance to William, while James was alive, would have to publicly and credibly reconcile the doctrine and allegiance to William as *de facto* King without endorsing resistance.

II

Abednego Seller was an Anglican clergyman who became a Nonjuror.³⁴ His *History of Passive Obedience*, appearing in this environment of popular opposition to resistance and uneasiness about the Revolution, had a big impact. Seller said that Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance were teachings founded by Jesus Christ and practiced by Christians, especially Anglicans, for centuries. Subjects could not get out of loyalty to their ruler. Seller attacked Anglicans who abandoned the doctrine and resisted James by giving William allegiance. This brought ‘unjust Scandal on the Church.’ Some of Anglicanism’s ‘most illustrious Champions’ became ‘the greatest Hypocrites and Time-servers in the World’ by sacrificing ‘their Consciences to their Desires of growing rich and powerful....’ Williamites had no sincerity because ‘they would have owned other Principles’ in different circumstances; this was effectively embracing ‘the “Roman” Faith’ by abandoning their sworn oath of allegiance and resisting James.³⁵ Seller’s *History* quoted numerous

³² William Sheridan, *St. Paul’s Confession of Faith, or a Brief Account of his Religion. In a Sermon Preach’d at St. Warbrough’s Church in Dublin, March 22, 1684/5* (Dublin, 1685), p.6; idem, *St. Paul’s Confession of Faith... In a Sermon Preach’d at St. Warbrough’s...* (London, 1685); idem, *Catholick Religion Asserted by St. Paul, and Maintained in the Church of England; In Opposition to the Errors in the Church of Rome. In a Sermon Preached at St. Warbroughs Church in Dublin* (Dublin, 1686).

³³ James Canaries, *A Sermon Preached at Selkirk upon the 29th of May, 1685 being the Anniversary of the Restoration of the Royal Family to the Throne of these Kingdoms* (Edinburgh, 1685), pp.19-20, 23.

³⁴ Stuart Handley, ‘Seller, Abednego (1646/7-1705),’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25057, accessed 19 July 2013].

³⁵ Seller, *History of Passive Obedience*, ‘Preface.’

influential clerics and Biblical passages on the absolute inescapability of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance. Romans 13:2 was a favoured passage: ‘They that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation.’ Genuine adherents to this teaching would not ‘rise against the lawful Magistrate....’³⁶ Many Anglican authors cited by Seller gave William allegiance so Seller’s *History* was intended to embarrass them.³⁷ Edward Stillingfleet was a Tory Williamite.³⁸ Seller quoted Stillingfleet’s previous assertions that resistance was ‘destructive to Civil Societies.’³⁹ A monarch was accountable only to God; this made resistance unnecessary and sinful. Williamites taking Nonjurors’ benefices would receive ‘Damnation’ for this, a ‘sad prize for their Victories....’⁴⁰ He was not the first Jacobite to make this argument but his comprehensive condemnation of allegiance to William and Mary as a violation of this doctrine created a massive impact on the debates.⁴¹

Seller outraged Williamites. One pamphlet denounced Seller’s ‘plain evil Design against the present Settlement’ of William and Mary.⁴² Whig Richard Claridge advocated allegiance to William and Mary because they possessed the Crown; he accepted resistance but denied the Revolution was a rebellion.⁴³ He also condemned Seller’s *History* and Nonjurors in general as ‘contributors... to our Dissettlement and the Restrengthening the Papal Interest.’ They should ‘quietly sit down and enjoy their private Opinion’ instead of publicly condemning Williamites with pamphlets like Seller’s *History*.⁴⁴ Historians have generally described the doctrine as an inconvenience circumvented with ideas like Conquest and Providence. Some historians note a link between providential theory and *de facto* allegiance in getting around Non-Resistance but Straka, Padley and Clark have said the doctrine was an

³⁶ Ibid, p.125.

³⁷ Ibid, passim.

³⁸ W.A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford, 1988), pp.52-3.

³⁹ Seller, *History of Passive Obedience*, pp.81-2.

⁴⁰ Ibid, p.125.

⁴¹ Thomas Wagstaffe, *A Letter to the Author of the Late Letter out of the Countrey...* (London, 1689), p.6; Jeremy Collier, *The Desertion Discuss’d...* (London, 1689), pp.4-5 also addressed Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance in early 1689 but did not create an impact like Seller’s.

⁴² *The Charity and Loyalty of Some of Our Clergy...* (London, 1690), pp.30-1.

⁴³ Richard Claridge, *A Defence of the Present Government under King William and Queen Mary...* (London, 1689), pp.3-4.

⁴⁴ Richard Claridge, *A Second Defense of the Present Government under King William and Queen Mary...* (London, 1689), pp.22-3.

important idea itself in defending the Revolution and allegiance to William.⁴⁵ Williamites could not surrender this important moral high ground to Jacobites. Seller portrayed allegiance to William as sinful and Anglicans, the largest denomination in England, would not give allegiance to a regime that violated Anglican doctrine.

Some Williamites responded to Nonjuror taunts by claiming that James's flight meant he was no longer the 'powers that be' and so the doctrine obliged allegiance to William as *de facto* King.⁴⁶ Edmund Bohun asserted that the doctrine obliged loyalty to the 'King in being' who had authority in England to protect subjects and prevent 'the Ruine of' Anglicanism.⁴⁷ Tory Anglican cleric Thomas Long repeatedly asserted that Anglican clergy throughout 1688-9 acted 'according to their Doctrine of *Non-resistance* and *Passive Obedience*....' They maintained loyalty to James but 'the case of *Allegiance* was altered and utterly ceased' by James's flight. William in 'Possession' of the government as *de facto* ruler could not be resisted. Refusing allegiance to William, who preserved traditional monarchy, was actually violating the doctrine.⁴⁸ Williamite responses to Seller followed these arguments in asserting that the doctrine obliged allegiance to *de facto* rulers.

Stillingfleet, cited by Seller, used this line. He argued that the absent James could not preserve Anglicanism; William as *de facto* King could, which was an objective of the doctrine.⁴⁹ Allegiance to *de facto* monarchs was 'no *Renouncing the Doctrine of Passive Obedience, or asserting the Lawfulness of*

⁴⁵ Stephen Zwicker, 'Representing the Revolution: Politics and High Culture in 1688,' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *By Force or Default? The Revolution of 1688-1689* (Edinburgh, 1989), pp.112-3; Gerald Straka, 'The Final Phase of Divine Right in England, 1688-1702,' *The English Historical Review*, 77, No. 305 (October, 1962), pp.641-51, 657-8; Padley, 'Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution,' pp.684-5, 688-96; Clark, *English Society*, pp.83-8.

⁴⁶ *The Case of the People of England in their Present Circumstances*... (London,, 1689), pp.15-20; Richard Booker, *Satisfaction tendered to all that Pretend Conscience to our Present Governours, and Refusing the New Oaths of Fealty and Allegiance* (London, 1689), pp.2-5.

⁴⁷ Edmund Bohun, *The Doctrine of Non-Resistance or Passive Obedience, no way concerned in the Controversies now Depending between the Williamites and the Jacobites by a lay of the Communion of the Church of England* (London, 1689), pp.3, 18, 29-31.

⁴⁸ Thomas Long, *A Resolution of Certain Queries concerning Submission to the Present Government*... (London, 1689), 'The Introduction,' pp.21-3, 31-2, 34-45; idem; *Reflections upon a Late Book, Entitled, The Case of Allegiance Consider'd*... (London, 1689), pp.2-4, 8-9, 12; idem, *A Full Answer to All the Popular Objections that Have Yet Appear'd, For Not Taking the Oath of Allegiance to Their Present Majesties*... (London, 1689), pp.6, 18-9, 26-8, 38-9, 41-2, 62-4, 66-7, 71, 82-3.

⁴⁹ Edward Stillingfleet, *A Discourse Concerning the Unreasonableness of a New Separation, on Account of the Oaths with an Answer to the History of Passive Obedience*... (London, 1689), pp.8-9, 29-31, 40-2; 'Act for Uniformity,' *Book of Common-Prayer*... (London, 1662).

*Resistance....*⁵⁰ In defending himself Stillingfleet asserted that the ruler in ‘actual Possession of the Throne,’ the *de facto* monarch, ‘requires an *Allegiance*’ and could not be resisted. James, the rightful King, could not rule in 1689, thus allegiance to William was acknowledging the actual authority in England who could provide ‘Protection’ for subjects and Anglicanism.⁵¹ This tied Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance with *de facto* theory and turned the doctrine against Seller by claiming that he was wrong about the doctrine and allegiance.

Seller also quoted a sermon by Long, which stated that those who resisted the monarch ‘mock God’ and ‘unsuspectedly destroy His Vicegerent.’⁵² Long denied Seller’s claim that he and other Williamites had ‘renounced their first Principles of Loyalty....’⁵³ He questioned ‘how well’ Seller ‘hath performed the Office of an Historian;’ Seller was picking ‘and chooseth out on an obscure place’ the evidence to support his argument.⁵⁴ Seller must have had ‘a Commission from James the Second’ to exploit the doctrine and denounce Williamites as ‘Apostates, Traytors, and perjured Persons....’⁵⁵ Long, like Stillingfleet, argued that William replacing James meant that the doctrine obliged allegiance to William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs; the ‘powers that be’ could not be resisted. Again Long was trying to turn the doctrine against Jacobites. Long argued that the Bible did not distinguish between resisting *de facto* and *de jure* monarchs. Referring to himself in the third person Long said he ‘changed not his Opinion of the Doctrine of Non-Resistance, and Passive Obedience, but thought it ought to be transferred from the Person of the late King, to the present King and Queen....’⁵⁶ Long continued to denounce resistance and denied there was any resistance in the Revolution.⁵⁷ In 1689 the ‘powers that be’ were *de facto* rulers without a legal right but denying William allegiance would be resisting the *de facto* rulers, which was a sin.

⁵⁰ Stillingfleet, *A Discourse*, pp.8-9.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, pp.8-9, 29-31, 40-2.

⁵² Seller, *History of Passive Obedience*, p.116.

⁵³ Long, *Historian Unmask’d*, pp.3-4.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*, p.36.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, p.63.

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, pp.63-4.

⁵⁷ Thomas Long, *Reflections upon a Late Book, Entitled, The Case of Allegiance Consider’d...*(London, 1689), pp.2-3.

Edward Fowler, another Tory Anglican cleric cited by Seller, also attempted to turn the doctrine against Seller. Fowler feared that Seller's *History* would persuade 'weak' people to become Jacobites. It was necessary, Fowler believed, to publicly refute Seller in order to 'prevent Atheistical and Debauched Persons making use of it, to the Scandalizing of weak inconsiderative People against Religion....'⁵⁸ Fowler claimed that he could 'scarcely desire a more easy Task, than to shew these New Oaths are no whit repugnant to the Asserting of the most Absolute Passive Obedience....'⁵⁹ He employed different theories, including Conquest, to defend allegiance to William but also said that Non-Resistance itself compelled allegiance to William.⁶⁰ Denying William allegiance 'would be a Notorious Contradiction to the Doctrine of Passive Obedience' because without William there would be no authority and this would bring 'the utter Ruine of our *Religion*....'⁶¹ Nonjurors had 'gone too far in their Doctrine of Passive Obedience.' When Williamites 'transferred their Allegiance' they 'also transfer their *Passive Obedience* to' William and Mary. Nonjurors and James made the doctrine 'Absolute,' which could potentially bring Anglicanism's ruin under an absolute ruler.⁶² Fowler, like Stillingfleet and Long, countered Seller by asserting that Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance meant that *de facto* rulers could not be resisted therefore allegiance was owed to William and Mary.

Thomas Bainbrigg, another Anglican cleric, denounced Seller's attacks on Long, Fowler and others as trying 'to blacken some very good Men.'⁶³ Bainbrigg said that resistance 'in most Cases, is a great sin' but, unlike Long and Fowler, he said that sometimes 'Talk of *Non-Resistance*... does little good in the World; and the Talk of Resistance, in a certain Case, does as little harm....'⁶⁴ Seller's *History* was neither 'instructive or pleasing.' Bainbrigg criticised Seller and Nonjurors' 'Hypochondriacal Affection' for the doctrine by rejecting God's providential enthronement of William. Nonjurors used this

⁵⁸ Edward Fowler, *A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England, who have sworn Allegiance to King William and Queen Mary, From the Imputations of Apostasy and Perjury, which are Cast upon them upon the Account, in the Now Publish'd History of Passive Obedience* (London, 1689), pp.3-4.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, p.5.

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, pp.5-7. See Chapter Three for Fowler's use of Conquest theory.

⁶¹ *Ibid*, pp.9-11.

⁶² *Ibid*, pp.13-5.

⁶³ Thomas Bainbrigg, *Seasonable Reflections, On a Late Pamphlet, Entitled, A History of Passive Obedience... wherein The True Notion of Passive Obedience is settled...* (London, 1690), pp.1-3.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, pp.47, 11-3, 48.

doctrine to support James's tyranny and overthrowing the traditional English constitutional and religious order.⁶⁵ Seller's selective quoting 'to disparage the late Revolution' with the doctrine was wrong because those writings were irrelevant in 1689. Rejecting allegiance to William was a greater sin because it was resisting the ruler actually 'in Authority.'⁶⁶ Bainbrigg lamented how this doctrine became 'the last resort of the wretched... It is a Duty we grant it, but such a one as cannot always be practised, nor ought it all times to be discoursed of....' The Revolution was a providential act and subjects rejecting it would be sinfully resisting God.⁶⁷ Responding to Seller, Tories, like Long, Fowler and Bainbrigg, argued that Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance obliged allegiance to William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs. Refusing allegiance to William and Mary was sinfully violating the doctrine.

Even extreme Whigs, who believed that tyranny could be resisted, also used this doctrine in polemics against Seller. They recognised that Seller's *History* was influential and realised that if William's reign was to be secured Anglicans would have to believe that allegiance to William did not violate the doctrine. Like Long and other Tories, these Whigs' responses to Seller asserted that he and other Jacobites had gone too far in their interpretations of the doctrine. One Whig response to Seller, *The History of Self-Defence*, derided Seller as 'so enamoured with his Strumpet Non-Resistance that he has lost his senses, or it may be drowned them with drinking of King James's Health....' This author characterised the Revolution as self-defence not rebellion, which 'Histories both Sacred and Profane' supported.⁶⁸ The New Testament frequently showed that Non-Resistance and allegiance were owed to 'Lawful Magistrates... and not to Tyrants' like James. Again Seller was responded to with the argument that denying William allegiance was sinfully resisting the 'powers that be.'⁶⁹ Numerous Biblical examples were cited to show that 'all true hearted *Englishmen* and good *Protestants*' should give William and Mary allegiance.⁷⁰ This pamphlet was more extreme in condemning James than Long and Stillingfleet but it still argued that the doctrine compelled loyalty to

⁶⁵ Ibid, pp.3-5, 59-67.

⁶⁶ Ibid, pp.5-17.

⁶⁷ Ibid, pp.1-4, 30-3.

⁶⁸ *The History of Self-Defence, In Requit to the History of Passive Obedience* (London, 1689), pp.3-4.

⁶⁹ Ibid, pp.12-3.

⁷⁰ Ibid, pp.28-34

William because as King he would preserve Protestantism. Denying William allegiance was a greater sin of resistance than maintaining loyalty to James.

Other Whigs advocating resistance denounced Seller's use of this doctrine, and the doctrine in general, as supporting Jacobite tyranny. One Williamite hoped that Seller and other Nonjurors would be isolated in 'Conventicles,' like Dissenters during the Restoration, to prevent these 'enemies to the present Constitution' preaching against William.⁷¹ Radical Whig Samuel Johnson repeated his early-1680s criticism of Non-Resistance by attacking Seller. Johnson argued that the doctrine was destructive to England because Seller and others used it in attempting to bind England to James and absolutism.⁷² These Nonjurors had an 'Allegiance Blindfold' in slavishly seeking James's restoration. Johnson believed that resistance was sometimes necessary and so viewed Tories, who gave William allegiance and advocated Non-Resistance in the post-Revolution Church, as Jacobites. Tories and Jacobites were undermining the Revolution by denying that there was justifiable resistance in 1688-9.⁷³ Seller's *History* would 'blacken all the Glorious Instruments of our Deliverance.'⁷⁴ Johnson conceded that Romans 13:2 prohibited resistance but only against princes who ruled lawfully. James had usurped his legal authority therefore resisting James was legitimate and ensured William's enthronement. William could not be resisted and was owed allegiance as a legal King.⁷⁵ In doing so Johnson attacked the prevailing conservative views of the Revolution, which downplayed the significance of the Revolution apart from William substituting James, propagated by Long and others who denied resisting James. Timothy Wilson's response to Seller justified allegiance to William by stating that James's violating his Contract with subjects and providence enthroning William justified allegiance to William. Wilson accepted that lawful monarchs, especially those enthroned by providence, could not be resisted but 'Defensive Arms against Illegal Proceedings and Universal Oppression... is not the Resistance of which St.

⁷¹ James Parkinson, *An Account of Mr. Parkinson's Expulsion from the University of Oxford in the Late Times. In Vindication of him from the False Aspersions cast on him in a late Pamphlet, Entituled, The History of Passive Obedience* (London, 1689), pp.18-20.

⁷² Samuel Johnson, *An Argument Proving that the Abrogation of King James by the People of England from the Regal Throne...* (London, 1692), pp.6-7, 9-11.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp.11-2, 33-5.

⁷⁴ Samuel Johnson, *Reflections on the History of Passive Obedience...* (London, 1689), pp.1-2.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.8-11; Johnson, *Argument Proving*, pp.11-2. See Chapter Seven for more on the issue of allegiance to William as a *de jure*, rightful and lawful, King.

Paul speaks....⁷⁶ Seller was a ‘Subtle *Jesuit*, personating a Protestant.’ Wilson hoped that subjects would renounce Passive Obedience because it obligated allegiance to James but, like Long and Tory respondents to Seller, said that allegiance was owed to William because he could not be resisted.⁷⁷

Another radical Whig pamphlet alleged that Seller’s *History* was part of a plot by Catholics and ‘*Passive-Obedience men*’ of the ‘Lambeth Club’ to undermine William. This conspiracy was ‘to be back’d with another *Enquire* of theirs; and that was the publishing to the World, *The History of Passive Obedience*.’⁷⁸ Again this said that Seller and Jacobites misinterpreted the doctrine. Seller’s ‘silly Pamphlet was banded about in Triumph among’ Nonjurors but the Bible ‘was removed’ from their actions. This was Williamite recognition of Seller’s influence amongst Nonjurors rejecting allegiance to William.⁷⁹ To diminish Seller and Nonjuror-Jacobite influence their actions were depicted as part of a French plot against Protestantism. William as King could preserve Protestantism and England from tyrannical popery.⁸⁰ While this pamphlet loathed the doctrine in general, the radical Whig author recognised that this doctrine was, because of Seller, central to many subjects in deciding whether William was owed allegiance as *de facto* King. Therefore the author argued that maintaining allegiance to James was ‘a greater Invasion of their darling *Passive Obedience*, than the Swearing to’ William ‘after he is declared and acknowledged King by the Parliament.’ The author reluctantly accepted that the doctrine was at this time important to allegiance debates. This was why they said that the doctrine obliged loyalty to William because rejecting allegiance to William, the ‘powers that be,’ was violating the doctrine.⁸¹

Both Whigs and Tories recognised Seller’s influence and sought to counter it. They asserted that Seller and Nonjurors generally were too extreme in their interpretations of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance. Maintaining allegiance to James was resisting God’s providence and the ‘powers that be,’ a sinful violation of the doctrine. Allegiance to William was more in keeping

⁷⁶ Timothy Wilson, *The Vanity and Fidelity of the History of Passive Obedience detected...* (London, 1690), pp.1-2, 4-6.

⁷⁷ *Ibid*, pp.9-10, 6-8.

⁷⁸ *A Modest Enquiry into the Causes of the Present Disasters in England. And who they are that Brought the French Fleet into the English Channel, Described* (London, 1690), pp.2-3, 16.

⁷⁹ *Ibid*, pp.16-7.

⁸⁰ *Ibid*, pp.3-7, 17.

⁸¹ *Ibid*, p.11.

with the doctrine than allegiance to James because William as *de facto* King preserved traditional order in Church and state.

While Williamites denounced Seller, Jacobites praised his *History* for showing that Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance was integral to Anglicanism and that allegiance to William was sinfully resisting James. Anglo-Irish Nonjuror George Hickes praised Seller's *History* for showing that Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance 'are Church of *England* Principles' while denouncing Fowler's response to Seller.⁸² Fowler and other Williamites had 'deserted' the doctrine to become resistance advocates like Hobbes and Milton.⁸³ Loyalty oaths could only be taken if they did not break this doctrine, which the oaths to William did.⁸⁴ Hickes argued that Nonjurors were motivated by adherence to Anglican doctrine rather than love of James whereas Williamites were motivated by personal covetousness to fill Nonjurors' benefices. Williamites embracing resistance theory would bring disorder to England and Anglicanism.⁸⁵ Scottish Episcopalian Nonjuror Thomas Morer also praised the 'Resolute Christians' who would rather suffer than give William allegiance. Morer predicted that Nonjurors would have favourable mentions in a future Seller-style *History of Passive Obedience* that described 'not only the Doctrine, but real Practice of Passive Obedience, in the Sufferings of those Men....'⁸⁶ Future generations would praise the Three Kingdoms' Nonjurors for suffering deprivations because they adhered to the doctrine in 1689-90 by maintaining allegiance to James. Seller published *A Continuation of the History of Passive Obedience* where he quoted more authorities on the doctrine while also praising his own work. According to Seller the original *History* was 'favourably received by the generality of Readers, tho' unjustly censured' and 'undeservedly reproach'd' by Williamites.⁸⁷ The *Continuation* again showed how all power came from God and consequently any resistance to the monarch was 'a damnable Sin....' Seller believed that after such extensive treatises on the doctrine 'the Reader must be

⁸² George Hickes, *A Letter to the Author of a Late Paper, entituled, A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England, &c. In Defence of the History of Passive Obedience* (n.p., 1689), p.3.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp.3-5.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.8-9.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.12-4.

⁸⁶ Thomas Morer, *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland in several letters...* (London, 1690), 'To the Christian Reader.'

⁸⁷ Abednego Seller, *A Continuation of the History of Passive Obedience...* (Amsterdam, 1690), 'A Prefatory Epistle to the Author of the First Part of the History of Passive Obedience.'

very weak, or very negligent' if they did 'not observe' the doctrine by breaking allegiance to James.⁸⁸

When William Sherlock's infamous *Case of Allegiance* was published and dominated the public debate, much of it focused on Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.⁸⁹ However Seller's *History* and Williamite and Jacobite reactions to it had set a pattern for discussion of the doctrine in the public debates on allegiance and the Revolution which debate over Sherlock's *Case* followed. In 1689 Sherlock responded to Johnson's denouncing of Non-Resistance by urging allegiance to James partly on Non-Resistance grounds. Sherlock stated that the 'Christian Religion doth plainly forbid the Resistance of Authority....'⁹⁰ By 1690 Sherlock was a Williamite. Several historians have commented on how Sherlock argued that providence enthroned William as *de facto* King and that the Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance doctrine was part of his justification.⁹¹ While providence was central to Sherlock's *Case* he also employed Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance arguments to urge allegiance to William in the same way that Long and other Anglican Williamites responded to Seller. He continued to condemn the 'Rebellion of Subjects' but said that Non-Resistance and *de facto* theory were 'founded on the same Principle.' 'St. Paul, who most expressly teaches this Doctrine of Non-resistance, joyns these two together, Obedience to the present Powers, and Non-resistance....'⁹² This demonstrated that not only could allegiance be given to William without 'renouncing... the Doctrine of Non-Resistance and Passive Obedience' but denying William allegiance was to 'renounce the Doctrine....'⁹³ In later pamphlets Sherlock repeated this view that subjects

⁸⁸ Ibid, p.132.

⁸⁹ Padley, 'Rendering unto Caesar,' pp.684-5, 688-96.

⁹⁰ Samuel Johnson, *Remarks upon Dr. Sherlock's Book intituled The Case of Resistance of the Supreme Powers stated and resolved, according to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures written in the year 1683* (London, 1689), 'Preface;' William Sherlock, *Observations upon Mr. Johnson's Remarks, upon Dr. Sherlock's Book of Non-Resistance* (London, 1689), Q5, pp.19-21.

⁹¹ Goldie, 'Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium*,' pp.570-2; Quentin Skinner, 'The Ideological Context of Hobbes's Political Thought,' *The Historical Journal*, 9, No. 3, pp.301-3; M.P. Thompson, 'The Idea of Conquest in Controversies over the 1688 Revolution,' *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar., 1977), pp.40-2; Straka, 'Final Phase of Divine Right theory,' pp.646-8; Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, pp.80-6; Padley, 'Rendering unto Caesar,' pp.684-5, 688-96.

⁹² William Sherlock, *The Case of the Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers... Third Edition* (London, 1691), 'The Preface,' pp.36-7.

⁹³ Ibid, pp.37-8, 49-50, 65-6.

‘cannot resist’ William; ‘*Non-resistance* must be Due, not to the King, whom God has pulled down, but to the King whom God has set up....’⁹⁴

Several Jacobite denunciations of Sherlock focused on his use of this doctrine and followed the same line that Seller had promoted.⁹⁵ Over two pamphlets John Kettlewell, an Anglican lawyer, attacked Sherlock’s claim that Non-Resistance obliged loyalty to William as *de facto* King. Non-Resistance was owed to ‘Rightful Powers and Authorities,’ like James, not ‘Providential and Usurping Powers.’⁹⁶ Kettlewell was aghast at Sherlock and Williamites for attacking ‘the noblest Virtues of our Holy religion....’⁹⁷ Passive Obedience meant subjects had ‘*To keep under a King’s Obedience*. And to cast off his Authority, is the highest Disobedience.’ No circumstances allowed subjects to ‘disclaim their King’s Authority over them, and throw off all Obedience to him’ by ‘transferring Allegiance from him.’ This was ‘the uttermost Heinousness and Aggravation of Resistance.’⁹⁸ Subjects resisting James by giving William allegiance were ‘very Unrighteous.’⁹⁹ Nonjurors, like George Hickes, Robert Jenkin and Thomas Browne, condemned Sherlock for having ‘renounc’d’ Passive Obedience and the teaching of Romans 13 to ‘obtain the Rich Deanery’ of St. Paul’s Cathedral. Monarchs were ‘irresistible’ and that meant allegiance could not be broken.¹⁰⁰

Thomas Wagstaffe’s condemnations of Sherlock again highlighted how important Seller’s *History* was to the allegiance debates. Wagstaffe’s *Sherlock against Sherlock* went through two editions and was re-published in Edinburgh showing some popular support for this Jacobite argument on

⁹⁴ William Sherlock, *A Vindication of the Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers, in Reply to An Answer to a Late Pamphlet, intituled, Obedience and Submission to the Present Government...* (London, 1691), pp.13-4, 18, 63-5, 73-4.

⁹⁵ Other Jacobites focused on Sherlock advocating allegiance to *de facto* monarchs instead of allegiance to *de jure* monarchs and this is explored in Chapter Seven.

⁹⁶ John Kettlewell, *The Duty of Allegiance Settled upon its True Grounds, according to Scripture, Reason...in Answer to a Late Book of Dr. William Sherlock...* (London, 1691), p.69.

⁹⁷ John Kettlewell, *Christianity, A Doctrine of the Cross, or, Passive Obedience, under any Pretended invasion of Legal Rights and Liberties* (London, 1691), ‘To the Reader.’

⁹⁸ Kettlewell, *The Duty of Allegiance*, pp.70-1.

⁹⁹ *Ibid*, p.82.

¹⁰⁰ George Hickes, *The Pretences of the Prince of Wales Examin’d and Rejected in a letter to a Friend in the Country* (n.p., 1702), pp.2-3; Robert Jenkin, *The Title of an Usurper after a Thorough Settlement Examined; in Answer to Dr. Sherlock’s Case...* (London, 1690), ‘The Preface,’ pp.2-4, 18-20, 23, 53, 80; Thomas Browne, *An Answer to Dr. Sherlock’s Case of Allegiance...* (London, 1691), pp.2, 6-7, 32.

Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.¹⁰¹ He quoted Sherlock's statements from the *Case* alongside Sherlock's earlier condemnations of resistance to show how Sherlock renounced his 'former Principles.'¹⁰² Wagstaffe's task was considerably easier with Sherlock having made statements like 'Non-resistance is as perfect Subjection as can be paid to Sovereign Princes.'¹⁰³ Throughout the 1690s Wagstaffe repeatedly castigated Sherlock and Williamites for abandoning Non-Resistance. Sherlock had been 'perfectly corrupted' to become like his enemy Johnson.¹⁰⁴ Wagstaffe said that Sherlock must have had 'a Convocation Book of his own' because Sherlock misrepresented Overall to create 'a new Notion of Allegiance, a New Notion of Right and Wrong.'¹⁰⁵ Arguing that providence and Non-Resistance compelled allegiance to William was 'a most absurd and ungodly Doctrine.'¹⁰⁶ With Williamites misrepresenting the doctrine for their own ends they would need 'to write a *New History of Passive Obedience*.'¹⁰⁷ This shows how Seller had effectively set the tone for the English allegiance debates when the focus was on this doctrine. Seller's *History* was important to English Jacobitism during 1689-92. Kettlewell, Wagstaffe and others used the same argument that Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance obliged continued allegiance to James. Wagstaffe praised Seller for having produced this extensive pamphlet, which showed how allegiance to William was sinful resistance. Nonjurors were committed to this doctrine and Anglicans were expelled from offices because of this commitment.

As the 1690s progressed Anglican Williamites continued to assert that Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance obliged loyalty to William. The doctrine was not completely dropped by Williamites and did not become an indicator of Jacobitism as Pincus claims.¹⁰⁸ Numerous Williamite respondents to Sherlock carried on the lines developed in response to Seller. Radical

¹⁰¹ Thomas Wagstaffe, *Sherlock against Sherlock*... (London, 1690); idem, *Sherlock against Sherlock*... (Edinburgh, 1691); idem, *Sherlock against Sherlock... Second Edition* (London, 1691).

¹⁰² Wagstaffe, *Sherlock against Sherlock*... (London, 1690), 'Preface.'

¹⁰³ Ibid, p.19.

¹⁰⁴ Thomas Wagstaffe, *An Answer to a late Pamphlet, Entituled Obedience and Submission to the Present Government, Demonstrated from Bishop Overall's Convocation-Book with a Postscript in Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Case*... (London, 1690), pp.1-3; idem, *An Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Case*... (London, 1692), pp.49-50, 123-4, 151-2; idem, *An Answer to a Letter to Dr. Sherlock written in Vindication*... (London, 1692).

¹⁰⁵ Wagstaffe, *An Answer to a Late Pamphlet*, pp.13-4.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, pp.14-5.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, pp.21-2, 28-9.

¹⁰⁸ Pincus, *1688*, pp.412-4, 424, 446-8, 457-8, 461.

Whigs, like Wilson, continued to assert that Contractual resistance was part of the Revolution but also argued that William should not be resisted.¹⁰⁹

Both sides continued to assert that they were right on the doctrine.¹¹⁰ Some Williamites continued arguing that resisting William would bring ‘unhappy Consequences’ but this was less important in later-1690s pamphlets.¹¹¹ William became *de facto* King without altering the ‘Hereditary Monarchy’ and could not be resisted.¹¹² Samuel Hill, another Tory Anglican cleric, said that Passive Obedience was integral to the Revolution.¹¹³ However other Williamites, who said that Non-Resistance obliged loyalty to William, lamented how Jacobites were effectively claiming public ownership of the doctrine. William Lloyd, who argued that Non-Resistance obliged loyalty to William as *de facto* King, decried how Jacobites exploited the doctrine by attempting to make ‘Our Obedience... as a perfect Snare to us....’¹¹⁴ A Williamite satirical dialogue between Jacobites Sir Roger L’Estrange and Robert Ferguson had Ferguson admitting that the doctrine was useful in persuading subjects to maintain allegiance to James.¹¹⁵ Other Williamites denounced the entire doctrine. One Whig said that ‘the consequence of Preaching up *Passive Obedience* was so far from adding Authority, that in the

¹⁰⁹ Timothy Wilson, *Conscience Satisfied: In a Cordial and Loyal Submitting to the Present Government of King William and Queen Mary, in Three Discourses: Justifying the Williamites against the Jacobites...* (London, 1690), pp.5-7, 10, 12-5, 22-6; idem, *God, The King, and the Countrey, United in Justification of his Present Revolution...* (London, 1691), pp.5, 10-1, 12-3, 24-8; A.B., *Allegiance Vindicated: Or, The Takers of the New Oath of Allegiance to K. William & Q. Mary Justified: And the Lawfulness of taking it Asserted... Concerning Non-Resistance & Passive Obedience...* (London, 1690), p.5; James Parkinson, *An Examination of Dr. Sherlock’s Book, Entitled, The Case of The Allegiance...* (London, 1691), pp.17-8; idem, *A Dialogue between a Divine of the Church of England, and a Captain of Horse Concerning Dr. Sherlock’s late Pamphlet...* (London, 1690), p.2.

¹¹⁰ George Hickeys, *A Word to the Wavering: or an Answer to the Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs...* (n.p., 1691), pp.2-5; *Passive Obedience in Actual Resistance. Or, Remarks upon a Paper fix’d up in the Cathedral Church of Worcester, by Dr. Hicks...* (London, 1691), pp.1-2, 4-5, 14-5, 18-9; Thomas Brown, *The Weesils a satirical fable...* (London, 1691), pp.1-2, 4, 8; idem, *The Reasons of the New Converts taking the Oaths to the Present Government in a Dialogue* (London, 1691), pp.12-3; idem, *The Late Converts Exposed...* (London, 1690), passim; *The Case of the Suspended Bishops Considered...* (London, 1691), pp.4-5, 31.

¹¹¹ Theophilus Dorrington, *The Honour Due to the Civil Magistrate Stated and Urg’d; In a Sermon Compos’d for the Thanksgiving, for the Happy Discovery of the Late Horrid and Execrable Conspiracy...* (London, 1696), pp.14-5, 25.

¹¹² William Lloyd, *The Pretences of the French Invasion Examined for the Information of the People of England* (London, 1692), pp.9-10; idem, *A Discourse of God’s Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms by the Bishop of S. Asaph* (London, 1691), pp.14-6.

¹¹³ Samuel Hill, *A Debate on the Justice and Piety of the present Constitution: Under King William. In Two Parts* (London, 1696), p.16.

¹¹⁴ William Lloyd, *A Sermon Preached Before Her Majesty, on May 29, being the Anniversary of the Restauration of the King...* (London, 1692), pp.18-9.

¹¹⁵ *A Dialogue between Sir Roger L’Estrange and Robert Ferguson in Newgate relating to the Plot* (London, 1696), pp.1-2.

end it proved the very means of destroying what was just and due Allegiance, and the Government it self....'¹¹⁶ A Nonconformist Williamite pamphlet said that 'promoting the dangerous Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance' encouraged James's tyranny when he ruled England and was why Jacobites maintained loyalty to James.¹¹⁷

Both Williamite and Jacobite Anglicans argued that the other side misrepresented Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance. In England Seller's *History* set the tone for discourses on allegiance and this doctrine in 1689-92. Nonjuror-Jacobites agreed with his assertion that allegiance to William was sinfully resisting James the divinely ordained rightful and lawful monarch. Numerous Williamites countered that the doctrine obliged allegiance to William because he was *de facto* King. Like the History-heavy early-1689 polemics explored in Chapter One, the English Anglican Williamite polemics presented the Revolution as William being enthroned as *de facto* King either by Providence or after a Conquest and he could not be resisted. There were some radical Williamites who disagreed with this portrayal of the Revolution as little more than William replacing James and believed that use of this doctrine in polemics, even by apparent Williamites, indicated Jacobitism. However even some of these radical Williamites accepted that the doctrine was important and argued that William should not be resisted and was owed allegiance. Whig and Tory Williamites asserted, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, that William was *de facto* King. This meant that William was 'the powers that be' from 1688-9 and was owed allegiance; maintaining allegiance to James was resisting 'the powers that be.' In 1689-92 this doctrine became central to numerous Anglican justifications of allegiance to William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs despite efforts by Seller and Nonjuror-Jacobites using this doctrine to urge allegiance to James.

III

¹¹⁶ *Ratio Ultima: For a Full Compliance with the Present Government argued in a Letter to a Person of Honour in the Country, under Dejection on the Account of Peace* (London, 1697), pp.5-7.

¹¹⁷ *Animadversions on the Two last 30th of January Sermons, The One Preached to the Honourable House of Commons, The Other to the Lower House of Convocation. In a Letter* (London, 1702), pp.20-5.

While some English radicals, like Johnson and Pierre Allix, presented Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance as an archaic Jacobite doctrine to enslave England such views were more popular amongst Scottish Presbyterian Williamites.¹¹⁸ The doctrine was also important to allegiance debates in Scotland but with different circumstances and some similarities to the English debates. In Scotland Presbyterianism replaced Episcopacy as the established Church. This was partly caused by most Episcopalian bishops maintaining loyalty to James because of their adherence to Passive Obedience. Clare Jackson says that Episcopalian commitment to the doctrine, driven in part by fear of anarchy, led to most Episcopalian clerics becoming Jacobites with some becoming Williamites. However most examinations of this period generally focus on the Presbyterian-Episcopalian antagonism.¹¹⁹ These studies frequently overlook the importance of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance to Scottish allegiance debates in 1689-92 with even Presbyterian polemicists writing on this doctrine. Presbyterianism's establishment and the majority of Episcopalian clerics becoming Jacobites mean that pamphlets employing this doctrine were different in Scotland but there were also many similarities with English arguments on this doctrine. The differences and similarities will be explored here.¹²⁰

Allegiance and Prerogative Considered, published prior to William's enthronement in Scotland, like Long and Fowler, combined Providence and Non-Resistance. It was clear that 'Heaven it self fully loos'd the Nation from their Allegiance, and by remarkable providences granted a clear Dispensation from their Oaths to K. James the 7th.'¹²¹ The pamphlet claimed that resisting William would bring 'the Total Ruine... of the Reformed Religion over all

¹¹⁸ Johnson, *Reflections on the History of Passive Obedience*, pp.8-11; idem, *An Argument Proving*, pp.11-2; Pierre Allix, *Reflections upon the Opinions of Some Modern Divines, concerning the Nature of Government* (London, 1689), pp.24-35; George Ridpath, *The Scots Episcopal Innocence...* (London, 1694), pp.6-7.

¹¹⁹ Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.200-15; Kidd, 'Religious Realignment,' passim; Whiteford, 'Jacobitism as a factor,' Part I, pp.132-9; T.N. Clarke, 'Scottish Episcopalians,' pp.36-7; Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union*, p.3; Alasdair Raffae, *The Culture of Controversy Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660-1714* (Woodbridge, 2012), pp.47-8.

¹²⁰ The effect of Presbyterianism becoming the Established Church in Scotland at Episcopacy's expense and how this impacted on allegiance is explored in greater detail in Chapters Five and Seven.

¹²¹ Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative Considered in a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to his Friend, upon his being chosen a Member of the Meeting of States in Scotland...* (n.p., 1689), p.4. See Chapter Eight for more on the role of providential theory in the allegiance debates across the Kingdoms.

Europe.’ Passive Obedience did not oblige subjects ‘to an Active concurrence with’ James in his attempted ‘Suppression or Extirpation of the true Religion.’ All Christians ‘will own... *That it is better to obey God then Men.*’ This was, like English pamphlets, using this doctrine to urge loyalty to William.¹²²

Chapter One showed how Sir George Mackenzie, despite supporting James in the Convention, or someone acting in his name, was prepared to accept William as *de facto* King. His 1689 *Memorial* to William, co-authored with Viscount Tarbat, showed how history and Passive Obedience obliged a loyalty to William. This *Memorial*, like *Allegiance and Prerogative*, was written before William’s official enthronement but showed acceptance of his authority. Mackenzie and Tarbat attacked Presbyterians who preached ‘Rebellion’ with ‘fire and fury.’¹²³ William could only count on Episcopalian loyalty and his intervention was to ‘support our Laws,’ which meant he was ‘honour bound to support Episcopacy.’¹²⁴ Tarbat and Mackenzie said that ‘Episcopacy is necessary for support of the Monarchy’ because of its principles like Passive Obedience, Non-Resistance and hierarchical governance. Presbyterianism ‘incorporated into it many horrid Principles, inconsistent with humane Society’ and monarchy.¹²⁵ Abolishing Episcopacy would bring ‘new Revolutions’ because Presbyterians did not have Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance to restrain them and guarantee their loyalty to William.¹²⁶ Mackenzie continued this argument in his *Vindication* of Charles II’s government where he denounced Presbyterian ‘Agressors.’¹²⁷ Late-1670s Presbyterian Covenanters were ‘openly in Rebellion’ against Charles II. The Covenant was ‘the Foundation of the Rebellion’ and so ‘no Oath of Allegiance can bind’ Presbyterians to the monarch.¹²⁸ *Vindication* was published after Presbyterianism’s establishment but Mackenzie still sought to highlight the ‘Rebellious Limitations of Obedience by the Covenanters,’ a key difference between Presbyterians and Episcopalians.¹²⁹ In defending Episcopacy Mackenzie and Tarbat said Presbyterians were rebellious but Episcopalians

¹²² Ibid, pp.5-7.

¹²³ George Mackenzie & George Mackenzie, Viscount Tarbat, *A Memorial for his Highness the Prince of Orange in relation to the Affairs of Scotland...* (London, 1689), p.3.

¹²⁴ Ibid, pp.3-4.

¹²⁵ Ibid, pp.3-5.

¹²⁶ Ibid, pp.13, 18-20.

¹²⁷ Sir George Mackenzie, *A Vindication of the Government in Scotland during the Reign of King Charles II...* (London, 1691), pp.3-4.

¹²⁸ Ibid, pp.20-1.

¹²⁹ Ibid, passim.

were inclined to loyalty because of Non-Resistance teaching. With William as *de facto* King such defences of Episcopacy by highlighting the doctrine as obliging loyalty to the ‘powers that be’ can be seen, especially with the authors’ acceptance of William, as effectively using the doctrine to urge allegiance to William.

Although Jacobite Episcopalian outnumbered Williamite Episcopalian, Jacobite Episcopalian polemics provide further evidence that there were some Episcopalian publicly justifying allegiance to William with this doctrine. Jacobite Episcopalian Alexander Monro said that Passive Obedience was ‘true Christian Doctrine’ and obliged loyalty to James. Monro’s pamphlets, published after Presbyterianism’s establishment, mainly focused on condemning Presbyterian persecution of Episcopalian.¹³⁰ In attacking Presbyterian persecution Monro also highlighted how some Episcopalian were being persecuted despite having given William allegiance. Presbyterians denounced Williamite Episcopalian commitment to the Passive Obedience doctrine as ‘more dangerous to’ William’s government ‘than the Principles of the *Covenant* were to the former....’ Monro believed that Williamite Episcopalian commitment to Passive Obedience would not disturb William’s government because it compelled subjects to be loyal.¹³¹ This fuelled Monro’s main theme of Presbyterian persecution justifying Episcopalian allegiance to James but also provides evidence of the Williamite Episcopalian minority using the Passive Obedience doctrine to justify allegiance to William.

Harris argues that James Canaries employed ideas about ‘limited resistance’ and ‘upheld the Pauline injunction to obey the powers that be....’¹³² Canaries did assert that Passive Obedience did not oblige loyalty to tyranny but, like many English Anglican Williamites, Canaries argued that those possessing power could not be resisted. Canaries, like other Anglican and Episcopalian Williamites, used the Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance doctrine to urge subjects to support William.¹³³ In 1691 William commissioned John Campbell, Earl of Breadalbane, to ensure the mainly Episcopalian

¹³⁰ This is explored in detail in Chapter Five.

¹³¹ Alexander Monro, *An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland chiefly oppos’d to the Censures...* (London, 1693), pp.90, 20-1.

¹³² Harris, ‘Incompatible revolutions?’, pp.215-6.

¹³³ James Canaries, *A Sermon Preached at Edinburgh, in the East-Church of St. Giles, upon the 30th of January, 1689 being the anniversary of the martyrdom of King Charles the First* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp.6-7, 21, 33-4, 42-7, 50-2, 54, 60, 65, 82-3. See Chapters One and Three for his use of History and Conquest.

Highland clans gave William allegiance as *de facto* King by January 1692. Breadalbane employed different means, including bribery, to achieve this.¹³⁴ One overlooked aspect of Breadalbane's campaign was how he used the Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance doctrine. A contemporary account of the Glencoe Massacre provides evidence of this and how some Episcopalians publicly linked the doctrine with allegiance to William as *de facto* King. Breadalbane 'did undertake to cause the Highlanders to lay down their Arms, give over Hostility, and to give Passive Obedience to the present Government, by taking the Oaths (which was very well done...).' ¹³⁵ This account said that most Highlanders 'did come all in done by the prefixed' date 'except the Glenco-men...'¹³⁶ It is not possible to know whether Breadalbane's employment of Passive Obedience or bribery induced these Episcopalians to take the new Oath to William. However this pamphlet is further evidence that the doctrine was a significant part of public justifications of allegiance to William by some Episcopalians. These Williamite Episcopalians, like the English Williamite Anglican majority, believed that allegiance to William as *de facto* King was more in keeping with the doctrine than maintaining allegiance to James. This was a significant minority amongst Episcopalians but shows that in Scotland, like in England, linking the doctrine with allegiance to *de facto* monarchs was an important part of the allegiance debates.

However most Episcopalian clerics became Jacobites. William's support for Presbyterianism becoming the established Church has been partly attributed to Episcopalians, like Bishop Alexander Rose of Edinburgh, publicly rejecting allegiance to William in part because of Passive Obedience.¹³⁷ Despite some Episcopalians, like Mackenzie and Breadalbane, using the doctrine to defend allegiance to William the doctrine became associated with allegiance to James in Scotland's allegiance debates. After their establishment Presbyterians propagated this association between the doctrine and Jacobitism. Presbyterian Williamite William Jameson attacked the 'presupposition of pure passive obedience' as transforming 'regular Monarchy into an absolute

¹³⁴ Paul Hopkins, *Glencoe and the End of the Highland War* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.124-8, 269-72.

¹³⁵ *An Impartial Account of Some of the Transactions in Scotland, Concerning the Earl of Broadalban, Viscount and Master of Stair, Glenco-Men, Bishop of Galloway, and Mr. Duncan Robertson. In a Letter from a Friend* (London, 1695), p.26.

¹³⁶ *Ibid*, p.26.

¹³⁷ Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.211-3.

Tyranny' under James to 'ruine all Subjects.'¹³⁸ Jameson believed that it was Christian duty to resist tyranny as happened in 1688-9.¹³⁹

George Ridpath, one of the most vigorous Presbyterian defenders of the Revolution in Scotland, in his *Scots Episcopal Innocence* attacked Episcopalians who denied William allegiance. Ridpath denounced those who 'extoll'd and applauded' Passive Obedience because they could not give William allegiance without 'down-right Perjury.' If Episcopalians 'have never, by any publick Authentick Act, renounced that Doctrine' then there was 'no great cause to think that they will be any steadier in their Allegiance to King William, than they were to King James....'¹⁴⁰ This pamphlet also advocated allegiance to William as *de jure*, rightful and lawful, King because Ridpath believed it would secure the Revolution. However this statement also shows that some Episcopalians justified allegiance to William as *de facto* King with this doctrine. Ridpath said that this allegiance was insufficient and that refusing to recognise William as *de jure* King was evidence of Jacobitism because it showed apathy to accepting William's rule as permanent. This equation of *de facto* theory with Jacobitism also saw Ridpath associate Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance with Jacobitism and he used this to justify actions against Episcopalians who refused to accept the entire Revolution settlement.¹⁴¹

However Ridpath also differentiated between how the doctrine was employed in the allegiance debates in Scotland and England. In a 1693 pamphlet Ridpath noted that most English Anglicans were able to reconcile allegiance to William with the Non-Resistance doctrine. Ridpath wanted Episcopalians and their 'Hot-headed Clergy' to see that 'their Passive Obedience' did not prevent 'the honest Church-of-England Laicks' supporting William when they were threatened by James.¹⁴² To Ridpath it was strange that many Episcopalians saw denying William allegiance as an 'act more' in keeping with 'the Prelatical Principles of Passive Obedience and

¹³⁸ William Jameson, *Nazianzeni querela et votum justum, The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy examin'd...defence of...the Author of An Enquiry into the New Opinions...*(Glasgow, 1697), p.15. See Chapter Five for more on how toleration and accusations of persecution impacted on the allegiance of Protestants outside the Established Churches.

¹³⁹ *Ibid*, p.51.

¹⁴⁰ Ridpath, *Scots Episcopal Innocence*, pp.6-7.

¹⁴¹ This is discussed in greater detail in Chapters Five and Seven.

¹⁴² George Ridpath, *A Continuation of the Answer to the Scots Presbyterian Eloquence...*(London, 1693), pp.6-7.

Nonresistance, than' giving William allegiance.¹⁴³ Ridpath highlighted this difference between Scottish Episcopalians and English Anglican Williamites to prevent Episcopalians gaining sympathy in England and pressuring for a more tolerant government attitude towards Episcopalians in Scotland. He highlighted how Episcopalians used this religious doctrine to justify their Jacobitism and this was at odds with most English Anglican clerics' views. In Scotland Presbyterians equated publicly preaching this doctrine with supporting allegiance to James.

Many Episcopalian polemicists, outraged by persecution and attacks by Ridpath and others, produced pamphlets that supported the Presbyterian view that Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance indicated Jacobitism. Episcopalian pamphleteers Alexander Monro, John Sage and Thomas Morer said that this doctrine obliged continued allegiance to James to avoid damnation. They also touched on how Presbyterian intolerance also justified denying William allegiance, which is the focus of Chapter Five, in addition to using Non-Resistance. Monro, responding to Ridpath, argued that Non-Resistance was necessary 'under all Forms and Models of Government' and no matter what the government did 'no Judicatory allows the remedy of a Rebellion.'¹⁴⁴ Numerous Episcopalians were expelled from Edinburgh University for declining the new oaths to William. One of the reasons for the expulsion of Divinity Professor John Strachan was his commitment to Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.¹⁴⁵ Monro provides evidence that, like Seller and English Anglican Jacobites, a strict interpretation of the doctrine justified maintaining allegiance to James and was an important part of Jacobitism.

Thomas Morer said that Episcopalians did nothing at the Revolution because they had 'a deep impression of their Allegiance to King James' and believed that it was morally safer not to act. This meant that many Episcopalians did not participate in elections and the Convention because they believed this parliament, without James's approval, was tantamount to resistance.¹⁴⁶ The entire Revolution was sinful resistance. William's 'purely

¹⁴³ Ibid, pp.20-1.

¹⁴⁴ Alexander Monro, *The Spirit of Calumny and Slander, examin'd, chastis'd, and expos'd, in a letter to a Malicious libeller more particularly address'd to Mr. George Ridpath...* (London, 1693), pp.23-4.

¹⁴⁵ Alexander Monro, *Presbyterian Inquisition as it was lately Practised against the professors of the Colledge of Edinburgh...* (London, 1691), pp.75-6.

¹⁴⁶ Morer, *An Account of the Present Persecutions*, pp.2-4.

Presbyterian' *Declaration* to Scotland and James being 'disown'd by his Subjects' would lead to perdition.¹⁴⁷ Adherence to the 'Apostolick Doctrin of Non-Resistance' meant refusing to break allegiance to James and enduring any resulting suffering.¹⁴⁸ John Sage, another Episcopalian Jacobite, said that he would not 'dishonour my Native Country' by resisting James.¹⁴⁹ Passive Obedience was not a 'Popish Doctrine.'¹⁵⁰ Episcopalian Jacobites believed their commitment to this doctrine compelled them to deny William allegiance. Presbyterian Williamite General Hugh Mackay said that Episcopalian ministers 'preached King James more than Christ as they had been accustomed to take passive obedience more than the gospel for their text...'¹⁵¹ Mackay's bias is obvious but he led Williamite forces in the Highlands and so would have had knowledge of his Jacobite enemies, therefore his attribution of Non-Resistance as an important factor in Jacobites' allegiance is significant. It provides evidence that Episcopalian Jacobite Non-Resistance polemics had an impact on their audience and led many to deny William allegiance just as English Anglican Nonjurors did but with more significant numbers in Scotland.

As with English Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance arguments Williamite Episcopalian, like Tarbat and Breadalbane, believed that this doctrine was one reason why they had to give William allegiance as *de facto* King. Morer, Monro and other Jacobite Episcopalian, like Seller and English Nonjurors, had a rigid interpretation of the doctrine and believed that the new oath of allegiance and the Revolution was sinfully resisting James. The main difference with the English debates was that most Episcopalian clerics became Nonjurors. Part of this was due to Presbyterian intolerance after Presbyterianism's establishment but Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance was also integral to the Scottish allegiance debates. There was a significant Williamite Episcopalian minority who, like English Anglican Williamites, justified allegiance to William as *de facto* King because of this doctrine and focused on the Revolution primarily as William's enthronement. However most Episcopalian clerics became Jacobites. They argued that allegiance to

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, pp.14-5.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, pp.64-5.

¹⁴⁹ John Sage, *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery. As it has been lately Established in the Kingdom of Scotland...* (London, 1697), pp.40-1.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid, p.325.

¹⁵¹ Hugh Mackay, *Memoirs of the War Carried on in Scotland and Ireland. M.DC.LXXXIX.-M.DC.XCI...* (Edinburgh, 1833), pp.76-7.

William supported a Revolution that was sinfully resisting the divinely ordained monarch. Presbyterian Williamites portrayed the Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance doctrine as a Jacobite excuse for denying William allegiance. Episcopalian Jacobite and Presbyterian Williamite polemics employing this doctrine show that by 1691 in Scotland, despite a Williamite Episcopalian minority, views of the Revolution were becoming less conservative. In contrast to England, where allegiance polemics focused on William replacing James, depicting the Revolution as something more significant than a personnel change were more popular with Scottish allegiance polemics. Although this issue showed some divergence in views on the Revolution in England and Scotland, Irish Anglican Williamites, like English Anglican Williamites and the Williamite Episcopalian minority, focused on William becoming *de facto* King.

IV

Irish historiography, like English historiography, tends to view Passive Obedience as an inconvenience circumvented with ideas like Conquest and Providence. Some historians have noted how William King and other Anglican clerics either discarded the doctrine or argued that Passive Obedience had limits and allowed for self-defence.¹⁵² S.J. Connolly highlights that many Anglicans, like King and Edward Wetenhall, claimed that allegiance to William was an adhering to the ‘powers that be,’ or *de facto* theory.¹⁵³ However Raymond Gillespie argues that Irish Anglicans accepted James’s authority in Ireland even after William’s enthronement in England.¹⁵⁴ Ireland being under Jacobite control longer than England and Scotland shows just how central Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance was to Anglican-Episcopalian thinking on allegiance. Scottish Presbyterian Jacobite Sir James Montgomery’s 1692 *Great Britain’s Just Complaint* criticised Irish Anglicans for being ‘rather lookers on than actors’ during the Revolution, waiting to see who would

¹⁵² Harris, ‘Incompatible Revolutions,’ p.216; Raymond Gillespie, *Seventeenth-century Ireland* (Dublin, 2006), pp.289-94; McGuire, ‘Church of Ireland and the Glorious Revolution,’ pp.138-49; O’Regan, *Archbishop William King*, pp.20-2, 25-6, 42-4.

¹⁵³ S.J Connolly, *Divided Kingdom Ireland 1630-1800* (Oxford, 2008), pp.177-83.

¹⁵⁴ Raymond Gillespie, ‘The Irish Protestants and James II, 1688-90,’ *Irish Historical Studies*, 28, No. 110 (Nov., 1992), pp.128-9.

triumph.¹⁵⁵ Irish Anglican allegiance polemics during 1689-92, like English and some Scottish polemics, linked the doctrine with *de facto* theory. However this link was even more explicit in Ireland than in England and Scotland because Irish Anglican polemics also defended their passivity under James.

Criticism of Irish Anglicans, like Montgomery's, compelled Irish Anglicans to publicly defend their passivity under James alongside their transferring allegiance to William.¹⁵⁶ Two speeches by Anthony Dopping, Anglican Bishop of Meath, were published in a broadside after William's triumph at the Boyne. This broadside was intended to embarrass Dopping by showing a 1689 speech addressed to James and another from 1690 addressed to William. These speeches show how Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance was closely related to *de facto* theory. Dopping's speech to James, on behalf of Dublin and rural clergy, congratulated James on his arrival in Dublin. In it he promised James that Irish Anglicans were resolved 'to continue firm to that Loyalty which the Principles of our Church oblige us to, which in pursuance to those Principles we have hereto practised....'¹⁵⁷ In 1690 William established his authority in Dublin after the Boyne. Dopping expressed 'our Gratitude and Duty to' William 'as our King,' praising his campaign 'to Rescue us from the Oppressions and Tyranny of Popery' while also highlighting how Anglican clergy carried out their pastoral duties under James.¹⁵⁸ These speeches show how the doctrine was central to Irish Anglican thinking on allegiance. Dopping said he owed allegiance to James because of Anglican loyalty 'Principles,' Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, but in 1690 he accepted William as King. This was allegiance to *de facto* monarchs and refusal to resist the 'powers that be.' James was *de facto* King in Ireland, possessing the government in 1688-9, but after the Boyne William became *de facto* King in Ireland. The main difference between Dopping and English Anglican Williamite polemics was that James remained *de facto* King in Ireland after William's enthronement in England. Dopping's speeches focused on who was

¹⁵⁵ Sir James Montgomery, *Great Britain's Just Complaint Second Edition* (Oxford, 1692), pp.50-1.

¹⁵⁶ J.I. McGuire, 'A Remora to King James's affairs: William King's Defence of Protestant Office-holders, 1689-90,' in Christopher J. Fauske (ed.) *Archbishop William King and the Anglican Irish Context, 1688-1729* (Dublin, 2004), pp.36-8.

¹⁵⁷ Anthony Dopping, *Two Speeches by the Bishop of Meath, one to King James, when the Clergy waited on His Majesty at Dublin Castle, March 1688/9 the other to King William at his Camp nigh Dublin, July 7 1690* (n.p., 1690).

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

de facto King and so presented the Revolution as William replacing James as *de facto* King without mentioning any changes to the monarchy.

The Siege of Derry was one episode where Irish Protestants favoured what some would term resistance even though Protestants in the city were divided on allegiance with Presbyterians advocating resistance more frequently than Anglicans.¹⁵⁹ Presbyterian pamphlets on the Siege asserted that for much of the Siege Anglican clerics preached Non-Resistance. These pamphlets were part of the post-war Anglican-Presbyterian antagonism as to which denomination deserved more credit for preserving Londonderry. However these Anglican and Presbyterian pamphlets provide evidence of the importance of the doctrine to Anglican actions on allegiance. Presbyterians said Anglican adherence to the doctrine showed that Presbyterians were the true heroes of Derry. One Presbyterian pamphlet criticised Anglican clerics for their ‘pretended Conscience’ and how even after the Siege they ‘refuse to Swear Allegiance to the best of Kings,’ William.¹⁶⁰ Ezekiel Hopkins, Bishop of Derry, preached ‘the Doctrine of Passive Obedience’ when Jacobite forces besieged the city. Hopkins ‘gravely exhorted’ Anglicans that ‘they should... become a Victim to the sanguinary Cut-throats’ because ‘the Loyalty of their Obedience to their ONLY lawful Sovereign, would recompense their deepest Sufferings....’¹⁶¹ According to this Presbyterian pamphlet ‘a young Presbyterian *Scot*’ challenged Hopkins’s preaching before some Presbyterians closed the gates on the Jacobites and this Presbyterian resistance saved Derry. Hopkins found ‘his Doctrine’ frequently repeated until ‘the Church-rebel *Jack Presbyter*’ forced Hopkins to leave Londonderry ‘to the disloyal Whiggs.’¹⁶² However this Presbyterian author did praise the Anglican George Walker for asserting that ‘God intimates to the World the Church of *England* defends and maintains their Majesty’s Interest, and the Protestant Religion.’¹⁶³ Ulster Anglicans differed on what the doctrine meant. To Hopkins it meant Non-Resistance to James but to Walker it meant obedience to God and preserving

¹⁵⁹ Gillespie, ‘Irish Protestants and James II,’ pp.128-33.

¹⁶⁰ *An Apology for the Failures Charg’d on the Reverend Mr. George Walker’s Printed Account of the Late Siege of Derry, In a Letter to the Undertaker of a more Accurate Narrative of that Siege* (n.p., 1690), pp.11-2.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid*, pp.12-3.

¹⁶² *Ibid*, pp.13-4.

¹⁶³ *Ibid*, p.15.

religion while not resisting authority; in Derry James had no authority so could not be obeyed.

John Mackenzie, another Londonderry Presbyterian, in his account defended Anglicans and Presbyterians ‘from any Imputation of Disloyalty or Sedition, in the Judgment of all that are not Bigots for Unlimited Non-Resistance....’¹⁶⁴ Mackenzie criticised ‘Bigots,’ like Hopkins, who overemphasised Non-Resistance and condemned Derry residents for ‘Disobedience to their Sovereign.’ However most Presbyterians and Anglicans believed that it was ‘for their own Safety’ that Jacobite forces were refused entry to Londonderry. Even when James was at the Walls Jacobites’ urging Non-Resistance was useless because the ‘Men on the Walls... were resolv’d to the defend the Protestant Religion, and King *William’s* Interest....’¹⁶⁵ Many Protestants believed that the decision to enthrone William as *de facto* King of England also applied to Ireland. Therefore Ulster Anglicans were not resisting the ‘powers that be’ because James clearly had no authority in Derry or Enniskillen.¹⁶⁶ By 1689 authorities in Londonderry were declaring for William because as *de facto* King of England he could preserve Irish Protestantism as Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance was meant to. The role of providence in enthroning William also meant that it was sinful to resist William.¹⁶⁷

Outside Ulster in 1688-9 Irish Anglicans displayed more passivity and their polemics after William’s victory at the Boyne clearly link the Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance doctrine with *de facto* theory. Edward Wetenhall’s *Case of the Irish Protestants* showed this when urging Irish Anglicans to ‘receive and submit to King William and Queen Mary....’¹⁶⁸ Wetenhall described declaring allegiance to William as acting with the doctrine ‘where it ever was: In our Bibles and in our Hearts; and I will add too, (not without Defiance to all who reproach us on this account) in our Practice also....’¹⁶⁹ Non-Resistance meant no resistance to *de facto* authorities, which in

¹⁶⁴ John Mackenzie, *A Narrative of the Siege of London-Derry...*(London, 1690), ‘The Preface.’

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid*, pp.8, 28.

¹⁶⁶ Andrew Hamilton, *A True Relation of the Actions of the Inniskilling Men* (London, 1690), p.8.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid*, pp.2, 10-3.

¹⁶⁸ Edward Wetenhall, *The Case of the Irish Protestants: In Relation to Recognising Allegiance to, and Praying for King William and Queen Mary, Stated and Resolved* (London, 1691), pp.1-3. Wetenhall also used Conquest theory and this is examined in Chapter Three.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid*, pp.18-9.

Ireland only recently changed.¹⁷⁰ Wetenhall claimed that Irish Anglicans under James and William firmly adhered to the doctrine. Under William ‘we adhere to the practice of Non-Resistance’ and were ‘constant to our Faith and Duty.’¹⁷¹ The doctrine was not to defend James’s Catholic absolutism but neither did it oblige rebelling for a Protestant ruler.¹⁷² It was why Irish Anglicans did not act against James after William was crowned in England but it was also why they eventually gave allegiance to William. Irish Anglicans ‘suffered’ under James with ‘due regard to the Christian Laws’ like Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.¹⁷³ They did not act against James because of the doctrine but from 1690 it was the ‘Practice’ of devout Anglicans to give William allegiance after he became *de facto* King in Ireland.¹⁷⁴

The relationship between *de facto* theory and this doctrine was further propounded in William King’s *State of the Protestants in Ireland*. King claimed his pamphlet was to show ‘the true Notion and Latitude of’ Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.¹⁷⁵ Historians have explored King’s ‘hotchpotch of arguments’ like ‘Lockean’ self-defence or providence or that Passive Obedience reached ‘only tolerable evils.’¹⁷⁶ Passive Obedience and Conquest theory are two important ideas in King’s pamphlets that have gone largely unexplored. Like English Anglican and Scottish Episcopalian Williamites, King used the doctrine to justify allegiance to William. Non-Resistance remained a ‘Principle amongst Protestants.’ As ‘private Men’ subjects could ‘not take up the Sword, or resist the King.’¹⁷⁷ Subjects were to act ‘according to the Laws and Gospel, behave themselves peaceably and submissively towards their Superiors....’¹⁷⁸ It was only after ‘King James’s Power was put to an end’ at the Boyne that William became *de facto* King

¹⁷⁰ Ibid, pp.13-4.

¹⁷¹ Ibid, pp.19-20.

¹⁷² Ibid, pp.20-1.

¹⁷³ Ibid, p.21.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid, pp.18-9, 23-4.

¹⁷⁵ William King, *The State of the Protestants of Ireland under the late King James’s Government...* (London, 1691), p.1.

¹⁷⁶ Eccleshall, ‘Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland,’ pp.65-71; idem, ‘Anglican Political Thought,’ pp.57-9; O’Regan, *Archbishop William King of Dublin*, pp.40-54; Christopher J. Fauske, “‘The Angel of St. Patrick’s is now the guardian of the Kingdom,’” in Christopher J. Fauske (ed.) *Archbishop William King and the Anglican Irish Context, 1688-1729* (Dublin, 2004), pp.17-8; Hill, ‘Politics and the Writing of History,’ pp.227-9; McGuire, ‘Remora to King James’s Affairs: William King’s Defence,’ p.39; Patrick McNally, ‘William King, patriotism and the “national question,”’ in *ibid*, pp.49-51.

¹⁷⁷ King, *State*, pp.4-5, 221-2. See Chapter Three for his use of Conquest theory.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid, pp.221-2.

partly by Conquest, which is examined in detail in Chapter Three. William as *de facto* King could not be resisted.¹⁷⁹ King claimed that Jacobite rhetoric on Passive Obedience ‘met with very slender reception in *Ireland*.’¹⁸⁰ The Revolution was ‘Deliverance’ and subjects were ‘obliged to make’ returns ‘for it.’¹⁸¹ It would be ‘unpardonable folly’ for Irish Anglicans to ‘refuse a deliverance, especially from *England*’ when William acquired the Irish government.¹⁸² King repeatedly argued that James was *de facto* King until his power was ‘at an end’ after the Boyne, which meant that William could not be resisted because as *de facto* King he was entitled to allegiance.

Jacobite Charles Leslie deftly took apart King’s argument on Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance. Leslie denounced Williamites for ‘recanting and Preaching down their former Principles’ which would ‘ruin the Church of England’ Communion across the Kingdoms.¹⁸³ This would bring the ‘Destruction of Mankind, by setting up such Principles as countenance Rebellions’ along with ‘the Destruction of Soul and Body.’¹⁸⁴ King showed the ‘Spirit of Atheism’ by promoting rebellion ‘contrary to the Spirit of true Religion.’¹⁸⁵ Advocating allegiance to William was to ‘run down and ridicule the Holy Scripture, and all Reveal’d Religion... every where, without Restraint or Shame.’¹⁸⁶ Rebellion against James meant ‘we have lost Christianity, both as to Faith and Practice.’¹⁸⁷ Leslie highlighted how there was no ‘higher Assertor’ of Passive Obedience in the 1680s than King.¹⁸⁸ During 1688-9 King, Dopping and other Irish Anglicans held onto ‘their Church of England loyalty... even with Relation to King James after he was declared Abdicate, and a new King... set upon the Throne’ in England. William was ‘claiming the Allegiance’ of Irish subjects but King and others refuted him.¹⁸⁹ King even defended Hopkins’s protests against the Derry gates being closed and

¹⁷⁹ Ibid, p.200.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid pp.200, 222-3.

¹⁸¹ William King, *Europe’s Delivery from France and Slavery in a Sermon Preached at St. Patrick’s Church, Dublin on the 16th of November, 1690...being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Preservation of his Majesty’s Person...*(London, 1691), pp.2, 22.

¹⁸² King, *State*, pp.95-7, 200.

¹⁸³ Charles Leslie, *An Answer to a Book, intituled, The State of the Protestants in Ireland under the Late King James’s Government...*(London, 1692), ‘Preface.’

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, pp.1-2.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid, pp.27-8, 36-7.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid, p.37.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, p.37.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, pp.113-4, 117-9.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid, pp.121-3.

discouraged Protestants from ‘joyning in Rebellion.’¹⁹⁰ Leslie hoped that King and Williamites would ‘discover their own Shame’ for abandoning Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.¹⁹¹ This criticism of King and other Williamites provides evidence that many Irish Anglicans, including King, maintained loyalty to James because of the doctrine. After William established himself in Ireland King and others used the doctrine to justify allegiance to William, which outraged Leslie.

Leslie, like Seller and Hickes, repeatedly promoted the Jacobite view that the doctrine obliged continued loyalty to James, the rightful King. He praised English and Scottish Nonjurors who suffered deprivations because of ‘their Firmness to what the People think to have been the uncontroverted Doctrine of the Church of England, that is Passive Obedience.’¹⁹² Leslie said that Nonjurors in each Kingdom strictly adhering to the doctrine were like early Christians persecuted for upholding their beliefs. He praised John Lake, former Bishop of Chichester, who said that Nonjurors ‘would have gone to the Stake, rather than have forsaken their Passive Obedience, or taken the present Oaths...’¹⁹³ Whether the King was Catholic or Protestant, autocratic or benevolent, was irrelevant because the ‘Duty of Subjects’ was not to resist.¹⁹⁴ Despite Leslie’s strong arguments most Irish Anglicans disagreed with him. Irish Whig Sir Francis Brewster wrote in 1698 that there was little ‘refusal to take the Oaths to his present majesty’ amongst Irish Anglicans. It was clear that ‘both the Clergy of that Church, and their Congregations unalterably staunch, and firm to the Government of *England* both in Church and State, as it is by Law established, to continue for ever in the hands of Protestant Princes.’¹⁹⁵ Despite Leslie’s efforts politically involved Irish Anglicans followed the Williamite argument, established in England, that this doctrine obliged allegiance to William as *de facto* King.

Leslie, Hopkins and Presbyterian pamphlets provide evidence that while James possessed Ireland’s government most Irish Anglicans, with the exception of some Ulster Protestants, believed that the doctrine compelled

¹⁹⁰ Ibid, p.114.

¹⁹¹ Ibid, p.115.

¹⁹² Ibid, pp.123-4.

¹⁹³ Ibid, pp.132-3.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid, pp.143, 8, 54-9.

¹⁹⁵ Sir Francis Brewster, *A Discourse Concerning Ireland and the Different Interests thereof...* (London, 1698), pp.43-4.

continued loyalty to James. These polemics also show that, like Seller and Morer, Irish Nonjurors refused the new oath of allegiance to William because they believed it was sinfully resisting James. William King, Wetenhall and others took the view, popular with English Anglican and Scottish Episcopalian Williamites, that the doctrine obliged loyalty to *de facto* authorities. Their polemics, defending their inaction under James before giving William allegiance, show that amongst Irish Anglicans Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance was their main guiding principle on allegiance in 1689-92. Even after William was enthroned in England, constitutionally also binding Ireland, most Irish Anglicans, with some exceptions in Ulster, did not declare for William because James was *de facto* ruler of Ireland.¹⁹⁶ After William triumphed at the Boyne many Irish Anglicans saw William as *de facto* King who could not be resisted. Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, to Williamites, obliged allegiance to *de facto* monarchs.¹⁹⁷

V

Clark has said that the Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance doctrine was useful for inducing support for William and preventing rebellion against him and his successors.¹⁹⁸ Examining allegiance pamphlets from each Kingdom shows that the doctrine was integral to allegiance debates in 1689-92. Seller's *History* had a massive impact. He and other Anglican-Episcopalian opponents of the Revolution across the Kingdoms argued that the new oath of allegiance to William was sinfully resisting James and so declined the oath. These Nonjurors were deprived of their benefices because of their adherence to the doctrine. They may not have actively conspired to restore James but their refusal to bind their consciences to William by taking the new oath made them Jacobites. Seller was not the first Jacobite to make this argument but was one of the most influential pamphleteers in 1689. The responses to his pamphlet set the tone of the allegiance debates, especially on this doctrine, into 1690-1 and the Sherlock controversy. In England and Ireland Nonjurors were small in number but made up for this with impact and influence, especially when their polemics used this doctrine. Most Scottish Episcopalian clerics declined

¹⁹⁶ Hamilton, *A True Relation*, pp.2, 8-13; King, *The State*, pp.1-5, 220-1.

¹⁹⁷ Wetenhall, *The Case*, pp.18-21; Leslie, *An Answer*, pp.37, 121-4, 143.

¹⁹⁸ Clark, *English Society*, pp.77, 134-6.

allegiance to William in part because of this doctrine. Nonjurors in the Three Kingdoms were firm that the doctrine precluded allegiance to William because it was sinfully resisting the divinely ordained King James just as Seller articulated.

Williamites in the Churches of England and Ireland and a minority of Scottish Episcopalians recognised that this doctrine was integral to their religion. They could not surrender this vital issue to Jacobites and countered Seller and Jacobites by arguing that Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance actually obliged allegiance to William as *de facto* King. Responses to Seller set the tone for Williamite Anglican and Episcopalian polemics across the Kingdoms and these polemics were not ‘contradictory’ as Harris claims.¹⁹⁹ They followed on from their use of History in early 1689 to defend the Revolution and portray it as little more than a change of monarchs within the traditional order and constitutional norms. Long, Fowler, Sherlock, Tarbat, King and Wetenhall amongst others made this argument. They argued that the oft-cited Biblical precedents of not resisting the ‘powers that be’ were *de facto* rulers. Therefore maintaining allegiance to James was actually sinful resistance. Some saw it as rejecting the providential deliverance yet Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance was a specific idea Williamites used alongside providence to argue that subjects were compelled to give William allegiance. Throughout the 1690s and well into Anne’s reign Anglican Williamites, like Henry Sacheverell, argued that it was specifically Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance that obliged loyalty to William.²⁰⁰ When this doctrine dominated the allegiance debates it ensured that conservative interpretations of the Revolution, downplaying the significance of it, continued to dominate the public discourse during 1689-92. This was important for ensuring that most Anglican clerics gave William allegiance as *de facto* King but others wanted a more comprehensive account as to how William became *de facto* King. Clerics dominated this part of the debate but other theorists realised that another idea and account of how William became King was needed than merely asserting it was sinful to resist *de facto* monarchs. Subjects, like Anglican clerics, were still cautious about embracing the implications of the Revolution. Therefore presenting the Revolution as a Conquest that made William *de facto* King

¹⁹⁹ Harris, ‘Incompatible Revolutions,’ pp.223-5.

²⁰⁰ Henry Sacheverell, *The Perils of False Brethren, both in Church and State...*(London, 1709), pp.15-9.

became prevalent amongst more temporally focused theorists between 1689 and 1692 and appealed to a very broad audience across the Kingdoms.

Chapter Three: Conquest Theories, 1689-92.

Many Anglican Williamites had used Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance to justify allegiance to William by asserting that it was a sin to resist the *de facto* King. However several Williamites, including many Non-Anglicans, across the Kingdoms believed that they needed a more extensive account of how William became *de facto* King when justifying allegiance. Many polemicists had used Providential theory, which said that God enthroned William, but between summer 1689 and 1692 portraying the Revolution as a Conquest of James was one of the most popular arguments in the Three Kingdoms.¹ Anglican clerics dominated when the debate focused on Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, Conquest theories, which said that success following a military expedition could confer political authority, had a broader appeal. Conquest theories were popular with polemicists who were not clerics, non-Anglicans and Anglican clerics as well. English Tory Edmund Bohun when describing William's enthronement said that 'to query whether it is a real Conquest, is very absurd.' William had a 'good Right to our Allegiance' because he conquered James. James's flight in 1688 was the 'Conquest, a voluntary Surrender, and a wilful Desertion of a Crown.'² Bohun said this was not a 'Brutish force' Conquest of England, that implied absolutism and extensive changes beyond who wore the Crown; it was a 'willing Submission' by subjects to a Conquest of James.³ The 'willing Submission' by subjects to William's enthronement was to show that this was a consensual expedition and was not a coercive Conquest of Kingdoms. Bohun did not come up with this idea but his was one of the most succinct Conquest polemics in early 1689. This chapter explores how in various descriptions this Conquest of James was one of the most popular arguments across the Kingdoms between 1689 and 1692 before opinions changed and this fell out of favour amongst Williamite polemicists.

¹ In the early 1690s providential theory was a clear part of the discourse and elements of this have been examined in Chapter Two and the use of providential ideas in allegiance polemics is examined in greater detail in Chapter Eight.

² Edmund Bohun, *The Doctrine of Non-Resistance or Passive Obedience, no way concerned in the Controversies now depending between the Williamites and Jacobites by a lay Gentleman of the Communion of the Church of England* (London, 1689), pp.24-5, 5, 31. See Chapter One for his use of History and Chapter Two for his use of Non-Resistance.

³ *Ibid*, pp.5, 31, 9-10; Edmund Bohun, *The History of the Desertion...* (London, 1689), pp.3-4, 9-11, 47-50, 110-1, 154-7.

Political legitimacy through Conquest was hotly contested throughout the seventeenth century. English theorists debated the nature of the Norman Conquest, its role in creating Common Law and institutions as well as providing the basis of the English monarch's right to allegiance. Whether William I conquered England or his rival Harold and whether this established subjects' rights were central to these debates. James VI and I's succession in England and the subsequent Calvin's Case led to many English jurists debating allegiance through Conquest.⁴ Some theorists attributed the origins of government to Conquests in order to avoid endorsing popular consent notions. Others argued that Conquest needed popular consent or an accompanying Contract to confer legitimacy.⁵ J.G.A. Pocock argues that interpretations of Conquests as part of England's ancient constitution formed the basis for Whig and Tory political thought albeit in different lights.⁶ Early Modern Scotland also debated whether a Conquest conferred political legitimacy.⁷ In Ireland Conquest was seen as legitimising English political authority there.⁸ Polemics asserting legitimacy through Conquest were prominent at times of political turmoil. During the Engagement Controversy Conquest theories justifying allegiance to Cromwell were popular.⁹ Conquest ideas were important in

⁴ Glenn Burgess, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution: An Introduction to English Political Thought 1600-1642* (Brighton, 1993), pp.128-36; Robert Zaller, *The Discourse of Legitimacy in Early Modern England* (Stanford, 2007), pp.320-39, 669.

⁵ Johann P. Sommerville, *Thomas Hobbes Political Ideas in Historical Context* (Basingstoke, 1992), pp.63-9.

⁶ J.G.A Pocock's *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law* (Cambridge, 1987) argues that both political traditionalists and radicals used arguments based on Conquest theory. More recently William Klein has come to similar conclusions in his 'The Ancient Constitution Revisited' in Nicholas Phillipson & Quentin Skinner (eds.) *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993).

⁷ J.H Burns, *The True Law of Kingship Concepts of Monarchy in Early-Modern Scotland* (Oxford, 1996), pp.37-41, 84-91, 115-21, 236-8.

⁸ Robert Eccleshall, 'Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland in the 1690s' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Basingstoke, 2001); passim; Jacqueline Hill, 'Politics and the Writing of History,' in Boyce, Eccleshall, Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, passim; Charles C. Ludington, 'From Ancient Constitution to British Empire: William Atwood and the Imperial Crown of England,' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.) *Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland Kingdom or Colony?* (Cambridge, 2000), pp.246-60.

⁹ Quentin Skinner, 'History and Ideology in the English Revolution,' in Quentin Skinner (ed.) *Visions of Politics Volume III: Hobbes and Civil Service* (Cambridge, 2002); Mark Goldie, 'The English System of Liberty,' in Mark Goldie & Robert Walker (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.44-5; Edward Vallance, 'Oaths, Casuistry, and Equivocation, Anglican Responses to the Engagement Controversy,' *The Historical Journal*, 44, No. 1 (Mar., 2001), pp.59-60, 65; Sommerville, *Thomas Hobbes Political Ideas in Historical Context*, pp.63-9.

political discourse throughout the seventeenth century and so naturally became important in the post-Revolution allegiance debates.

English Conquest theories have been one of the more discussed aspects of post-Revolution allegiance debates. The different types of Conquest theories were frequently associated with allegiance to *de facto* rulers. Mark Goldie identified three Conquest theories: the Hobbesian tradition of consensual submission to a Conqueror providing protection; the historical-legal legacy of the Norman Conquest; and the ‘most explicitly and popularly’ used idea of Conquest in a just war as Grotius articulated. Goldie explores Bohun’s use of this final theory and its popularity amongst political traditionalists in accepting William and the Revolution.¹⁰ M.P. Thompson similarly argued that notions of Conquest in a just war and whether it was a Conquest like 1066 were two popular Conquest theories from 1689.¹¹ Howard Nenner has said that Bohun and Gilbert Burnet used Grotius’s writings to argue that the Revolution was a Conquest of James and not a hostile subjugation of England.¹² Where Goldie, Nenner and Thompson focused on just war and the legacy of 1066 this chapter focuses on a widely popular and simple notion of William conquering James and taking his subjects’ allegiance as part of this Conquest, as Bohun articulated. In these tracts the Conquest of James was closely linked with just war theories. However the two theories described different parts of the Revolution. Just war justified William’s landing in England while the Conquest was James’s flight and William’s taking the throne without altering the nature of the monarchy, justifying allegiance to William.¹³ This depicted the Revolution as a simple Conquest of James’s kingship and with it a transfer of allegiance to William, the *de facto* King. Politically diverse polemicists from each Kingdom would adopt this argument to justify their positions on allegiance.¹⁴

¹⁰ Mark Goldie, ‘Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium* in the Revolution, 1689-1693,’ *The Historical Journal*, 20, No. 3 (Sep., 1977), pp.569-86.

¹¹ M.P. Thompson, ‘The Idea of Conquest in Controversies Over the 1688 Revolution,’ *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar., 1977), pp.33-46.

¹² Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: Succession to the Crown of England 1603-1714* (Basingstoke, 1995), pp.200-3.

¹³ Bohun, *History of the Desertion*, pp.10-1, 47-50; Bohun, *Doctrine of Non-Resistance*, pp.24-5, 5-6.

¹⁴ Sir Francis Grant’s *The Loyalists’ Reasons For his Giving Obedience, and Swearing Allegiance, to the Present Government...* (Edinburgh, 1689), p.29 is a Scottish example while Edward Wetenhall’s *The Case of the Irish Protestants: In Relation to Recognising, or Swearing Allegiance to, And Praying for King William and Queen Mary, Stated and Resolved.* (London, 1691), p.6 is an Irish example.

Constitutional issues dominate the limited Irish historiography on post-Revolution Conquest theories. Robert Eccleshall and Raymond Gillespie have alluded to William receiving allegiance from Irish Anglicans after his Conquest of James. However most examinations of post-Revolution Irish Conquest ideas focus on how these notions were used to circumvent problems like Non-Resistance and neglect the importance of allegiance and similarities with the other Kingdoms.¹⁵ Clare Jackson has explored the just war Conquest theory in post-Revolution Scotland but apart from her work post-Revolution Conquest theories have received little attention in Scottish historiography.¹⁶ This chapter shows how viewing the Revolution as a Conquest of James was a popular justification of allegiance to William across the Kingdoms.

Conquest theories were always open to criticism. In 1649 John Lilburne criticised obedience to a Conqueror as supporting the establishment of a tyranny.¹⁷ During the Engagement Controversy several polemicists propounded this view while others said that Conquest could only confer legitimacy if subjects consented to the Conquest, thereby establishing subjects' rights as in 1066. Some Royalists, like Edward Hyde, argued that a Conquest without consent undermined English constitutional norms.¹⁸ Even Hobbes argued that Conquests needed consent to justify allegiance and prevent subjects' enslavement.¹⁹ Goldie says that many theorists used this 'Hobbesian' Conquest argument in post-1688 debates.²⁰ Bohun asserted that a conqueror of

¹⁵ Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (London, 1980), pp. 28-9; Robert Eccleshall, 'Anglican Political Thought in the Century after the Revolution of 1688,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Thought in Ireland since the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1993), pp.53-5, 58; idem, 'Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland,' S.J. Connolly, 'The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr: Regicide and Revolution in Anglican Political Thought c. 1660-1745,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54, No. 3, (July, 2003), pp.485-90; idem, 'The Glorious Revolution in Irish Protestant Political Thinking,' in S.J. Connolly (ed.) *Political Ideas in Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2000), pp.30-2; Jacqueline Hill, 'Politics and the Writing of History,' pp.279-80; Philip O'Regan, *Archbishop William King of Dublin (1650-1729) and the Constitution in Church and State* (Dublin, 2000), pp.40-53; Raymond Gillespie, 'The Irish Protestants and James II, 1688-90,' *Irish Historical Studies*, 28, No. 110 (Nov., 1992), p.132.

¹⁶ Clare Jackson, 'Revolution Principles, *Ius Naturae*, and *Jus Gentium* in Early-Enlightenment Scotland: the Contribution of Sir Francis Grant, Lord Cullen (c.1660-1726),' in Tim Hochstrasser & Peter Schröder (eds.) *Early Modern Natural Law Theories Contests and Strategies in the Early Enlightenment* (London, 2003), pp.107-124; idem, *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690 Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp.204-5.

¹⁷ John Lilburne, *The Legall Fundamentall Liberties of England, revised, asserted, and vindicated* (London, 1649), pp.41, 56-8.

¹⁸ Skinner, 'History and Ideology in the English Revolution,' pp.153-8, 162-8; Pocock, *Ancient Constitution and Feudal Law*, pp.147-51.

¹⁹ Quentin Skinner, 'Thomas Hobbes on the Proper Signification of Liberty: The Prothero Lecture,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society Fifth Series*, 40, (1990), pp.147-50.

²⁰ Goldie, 'Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium*,' p.570.

a monarch could have allegiance provided subjects were not servile as a conquest of kingdoms implied. This was partly why Bohun said that William conquered James not England.²¹ A conquest of Kingdoms implied wholesale constitutional changes but a Conquest of a monarch downplayed such changes. From 1692 there were growing criticisms of Conquest theories. Goldie and Thompson focus on the popularity of English conquest polemics but only briefly mention criticisms of Charles Blount's *King William and Queen Mary, Conquerors*.²² Other historians have described the popularity of Conquest theories in English polemics alongside other theories to justify allegiance but also neglect increasingly prevalent criticisms from 1692.²³ Historians have generally overlooked Jacobite Conquest theses. This chapter will show how criticisms of Conquest theories and Jacobite Conquest polemics ensured that by 1693 Conquest theories were increasingly unpopular. Conquest theories began to fall out of favour with polemicists, demonstrating the changing political thought on the Revolution.

I

The Revolution began in England and this was where Conquest theories were first employed. As has been stated Bohun claimed that William was entitled to allegiance because he conquered James. Over the course of several pamphlets Bohun used this Conquest to supplement his use of History and Non-Resistance arguments to urge allegiance to William as *de facto* King.²⁴ The Revolution was not a conventional military conquest of England. William's 1688 *Declaration* 'conquered all that saw or heard it' and James's flight was when William 'conquered King James.'²⁵ It was 'the Noblest as well as most effectual Conquest;' it was a Conquest with 'the Pen; Swords conquer Bodies only, Reason and Interest, Justice and Mercy, subdue Souls too, and at once bring the whole Man under....'²⁶ With this peaceable Conquest of James most subjects 'transferred' allegiance to William as *de facto* King. William had

²¹ Bohun, *Doctrine of Non-Resistance*, pp.9-10.

²² Goldie, 'Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium*,' pp.570-85; Thompson, 'The Idea of Conquest,' pp.43-50.

²³ Gerald Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962), pp.39-64, 124-6; Nenner, *Right to be King*, pp.1-2, 78, 157-9, 200-3.

²⁴ See Chapters One and Two.

²⁵ Bohun, *History of the Desertion*, pp.72-3; Bohun, *Doctrine of Non-Resistance*, pp.9-10.

²⁶ Bohun, *Doctrine of Non-Resistance*, pp.24-5.

‘as good Right to our Allegiance, on that score, as ever any conquering Prince had.’²⁷ This was not just *jus gentium* Conquest theory as Goldie describes.²⁸ Allegiance to William supported this Conquest that ‘preserved’ traditional English monarchical government.²⁹ The only change with this minimalistic Conquest was who wore the Crown. To support this argument Bohun cited a letter from John Churchill, future Duke of Marlborough, to James that said William had ‘a pretence by Conquest’ to receive allegiance when James fled and William issued his declaration.³⁰ William conquered James through his Declaration, which rallied subjects to his side, and when James abandoned the government. This Conquest made William *de facto* King and entitled him to allegiance.

J.P. Kenyon dismissed the popularity of Conquest theories early in William’s reign.³¹ However between 1689 and 1692 numerous Williamites, like Bohun, argued that William was entitled to allegiance as *de facto* King after Conquering James, without constitutional change. This simple version of Conquest was popular amongst Tories and Whigs. Gilbert Burnet’s *Pastoral Letter* said that when James fled ‘his Right and Title did accrue to the King [William], in the Right of a Conquest over him....’³² *Jus Gentium* Conquest theory, which said that William intervened in England in a just war, was part of Burnet’s *Letter*.³³ There were many ideas in Burnet’s *Letter* but the above quote shows Burnet describing the Revolution as a Conquest of James entitling William to allegiance. It was *jus gentium* that justified William’s landing but the Conquest occurred after the landing and James’s flight.³⁴ Anglican cleric Thomas Comber said that several European monarchs based their legitimacy on having triumphed in military conquests.³⁵ Comber agreed with Burnet’s *Letter* that James was ‘conquered, and forced to withdraw himself’ ending

²⁷ Ibid, pp.24-5, 5-6.

²⁸ Goldie, ‘Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium*,’ pp.572, 576-7.

²⁹ Bohun, *History of the Desertion*, pp.52; idem, *An Answer to the Desertion Discuss’d*... (n.p., 1689) 114-5, 168. See Chapter One and Two.

³⁰ Bohun, *History of the Desertion*, pp.111-2.

³¹ J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (Cambridge, 1990), pp.29-32.

³² Gilbert Burnet, *A Pastoral Letter writ by Right Reverend Father in God Gilbert Burnet, Lord Bishop of Sarum, to the Clergy of his Diocess, concerning the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy to K. William and Q. Mary* (London, 1689), p.21.

³³ Goldie, ‘Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium*,’ pp.583-5.

³⁴ Burnet, *Pastoral Letter*, pp.21-2, 24. See Chapter One for Burnet’s use of History.

³⁵ Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, p.53.

allegiance to him.³⁶ This ‘Conquest of the King’ had the ‘Consent of the Nation assembled in Convention....’³⁷ William and Mary were ‘in Possession of the Crown of *England*’ after James was ‘fairly conquered....’ They were ‘invested with the Regal Power’ which allowed ‘our Allegiance’ to be ‘transferr’d from the late King, who was justly conquered, who does not govern us and can no further protect us.’³⁸ Subjects owed them allegiance because they were *de facto* monarchs after this Conquest.³⁹ Throughout 1689-91 increasing numbers of English Williamites employed this theory.

Goldie and Thompson have described Tory Anglican cleric Edward Fowler’s use of Conquest as part of Williamite efforts to defend themselves from Jacobite taunts over Passive Obedience by promoting William’s ‘Right of War.’⁴⁰ However Fowler, like Bohun and Comber, described the Conquest as a specific point of the Revolution.⁴¹ This Conquest was ‘not repugnant to the Doctrines and Principles of the Church of *England*.’⁴² Subjects consented to this Conquest, which took away ‘any pretence to a Conquest over the People, or a Government by Force.’ It was not a Conquest of England or the English people.⁴³ During the Engagement Controversy Hobbes and others defended allegiance to Cromwell by describing 1066 as a consensual Conquest.⁴⁴ Fowler carried on this legacy by arguing that a new ruler earned allegiance by conquering a king with subjects’ consent thereby avoiding the negative connotations associated with conquering kingdoms. The ‘obligation of Oaths’ depended on conditions like who possessed the government.⁴⁵ William earned allegiance because ‘King *James* was Conquered, the *Nation* was not’ and Nonjurors should accept that.⁴⁶ Fowler repeatedly described James’s flight as the ‘plain *Conquest*’ and James as the ‘Conquered Prince....’ However

³⁶ Thomas Comber, *A Letter to a Bishop Concerning the Present Settlement and the New Oaths* (London, 1689), pp.3-4, 18.

³⁷ *Ibid*, pp.18-9, 21-2.

³⁸ *Ibid*, pp.22-3.

³⁹ *Ibid*, pp.23-5.

⁴⁰ Goldie, ‘Edmund Bohun and *jus Gentium*,’ pp.583-4; Thompson, ‘The Idea of Conquest,’ pp.33-46.

⁴¹ Edward Fowler, *An Answer to the Paper Delivered by Mr Ashton at his Execution to Sir Francis Child: Sheriff of London, &c. Together with the Paper it self* (London, 1690), pp.11-2, 22-4.

⁴² *Ibid*, p.15.

⁴³ *Ibid*, p.23.

⁴⁴ Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution*, pp.149-52, 156-72.

⁴⁵ Fowler, *An Answer to the Paper*, pp.22-4.

⁴⁶ Edward Fowler, *A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England who have sworn Allegiance to K. William and Q. Mary, from the Imputations of Apostasy and Perjury...* (London, 1689), pp.6-8.

William did not claim to be a conqueror because the Convention supported his accession, this meant the Revolution was not a Conquest of England. Allegiance was owed to William as *de facto* King because the Revolution was a Conquest of James that changed who wore the Crown and preserved traditional order.⁴⁷

Tory Thomas Bainbrigg in declaring ‘for King *William*’ compared William with King David of Israel. Like David, William ‘was a Conqueror, tho’ not of the People (neither he, nor they ever thought so) yet of the King he was....’ These Conquerors of monarchs, unlike conquerors of nations, earned subjects’ allegiance.⁴⁸ A Whig ‘Divine in the North’ differentiated between William-style Conquerors and usurpers. Unlike usurpers, subjects would ‘own a Conqueror to be supreme, even when the conquered King is living....’ William was ‘own’d by the Nation’ as King and this showed that James was conquered but not England.⁴⁹ Gerald Straka and Thompson have described High-Church Tory William Sherlock’s infamous *Case of Allegiance* as combining Conquest and Providential theories. Thompson says that Sherlock described a Conquest of England while Straka views Sherlock’s *Case* as describing a Conquest of England and James.⁵⁰ Sherlock’s *Case* was the bestselling pamphlet of the allegiance debates.⁵¹ His subsequent defences of his *Case*, and with it allegiance to William as *de facto* King, used the popular Conquest of James argument. If ‘the Prince be conquered, and driven out of his Kingdom’ then subjects were ‘perfectly at liberty to submit to the new Conqueror, as they were before to submit to their old Prince....’⁵² Sherlock, one of the most influential pamphleteers, employing this idea indicates that this argument was quite popular in England.

Straka argued that Conquest was usually combined with providential theories to broaden the appeal of many pamphlets.⁵³ Numerous polemicists

⁴⁷ Ibid, pp.6-8.

⁴⁸ Thomas Bainbrigg, *Seasonable Reflections on a Late Pamphlet entituled A History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation wherein the true Notion of Passive Obedience is settled...* (London, 1690), pp.41-3.

⁴⁹ Divine in the North, *A Discourse, shewing that it is Lawfull, and our Duty to swear Obedience to King William, notwithstanding the Oath of Allegiance to the Late King* (London, 1689), pp.3, 9-10, 21-2.

⁵⁰ Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, pp.56-8; Thompson, ‘The Idea of Conquest,’ pp.40-2.

⁵¹ Mark Goldie, ‘The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument: An Essay and an annotated Bibliography of Pamphlets in the Allegiance Controversy,’ *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 83 (1980), pp.481, 490-1, 557.

⁵² William Sherlock, *A Vindication of the Case of Allegiance...* (London, 1691), p.13.

⁵³ Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, pp.39-64, 124-6.

argued that Conquest ideas were important when deciding allegiance.⁵⁴ Three pamphlets by William Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph, repeatedly described the Revolution as a Conquest of James obliging allegiance to William and attest to this argument's popularity between 1689 and 1692. Lloyd also used providential arguments in his polemics. 1688 was 'a Conquest without Blood.' This 'Deliverance' made 'the People glad' with William's enthronement.⁵⁵ Lloyd repeatedly asserted that William's Conquest of James meant 'no alteration in the Ancient Government of the Nation, but only the exchange of persons;' the monarchy remained 'Hereditary.'⁵⁶ William's intervention in England was part of a just war to assist English subjects whose adherence to Non-Resistance meant they could not resist James.⁵⁷ Like other polemicists, Lloyd identified the Conquest as a specific providentially endorsed moment authorising subjects to give William allegiance when he conquered James.⁵⁸ The Revolution was the 'Conquest of one Prince over another' that allowed subjects to transfer allegiance or 'Peoples attorning their Allegiance' to William as Lloyd put it.⁵⁹ Numerous ideologically diverse English subjects justified allegiance to William because of his Conquest of James, which preserved traditional monarchy and Non-Resistance. This shows that this was one of the more popular views on the Revolution in England during 1689-92.

II

Some of these English Conquest pamphlets were re-printed in Scotland showing that there was support for these arguments there. *The Proceedings of the Present Parliament Justified by the Opinion of... Hugo Grotius* was one pamphlet re-printed in Scotland to convince subjects to give

⁵⁴ *Melius Inquirendum: Or a further Modest and Impartial Enquiry into the Lawfulness of Taking The New Oath of Allegiance* (London, 1689), p.10.

⁵⁵ William Lloyd, *A Sermon Preached before their Majesties at Whitehall, on the Fifth day of November, 1689 being the Anniversary-day of thanksgiving for that great deliverance from the gunpowder-treason, and also the day of His Majesties happy landing in England* (London, 1689), pp.31-2.

⁵⁶ William Lloyd, *Utrum Horum, or, God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms: And Some Clergy-Men's ways of Disposing of them* (n.p., 1691), pp.59-60, 55; William Lloyd, *A Discourse of God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms by the Bishop of S. Asaph* (London, 1691), pp.14-6.

⁵⁷ William Lloyd, *A Sermon Preached Before Her Majesty, on May 29, being the Anniversary of the Restoration of the King and Royal Family...* (London, 1692), pp.17-9.

⁵⁸ Lloyd, *A Discourse of God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms*, pp.55-9.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, pp.19-21, 58-60.

William allegiance.⁶⁰ Jackson has shown how this pamphlet, attributed to Charles Blount, along with Sir Francis Grant's polemics were part of a popular use of Grotian just war Conquest theory in Scotland.⁶¹ W.A. Speck claims that some defences of the Revolution in England and Ireland depicted the Revolution as a Conquest but in Scotland arguments about James being dethroned because he violated his Contract with subjects were more popular.⁶² However the notion of William earning allegiance after having conquered James was fairly popular in Scotland and in Scottish-published pamphlets. Like English polemics, many Conquest pamphlets had just war theory alongside the notion that William conquered James as described in *The Proceedings* which labelled William 'the Conqueror.'⁶³ This pamphlet also employed Contract theory but resoundingly said that allegiance was owed to William because he conquered James.⁶⁴ Just war justified William's landing but William obtaining the Kingship was the Conquest of James.⁶⁵ The Revolution was not a Conquest of Kingdoms because 'the Conqueror had a Right prior to his Conquest....' James through his actions 'renounces his lawful Title' and William's Conquest transferred 'a Right' to subjects' allegiance. This pamphlet's publication in Edinburgh suggests that many Scots were prepared to accept William as a Conqueror of James.⁶⁶

Edmund Hickerlingill was an English Nonconformist who had lived in Scotland during the 1650s.⁶⁷ Hickerlingill's *Ceremony-monger* was published in England and Scotland in 1689. This panegyric to William noted the role of popular opinion in deciding allegiance. Hickerlingill wrote of 'our Renowned King William, the Conqueror (of Hearts, and therefore the Conqueror) of Kingdoms....'⁶⁸ William's Conquest of 'Hearts' led to subjects supporting him, putting the Kingdoms under William. This Conquest 'without Blood' was

⁶⁰ [Charles Blount], *The Proceedings of the Present Parliament Justified by the Opinion of the most Judicious and Learned Hugo Grotius* (Edinburgh, 1689), p.3.

⁶¹ Jackson, 'Revolution Principles,' pp.107-24; idem, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.204-5.

⁶² W.A. Speck, 'William III and the Three Kingdoms,' in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007), pp.39-41.

⁶³ [Blount], *The Present Proceedings of the Present Parliament*, p.5.

⁶⁴ Ibid, pp.9-12.

⁶⁵ Ibid, p.7.

⁶⁶ Ibid, pp.5, 7, 9-12.

⁶⁷ J. L. C. McNulty, 'Hickerlingill, Edmund (bap. 1631, d. 1708)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13200>, accessed 18 May 2013].

⁶⁸ Edmund Hickerlingill, *The Ceremony-monger his Character in Five Chapters...*(Edinburgh, 1689), p.4.

William stopping James's 'Popery,' not attacking the Kingdoms. William obtained the kingship and the allegiance that went with it.⁶⁹ Hickeringill was more radical than most polemicists. He described 1689 as a Conquest like 1639.⁷⁰ In 1639 following the Bishops' War Scottish Covenanters acquired by conquest the ecclesiastical governance of Scotland from the bishops.⁷¹ Similarly 1689 was the Conquest of the throne, civil government, as opposed to the religious governance in 1639. William conquered James, taking the Kingship and subjects' 'Loyalty' and 'Hearts.'⁷²

Other Scottish Williamite Conquest polemics did not resort to such controversial precedents. Like English Williamites, many believed William's Conquest of James justified allegiance to William and was a victory in the battle for public support. Presbyterian Sir Francis Grant argued that William 'had no intention of Conquering the Nation,' the Revolution was a 'Conquest of the King only.'⁷³ Just war, as Jackson has said, was part of his thesis.⁷⁴ Allegiance was an integral part of the monarchy. Therefore Grant, like other Scottish and English Williamites, justified allegiance to William as *de facto* King because he conquered James and wanted Scottish subjects to accept this Conquest. It was not a Conquest of Scotland, such a conquest 'may alienate' subjects from William. William was 'a Conqueror of the King only.' The 'Regal Right was acquired' by William through 'Conquest of the King, not the Kingdom.'⁷⁵ Williamite Episcopalian James Canaries used various theories, including Conquest of James, to justify transferring allegiance from James.⁷⁶ Canaries said a 'Right of Conquest' could be conferred on a ruler who 'overcomes another....' In 1689 the defeated monarch had to choose whether or not to flee or accept 'those conditions his Conqueror is pleased to prescribe....' If subjects accepted this Conqueror then obedience was owed to the conqueror.⁷⁷ Canaries and Grant were from different religious backgrounds

⁶⁹ Ibid, pp.3-4.

⁷⁰ Ibid, pp.4-7.

⁷¹ Tim Harris, *Rebellion Britain's First Stuart Kings* (Oxford, 2014), pp.371-2, 374-95, 428-9.

⁷² Hickeringill, *The Ceremony-monger*, pp.7-10, 36.

⁷³ Sir Francis Grant, *The Loyalists Reasons For his Giving Obedience, and Swearing Allegiance, to the Present Government...* (Edinburgh, 1689), p.29.

⁷⁴ Jackson, 'Revolution Principles,' pp.107-24.

⁷⁵ Grant, *Loyalists Reasons*, pp.29-31.

⁷⁶ See Chapter One for Canaries's use of History and Chapter Two for his use of Passive Obedience.

⁷⁷ James Canaries, *A Sermon Preached at Edinburgh, in the East-Church of St. Giles, upon the 30th of January, 1689 being the anniversary of the Martyrdome of King Charles the First* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp.51-4.

but in parts of their polemics both described the Revolution as James, not Scotland, being conquered and this obliged allegiance to the *de facto* King.

Alexander Pennecuik was a physician and poet.⁷⁸ He wrote two poems justifying allegiance to William as a Conqueror. His 1689 pamphlet asserted this before Scotland's Convention formally declared William as King. Pennecuik emphasised that this was a metaphorical, not military, Conquest. William came to 'Conquer more by Kindness then by Sword.'⁷⁹ In 1699 with the Darien Crisis making William unpopular in Scotland Pennecuik argued that William was owed continued allegiance because he had conquered James. William was the 'Conqueror of Kingdoms and Hearts.'⁸⁰ While this implies William conquered more than just James, William being the Conqueror of 'Hearts' shows the Revolution was not a hostile Conquest of Scotland but a consensual change of ruler described as a Conquest. Focusing on 'Hearts' was to avoid depicting the Revolution as a hostile Conquest, which subjects would not support. William was the 'Reconciler of Intestine Jarrs' with this widely supported Conquest.⁸¹ Pennecuik's references to 'Thistle,' 'Rose' and 'Harp' show he believed this was the case in all Three Kingdoms. He promised continued Scottish loyalty 'with hearts, with hands and head' to William as a Conqueror.⁸² This was a poetic description of the Revolution as a Conquest. Pennecuik's poems show that William had popular support and was given allegiance as a Conqueror. However Pennecuik was at pains to present submission to William as a conquest by 'Kindness' and not the result of a military conquest. While different to more explicit arguments about a Conquest of James advanced by Grant and Canaries, this was an artistic representation of William as King through a Conquest that was not a hostile Conquest of Scotland. Pennecuik was artistically describing how William took James's throne in a Conquest, effectively a Conquest of James.

⁷⁸ Harriet Harvey Wood, 'Pennecuik, Alexander (1652–1722)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21861>, accessed 30 Sept 2014].

⁷⁹ Alexander Pennecuik, *To His Highness the Prince of Orange, The Humble Address and Supplication of the Parishoners and Inhabitants of the Famous of Linton Submetrapolitan of Tiviotdale* (n.p., 1689), 'Prologue.'

⁸⁰ Alexander Pennecuik, *Caledonia Triumphans: A Panegyrick to the King* (n.p., 1699).

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

Many Highland clans maintained allegiance to James up to 1692.⁸³ Further evidence of allegiance to William justified through Conquest comes through the Earl of Breadalbane's efforts to persuade Highland clans to give 'voluntary submission and obedience' to William. Breadalbane had employed Passive Obedience arguments but examining his objectives with other sources shows that there was a practical public recognition of William as a Conqueror of James.⁸⁴ Williamites frequently labelled Jacobites as 'rebels' against William.⁸⁵ However Jacobites did not see themselves as rebels. *The Grameid*, a contemporary lament for defeated Scottish Jacobites, presented Jacobites as resisting a party 'treacherous to the King' and like previous generations of Highlanders resisting foreign conquests.⁸⁶ 'Roman power' had the obedience of a vast 'conquered world' but 'Scotland was the limit of her triumph.'⁸⁷ Jacobites, like Viscount Dundee, continued this tradition by resisting this foreign conquest.⁸⁸ William's Conquest would mean that 'the lofty house of Fergus [Stuart] becomes the prey of the rapacious Dutchman, and unhappy Albion sinks in civil strife.'⁸⁹ Some Jacobites believed that not all of Scotland was conquered because William's authority did not reach the Highlands. Some Highlanders had submitted to William. *The Grameid* did not accept Scotland was conquered and refused to accept the Revolution but the author did 'admit that Albion's sceptre has fallen... beneath the Dutch yoke.' It was the 'sceptre' or the monarchical position that fell to William, not Scotland. Therefore *The Grameid* was denouncing a Conquest of James.⁹⁰ To avoid military retribution Highlanders had to submit to William and take the Oath of Allegiance, which many did after seeking James's permission.⁹¹ *The Grameid* together with Breadalbane's attempt to induce loyalty can be seen as some Highlanders

⁸³ Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance was an important part of the Highland clans and their allegiance and was examined in Chapter Two.

⁸⁴ 'Concessions in Favour of the Highlanders, Aug. 17/27, 1691,' *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William and Mary, May 1690-Oct 1691*, ed. William John Hardy (London, 1898), p.491. See Chapter Two for his use of Passive Obedience.

⁸⁵ Examples of Williamites labelling Jacobite Highlanders as 'rebels' are *An Account of the late Great and Famous Victory over two thousand High-land rebels, in the north of Scotland...* (London, 1690); *A Proclamation Indemnifying such Rebels as shall lay down their Arms* (Edinburgh, 1689); *The Exact Narrative of the Conflict at Dunkeld* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp.1-2.

⁸⁶ *The Grameid: An Heroic Poem Descriptive of the Campaign of Viscount Dundee in 1689 and other Pieces by John Philip of Almericlose 1691* (Edinburgh, 1888), 'Book I,' pp.11, 23.

⁸⁷ *Ibid*, 'Book I,' p.23.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, 'Book II,' p.56.

⁸⁹ *Ibid*, 'Book II,' p.40.

⁹⁰ *Ibid*, 'Book III,' p.101.

⁹¹ Paul Hopkins, *Glencoe and the End of the Highland War* (Edinburgh, 1998), p.317.

accepting William as *de facto* King because William took the throne in a Conquest of the King.

Breadalbane's memo and *The Grameid* show that there was effectively a practical recognition of William as a Conqueror of James's throne amongst some Highlanders. This was similar to the way Pennecuik, Grant, Canaries and other polemics in Scotland justified allegiance to William as *de facto* King because William conquered James and his kingship, not Scotland. As in England this Conquest of James argument was relatively popular during 1689-92, albeit more reluctantly accepted in the Highlands. This focus on the Revolution's personnel change over constitutional and religious changes shows that a considerable part of the politically involved in Scotland displayed a cautious embrace of the Revolution just as happened in England.

III

Chapter Two showed how Passive Obedience was central to Irish Anglican decisions on allegiance; it was used to defend passivity under James and then giving William allegiance. William's kingship in Ireland was established after a military campaign and this offered Irish Williamites the opportunity to use Conquest theories alongside Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance to strengthen their defences of allegiance to William. Irish Williamite polemics were slightly different from English Conquest theses because a bloody military campaign had to be taken into account. However like English and Scottish Conquest polemics, they essentially described William becoming *de facto* King after conquering James. Many Williamite polemics referred to a 'Conquest in Ireland' not of Ireland.⁹² One broadside depicted William celebrating his 'Conquest gained in Ireland Over' his and 'England's Foes....' The Conquest of James in Ireland was more violent than in England and Scotland.⁹³ Jacqueline Hill and other historians have highlighted Irish Tories and Whigs defending William and the legitimacy of English authority in Ireland from the 1690s into the eighteenth century with Conquest theories. Some contemporary criticisms of Conquest polemics have been noted but

⁹² *The Happy Meeting of King William and Queen Mary, at his Return from and After his Conquest in Ireland* (London, 1690); *An Exact Relation of Routing the Irish Army under Sarsfield... in order to a Capitulation for Surrender of Limerick into their Majesties Hands* (London, 1691).

⁹³ *The Happy Meeting of King William and Queen Mary.*

allegiance and the popular views of the Revolution are secondary in a historiography focused on the constitutional connexion with England.⁹⁴ The idea that James was conquered was popular amongst Irish Protestants during 1689-92 just as it was in England and Scotland.

In 1689 lawyer Sir Richard Cox, writing from his English sanctuary, publicly pleaded for William to lead an expedition to defeat James and bring Irish subjects into allegiance to William. History was the main theme in *Hibernia Anglicana* to justify allegiance to William, as explored in Chapter One, but Cox also briefly employed the Conquest-of-James argument.⁹⁵ Cox recalled how the ‘First Conquest’ of Ireland established English monarchical authority there but he was also urging William to re-establish the authority of *de facto* Kings of England there.⁹⁶ William as *de facto* King of England should imitate his predecessors in ‘retaining *Ireland* inseparably united to the Crown of *England*.’⁹⁷ Cox said that the ‘English Subject owes Allegiance’ to ‘the King *de facto*’ and subjects in Ireland owed this same allegiance to the *de facto* King of England since Henry II acquired Ireland.⁹⁸ Ireland needed to be ‘re-conquered’ because James, no longer King of England, controlled Ireland and prevented Irish ‘Obedience’ to William. James had unjustly taken the *de facto* English monarch’s entitlement to Ireland and this had to be rectified.⁹⁹ It was taking the government of Ireland, which was part of the English Crown that William acquired in 1688-9, from James thereby completing the Revolution and the Conquest of James.¹⁰⁰

Like Cox, William King’s famous *State of the Protestants of Ireland* referred to Henry II’s twelfth-century ‘Conquest’ of Ireland.¹⁰¹ King’s *State* has been described as a ‘hotchpotch of arguments’ that formed part of Irish Protestant political ideology into the eighteenth century but historiography

⁹⁴ Hill, ‘Politics and the Writing of History,’ pp.227-31; Eccleshall, ‘Anglican Political Thought in the Century after the Revolution,’ p.58; idem, ‘Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland,’ passim; Connolly, ‘Glorious Revolution in Irish Protestant Political Thought,’ pp.30-2.

⁹⁵ Sir Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana*... (London, 1689), ‘To the Reader.’

⁹⁶ Ibid, ‘To their Most Excellent Majesties William and Mary.’

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid, pp.296-8, 1-2.

⁹⁹ Ibid, ‘To the Reader;’ Cox also briefly used this argument in *Aphorisms Relating to the Kingdom of Ireland*... (London, 1689), passim.

¹⁰⁰ Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana*, ‘To the Reader,’ ‘To their Most Excellent Majesties,’ pp.296-8, 1-2.

¹⁰¹ William King, *The State of the Protestants of Ireland*... (London, 1691), pp.50-1.

overlooks his use of Conquest-of-James arguments to justify allegiance.¹⁰² King's main aim was defending Irish Anglican inaction under James and allegiance to William using Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance ideas. Like Bohun, King also argued that William conquered James.¹⁰³ King said that James's 'Power' was ended by William's victory 'at the *Boyn*....'¹⁰⁴ James even 'advised those about him, both at the *Boyn*... and the next Morning in Council at the Castle of *Dublin*, to make the best Terms they could, and quietly submit to the Conqueror, who, he said, was a Merciful Prince.'¹⁰⁵ King said that Irish 'Fidelity or Allegiance to King *James*' finished 'at the *Boyn*... when he quitted the Field.'¹⁰⁶ Just war was part of this but, like Bohun, King identified the very moment James was conquered and allegiance was owed to William. King's pamphlet took into account Ireland's unique circumstances and partially justified allegiance to William as *de facto* King through a Conquest of James at the Boyne.¹⁰⁷

Edward Wetenhall was more politically traditionalist than King. As part of an examination of Irish Protestant views of the Revolution from the 1690s through to the nineteenth century Connolly briefly notes Wetenhall's use of Conquest.¹⁰⁸ Like King, Wetenhall used Non-Resistance and Conquest arguments to justify allegiance to William as *de facto* King.¹⁰⁹ Wetenhall declared '*Ireland* conquered' but this was like English theorists using 1066 as a reference point for political legitimacy. He described the Conquest in 1690 as making William *de facto* King in Ireland, which James illegitimately held in 1688-9. Ireland belonged to the English monarch so William was re-taking what belonged to him as *de facto* King of England and completing the conquest of James. Like Lloyd and Sherlock, Wetenhall combined Conquest-of-James

¹⁰² Eccleshall, 'Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland,' pp.65-71; idem, 'Anglican Political thought,' pp.57-9; O'Regan, *Archbishop William King of Dublin*, pp.40-54; Christopher J. Fauske, "'The Angel of St. Patricks is now the Guardian of the Kingdom,'" in Christopher J. Fauske (ed.) *Archbishop William King and the Anglican Irish Context, 1688-1729* (Dublin 2004), pp.17-8; Hill, 'Politics and the Writing of History,' pp.227-9; J.I. McGuire, 'A Remora to King James's Affairs: William King's Defence of Protestant Office-holders' in Fauske (ed.) *Archbishop William King*, p.39; Patrick McNally, 'William King, patriotism and the "national question,"' in Fauske (ed.) *Archbishop William King*, pp.49-51.

¹⁰³ King, *The State of the Protestants of Ireland*, pp.5-10, 19-20, 141. See Chapter Two for his use of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*, p.200.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, p.141.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, p.141.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid*, p.141.

¹⁰⁸ Connolly, 'The Glorious Revolution in Irish Protestant Political Thinking,' pp.30-5, 40-1.

¹⁰⁹ See Chapter Two for Wetenhall's use of Passive Obedience.

with Providence arguments. Providence ‘put us under the Power of the *Second William the Conqueror*, whom I must affirm... to have a *Right to our Allegiance by Conquest*; that which gave the King of *England* the first (and still avowed) Title to *Ireland*.’¹¹⁰ This was not a hostile Conquest of Ireland but re-conquering the English *de facto* King’s entitlement to allegiance from subjects in Ireland that James’s possessing the Irish government had denied. Irish subjects had not been conquered but submitted and acknowledged that William had ‘our *captivated Hearts*’ as part of his campaign.¹¹¹ Wetenhall said subjects were ‘released’ from loyalty to James at the Boyne.¹¹² When William ‘the Conqueror’ offered terms to his subjects after the Boyne Irish subjects were ‘at liberty to embrace them and accept them.’ Wetenhall’s pamphlet was, like Bohun’s polemics, identifying a clear moment when William conquered James and the throne. This made him *de facto* King in Ireland and partially obliged allegiance to him. The main difference was that Ireland, a possession of the English Crown, had to be taken from James in a military campaign which meant that James was conquered at a different moment in Ireland.¹¹³

With an actual military campaign in Ireland there were plenty of polemics in the Irish public discourse that presented surrendering to Williamite forces as effectively giving William allegiance as *de facto* King though a Conquest of James. These arguments were similar to *The Grameid* and Breadalbane’s appeal to Highlanders in Scotland. The Duke of Tyrconnell’s apparent speech urging the Limerick garrison to surrender was printed in London and Ireland. According to this pamphlet Tyrconnell said that James was ‘very well satisfy’d’ with the Jacobite army’s conduct and loyalty but to ‘prevent the Effusion of more Blood’ they should surrender.¹¹⁴ Although this could just be Williamite propaganda it does show that Tyrconnell accepted, or was presented as accepting, that the Revolution was both a rebellion and invasion against James. This pamphlet had Tyrconnell alluding to the ‘falling Crown’ in order to convince Jacobites across the Kingdoms that James was

¹¹⁰ Edward Wetenhall, *The Case of the Irish Protestants: In Relation to Recognising, or Swearing Allegiance to, and Praying for King William and Queen Mary, Stated and Resolved* (London, 1691), p.6.

¹¹¹ *Ibid*, pp.24-6.

¹¹² *Ibid*, p.13.

¹¹³ *Ibid*, p.13.

¹¹⁴ *The Duke of Tyrconnell’s Speech to the Garrison and Magistrate of the City of Limerick upon the Debates for the Surrender of the said Place* (Limerick/ London, 1691), pp.1-2.

defeated and William was *de facto* King because he conquered James.¹¹⁵ The Kingdoms did not fall to William but the ‘Crown’ did. While Tyrconnell did not survive long enough to face the dilemma of the new oath, many who served under him would effectively give William allegiance as *de facto* King because James was Conquered and defeated.

Eoin Kinsella has explored the implementation of the different terms of the Jacobite surrender in 1691, especially how these affected Catholics.¹¹⁶ Catholic positions on allegiance are explored in Chapter Six. However some Catholic acts of allegiance can be seen as a practical recognition of William as *de facto* King, his having Conquered James being apparent with the Treaties of Galway and Limerick. Denis Daly and Edmund Malone, two Catholic lawyers, sought to practice law as allowed under the Treaty of Galway. Both took the Oath of Allegiance according to the ‘Articles lately made on surrender of the said Town of Gallway.’¹¹⁷ Allegiance to William according to the Treaty of Galway was effectively recognising William as having taken the kingship from James by military conquest. Charles O’Kelly, a Catholic Jacobite, lambasted officials in Jacobite-controlled areas of Ireland in 1690-1 who had not ‘preserved the Interest of Amasis [James]’ but had submitted and given allegiance to William.¹¹⁸ O’Kelly despised his former colleagues ‘who coveted Nothing more than to submit to Prince’ William.¹¹⁹ Daly and Malone’s true motivations cannot be known. However the pamphlet advocating their desire to practice law, along with O’Kelly’s criticisms, shows that their allegiance to William was according to the Treaty of Galway that recognised William’s Conquest of James.¹²⁰ This can be seen as a practical example of allegiance to William based on a Conquest of James. Irish Williamites presented the campaign in Ireland as completing the Conquest of James that made William *de facto* King in England in 1688-9. The Conquest of James obliging

¹¹⁵ Ibid, p.1.

¹¹⁶ Eoin Kinsella, ‘In Pursuit of a Positive Construction: Irish Catholics and the Williamite articles of Surrender, 1690-1701,’ *Eighteenth-Century Ireland/ Iris an dá Chultúr*, 24 (2009), pp.11-35.

¹¹⁷ *The State of the Case of Denis Daly, and Edmund Malone, Esqs; Barristers at Law, Comprised in the Articles lately made, on Surrender of the Town of Gallway in the Kingdom of Ireland* (n.p., 1696).

¹¹⁸ Charles O’Kelly, *Macariae Excidium, or The Destruction of Cyprus: Being a Secret History of the War of the Revolution in Ireland*, ed. John Cornelius O’Callaghan (Dublin, 1850), pp.71, 77.

¹¹⁹ Ibid, p.71.

¹²⁰ *The Duke of Tyrconnell’s Speech*, pp.1-2; *The State of the Case of Denis Daly*; O’Kelly, *Macariae Excidium*, pp.71, 77.

allegiance to William as *de facto* King was completed later in Ireland than the other Kingdoms but it was also a popular view of the Revolution and allegiance in Ireland's public discourse. Irish Conquest polemics, like their English and Scottish counterparts, further propagated rather conservative views of the Revolution, which downplayed any changes except for William replacing James.

IV

O'Kelly's criticism of ex-Jacobites giving allegiance to William was one of many Jacobite criticisms of Conquest theories in general. In the early 1690s Jacobites were divided over Conquest theories. There were some who used Conquest theories when a successful French-backed invasion seemed likely. Others made arguments to undermine Williamite Conquest arguments by describing how William's hostile conquest established a tyranny in the Kingdoms. Before William's intervention a 1688 royal proclamation warned subjects of William's 'Preparations... to Invade and Conquer this Our Kingdom.'¹²¹ Jacobite polemics, which either praised or condemned Conquest theories, contributed to a decreasing popularity in using Conquest theories to justify allegiance from 1692. Both Jacobite and Williamite polemicists beginning to eschew this theory indicates how public attitudes were changing.

Some Jacobites were prepared to accept political legitimacy through Conquest under certain circumstances and if subjects' rights were protected.¹²² In 1692 William's war against France was going poorly despite the English victory at La Hogue preventing a French-backed invasion.¹²³ Williamites across the Kingdoms were terrified because Jacobites were openly proclaiming James's imminent restoration and that allegiance should be returned to him. According to English Tory Williamite Humphrey Prideaux until La Hogue 'Jacobites were come to that height of confidence to talke openly that now all

¹²¹ James II & VII, *By the King, A Proclamation forasmuch as the Great Preparations made to Invade and Conquer this our Kingdom require utmost care in providing for the Necessary safety and Defence thereof...* (London, 1688).

¹²² Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, p.58.

¹²³ Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford, 1999), pp.48-9, 122-8.

was their owne' with James's imminent military triumph.¹²⁴ Wetenhall repeatedly denounced arrogant Jacobite public statements on their impending victory. 'Their very common People stick not to our face to tell us, *They will yet have a Day for it*; and they are as confident of an Army from *France*, as ever they were.'¹²⁵ In another pamphlet Wetenhall warned that Jacobitism was a French puppet. Louis would 'enslave *Europe*, and then he will easily conquer *England*, and make *K. James* a glorious King again; and this makes them a hopeful prospect for *K. James's Return*.'¹²⁶ This Conquest would bring 'great Outrages' and arbitrary rule.¹²⁷ Williamites feared that Jacobites' proud proclamations of loyalty to James and James's imminent restoration through Conquest would herald a new era of arbitrary rule.

James's 1692 Declarations to England and Scotland contributed to this fear. While not explicitly mentioning a Conquest the Declarations used Conquest-style language to confidently proclaim James's imminent victory. His Declarations promised retribution on subjects who did not return allegiance to James before the invasion. The English Declaration differentiated between a French-backed Jacobite restoration to right a wrong and the Revolution's malevolent Conquest. English and Scottish subjects were 'cheated' by William's 'unnatural design of Invading Our Kingdoms,' which established 'Tyranny and barbarity' in the Kingdoms. William's days as King were numbered because the French-Jacobite army would 'untie the hands of Our Subjects, and make it safe for them to return their Duty, and repair to Our Standard....'¹²⁸ James's Scottish Declaration stated that the impending invasion would 'enable our faithfull subjects to declare for US, without any danger from their Enemies.'¹²⁹ The Scottish Declaration, similar to Williamite

¹²⁴ Humphrey Prideaux, 'Norwich June 13, 1692,' *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux Sometime Dean of Norwich to John Ellis Sometimes under-secretary of State, 1674-1722*, ed. Edward Maunde Thompson (London, 1875), p.151.

¹²⁵ Edward Wetenhall, *A Sermon Setting forth The Duties of the Irish Protestants, Arising from the Irish Rebellion, 1641. And the Irish Tyranny, 1688 &c...* (Dublin, 1692), p.16.

¹²⁶ Edward Wetenhall, *A Letter to a Friend, Occasion'd by the Surrender of Mons. Shewing how Unreasonable it is, for English Protestants, to wish success to the French Arms* (London, 1692), p.2.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp.19-20.

¹²⁸ James II & VII, *His Majesties Most gracious Declaration to his Good People of his ancient Kingdom of Scotland, Commanding their Assistance against the Prince and Princesse of Orange, and their adherents* (Saint Germain, 1692), p.1; *idem*, *His Majesties most Gracious Declaration to all his Loving Subjects, commanding their Assistance against the Prince of Orange, and his adherents* (Saint Germain, 1692), pp.1-2.

¹²⁹ James VII, *His Majesties Most gracious Declaration to his Good People of his ancient Kingdom of Scotland*, p.1.

Conquest arguments, said that there was no intention of conquering the Kingdoms. This would be an intervention to ‘recover our just Right’ to rule and subjects’ allegiance. Subjects had an opportunity ‘to shew their zeal and Loyalty’ by assisting this restoration.¹³⁰ The word Conquest was not explicitly used but the language implied that subjects should return allegiance to James because he would conquer the throne. This was similar to the way Williamites argued that William conquered James’s throne not the Kingdoms.

Kenyon argued that Whigs and Tories generally rejected Conquest theories because it implied absolutism and made subjects’ rights insecure.¹³¹ However Kenyon overlooked how popular this was between 1689 and 1692 and how Jacobite polemics were partially responsible for public hostility to Conquest arguments from 1692. Whig and Tory Williamites denounced James’s 1692 Declarations for the vindictive Conquest-style language seeking to force subjects to return allegiance to James. The Scottish-born but English-based Whig James Welwood responded to James’s more conciliatory 1693 Declaration by denouncing the 1692 Declarations as a truer reflection of James. Welwood mocked James’s claims of military prowess and dreams of ‘glorious Conquests at home’ similar to his ancestors’ ‘Conquests abroad.’¹³² The on-going war and French invasion fears were important political issues in 1692-3.¹³³ Welwood lambasted James for using Conquest-style language to validate a potential restoration and allegiance to him. Such a foundation would ruin England by establishing ‘Popery’ and undermining subjects’ lives, liberties and properties.¹³⁴ Sherlock, who partially justified allegiance to William with a Conquest theory, said that James’s restoration could only come through a French conquest, which differed to William’s popularly supported conquest. A Jacobite restoration would be a conquest of Kingdoms and not just a conquest of a monarch.¹³⁵ These Williamites saw returning allegiance to James through Conquest as supporting absolutism.

¹³⁰ Ibid, pp.2-3.

¹³¹ Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.29-32, 39.

¹³² James Welwood, *An Answer to the Late K. James’s Last Declaration, dated at St. Germans, April 17, s.n. 1693* (London, 1693), pp.18-9.

¹³³ Henry Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III* (Manchester, 1977), pp.103-5.

¹³⁴ Welwood, *An Answer to the late K. James’s Last Declaration*, pp.1-5, 19-20.

¹³⁵ William Sherlock *A Letter to a Friend Concerning a French Invasion, To Restore the Lawful King James to his Throne and what may be Expected from him, should he be Successful in it* (London, 1692), pp.9-10, 17-8.

Nenner notes that Williamites argued that William conquered James and not the Kingdoms because they realised that submitting to a conqueror of a kingdom or subjects implied that subjects were being subjugated to an absolutist.¹³⁶ Williamite responses to James's Declarations highlighted the negatives associated with Conquest theories and said that a Jacobite restoration and allegiance to James would only happen with a full-scale conquest of the Kingdoms and not just the monarch. These responses associated Conquest theories with absolutism and subjects losing their liberties. William Lloyd's response to James's 1692 Declaration said that 'our Allegiance is now transferr'd to' William and could not be broken without 'Universal Ruin.'¹³⁷ Returning allegiance to James was only possible through a French conquest 'set upon on the Nations Ruin.'¹³⁸ In 1692 Lloyd still defended William's intervention as part of a just war.¹³⁹ However Lloyd's criticism of the idea of a conquest as a means to justify allegiance to James was significant. Between 1689 and 1692 Lloyd had consistently described the Revolution as a Conquest of James but in the late 1690s Lloyd no longer described the Revolution in such terms. Lloyd's 30 January 1697 sermon praised the Revolution as a providential event but no longer called it a conquest.¹⁴⁰ The Williamite responses to James's 1692 Declarations marked the start of public views on allegiance and the Revolution evolving.

Williamites continued to criticise James for pressing his claim through a conquest. One Williamite author said a Jacobite victory would mean 'the utter Ruine... of the Law, Liberties and Religion now established....'¹⁴¹ The author said that James's 1692 Declaration was 'Industriously dispersed' around London and potentially influencing many subjects. However the author believed it was 'Folly' for James to think that his Declaration would induce loyalty. William's altruistic intervention differed from a potential French-Jacobite one because the Convention consented to William's intervention

¹³⁶ Nenner, *Right to be King*, pp.200-3.

¹³⁷ William Lloyd, *The Pretences of the French Invasion examined for the Information of the People of England* (London, 1692), pp.1-2, 4-5.

¹³⁸ *Ibid*, pp.14-6.

¹³⁹ Lloyd, *Sermon Preached before her Majesty on May 29*, pp.17-9.

¹⁴⁰ William Lloyd, *A Sermon Preach'd before the House of Lords at the Abbey-Church of St. Peter's-Westminster, on the 30th of January, 1696/7...* (London, 1697), pp.27-8; Lloyd, *A Discourse of God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms*, pp.55-9; *idem*, *A Sermon preached before Their Majesties at Whitehall, on the fifth day of November, 1689*, pp.31-2.

¹⁴¹ *Reflections upon the Late King James's Declaration, and Lately Dispersed by the Jacobites* (London, 1692), pp.1-2.

whereas James's potential conquest would have no consent.¹⁴² Allegiance to James would bring 'all the Calamities that being conquer'd can bring upon us....'¹⁴³ Another Williamite pamphlet said that James's demanding allegiance with Conquest-style language was repugnant to Williamites' 'Enlightening British Intellectual' arguments.¹⁴⁴ James would not just re-take his throne; he would also conquer the Kingdoms and impose French-style absolutism. Allegiance to James after this Conquest would destroy subjects' liberties.¹⁴⁵ In 1696 Anglican cleric Samuel Bradford said that the Revolution involved 'Consent, not Conquest.'¹⁴⁶ These arguments, like Lloyd's, are evidence of increasing hostility to Conquest theories in general because Conquest theories were seen as a French-Jacobite means of coercing allegiance to an absolutist.

James's 1693 Declaration, issued after Jacobite realisation that the 1692 Declarations were a propaganda disaster, deliberately used softer language in appealing to subjects.¹⁴⁷ The increasing hostility to James's Conquest-style language in the 1692 Declarations made many Jacobites realise that Conquest arguments would not induce loyalty to James. Several Jacobite polemics attacked the idea of allegiance to any form of Conqueror in order to undermine Williamite polemics and present allegiance to James as more beneficial for subjects. One Jacobite expressed reluctance to accept James as a conqueror but James should not 'leave any Stone unturn'd for his Restauration;' it was better to 'come with Force as a Conqueror than not at all.'¹⁴⁸ This author realised that justifying allegiance to James through some form of Conquest had negative connotations. From 1689 Jacobites had frequently criticised the Revolution as a Conquest of the Kingdoms not just James. Allegiance to William as a Conqueror would ruin subjects' rights.¹⁴⁹ It would make 'us all Slaves.'¹⁵⁰ The post-Revolution environment was like the Civil Wars 'wherein the Victorious Rebels had conquer'd' and asserted

¹⁴² Ibid, pp.12-4.

¹⁴³ Ibid, p.17.

¹⁴⁴ *The Jacobite Hudibras containing the Late King's Declaration in Travesty* (London, 1692), 'Preface.'

¹⁴⁵ Ibid, pp.3-5.

¹⁴⁶ Samuel Bradford, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor, The Aldermen, and Citizens of London, at St. Mary Le Bow, On Thursday, November 5. 1696* (London, 1697), pp.19-20.

¹⁴⁷ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.403-4.

¹⁴⁸ *A Letter from a Gentleman in Flanders to a Lord in the Parliament* (n.p., 1690).

¹⁴⁹ *The Loyal Martyr Vindicated* (n.p., 1691), pp.29-30.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid, p.32.

allegiance to Cromwell through Conquest.¹⁵¹ Royalists had made similar criticisms of Conquest theories during the Engagement Controversy.¹⁵² Charles-Edouard Levillain has highlighted how some polemicists said that William was a military dictator like Cromwell.¹⁵³ Chapter One examined how numerous Jacobites compared William with Cromwell in advocating allegiance to James. Some Jacobite polemics from 1689 and into the 1690s again compared William with Cromwell but many of these pamphlets centred on rejecting the idea of allegiance based on a conquest. *The Loyal Martyr Vindicated*, like other Jacobite polemics, believed they were carrying on the Royalist tradition by rejecting allegiance to a conqueror because allegiance to any kind of conqueror endangered subjects' rights.¹⁵⁴

From 1692-3 this became a more noticeable feature of Jacobite polemics. In 1693 English Jacobite lawyer Charlwood Lawton wrote *A French Conquest Neither Desirable nor Practicable*. Tory Williamite Narcissus Luttrell recorded that many Williamites were worried about the wide public distribution of Lawton's 'Scandalouse' pamphlet.¹⁵⁵ Lawton's *French Conquest*, addressing James and the Three Kingdoms' populations, set out the problems with allegiance to a Conqueror. Conquest was 'a harsh Word, and it frightens weak Minds.'¹⁵⁶ It was 'debase,' a 'precarious' Title; anyone advocating Conquest was looking after 'their own Interest more than' James's.¹⁵⁷ Perception was central to convincing subjects and so Lawton argued that allegiance to James after a French-backed Conquest would make James seem illegitimate because his restoration would have come through unlawful means. It was 'not the Interest' of James, Louis, Jacobites or subjects to have such a Conquest.¹⁵⁸ Lawton gave one of the fullest Jacobite critiques of allegiance to a Conqueror. He declared that a 'Conqueror is not in the Language of our Loyalty.'¹⁵⁹ Conquest implied unwilling allegiance enforced

¹⁵¹ Ibid, p.36.

¹⁵² Vallance, 'Oaths, Casuistry, and Equivocation, Anglican Responses to the Engagement Controversy,' pp.59-60, 65; Skinner, 'History and Ideology in the English Revolution,' passim.

¹⁵³ Charles-Edouard Levillain, 'Cromwell Redivivus? William III as Military Dictator: Myth and Reality,' in Mijers & Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III*, pp.159-76.

¹⁵⁴ *The Loyal Martyr Vindicated*, pp.44-5.

¹⁵⁵ Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714 volume III* (Oxford, 1867), p.88.

¹⁵⁶ Charlwood Lawton, *A French Conquest Neither Desirable nor Practicable. Dedicated to the King* (London, 1693), 'To the King.'

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, pp.4, 9-11.

¹⁵⁹ Lawton, *French Conquest Neither Desirable nor Practicable*, p.4.

by standing armies. Such Conquests, like the Roman Conquest of Gaul, failed to induce subjects' loyalty.¹⁶⁰ James as *de jure*, rightful and lawful, King had the moral and legal high ground. Claiming allegiance by Conquest, with the implied coercion, would be surrendering that high ground to Williamites. This was why it was 'not the Interest' of James to press his claim through Conquest.¹⁶¹ A Jacobite restoration could only happen through means that would not be to the 'prejudice of our Rightful Monarch or his Posterity, or our Constitution.'¹⁶² Lawton then described the 'Philanderings,' 'Pillaging' and other breaches of the law the Kingdoms endured under William.¹⁶³ To Lawton Conquest theories offered no positives and actually undermined rather than aided James's restoration.

Jacobites, from Whig and Nonjuring backgrounds, made this argument. Nonjuror Samuel Grascome said that William's 'setting up a Title of Conquest,' his 'haughty Designs' and 'sham plots' were designed to make William 'Absolute.' Grascome decried how Williamites used Conquest theories and a 'pretended Necessity' to deceive subjects into giving William allegiance.¹⁶⁴ Irish-born Nonjuror Henry Dodwell challenged Sherlock and others advocating allegiance to William as a Conqueror why they felt 'obliged to surrender their Rights' to 'Wicked men' who invaded the Kingdoms.¹⁶⁵ Loyalty to this Conqueror was a '*Subversion of the Laws.*'¹⁶⁶ Sir James Montgomery, the Scottish Whig Jacobite, said that William treated subjects as a 'Conquered People.'¹⁶⁷ Irish Nonjuror Charles Leslie said that the Glencoe Massacre typified how William was '*Absolute and Unaccountable*' after taking the Kingdoms.¹⁶⁸ Robert Ferguson similarly denounced loyalty to William as a Conqueror for putting subjects 'into the State of *Slaves* instead of Subjects.'¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, pp.10-3.

¹⁶¹ Ibid, pp.8-9.

¹⁶² Ibid, p.13.

¹⁶³ Ibid, pp.1-2.

¹⁶⁴ Samuel Grascome, *New Court-Contrivances; or, More Sham-Plots still, against true-hearted Englishmen* (n.p., 1693), pp.1-2.

¹⁶⁵ Henry Dodwell, *A Defence of the Vindication of the Deprived Bishops...* (London, 1695), pp.13-5.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid, p.75.

¹⁶⁷ Sir James Montgomery, *Great Britain's Just Complaint Second Edition* (Oxford, 1692), pp.26-7.

¹⁶⁸ Charles Leslie, *Gallienus Redivivus, or, Murther Will Out, &c. Being a True Account of the De-Witting of Glencoe, Gaffney, &c* (Edinburgh, 1695), pp.22-4.

¹⁶⁹ Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Account of Some of the Late Incroachments and Depredations of the Dutch upon the English and of a Few of those many Advantages which by Fraud and Violence they have made of the British Nations Since the Revolution...* (n.p., 1695), pp.66-8.

Conquest implied tyranny and absolutism. Under a conqueror subjects' liberties would have no security and from 1693 this notion, examined in Chapter Four, of allegiance related to monarchical protection of liberties became more prominent in the allegiance debates. The rhetoric around the Revolution was changing; it was no longer purely about the monarch's person but was increasingly about the type of monarchy William or James offered.

A Dialogue Between K.W. and Benting was a 1695 Jacobite pamphlet which imagined William in conversation with his close advisor William Bentinck, Earl of Portland. Bentinck wanted William to be 'like another *William the Conqueror*' and compile 'another *Dooms-day Book*' to accurately 'Estimate' England's wealth in order to prevent subjects from being able to 'cheat' William out of 'any *Tax or Poll...*'¹⁷⁰ William said that he desired to 'make a *Conquest*' and if he did he believed 'my work' would be 'done.' However this William recognised the popular mood and said he could not portray himself as such a Conqueror because it implied absolutism.¹⁷¹ This pamphlet shows how the public mood had changed on depicting the Revolution as a Conquest. A Jacobite-imagined version of William acknowledged that subjects would not accept William as a Conqueror but would continue to give him allegiance so long as he appeared benevolent and to have subjects' consent.¹⁷² While some Jacobites argued that James could demand allegiance through Conquest after a French invasion, Jacobite polemics denouncing Conquest theories had a greater impact. This allowed them to portray William as a tyrant suppressing subjects' liberties. These were the images of Conquest Williamites wanted to avoid having associated with William and why they asserted that William conquered James not the Kingdoms. Williamites had denounced potential Jacobite Conquests as endangering subjects and their liberties but given previous popular justifications of allegiance to William as a Conqueror Jacobites skilfully turned these arguments against Williamites. Lawton, Grascome and other Jacobites contributed to a public environment in the Kingdoms that was increasingly hostile towards allegiance through Conquest from 1692.

¹⁷⁰ *A Dialogue Between K.W. and Benting, Occasioned by his Going into Flanders after the Death of the Queen* (n.p., 1695), pp.7-8.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid*, p.8.

¹⁷² *Ibid*, pp.7-8. See Chapter Four for more on this pamphlet.

As has been shown Williamites, like Welwood, wrote strong denunciations of James's 1692 Declarations. These responses, along with Jacobite critiques of Conquest arguments, indicate a changing political thought in the Kingdoms on the Revolution and Conquest. Conquest theories of all kinds were becoming a liability in defending allegiance to William. Some Williamites had always been hostile to Conquest arguments. John Locke's *Two Treatises* said such theses would create a 'purely Despotical' regime.¹⁷³ Advocates of Contractual allegiance were the most vocal in criticising political legitimacy through Conquest. Richard Ashcraft and Maurice Goldsmith have highlighted how *Political Aphorisms*, a popular pamphlet which went through three editions, in comparing 1688-9 and 1066 claimed that the Norman Conquest involved consent.¹⁷⁴ In defending the Revolution the author argued that 'Conquest may restore a Right, Forfeiture may lose a Right, but 'tis Consent only that can transact or give a Right.' Contract, not Conquest, gave William legitimacy.¹⁷⁵ English Whig lawyer William Atwood argued that in 1689, like 1066, allegiance was transferred because Contractual, not Conquest, ideas offered security for subjects' liberties.¹⁷⁶ Scottish Whig Sir James Steuart argued that 'a speedy Conquest' may permit transferring allegiance but without a Contract the Conqueror could establish a tyranny.¹⁷⁷ From 1692 these Whig concerns about allegiance to a Conqueror became more widespread as polemicists began to reject Conquest arguments.

Radical Whig Samuel Johnson said that Conquest was a 'wicked False Title to unsettle the Throne.' It implied enforced allegiance on an unwilling population and took away subjects' liberties because Conquerors were

¹⁷³ John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government: In the former, The False Principles, and Foundation of Sir Robert Filmer, and his Followers, are Detected and Overthrown...*(London, 1690), Book II, Chapter XVI, No. 177, pp.401-2.

¹⁷⁴ Richard Ashcraft & M.M. Goldsmith, 'Locke, Revolution Principles, and the Formation of Whig Ideology,' *The Historical Journal*, 26, No. 4 (Dec., 1983), pp.774-8, 785.

¹⁷⁵ *Political Aphorisms: or, The True Maxims of Government displayed...Third Edition* (London, 1691), pp.29-31.

¹⁷⁶ William Atwood, *Wonderful Predictions of Nostredamus, Grebner, David Pareus, and Antonius Toruatus wherein the grandeur of Their Present Majesties, the happiness of England...are plainly delineated...*(London, 1689), 'Preface.'

¹⁷⁷ Sir James Steuart, *Salus Populi Suprema Lex, or, The Free Thoughts of a Well-wisher for a Good Settlement* (n.p., 1689), pp.7-8.

absolute.¹⁷⁸ Accepting ‘a Foreign Conquest’ suggested that the Revolution was immoral coming through ‘wrongful and wicked Means.’¹⁷⁹ Tory Humphrey Prideaux wrote in a 1693 letter that ‘For a prince, that makes his way to a throne by [the] sword, to make [the] people swear to his title seems to me a very strange imposition....’ Prideaux believed that ‘noe wise prince would’ accept allegiance through Conquest.¹⁸⁰ English Whigs and Tories were now criticising allegiance to William based on Conquest as unhelpful to his cause.

The bitter controversy over Charles Blount’s 1693 *King William and Queen Mary, Conquerors* shows how popular criticism of allegiance to William based on Conquest theories had become. Kenyon, Goldie and Thompson briefly discuss the Blount controversy but generally overlook how this controversy shows the increasing hostility to Conquest theories and changing opinions on the Revolution in England and Scotland.¹⁸¹ Luttrell recorded that Blount had a big impact on English politics.¹⁸² Blount, a Whig, argued that subjects were justified ‘in swearing and paying Allegiance to’ William and Mary as ‘Princes *de jure*,’ not just *de facto*. This challenged the conservatism that dominated English views of the Revolution from 1689 by calling for allegiance to William as *de jure* King thus giving his regime a veneer of permanence that allegiance to William as *de facto* King did not. Blount believed they had earned this through ‘the Right of Conquest consequent to a just War, and at time it was absolutely necessary to insist upon it.’ However, like Bohun and other more conservative Williamite polemicists, Blount argued that James was a ‘conquered Prince’ while England was unconquered.¹⁸³ Blount was not completely blind to the increasing hostility to Conquest theories and stated that allegiance to William as a Conqueror did not ‘thwart the Determination of the Convention’ because this Conquest secured ‘Civil Rights and Liberties.’¹⁸⁴ However arguing for allegiance to William and

¹⁷⁸ Samuel Johnson, *An Argument Proving, that the Abrogation of King James by the People of England...* (London, 1692), pp.15-6.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid*, pp.23, 27, 41.

¹⁸⁰ Humphrey Prideaux, ‘Norwich, December 4, 1693,’ *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux*, p.158.

¹⁸¹ Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.29-32; Goldie, ‘Edmund Bohun and *Jus gentium*,’ pp.573-4, 583-6; Thomson, ‘The Idea of Conquest,’ pp.39-45.

¹⁸² Luttrell, *Brief Relation... Volume III*, p.19.

¹⁸³ Charles Blount, *King William and Queen Mary, Conquerors, or, A Discourse endeavouring to prove that their Majesties have on their side, against the late King...* (London, 1693), pp.53-7, 7-8, 38-9, 41-8, 27-8.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid*, pp.45-7.

Mary as *de jure* monarchs implied that the Revolution was a more significant conquest than many Williamites found acceptable.

This provoked public admonishment in print and parliament. One pamphlet, *An Account of Mr. Blount's late Book*, went through two editions. The author, shocked by Blount's 'Boldness,' argued that it would only 'please' Blount and a few likeminded people.¹⁸⁵ Blount's pamphlet was 'possibly the coarsest and most disrelishing Compliment (to give it no worse Name) he could have pickt them....'¹⁸⁶ It was 'the most inaccountable Labyrinth and Confusion, from his Chimerical distinction of Conquering King James, but not the Kingdom of *England*, which strictly examin'd, is little more than just nothing.'¹⁸⁷ According to the author anyone could claim a right of Conquest whether they had a 'right or wrong Cause.'¹⁸⁸ William never claimed to be a Conqueror; allegiance based on Conquest 'is not the most sparkling Crown Jewel' and implied a vanquished country under a conqueror where allegiance was enforced by the sword.¹⁸⁹

These criticisms were echoed in the English Commons. Blount's pamphlet was criticised by many members because it implied the 'subversion' of subjects' liberties. It was 'inconsistent' with the increasingly prominent view that the Revolution was to secure subjects' liberties.¹⁹⁰ Members of the Commons also criticised earlier Conquest polemics by Lloyd and Burnet alongside Blount's. The Commons condemned these pamphlets and ordered them to be burned by the hangman because allegiance justified by Conquest 'was highly injurious to their Majesties.'¹⁹¹ Condemnation of Blount, Lloyd and Burnet shows this was not part of Whig-Tory antagonism as Henry Horwitz suggests.¹⁹² Tory and Whig writers aired these criticisms and now Tory and Whig Commons' members were denouncing arguments by Blount, Lloyd and Burnet. Conquest theory polemics were 'assertions of dangerous

¹⁸⁵ *An Account of Mr. Blount's late Book entituled, King William and Queen Mary Conquerors under the Censure of the Parliament Second Edition* (London, 1693), pp.3-4.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid*, pp.4-5.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid*, pp.17-8.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid*, pp.15-6.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid*, pp.15-8.

¹⁹⁰ Narcissus Luttrell, *Parliamentary Diary of Narcissus Luttrell, 1691-1693*, ed. Henry Horwitz (Oxford, 1972), pp.376-7, 386-7. See Chapter Four for changing popular perceptions of the Revolution securing subjects' liberties.

¹⁹¹ 'Second Parliament of King William: Fourth Session- begins 4/11/1692,' *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume 2: 1680-1695 (Chandler's)* (1742), pp.408-15. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=37651>. Date accessed: 30 April 2013.

¹⁹² Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III*, pp.103-9.

consequence to their Majesties, to the Liberties of the Subject, and Peace of the Kingdom.’¹⁹³ Bohun, a Tory, was licenser and authorised Blount’s pamphlet because he believed it would ‘bring over... the disaffected by offering the title of conquest to their consideration.’¹⁹⁴ This hostile reaction to Blount’s pamphlet cost Bohun his job.¹⁹⁵ Samuel Johnson continued criticising Conquest theories by attacking Burnet’s *Pastoral Letter*, which was also condemned by the Commons. To Johnson ‘consent’ in the form of a Contract, not Conquest, was the only way to justify allegiance.¹⁹⁶ These condemnations of three important Conquest pamphlets show how the public mood had changed. Conquest was now seen as potentially establishing arbitrary rule and so ‘inconsistent’ with the Revolution.

As previously shown Lloyd had dropped Conquest arguments in his 30 January sermon of 1697.¹⁹⁷ Whig Anglican cleric Henry Meriton condemned allegiance to Conquerors. ‘Political Authority cannot arise from Conquest;’ it was a ‘Confutation’ that was ‘so contrary to the *genius* of an *English Man*...’¹⁹⁸ Polemicists who ‘eagerly’ declared that ‘Conquest is the Foundation of our Government’ were propagating ‘a Doctrine of the Divine Right of Slavery.’¹⁹⁹ ‘Conquest and Usurpation exclude the consent of the People;’ it implied an absolutist ruler and contradicted the idea that the Revolution secured liberties and banished James’s tyranny.²⁰⁰ This notion that the Revolution secured subjects’ liberties and justified allegiance to William is explored in Chapter Four but the lack of security for liberties with allegiance to a Conqueror was now more prominent in public discourse.

By 1696 Edward Fowler had also dropped Conquest from his polemics. In 1689-90 Fowler described the Revolution as a ‘plain Conquest’ of James that justified allegiance to William.²⁰¹ After the 1696 Assassination Plot Fowler said that William came ‘not as our Conqueror, but for having been the

¹⁹³ *Chandler’s*, pp.408-15.

¹⁹⁴ Luttrell, *Parliamentary Diary*, p.379.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid*, pp.383, 387.

¹⁹⁶ Samuel Johnson, *Notes upon the Phoenix Edition of the Pastoral Letter Part I* (London, 1694), pp.35, 41-2.

¹⁹⁷ Lloyd, *A Sermon Preach’d before the House of Lords on the Abbey-Church of St. Peter’s-Westminster, on the 30th of January, 1696/7*, pp.27-8.

¹⁹⁸ Henry Meriton, *A Sermon Preacht at the Cathedral Church in Norwich, Upon the 11th of April 1696*... (London, 1696), pp.12-3.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid*, p.13.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid*, pp.15-22, 28-30, 35-7. For more on how liberties were used to justify allegiance see Chapter Four.

²⁰¹ Fowler, *A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England*, pp.6-8; *idem*, *Answer to a Paper Delivered by Mr. Ashton*, pp.15, 23.

Glorious Instrument of our Deliverance.’²⁰² The word Conquest only appears in this sermon to denounce a potential French-Jacobite Conquest.²⁰³ Burnet’s 1695 eulogy for Mary asserted that William would ‘Conquer Enemies’ but warned that England could become ‘easie Prey to Foreign Conquerors.’²⁰⁴ In another post-1693 pamphlet Burnet warned of those who gave their ‘Fidelity’ in support of France’s ‘Unlawful Wars and Conquests’ threatening the Kingdoms.²⁰⁵ Many Williamite polemicists either dropped Conquest arguments or aired more critical views of Conquests. This shows how the English public discourse had changed. The conservative views of the Revolution, downplaying all but the personnel change, were coming under increasingly popular criticism.

As the 1690s progressed Scottish Williamites also displayed more hostility to Conquest theories. Andrew Fletcher, the famous Scottish Whig, said that Conquerors destroyed all before them in becoming ‘absolute.’²⁰⁶ While specifically addressing the standing army issue Fletcher rejected any notions of Conquest being in subjects’ ‘Interest’ and further contributed to a public environment that was hostile to legitimacy through Conquest. Fletcher believed that William maintaining a standing army would make him appear like a Cromwell-style Conqueror who needed an army to forcibly secure support for his rule. This was no ‘Security of the British Liberties.’²⁰⁷ Fletcher, like the English Commons, saw Conquest as inconsistent with notions that the Revolution secured liberties.²⁰⁸

George Ridpath, another Scottish Whig, in a pamphlet on the fallout from the Darien scheme rejected any Scottish acceptance of a conqueror’s rule. Ridpath accepted that while English theorists could use Conquest because 1066 was seen as establishing the English monarchy Scots could not because they had a history of rejecting allegiance to invaders claiming a right of Conquest. ‘Our Case is not like that of other Nations who obtained their Priviledges from

²⁰² Edward Fowler, *A Sermon Preached Before the House of Lords in the Abby-Church at Westminster, upon Thursday the Sixteenth of April 1696...* (London, 1696), p.23.

²⁰³ *Ibid*, p.27.

²⁰⁴ Gilbert Burnet, *An Essay on the Memory of the Late Queen by Gilbert, Bishop of Sarum* (London, 1695), pp.37, 148.

²⁰⁵ Gilbert Burnet, *A Sermon Preach’d before the Queen, at White-hall, on the 11th of March, 1693/4...* (London, 1694), pp.13-5.

²⁰⁶ Andrew Fletcher, *A Discourse of Government with Relation to Militias* (Edinburgh, 1698), pp.6-7.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid*, pp.62-3, 25-6.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid*, pp.62-3.

the Favour and Clemency of their Conquerors....'²⁰⁹ Ridpath used various ideas to defend the Revolution and allegiance to William throughout the 1690s and 1700s.²¹⁰ Both Ridpath and Fletcher rejected the idea of allegiance to a Conqueror as inconsistent with the Revolution and Scottish concepts of monarchy. While there were fewer Conquest polemics in Scotland than in England there was still a swath of the population open to these ideas, as outlined earlier. Ridpath and Fletcher are evidence of more public hostility to these ideas but, as in England, with Conquest theories coming under increasing public criticisms the issue of liberties became prominent in allegiance debates. Chapter Four explores this increasing public focus on subjects' liberties alongside concerns about how William governed. From 1692-3 English and Scottish polemicists were increasingly critical of the idea that allegiance could be justified with any kind of Conquest theory. This resulted in the frequent absence of Conquest-of-James arguments in post-1692 English and Scottish allegiance polemics.

In Ireland William Molyneux's *Case of Ireland* was the most noticeable Irish critique of political legitimacy through Conquest. Molyneux, like English and Scottish Williamites, criticised Conquest theories for undermining subjects' liberties.²¹¹ However even after English and Scottish Williamites turned against Conquest arguments some Irish polemicists continued justifying allegiance to William with Conquest arguments. Irish Tory Edmund Arwaker boasted of William's 'Conquest at the Boyne,' which signalled James's defeat and brought Irish subjects under William.²¹² French-born Irish Anglican Jacques Abbadie favourably compared William with Cyrus the Great, 'Conqueror of Asia' and 'Restorer of Jewish Liberties.'²¹³ Abbadie declared 'WILLIAM the Conqueror' who 'blest Ireland with glorious and

²⁰⁹ George Ridpath, *Scotland's Grievances Relating to Darien &c., humbly offered to the Consideration of the Parliament* (n.p., 1700), p.51.

²¹⁰ See Chapters Five, Seven, Eight, Nine.

²¹¹ William Molyneux, *The Case of Ireland's Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England stated...* (Dublin, 1698), 'To the King,' pp.14-5, 17-8, 20-2. Both Charles C. Ludington, 'From Ancient Constitution to British Empire: William Atwood and the Imperial Crown of England,' pp.246-60 and Patrick Kelly, 'Recasting a Tradition: William Molyneux and the Sources of *The Case of Ireland...Stated* (1698),' in Ohlmeyer (ed.) *Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland* describe debates on the legitimacy of the English connexion through Conquest. See Chapter Four for more on the issue of liberties and allegiance.

²¹² Edmund Arwaker, *An Epistle to Monsieur Boileau, Inviting his MUSE to forsake the French Interest, and Celebrate the King of England* (London, 1694), p.7.

²¹³ Jacques Abbadie, *A Panegyric on our Late Sovereign Lady Mary Queen of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, of Glorious and Immortal Memory who died at Kensington, on the 28th of December, 1694* (London, 1695), pp.1-4, 15.

happy Days.’ This Conquest guaranteed Irish Protestant liberties and safety.²¹⁴ There were occasional English and Scottish pamphlets defending allegiance to William because of his Conquest of James after 1693.²¹⁵ Despite these few pamphlets there had been a decisive swing against allegiance based on Conquest from 1692-3.

VI

Although there was considerably less hostility to allegiance based on Conquest in Ireland examining all Three Kingdoms shows that public views had changed. Between 1689 and 1692 the idea that William was owed allegiance as *de facto* King because he conquered James not the Kingdoms was popular in all Three Kingdoms. As with Williamite justifications that used History and Non-Resistance arguments, explored in Chapters One and Two, these Conquest-of-James arguments generally portrayed the Revolution as changing the monarchs without altering the monarchy. A conquest of the Kingdoms implied wholesale constitutional changes and subservience to a hostile invader. This shows the continued conservative reluctance to embrace the Revolution, as Chapters One and Two also showed, was still dominant. Between 1689 and 1692 most polemicists in the Kingdoms accepted William as *de facto* King but were reluctant at this time to embrace any hint of radicalism implied by the Revolution.

However events from 1692-3 indicate that public views of the Revolution were changing and that the dominant conservatism of 1689-92 was beginning to give way. James’s 1692 Declarations and Jacobites proclaiming that a French-Jacobite invasion would allow for subjects to return allegiance through Conquest provoked a hostile Williamite reaction. The more effective Jacobite polemicists like Lawton, Leslie and others realised that threatening Conquest-style language would not induce loyalty to James. They argued that allegiance to any kind of Conqueror implied loyalty to a hostile invader who was absolute and undermined subjects’ liberties. In doing this, these Jacobites were also undermining the popular Williamite allegiance arguments that

²¹⁴ Ibid, pp.22-3.

²¹⁵ *Enquiry into the Nature and Obligation of Legal Rights: with Respect of the Late K. James’s Remaining Right to the Crown* (London, 1693), pp.28, 33-4, 37, 41, 53; Pennecuik, *Caledonia Triumphans*.

William's Conquest of James preserved traditional order. By depicting the Revolution as a hostile Conquest that established a tyranny undermining subjects' liberties they were contributing to a public environment that had increasingly negative views of allegiance to a Conqueror.

There had always been some Whig criticism of Conquest theories, but from 1692-3 Williamites were also increasingly critical of advocating allegiance based on any kind of Conquest because of fears it created a tyranny undermining subjects' liberties. This was at the heart of the 1693 controversy over Blount's *King William and Queen Mary, Conquerors*. Blount's pamphlet along with Conquest polemics by Lloyd and Burnet were condemned by the Commons and publicly burned for being 'inconsistent' with the idea that the Revolution guaranteed liberties.²¹⁶ From 1693 pamphleteers across the Kingdoms were criticising defences of allegiance to William based on Conquest because it was seen as undermining William by implying that he was absolute and gave no security for subjects' liberties. It also insinuated that William coerced allegiance from subjects after a hostile takeover.²¹⁷ Some, like Lloyd and Fowler, dropped Conquest justifications from their polemics in the later-1690s.²¹⁸ Public views of the Revolution had changed and subjects' liberties would become increasingly prominent and important in justifying allegiance with the declining popularity of Conquest theories. In 1689 English Anglican Williamite Thomas Comber advocated allegiance to William because he conquered James but recognised that allegiance based on Conquest was problematic. Comber said that allegiance to William was justified because of his Conquest and a 'True Contract betwixt the Prince of *Orange* and the Nation.' This 'Contract' ensured 'our Rights are secure.'²¹⁹ From 1692-3 with Conquest theories falling out of favour this idea of allegiance dependent on subjects' rights or liberties being guaranteed, what Comber called a 'Contract,' became more prominent in debates on allegiance. With this the conservatism

²¹⁶ Chandler's, pp.408-15; Luttrell, *Parliamentary Diary*, pp.379, 383, 387.

²¹⁷ Ridpath, *Scotland's Grievances*, p.51; Fletcher, *A Discourse of Government*, pp.6-7, 25-6, 62-3; Johnson, *Notes upon the Phoenix Edition*, pp.35, 41-2; *An Account of Mr. Blunt's Late Book*, pp.3-5, 15-8; Molyneux, *The Case of Ireland*, 'To the King,' pp.14-5, 17-8, 20-2.

²¹⁸ Lloyd, *A Sermon Preach'd before the House of Lords at the Abbey-Church of St. Peter's-Westminster, on the 30th of January, 1696/7*, pp.27-8; Lloyd, *A Discourse of God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms*, pp.55-9; Fowler, *A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England*, passim; Fowler, *A Sermon Preached Before the House of Lords in the Abby-Church at Westminster, upon Thursday the Sixteenth of April 1696*, pp.23, 27.

²¹⁹ Thomas Comber, *A Letter to a Bishop Concerning the Present Settlement and the New Oaths* (London, 1689), pp.21-5.

that dominated views of the Revolution from 1689 was beginning to give way to more progressive views and a stronger embrace of the Revolution as more than merely changing personnel.

Chapter Four: Contracts, Liberties and Allegiance.

Around 1692-3 increasing numbers of Jacobite and Williamite polemicists argued that allegiance based on Conquest theories undermined ‘British Liberties.’¹ Some polemicists who used Conquest theories to justify allegiance acknowledged this problem. Anglican Williamite Thomas Comber justified allegiance to William as *de facto* King on grounds of Conquest and a ‘True Contract’ with English subjects, which secured ‘our Rights.’² English Whig James Tyrrell argued that ‘All the Liberties and Priviledges which Subjects enjoy’ were part of an ‘Original Contract.’ If a king infringed subjects’ liberties this ‘Contract’ was broken and subjects ‘discharged’ of ‘Allegiance to him.’³ Comber and Tyrrell argued that allegiance depended on subjects’ liberties being guaranteed in a Contractual relationship. However other polemicists, who balked at Contractual resistance ideas, adopted remarkably similar language linking allegiance to liberties without calling it a Contract. Tory Charles Davenant was one such polemicist.⁴ Guaranteeing liberties was always seen as a monarchical duty.⁵ Chapters One through Three showed how between 1689 and 1692 Williamite allegiance polemics tended to portray the Revolution as William replacing James with little or no change to the monarchy. At the same time as Conquest theories becoming unpopular William was also increasingly unpopular because of the exhaustive war, economic malaise, misgovernment and corruption.⁶ From 1692-3 this resulted in greater emphasis on the Revolution changing the monarchy. Allegiance was no longer just about who was *de facto* King, as most polemics in 1689-92 focused on. It was increasingly about the type of government each monarch offered and how this affected subjects and their ability to exercise their rights or liberties. This chapter explores these changing views when Williamites and

¹ Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Account of Some of the Late Incroachments and Depredations of the Dutch upon the English and of a few of those many Advantages which by Fraud and Violence they have made of the Brittish Nations since the Revolution...*(n.p., 1695), pp.66-8; Andrew Fletcher, *A Discourse of Government with Relation to Militias* (Edinburgh, 1698), pp.35-8, 25-6.

² Thomas Comber, *A Letter to a Bishop Concerning the Present Settlement and the New Oaths* (London, 1689), pp.21-5.

³ James Tyrrell, *Bibliotheca Politica...*(n.p., 1694), pp.114, 697-8.

⁴ Charles Davenant, *A Discourse upon Grants and Resumptions...*(London, 1700), pp.14-25, 86-8, 96-7, 389-93.

⁵ Tim Harris, *Rebellion Britain's First Stuart Kings* (Oxford, 2014), pp.17-30.

⁶ Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy 1660-1714* (London, 2013), pp.384-5, 509-13; Christopher Whatley, *The Scots and the Union Then and Now* (Edinburgh, 2014), pp.151-3.

Jacobites across the Kingdoms put greater emphasis on allegiance to William as supporting perceived post-Revolution changes to the monarchy and how these impacted on subjects' liberties.

During the Restoration across the Kingdoms Contract ideas expressed through Covenants or political resistance were controversial and seen as belonging to political and religious 'radicals.'⁷ Contract theories were unpopular because they were seen as promoting conditional allegiance, anarchy, regicide and resistance to divinely ordained authority.⁸ Various Contract theories have engendered much scholarship on seventeenth-century debates on the historical evolution of a constitutional Contract.⁹ Hobbes and Locke loom large in intellectual histories. Locke and others promoting Contract arguments are seen as exemplifying the Revolution's progressivism and radicalism.¹⁰ Mark Goldie and others argue that Contractual resistance arguments were unpopular in justifying the Revolution and allegiance due to fears of repeating 1649.¹¹ It is necessary to get away from these traditional understandings of Contract arguments justifying resistance or revolution.

⁷ Ian B. Cowan, *The Scottish Covenanters, 1660-1688* (London, 1976), pp.159-60; J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832 Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 2000), pp.71-2, 77-80; Tim Harris, *Restoration Charles II and his Kingdoms 1660-1685* (London, 2006), p.118-20, 156-7; Richard L. Greaves, "'That Kind of People: Late Stuart Radicals and their Manifestoes, a Fundamental Approach,' in Glenn Burgess & Matthew Festenstein (eds.) *English Radicalism, 1550-1850* (Cambridge, 2007), pp.87-95; J.H. Burns, 'George Buchanan and the anti-monarchomachs,' in Nicholas Phillipson & Quentin Skinner (eds.) *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.3-5.

⁸ David Martin Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (Rochester, 1999), pp.194-6; J.P. Kenyon, 'The Revolution of 1688: Resistance and Contract,' in Neil McKendrick (ed.) *Historical Perspectives in English Thought and Society in honour of J.H Plumb* (London, 1974), pp.43-57; Allan I. Macinnes, 'Covenanting Ideology in Seventeenth Scotland,' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.) *Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland: Kingdom or Colony* (Cambridge, 2000), pp.199-203; Johann P. Sommerville, *Thomas Hobbes Political Ideas in Historical Context* (Basingstoke, 1992), pp.67-9. See also Chapters One and Two.

⁹ Lois G. Schwoerer, 'The Right to Resist: Whig Resistance Theory, 1688-1694,' in Phillipson & Skinner (eds.) *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, pp.239-41; Glenn Burgess, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution. An Introduction to English Political Thought, 1603-1642* (Brighton, 1993), pp.96-7, pp.99-100; Johann P. Sommerville, 'Absolutism and Royalism,' in J.H. Burns & Mark Goldie (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700* (Cambridge, 1991), p.355.

¹⁰ Quentin Skinner, 'The Ideological Context of Hobbes's Political Thought,' *The Historical Journal*, 9, No. 3 (1966), pp.301, 307-8; John Miller, 'The Glorious Revolution: "Contract" and "Abdication" Reconsidered,' *The Historical Journal*, 25, No. 3 (1982), pp.543-4; Schwoerer, 'The Right to Resist,' pp.236-41, 250-1; J.R. Western, *Monarchy and Revolution: The English State in the 1680s* (Basingstoke, 1985), pp.282-3; Edward Vallance, 'Loyal or Rebellious? Protestant Associations in England 1584-1696,' *The Seventeenth Century*, 17, Issue 1 (2002), pp.2, 10, 18; Thomas P. Slaughter, "'Abdicate" and "Contract" in the Glorious Revolution,' *The Historical Journal*, 24, No. 2 (Jun., 1981), pp.324, 330-7.

¹¹ Mark Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument,' *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities* 83, (1980), pp.490, 508; Justin Champion, 'Political Thinking between the Restoration and the Hanoverian Succession,' in Barry Coward (ed.) *A Companion*

Glenn Burgess convincingly argues that so-called ‘radicals’ were not isolated from non-radicals and that focusing on conservative-radical dichotomies inhibits insights into political discourses.¹² John Miller described how in 1689 English Whigs and Tories frequently used terminology about liberties and duties, generally considered Whig property, to describe how James lost his throne because he failed in his duties.¹³ Howard Nenner asserts that Contract based on ‘mutuality of obligation’ had ‘limited’ public traction but after 1689 the monarch-subject relationship became more formalised with subjects less inclined to trust monarchs’ promises to rule for subjects’ benefit.¹⁴ Edward Vallance argues that allegiance was no longer granted unconditionally as Contractual views of allegiance became publicly more acceptable in the later seventeenth century.¹⁵ Steven Pincus says that the late 1690s saw Whig ideas dominate English public discourse but Contract arguments about monarchs working for the public good were more popular than resistance arguments.¹⁶ Kevin Sharpe argues that the Revolution changed public perceptions of the monarchy, which became more attentive to subjects’ concerns.¹⁷ This chapter builds on works by Nenner, Vallance, Pincus, Sharpe and Miller to show how from 1692-3 rhetoric on the Revolution was changing. Monarchical protection of liberties, which Whigs said was part of a Contract, was not exclusive Whig property. Liberties always featured in Williamite polemics but from the mid-1690s subjects’ liberties and post-Revolution innovations were more prominent in rhetoric on the Revolution and allegiance. Allegiance was no longer solely about loyalty to the monarch’s person. Whether or not the Revolution was transformative is another debate; this chapter, as with this thesis as a whole,

to *Stuart Britain* (Oxford, 2003), p.485; James Tully, ‘Placing the “Two Treatises”,’ in Phillipson & Skinner (eds.) *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, pp.253-4; Gerald Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962), pp.28, 35-6; H.T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property* (London, 1977), pp.57-8, 70-80; Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance*, pp.202-3.

¹² Glenn Burgess, ‘Introduction,’ in Burgess, Festenstein (eds.) *English Radicalism*, pp.9-10; idem, ‘Radicalism and the English Revolution,’ in *ibid*, pp.71, 80-1.

¹³ Miller, ‘The Glorious Revolution: “Contract” and “Abdication” Reconsidered,’ pp.544-55.

¹⁴ Howard Nenner, ‘Loyalty and the Law: The Meaning of Trust and the Right of Resistance in Seventeenth-Century England,’ *The Journal of British Studies*, 48, Issue 04, (Oct., 2009), pp.859-70.

¹⁵ Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, *passim*.

¹⁶ Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (London, 2009), pp.419-24 455-6, 434, 443-50.

¹⁷ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp. xvii-xix, 343-9, 407-8.

examines the contemporary public perceptions of the Revolution as articulated in allegiance polemics.¹⁸

Scottish and Irish historiographies also overlook how political thought on the Revolution changed. Comparisons of the Revolution in Scotland and England generally view the Scottish Revolution as more ‘Whiggish’ and Contract-oriented.¹⁹ Scottish historiography, like English historiography, repeatedly examines the popularity of some Contract arguments around 1689.²⁰ Bruce Lenman, like Miller, argues that Scottish Contract-style language did not indicate radicalism.²¹ According to S.J. Connolly ‘Few Irish Whigs... embraced radical theories’ like Contractual resistance.²² Others describe ‘Whiggish’ Irish Williamite polemics and highlight Contractual language in works by William King, Edward Wetenhall and self-described Tory Sir Richard Cox.²³ In Scotland and Ireland, as in England, linking subjects’

¹⁸ Lionel K.J Glassey, ‘In Search of the Mot *Juste*: Characterizations of the Revolution of 1688-9,’ in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (eds.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013) gives a good overview of debates over whether the Revolution was transformative from 1689 and historiography on the Revolution over the centuries.

¹⁹ Allan I. Macinnes, ‘William of Orange- “Disaster for Scotland”?’ in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007), p.207; 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), pp.46-8; idem, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2007), passim; Geoffrey Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power: Late Stuart and Early Georgian Britain 1660-1722* (Harlow, 1993), p.218; Ian Cowan, ‘Church and State Reformed? The Revolution of 1688-9 in Scotland,’ in Israel (ed.) *Anglo-Dutch Moment*, p.163-83; W.A. Speck, ‘William III and the Three Kingdoms,’ in Mijers, Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III*, pp.41-2, 47-8.

²⁰ Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (Woodbridge, 2003), p.192, pp.195-7, 199; T.N. Clarke, ‘The Scottish Episcopalians 1688-1720’ (University of Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 1987), pp.12-3; Keith Brown, *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603-1715* (Basingstoke, 1992), pp.77-8; Jeffrey Stephen, ‘Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland and the Scottish Parliament, 1689-95’ *The Scottish Historical Review*, LXXXIX, No. 227 (April, 2010), pp.25-8; Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland’s Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge, 1993), p.15; idem, *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1660-1800* (Cambridge, 1999), pp.128-37.

²¹ Bruce P. Lenman, ‘The Poverty of Political Theory in the Scottish Revolution of 1688-1690,’ in Lois Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.253-5.

²² S.J. Connolly, ‘The Glorious Revolution in Irish Protestant Political Thinking,’ in S.J. Connolly (ed.) *Political Ideas in Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2000), pp.41-53; idem, *Divided Kingdom Ireland 1630-1800* (Oxford, 2008), pp.216-7.

²³ Padraig Lenihan, *Consolidating Conquest: Ireland 1603-1727* (Harlow, 2008), p.201; Patrick McNally, ‘William King and the “national question,”’ in Christopher J. Fauske (ed.) *Archbishop William King and Anglican Irish Context, 1688-1729* (Dublin, 2000), pp.25-6; Joseph Richardson, ‘Archbishop William King (1650-1729): “Church Tory and State Whig?”’ *Eighteenth-Century Ireland/ Irish an dá Chultúr*, 15 (2000), pp.65-6, 73; Robert Eccleshall, ‘The Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland in the 1690s,’ in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall

liberties and allegiance became increasingly prominent and was not exclusively radical Whig property. This chapter explores this neglected changing rhetoric on allegiance and the Revolution across the Three Kingdoms.

From the mid-1690s the Country and Court platforms coloured much of the Kingdoms' political discourses. According to Julian Hoppit the English Country platform was not a formal party but a 'persuasion' of Whigs and Tories concerned about issues like high taxes, standing armies, expanding executive power, and subjects' liberties.²⁴ Country polemics in Scotland and Ireland aired similar concerns about government policies affecting subjects' liberties.²⁵ Historiography on Court-Country antagonisms overlooks these platforms' role in the changing rhetoric on allegiance and the Revolution although some historians note similarities between Country and Jacobite polemics. However most Country polemicists were Williamites.²⁶ This chapter shows how Country and Court platforms contributed to the greater public emphasis on the Revolution guaranteeing liberties as part of subjects' allegiance, which Jacobites tried to exploit. Jacobite use of Contract theories has been credited with reviving Jacobitism by attempting to exploit popular Country grievances.²⁷ These studies of 'Whig Jacobites' are generally single-kingdom studies. This chapter shows how 'Whig Jacobites' used language similar to Williamites about allegiance related to liberties frequently in Three-Kingdom contexts to urge allegiance to James.²⁸ Even Nonjurors and Catholic Jacobites adopted this language.²⁹ Several of these pamphlets dealt with many different issues but their comments on allegiance and greater emphasis on

& Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Basingstoke, 2001), pp.68-71.

²⁴ Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford, 2000), pp.155-60.

²⁵ Allan I. Macinnes, 'Jacobitism in Scotland: Episodic Cause or National Movement?', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 86, No. 222, Part 2 (Oct., 2007), p.249; Dickinson, *Liberty and Property*, pp.92-5; D.W. Hayton, *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians and Parties* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp.38-40, 45.

²⁶ Dennis Rubini, *Court and Country 1688-1702* (London, 1968), passim; Mark Goldie & Clare Jackson, 'Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites,' in Mijers & Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III*, pp.177-99; Paul Monod, 'Jacobitism and Country Principles in the Reign of William III,' *The Historical Journal*, 30, No. 2 (Jun., 1987), pp.289-310; Macinnes, 'Jacobitism in Scotland,' pp.220-3; Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996), pp.191-226.

²⁷ Goldie & Jackson, 'Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites,' pp.177-99.

²⁸ Sir James Montgomery, *Great Britain's Just Complaint Second Edition* (Oxford, 1692), passim; Charlwood Lawton, *The Jacobite Principles Vindicated...* (n.p., 1693), p.4; idem, *A French Conquest neither Desirable nor Practicable...* (London, 1693), passim.

²⁹ Charles Leslie, *Gallienus Redivivus, or, Murther will out, &c Being a True Account of the De-witting of Glencoe, Gaffney, &c.* (Edinburgh, 1695), pp.17-22.

liberties, which some called a Contract, show how opinions on the Revolution evolved since 1689.

I

Historiography frequently views the Bill of Rights and Claim of Right as evidence of progressivism, Contract theory and liberty triumphing at the Revolution. However early-allegiance polemics frequently denied notions of Contract and focused on the Revolution changing monarchs but not the monarchy.³⁰ Between 1689 and 1692 some polemicists used Contract arguments, which described subjects' liberties as related to allegiance. Robert Ferguson's 1689 English Williamite pamphlet defended Contractual resistance to James because his 'Evils' made him 'unqualified' to be King.³¹ Melinda Zook describes this as his 'finest Whig polemic' in justifying Contractual resistance.³² However resisting James and giving William allegiance were two issues. Allegiance to William was partly justified because he intervened for 'our Liberties and Laws.' William would 'observe his Oath' to protect liberties.³³ Daniel Defoe and Gilbert Burnet also used this in parts of their 1689 pamphlets.³⁴ Even non-Whigs used similar rhetoric. Tory Anglican Thomas Long advocated allegiance to William as *de facto* King by using History and Non-Resistance arguments.³⁵ Long condemned Contractual resistance but also said James could not protect subjects' 'Religion and Liberties' and so failed in 'The Mutual Oaths and Obligations that pass between the Prince and

³⁰ Tim Harris, 'The People, the Law, and the Constitution in Scotland and England,' pp.28-58; Schwoerer, *The Declaration of Rights*, passim; David Lieberman, 'The Mixed Constitution and the Common Law,' in Mark Goldie & Robert Walker (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2006), p.320; Wout Troost, *William III, the Stadholder-King A Political Biography* J.C Grayson (trans) (Aldershot, 2005), pp.210-4; Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, pp.35-7, 46-8; Clark, *English Society*, pp.79-80, 134, 154; Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance*, p.202. See also Chapters One, Two, Three.

³¹ Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Justification of the Prince of Orange's Descent into England...* (n.p., 1689), pp.22-3.

³² Melinda Zook, 'Turncoats and Double Agents in Restoration and Revolutionary England: The Case of Robert Ferguson, The Plotter,' *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 42, No. 3 (2009), pp.370-1.

³³ Ferguson, *Brief Justification*, p.36.

³⁴ Daniel Defoe, *Reflections Upon the Late Great Revolution...* (London, 1689), pp.6-9, 36-8, 48-9, 66-8; Gilbert Burnet, *Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs...* (London, 1689), pp.4-5, 9-11; *The Case of the People of England in their Present Circumstances...* (London, 1689), pp.9-10.

³⁵ See Chapters One and Two.

People....'³⁶ He separated resistance from guaranteeing liberties but Nonjuror George Hickes lambasted Long for asserting that the 'foundation of all Government is in compact' and allegiance was 'conditional.'³⁷ In 1689 some polemicists saw liberties as part of allegiance while others saw this as radical Contract argument and so other ideas were more prevalent in England.

Chapters One through Three showed how Scottish polemicists employed different arguments, including Contract theories, to justify allegiance to William. As in England, some Scottish polemics by radical and non-radicals partly justified allegiance to William because he guaranteed liberties. Ferguson's 1689 Scottish pamphlet said liberties and Protestantism were 'Subverted and Overthrown' by James and Charles II. This breach of the 'Original Contract' justified resistance but allegiance to William and Mary was partly justified because they protected liberties. The Claim of Right protected subjects' liberties and was a condition 'upon which the People agreed to yield their Obedience and Subjection.'³⁸ Other 1689 Scottish pamphlets contained this language alongside or secondary to other ideas like History.³⁹ Sir Francis Grant in *Loyalists Reasons*, like Long in England, opposed Contractual resistance but said that liberties were important to allegiance. Grant described the 'mutuality' in the subject-monarch relationship through the Oath of Allegiance and Coronation Oath. One reason allegiance to James ended was because he failed to rule according to his oath.⁴⁰ William's intervention rescued subjects 'from ruin in their Religion, Lives, Fortunes, and Liberties....'⁴¹ In 1688-9 'my *Allegiance*... transferred from King *James*, to his Highness; (*Protection* and *Allegiance* being naturally reciprocal;) and then I entered in a *Religious Covenant* under his conduct.'⁴² This implied conditional

³⁶ Thomas Long, *A Full Answer to all the Popular Objections that have yet Appear'd, For not Taking the Oath of Allegiance to their Present Majesties*... (London, 1689), pp.54-5; idem, *The Historian Unmask'd*... (London, 1689), pp.7-8; idem, *A Resolution of Certain Queries*... (London, 1689), p.16.

³⁷ George Hickes, *A Letter to the Author of a Late Paper, entituled, A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England, &c. In defence of the History of Passive Obedience* (n.p., 1689), pp.5-6.

³⁸ Robert Ferguson, *The Late Proceedings and Votes of the Parliament of Scotland*... (Glasgow, 1689), pp.5-6, 24-5.

³⁹ *A Vindication of the Proceedings of the Convention of the Estates in Scotland*... (London, 1689), pp.4-6, 8-10, 14, 25-6, 31-2; Sir James Steuart, *Salus Populi Suprema Lex*... (n.p., 1689), pp.4-5; James Welwood, *Reasons Why the Parliament of Scotland Cannot Comply with the Late King James's Proclamation*... (London, 1689), pp.7, 10, 16, 26. See Chapter One.

⁴⁰ Sir Francis Grant, Lord Cullen, *The Loyalists Reasons for his Giving Obedience*... (Edinburgh, 1689), 'Introduction.' See also Chapters One and Three.

⁴¹ Ibid, pp.17-8.

⁴² Ibid, pp.57-8.

allegiance but Grant denounced radical Presbyterian Covenants for promoting resistance and the ‘perpetual Revolts of Subjects.’⁴³ Grant’s pamphlet used several ideas including History and Conquest but denounced radical Contract theories while asserting that protecting liberties in a ‘*Religious Covenant*’ was part of allegiance to William.⁴⁴ However in 1689 Contractual resistance was a minority view in Scotland.⁴⁵

Some Irish Presbyterians said that resistance was integral to the Revolution. In 1713 Presbyterian minister James Kirkpatrick described Contractual resistance as ‘an Essential Fundamental Principle of the late *Revolution*, and Source of all the Blessings deriv’d to us from it....’⁴⁶ There has been debate over whether Irish Anglican Williamites employed radical Contract theories to defend the Revolution. Connolly denies that they were radical but says that many, including Cox, referenced the mutuality of oaths.⁴⁷ In certain polemics it is possible to see references to mutuality and emphasis on allegiance related to subjects’ liberties without advocating resistance.⁴⁸ Robert Eccleshall describes William King’s *State* as ‘pure Locke.’⁴⁹ Chapters Two and Three showed how King justified allegiance to William with Non-Resistance and Conquest ideas but he also referenced a ‘Compact.’ King said that there was ‘mutual consent’ in allegiance but ‘inconvenient’ acts did not warrant breaking allegiance.⁵⁰ James’s ‘absolute Power’ invaded the ‘Liberties and Fortunes of his Protestant Subjects’ in Ireland.⁵¹ William rescued Irish Protestants and their liberties, which partially justified allegiance to him.⁵² The Tory Cox also spoke of mutuality in oaths.⁵³ He described allegiance and

⁴³ Ibid, pp.57-8.

⁴⁴ Ibid, pp.57-8, 17-8.

⁴⁵ Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.192-4, 198-205. See Chapters One and Three.

⁴⁶ James Kirkpatrick, *An Historical Essay upon the Loyalty of Presbyterians In Great-Britain and Ireland from the Reformation to this Present Year 1713...* (n.p., 1713), pp.19, 391-2. See Chapter Two for Presbyterian criticisms of Anglicans for commitment to Non-Resistance and Chapter Five for more Irish Presbyterian views on allegiance and the Revolution.

⁴⁷ Eccleshall, ‘Anglican Political Thought in the Century after the Revolution of 1688,’ pp.67-72; Connolly, ‘The Glorious Revolution in Irish Protestant Political Thinking,’ pp.41, 51-3.

⁴⁸ See Chapters One, Two, Three.

⁴⁹ Robert Eccleshall, ‘Anglican Political Thought in the Century after the Revolution of 1688,’ in George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Thought in Ireland since the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1993), pp.48-50, 57-60.

⁵⁰ William King, *The State of the Protestants of Ireland...* (London, 1691), pp.67-9, 76, 79-82, 88-96, 165-6, 225-8.

⁵¹ Ibid, pp.42-3, 49-50, 164-7, 205-7.

⁵² Ibid, pp.10-1, 225-8, 239-42.

⁵³ S.J Connolly, ‘Cox, Sir Richard, first baronet (1650-1733)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/6527>, accessed 9 Feb. 2014]; Connolly, *Divided Kingdom*, pp.216-7, 226-8.

protection as ‘reciprocal’ and while noting that liberties were an issue his main focus was using History to advocate allegiance to William.⁵⁴ Like Grant and Long, Cox and King focused on William’s enthronement as *de facto* King, which protected liberties without constitutional change.⁵⁵

Some non-radicals adopted language emphasising how allegiance was linked to monarchs guaranteeing subjects’ liberties. Whigs frequently called this a Contract but it was not their exclusive property. Between 1689 and 1692 subjects’ liberties were a feature of many allegiance polemics but other theories, like History, Non-Resistance, and Conquest, were more prominent at this time. From 1692-3 with Conquest theories and William increasingly unpopular and Court-Country divisions dominating politics, this language became more prominent in discourse on allegiance.

II

Chapter Three showed how criticisms of Conquest theories reached a crescendo by 1692-3.⁵⁶ Allegiance polemics from 1689 to 1693, as Chapters One through Three showed, focused on William being *de facto* King but from 1693 there was a different emphasis when describing allegiance and the Revolution. Across the Kingdoms the Revolution was increasingly described as having changed the monarchy for the benefit of subjects’ liberties as well as who wore the Crown. This changed emphasis coincided with the rise of the Court-Country dichotomies. Country polemics frequently said that allegiance to William was justified because he supposedly guaranteed liberties but parts of his government were actually undermining liberties. This was partly to gain political advantage but also shows the growing popularity of linking allegiance to William with subjects’ liberties. Allegiance to William, they claimed, symbolised supporting the Revolution that changed what was a tyranny under James into a monarchy protecting liberties. William’s Court supporters responded to Country platforms by presenting continued allegiance to William

⁵⁴ Sir Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana, or, The History of Ireland...* (London, 1689), ‘To their Most Excellent Majesties William and Mary...’, pp.56-7. See Chapter One.

⁵⁵ See Chapters One through Three for more on Cox and King’s primary ideas in justifying allegiance.

⁵⁶ *The Jacobite Hudibras Containing the late King’s Declaration in travesty* (London, 1692), pp.1-2; Samuel Grascome, *New Court-Contrivances; or, More Sham-Plots still, against true-hearted Englishmen* (n.p., 1693), pp.2, 4-6. See Chapter Three.

as preserving subjects' liberties and denying that parts of his government were undermining liberties. English Whig Sir Richard Blackmore described both Court and Country platforms as passionate about liberties and allegiance.⁵⁷ Although many of these polemics dealt with various issues their comments on allegiance and the Revolution show how opinions had evolved.

In England most Whigs supported the Whig 'Junto' government. There has been debate over whether Whig-Tory or Country-Court was the main English political division in the 1690s. The Country platform consisted of anti-Junto Whigs and Tories sharing concerns over issues like taxes, corruption, standing armies, and expanding executive power. They believed these infringements on liberties showed that the Revolution was incomplete.⁵⁸ Scottish Country polemics had similar grievances.⁵⁹ David Hayton notes the late-1690s emergence of an Irish Country platform.⁶⁰ Country-Court divisions did not replace traditional political divisions but added another dimension to the Kingdoms' existing mid-1690s factionalism. Hoppit compellingly argues that there was no formal Country party but a 'persuasion' of common grievances.⁶¹ Gabriel Glickman argues that the Country platform emerged when English parties were trying to dissociate themselves from ideas supporting absolutism and claim ownership of the Revolution. Being perceived as defending liberty garnered political advantage and public support.⁶² Some historians highlight Jacobite attempts to exploit this popular Country discontent.⁶³ The 1695 expiry of the Licensing Act and 1697 Ryswick Peace Treaty with France allowed polemicists more freedom of expression when discussing the Revolution, compelling William to be more attuned to subjects'

⁵⁷ Sir Richard Blackmore, *A Short History of the Last Parliament* (n.p., 1699), pp.14-6.

⁵⁸ Gabriel Glickman, 'Political Conflict and the Memory of the Revolution in England, 1689-c.1745,' in Harris & Taylor (eds.) *Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy*, pp.258-60; J.A. Downie, *Robert Harley and the Press...* (Cambridge, 1979), pp.20-33; D.W. Hayton, 'The "Country" interest and the Party System,' in Clyve Jones (ed.) *Party and Management in Parliament, 1660-1784* (New York, 1984); Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2006), pp.22-5, 50, 182-5, 255-6; Rubini, *Court and Country*, passim; Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, pp.191-226.

⁵⁹ Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.13-4, 35-6, 42-4, 55-8, 217-9; Paul Hopkins, *Glencoe and the end of the Highland War* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.488-99; Alasdair Raffae, 'Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics after the Revolution of 1688-1690,' *The Historical Journal*, 53, No. 2 (2010), pp.318-9.

⁶⁰ Hayton, *Ruling Ireland*, pp.38-45.

⁶¹ Hoppit, *Land of Liberty?*, pp.155-9.

⁶² Glickman, 'Political Conflict and the Memory of the Revolution,' pp.257-62.

⁶³ Ibid, pp.253-6; Monod, 'Jacobitism and Country Principles,' pp.290-303; Goldie & Jackson, 'Williamite Tyranny and Whig Jacobites,' pp.177-83; Macinnes, 'William of Orange- "Disaster for Scotland"?', pp.220-3.

views.⁶⁴ Across the Kingdoms the Country polemicists complained about aspects of William's government but publicly they generally remained Williamites. Guaranteeing liberties was central to their idealized views of allegiance and the Revolution. Some Country figures called their arguments Contractual but others opposed to Whig radicalism also used language about allegiance to William supporting a monarchy protecting liberties, which shows how public rhetoric had changed.

With some English Country polemics expressing disappointment with William's government there has been confusion over some pamphlets. Some historians describe the 1694 *Honest Commoner's Speech* as Jacobite while others describe it as Country criticism of William without labelling it Jacobite.⁶⁵ *Honest Commoner's Speech* was ambiguous in parts but it also praised the Revolution for protecting subjects' liberties, which justified allegiance to William. William came not 'for a Crown, but our Safety....'⁶⁶ The Revolution was to guarantee the 'freedom of an English Man' but parts of William's government were 'Defective' in this and reminiscent of James's tyranny. William appointed questionable ministers, including some who served James, who undermined liberties in various ways. One example was suspending *Habeas Corpus* 'though the Liberty of it be declared a Fundamental Right....' Another example was Scotland being ruled in 'Violation of the Conditions upon which they presented the King with the Crown of *Scotland*....' Court corruption and the cost of the war in Ireland were other examples.⁶⁷ Such acts damaged subjects' 'Rights.' The author warned that William's government should remember 'King *James's* Fate' and wanted subjects' rights protected regardless of which King triumphed. William's government should 'Rule by' the promises in his 1688 Declaration, 'the *Original Contract* of' his government.⁶⁸ This pamphlet advocated that Parliament take advantage of William needing supply to oblige his government to address grievances and fully protect subjects' 'Rights.'⁶⁹ Despite flirting

⁶⁴ Pincus, *1688*, pp.440-5; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.343-9, 407-8, 484-6, 649-50; Troost, *William III, the Stadholder-King*, pp.228-37; Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance*, p.225.

⁶⁵ Glickman, 'Political Conflict and the Memory,' pp.260-2; Goldie & Jackson, 'Williamite Tyranny and Whig Jacobites,' pp.184, 194, 196; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.491-3; James Jay Carafano, 'William III and the Negative Voice,' *Albion*, 19, No. 4 (Winter, 1987), p.521.

⁶⁶ *An Honest Commoner's Speech* (n.p., 1694), p.3.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, pp.3-5.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, pp.6-7.

⁶⁹ *Ibid*, pp.3-5.

with Jacobitism to gain concessions from William's government this pamphlet still praised and promoted the idea that the Revolution secured liberties. It emphasised that allegiance to William should guarantee subjects' 'Rights' in a 'Contract' but his government needed improving to make it more in line with that idea of the Revolution introducing a government protecting liberties.

Other English Country polemicists made similar statements but had stronger expressions of loyalty to William. The Whig Earl of Warrington described differences between monarchical government under James and William. After the Revolution the 'King's Will' was no longer a 'measure of our Obedience.' The Revolution changed the monarchy by ending their ancestors' struggles 'to preserve our Liberties' against royal absolutism.⁷⁰ There have been suggestions that Warrington privately flirted with Jacobitism.⁷¹ While complaining about aspects of William's government infringing liberties Warrington still publicly proclaimed loyalty to William. He said the failure of Jacobite plots was a 'mercy' because England was preserved from James returning with 'Popery and Arbitrary Power.'⁷² William's monarchy was meant to be different to James's 'Arbitrary Power.' Warrington's Country polemic accentuated this idea that allegiance to William supported a Revolution protecting liberties even if parts of his government had so far failed in this.

In 1699 Richard Kingston was a Williamite pamphleteer desperate to improve his finances as a polemicist.⁷³ His *Tyranny Detected, and the Late Revolution Justify'd* expressed popular Whig Country disappointment over an incomplete Revolution and said that subjects' 'Satisfaction in our *New King*' had 'vanish'd.' Some ministers were using the 'very *Tools* that assisted the *late King* in subverting their *own Religion*, and the *Civil Rights*.' James and England were 'happy' together until James 'violated his Oaths and Promises' by subverting Protestantism and 'Civil Rights.' The Revolution was about

⁷⁰ Henry Booth, Earl of Warrington, *The Charge of the Right Honourable Henry Earl of Warrington to the Grand Jury at the Quarter Sessions held for the County of Chester on the 11th of October, 1692* (London, 1693), pp.19-20, 1-3, 7-9.

⁷¹ Mark Knights, 'Uncovering a Jacobite Whig? The Commonwealth Principles of Henry Booth, 1st Earl of Warrington' in Clyve Jones (ed.) *British Politics in the Age of Holmes*, Special Issue of *Parliamentary History* (2009), pp.59-87.

⁷² Booth, Warrington, *The Charge*, pp.3-6.

⁷³ W.A.J Archbold, 'Kingston, Richard (b. c.1635, d. 1710?)', rev. M.E. Clayton, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article15627, accessed 5 May 2014].

‘Rights.’⁷⁴ If subjects’ liberties continued to be compromised with James-style government it could enflame popular discontent and undermine William. Despite this criticism Kingston, like Warrington, reasserted loyalty to William. The Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy subjects had taken since 1689 prevented James returning to ‘Ruin’ England.⁷⁵ It was ‘Nonsense’ to believe that James would secure liberties given his previous broken promises.⁷⁶ William’s monarchy, while needing improvement, protected subjects’ ‘Rights’ better than James-style tyranny; therefore allegiance to William supported subjects’ ‘Rights.’

Some issues were a lightning-rod for Country anger. The post-Ryswick standing army was one issue seen as threatening English liberties because it was seen as a potential instrument of tyranny and William maintained it for longer than parliament authorised.⁷⁷ Irish-born Country Whig John Trenchard argued that a standing army was inconsistent with the notion that the Revolution guaranteed liberties. Trenchard believed that ‘the most likely way of restoring King *James*, is maintaining a Standing Army to keep him out.’⁷⁸ Armies were an affront to liberties. The Revolution witnessed a ‘glorious Deliverer’ protecting subjects from James’s tyranny. In 1689 William and the Convention showed ‘Bravery’ by preserving ‘our Liberties’ and Protestantism.⁷⁹ Maintaining an army, after Ryswick ended hostilities with France, contradicted ‘the Preservation of our Laws and Liberties’ at the Revolution.⁸⁰ Subjects’ loyalty, which was assured with guaranteed liberties, provided better security than any army. ‘For the King’s Safety stands upon a Rock whilst it depends upon the solid Foundation of the Affections of the People....’ William maintaining an army against subjects’ wishes would hardly endear him in their ‘Affections.’⁸¹ Trenchard wanted the army disbanded and

⁷⁴ Richard Kingston, *Tyranny Detected, and the Late Revolution Justify’d...* (London, 1699), pp.24-5.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.94-7, 28-9, 66-7.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p.29.

⁷⁷ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p.492; Lois G. Schwoerer, *No Standing Armies: The Antiarmy ideology in Seventeenth-Century England* (London/Baltimore, 1974), passim; Rubini, *Court and Country*, pp.133-56.

⁷⁸ John Trenchard, *An Argument, Shewing, that a Standing Army is Inconsistent with a Free Government, & Absolutely destructive to the Constitution of the English Monarchy* (London, 1697), pp.27-8.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p.29.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.22-3, 14.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp.27-8.

to do this he argued that William was given allegiance on the understanding that his government guaranteed liberties.

Concern over liberties and traditional notions of Contract are generally associated with Whigs.⁸² However Tories were also prominent in the Country platform, sharing concerns with Country Whigs over subjects' liberties.⁸³ Glickman describes this as part of popular moves away from absolutist language by Tories and Jacobites.⁸⁴ Tory Country polemicists expressed loyalty to William while seeking changes in government policy with rhetoric similar to Country Whigs but often without calling it a Contract. Sir Bartholomew Shower complained that the 'Court is too Arbitrary.'⁸⁵ Shower was a Tory MP with Jacobite sympathies.⁸⁶ However his 1692 *Reasons for a New Bill of Rights* reflected the changing rhetoric on the Revolution; it promulgated the idea that allegiance to William was to protect subjects' liberties. Suspending *Habeas Corpus* and the Bill of Rights' weakness in securing liberties 'must make the Government lose ground by narrowing of its bottom.' Undermining subjects' liberties would 'alienate Affections of the People, and this hath been found true in Three Reigns already within our Memory....'⁸⁷ This was an ominous warning but Shower portrayed the Revolution as supposedly bringing a monarchy under William that protected liberties, justifying loyalty to William but his government had to improve on this to guarantee subjects' loyalty.

Charles Davenant was a Tory who lost offices in 1689 because of perceived closeness to James.⁸⁸ By 1700 Davenant described 'the late Revolution' as justified by 'Necessity, and the Good it has produc'd.'⁸⁹ Davenant repeatedly said monarchical duties to subjects, especially the protection of liberties, were part of allegiance. There were 'Links of Protection

⁸² John Marshall, 'Whig Thought and the Revolution of 1688-91,' in Harris & Taylor (eds.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy*, passim.

⁸³ Wout Troost, *William III and the Stadholder-Kind*, pp.225-7.

⁸⁴ Glickman, 'Political Conflict and the Memory of the Revolution,' pp.257-64.

⁸⁵ Sir Bartholomew Shower, *Reasons for a New Bill of Rights...* (London, 1692), pp.8-11.

⁸⁶ Robert J. Frankle, 'Shower, Sir Bartholomew (1658-1701)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25471>, accessed 5 Feb 2014].

⁸⁷ Shower, *Reasons*, pp.12-4, 22-3, 28-9.

⁸⁸ Julian Hoppit, 'Davenant, Charles (1656-1714)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7195>, accessed 17 Feb 2014].

⁸⁹ Charles Davenant, *A Discourse upon Grants and Resumptions showing how our Ancestors have proceeded with Such ministers as have procured themselves grants of the Crown-Revenue...* (London, 1700), pp.23-4.

and Obedience, which should hold Prince and People together.’ Davenant then listed examples from Ancient Rome to James of rulers ousted because they tyrannically ‘invaded’ subjects’ ‘Liberties.’⁹⁰ Taxes and standing armies, issues in 1688-9 and 1700, were not ‘consistent with our Civil Rights.’⁹¹ However expressing discontent was not disloyalty because these issues could be resolved ‘without bringing any Reflection upon the King, whose Honour above all things ought to be regarded....’⁹² Davenant said William had to rule in accordance with subjects’ desires, especially protecting liberties, in order to have subjects’ ‘Obedience’ but did not label this a Contract. This was another Tory asserting that the Revolution changed a tyranny under James to a monarchy under William respecting subjects and their liberties, which earned him allegiance.

Welsh Tory lawyer Robert Price supported the Revolution but pre-Revolution service for James cost him election to the Convention.⁹³ His 1695 Commons’ speech opposing William’s redistributing Welsh land contained notions of allegiance based on guaranteeing subjects’ liberties and shows how public opinions on the Revolution evolved amongst the politically involved. Like other Country Tories, Price adopted rhetoric on the Revolution, which contrasted with Tories’ more conservative language in 1689-92 but was even more explicit than Davenant or Shower.⁹⁴ Price described ‘our Welsh Original Contract... of so long a standing’ between English monarchs and Welsh subjects and the ‘Contract made not above seven or eight Years’ ago with William. The 1689 ‘Bill of Rights and Liberties’ was ‘the Foundation of’ William’s government. A ‘unanimous’ Commons’ address supported Price demanding William abandon redistributing these lands because it expanded his prerogative thereby infringing subjects’ liberties.⁹⁵ David Onnekink contends that William abandoned these redistributions because Price capitalised on the Country platform’s popular xenophobia towards William’s Dutch advisors, the

⁹⁰ Ibid, pp.14-24, 86-8, 96-7.

⁹¹ Ibid, pp.24-5, 389-93.

⁹² Ibid, p.393.

⁹³ Stuart Handley, ‘Price, Robert (1655-1733)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2007 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22763, accessed 5 May 2014].

⁹⁴ See Chapters One through Three for more on the conservatism between 1689 and 1692.

⁹⁵ ‘The Third Parliament of King William: First Session- begins 22/11/1695,’ *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume 3: 1695-1706 (Chandler’s)* (1742), pp.1-25. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=37654>. Date accessed: 16 February 2014.

grants' intended beneficiaries.⁹⁶ However this overlooks the importance of allegiance, the Revolution and liberties to Price's speech and the Commons' address, which contributed to the political pressure forcing William's U-turn. English monarchs 'reigned best when they had the Affection of their Subjects' and monarchs were 'secure, when the People were sensible, that the King was intirely in their Interest....' Redistributing land without 'Consent of the Parliament' went against the 'Interest of the Crown' by undermining Parliament and subjects' liberties. William had subjects' 'Affection' or loyalty because his succession, with the Bill of Rights as its 'Foundation,' supposedly protected liberties.⁹⁷ Price's speech and the 'unanimous' Commons' support for him shows how, even amongst Tories, descriptions of allegiance increasingly promoted the idea that the Revolution was more than William replacing James. Allegiance or 'Affection' for William supported a monarchy protecting liberties. Price's speech was later published as a pamphlet showing some popularity for its sentiments.⁹⁸

From the mid-1690s William's government was unpopular. English Whigs and Tories in the Country platform complained about numerous aspects of William's government. Despite these grievances English Country polemicists publicly remained loyal to William and their descriptions of allegiance show how the political thought on the Revolution had changed since 1689-92. English Country polemicists said that they had given William allegiance because his government supposedly protected liberties when it was established at the Revolution. Some, like Price, explicitly called this a Contract but others refused to use the word Contract. However from the mid-1690s there was a common rhetoric emphasising allegiance to William as supporting the Revolution, which introduced or re-introduced a monarchy guaranteeing subjects' liberties in contrast to James's tyranny. The Revolution was now described as involving changes more significant than who wore the Crown. While this was to leverage government concessions on issues like land grants or standing armies, it also shows the evolving popular rhetoric on the Revolution. Chapters One through Three showed how polemics justifying allegiance to William focused on who was *de facto* King and their ability to

⁹⁶ David Onnekink, *The Anglo-Dutch Favourite: The Career of Hans Willem Bentinck, 1st Earl of Portland (1649-1709)* (Ashgate, 2007), pp.185-8, 194-5.

⁹⁷ 'Third Parliament of King William: First Session- begins 22/11/1695,' *Chandler's*, pp.1-25.

⁹⁸ Robert Price, *The Speech of a Bold Briton in Parliament...*(n.p., 1702).

provide a government. From 1693, with fears over liberties and William's increasing unpopularity, greater emphasis was put on how the monarchy changed from a tyranny under James to a monarchy under William that guaranteed liberties. English Country polemicists still proclaimed loyalty to William because they saw this act as supporting the Revolution's changes but were disappointed that his government was not protecting liberties as they had hoped. Irish and Scottish Country polemicists demonstrated similar evolutions of opinion on allegiance and the Revolution.

III

Mid-1690s Ireland also saw greater emphasis on allegiance to William being linked to subjects' liberties in the public discourse. Irish party groupings were harder to distinguish than English factions. Hayton says that a significant proportion of the Irish political nation subscribed to what can be described as Whiggish and Country principles.⁹⁹ William Molyneux's *Case of Ireland*, one of the foremost Irish Whig polemics, has been described as using 'Lockean' Contract theory.¹⁰⁰ Much of Molyneux's *Case* detailed William's legal right but the Contract he described, emphasising allegiance to William as guaranteeing liberties, was similar to the rhetoric that developed in England.¹⁰¹ Molyneux argued that Irish subjects gave 'Allegiance' to 'the King of *England*' because the *Magna Charta* for Ireland granted Irish subjects liberties.¹⁰² English parliamentary supremacy over Ireland went against the idea that the Revolution protected 'the Rights and Liberties of these Nations.'¹⁰³ Molyneux described these liberties as part of the 'Original Compact' between Irish subjects and English monarchs. Allegiance to William was partly justified by his guaranteeing subjects' liberties but England's

⁹⁹ Hayton, *Ruling Ireland*, pp.38-40, 45.

¹⁰⁰ J.G. Simms, 'The Establishment of Protestant Ascendancy 1691-1714,' in T.W. Moody & W.E. Vaughan (eds.) *New History of Ireland IV Eighteenth-Century Ireland 1691-1800* (Oxford, 1986), p.5; Jacqueline Hill, 'Ireland without Union: Molyneux and his legacy,' in John Robertson (ed.) *A Union for Empire: Political Thought and the British Union of 1707* (Cambridge, 1995), pp.279-80, 284-6; Mark Goldie, 'The English System of Liberty,' in Goldie & Walker (eds.) *Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, pp.54-5.

¹⁰¹ For Molyneux's use of Legal Right see Chapter Seven.

¹⁰² William Molyneux, *The Case of Ireland's being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England stated...* (Dublin, 1698), pp.44-7, 55, 61-71, 165-174.

¹⁰³ *Ibid*, pp.105-6, 115.

Parliament legislating for Ireland undermined these liberties.¹⁰⁴ A 1697 Irish Commons' resolution expressed similar views to Molyneux. The English Commons saw this resolution and Molyneux's *Case* as indicating worrying popular support for disobedience to England in Ireland.¹⁰⁵ English Whig John Cary denounced Molyneux's claim that there was a separate '*Compact*' between William and Irish subjects but accepted that William's 'Original Compact' with England guaranteed liberties in Ireland.¹⁰⁶ Liberties were now more prominent in describing the allegiance of subjects in Ireland even if Ireland's Country platform was not as easily discernible as England's Country platform.

Polemics by Francis Brewster and Richard Cox also show the changing rhetoric on the Revolution in Ireland. Irish Whig Brewster praised the Revolution for having 'restor'd us to our Religion, Estates and Liberties.' Like Molyneux, Brewster said that William's right and Contract with Ireland were separate to his English kingship. Allegiance to William was to support subjects' liberties but aspects of English government in Ireland were undermining these liberties.¹⁰⁷ The Tory Cox also linked allegiance to William with a monarchy protecting liberties. Cox feared subjects being 'subservient to the designs of a corrupt Court....'¹⁰⁸ Irish Protestants' liberties were being infringed by English government misrule. William should 'not let' Irish subjects' 'service to *England*' and 'zeal to their Religion, their Love to their Liberty' result in financial loss through English parliamentary suzerainty damaging Irish industry and liberties.¹⁰⁹ Chapter One showed how Cox used History to justify allegiance to William as *de facto* King without constitutional change. By 1698 he subscribed to rhetoric, increasingly popular in Anglican Ireland, about allegiance to William supporting the idea that the post-Revolution monarchy guaranteed subjects' liberties. Molyneux, Brewster and

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, pp.154, 156-7, 168-9.

¹⁰⁵ 'House of Commons Journal Volume 12: 30 June 1698,' *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 12: 1697-1699* (1803), pp.336-8. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=39667>. Date accessed: 11 August 2014.

¹⁰⁶ John Cary, *A Vindication of the Parliament of England in Answer to a Book, written by William Molyneux...* (London, 1700), pp.9-11, 20, 25-7, 60-1, 76-80, 109-22, 131-40.

¹⁰⁷ Sir Francis Brewster, *A Discourse Concerning Ireland...* (London, 1698), pp.38-9, 11-2.

¹⁰⁸ Sir Richard Cox, *Some Thoughts on the Bill Depending before the Right Honourable the House of Lords for Prohibiting the Exportation of the Woolen Manufactures of Ireland...* (Dublin, 1698), pp.7-8.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, p.16.

Cox, like English Country polemicists, sought to ensure that William's government was fully in accordance with that idea.

Irish Whig John Toland produced Country polemics that impacted on English and Irish politics.¹¹⁰ His views on Contract, allegiance and liberties were more extreme than most Whigs and Country polemicists; he defended actions against Charles I as subjects seeking to 'Assert their *Rights*, and Vindicate the *Laws* and *Liberties* of their *Country*.'¹¹¹ However his late-1690s pamphlets contained the popular rhetoric linking the Revolution, subjects' liberties and allegiance. Toland criticised pre-Revolution politicians who were 'the most vigorous Assertors of their Country's Liberty' but under William they fell 'in with the Arbitrary measures of the Court, and appear the most active Instruments for enslaving their Country....' Court figures were 'unfit to be trusted with' subjects' 'Liberties.' If subjects' liberties were continuously undermined it could make subjects weary of William and ultimately bring the restoration of James's arbitrary rule.¹¹² The Irish Commons' condemnation of Toland's *Christianity not Mysterious* forced him to move to England.¹¹³ One of Toland's defenders denounced this condemnation as contradicting the liberty to freely publish material, which the author believed the Revolution guaranteed. The author described Toland's argument for the 'impartial *Liberty* of writing and speaking whatever is not destructive of *Civil Society*' as advantageous to the Kingdoms.¹¹⁴ This pamphlet was another description of the Revolution as establishing a government guaranteeing liberties. 'JAMES the Second was justly abdicated... because he was an Enemy to the *People* for whom he was made a *King*....' William, 'our most Glorious Hero,' was 'the Restorer of Universal Peace and Liberty.' The '*People of Great Britain*' invested William 'with the Supreme Power.' William 'indefatigably employ'd' his power for subjects' 'good' by 'vindicating, settling, and enlarging their Civil and Religious Rights.' These pamphlets highlighted examples of the post-

¹¹⁰ Stephen H. Daniel, 'Toland, John (1670-1722),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27494, accessed 9 Oct 2014].

¹¹¹ John Toland, *A Defence of the Parliament of 1640 and the People of England against King Charles I and his adherents containing a Short Account of some of the many Illegal, Arbitrary, Popish and Tyrannical actions of King Charles I...* (London, 1698), 'To the Reader,' pp.53-4.

¹¹² John Toland, *The Danger of Mercenary Parliaments* (n.p., 1698), pp.1-4, 6-7.

¹¹³ Daniel, 'Toland, John (1670-1722),' *ODNB*.

¹¹⁴ *An Apology for Mr. Toland in a Letter for himself to a Member of the House of Commons in Ireland, written the day before his book was resolv'd to be burnt by the Committee of Religion...* (London, 1697), p.30.

Revolution polity undermining liberties that the post-Revolution monarchy was supposed to guarantee and that allegiance to William supported.¹¹⁵

Pincus describes Robert Molesworth's *Account of Denmark* as part of a popular campaign to ensure England supported liberties across Europe.¹¹⁶ However Molesworth was another Irish-born Whig who effused about subjects' liberties in a Contract between monarchs and subjects. His *Account* touched on the rhetoric about allegiance to William supporting the post-Revolution monarchy guaranteeing subjects' liberties.¹¹⁷ He described a perpetual contest between European monarchs and subjects over liberties. In the Three Kingdoms this contest ended in 1688-9 or at least that was what was 'pretended to by the late Revolution.' Arguments that the Constitution was not based on 'Original Contract' were 'derogatory to the present Government, and absolutely destructive to the legal Liberties of the *English Nation*....' Allegiance was related to guaranteed liberties in what Molesworth, unlike Cox, labelled a 'Contract.'¹¹⁸ His 1711 *Principles of a Real Whig* would expand on notions that the Revolution established liberty.¹¹⁹ Opponents attacked Molesworth's 'Original Contract' for showing 'Antimonarchical Distemper.'¹²⁰ However other critics acknowledged the link between liberties and allegiance to William while denouncing Molesworth's Contract. One attacked Molesworth's Contract but said 'Health and Liberty' were 'Two precious Jewels.' Another praised Molesworth's 'excellent' description of the Revolution rescuing liberties but criticised his Contractual resistance argument. Both critics agreed that loyalty to William guaranteed liberties.¹²¹ Controversy over Molesworth's *Account* shows there was still bitter debate over the validity of Contractual resistance. However both Molesworth and his opponents expressed the idea that subjects' liberties were an important part of allegiance to William. This shows how the Revolution was now popularly seen as more

¹¹⁵ Ibid, pp.13-7.

¹¹⁶ Pincus, *1688*, p.12; D.W. Hayton, 'Molesworth, Robert, first Viscount Molesworth (1656–1725)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18901>, accessed 1 May 2014].

¹¹⁷ Robert Molesworth, *An Account of Denmark as it was in the year 1692* (London, 1694), 'The Preface.'

¹¹⁸ Ibid, 'The Preface.'

¹¹⁹ Pincus, *1688*, p.12.

¹²⁰ Thomas Rogers, *The Common-wealths-man unmasqu'd, or, a Just rebuke to the Author of the Account of Denmark*... (London, 1694), pp.100-2.

¹²¹ Jadocus Crull, *Denmark Vindicated*... (London, 1694), pp.1-2; William King, *Animadversions on a Pretended Account of Denmark* (London, 1694), pp.195-6, 199-202, 'To Mr M---.'

than a monarchical personnel change with ideologically diverse polemicists employing this language.

Molesworth, Molyneux, Toland, Brewster, Cox and other polemicists provide evidence that Irish Anglican public opinions on the Revolution were evolving. Chapters One through Three showed how Irish Anglican Williamite allegiance polemics between 1689 and 1692 focused on William replacing James as *de facto* King. From the mid-1690s Irish Anglican Williamites, from Whig and Tory backgrounds, expressed what could be described as Country views similar to the English Country platform. They put greater emphasis on the idea that the Revolution changed the monarchy and allegiance to William was meant to support a monarchy guaranteeing subjects' liberties. Perceived infringements on subjects' liberties by parts of William's government prompted expressions of disappointment that the Revolution was incomplete and these issues needed addressing. These polemics indicate that in Irish political discourse, like English political opinions, greater emphasis was put on allegiance to William supporting the Revolution's changes to the monarchy, which protected subjects' liberties.

IV

Scotland's Country platform was one of the most intense in the Kingdoms and skilfully exploited popular grievances to compel changes in government policy.¹²² Throughout the seventeenth century Presbyterian Covenants were seen as promoting Contractual allegiance.¹²³ Historians have explored the influence of Covenants in post-Revolution Scottish politics and whether Scottish politics was becoming more secular from 1689.¹²⁴ Chapters Two, Five, Six, Seven, and Eight show how Presbyterian-Episcopalian antagonism and other religious issues and ideas impacted on Scottish allegiance debates and views on the Revolution. Like their English and Irish counterparts, Scottish Country polemics, while touching on religious matters,

¹²² Karin Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.13-28, 43-9.

¹²³ Cowan, *Scottish Covenanters*, passim; Macinnes, 'Covenanting Ideology in Seventeenth-Century Scotland,' pp.199-203.

¹²⁴ Macinnes, 'Covenanting Ideology Seventeenth-Century Scotland,' pp.199-203; Alasdair Raffé, 'Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics after the Revolution of 1688-1690,' *The Historical Journal*, 53, Issue 02 (June, 2010), pp.323-5.

generally focused on civil liberties when describing allegiance to William as supporting a monarchy protecting subjects' liberties. Many of these Scottish polemicists dealt with these important religious issues, like the Presbyterian establishment, separately to these civil liberties. The focus of this chapter is on how Scottish allegiance debates were affected by the changing perceptions of the post-Revolution monarchy and the impact on subjects' liberties. Burnet's comments on mid-1690s Scotland show that the Glencoe Massacre and Darien failure were political issues, which were separate to religious issues and debate over William's legal right. He lamented the 'fury' unleashed by Darien and how Glencoe, the 'greatest blot' of William's reign, had 'a very ill effect in alienating' many Scots from William.¹²⁵ Glencoe and Darien contributed to the Country platform's popularity.¹²⁶ As in England, the immediate Jacobite threat was lessened after Ryswick and allowed Country polemicists greater freedom of expression.¹²⁷ This resulted in Scottish Country polemicists declaring loyalty to William while criticising aspects of his government. Scottish Country polemics, like their English and Irish counterparts, provide evidence of a changed emphasis in the post-Revolution allegiance debates. This was partly to leverage concessions but shows how allegiance to William was increasingly seen as supporting changes to the monarchy.

Sir William Seton, a Country politician, denounced Darien as 'a *Jacobite Design*' to foster disloyalty to William.¹²⁸ Seton made this accusation in order to portray himself and Country polemicists as guardians of the Revolution. He claimed that Court denunciations of Country polemicists as disloyal were to frighten 'the People of *England*... into a Belief, that the *Jacobite Party in Scotland* is so formidable, that a Standing Army is necessary....'¹²⁹ This army would 'suppress the Liberty of both Nations' and ultimately bring William's dethronement because he would have failed to protect subjects' liberties as promised.¹³⁰ Seton still idealized William and the Revolution: 'His present Majesty hath done many great Actions, both for the

¹²⁵ Gilbert Burnet, *History of his own Time... Volume II* (London, 1734), pp.234-5, 156, 90. For more on religious issues and the legal right issue see Chapters Two, Five, Six, Seven and Eight.

¹²⁶ Alasdair Raffe, 'Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics after the Revolution of 1688-1690,' pp.318-9; Hopkins, *Glencoe*, pp.491-8.

¹²⁷ Whatley, *Scots and Union*, pp.2-3, 152-64, 179.

¹²⁸ Sir William Seton, *A Short Speech Prepared to be Spoken, By a Worthy Member in Parliament, Concerning the Present State of the Nation* (Edinburgh, 1700), p.14.

¹²⁹ *Ibid*, pp.14-5.

¹³⁰ *Ibid*, pp.97-9.

welfare of his Kingdoms, and for his own Reputation....'¹³¹ Under previous regimes subjects' 'Liberties' were 'exposed' until William secured them. Country polemicists were 'Jealous of the Peoples Liberties and Rights, and to be careful for the Publick Safety.'¹³² Seton's pamphlet described the Revolution as introducing a monarchy that guaranteed subjects' liberties, which allegiance to William supported. He wanted figures, like those responsible for Darien, dismissed because their actions were inconsistent with notions that the Revolution protected liberties and caused public discontent.

Country Whigs Andrew Fletcher and George Ridpath, who had criticised allegiance based on Conquest theories, also wanted grievances redressed to frustrate growing discontent. Both asserted that William was given allegiance in support of a monarchy protecting subjects' liberties but were disappointed by parts of William's government. Fletcher said that William's Coronation Oath meant his government was to be different from the preceding 'Arbitrary Power.'¹³³ He believed that without a completely Whig government the Revolution was incomplete.¹³⁴ Corruption led many politicians to 'Betray the Interest of this Nation.'¹³⁵ Parts of William's government were reminiscent of James's. If William's counsellors were true Williamites his government would not be acting this way.¹³⁶ William's ministers not supporting Darien went against Scottish subjects' wishes.¹³⁷ Fletcher denounced this example of William's English and Scottish ministers undermining liberties but did not blame William. William, 'our Deliverer,' would also 'Abominat... Dishonourable Ministers' who were 'Corrupting' officials to 'Betray' Scottish 'Liberties.'¹³⁸ Those ministers were 'enemies to the Liberties of this Country;' Fletcher associated such 'Arbitrary Power' with the 'Party of the late King James.'¹³⁹ English ministers ensured Darien failed and William, a 'just King' and 'Father of both countries,' should reflect 'upon the Oaths He has taken to

¹³¹ Sir William Seton, *The Interests of Scotland in Three Essays...* (n.p., 1700), p.40.

¹³² *Ibid*, pp.97-9.

¹³³ Andrew Fletcher, *Two Discourses Concerning the Affairs of Scotland...* (n.p., 1698), 'The First Discourse,' pp.39-41.

¹³⁴ Paul Henderson Scott, *Andrew Fletcher and the Treaty of Union* (Edinburgh, 1994), pp.46-8.

¹³⁵ Andrew Fletcher, *Some Thoughts Concerning the Affairs of this Session of Parliament* (n.p., 1700), pp.10-1.

¹³⁶ Fletcher, *Two Discourses*, 'The first Discourse,' pp.43-4.

¹³⁷ Andrew Fletcher, *A Short and Impartial View of the Manner and Occasion of the Scots Colony coming away from Darien...* (n.p., 1699), pp.3-5.

¹³⁸ Fletcher, *Some Thoughts concerning the Affairs of this Session of Parliament*, pp.9-11, 13.

¹³⁹ Fletcher, *Two Discourses Concerning Affairs*, 'The First Discourse,' pp.44-50.

both Kingdoms' and fix this iniquity between the Kingdoms.¹⁴⁰ James's government engaged in a 'Conspiracy against the Religion and Liberties of this Nation' before the Revolution ousted him. Glencoe and the standing army were other examples of ministers undermining William by infringing subjects' liberties.¹⁴¹ Parts of Fletcher's polemics asserted that some officials were deliberately undermining William by attacking liberties. Like Seton, he believed that allegiance to William was supporting his monarchy, which, unlike James's tyranny, guaranteed liberties.

Ridpath was one of the most prolific Scottish Williamites. When the Darien calamity dominated Scottish politics Ridpath denounced parts of William's government for infringing subjects' liberties by not supporting Darien but resolutely declared allegiance to William as guaranteeing liberties. William 'accepted our Crown upon those terms in the Claim of Right, promising to protect us from the *violation of those Rights we therein asserted, and from ALL OTHER ATTEMPTS upon our Religion Laws and Liberties....*'¹⁴² Scottish and English ministers neglected these obligations; their hostility to Darien impaired Scottish subjects' liberty from government interference in property as the Claim outlined.¹⁴³ Their refusing subjects' petitions also contravened the Claim. James was removed for such 'Maleadministration.'¹⁴⁴ Ridpath, like Fletcher, believed that highlighting government inconsistencies with the Revolution showed 'Loyalty, Moderation, and steady Affection towards that Government....'¹⁴⁵ 'King *William*, our great Deliverer' was not meant to be 'absolute' but 'pernicious Counsellors' took advantage of subjects' loyalty to introduce absolutism contradicting the post-Revolution monarchy.¹⁴⁶ Undermining liberties was part of a plot to make Scotland ungovernable and enable Jacobites to 'send over to St. *Germain*s and pray that the late King to return' to provide a government. This would ensure Protestantism's destruction and subjects having to 'condemn our Claim of Right to the flames, and abjure Parliaments for ever....' A restored James would govern with 'Absolute Power, uncontrollable Authority, Proclamations

¹⁴⁰ Fletcher, *Some Thoughts*, pp.6-7.

¹⁴¹ Fletcher, *Two Discourses Concerning Affairs*, 'The First Discourse,' pp.44-50.

¹⁴² George Ridpath, *Scotland's Grievances Relating to Darien &c., humbly offered to the Consideration of the Parliament* (n.p., 1700), p.25.

¹⁴³ *Ibid*, pp.25-7.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid*, pp.25-6, 9-10, 12-3.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid*, p.27.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid*, p.27.

casing and annulling all our Laws....’ Subjects would be forced to ‘promise’ James ‘Obedience without reserve.’¹⁴⁷ William’s government was supposed to be different to James’s. Ridpath and Fletcher still saw allegiance to William as supporting a monarchy protecting liberties but wanted aspects of his government, reminiscent of James’s reign, rectified in order to complete the Revolution.

Perceptions of the government not being attuned to subjects’ desires contributed to repeated Country attacks on parts of William’s government for undermining subjects’ liberties. The on-going economic catastrophe undermined notions that the Revolution protected subjects’ liberties.¹⁴⁸ Another pamphlet attacked Court figures as ‘Self-Interested People’ who ‘pretend’ to act in ‘the Interest of’ Scotland.¹⁴⁹ Ministerial misrule and refusal to address subjects’ complaints led to Charles I’s regicide and James’s removal.¹⁵⁰ This author argued that ‘the Security of the King’s government is chiefly owing to the Affection of his Subjects....’¹⁵¹ Some Courtiers were fuelling disaffection and forcing subjects to support tyranny by not respecting subjects’ liberties. Scottish Country polemicists believed that allegiance to William was supporting the Revolution that introduced a monarchy guaranteeing subjects’ liberties in contrast to James’s tyranny. Whether the Revolution actually changed the monarchy is another debate.¹⁵² Scottish Country polemicists, like their English and Irish counterparts, felt short-changed by the post-Revolution government but still declared loyalty to William as supporting the post-Revolution monarchy protecting liberties. They just wanted problems rectified to complete the Revolution.¹⁵³ From the mid-1690s in Scotland, as in England and Ireland, there was greater emphasis on the idea that allegiance to William supported a monarchy guaranteeing liberties. This was in contrast to earlier allegiance polemics where the Revolution was described in minimalistic terms. The popularity of this changed

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, pp.51-2.

¹⁴⁸ *The People of Scotland’s Groans and Lamentable Complaints* (Edinburgh, 1700), pp.1-2.

¹⁴⁹ *Memorial to the Members of Parliament of the Court Party* (n.p., 1700), p.1.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid, pp.1-2.

¹⁵¹ Ibid, pp.3-4.

¹⁵² Glassey, ‘In Search of the Mot *Juste*,’ gives an overview of debates over the revolutionary nature of the Revolution.

¹⁵³ Ridpath, *Scotland’s Grievances*, pp.25-7; Fletcher, *Some Thoughts*, pp.9-11, 13; Seton, *Interests of Scotland*, pp.40, 97-9.

emphasis in the rhetoric on allegiance and the Revolution can be further seen by Court use of this language in response to Country platforms.

V

To counter Country polemicists' accusations Court polemicists denied that William's government was undermining subjects' liberties and asserted that his government was protecting liberties. This justified continued allegiance to William because it supported the changes to the monarchy, which had been tyrannical under James. The 1695 Scottish *Act for a Solemn Fast* appointed a national prayer day for William's military success. This, like many Williamite declarations since 1689, described William's succession as defending Protestantism 'and the Recovery and Establishment of the Rights, Liberties and Peace' in the Kingdoms and Europe.¹⁵⁴ William's response to the Scottish Parliament's 1697 congratulatory address on Ryswick continued associating his monarchy with liberties. William said it was always 'Our Chief Care, to Protect all Our Good Subjects, in the full and free Possession of their Religion, laws and Liberties....'¹⁵⁵ Monarchs frequently made statements about protecting liberties. However in response to Country disenchantment and William's potentially destabilising unpopularity Court polemicists argued that William's government had not undermined subjects' liberties. They argued that allegiance to William continued to support a government protecting subjects' liberties in contrast to the preceding tyranny under James, which could return if the discontent was not challenged.

Three of William's chief Scottish ministers used this argument in the late 1690s. Viscount Seafield, Scottish Secretary of State in the late 1690s, used this rhetoric in a 1698 speech to Scotland's Parliament promising to satisfy subjects by addressing issues like economic hardship. Under William subjects enjoyed 'Religion, Laws and Liberties' along with 'Presbyterian Government established in this Church which his Majesty has declared he will

¹⁵⁴ George Mackenzie, Viscount Tarbat, *The Laws and Acts made in the Fifth Session of the first Parliament of our Most High...Sovereign William, by the Grace of God, King of Scotland, England, France and Ireland...begun at Edinburgh, May 9. 1695...*(Edinburgh, 1695), 'Act for a Solemn Fast, May 16 1695,' pp.1-2.

¹⁵⁵ William III & II, *His Majesties Gracious Answer to the foresaid Letter* (Edinburgh, 1697).

maintain,' and laws passed 'for the Ease and Satisfaction of the Nation.'¹⁵⁶ High Commissioner to Parliament James Douglas, Duke of Queensberry, described William's succession as the 'most Seasonable and Acceptable Deliverance, that ever happened to a Nation....' William's 'chief Design' was 'to Preserve your *Religion, Laws and Liberties*, and the *Presbyterian Government* of this Church, as it is Established....'¹⁵⁷ Lord High Chancellor Patrick Hume, Earl of Marchmont, praised the 'great things' William achieved and which obliged 'perpetual gratitude' to William. Marchmont reminded subjects of William 'Rescuing and Establishing our Religion, Liberties and Laws' from 'the Great and Eminent Danger' under James.¹⁵⁸ James's monarchy attacked laws, liberties and religion whereas William's monarchy guaranteed these. Marchmont, Queensberry and Seafield feared subjects' disillusionment could threaten the post-Revolution government by encouraging Jacobites. They asserted that allegiance to William supported the post-Revolution monarchy protecting liberties in contrast to James's pre-Revolution tyranny.

Some Scottish Court polemicists realised that William's government undermining liberties was inconsistent with allegiance to William as supporting a monarchy protecting liberties and Jacobites could exploit this. One 1695 pamphlet accepted that it was 'evident to the conviction of the Nation' that Glencoe inhabitants were 'murdered... against the Laws of Nature and Nations... and the publick Faith.'¹⁵⁹ William's enemies would exploit this 'grossest cruelty' unless 'His Majesty and the Estates provide them a Remedy' because Glencoe was perpetrated 'under the colour of His Majesties Authority....'¹⁶⁰ To secure subjects' allegiance to William justice had to be carried out to free 'the Publick from the least Imputation which may be cost thereupon by Foraign Enemies' who said Glencoe exemplified William's

¹⁵⁶ James Ogilvy, Viscount Seafield, *The Speech of James Viscount of Seafield, Principal Secretary of State, and President to the Parliament of Scotland. On Tuesday the Nineteenth of July 1698* (Edinburgh, 1698), pp.3-4.

¹⁵⁷ James Douglas, Duke of Queensberry, *The Speech of James Duke of Queensberry, &c. His Majesties High Commissioner to the Parliament of Scotland, on Tuesday the twenty one day of May 1700* (Edinburgh, 1700).

¹⁵⁸ Patrick Hume, Earl of Marchmont, *The Speech of Patrick Earl of Marchmont, &c. Lord High Chancellor to the Parliament of Scotland on Tuesday 21 May 1700* (Edinburgh, 1700), p.2.

¹⁵⁹ *To his Grace, His Majesties High Commissioner, and the Right Honourable the Estates of Parliament. The Humble Supplication of John Mcdonald of Glencoe for himself, and in the name of Alexander Mcdonald of Achatriechator, and the poor Remnent that is left of that Family* (Edinburgh, 1695).

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

rule.¹⁶¹ Glencoe was not characteristic of William's rule protecting liberties but damaged his reputation amongst some subjects.¹⁶² Other Court polemicists dismissed Glencoe's potential impact. One printed account of Scotland's 1695 Parliament said the outrage 'comes to nothing' because Parliament 'concurred unanimously to serve the King and Country' despite 'desperat and uneasie *Jacobites*' who 'vaunt upon... Accidents' like Glencoe.¹⁶³ The author proclaimed his own 'steadfastness to the present Government' which was 'mild, merciful and peaceable' unlike James's 'Arbitrary and dispotick power.'¹⁶⁴ On-going political 'Differences' in Scotland 'would evanish' if William visited to remind subjects that his monarchy was better than James's. This would confirm subjects' allegiance to and affection for William.¹⁶⁵ These two pamphlets on Glencoe show that Scottish Court figures knew that Glencoe could negatively affect the perception of William's government protecting liberties and with it subjects' allegiance. However *Impartial Account* believed that most subjects would remain loyal to William despite this and French-Jacobite attempts to exploit it.

There was now a popular acknowledgement that the Revolution changed more than just the monarch as earlier Scottish Williamite pamphlets focused on, especially in 1689.¹⁶⁶ Both sides of Scotland's Country-Court divide asserted that allegiance to William supported the Revolution, which changed the nature of the monarchy. By the late 1690s there was greater emphasis on the idea that the Revolution changed a tyranny under James into a monarchy protecting subjects' liberties under William. From the mid-1690s William and his government were unpopular in Scotland and regularly criticised by Country polemicists but there was no alternative; James's pre-Revolution tyranny was still seen as far worse. Country and Court polemicists disagreed over whether William's government was fully in accordance with what was perceived as established at the Revolution but both argued that the post-Revolution monarchy was to guarantee subjects' liberties. Allegiance to William became a statement of support for the significant changes that the

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ *An Impartial Account of Some of the Transactions in Scotland, Concerning the Earl of Broadalban, Viscount and Master of Stair, Glenco-men, Bishop of Galloway, and Mr Duncan Robertson in a letter from a friend* (London, 1695), p.30.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid, pp.1-3, 15-6.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid, p.30.

¹⁶⁶ See Chapters One, Two, Three.

Revolution introduced. Concern for subjects' liberties and perceived changes to the monarchy, which now supposedly guaranteed liberties, was one of the most important issues in the Scottish allegiance debates and shows how political thought on the Revolution had changed. Scottish Court and Country platforms employing similar rhetoric on liberties and the changed monarchy show that the Revolution was now popularly regarded as more than a personnel change in Scotland. English Court responses to Country polemics indicate a similar trend in England.

Denis Rubini says that English Court politicians frequently denounced Country opponents as disloyal.¹⁶⁷ While some cast aspersions on Country polemicists English Court responses, like Scottish Court polemics, generally asserted that William's government had not undermined liberties. Allegiance to William supported a monarchy protecting subjects' liberties. English Whig Matthew Tindal believed that subjects needed reminding that it was 'their Duty as well as Interest, to bear True Faith and Allegiance' to William.¹⁶⁸ Sharpe describes Tindal's 1694 *Essay* as a Court response to the mid-1690s popular discontent in England.¹⁶⁹ In countering discontent Tindal tapped into the popular rhetoric about allegiance to William securing liberties. Subjects were 'obliged for the sake of their own Safety and Preservation to pay Allegiance where it is most for their own Interest and Advantage.'¹⁷⁰ Liberties were undermined when a ruler could not 'Protect his People.'¹⁷¹ At that point the 'Relation between Sovereign and Subjects is destroyed....' Tindal acknowledged that the ongoing war was burdensome but believed the cost was 'absolutely necessary' to 'secure Millions of Souls, Three nations, and their Posterity, from a Bondage both Spiritual and Temporal' offered by Jacobitism. This reminder was to ensure that subjects saw no alternative to allegiance to William.¹⁷² Tindal could not understand how some subjects refused 'to pay their allegiance to a King... by whom they have been secured from groaning under the worse of Slaveries....' William restored 'the great liberty and

¹⁶⁷ Rubini, *Court and Country*, passim.

¹⁶⁸ Matthew Tindal, *An Essay Concerning Obedience to the Supreme Powers, and the Duty of Subjects in all Revolutions with some Considerations touching the Present Juncture of Affairs* (London, 1694), 'The Introduction.'

¹⁶⁹ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.403-4.

¹⁷⁰ Tindal, *Essay Concerning Obedience*, pp.16-7.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid*, pp.5-8, 17.

¹⁷² *Ibid*, pp.67-8, 50-4.

freedom' that subjects enjoyed before James.¹⁷³ This meant 'it is the duty of all People to bear True Faith and Allegiance to the present Government.'¹⁷⁴ Tindal called this a 'Contract' and 'Compact' but again emphasised how the Revolution installed a monarchy protecting liberties.¹⁷⁵ The key difference between Tindal and Country polemicists was Tindal's belief that William's government had not undermined liberties.

From the mid-1690s most political factions wanted to be seen as guardians of the Revolution and subjects' liberties.¹⁷⁶ In 1689 radical Whig Samuel Johnson used Contractual resistance arguments to defend the Revolution.¹⁷⁷ His later pamphlets, while defending resistance, also described allegiance to William as guaranteeing liberties. Johnson openly called this a 'Contract' and criticised allegiance to conquerors for undermining subjects' liberties.¹⁷⁸ William's intervention in 1688-9 was a 'happy Necessity of assisting the People to assert their Rights.' Allegiance to William and Mary was justified because the Declaration of Rights guaranteed 'the Rights and Liberties of the Subjects.'¹⁷⁹ Responding to the Commons burning Burnet's *Pastoral Letter* for using Conquest theory, Johnson's *Notes upon the Phoenix Edition* again linked liberties with allegiance in what he explicitly called a Contract. James's tyranny was a 'Breach of Covenant' that 'made our Allegiance to him Impossible.'¹⁸⁰ The Revolution replaced James's tyranny with a monarchy that safeguarded Protestantism and subjects' rights. Therefore allegiance to William defended subjects' 'Liberties and Properties.'¹⁸¹ Johnson even called for allegiance to William as a *de jure*, rightful and lawful, King to cement the Revolution.¹⁸² Polemicists using ideas like Non-Resistance to defend allegiance to James undermined 'Civil Rights.'¹⁸³ Johnson continued defending resisting James; allegiance was 'Reciprocal,' a Contract. However

¹⁷³ Ibid, pp.51-4.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid, pp.67-8.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, pp.44, 48, 67-8.

¹⁷⁶ Pincus, *1688*, pp.281-2, 294-302, 414-9, 440-7.

¹⁷⁷ Samuel Johnson, *Remarks upon Dr. Sherlock's Book intituled The Case of Resistance...*(London, 1689), 'Preface,' pp.6-7.

¹⁷⁸ Samuel Johnson, *An Argument Proving that the Abrogation of King James by the People of England from the Regal Throne...was according to the Constitution...*(London, 1692), pp.15-6, 20-1. For more on Johnson's criticism of Conquest theories see Chapter Three.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid, pp.3-4, 30, 33-5, 48-9, 58-9.

¹⁸⁰ Samuel Johnson, *Notes Upon the Phoenix Edition of the Pastoral Letter Part I* (London, 1694), pp.34-7.

¹⁸¹ Ibid, pp.28-9, 46-50, 59-62, 106-10.

¹⁸² See Chapter Seven.

¹⁸³ Johnson, *Notes*, pp.28-9.

Johnson also described William's enthronement as the moment when a government guaranteeing liberties was introduced.¹⁸⁴ Allegiance to William supported these changes to the monarchy.

Parts of James Tyrrell's *Bibliotheca Politica* and *Brief Enquiry* also linked subjects' liberties with allegiance.¹⁸⁵ Julia Rudolph describes *Bibliotheca* as a 'paradigmatic expression' of Whig principles. She and J.P. Kenyon describe Tyrrell's Contract argument as more moderate and less explicit than Locke's.¹⁸⁶ Tyrrell's more moderate Contract theory also described allegiance to William as supporting a monarchy protecting liberties. James violating 'his *Original Contract* between him and his People' meant 'Subjects are discharged of Allegiance to him.'¹⁸⁷ His restoration would ensure 'Destruction of our Religion and Civil Liberties.' Allegiance to William supported a monarchy protecting Protestantism and liberties.¹⁸⁸ Tyrrell, like other Court polemicists, emphasised that the monarchy under James was tyrannical but the Revolution changed the monarchy. The post-Revolution monarchy guaranteed subjects' liberties. Subjects giving William allegiance would support and preserve these changes.

To undermine mid-1690s Country polemics Daniel Defoe, one of the most prolific English Whigs, expanded on his 1689 thesis where he linked allegiance, William and subjects' liberties.¹⁸⁹ He lambasted one Country author as being either a 'Grumbletonian' or 'down-right *Jacobite*.'¹⁹⁰ Country polemicists were not the '*Patriots*' they presented themselves as but Tory-Jacobites who 'Sacrificed our Religion and Liberties' under James and sought his restoration.¹⁹¹ James's return would 'make a Jest of Liberty and

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, pp.9-15, 20-2.

¹⁸⁵ Tyrrell, *Bibliotheca Politica*, 'The Preface to the Reader,' pp.4-5, 84-9, 114-6; idem, *A Brief Enquiry into the Ancient Constitution and Government of England...*(London, 1695), pp.10-1, 19, 22-3

¹⁸⁶ Julia Rudolph, *Revolution by Degrees James Tyrrell and Whig Political Thought in the Late Seventeenth Century* (Basingstoke, 2002), pp.9-15, 17-20, 66-9, 106-9, 166-7; J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (Cambridge, 1990), pp.19, 36-7, 47-50.

¹⁸⁷ Tyrrell, *Brief Enquiry*, pp.10-1, 19, 22-3, 72; idem, *Bibliotheca Politica*, 'The Tenth Dialogue,' pp.697-8.

¹⁸⁸ Tyrrell, *Bibliotheca Politica*, 'The Thirteenth Dialogue,' pp.942-5.

¹⁸⁹ Defoe, *Reflections*, passim.

¹⁹⁰ Daniel Defoe, *Some Reflections on a Pamphlet lately published entitled An Argument shewing that a Standing Army & is Inconsistent with a Free Government...*(London, 1697), pp.1-2.

¹⁹¹ Daniel Defoe, *The Life of that Incomparable Princess, Mary, our late Sovereign Lady...who departed this life...the 28th of December, 1694* (London, 1695), pp.53-4; idem, *The Six Distinguishing Character of a Parliament-Man address'd to the Good People of England* (London, 1700), p.18; idem, *The Englishman's Choice...*(London, 1694), pp.3-5.

Property....'¹⁹² Politicians and readers should 'value a Prince who is faithful to the Liberty and Interest of his Country....'¹⁹³ Defoe believed that subjects needed 'only a general Hint to refresh their Memory' of pre-Revolution tyranny under Charles and James.¹⁹⁴ In 1688 William arrived with 'two Tablets of the Law engraven upon his Sword, RELIGION and RIGHTS....' This 'potent... Commission' meant he was unopposed. William received the 'Gratitude of the Nation' who enthroned and supported him.¹⁹⁵ To Defoe 'no Man, who understands the Constitution of this *Monarchy*, can be against the *present Government* out of *principle*.'¹⁹⁶ The Revolution secured liberties under William: 'can *Englishmen* see any anchor for their hopes and expectations of Good to the Publick but in *King William*.' Allegiance to William was resisting 'the Enemies to the *English Liberties*.'¹⁹⁷ Defoe saw Country disenchantment as encouraging Jacobitism and undermining William and liberties by not giving William enthusiastic loyalty.

Other English Court polemicists were more conciliatory to the Country platform but had similar rhetoric about allegiance to William supporting a Revolution that introduced a monarchy protecting liberties without labelling it Contract. Blackmore's 1699 *Short History of the Last Parliament* acknowledged that Court and Country platforms wanted to protect the Revolution and subjects' liberties. He admitted that complaints about taxes, standing armies and corruption were 'not for overturning' William's government but 'for distressing and streight'ning it.'¹⁹⁸ Country rhetoric had similarities with 'known Enemys of the Government' except on 'overthrowing the present Settlement, and the Restoration of the late King.' Blackmore saw Court-Country divisions as a false division because the Revolution 'alter'd' things to the extent that 'the Interest of their Country was plainly the same with that of the Court....' William sought to maintain the 'Principles of Liberty by which the Government was brought about....' His monarchy protected liberties; this was a terrific change from James's reign. Subjects 'could never

¹⁹² Daniel Defoe, *A Dialogue Betwixt Whig and Tory, alias Williamite and Jacobite Wherein the Principles and Practices of each party are fairly and impartially stated...* (London, 1693), p.6.

¹⁹³ Defoe, *Six Distinguishing Characters of a Parliament-Man*, p.18.

¹⁹⁴ Defoe, *A Dialogue betwixt Whig and Tory*, p.6.

¹⁹⁵ Defoe, *The Life of that Incomparable Princess*, pp.54-5.

¹⁹⁶ Defoe, *The Englishman's Choice*, pp.13-5.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid, pp.19-21.

¹⁹⁸ Blackmore, *A Short History of the Last Parliament*, p.14.

expect any other more favourable to them, either in their Civil or Religious Interests' than William. The 'Preservation of their Religion, Laws and Libertys, was inseparably interwoven with that of the Government.'¹⁹⁹ *Ratio Ultima* similarly said allegiance could only go to William because James's tyranny only offered the 'Propagating his Faith, and our Ruine.'²⁰⁰ These Court polemics show how popular the emphasis on allegiance to support the Revolution's establishing a monarchy protecting liberties had become with both sides of the Court-Country divide employing it.

Scottish and English Court responses to Country polemics provide evidence of the evolving opinions on the Revolution in the Kingdoms. Between 1689 and 1692 allegiance to William was justified with different ideas on the basis that he was *de facto* King without extensive changes to the monarchy. As Chapter Three showed there were growing popular fears from 1692-3 about Jacobite plots and concerns that allegiance to a Conqueror could create a tyranny undermining subjects' liberties. Court and Country polemicists put greater emphasis on the Revolution changing the monarchy along with the monarch and allegiance to William supported these changes. Under James the monarchy was a tyranny; William's enthronement transformed this into a monarchy protecting subjects' liberties. Some, like Tyrrell and Toland, labelled this a Contract but others from more conservative backgrounds, like Davenant, used this same rhetoric often without calling it Contract or endorsing radical resistance. Many Country polemicists used this rhetoric to build political pressure and gain concessions but it also shows how opinion on allegiance and the Revolution had evolved. Substantial and growing sections of the politically involved across the Kingdoms were now embracing the Revolution as having changed more than just the monarchy and allegiance to William supported these changes. This was in contrast to the prevalent conservatism of 1689-92 described in Chapters One through Three.

One 1695 English Court pamphlet, *The Spirit of Jacobitism*, denounced a Jacobite pamphlet, *A Dialogue Between K.W. and Benting*, for trying to exploit disillusionment in England. *Spirit of Jacobitism*, like other English Court polemics, said that allegiance was 'inseparably appendent to' the

¹⁹⁹ Ibid, pp.14-6.

²⁰⁰ *Ratio Ultima: For a Full Compliance with the Present Government argued In a Letter to a Person of Honour in the Country, under Dejection on the Account of Peace* (London, 1697), pp.3-4, 15-7.

‘trust and power to Rule and defend his People.’²⁰¹ This meant that in 1688-9 when subjects ‘were out of Humour with King *James*’ and his tyranny allegiance was given to William. Although subjects were ‘much displeased with K. *William*’ if they ‘had K. *James* again, I am apt to think in a little time K. *William* will be the desirable and long look’d for Man again.’²⁰² This Court pamphlet acknowledged popular discontent but asserted that allegiance to William was better for subjects than James because William’s government protected subjects and their liberties. The adoption of this rhetoric by opposing Williamite factions attests to the growing popularity of the emphasis on changes to the monarchy at the Revolution as opposed to just the personnel change. However *Spirit of Jacobitism*’s attack on *A Dialogue* recognised that Jacobites were attempting to exploit disappointment with the Revolution and the greater public emphasis on linking allegiance, the Revolution and liberties.

VI

A Dialogue between K.W. and Benting imagined William in conversation with his confidant, William Bentinck, Earl of Portland.²⁰³ Onnekink says that *Dialogue* exploited rumours over William’s sexuality and popular xenophobia towards his Dutch advisors.²⁰⁴ To entice allegiance to James many mid-1690s Jacobite pamphlets tapped into the increasingly popular emphasis of linking allegiance with liberties, which some called Contract. *Dialogue* did this alongside criticising Conquest theories. According to *Dialogue* William and Bentinck would have preferred to exploit a fully conquered England but William was ‘sensible’ to portray himself as a ‘*Tenant at will, or by Curtesie*’ and could ‘be turned out at Pleasure’ by subjects.²⁰⁵ William realized that ‘many are not so willing to be deceiv’d as formerly they were’ by propaganda about William protecting liberties. Many subjects were on the brink of ‘utter Ruine’ and growing ‘desperate.’²⁰⁶ This caricature of William even admitted that ‘nothing can restore *Peace, Trade, and Safety* to

²⁰¹ *The Spirit of Jacobitism: or, Remarks upon a Dialogue between K.W and Benting in a Dialogue between Two Friends of the Present Government* (London, 1695), pp.6-9.

²⁰² *Ibid*, pp.8-9.

²⁰³ *A Dialogue Between K.W and Benting, Occasioned by his Going into Flanders after the Death of the Queen* (n.p., 1695), passim.

²⁰⁴ David Onnekink, *The Anglo-Dutch Favourite*, pp.188-96.

²⁰⁵ *A Dialogue Between K.W and Benting*, pp.7-8.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid*, pp.2-3.

the Nation but the *Restoration* of K. James....' England's 'Wearied People' would enthusiastically welcome James to end 'all the Broyls and bloody Wars in *Europe*....' This William said that he should 'have *forfeited* the Crown of *England*' if notions of the Revolution protecting liberties were followed.²⁰⁷ *A Dialogue* recognised that there was a greater emphasis in the public discourse on how the Revolution affected subjects' liberties and challenged Williamites arguing that William's government protected liberties. Jacobites from all backgrounds adapted this popular rhetoric linking allegiance with liberties to denounce the Revolution for deceiving subjects and establishing a tyranny. They portrayed allegiance to James and a Jacobite restoration as the only way to have a monarchy where subjects and their liberties were protected.

Several historians have highlighted Court fears over common grievances in Country and Whig Jacobite polemics. Whig Jacobitism has been credited with broadening Jacobitism's appeal beyond Nonjurors and Catholics.²⁰⁸ Historiography of Whig Jacobitism, and Jacobite ideology generally, focuses on these polemics within single-kingdom contexts while highlighting internal Jacobite ideological divisions between Whig and Nonjuring Jacobites.²⁰⁹ This neglects how Jacobitism across the Kingdoms was publicly united in their goal of restoring James despite internal divisions. Glickman briefly notes that by 1693 some Nonjurors, like Charles Leslie, adapted the theses of 1689 'radicals.'²¹⁰ However Jacobites, including Nonjurors, adapted the popular rhetoric that developed in the Three Kingdoms in the mid-1690s on allegiance to William supporting a monarchy protecting subjects' liberties. Jacobites exploited this emphasis on liberties and popular grievances to entice subjects to return allegiance to James. John Macky, a Williamite spy at St. Germain, published a pamphlet describing Jacobite machinations. Macky said that after La Hogue and the 1692 Declarations

²⁰⁷ Ibid, pp.3-5. See Chapters Three and Six for *Dialogue's* comments on Conquest and Catholics.

²⁰⁸ Goldie & Jackson, 'Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites,' pp. 177-99; Monod, 'Jacobitism and Country Principles,' pp.289-310; Glickman, 'Political Conflict and Memory,' pp.246, 259-61, 263; Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester, 1994), pp.53, 61, 68; Paul Hopkins, 'Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie,' in Eveline Cruickshanks & Edward Corp (eds.) *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995), pp.52-3, 56-8.

²⁰⁹ Goldie & Jackson, 'Williamite Tyranny and Whig Jacobites,' pp.177-81; Allan Macinnes, 'William of Orange- "Disaster for Scotland"?,' pp.220-3; Monod, 'Jacobitism and Country Principles,' pp. 293-310; Daniel Szechi, 'The Jacobite Revolution Settlement, 1689-1696,' *The English Historical Review*, 108, No. 428 (Jul., 1993), pp.610-28.

²¹⁰ Glickman, 'Political Conflict and the Memory of the Revolution in England,' p.259.

Jacobite polemicists deliberately changed emphasis to exploit popular disillusionment with William and portray James as a guardian of liberties.²¹¹

In doing this Jacobites across the Kingdoms condemned Williamite deceit on liberties to entice subjects' into allegiance to William. One Jacobite pamphlet denounced William's 1688 Declaration as 'notoriously a *Principal means to move the Hearts of the People...*'²¹² Allegiance to James would restore subjects' liberties. Leslie, Charlwood Lawton, Ferguson and others built on their criticisms of allegiance to William as a Conqueror to argue that the Revolution established a tyranny and allegiance to James supported a monarchy protecting liberties. Like their Williamite opponents, some called this a Contract while others used similar language and arguments but remained hostile to Contractual resistance. However they were united in depicting the Revolution as a lie and allegiance to James as supporting a monarchy that would actually guarantee liberties.²¹³

Lawton and Nathaniel Johnston were two of the first Whig Jacobites denouncing William with Contract arguments.²¹⁴ Johnston described grievances across the Kingdoms and how the way to restore subjects' liberties was to 'return to our known Duty, and call back our lawfull King' James.²¹⁵ James was 'a lover of his People... a Desirer of true Liberty to tender Consciencs, an Hater of all Injustice, and a true Father to his Countrey.'²¹⁶ Lawton lambasted Williamites who denounced James's tyranny but accepted William's tyranny. Whigs' 'Republican Reasons' justifying the Revolution were superseded by 'Tory methods to establish' William. Lawton cited William suspending *Habeas Corpus*, high taxes, and William's rule in Scotland, which 'violated the very Fundamentals of the Constitution,' as examples of William attacking liberties. This made 'more than a King James of King William.'²¹⁷ In 1688-9 'perpetual Dictatorship' was established just as the

²¹¹ John Macky, *A View of the Court of St. Germain, From the Year 1690...* (Dublin/Glasgow, 1696), pp. 7, 1, 11-2.

²¹² *The Fidelity of a Loyal Subject of the Kingdom of England: or, An Honest Act of Fidelity to King James, King William, And the Whole Kingdom* (n.p., 1698), pp.3-4.

²¹³ Charlwood Lawton, *A French Conquest Neither Desirable nor Practicable* (n.p., 1693), pp.1-2, 4, 8-13; Charles Leslie, *Gallienus Redivivus, or, Murther Will Out, &c. Being a True Account of the De-witting of Glencoe, Gafney, &c.* (Edinburgh, 1695), pp.22, 24; Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Account of Some of the late Incroachments and Depredations of the Dutch upon the English...* (n.p., 1695), pp.66-8. For more on Conquest see Chapter Three.

²¹⁴ Goldie & Jackson, 'Williamite Tyranny and Whig Jacobites,' pp.181-2, 187-8.

²¹⁵ Nathaniel Johnston, *The Dear Bargain...* (n.p., 1690), pp.5-18, 23-4.

²¹⁶ *Ibid*, p.24.

²¹⁷ Charlwood Lawton, *The English-Man's Complaint* (n.p., 1689), pp.1-2.

popular ‘thirst after Liberty’ during the Roman Republic established a tyrannical Empire.²¹⁸ It perplexed Lawton how ‘what we objected against King *James*, should be endured from a Stranger....’²¹⁹ Whigs should have been ‘more Explanatory about’ their ‘*New Original Contract*’ because William’s ‘Violation of the Conditions’ should mean subjects were ‘discharged’ of allegiance to him.²²⁰ As this language became more prominent from 1692-3 Jacobites would follow these early examples and frequently cited incidents from each Kingdom.

In the mid-1690s when Whig Jacobites Sir James Montgomery, Lawton and Ferguson were at their most prolific, their pamphlets had similar structures to Lawton and Johnston’s earlier pamphlets. There were three distinct parts to their pamphlets, which openly called the link between allegiance and liberties a Contract. First they denounced the Revolution as deceiving subjects with promises of liberty to get subjects to give William allegiance. Scottish Presbyterian Montgomery, who supported the Revolution in 1689, said that William’s promises to preserve liberties and Protestantism duped many subjects.²²¹ Ferguson, another ex-Williamite, attacked William’s ‘pretences’ of protecting rights and Protestantism to gain support. Some Scottish Williamites used the Claim of Right to justify transferring ‘their own and Peoples Allegiance’ but William violated this.²²² James was dethroned ‘upon pretended Miscarriages in his Government....’²²³ Lawton repeatedly denounced William for not rectifying ‘our Grievances’ as he promised.²²⁴ William’s government turned out to be ‘against all which Things the P. of O. his own *Declaration* inveighed, and our *Bill of Rights* provided....’²²⁵ These promises led subjects to believe that the Revolution would secure liberties.

The next part of these polemics was listing examples of William breaking his Contract by infringing subjects’ liberties thereby ending allegiance to him. Glencoe, suspending *Habeas Corpus*, expelling Nonjurors, refusing petitions, illegal trials, benevolence to Catholics, redistributing Irish

²¹⁸ Charlwood Lawton, *Honesty is the Best Policy* (n.p., 1689), pp.1, 4.

²¹⁹ Lawton, *The English-Man’s Complaint*, p.2.

²²⁰ Charlwood Lawton, *Better Late Than Never* (n.p., 1690), pp.1-2.

²²¹ Sir James Montgomery, *Great Britain’s Just Complaint... Second Edition* (Oxford, 1692), pp.32-3.

²²² Ferguson, *Brief Account*, pp.61-4.

²²³ Robert Ferguson, *A Letter to Mr. Secretary Trenchard...* (n.p., 1694), p.4.

²²⁴ Charlwood Lawton, *The Jacobite Principles Vindicated: In Answer to a LETTER sent to the AUTHOR* (London, 1693), pp.1-2.

²²⁵ Lawton, *French Conquest*, pp.16-7.

land, high taxes and other transgressions of the law were cited.²²⁶ Montgomery and Ferguson carefully differentiated between William's rule and James's. Ferguson argued that unlike previous reigns 'it is undeniable, there is a very *formal* and *explicite*' Contract 'between K. *William* and' English subjects. The Claim of Right was an even 'more *explicite*' Contract. This meant that subjects had 'a Legal Right as well as Cause to proceed to the deposing and abdicating' of William for undermining liberties.²²⁷ Montgomery said William's government had 'Strains of Absolute and Despotick Power, which King James's Reign did not furnish us with any Instances of the Like.'²²⁸ 'K. William's manifest Infractures of that Original Contract' in each Kingdom ended allegiance to him.²²⁹ English Jacobite John Ashton was executed in 1691 for plotting against William.²³⁰ Lawton claimed that Ashton not receiving a fair trial, 'one of the Articles of our new Original Contract,' was another example of William attacking the '*Rights of Subjects*.'²³¹ Supporting William would 'make *Slavery* Authentick' and 'bubble out all sense of *Liberty*.' Lawton asked Williamites whether '*Lives* Liberties and the Estates of Englishmen' were 'better guarded' with William.²³² All three polemicists demonstrated examples from each Kingdom of William's tyranny undermining liberties, which broke his Contract and ended subjects' allegiance to him.

The final part of these Whig Jacobite polemics was to present allegiance to James as restoring subjects' liberties. With subjects free 'from all Obligation of Fealty' to William, Ferguson said James's restoration would solve the Kingdoms' problems.²³³ Ferguson again combined this with criticism of Conquest theories. He argued that 'the *Dutch*' were terrified by potentially losing the Kingdoms 'either through the Prince of *Orange*'s Death, or through King *James*'s Restauration.' Such a prospect would see 'these Nations' no

²²⁶ Montgomery, *Great Britain's Just Complaint*, pp.25-6, 28-35; Lawton, *French Conquest*, pp.16-7, 24-5; idem, *The Vindication of the Dead: or, Six Hours Reflections upon the Six Weeks Labour in Answering Mr. Ashton's Speech...* (n.p., 1693), pp.1-2; Robert Ferguson, *A Letter to Mr. Secretary Trenchard*, pp.4-5; idem, *Brief Account*, pp.21-3, 29-38; idem, *A Letter to the Right Honourable Sir John Holt, Kt. Lord Chief Justice of the Kings Bench...* (London, 1694), pp.8-9.

²²⁷ Ferguson, *Letter to Mr. Secretary Trenchard*, p.4; Ferguson, *Brief Account*, pp.61-4.

²²⁸ Montgomery, *Great Britain's Just Complaint*, p.33.

²²⁹ Ibid, pp.57-8.

²³⁰ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.473-5.

²³¹ Lawton, *The Vindication of the Dead*, pp.1-2.

²³² Charlwood Lawton, *A Short State of Our Condition, with Relation to the Present Parliament* (n.p., 1693), p.1.

²³³ Ferguson, *Brief Account*, pp.31-3, 64-5. See Chapter Three.

longer ‘mised’ about liberties and post-Revolution government.²³⁴ Lawton argued that a ‘true lover’ of liberties was not a Williamite and ‘our *Oaths*, and the *Original Contract* of our Law Books, bind us to restore’ James who would ‘Redress’ grievances.²³⁵ Without James there would be a ‘Ruin of that *Liberty*.’ The way to ‘Restore your Rights’ was to ‘Restore your KING.’²³⁶ Montgomery agreed that ‘returning to our Duty, and restoring’ James ‘by as general a Consent as he was chased away by us’ was how to ‘restore Laws and Liberties’ and secure Protestantism ‘upon lasting and absolute Foundations.’²³⁷ These pamphlets had similarities with the mid-1690s Court and Country polemics, which put greater emphasis on monarchical protection of liberties in securing allegiance. Ferguson, Lawton and Montgomery used similar rhetoric, which they called a Contract, to assert that the Revolution deceived subjects and William broke his Contract by infringing liberties. Allegiance to William supported the Revolution that turned the monarchy into a tyranny. Restoring James and returning allegiance to him would undo the Revolution’s changes and restore a monarchy protecting liberties.

Montgomery has been credited with broadening Jacobitism’s appeal.²³⁸ Lawton praised Montgomery’s ‘excellent Book’ for showing ‘How willing’ James was ‘to redress our Grievances’ and countering misinformation about Jacobitism establishing tyranny.²³⁹ These pamphlets tapping into the popular rhetoric linking allegiance, the Revolution and subjects’ liberties worried Williamites. Luttrell feared the wide circulation and influence of Lawton’s *French Conquest*.²⁴⁰ However these arguments were no longer confined to Whig ideologues. Glickman says that Tories and Jacobites soon adopted Whig arguments within the Country platform but such tracts generally ‘sat incongruously with legitimist and non-juring’ arguments.²⁴¹ However many Nonjurors continued criticising explicit Contractual resistance arguments while adopting the rhetoric linking allegiance with monarchical protection of liberties, which Lawton and others called a Contract. These Nonjurors, like

²³⁴ Ferguson, *Brief Account*, pp.58-67.

²³⁵ Lawton, *Short State*, pp.1-2; idem, *Jacobite Principles Vindicated*, pp.6-7.

²³⁶ Lawton, *French Conquest*, pp.16-7, 24-5.

²³⁷ Montgomery, *Great Britain’s Just Complaint*, pp.41, 53-4.

²³⁸ Hopkins, ‘Sir James Montgomerie,’ passim.

²³⁹ Lawton, *French Conquest*, pp.6-8, 13, 1.

²⁴⁰ Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs From September 1678 to April 1714 Volume III* (Oxford, 1867), p.88.

²⁴¹ Glickman, ‘Political Conflict and Memory of the Revolution,’ pp.259, 263.

Whig Jacobites, denounced the Revolution for turning the monarchy into a tyranny and argued that allegiance to William supported a tyranny attacking subjects' liberties. Irish Nonjuror Charles Leslie mocked Whig Williamites' inability to 'find the *Original Contract*' anywhere in English history.²⁴² Yet Leslie condemned allegiance to William with language similar to Whig Jacobite and Country polemics. His 1692 *Answer* noted that the Glencoe 'Murderers are not punished.'²⁴³ He denounced expulsions of English and Irish Nonjurors and 'Cruelties... towards the *Loyal and Episcopal Party*' in Scotland. Leslie balanced describing Williamite tyranny with criticising Contractual resistance. Williamite Contractual resistance arguments could even 'justifie' Catholic rebellions 'against the Present Government' and if Whigs were consistent they would dethrone William.²⁴⁴

In the mid-1690s Leslie, reflecting popular rhetoric in the Kingdoms, put even more emphasis on allegiance and liberties. His 1695 *Gallienus Redivivus* condemned William's lies about protecting liberties to gain allegiance. The title page quoted Plutarch's statement that demanding liberty could establish a tyranny making previous regimes appear benevolent 'compar'd with the Arbitrariness and Extinction of these pretended DELIVERERS.'²⁴⁵ Leslie, like Lawton, listed examples of William's tyranny installed after a Conquest. The Scottish Parliament verifying the 'Fact of the Murther of Glencoe' and Presbyterian attacks on Episcopalians demonstrated Williamite tyranny.²⁴⁶ England's Parliament was not 'behind that of *Scotland* in Sacrificing our *Laws, Lives, and Liberties* to an *Arbitrary and Despotick Power*.'²⁴⁷ In Ireland the 'murther of *Gaffney*,' a Catholic executed for Jacobitism without a trial and 'no Evidence,' was an attack on liberties that 'Exceeds even that of *Glenco*.' The resulting outrage was such that some 'Irish Protestants' tried and failed to impeach Lord Coningsby in the English Commons for ordering the execution.²⁴⁸ Leslie denounced Coningsby's actions

²⁴² Charles Leslie, *The Case of the Regale and the Pontificat Stated...* (n.p., 1700), pp.214-5.

²⁴³ Charles Leslie, *An Answer to a Book, Intituled, The State of the Protestants in Ireland under the Late King James's Government...* (London, 1692), pp.152-3.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 'To the Reader,' pp.10-1, 45-7.

²⁴⁵ Charles Leslie, *Gallienus Redivivus, or, Murther Will out, &c. Being a True Account of the De-Witting of Glencoe, Gaffney, &c.* (Edinburgh, 1695), Title Page.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid*, pp.8-11. See Chapter Three for Leslie's criticism of Conquest.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid*, p.13.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid*, pp.13-5; 'Second Parliament of King William: Fifth session- begins 7/11/1693', *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons : Volume 2: 1680-1695 (Chandler's)* (1742), pp.415-445. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=37652>. Date

in William's name as 'without precedent' and leaving 'Ireland... without all hopes of Redress....' Irish subjects' 'Liberties' were 'much more notoriously violated by their *Deliverers*, than by all the instances which were so much alleged against their *Lawful King*....'²⁴⁹ This was like Plutarch and Lawton describing how demanding liberties established tyranny.²⁵⁰ 1688-90, like the 1640s, witnessed supposed deliverers destroying liberties. 'Have we forgot our late *Deliverers* in *Forty One*?' Williamites seemed to call 'their *Slavery Liberty*!'²⁵¹ From 1692 across the Kingdoms greater emphasis was placed on monarchical protection of liberties in allegiance polemics. Leslie tried to tap into this by portraying allegiance to James, not William, as supporting a monarchy protecting subjects' liberties.

While Whig Jacobites asserted that William broke his Contract, Leslie asserted that William's tyranny resulted from subjects violating 'all the *Sacred Bonds of Natural Allegiance*' to James.²⁵² Williamites tricked subjects on liberties; James alone would secure liberties.²⁵³ The Three-Kingdom population was now accustomed to language linking subjects' liberties with allegiance as shown by its employment in one of the foremost Nonjurors' pamphlets. Leslie's fellow Irish-born Nonjuror Henry Dodwell argued that allegiance to William 'obliged' subjects 'to surrender their Rights' while James would guarantee liberties.²⁵⁴

Goldie and Jackson have said that despite common Country principles amongst Jacobites there were clear differences between Whig Jacobites and Nonjurors. Nonjurors favoured Non-Resistance and divine right ideas over Contract.²⁵⁵ However Jacobite reaction to William Anderton's execution shows how politically diverse Jacobites used rhetoric linking allegiance and liberties. Whig Jacobite Anderton's 1693 *Remarks upon the Present Confederacy* denounced Williamite attacks on English and Scottish Nonjurors, high taxes, Ireland's declining population and Dutch appropriating

accessed: 16 February 2014; Anchtell Grey, 'Debates in 1694: January,' *Grey's Debates of the House of Commons: Volume 10* (London, 1769), pp.374-82. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=40529>. Date accessed: 16 February 2014.

²⁴⁹ Leslie, *Gallienus Redivivus*, pp.19-21, 16-7.

²⁵⁰ Ibid, Title Page; Lawton, *Honesty is the Best Policy*, pp.1, 4.

²⁵¹ Leslie, *Gallienus Redivivus*, pp.19-21, 16-7.

²⁵² Ibid, p.17.

²⁵³ Ibid, p.22.

²⁵⁴ Henry Dodwell, *A Defence of the Vindication of the Deprived Bishops*... (London, 1695), pp.13-5.

²⁵⁵ Goldie & Jackson, 'Williamite Tyranny and Whig Jacobites,' pp.181-5.

of English money.²⁵⁶ William had ‘acted quite contrary’ to his promises in the 1688 Declaration.²⁵⁷ This showed ‘our *Liberties and Properties*’ were ‘unjustly invaded’ with ‘more Instances of *Arbitrary Power* daily committed’ under William than James.²⁵⁸ Like Ferguson and Lawton, Anderton described the allegiance-liberties link as a Contract. Therefore William ‘forfeited the Crown by his own Act, having violated the very *Instrument of Government* he subscribed,’ the Declaration of Rights, on his accession. Allegiance to James was again presented as guaranteeing liberties.²⁵⁹ Anderton was executed for his seditious publications.²⁶⁰ His gallows speech also made this argument.²⁶¹

Nonjuror Samuel Grascome gave one of the strongest denunciations of Anderton’s execution. Anderton’s execution, like Ashton’s, showed that under William subjects ‘have a very ill security for their Lives, Liberties.’²⁶² Like Whig Jacobites, Grascome disputed Williamite claims that William protected ‘the Rights and Privileges of the Subject.’ This deceit resulted in ‘so many infatuated and blind Countrymen’ deposing James.²⁶³ Grascome asked ‘where is this Liberty and Property? Where the Rights and Privileges of the Subjects?’ William’s rule was ‘Arbitrary’ but James’s restoration would protect liberties.²⁶⁴ Anderton’s polemic and Grascome’s reaction to his execution shows that Nonjurors and Whig Jacobites had some unity in presenting allegiance to William as a duplicity that undermined liberties in contrast to allegiance to James supporting liberties.

Catholic Jacobite Alexander Irvine also attacked inconsistencies in Williamite polemics.²⁶⁵ Parts of his 1694 *Dialogue* between Williamite ‘A’ and Jacobite ‘B’ employed the rhetoric linking allegiance, the Revolution and liberties. To Irvine there was no formal Contract and grievances never

²⁵⁶ William Anderton, *Remarks upon the Present Confederacy...* (n.p., 1693), pp.18-21, 26-7, 31.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid*, pp.6-8.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid*, p.31.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid*, p.46.

²⁶⁰ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.490-3.

²⁶¹ William Anderton, *True Copy of the Paper delivered to the Sheriffs of London and Middlesex by William Anderton at the place of execution...* (n.p., 1693).

²⁶² Samuel Grascome, *An Appeal of Murther from Certain Judges, lately sitting at the Old Baily to the Righteous Judge of Heaven and Earth...* (n.p., 1693), pp.1, 19-21, 3-4.

²⁶³ *Ibid*, pp.5, 30, 34-5.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid*, pp.37-8.

²⁶⁵ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p.486.

warranted rebellion.²⁶⁶ It was ‘most unreasonable’ that William received allegiance ‘upon K. *James’s* Deposition for Male-administration.’²⁶⁷ He highlighted how William vetoed bills, like the Triennial bill, designed to redress grievances from 1688. Under William the Kingdoms witnessed ‘Havock made of the Liberties and Properties of the Subjects....’ If James persecuted Scottish Episcopalians, as William did, Protestants would have labelled him ‘the Destroyers of our Religion.’²⁶⁸ Irvine denounced Contractual resistance but said that protecting liberties was part of allegiance and allegiance to James protected liberties. James restoring subjects’ liberties by undoing William’s post-Revolution tyranny would guarantee James ‘the Fidelity and Affection of his Subjects.’²⁶⁹ Irish Catholic Charles O’Kelly argued that Catholics could not give William allegiance because the Treaty of Limerick was not implemented as promised. This meant Catholics had more rights under James who was more worthy of allegiance.²⁷⁰ These Catholic Jacobites, like Nonjurors and Whig Jacobites, presented allegiance to James as guaranteeing subjects’ liberties in contrast to William’s post-Revolution tyranny.

Further evidence of this rhetoric’s prominence comes from James’s 1693 Declaration. This was an about-turn from his 1692 Declarations, which Williamites criticised for being out of touch and ignoring monarchical obligations to subjects’ rights.²⁷¹ James now desired ‘to be beholding to our Subjects Love to us, then to any other expedient whatever, for our Restoration....’²⁷² Daniel Szechi says this Declaration’s ideas became a permanent fixture of Jacobitism but does not examine its role in allegiance debates.²⁷³ James’s 1693 Declaration recognised the greater emphasis in the allegiance debates on subjects’ liberties by presenting allegiance to James and his restoration as protecting subjects’ liberties. He promised to ‘redress all

²⁶⁶ Alexander Irvine, *A Dialogue Between A and B Two Plain Countrey-Gentlemen, Concerning the Times* (London, 1694), pp.26-7, 31. Irvine also discussed *de jure* allegiance and this is examined in Chapter Seven.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid*, pp.29-31.

²⁶⁸ *Ibid*, pp.47-8.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid*, pp.54-5.

²⁷⁰ Charles O’Kelly, *Macariae Excidium, or The Destruction of Cyprus....*, ed. John Cornelius O’Callaghan (Dublin, 1850), pp.153-6.

²⁷¹ See Chapter Three. Macky, *A View of the Court*, pp.6-7, 10-2; William Sherlock, *A Letter to a Friend Concerning a French Invasion, To Restore the Late King James to his throne...* (London, 1692), pp.9-10; *Reflections upon the Late King James’s Declaration...* (London, 1692), pp.1-2.

²⁷² James II & VII, *His Majesties Most Gracious Declaration to all his Loving Subjects* (n.p., 1693).

²⁷³ Szechi, ‘Jacobite Revolution Settlement,’ pp.623-5.

Grievances... relieve our People from Oppression and Slavery... and... establish the Liberties of our People.²⁷⁴ One defence of this Declaration denounced how William broke 'his Coronation Oath' by governing Scotland 'with a *Dictatorial Power*, and much like a *Conquered Province*.'²⁷⁵ Subjects' weariness would force William to 'make way for his [James's] Restoration.' James's 'repentance... and the securities he offers against such Errors... will infallibly dispose all mankind to receive him.' Subjects' liberties were again used as a means to induce allegiance to James.²⁷⁶ From 1692-3 across the Kingdoms polemicists were less predisposed to Conquest theories because it implied supporting absolutism. Jacobites recognised that Williamite polemics portraying allegiance to William as supporting a monarchy guaranteeing liberties were increasingly prevalent in the public discourse. With William increasingly unpopular mid-1690s Jacobites adapted this rhetoric. Nonjurors, Whig and Catholic Jacobites used similar language to denounce the Revolution as a lie that established a tyranny undermining subjects' liberties instead of protecting them. The likes of Lawton called this a Contract but Nonjurors and Catholic Jacobites used similar language to say that allegiance to James guaranteed subjects' liberties without endorsing Contractual resistance.

Jacobites using this language worried Williamites. James Welwood, who partly justified allegiance to William with Contract arguments, lambasted notions that James would protect subjects' liberties.²⁷⁷ The 1692 Declarations showed James's true attitude to liberties. James violated his '*solemn*' oath so it was 'madness' to believe he had changed.²⁷⁸ Jacobites had no desire to protect liberties; they would 'coyn as many Oaths and Promises in his [James's] name as they please, if it serve their turn.'²⁷⁹ Welwood believed that subjects would see through Jacobite propaganda; the majority favoured William and so 'we are

²⁷⁴ James II & VII, *His Majesties Most Gracious Declaration to all his Loving Subjects* (n.p., 1693).

²⁷⁵ *A Reply to the Answer Doctor Welwood has made to King James's Declaration which Declaration was dated at St. Germain's, April 17th, S.N., 1693...* (n.p., 1694), pp.32-3, 23-4, 26-9.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid*, pp.42-3.

²⁷⁷ James Welwood, *Reasons why the Parliament of Scotland cannot comply with the late K. James's proclamation sent lately to that Kingdom, and prosecuted by the late Viscount Dundee...* (London, 1689), pp.11-23; James Welwood & John March, *A Vindication of the Present Great Revolution; in Five Letters Pass'd betwixt James Welwood... and Mr. John March...* (London, 1689), pp.28-31. In these pamphlets Welwood partially justified allegiance with Contract theory.

²⁷⁸ James Welwood, *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration...* (London, 1693), p.4.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid*, p.40.

in no danger of seeing him [James] in *England*.²⁸⁰ In 1696 Titus Oates said that Jacobites, like Popish Plot Catholics, were raising discontent to advance their conspiracies. The idea that loyalty to James guaranteed liberties was an oxymoron. Allegiance to James was ‘Against *the Interest of Parliaments*, and so against your own Freedoms as you were *Englishmen*.’²⁸¹ Whig Thomas Percival also denounced how Jacobites were exploiting discontent and portraying William ‘as a tyrant.’²⁸² Diarist John Evelyn’s entry on the 1696 Assassination Plot notes that Jacobites ‘timed’ their plot to take advantage of discontent over taxes and corruption but most subjects were resolved to take the Association and remain loyal to William.²⁸³ These Williamites denounced Jacobite arguments about allegiance to James protecting liberties.

Thomas Comber, who justified allegiance to William with Conquest and Contract ideas, denounced Montgomery’s *Complaint* for attempting ‘to seduce their Majesties Subjects from their *Allegiance*’ by ‘misrepresenting K. *William*’s Actions....’²⁸⁴ Representing ‘King *James* as one who never did any Evil, and King *William* as if he never did any Good’ fooled ‘weak People.’ However ‘any considering Man’ would remember James attacking ‘Religion, Liberty, Property; in all which our King is bound by Oath to defend us.’ The Revolution in England and Scotland prevented James ‘taking away his Subjects Liberties.’²⁸⁵ This was why ‘the greatest part of the Nation... with a Good Conscience, took the *Oath of Allegiance* to King *William*....’ Subjects accepting ‘Conditional’ allegiance arguments were bound ‘till King *William* desert us, as King *James* did; or till he utterly break the Original Contract.’²⁸⁶ Under William subjects’ complaints were addressed ‘and care is taken for the future.’²⁸⁷ Polemics by Comber, Welwood and Oates repeated the Williamite argument about the post-Revolution monarchy protecting liberties. Their responses to Jacobites arguing that James was a truer guardian of liberties shows how important these arguments had become in the allegiance debates.

²⁸⁰ Ibid, p.12.

²⁸¹ Titus Oates, *A Tragedy, Called The Popish Plot Reviv’d: Detecting the Secret League Between the Late King James and the French King...* (London, 1696), pp.3, 7.

²⁸² Thomas Percival, *The Rye-House Travesties, or, A True Account and Declaration of the horrid Conspiracy against His Majesty King William...* (London, 1696), pp.22-3, 40-1.

²⁸³ John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn... Volume V Kalendarium, 1690-1706*, ed. E.S De Beer (Oxford, 2000), pp.231-3. See Chapter Seven for more on the Association.

²⁸⁴ Thomas Comber, *The Protestant Mask Taken Off from the Jesuited Englishman: Being, an Answer to a Book, Entitled, Great Britain’s Just Complaint* (London, 1693), pp.29-30, 37.

²⁸⁵ Ibid, pp.25-8.

²⁸⁶ Ibid, pp.58, 62.

²⁸⁷ Ibid, p.33.

They clearly felt that these Jacobite arguments needed countering in order to prevent subjects giving allegiance to James instead of William.

Whether the post-Revolutionary monarchy protected subjects' liberties was more prominent in commentary on allegiance from 1692-3. Allegiance was no longer only about loyalty to the *de facto* monarch but also the monarchy that ruler offered. Jacobites, building on their criticisms of Conquest ideas described in Chapter Three, argued that the Revolution transformed the monarchy into a tyranny, which allegiance to William supported. This had been a feature of Jacobite polemics since 1689 but from 1693, recognising the greater Williamite emphasis on oaths of allegiance supporting a monarchy protecting liberties, Jacobite polemicists also put more emphasis on liberties. Popular concerns for liberties that emerged from criticisms of allegiance to Conquerors and the Court and Country platforms allowed Jacobites to cite events from each Kingdom as proof that Williamite claims about protecting liberties were lies. Some Jacobites openly employed what they called contractual arguments while others, reticent about advocating resistance, used similar rhetoric about the Revolution undermining liberties. Nonjurors, Catholic and Whig Jacobites all presented allegiance to James as supporting the undoing of the Revolution and restoring a monarchy that protected subjects' liberties.

VII

Explicit Contractual resistance arguments remained unacceptable to many in the 1690s. Some Tories, like William Sherlock, denounced them.²⁸⁸ In 1692 Sherlock expressed concern about the changing popular rhetoric on the Revolution. He saw Contract theories as a 'fatal Evil' that 'infects Mens minds with loose Notions of government and Obedience' promoting regicide and damnation.²⁸⁹ Sherlock denounced how Williamite Tories were being reviled as 'Enemies to the Constitution, and with reproaching the Wisdom and Justice of the Nation in the late Happy Revolution....' Whigs believed the Revolution could 'be defended upon no other Principle' but Contract.²⁹⁰ Sherlock feared

²⁸⁸ Kenyon, 'The Revolution of 1688: Resistance and Contract,' pp.45-6, 50.

²⁸⁹ William Sherlock, *A Sermon Preach'd Before the Honourable House of Commons, at St. Margaret's Westminster January the XXXth, 1691/2* (London, 1692), pp.18-9.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.18-9.

that Contract theories being more prominent could affect subjects' allegiance by allowing Jacobites to exploit popular grievances and restore James in conjunction with a French-backed invasion. 'It is made a popular pretence to raise discontents, and to make people disaffected to the present Government.'²⁹¹ However Sherlock remained optimistic that Jacobites seeking 'another *Revolution*, to turn King *William* out, as brought him in, they will in all probability be mistaken.' Most subjects remained Williamites despite disenchantment.²⁹² Sherlock maintained that William's enthronement meant there was no 'alteration in the Principles of Government and Obedience.'²⁹³ However increasing numbers, including many Tories, were subscribing to the view that allegiance to William supported the Revolution, which changed what was a tyranny under James into a monarchy protecting subjects' liberties. Sherlock provides further proof that popular views were changing.

Vallance, Pincus and Mark Knights argue that popular ideology in English political culture changed over the course of the seventeenth century. Pincus argues that during the 1690s Whig views of the constitution and Revolution became dominant.²⁹⁴ Miller and Lenman argue that what could be considered Contract theories were not the sole property of political radicals or Whigs.²⁹⁵ This chapter has shown that in each Kingdom political rhetoric on allegiance and the Revolution was changing. Chapters One through Three showed that during 1689-92 a conservatism, which focused on the Revolution changing who wore the Crown and downplayed changes to the monarchy, dominated Williamite allegiance polemics. There were some notable exceptions, like Scottish Presbyterian polemics, arguing that it was more than a personnel change.²⁹⁶ However it was around 1692 that this early conservatism began to give way across the Kingdoms.

Increasing numbers of polemicists asserted that the Revolution changed the monarchy from a tyranny under James into a monarchy under William, which protected subjects' liberties. Whigs called this link between

²⁹¹ William Sherlock, *A Letter to a Friend Concerning a French Invasion to Restore the Late King James to his Throne and what may be expected...* (London, 1692), pp.20-1.

²⁹² *Ibid.*, p.20.

²⁹³ Sherlock, *A Sermon Preach'd...January the XXXth 1691/2*, pp.21-3.

²⁹⁴ Vallance, 'Loyal or Rebellious?'; *idem*, *Revolutionary England*, *passim*; Pincus, *1688*, *passim*; Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, *passim*.

²⁹⁵ Miller, 'The Glorious Revolution: "Contract" and "Abdication" Reconsidered'; Lenman, 'Poverty of Political Theory.'

²⁹⁶ See Chapters Two, Five and Seven.

allegiance and liberties a Contract but the Country and Court platforms, which were influential on late-1690s English and Scottish politics, show how rhetoric was changing. This changed rhetoric cannot be described as purely ‘Whiggish.’ Many polemicists, including English Tories, criticised Contractual resistance arguments but used similar language emphasising how allegiance to William was related to his monarchy guaranteeing liberties. Court and Country platforms added new dimensions to the political discourse rather than replacing existing groupings. English, Irish, Scottish, Whig and Tory Country polemicists used this language to leverage concessions on various issues they saw as undermining liberties and have William’s government fully consistent with notions that it guaranteed liberties. In response Court polemicists used this same language to deny that William’s government was infringing liberties. However both Country and Court polemics generally remained Williamites and argued that allegiance to William supported a changed post-Revolution monarchy guaranteeing liberties and this was better than the tyranny James offered. From the mid-1690s this rhetoric was more prominent in describing the Revolution and allegiance. William’s unpopularity and Conquest theories being less acceptable contributed to this new emphasis on allegiance that showed the Revolution was more than a change of person. This was why allegiance to William remained popular even though William was personally unpopular. Allegiance no longer focused on who was *de facto* monarch; what the rival monarchs’ rule offered was now more important in the allegiance debates and William’s rule was perceived as far better for subjects and their liberties than James’s tyranny. The public discourse, especially in Scotland, was less conservative than it had been in 1689-92 but many were not prepared to endorse Contractual resistance even though they used similar language emphasising allegiance dependent on liberties.

Jacobites, from Nonjuring, Whig, and Catholic backgrounds, co-opting this language provides further evidence of the changed rhetoric on the Revolution and greater emphasis on subjects’ liberties. They argued that the Revolution changed the monarchy into a tyranny. Like Court and Country Williamites, Jacobites had differing views but a common goal and rhetoric. Whig Jacobites asserted that William broke his Contract by undermining liberties; Nonjurors asserted that breaking allegiance to James allowed William to establish tyranny. However all agreed that allegiance to James and his

restoration would restore subjects' liberties. Jacobitism was not static and repeatedly sought to speak to popular opinion in the Kingdoms hence their greater emphasis on allegiance to James supporting the restoration of a monarchy protecting liberties.

This language was less conservative but not 'radical' or 'Lockean' Contract theory; Country and Jacobite polemicists routinely employed this language while criticising radicalism and avoiding the term 'Contract.' More 'radical' versions were still frequently frowned upon. In 1693 extreme Scottish Presbyterians rejected allegiance to William because he did not aid 'our Covenanted Reformation.'²⁹⁷ Conservative Irish Anglicans said this Contractual rejection of allegiance to William justified denying toleration for Irish Presbyterians.²⁹⁸ This contrasted with England and Scotland where by the late 1690s the Revolution was increasingly seen as ensuring that many Protestants not subscribing to the established Churches were loyal to William; another beneficial post-Revolution change. Monarchical guarantee of liberties were more prominent in debates over allegiance and the Revolution from the mid-1690s. Whether these liberties extended to Protestants not conforming to the established Churches was another issue that exercised polemicists across the Kingdoms from the mid-1690s. These Protestants and their attitudes to allegiance and the Revolution would impact on the wider allegiance debates.

²⁹⁷ *A True Copie of the Declaration Published at Sanquhair upon the tenth of August 1692* (n.p., 1693), pp.5-8, 10-4.

²⁹⁸ Anthony Dopping, *The Case of the Dissenters of Ireland consider'd...* (Dublin, 1695), pp.2-3; Tobias Pullen, *An Answer to a Paper Entitled, The Case of the Protestant Dissenters of Ireland in reference to a Bill of Indulgence, represented and argued* (Dublin, 1695), pp.4-5.

Chapter Five: Toleration, Established Churches and Allegiance.

From the mid-1690s the Revolution was increasingly seen as more significant than a change of monarchical personnel; allegiance to William became popularly seen as guaranteeing subjects' liberties. Whether these liberties extended to Protestants not subscribing to the Established Churches also became an important part of the allegiance debates from the mid-1690s. In 1713 Irish Presbyterian cleric James Kirkpatrick wrote a history of Presbyterian loyalty in the Three Kingdoms. Hoping to win toleration, Kirkpatrick tried to claim Presbyterian ownership of the Revolution. Kirkpatrick contrasted enthusiastic Presbyterian loyalty to William with Anglican caution towards the Revolution and allegiance to William.¹ During the Restoration religious uniformity was royal policy in all Three Kingdoms. Anglicanism was the Established Church in England and Ireland while Episcopacy was established in Scotland. Across the Kingdoms obedience to the Established Church was, as Mark Knights says, 'a touchstone for political loyalty.' Toleration of Protestant Dissenters was seen as tolerating disloyalty. Nonconformists' role in the Civil Wars also contributed to a popular image of Dissenters being disloyal.² In the 1680s this was beginning to change with growing calls for the repeal of penal laws against Dissenters.³ After the Revolution these calls for legal protection of Dissenters and Dissenter support

¹ James Kirkpatrick, *An Historical Essay upon the Loyalty of Presbyterians In Great Britain and Ireland from the Reformation to this Present Year...* (n.p., 1713), 'Preface,' pp.393-8. The conservatism and perceived Anglican reluctance to embrace the Revolution can be seen in Chapters One, Two and Three.

² Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant...* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp.6-9, 165-70; David Martin Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England...* (Rochester, 1999), pp.194-6; Robert Armstrong, 'Of Stories and Sermons: Nationality and Spirituality in Presbyterian Ulster in the late Seventeenth Century,' in Robert Armstrong & Tadhg Ó hAnnrachain (eds.) *Community in Early Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2006), pp.230-1; Raymond Gillespie, 'Presbyterian Propaganda,' in Kevin Herlihy (ed.) *The Politics of Irish Dissent 1650-1800* (Dublin, 1997), pp.116-9; Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-1681* (Cambridge, 1994), pp.366-7; Tim Harris, *Restoration...* (London, 2006), passim; Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland...* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp.145-50; Ian McBride, 'Ulster Presbyterianism and the Confessional State, c.1688-1733,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Basingstoke, 2001), pp.169-75; Mark Goldie, 'The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England,' in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel & Nicholas Tyacke (eds.) *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991), pp.331-2.

³ Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Oxford, 1978), pp.256-62; Tim Harris, *Revolution...* (London, 2007), pp.450-1, 481; Scott Sowerby, *Making Toleration The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution* (London, 2013), passim.

for William meant that their political allegiance and position within the post-Revolution religious settlements influenced the wider allegiance debates.

Each Kingdom had a different religious settlement. In England Anglicanism remained the established Church but the 1689 Toleration Act suspended penal laws against Dissenters who took the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy and the anti-Transubstantiation declaration. Quakers gained similar protection in 1696 if they took an affirmation of loyalty instead of the oaths.⁴ Presbyterianism replaced Episcopacy as the Established Church in Scotland; Episcopalians thus became the Dissenters but there was eventually limited protection for some Episcopalian clerics who gave William allegiance.⁵ In Ireland the Restoration Anglican establishment remained unchanged by the Revolution.⁶ Despite these differences the issue of toleration in exchange for allegiance to William was an important part of the allegiance debates in each Kingdom. Many Dissenters were deeply involved in politics and so their public views on allegiance and the Revolution are important. Their polemics and ideas of toleration also influenced polemics by members of the Established Churches. In each Kingdom Jacobite allegiance polemics also touched on this issue. By examining the issue of the allegiance of Protestants not subscribing to the Established Churches this Chapter is able to show the continuing evolution of political thought on the Revolution in the 1690s.

Steven Pincus, Tony Claydon, and other historians have examined portrayals of the Revolution in propaganda as a 'Protestant crusade' against popery.⁷ Several historians have examined the English Toleration's impact on society and the developing party politics. Some have explored Anglican hostility to Toleration but its impact on the allegiance debates has received little attention. Jacobite attempts to exploit this issue have also received little

⁴ 'Act for Exempting their Majesties' Protestant Subjects Dissenting From the Church of England From the Penalties of Certain Laws,' and 'An Act that the Solemn Affirmation and Declaration of the People called Quakers shall be Accepted instead of an Oath in the Usual Form,' *English Historical Documents, 1660-1714*, ed. Andrew Browning (London, 1953), pp.400-5.

⁵ 'Claim of Right,' 'Act Repealing Assertary Act, 1690,' 'Act Ratifying the Confession of Faith and the Presbyterian Church Government, 1690,' 'Act Concerning Patronages, 1690,' in *English Historical Documents*, pp.638, 639-40, 640-2; Sir William Seton, *A Continuation of a Few Brief and Modest Reflections Perswading a Just Indulgence to be Granted to the Episcopal Clergy and People in Scotland...* (n.p., 1703), pp.9-10.

⁶ McBride, 'Ulster Presbyterianism and the Confessional State,' pp.169-71.

⁷ Steven Pincus, *1688: The first Modern Revolution* (London, 2009), pp.307, 452; Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996), passim; Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford, 1999), pp.106-7.

attention.⁸ The few examinations of England's allegiance debates focus on Anglicanism, neglecting how Toleration and Dissenter opinions affected the wider allegiance debates.⁹

In Scotland, many Presbyterians were hostile to tolerating Episcopalians not subscribing to Presbyterianism's establishment and this caused tension with William. However limited legal protection for some Episcopalians was introduced in Scotland. The 1693 *Act for Settling the Quiet and Peace of the Church* and 1695 Church Act protected some Episcopalian clerics who gave William allegiance. Jacobitism's role in Presbyterian-Episcopalian antagonism has been discussed but, as with English historiography, specific post-Revolution ideas on toleration in the allegiance debates have been overlooked.¹⁰ In Ireland, despite efforts by William and his English ministers, Anglicanism's monopoly was maintained but historians

⁸ Among the numerous discussions of the Toleration Act are: Goldie, 'Theory of Religious Intolerance,' passim; K.R.P. Clark, 'Defoe, Dissent, and Early Whig Ideology,' *The Historical Journal*, 52, Issue 03, (Sept., 2009), pp.597-602, 613; John Spurr, 'Later Stuart Puritanism,' in John Coffey & Paul C.H. Lim (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008), pp.90-3; Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'Toleration and Religion after 1688,' in Grell, Israel, Tyacke (eds.) *From Persecution to Toleration*, pp.391-6, 408; Jonathan I. Israel, 'William III and Toleration,' in Grell, Israel, Tyacke (eds.) *Persecution to Toleration*, pp.129-37; G.V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730* (Oxford, 1975), pp.10-4, 19-20, 46-7; B.W. Hill, *The Growth of Parliamentary Politics, 1659-1742* (London, 1976), pp.37-40, 50-1; Nicholas Tyacke, 'The "Rise of Puritanism" and the Legalizing of Dissent, 1571-1719,' in Grell, Israel, Tyacke (eds.) *Persecution to Toleration*, pp.41-4; Sowerby, *Making Toleration*, pp.250-1, 264.

⁹ Allegiance has almost exclusively been examined in an English Anglican context. David Martin Jones and Edward Vallance in their studies of Oaths in the Seventeenth century discuss Presbyterian and other Nonconformist issues of allegiance but primarily during the Civil Wars, Interregnum and Restoration not after the Revolution: Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance*, pp.175-9, 194-9; Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, passim. Goldie and others see the Allegiance debates as a mainly Anglican affair. Mark Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument,' *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 83, (1980), pp.479-520; idem, 'The Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution,' in Robert Beddard (ed.) *The Revolutions of 1688* (Oxford, 1991) pp.103-36; Gerald Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962); Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: Succession to the Crown of England 1603-1714* (Basingstoke, 1995); J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689-1720* (Cambridge, 1990), passim.

¹⁰ T.N. Clarke, 'The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* XXIV, Part I (1990), pp.48-51; idem, 'The Scottish Episcopalians 1688-1720,' (University of Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 1987), pp.9, 13-8, 25, 64-6, 72; Jeffrey Stephen, *Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland 1689-1716* (Farnham, 2013), pp.187-96, 295-6; Alasdair Raffae, 'Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics after the Revolution of 1688-1690,' *The Historical Journal*, 53, Issue 2 (2010), pp.322-9; Lionel K.J. Glassey, 'William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland, 1689-90,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XXII (1989), pp.319-24, 329; Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland...* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp.213-4; P.W.J. Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians* (Edinburgh, 1979), pp.4, 25-39; Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (London, 1980), pp.55-6; idem, 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism,' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759* (Edinburgh, 1982), pp.39-40, 44; idem, 'The Scottish Nobility and the Revolution of 1688-1690,' in Beddard (ed.) *The Revolutions of 1688*, pp.144-8, 159-62.

have overlooked how this impacted on allegiance debates.¹¹ This chapter explores the intersected issues of allegiance and toleration to show how public views on the Revolution evolved in each Kingdom.

Throughout the Restoration Dissenters tried to counter popular perceptions of their disloyalty. Richard Baxter, an English Nonconformist cleric, stated that many Nonconformists were prepared to give Charles II allegiance.¹² Several Nonconformists embraced efforts by Charles and James to introduce toleration.¹³ Joseph Boyse, the Irish-based Presbyterian cleric and future Williamite, publicly thanked James for his Indulgence and promised him Irish Presbyterians' 'due Loyalty.'¹⁴ Despite James's efforts and some Nonconformists' polemics, the link between religious uniformity and political allegiance remained the predominant view during the Restoration.¹⁵ Influential Episcopalian Andrew Honyman articulated this position when attacking Presbyterians' 'limited' allegiance, which was 'far... from the tenor of our lawfull Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, yea and Christianity....'¹⁶ Irish Anglican clergyman William King denounced Nonconformists' 'great Wickedness' in rebelling against monarchs and highlighted Anglicans' 'unquestionable' loyalty.¹⁷ Such views did not completely disappear after the Revolution.¹⁸ However the gradual acceptance of legal protection for Williamite Protestants not subscribing to the Established Churches in England

¹¹ McBride, 'Ulster Presbyterianism and the Confessional State,' pp.169-78, 187; S.J. Connolly, *Religion, Law and Power The Making of Protestant Ireland, 1660-1760* (Oxford, 1995), pp.160-9; J.C. Beckett, *Protestant Dissent in Ireland, 1687-1780* (London, 1948), pp.20-6, 31-6; Toby Barnard, *A New Anatomy of Ireland: The Irish Protestants, 1649-1770* (London, 2003), pp.93-4, 174-6; D.W. Hayton, *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians and Parties* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp.186-7; idem, 'Exclusion, Conformity, and Parliamentary Representation: The Impact of the Sacramental Test on Irish Dissenting Politics,' in Kevin Herlihy (ed.) *The Politics of Irish Dissent 1650-1800* (Dublin, 1997), pp.52-4, 60-1; Phil Kilroy, *Protestant Dissent and Controversy in Ireland 1660-1714* (Cork, 1994), pp.188-93.

¹² Richard Baxter, *The English Nonconformity as under King Charles II and King James II...* (London, 1689 reprint), pp.31-2, 1-2, 36-8, 128, 144, 259.

¹³ Watts, *The Dissenters*, pp.256-62; Harris, *Revolution*, pp.450-1, 480; Sowerby, *Making Toleration*, pp.40-4, 174-6, 226.

¹⁴ Joseph Boyse, *Vindiciae Calvinisticae: or, some Impartial Reflections on the Dean of Londondereys Considerations That Obliged him to come over to the Communion of the Church of Rome...* (Dublin, 1688), 'To the Reader.'

¹⁵ Knights, *Politics and Opinion*, p.366; Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, p.145; Harris, *Restoration*, passim.

¹⁶ Andrew Honyman, *The Seasonable Case of Submission to the Church-government as now Re-established by law, briefly stated and determined by a lover of the peace of this Church and Kingdom* (Edinburgh, 1662), pp.40-6.

¹⁷ William King, *An Answer to the Considerations which obliged Peter Manby...to embrace what he calls, the Catholick Religion...* (London, 1687), pp.6, 27-9, 37-8, 84-5.

¹⁸ Sowerby, *Making Toleration*, pp.250-1, 254-9, 264.

and Scotland shows how allegiance to William was increasingly seen as supporting more than a personnel change. This continued the trend, described in Chapter Four, that the Revolution was increasingly popularly regarded in two of the Three Kingdoms as a monumental transformative event. This contrasted with the earlier conservatism described in Chapters One through Three.

I

England was the first Kingdom to introduce toleration for Nonconformists who gave William allegiance. On William and Mary's coronation numerous Nonconformists and Anglicans proudly declared loyalty to them.¹⁹ Nonconformists have generally been seen as supporters of William and the Revolution.²⁰ Before the Toleration Act was passed Nonconformists differed over what measure would best protect them. Some favoured comprehension, accommodation within a broader Church of England, while others preferred toleration where Nonconformists remained outside the Established Church but with penal laws against them suspended. These differing opinions were united by a belief that the resulting measure depended on Dissenters giving 'reasonable Assurance of Fidelity' to William.²¹ John Humfrey, a Nonconformist favouring Comprehension, wrote that addressing Dissenters' 'Grievances' would 'establish the Throne of the King.'²² Accommodating Nonconformists was 'visibly the Interest of the Crown' of William.²³ A Civil War-era pamphlet by Royalist Anglican Jeremy Taylor was republished to justify both James's and William's attempts to introduce toleration.²⁴ Taylor argued that toleration of 'dissenting Opinions in Religion' would pacify the kingdom and ensure Dissenter loyalty to the monarch.²⁵

¹⁹ *An Address of the Dissenting Ministers (In and About the City of London) To the King and Queen, upon their Accession to the Crown. With their Majesties answer to it* (London, 1689), pp.1, 4, 6-7; Francis Fullwood, *Obedience Due to the Present King, notwithstanding our Oaths to the Former written by a Divine of the Church of England* (London, 1689), passim.

²⁰ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, p.176.

²¹ *The Charity and Loyalty of some of Our Clergy...* (London, 1689), pp.11-2.

²² John Humfrey, *Comprehension with Indulgence* (n.p., 1689), pp.3-4.

²³ *A Letter to a Friend* (n.p., 1689), pp.1-2.

²⁴ Jeremy Taylor, *Toleration Tolerated...* (n.p., 1689); idem, *Toleration Tolerated...* (London, 1687).

²⁵ Jeremy Taylor, *Toleration Tolerated...* (n.p., 1689), pp.2-3.

Some Anglicans passionately opposed Toleration; they repeated Restoration-era ‘Church in danger’ rhetoric but failed to impede the Toleration Act’s implementation.²⁶ Others were only prepared to offer limited measures that would benefit small numbers of Nonconformists. The eventual Toleration Act suspended penal laws for Nonconformists who took the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy. Many Nonconformists were satisfied with this degree of freedom; several gained political offices albeit through the controversial practice of Occasional Conformity where Nonconformists sometimes took Anglican sacraments to obtain offices.²⁷ Occasional Conformity caused further consternation amongst some Anglicans but, as J.C.D. Clark argues, most Anglicans felt secure enough in the post-Revolution environment to grant Toleration.²⁸

Many historians have commented on the controversy over John Locke’s *Letter Concerning Toleration* and his dispute with Tories, like Jonas Proast, but their focus on toleration overlooks these pamphlets’ views on allegiance.²⁹ During this debate Locke argued that it was absurd for one religious group to claim a monopoly on loyalty.³⁰ Locke repeatedly argued that Dissenters would be loyal because William’s government offered them protection.³¹ Persecuting potentially loyal subjects was counter-productive and antithetical to the ‘Duty of Christians to tolerate.’³² Locke believed that only Catholics and atheists should be regarded as potentially disloyal because neither could be trusted to keep the ‘Promises, Covenants, and Oaths, which

²⁶ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.162-76; Henry Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III* (Manchester, 1977), pp.21-6; Bennett, *Tory Crisis*, pp.10-1; Spurr, ‘Late Stuart Puritanism,’ pp.90-1; Hill, *The Growth of Parliamentary Parties*, pp.37-40, 50-1; Gordon J. Schochet, ‘Between Lambeth and Leviathan: Samuel Parker on the Church of England and Political Order,’ in Nicholas Phillipson & Quentin Skinner (eds.) *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.198-200.

²⁷ Denis Rubini, *Court and Country 1688-1702* (London, 1968), pp.25-6; Goldie, ‘Religious Intolerance,’ pp.331-2; Trevor-Roper, ‘Toleration and Religion after 1688,’ pp.391, 395-6; Tyacke, ‘The “Rise of Puritanism” and The Legalizing of Dissent, 1571-1719,’ pp.41-4.

²⁸ David Ogg, *England in the Reigns of James II and William III* (Oxford, 1955), pp.232-3; G.V. Bennett, ‘Conflict in the Church’ in Geoffrey Holmes (ed.) *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714* (London, 1969), pp.161-2; J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832, Religion, Ideology, Politics During the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 2000), pp.36, 81-2.

²⁹ John Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture*, pp.174-5, 593-4, 669-72, 690-2; Lois G. Schwoerer, ‘Locke, Lockean Ideas, and the Glorious Revolution,’ *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 51, No. 4 (Oct.-Dec., 1990), p.545; idem, *The Declaration of Rights, 1689* (London, 1981), p.144; idem, ‘The Coronation of William and Mary, April 11, 1689,’ in Lois G. Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.109, 125-127.

³⁰ John Locke, *A Letter Concerning Toleration...* (n.p., 1689), pp.5-6.

³¹ Ibid, pp.5-6, 47-8; John Locke, *A Second Letter Concerning Toleration...* (London, 1690), pp.31-2, 50-3; idem, *A Third Letter Concerning... Toleration* (London, 1692), pp.181-3, 228.

³² John Locke, *A Third Letter*, pp.47-8, 121, 172, 228, 181-3.

are the Bonds of Human Society.’ He argued that Toleration would make Dissenters loyal subjects of William.³³

Proast’s replies focused mainly on the damage Toleration could cause to Anglicanism.³⁴ However Tory Anglican cleric Thomas Long’s argument against Locke also touched on allegiance.³⁵ John Marshall and Mark Goldie have briefly commented on Long’s response to Locke’s *Letter*. Both have argued, respectively, that Long feared toleration was a backdoor for popery and could provoke a Dissenter rebellion.³⁶ Other historians have also described lingering Tory hostility to Toleration after 1689 because Toleration showed that the Revolution ‘was much more than a dynastic affair’ and challenged Tories seeking to downplay the Revolution’s significance.³⁷ Allegiance was important to Long and other Tory Williamite responses to Locke and Toleration because Toleration also challenged Long’s arguments that William was owed allegiance as *de facto* King but that there was no constitutional change in 1689.³⁸ In 1689-90 Long continued promoting Restoration-era views about allegiance being related to obedience to the Established Church. He claimed to represent the views of many likeminded Anglicans who sought ‘the Preservation of the True Religion and Loyalty.’³⁹ Toleration was ‘ready to blow up the Religion and Loyalty, by GOD’S Blessing, now Established, into meer Air and Atheism....’⁴⁰ Long referenced numerous Nonconformist-authored tracts as evidence that Dissenters were inherently treacherous and would be disloyal to William. He cited Dissenters, like Richard Baxter, who refused oaths of allegiance and supremacy in return for toleration under Charles II as examples of their disloyalty. Refusing the oath of supremacy in particular was denying that the King was the ‘Supreme Authority of the

³³ Locke, *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, pp.1-4, 14-7, 22-3.

³⁴ Jonas Proast, *The Argument of the Letter Concerning Toleration, Briefly consider’d and answer’d* (Oxford, 1690), pp.1-4, 14-7, 22-3.

³⁵ Thomas Long, *The Letter for Toleration Decipher’d, and the Absurdity and Impiety of an Absolute demonstrated, by the Judgment of Presbyterians, Independents...* (London, 1689), ‘Epistle Dedicatory.’

³⁶ Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture*, pp.449, 451, 465. Mark Goldie, ‘John Locke’s Circle and James II,’ *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Sep., 1992), pp.581, 585.

³⁷ Sowerby, *Making Toleration*, pp.255-60; Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford, 2000), pp.32-3.

³⁸ See Chapters One and Two.

³⁹ Long, *Letter for Toleration Decipher’d*, ‘Epistle Dedicatory.’

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

Nation;’ it was blatant disloyalty.⁴¹ Tolerating openly disloyal groups was a disaster waiting to happen.

According to Long Dissenters refused to adhere to laws on religious uniformity. These laws were designed to ensure subjects’ ‘due Obedience’ to the monarch.⁴² Legal protection of subversive Dissenters would allow a ‘secret Enemy within the Walls of a well Fortified City....’⁴³ Only Anglicans were genuinely loyal Williamites as shown by their demonstrations ‘to the Present Government both in Church and State.’ Anglican Williamites had ‘by our Oaths promised to bear Faith and true Allegiance to the King and Queen’s Majesties. And the whole Clergy have renewed their Allegiance to their Majesties, and their adherence to the Church as Established....’⁴⁴ Long expressed his hope that Anglicanism and William’s reign would be preserved from post-Revolution Nonconformist advances and potential rebellion.⁴⁵ Other Tory Williamites also saw Nonconformists’ rejection of Episcopal authority as a denial of royal authority and evidence of Dissenters’ continued disloyalty.⁴⁶ Anglican clergyman Robert Burscough advocated this in his anti-Dissenter pamphlets. He claimed that ‘obedience is always due’ to the King, bishops and societal superiors. Therefore rejecting obedience to bishops was rejecting loyalty to William.⁴⁷ This was another example of Dissenter infidelity, which had manifested itself on numerous previous occasions.⁴⁸ Nonconformist clerics were ‘Enemies to the State.’⁴⁹ Like Long, Burscough argued that Toleration was carelessly protecting openly disloyal groups and not rewarding Anglicans’ obedience.⁵⁰

Some Tories publicly demanded that the Toleration Act be repealed because they saw Toleration as potentially undoing the fabric of English

⁴¹ Ibid, pp.5-6, 30; Thomas Long, *The Case of Persecution, Charg’d on the Church of England, Consider’d and Discharg’d...* (London, 1689), ‘The Occasion of Publishing This Treatise,’ pp.8-9.

⁴² Long, *The Case of Persecution*, pp.4-12.

⁴³ Thomas Long, *Vox Cleri: or the Sense of the Clergy...Second Edition* (London, 1690), pp.7-8, 10.

⁴⁴ Ibid, ‘The Author’s Protestation.’

⁴⁵ Ibid, ‘The Author’s Protestation;’ Long, *The Case of Persecution*, pp.4-10; idem, *The Letter for Toleration Decipher’d*, pp.5-6.

⁴⁶ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.65-6, 168-72.

⁴⁷ Robert Burscough, *Treatise of Church and Government occasion’d by some letters lately printed concerning the same subject* (London, 1692), pp.7-8, 11-2, 15-6, 193-4.

⁴⁸ Ibid, ‘Preface to the Reader,’ pp. xvi, xviii-xix.

⁴⁹ Ibid, ‘Preface to the Reader,’ p. x.

⁵⁰ Robert Burscough, *A Discourse of Schism address’d to those Dissenters to those Dissenters who conform’d before the Toleration and Have since withdrawn themselves from the Communion of the Church of England* (London, 1699), pp.92-4, 125-6.

religion and monarchy. Roger Morrice's *Entring Book* records the Tory M.P. Sir Thomas Clarges's furious Commons' speech denouncing Toleration in December 1689. He said that Nonconformist 'Liberty' was granted on the condition that they subscribe to 'the Oath of Allegiance to' William but 'not one of an hundred had taken it....'⁵¹ This showed that Dissenters 'were not in King Williams interest... and... deserved to loose' their liberty.⁵² Tory Anglican cleric Humphrey Prideaux's early-1690s letters to senior Tory politician John Ellis show further Anglican distrust of Dissenters.⁵³ Prideaux alleged that some Dissenters refused the oaths to William and were 'ready for King James whenever he returns.'⁵⁴ Both Clarges and Prideaux supported William but resented post-Revolution Dissenter advances. Long, Clarges and other Tories wanted William as King of a Restoration-style England where Anglicanism remained dominant. Chapters One through Three showed how numerous Tories were already uneasy about the Revolution and they now wanted Toleration repealed so they could continue portraying the Revolution as little more than William replacing James.

Some Whigs saw hostility to Toleration as evidence of potential Tory disloyalty. Gilbert Burnet's *History* provides insights into the public discourse in the 1690s. Burnet recorded that the Church of England was divided on Toleration. He said that many Anglicans supported Toleration but there were Tory clerics who 'took the Oaths' to William and supported his government 'but they were not only cold in serving it, but were always blaming the Administration.' These Tories had 'esteem for Jacobites' and 'showed great resentments against the Dissenters, and were enemies to the Toleration.'⁵⁵ Burnet equated opposition to Toleration with opposition to the Revolution. He saw Tory loyalty as questionable because allegiance to William meant accepting all the Revolution's changes, including Toleration. Burnet's concerns for Tories were not unfounded. During the early 1690s numerous Anglican Jacobites attempted to exploit Tory-Anglican unease over Toleration. Anglican Jacobites presented allegiance to James as supporting the undoing of

⁵¹ Roger Morrice, *The Entring Book of Roger Morrice Volume V The Reign of William III 1689-91*, ed. Mark Knights (Woodbridge, 2007), R.46-7, p.320.

⁵² Ibid, R. 46-7, pp.320-1.

⁵³ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, p.173.

⁵⁴ Humphrey Prideaux, 'Saham, July 18, 1692,' *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux, Sometimes Dean of Norwich to John Ellis, Sometime Under-Secretary of State 1644-1722*, ed. Edward Maude Thompson (London, 1875), pp.154-5.

⁵⁵ Gilbert Burnet, *History of his own Time Vol. II...* (London, 1734), pp.214-5.

the Revolution's depraved innovations and restoring a regime that would better protect the Anglican establishment. Nathaniel Johnston argued that the Revolution was a Dissenter Revolution, like the Regicide, where numerous Anglicans were persuaded to renounce allegiance to James and support William's attack on Anglicanism and the rightful monarch.⁵⁶

The State Prodigal his Return also expressed Anglican Jacobite hostility to this Dissenter Revolution and hoped that Anglicans would see the 'Scandal and Change' William brought 'to our Church' and return allegiance to James.⁵⁷ This was to undermine Tory Williamite claims that the Revolution only changed who wore the Crown. The author also criticised Irish Williamites who 'laid' James 'aside, brought another in, and have supported' William 'against' their 'Allegiance and Religion.'⁵⁸ England's Toleration and prelacy's violent abolition in Scotland did not bode well for Anglicanism's future and showed how William had 'a strange way to maintain the Church of *England*' as he promised. Williamites had 'turn'd out *King James* for doing that which they, honest Men, have already far out done' with the post-Revolution Toleration.⁵⁹ This was clearly trying to exploit Tory Anglican unease over Toleration by depicting the Revolution and allegiance to William as supporting Anglicanism's ruin.

Several Jacobite polemics made this argument. Some recycled Restoration-era arguments warning how Nonconformist disloyalty threatened Church and State. Prominent Nonjuror Thomas Ken in *Lacrymae Exlesiae* argued that the Oath of Supremacy was integral to allegiance but rejected by many Nonconformists. This polemic was originally published in 1663 but reprinted in 1689. It asserted that the Oath of Supremacy was a loyalty test that 'resolved to maintain the Protestant Religion as it was established in the Church of England....'⁶⁰ England experienced Nonconformist disloyalty in the 1640s when they 'cryed down the established Government and Religion.' Nonconformists 'approved and encouraged the violent and most illegal Extravagencies, tending to the utter ruine of Religion and Government.'⁶¹ This

⁵⁶ Nathaniel Johnston, *The Dear Bargain...* (n.p., 1690), pp.15-6.

⁵⁷ *The State Prodigal his Return; Containing a True State of the Nation. In a Letter to a Friend...* (n.p., 1689), p.3.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp.1-2.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p.3.

⁶⁰ Thomas Ken, *Lacrymae Ecclesiae Anglicanae...* (n.p., 1689), p.4.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp.26-7.

reminder of Dissenter disloyalty and comparison of the Revolution and Toleration with 1640s-style radicalism was to increase Anglican unease over the Revolution. Thomas Smith, another Anglican Jacobite, argued that exempting Dissenters from penal laws was foolhardy. Dissenters did not care for ‘the sacred ties and religion of repeated *Oaths* and *Sacraments*, to the most solemn obligations of natural and civil right and justice.’ Under William attacks on ‘our holy religion are tolerated.’ This meant that England’s ‘ruine cannot be afar off.’⁶² Smith believed the Restoration establishment of Anglicanism had been ‘secured and established against the corruptions and innovations’ of Dissenters but the Revolution undermined this.⁶³ The only difference between these and anti-Toleration Tory polemics was that these Jacobites used William’s Toleration to advocate allegiance to James. These English Jacobites tried to woo Tory support by presenting allegiance to James as a return to the Restoration settlement where political loyalty and religious uniformity were one.

Despite these overtures to anti-Toleration feeling other Jacobites saw how English public opinion was changing. Charlwood Lawton, as Chapter Four showed, recognised the changing public views on the Revolution and greater emphasis on subjects’ liberties. His pamphlets emphasising subjects’ liberties also recognised that public opinions on toleration and allegiance had changed since 1689.⁶⁴ Goldie and Clare Jackson described the ‘Whig Jacobitism’ of Lawton and James’s 1693 Declaration as offering a more liberal toleration than William’s. This conciliatory approach was to build as broad as support as possible by gaining support from Dissenters and disappointed Whigs.⁶⁵ Jacobite offers of toleration reflect the fact that much English public opinion had grown more accepting of Nonconformists’ political allegiance and had begun to embrace Toleration as a beneficial post-Revolution change. Lawton’s *Jacobite Principles Vindicated*, in contrast to Smith’s and Johnston’s polemics, reflected the changed public opinion by offering ‘Civil

⁶² Thomas Smith, *A Discourse Concerning Divine Providence, in Relation to National Judgments* (London, 1693), pp.21-2.

⁶³ Thomas Smith, *Two Compendious Discourses the One Concerning the Power of God, the other about the certainty and evidence of a future state: published in opposition to the growing atheism and deism of the age* (London, 1699), pp.12-3.

⁶⁴ Charlwood Lawton, *The Jacobite Principles Vindicated: In Answer to a Letter sent to the Author* (n.p., 1693), pp.17-8.

⁶⁵ Mark Goldie & Clare Jackson, ‘Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites,’ in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007), pp.188-9.

Comprehension' to all who gave James allegiance. Allegiance to James should be the only requirement for toleration and toleration was 'the Interest of the Nation' by satisfying all loyal subjects.⁶⁶ The infamous Robert Ferguson also chided Williamite hypocrisy over toleration. James's attempts to introduce toleration were condemned as an attack on Anglicanism but most Williamites accepted William's Toleration. William introduced Toleration out of fear he 'might have lost... the Affection, Service, and Assistance of the whole Fanatick Party' who could 'turn *Jacobites*.' James's toleration was motivated not by fear but a real love for loyal subjects regardless of denomination.⁶⁷ Both James's 1692 and 1693 Declarations promised to maintain the Anglican establishment while also offering 'liberty of conscience' to Dissenters who aided his restoration and gave him allegiance.⁶⁸ There were two clear English Jacobite approaches. Some exploited Tory opposition to Toleration but others, like Lawton, believed that from 1693 there was greater public acceptance of Toleration in England. Allegiance to James was depicted as offering both a more liberal toleration and also as a means to undo the Toleration.

James's 1692 Declaration was made when a French-Jacobite invasion seemed imminent.⁶⁹ These overtures to English Dissenters and Whigs elicited harsh Williamite responses, which sought to demonstrate William's popular support while also showing how Dissenters' allegiance and Toleration were more publicly acceptable in England. With the French-Jacobite threat some Tory Anglicans who originally opposed Toleration now praised Toleration for guaranteeing Dissenter allegiance to William. Henry Compton, Bishop of London, opposed Toleration in 1689 but in 1692 accepted Nonconformists as loyal Williamites. He acknowledged his original opposition but denied seeking Toleration's repeal.⁷⁰ Compton praised Toleration for removing Dissenters' grievances and encouraging Dissenter allegiance to William. 'Security' was 'the greatest Blessing to any Nation, when all sorts of people are content and at

⁶⁶ Lawton, *Jacobite Principles Vindicated*, pp.19-21.

⁶⁷ Robert Ferguson, *Whether the Preserving the Protestant Religion was the motive...* (n.p., 1695), pp.15-6.

⁶⁸ James II and VII, *His Majesties most Gracious Declaration to all His Loving subjects, commanding their Assistance against the P. of Orange, and his Adherents* (n.p., 1692), p.4; James II and VII, *His Majesties Most Gracious Declaration to all his Loving Subjects* (n.p., 1693).

⁶⁹ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.122-5; See Chapters Three and Four for more on the 1692 and 1693 Declarations.

⁷⁰ Henry Compton, *The Bishop of London's Eight Letter to his Clergy, &c.* (London, 1692), pp.3-5.

their ease.’ It was ‘a Curse... to be unsafe, and under the continual apprehensions of Disturbance’ that accompanied persecution of Dissenters.⁷¹ The ‘bleating of Rebellion’ was ‘sacrific’d upon the Altar of Obedience’ because Dissenters were tolerated. Compton repeatedly praised Toleration for creating more loyal Williamites.⁷² William Sherlock originally opposed the Revolution and Toleration before his defection.⁷³ In the face of the 1692 Jacobite threat he accepted Dissenter allegiance to William. Sherlock dismissed James’s ‘liberty of conscience’ offer because Dissenters ‘have it already in as full and ample a manner as it can be given them.’ James’s proposition was ‘no Argument’ to induce Dissenters ‘to help forward another *Revolution*.’⁷⁴ Another Williamite pamphlet attacking James’s 1693 Declaration said England ‘already’ had Toleration so Dissenters had no reason to give James allegiance.⁷⁵ Fearing William’s removal some previously anti-Toleration Williamites now embraced Dissenter allegiance to William and praised Toleration as a post-Revolution innovation that pacified Dissenters and made them loyal. This gave William a broader base.

Chapter One showed how in early 1689 arguments from history, particularly the fears of Dissenters, cast a long shadow over the initial allegiance debates. Long and others still promoted Restoration-era views that Dissenters were politically disloyal. However by 1692 the popular rhetoric was changing to the point where Dissenter disloyalty was no longer a given. This embrace of one of the Revolution’s changes shows that English public views were continuing to drift away from the minimalistic interpretations of the Revolution that had originally induced many to give William allegiance. Both Dissenters and Anglicans were Williamites. Whig Bishop William Lloyd noted how some Tories complained that William was ‘too kind to Dissenters’ while Dissenters bemoaned that William was too kind to Anglicans. Lloyd said that despite these criticisms Anglicans and Dissenters were generally loyal to

⁷¹ Ibid, pp.8-9.

⁷² Ibid, pp.14-5, 17-9.

⁷³ William Sherlock, *A Letter to a Member of the Convention* (n.p., 1689), pp.1-4. See Chapter One for his opposition to the Revolution in 1689.

⁷⁴ William Sherlock, *A Second Letter to a Friend, concerning the French Invasion in which the Declaration lately dispersed under the Title of His Majesty’s most gracious Declaration to all his loving subjects...*(London, 1692), pp.28-9.

⁷⁵ *The True and Genuine Explanation of One King James’s Declarations* (London, 1693), p.2.

William against James, Protestantism's 'Enemy.'⁷⁶ Whig Anglican Thomas Percival wrote in 1696 that Jacobites viewed Anglicans and Nonconformist Protestants as one Protestant group loyal to William. These Protestants were 'Men whose Interest would not be divided from King *William*, as knowing they must fall with him, and undergo the same Fate.'⁷⁷ Increasing numbers of Anglican Williamites, from Tory and Whig backgrounds, praised Toleration for making Dissenters loyal Williamites and saw the Revolution as more than just William's enthronement. Allegiance to William supported a Revolution that introduced a government embracing Anglican and Dissenter allegiance.

Anglican Williamites hailing Toleration's impact on allegiance debates could point to numerous Dissenter proclamations of allegiance to William. These Dissenter polemics celebrated the Revolution as a transformative event. Many Nonconformists enthusiastically promoted allegiance to William as guaranteeing their newfound Toleration. Presbyterian minister John Howe said 'The favour of our Rulers in the present Established Liberty, we must thankfully acknowledge; and to Them [William and Mary] we are studious to approve our selves in the whole of this Affair.'⁷⁸ Howe described loyalty to William as related to establishing liberty for Protestants, including Presbyterians. Those demanding Toleration's repeal were 'common Enemies' of Protestantism seeking to divide William's subjects who were united by their allegiance.⁷⁹ London-based Scottish Presbyterian Robert Fleming praised Toleration as a '*Beam of Hope*.' He said that he reflected 'with pleasure' on the 'great Mercies received in the wonderful Deliverance which God had wrought for us....' This Protestant 'Union' was a '*Sign of Security and Peace*' against Jacobite threats. Fleming praised Toleration for bringing a degree of unity amongst Protestants supporting the Revolution.⁸⁰

Nonconformist minister Vincent Alsop praised Toleration for allowing Nonconformists to 'acquit' themselves 'both as Christians and good

⁷⁶ William Lloyd, *The Pretences of the French-Invasion Examined for the Information of the People of England...* (London, 1692), pp.14-5.

⁷⁷ Thomas Percival, *The Rye-House Travestie, or, A True Account and Declaration of the horrid and execrable Conspiracy against his Majesty King William...* (London, 1696), pp.41-2.

⁷⁸ John Howe, *Heads of Agreement assented to by the United Ministers in and About London, formerly called Presbyterian and Congregational* (London, 1691), 'The Preface to the Reader,' p.14.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp.14, 4.

⁸⁰ Robert Fleming, *The Rod or the Sword...* (London, 1694), pp.70, 73.

Subjects.’⁸¹ Alsop prayed that William would now have ‘a loyal, quiet people, disposed to obedience.’⁸² At points he contrasted Dissenters’ enthusiastic allegiance to William with ‘*Non-jurors*’ who ‘are converted to *Jurors*’ only because William triumphed militarily. These ‘State Proselytes’ would ‘upon the least temptation... become Apostates’ or Jacobites. However Alsop also said that most English Protestants regardless of denomination were loyal to William.⁸³ Alsop’s Thanksgiving sermon for William’s deliverance from the 1696 Assassination Plot displayed little difference from Anglican sermons that also praised this deliverance and reasserted loyalty to William.⁸⁴ Dissenter loyalty to William became an orthodox part of the mid-1690s English public discourse.

The extent of public acceptance of Toleration can be seen in a 1700 pamphlet claiming that Anglican clerics ‘promoting the Execution of penal laws against Dissenters’ were popularly derided and loathed. This was because such sentiments went against the popular concern for subjects’ liberties and acceptance of Toleration.⁸⁵ Following Mary’s death in 1695 Presbyterian minister William Bates took the opportunity to make ‘renewed Assurances of our Fidelity to’ William and his government. Bates prayed for William’s continued reign, which was ‘necessary for preserving the pure Religion, the Civil Rights of this Kingdom.’⁸⁶ The mention of ‘Civil Rights’ shows that Dissenters saw William as their King and his Revolution was their liberation. Bates expressed similar sentiments of loyalty following the 1697 Ryswick

⁸¹ Vincent Alsop, *Duty and Interest united in Prayer and Promise for Kings and all that are in Authority...* (London, 1695), p.5.

⁸² *Ibid.*, pp.19-20.

⁸³ Vincent Alsop, *Duty and Interest united in Prayer and Promise for Kings and all that are in Authority...* (London, 1695), pp.15-6, 19-20.

⁸⁴ Vincent Alsop, *A Sermon Preached upon the Wonderful Deliverance by his Majesty from Assassination...* (London, 1696), *passim*. Sermons by Anglicans such as Edward Fowler, *A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords in the Abby-Church at Westminster, upon Thursday the sixteenth of April, 1696 being a day of publick Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the most happy discovery and disappointment of a horrid design to Assassinate His sacred Majesty...* (London, 1696), pp.11-4, 23-4; Francis Gregory, *A Thanksgiving Sermon for the Deliverance of Our KING From the Late Intended ASSASSINATION...* (London, 1696), pp.9-11.

⁸⁵ *Animadversions on the Two Last 30th of January Sermons, The One Preached to the Honourable House of Commons, The Other to the Lower House of Commons. In a Letter* (London, 1700), pp.16-8, 22-3, 25-6. See Chapter Four for the development of the link between allegiance, the Revolution and subjects’ liberties.

⁸⁶ William Bates, *A Sermon Preached upon the Much Lamented death of our Late Gracious Sovereign Queen Mary to which is added The Address of Condolence to His Majesty his Dissenting members* (London, 1695), pp.25-6.

Peace Treaty.⁸⁷ The 1696 Affirmation Act allowed Quakers to make pronouncements of loyalty similar to those by other Nonconformists. While there was some opposition to this, it was a further sign of public commitment to pluralistic Protestantism in England.⁸⁸ Soon Quakers were publicly declaring loyalty to William in their unique way that did not involve swearing. Following the 1696 Plot one Quaker broadside declared that it was Quaker duty ‘to pray for the King.’⁸⁹ They refused the Association acknowledging William as *de jure* monarch but ‘not out of any Disaffection to the King.’ They did not oppose ‘his being Declared Rightful and Lawful King of these Realms’ but objected to the non-pacifist elements of the Association.⁹⁰ Even Quaker allegiance now had some public acceptability.

Daniel Defoe, a prominent English Dissenter, frequently linked Toleration and allegiance. Like Alsop, Defoe hailed Toleration and Dissenter allegiance to William while castigating Tory caution over allegiance. In 1689 Defoe said that pious Protestants must be loyal to William because the ‘Protestant Interest’ across Europe depended on William reigning in England. Williamites were ‘lovers either of our Civil or Religious Rights, and our secure, peaceable, and lasting enjoyment of them.’⁹¹ Defoe lambasted anti-Dissenter sentiments as proof that Tory allegiance to William was conditional and Tories were deliberately duplicitous on allegiance. Tories wanted William to ‘discard’ Whigs and re-establish ‘the penal Laws again upon the Fanaticks’ or Dissenters.⁹² In some pamphlets Defoe, like Burnet, equated opposition to Toleration with Jacobitism. His famous *True-born Englishman* castigated Tory-Jacobites for believing they could ‘cancel the Allegiance of the Nation’ by re-enthroning James.⁹³ Tory-Jacobites were disloyal but ‘No Nonconforming Sects disturb’ William’s reign.⁹⁴ By 1702 with Anne’s imminent succession Defoe’s *New Test of the Church of England’s Loyalty*

⁸⁷ William Bates, ‘Dr. Bates’s Congratulatory Speech to the KING, Novemb. 22. 1697. In the Name of the Dissenting Ministers in and about London,’ *A Sermon preach’d on the late day of thanksgiving, Decemb. 2, 1697 by John Howe...to which is prefixed Dr. Bates’s Congratulatory Speech to the King, Novemb. 22, 1697...*(London, 1698).

⁸⁸ Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture*, pp.451, 493-5, 678-9; Tim Harris, *Revolution*, pp.492-3.

⁸⁹ *The Ancient Testimony and Principle of the People Called Quakers Renewed with Respect to the King and Government, and touching the Present Association* (n.p., 1696).

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ Daniel Defoe, *The Advantages of the Present Settlement, and the Great Danger of a Relapse* (London, 1689), pp.32-4, 38.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p.8.

⁹³ Daniel Defoe, *True-Born Englishman A Satyr* (London, 1700), pp.45-7.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.4-5.

accepted that Anglicans and Dissenters were 'equally Loyal.'⁹⁵ 'Where now is the Difference between Church Loyalty, and Whiggish Loyalty, Roundhead or Cavalier, Churchman or Dissenter, Whig or Tory?' Dissenters and Anglicans were loyal to William.⁹⁶ To Defoe it was 'Preposterous' to 'keep up the Distinction between Parties as to Loyalty, when indeed there is no manner of Difference in the Case.'⁹⁷

One of Defoe's most significant comments on the Revolution and Toleration came in his 1698 pamphlet on 'Occasional Conformity,' whereby Nonconformists occasionally took sacrament in Anglican Churches in order to qualify for political offices. Defoe argued that Dissenters should not engage in Occasional Conformity because Toleration meant they no longer had to choose between religious principles and political loyalty. Dissenters could give William allegiance without compromising their faith through Occasional Conformity.⁹⁸ According to Defoe 'the Name of Protestant is now the common Title of an *Englishman*.'⁹⁹ The Revolution made Dissenters a legitimate part of English society. Dissenters could now satisfy their 'strong desire' to 'serve our Country' without 'a Violation of all our Principles and Profession....'¹⁰⁰ Allegiance to William supported these changes.

Popular views on allegiance and the Revolution had changed since early 1689. Some Tories, like Long, promoted allegiance to William while continuing to view Dissenters as disloyal. Several Anglican Jacobites tried to entice allegiance to James by exploiting Tory unease over Toleration. However, as Chapters Three and Four showed, the widespread conservatism of early Williamite polemics was starting to give way. Some Jacobite polemics began offering toleration to Dissenters alongside promises to preserve the Anglican establishment in order to gain the allegiance of as many subjects as possible. This is evidence of the evolving English public views on allegiance and the Revolution. From 1692 Jacobite threats led to Anglican Williamites increasingly praising Toleration as a post-Revolution innovation that ensured

⁹⁵ Daniel Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty: or, Whiggish Loyalty and Church Loyalty Compar'd* (n.p., 1702), pp.3-4, 7.

⁹⁶ *Ibid*, pp.21-2.

⁹⁷ *Ibid*, pp.26-7.

⁹⁸ Daniel Defoe, *An Enquiry into the Occasional Conformity of Dissenters in Cases of Preferment with a preface to the Lord Mayor, occasioned by his carrying the Sword to a Conventicle* (Dublin, 1698), pp.9-11.

⁹⁹ *Ibid*, p.8.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, pp.13-4.

Dissenter allegiance to William and broadened his support. Even some Tories who originally opposed Toleration now praised Toleration for engendering Dissenter loyalty. Defoe, Bates and other Dissenters described Nonconformists' allegiance to William and promoted it as supporting the Revolution settlement, including the Toleration that gave them some liberty. Chapter Four showed how allegiance to William was increasingly seen as supporting the post-Revolution changes to the monarchy. Anglican and Dissenter polemics linking Toleration with allegiance provide further evidence of the increasing popularity of viewing the Revolution as more significant than a personnel change as earlier Williamite allegiance pamphlets argued. Allegiance to William supported the Revolution's changes and this religious settlement, which was very different to the Restoration religious settlement.

II

In Scotland Presbyterianism replaced Episcopacy as the established Church. Presbyterian polemicists celebrated this change but many portrayed this as a re-establishment rather than a new innovation.¹⁰¹ Episcopalians were now dissenters from the established Church and many suffered persecution. However as Chapters One through Three have shown there were some Williamite Episcopalians who, like Presbyterian Williamites, in 1689 focused on William replacing James as *de facto* King as a means to encourage allegiance to William. Some Episcopalians appealed for English assistance, which influenced public debate over toleration and the allegiance of Protestants not subscribing to Scotland's Established Presbyterianism. In numerous Williamite and Jacobite polemics Presbyterianism's establishment was linked to any potential measure accommodating Episcopalians. This resulted in allegiance to William being viewed as a declaration of support for the significant changes, especially in ecclesiastical affairs, the Revolution introduced in Scotland.

Many Presbyterians rejected toleration of Episcopalians because they saw it as inconsistent with their belief in religious uniformity and this caused

¹⁰¹ Raffe, 'Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics after the Revolution,' pp.319-20, 323-7, 332-3; idem, *The Culture of Controversy Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660-1714* (Woodbridge, 2012), pp.40-3, 46-8, 78-81, 84-7; Colin Kidd, 'Religious Realignment between the Restoration and Union,' in John Robertson (ed.) *A Union for Empire: Political Thought and the British Union of 1707* (Cambridge, 1995), pp.145-62.

tensions with William. However the 1693 *Act for Settling the Quiet and Peace of the Church* protected Episcopalian clerics who still possessed Churches and took the oath of allegiance to William. Jeffrey Stephen describes this as ‘effectively an act of toleration’ for Williamite Episcopalians.¹⁰² Other historians have highlighted how the 1695 Church Act gave stronger legal protection for these Episcopalian clerics because it did not oblige them to participate in Presbyterian Church courts. This benefitted a small number of clerics and did not provide the extensive protection that the English Toleration Act offered. However the issue of allegiance remains neglected. Toleration and comprehension within a broader Church of Scotland were debated many times in the 1690s and Presbyterian-Episcopalian antagonism in seeking control of the Kirk has been commented on numerous times.¹⁰³ The religious settlement of the Presbyterian establishment and potential protection for Episcopalian clerics not subscribing to this establishment impacted on Scottish allegiance debates. Expulsions of Episcopalians from offices for Jacobitism have been commented on but historiography overlooks the importance of the toleration-allegiance link to these events.¹⁰⁴ Quakers’ petition for a Scottish Affirmation bill, similar to England’s, was rejected. Presbyterians and Episcopalians, the largest Scottish denominations, dominated Scottish Protestant discourse in the 1690s with fewer public comments by Protestants outside these groups.¹⁰⁵

Alasdair Raffe argues that imposing the Oath of Allegiance and Assurance, recognising William as the rightful King, on Episcopalians demonstrated Presbyterian intolerance. This intolerance, Raffe argues, shows

¹⁰² Raffe, ‘Presbyterianism, Secularization and Scottish Politics after the Revolution,’ pp.325-6; Stephen, *Defending the Revolution*, pp.295-6, 187-96.

¹⁰³ R. Buick Knox, ‘Establishment and Toleration during the Reigns of William, Mary and Anne,’ *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XXIII (1989), pp.334-8, 342-7; Ian B. Cowan, *The Scottish Covenanters 1660-1688* (London, 1976), pp.11, 89-90, 135-9; idem, ‘Church and State Reformed? The Revolution of 1688-9 in Scotland,’ in Jonathan I. Israel (ed.) *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact* (Cambridge, 2003), pp.180-1; T.N. Clarke, ‘The Williamite Episcopalians,’ pp.50-1; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.216-8; Kidd, ‘Religious Realignment,’ pp.146, 151-2, 158; Raffe, *Culture of Controversy*, pp.54-7, 192-3, idem, ‘Presbyterians and Episcopalians: The Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715,’ *The English Historical Review*, 125, No. 514 (2010), pp.570-98.

¹⁰⁴ Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.213-4; Riley, *King William and the Scottish Politicians*, pp.4, 25-39; Clarke, ‘The Scottish Episcopalians 1688-1720,’ pp.9, 13-8, 25, 64-6, 72; Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707* (Edinburgh, 2007), pp.2-4; Lenman, ‘The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism,’ pp.39-40, 44; Raffe, ‘Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics after the Revolution of 1688-1690,’ pp.322-5, 328-9; Glassey, ‘William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland, 1689-90,’ pp.319-24, 329.

¹⁰⁵ *The Case of the People, call’d Quakers, as it concerns an Affirmation, which they desire may be extended to all Britain* (n.p., 1698); Raffe, *Culture of Controversy*, pp.37-45.

how Scotland and England were diverging because England was now tolerating dissent in contrast to Scotland's Presbyterian-dominated settlement.¹⁰⁶ While the Revolution settlements were different the public debates in both Kingdoms had similarities in part due to many pamphlets being published in London where there was toleration. Allegiance to William became seen as supporting the Revolution settlement, which included the Presbyterian establishment and from 1693 a limited protection of Episcopalian clerics. Just as in England initial public conservatism towards the Revolution was giving way to an embrace of the Revolution as transformative.

In 1689-90 the Episcopalian hierarchy's Jacobitism forced William to scrap any notion of maintaining Episcopacy and after Presbyterianism was established many Episcopalians suffered persecution. William hoped that Williamite Episcopalians would have 'the same indulgence that Dissenters have in England' provided they took the oath of allegiance.¹⁰⁷ One 1691 memo for the Scottish Parliament said that many Episcopalians felt persecuted by the Presbyterians. This meant that Episcopalian clerics, very influential in 'the north half of' Scotland, were 'for the most part, dissatisfied' with William. It was worrying to see 'so great a party... disaffected to the present government' and who 'are therefore Jacobites....'¹⁰⁸ This memo recognised that persecution and allegiance were linked and said that an act protecting Episcopalians who gave William allegiance and promised not to overturn Presbyterianism would 'break the disaffected party.' A form of toleration would potentially induce Episcopalian allegiance to William.¹⁰⁹ This memo gave an accurate assessment of why many Episcopalians denied William allegiance. Numerous Episcopalian Jacobite polemics also cited the post-Revolution persecution to justify denying William allegiance.

Several Episcopalian pamphlets appealed for English Anglican assistance and warned that Scottish Presbyterians also threatened Prelacy in

¹⁰⁶ Alasdair Raffae, 'Scottish State Oaths and the Revolution of 1688-90,' in Sharon Adams & Julian Goodare (eds.) *Scotland in the Age of Two Revolutions* (Woodbridge, 2014), pp.182-6, 190-1; idem, 'Episcopalian Polemic, the London printing press and Anglo-Scottish Divergence in the 1690s,' *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 26 (2006), pp.23-41.

¹⁰⁷ Stephen, *Defending the Revolution*, pp.39-43, 69-73, 93, 152.

¹⁰⁸ 'Proposals for receiving the Episcopal ministers into the Presbyterian Church government in Scotland, and remarks on the unfitnes of pressing the oaths on particular persons as is ordered by the late Act of Parliament, 1691,' *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William and Mary, 1st November 1691- End of 1692*, ed. William John Hardy (London, 1900), p.50.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

England.¹¹⁰ However Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1695, wrote that loyalty to William was a precondition of any assistance.¹¹¹ Raffe has shown that Episcopalian pamphlets disputed Presbyterianism's popularity in the hope of overturning Presbyterianism in Scotland.¹¹² Many Episcopalian Jacobite arguments, like English Anglican Jacobite polemics, portrayed the Revolution as a Presbyterian-Nonconformist attack on the rightful monarch and established Church. Allegiance to William, they argued, supported this Revolution. Episcopalian Jacobite Alexander Cunningham said that 'the Principles of Scottish Presbytery grant no Toleration to Dissenters.'¹¹³ John Sage, another Episcopalian Jacobite, highlighted how Presbyterians 'had so thankfully embraced King *James's* Toleration' but now 'mounted on the Saddle' they 'refused to Tolerate any of a different Perswasion.'¹¹⁴ Episcopalian Jacobites said that the 1690 establishment of Presbyterianism and subsequent attacks on Episcopalians was another reason justifying denying William allegiance. This argument would be repeated numerous times in the 1690s.

Thomas Morer was another Episcopalian Jacobite who used this argument. He documented how Episcopalians were 'indiscriminately turned out' of offices even if they 'unanimously transferred their Allegiance from King *James* to King *William* and Queen *Mary*....'¹¹⁵ Morer portrayed the Scottish settlement as a more developed version of the Presbyterian-Nonconformist Revolution described by some English Anglican Jacobites.¹¹⁶ Restoration-era Presbyterians had demanded 'Liberty of Conscience' but since the Revolution they 'Tyrannize over others' like an 'inraged Lion.'¹¹⁷ Stephen has said that Morer and other Episcopalians attacked the Claim of Right as anti-Episcopalian.¹¹⁸ However Morer also denounced every aspect of the Revolution as anti-Episcopalian. He condemned the Convention and 'purely Presbyterian' proclamation of William and Mary as monarchs, which

¹¹⁰ Stephen, *Defending the Revolution*, pp.39-43, 69-73, 93, 152.

¹¹¹ D.H Whiteford, 'Jacobitism as a Factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland, 1689-1714, Part II- The Afflicted Church,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XVI, Part III (1968), pp.186-7.

¹¹² Raffe, 'Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics,' pp.325-6.

¹¹³ Alexander Cunningham, *Some Questions resolved concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland* (London, 1690), p.8.

¹¹⁴ John Sage, *An Account of the Late Establishment of Presbyterian Government...*(London, 1693), p.77.

¹¹⁵ Thomas Morer, *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland in several letters* (London, 1690), pp.33-4.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid*, pp.1-2; Johnston, *The Dear Bargain*, pp.15-6.

¹¹⁷ Morer, *Account of the Present Persecution*, 'To the Christian Reader,' pp.1-2.

¹¹⁸ Stephen, *Defending the Revolution*, pp.47-8.

Presbyterians used to justify persecuting Episcopalians. The entire Revolution in Scotland, including William's enthronement and the Claim, was anti-Episcopalian.¹¹⁹ Episcopalians could not support this Revolution because even Williamite Episcopalians had 'no more Protection' than 'the Rottenest *Jacobite* in the Kingdom.'¹²⁰ It was 'very surprising,' given William's vow in 1688-9 to protect Protestantism, that 'the present Governours should make it their business to sacrifice the Episcopal Clergy' to the 'Fury and blind Rage of' Presbyterians.¹²¹ William's government spurned Episcopalians, even those who gave him allegiance; therefore Episcopalians could not give William allegiance because of this persecution.

John Cockburn, like Morer, argued that the Revolution settlement was anti-Episcopalian. Cockburn, a prolific pamphleteer, wrote on many issues affecting allegiance.¹²² In two 1691 pamphlets he detailed how 'real Presbyterian Tyranny was established.' This tyranny meant that no group 'suffered so much as the *Episcopal Clergy* have in this Revolution.'¹²³ Persecution again justified rejecting allegiance to William. 'It is evident, that from the beginning of this Revolution, the Presbyterians have had the turning out of the Episcopal Clergy wholly in their Head.'¹²⁴ These pamphlets were clearly published in London to gain English assistance for Episcopalians. This persecution included making subjects promise to uphold Presbyterianism and recant Episcopacy as part of allegiance to William, which was why numerous Episcopalians denied William allegiance and resulted in their expulsions from offices.¹²⁵ Cockburn acknowledged that William proposed forms of toleration but Presbyterians' tying of political loyalty to the ecclesiastical settlement forced pious Episcopalians to deny William allegiance. This showed Presbyterian 'Contrivance to ruine the Interest of the *Episcopal Clergy*.'¹²⁶ It was a maxim of William's government that 'none could be trusted... who did

¹¹⁹ Morer, *Account of the Present Persecution*, pp.14, 25, 27.

¹²⁰ *Ibid*, p.35.

¹²¹ *Ibid*, p.63.

¹²² See Chapter Seven for Cockburn's use of *de jure* allegiance.

¹²³ John Cockburn, *An Historical Relation of the late General Assembly held at Edinburgh from Octob. 16, to Nov. 13 in the year 1690 in a letter from a person in Edinburgh to his friend in London* (London, 1691), pp.1-3; *idem*, *A Continuation of the Historical Relation of the late General Assembly in Scotland...* (London, 1691), pp.5-6.

¹²⁴ Cockburn, *A Continuation of the Historical Relation*, p.29.

¹²⁵ Cockburn, *An Historical Relation*, pp.40-1, 52-3; *idem*, *A Continuation of the Historical Relation*, pp.3-6, 10.

¹²⁶ Cockburn, *Continuation of the Historical Relation*, p.16.

not renounce their former sentiments' and 'abjure Episcopacy.'¹²⁷ The message was clear: Episcopalians could not give William allegiance because it involved recanting Episcopacy. Morer and Cockburn would expand on this to include issues of *de jure* monarchy but these parts of their theses defended rejecting allegiance to William because it supported the Revolution settlement that persecuted Episcopalians.¹²⁸

Tristram Clarke records how numerous Williamite Episcopalians lost their offices for refusing to support Presbyterianism.¹²⁹ Cockburn and Morer had used these expulsions to link toleration, or lack thereof, with allegiance and other Episcopalian Jacobites did the same. Alexander Monro also portrayed allegiance to William as supporting persecution. It was a 'great piece of Policy' that made it impossible 'to require Obedience to the Civil Authority, without the mixture of some *Presbyterian Test*....' When 'this Severity is complained of,' Presbyterians 'Clamourously Alledge, that the Episcopal Party are Enemies to King *William* and Queen *Mary*....' This meant all Episcopalians, even Williamites, were seen as having 'Disloyalty to King *William* and Queen *Mary*.'¹³⁰ Passive Obedience and James being *de jure* King were other issues that Monro explored but persecution was another specific reason for refusing allegiance to William.¹³¹ Similarly John Sage's *Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy* warned London readers that Scottish Presbyterians wanted to implement their Covenants and dominate all Three Kingdoms. Sage denied any 'malicious Design to Bespatter' William.¹³² However Sage also said that since the Revolution 'it's a received Axiom... that Protection and Allegiance are reciprocal....'¹³³ Without some form of toleration Episcopalians could not give William allegiance.

From 1692-3 there were efforts to introduce forms of comprehension or toleration and this led to the 1693 and 1695 Church Acts, which protected

¹²⁷ Cockburn, *An Historical Relation*, pp.57-64; idem, *Continuation of the Historical Relation*, pp.54-7.

¹²⁸ Cockburn, *Continuation of the Historical Relation*, pp.10, 16-7, 55; Morer, *Account of the Present Persecution*, pp.1-2, 14, 25, 27, 35, 63. See Chapter Seven for Morer and Cockburn's discussions on allegiance to William as *de jure* King.

¹²⁹ Clarke, 'The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland,' pp.44-5.

¹³⁰ Alexander Monro, *Presbyterian Inquisition as it was lately practised against the Professors of the Colledge of Edinburgh, August and September, 1690 in which the spirit of Presbytery and their present method of procedure is plainly discovered*... (London, 1691), pp.50-1.

¹³¹ See Chapter Two for Monro's use of Passive Obedience and Chapter Seven for *De jure* allegiance.

¹³² John Sage, *The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland truly represented*... (London, 1690), pp.103-4, 106-8.

¹³³ *Ibid*, p.104.

Episcopalian clerics who still held churches provided they took the oaths to William. These Acts were extremely limited but did give Episcopalians some legal protection.¹³⁴ However from 1692 Sage and Monro became even more explicit in using persecution to deny William allegiance. Monro's *Apology for the Clergy of Scotland* said that all Europe knew 'the late Presbyterian Barbarities and Cruelties towards the Episcopal clergy in *Scotland*.'¹³⁵ The 'Club' who advanced the Revolution were mostly 'Presbyterians, and zealously affected to the present Government.' Presbyterians were 'very active and industrious in dethroning K. *James*, and advancing K. *William* and Q. *Mary* to the Throne.'¹³⁶ The 'Consequence of so monstrous a Change' was Presbyterianism's establishment and persecution of Episcopalians. Post-Revolution Scotland, with Parliament 'resolute to support' Presbyterianism, was hostile to Episcopalians.¹³⁷ Again Sage said that the Oaths of Allegiance to William could not be taken without renouncing Episcopacy.¹³⁸ Sage and Monro also rejected allegiance to William because they believed that neither William nor the settlement was lawful. However the lack of toleration resulting from Presbyterianism's establishment and William's enthronement was another specific reason for declining allegiance to William. Monro, Sage and others repeatedly described the entire Revolution as Presbyterian even in 1693. This was a more developed and ominous Presbyterian rebellion than that depicted in English Anglican Jacobite polemics but had the same purpose in depicting the Revolution as a Nonconformist-Presbyterian victory.¹³⁹ These Episcopalian Jacobites said that they declined allegiance to William because they believed it supported the Revolution settlement, which overthrew Episcopacy, established Presbyterianism and resulted in persecution of Episcopalians.

¹³⁴ Stephen, *Defending the Revolution*, pp.187-96; Raffè, *Culture of Controversy*, pp.55-7, 192-3.

¹³⁵ Alexander Monro, *An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland chiefly oppos'd to the censures, calamities, and accusations of a late Presbyterian vindicator...* (London, 1693), pp.1-2.

¹³⁶ Alexander Monro, *A Letter to a Friend giving an account of all the Treatises that have been publish'd with relation to the present Persecution against the Church of Scotland* (London, 1692), pp.26-7.

¹³⁷ John Sage, *An Account of the Late Establishment of Presbyterian-Government by the Parliament of Scotland anno. 1690...and the consequences of it...* (London, 1693), pp.49-50.

¹³⁸ Ibid, p.77. See Chapter Seven for more on the Assurance.

¹³⁹ Ibid, pp.49-50, 77; Monro, *Presbyterian Inquisition*, pp50-1; Cockburn, *Continuation of Historical Relation*, pp.16-7, 55; Johnston, *Dear Bargain*, pp.15-6; *The State Prodigal his return*, pp.1-3.

Many English Anglicans, like Tenison, failed to see the depth of Episcopalian Jacobitism and lobbied William for relief of Episcopalians.¹⁴⁰ Raffe describes how Scottish Presbyterian pamphlets, written in response to charges of persecution, downplayed their Covenants to counter their reputation for disloyalty and extremism while defending the Presbyterian establishment.¹⁴¹ Allegiance was central to many of these responses. While Episcopalian Jacobites denounced Presbyterians for tying allegiance to William with support for Presbyterianism, many Presbyterian Williamites defended this measure. However they also eventually accepted the idea that there should be a form of legal protection for some Episcopalian clerics who gave William allegiance and promised not to overturn Presbyterianism. This was partly because these polemics had an audience in both Scotland and England, where as has been shown toleration was now accepted provided Dissenters from the Established Church gave William allegiance. London-based Scottish Presbyterian George Ridpath was outraged by how Episcopalians, through their polemics alleging persecution, ‘procured an abundance of Friends’ in England where tolerance was popular and some Anglicans still feared Presbyterianism.¹⁴² Ridpath alleged that Scottish Episcopalians frequented taverns in London ‘where it’s known that they associate only with *Jacobites*’ and pretend ‘as if they were true *Williamites*, and confessors for the Church of *England*.’ They deliberately deceived English Anglican Williamites on their allegiance to advance James’s interests by trying to create divisions between Scottish and English Williamites.¹⁴³

Other Scottish Presbyterian Williamites said it was their ‘Duty’ to publicly vindicate themselves, especially to London audiences, from the ‘Untruths, Contradictions, and Nonsense’ of Morer and other Episcopalian Jacobites. In denying persecution many Presbyterians also accepted the idea that some Episcopalian clerics should be legally protected provided they swore

¹⁴⁰ Whiteford, ‘Jacobitism as a Factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian relationships,’ pp.186-7.

¹⁴¹ Raffe, ‘Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics after the Revolution of 1688-1690,’ pp.325-7; idem, ‘Scottish State Oaths,’ pp.182-6, 190-1.

¹⁴² 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...* (London, 1694), pp.14-5.

¹⁴³ Ibid, pp.14-5.

allegiance to William and not to overturn Presbyterianism.¹⁴⁴ To dispel any illusions English sympathisers may have had the Presbyterians also emphasised how Episcopalians ‘never shewed any respect to’ William.¹⁴⁵ Like their Episcopalian opponents, these Presbyterian polemics spoke to a pan-British audience. This resulted in greater public acceptance in Scotland that allegiance to William negated legal retribution against Williamite Episcopalians but that did not preclude action against opponents of the Revolution. The Revolution was depicted as being more transformative than a monarchical substitution, as earlier Scottish Williamite polemics asserted, with allegiance to William supporting these changes.¹⁴⁶

Scottish Presbyterian Williamite Gilbert Rule denounced pamphlets by Morer, Cockburn and other Episcopalian Jacobites while praising Presbyterian loyalty to William. ‘None maintaine more loyal Principles towards’ monarchs than Presbyterians and in Scotland loyal Williamites were pious Presbyterians.¹⁴⁷ Morer and Cockburn’s pamphlets showed how Episcopalians ‘cannot oppose Presbytery, without setting themselves against’ William’s ‘Civil Government.’¹⁴⁸ Another response to Sage doubted that any Presbyterian had ‘ever’ refused allegiance to William while ‘all knew the Prelates Inclinations towards the present Civil Government...’¹⁴⁹ This was demonstrating to English audiences who the Williamites in Scotland were.

Scottish Presbyterian Williamite pamphlets then described how several Episcopalians advocated continued allegiance to James and this made them unworthy of legal protection. Rule saw Morer’s criticism of the Convention as ‘a Confession that their opposition to the present Establishment of the State, and the Church go together.’ Morer wanted ‘to dethrone Their present majesties’ and ‘pleadeth more for overturning the Throne, than the present Government of the Church.’ This showed that complaints of

¹⁴⁴ Gilbert Rule, *A True Representation of Presbyterian Government...*(Edinburgh, 1690), pp.1-2; idem, *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to Five Pamphlets...*(Edinburgh & London, 1691), ‘Preface,’ pp.1-2; idem, *A Just and Modest Reproof of a Pamphlet called The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence* (Edinburgh, 1693), pp.24-6.

¹⁴⁵ G.M., *The Case of the Afflicted Clergy...*(n.p., 1691), pp.1-2, 9.

¹⁴⁶ See Chapters One, Two and Three.

¹⁴⁷ Rule, *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to Five Pamphlets*, ‘Preface,’ pp.7-9; idem, *Just and Modest Reproof*, pp.18-9.

¹⁴⁸ Rule, *Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to Five Pamphlets*, pp.7-9.

¹⁴⁹ G.M., *The Case of the Afflicted Clergy*, pp.11, 14, 1-2, 9.

persecution covered Episcopalians' Jacobitism.¹⁵⁰ Both Rule and Ridpath listed examples of Episcopalians ejected from offices for denying William allegiance. This was not religious persecution but retribution against those seeking 'to overturn the present Establishment of the State.' It was absurd to legally protect openly treacherous subjects.¹⁵¹ Ridpath said it was 'manifest' that Scottish Presbyterians were genuinely loyal to William because they did not 'bargain with their Kings about Allegiance' unlike Episcopalians demanding toleration in exchange for allegiance.¹⁵² He gleefully highlighted how Episcopalians were at odds with most subjects in Scotland and England. The 'promises of Duty and Allegiance' had 'changed' at the Revolution. Scottish Presbyterians gave William allegiance 'As also did the Church of *England*' but Scottish Episcopalians rejected allegiance to William.¹⁵³ Episcopalian 'Writings and Acting, make it evident that... the Interest of King *James*, and that of Prelacy are linked together: And their Zeal for the one filleth them with Spite and Animosity against what is opposite to the other.'¹⁵⁴ Episcopalians publicly denying William allegiance and refusing to support the Revolution's changes were used by Scottish Presbyterian Williamites to defend their actions since the Revolution.

Although the post-Revolution religious settlements in England and Scotland were different there is also evidence of common public views on the link between allegiance and protection of Protestants not subscribing to the Established Church. By the mid-1690s Toleration was popular in England and so Scottish Presbyterians, who were also addressing English audiences, wanted to show that both Kingdoms were squarely behind William and the Revolution against Jacobite threats. Many Scottish Presbyterian Williamite pamphlets accepted that there would be legal protection for some Episcopalians who gave William allegiance. Rule asked 'Did ever any Government allow protection to any on other terms?'¹⁵⁵ He hailed the Revolution's establishment of William and Presbyterianism but also said that allegiance to William negated action against Protestants not subscribing to the Kirk. Episcopalians should 'readily

¹⁵⁰ Rule, *Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to Five Pamphlets*, pp.33, 10-1.

¹⁵¹ Ridpath, *Scots Episcopal Innocence*, pp.16-37; Rule, *Vindication*, pp.2, 6-7, 33, 10-1.

¹⁵² Ridpath, *Scots Episcopal Innocence*, pp.14-5.

¹⁵³ *Ibid*, p.23.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid*, p.44.

¹⁵⁵ Rule, *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to Five Pamphlets*, pp.38, 43-9.

fall into accord' with Presbyterians under William against popery.¹⁵⁶ Rule and other Presbyterians asserted that promising not to 'overturn the Church' was a reasonable part of allegiance tests.¹⁵⁷ He retained hostility towards Episcopalians and said that Williamite Episcopalians had 'Feigned Obedience' because they refused to support Presbyterianism. However he also publicly accepted that Episcopalians who gave William allegiance should be legally protected.¹⁵⁸ Another Presbyterian pamphlet said that Episcopalians denying William allegiance could 'have no plea for a Toleration to be granted them.'¹⁵⁹ Both Rule and Ridpath claimed that toleration without allegiance to William would be letting 'Vipers into' the 'Bosom' of Church and State.¹⁶⁰ These Presbyterians claimed to support legal protection for some Protestants not subscribing to Presbyterianism provided they gave William allegiance and accepted Presbyterianism's establishment.

This shows greater public emphasis on the Revolution's changes, which included William's enthronement, Presbyterianism's establishment, and protection, albeit reluctantly conceded, for Williamite Episcopalians. Chapter Four showed how allegiance to William was no longer just about William becoming *de facto* King; it also supported subjects' liberties. By the mid-1690s allegiance to William was increasingly seen in Scotland as supporting the religious settlement of Presbyterianism's establishment and limited protection of some Episcopalian clerics. This view was manifested in the 1693 and 1695 Church Acts, which protected some Episcopalian clerics who possessed churches and gave William allegiance.¹⁶¹ Derek Patrick has said that the

¹⁵⁶ Gilbert Rule, *A Sermon Preached before His Grace the King's Commissioner, and the Three Estates of Parliament, May the 25th, 1690* (Edinburgh, 1690), p.15.

¹⁵⁷ Rule, *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to Five Pamphlets*, pp.38, 43-9; G.M., *The Case of the Afflicted Clergy*, pp.54-6; Rule, *A True Representation of Presbyterian Government*, pp.9, 16.

¹⁵⁸ Gilbert Rule, *A Defence of The Vindication of the Church of Scotland in answer to An Apology of the Clergy of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1694), pp.19-22; idem, *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to Five Pamphlets*, pp.38, 43-9.

¹⁵⁹ G.M., *The Case of the Afflicted Clergy*, p.49.

¹⁶⁰ Rule, *Just and Modest Reproof*, pp.39-40; Ridpath, *Scots Episcopal Innocence*, pp.6-7.

¹⁶¹ 'Act for Taking the Oath of Allegiance and Assurance,' *The Records of the Parliament of Scotland to 1707*, ed. K.M. Brown (St. Andrews, 2007-2013), 1693/4/50. URL: <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1693/4/50>. 'Act for Taking the Oath of Alledgeance and the Assurance Edinburgh, the Twentie Third day of May, 1693' (Edinburgh, 1693); 'Act for Setling the Peace and Quiet of the Church,' *Records of the Parliament of Scotland*, 1693/4/89. Date Accessed: 26 July 2014. URL: <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1693/4/89>; 'Act Concerning the Church,' *Records of the Parliament of Scotland*, 1695/5/186. Date accessed: 31 December 2014. URL: <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1695/5/186>.

Scottish Parliament was attentive to the public's 'mood.'¹⁶² There was some public support for the passage of the 1693 Church Act as evidenced by the pamphlets preceding the Act's passage, like Rule's, but more significantly by Ridpath's *Scots Episcopal Innocence*, which was published after the Act's passage.

Ridpath praised England's Toleration Act because it showed William was a King with 'concern for the Welfare of all his Subjects' regardless of Protestant denomination.¹⁶³ William had an 'admirable Temperament towards his Church of *England*, and Dissenting Subjects.'¹⁶⁴ The 1693 Church Act protected Scottish Episcopalians but 'to the Amazement of all Good Men, those who petition'd for it, now when it is obtain'd, stand aloof.' This was the 'blackest Ingratitude' from Episcopalians 'who should have greedily embraced the opportunity of a Comprehension,' which William had worked for.¹⁶⁵ Episcopalian Jacobites rejected this 'because they are obliged to abjure all Interests which are opposite to his Majesty's.' It was fair that 'no Body can think the Government obliged to grant' Episcopalians 'Protection' if they refused 'to swear Allegiance.'¹⁶⁶ Episcopalians were not persecuted; actions were taken against those who wanted James to 'reinthrone himself' and coincidentally were Episcopalian. Ridpath even labelled English Anglicans his 'Brethren' because they, like Scottish Presbyterians, gave William allegiance. Members of both Kingdoms' Established Churches were loyal to William.¹⁶⁷ Ridpath described the Revolution as enthroning William, establishing Presbyterianism and granting limited protection of Episcopalians not subscribing to the Kirk if they gave William allegiance and showed support for these changes.

Other Scottish allegiance pamphlets provide more evidence of the popular acceptance of the idea that Episcopalians giving William allegiance would negate retribution. One 1690 pamphlet said that the Revolution had 'totally extinguish that Spirit of Persecution' present under James.¹⁶⁸ Irish

¹⁶² Derek John Patrick, 'People and Parliament in Scotland 1689-1702' (University of St. Andrews Ph.D. thesis, 2002), pp.144, 379-84.

¹⁶³ Ridpath, *Scots Episcopal Innocence*, p.1.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid*, p.1.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid*, p.1.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid*, pp.16-7.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid*, pp.10-2, 7, 14-5.

¹⁶⁸ *A Letter from Scotland, to a Gentleman at court in Relation to Scotch-Affairs* (London, 1690), p.1.

Presbyterians accepted their Scottish co-religionists' arguments. Joseph Boyse and John MacBride said that Episcopalians refused 'the *Oath of Fidelity to the King*,' which would have given them legal protection.¹⁶⁹ The 1693 and 1695 Church Acts did not provide as extensive protection as England's Toleration Act but were seen as a form of protection. Sir William Seton was a Williamite Episcopalian who criticised Presbyterian dominance since the Revolution.¹⁷⁰ His 1703 *A Continuation of a Few Brief and Modest Reflections* praised the 1695 Act as a Scottish form of toleration. Seton said it was 'not fair' that many Presbyterians viewed Episcopalians as Jacobites because this Act protected Williamite Episcopalians; the act recognised that not all Episcopalians were Jacobites. This Act 'was so oft recommended' by William and had public support. Seton disliked the Presbyterian establishment but accepted the Revolution, which legally protected Episcopalians who gave William allegiance.¹⁷¹

A significant minority of Episcopalians took the oaths even if some Presbyterians doubted their sincerity.¹⁷² The Revolution in Scotland witnessed not only the establishment of William and Presbyterianism but also a public commitment not to persecute Episcopalians who were loyal to William. James Gordon was an Episcopalian cleric who supported William's enthronement. He, like other Williamite Episcopalians, took the Oath of Allegiance and Assurance because they believed the 1695 Act would 'probably procure the Kings protection' for them.¹⁷³ Gordon refused the oaths in previous years but believed the 1695 Act provided sufficient protection for him conscientiously to give William allegiance without compromising Episcopacy. The Presbyterianism of the Kirk was one of the biggest changes the Revolution ushered in but the Revolution was also seen as eventually introducing limited protection for Williamite Episcopalians not subscribing to Presbyterianism.

¹⁶⁹ Joseph Boyse, *The Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland, In Reference to a Bill of Indulgence, Vindicated from the Exceptions alledg'd against it, in a late Answer* (n.p., 1695), pp.4, 8; John MacBride, *Animadversions on the Defence of the Answer to a Paper, Intituled, The CASE of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland, in Reference to a BILL of Indulgence...*(n.p., 1697), pp35-6, 40-3, 62-3.

¹⁷⁰ Sir William Seton, *A Short Speech Prepared to be Spoken, By a Worthy Member in Parliament, Concerning the Present State of the Nation* (Edinburgh, 1700), pp.14-6.

¹⁷¹ Sir William Seton, *A Continuation of a Few Brief and Modest Reflections Perswading a Just Indulgence to be Granted to the Episcopal Clergy and People in Scotland...*(n.p., 1703), pp.9-10.

¹⁷² Stephen, *Defending the Revolution*, pp.125-49.

¹⁷³ James Gordon, July-August 1695, *James Gordon's Diary*, eds. G.D. Henderson & H.H. Porter (Aberdeen, 1949), pp.44-8, 54-5.

By the mid-1690s there was greater public acceptance amongst the politically involved in Scotland, like in England, that the Revolution ended Restoration-style religious uniformity and allegiance. Some Scottish Presbyterians persecuted Episcopalians and Jacobites used these actions to depict the Revolution as a Presbyterian victory that overturned the natural order. They rejected allegiance to William because it supported these changes and persecution. Presbyterian Williamites denied persecution. They described how the Revolution established Presbyterianism but eventually described allegiance to William as supporting the Revolution's religious settlement, which supported Presbyterianism and a limited protection of Williamite Episcopalians. This meant that the Revolution was now generally being depicted in Scottish public discourse as transformative. While the changes in Scotland were more extensive and rapid than in England, partly because of Presbyterianism's establishment, there was a similar evolution of opinion. The initial conservatism in Scottish Williamite polemics described in Chapter One and which, as Chapters Two and Three showed, retained some popularity but by the mid-1690s it was more popular to embrace the Revolution as transformative. This shows that Scotland was quicker to accept the Revolution as a more substantial event than a mere personnel change than England was. However from the mid-1690s the post-Revolution religious changes were publicly accepted in Scotland and England with allegiance to William seen as endorsing these Revolution innovations.

III

Post-Revolution Anglican-Presbyterian antagonism in Ireland has received some scholarly attention but, like English and Scottish historiography, the effect of toleration on Irish allegiance debates has been overlooked. Irish Anglicans' anti-Dissenter views prevented the introduction of an Irish form of Toleration.¹⁷⁴ Phil Kilroy has examined this Anglican-Presbyterian antagonism but her sources on allegiance are mainly from Anne's reign.¹⁷⁵ Perceptions of

¹⁷⁴ McBride, 'Ulster Presbyterians and the Confessional State,' pp.171-8, 187; Connolly, *Religion, Law and Power*, pp.161-8; idem, *Divided Kingdom*, passim; Beckett, *Protestant Dissent in Ireland*, pp.20-6, 31-6; Bartlett, *The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation*, p.31; Barnard, *A New Anatomy of Ireland*, pp.93, 199-201; Hayton, *Ruling Ireland*, pp.186-7; Armstrong, 'Of Stories and Sermons,' pp.230-1.

¹⁷⁵ Kilroy, *Protestant Dissent and Controversy*, pp.176-81, 188-203.

loyalty to William and the Revolution were central to mid-1690s Irish Nonconformist and Anglican pamphlets. The Irish debates differed from the English and Scottish debates because in Ireland there was no legal protection for Protestants not subscribing to the Established Church. In 1713 Kirkpatrick was still demanding, as Irish Presbyterians had been doing throughout the 1690s, that Presbyterian allegiance to William had earned them toleration.¹⁷⁶ Responding to these arguments Irish Anglicans defended their monopoly by asserting Restoration-era views linking allegiance with religious uniformity. Tobias Pullen, Bishop of Dromore, summarized this by stating that Anglicans were grateful for the ‘miraculous deliverance’ at the Revolution but allegiance to William should involve preserving the ‘Church of *England*’ from Dissenters.¹⁷⁷ Irish debates frequently referenced English and Scottish debates where toleration and persecution affected allegiance. This also shows how the public attitudes of Irish Anglicans to William and the Revolution were differing from England and Scotland where accepting the Revolution as transformative was increasingly dominant in the public discourse.

After the Williamite War in Ireland several Nonconformists demanded toleration. In the 1690s the English Government twice attempted to introduce toleration to Ireland but Ireland’s Anglican-dominated Parliament vetoed this.¹⁷⁸ Nevertheless William rewarded Irish Presbyterians by increasing the *regium donum* royal grant to Presbyterian clergy.¹⁷⁹ Kirkpatrick’s history contained public pronouncements from 1689-90, which asserted that Presbyterian allegiance to William merited toleration. He quoted William’s declaration increasing the *regium donum* where William acknowledged the ‘Loyal and Dutiful address’ by Presbyterian ministers, ‘Trusty and Well-beloved Subjects.’ William said that the *regium donum* was increased because Presbyterian clerics endeavoured to ‘UNITE THE HEARTS OF OTHERS IN ZEAL AND LOYALTY TOWARDS’ William.¹⁸⁰ Kirkpatrick said that Presbyterians advocated allegiance to William even before he was *de facto* King in Ireland. He viewed opposition to William and opposition to toleration

¹⁷⁶ Kirkpatrick, *Historical Essay*, pp.393-5.

¹⁷⁷ Tobias Pullen, *A Sermon Preached in Christ Church before His Excellency the Lord Deputy and the Parliament, On the Fifth day of November, 1695...* (Dublin, 1695), pp.4-5, 14-9.

¹⁷⁸ Beckett, *Protestant Dissenters in Ireland*, pp.31-6.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid*, pp.28-30; Connolly, *Divided Kingdom*, pp.204-5.

¹⁸⁰ Kirkpatrick, *Historical Essay upon the loyalty of Presbyterians*, ‘Declaration in his Majesty’s Order to the Collector of Belfast for the Payment of his Royal Bounty to the Presbyterian Ministers in the North of Ireland,’ pp.396-7.

as enmity to Presbyterians.¹⁸¹ Anglicans' vetoing toleration outraged Kirkpatrick; he argued that Presbyterian allegiance to William, as demonstrated by their actions in 1688-91, should have been rewarded with toleration.

In the 1690s when Irish Presbyterians publicly called for toleration they frequently depicted the Revolution as a Presbyterian-dominated affair.¹⁸² Numerous Presbyterians claimed that they were the first Irish subjects to give William allegiance. John Mackenzie's *Narrative of the Siege of London-Derry* detailed Presbyterian actions 'in Proclaiming K. *William* and Q. *Mary*.'¹⁸³ Mackenzie said that Catholic Jacobites threatened all Protestants. However, as Chapter Two showed, Anglican commitment to Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance inhibited Anglicans declaring for William in contrast to Presbyterians eagerly declaring for William in Derry and elsewhere.¹⁸⁴ Other pamphlets described how '*Jack Presbyter*' and 'disloyal Whiggs,' not Anglicans, closed Derry's gates to thwart James.¹⁸⁵

Some Anglicans accused Presbyterian minister Alexander Osborn of being a Jacobite spy who almost brought about Londonderry's surrender. Joseph Boyse defended Osborn and denounced these false accusations as arising from traditional anti-Dissenter prejudices.¹⁸⁶ According to Boyse it was 'Exhortations' by Nonconformist clerics, like Osborn, which 'animated' Derry's inhabitants to persevere against the Jacobites. Across Ireland it was Presbyterians who enthusiastically supported William over James.¹⁸⁷ Boyse lamented how any Protestant unity at the Revolution had disappeared and Restoration-era Anglican-Presbyterian antagonism re-emerged. 'Tis pity that distinction of Parties... should be soon resum'd in these Discourses it has unhappily occasioned.'¹⁸⁸ Boyse and other Nonconformists believed they were William's most enthusiastic supporters in Ireland and Anglicans, who were

¹⁸¹ Ibid, pp.396-9.

¹⁸² Barnard, *Irish Protestants Ascents and Descents*, pp.144-6.

¹⁸³ John Mackenzie, *A Narrative of the Siege of London-Derry: Or, the late Memorable Transactions of that City...* (London, 1690), 'The Preface.'

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, pp.1-4, 8-10, 12-3, 28-30, 46. See Chapter Two for polemics on Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.

¹⁸⁵ *An Apology for the Failures Charg'd on the Reverend Mr. George Walker's Printed Account of the late Siege of Derry, In a Letter to the Undertaker of a more Accurate Narrative of that Siege* (n.p., 1689), pp.11-5.

¹⁸⁶ Joseph Boyse, *A Vindication of the Reverend Mr Alexander Osborn, in reference to the Affairs of the North of Ireland in which some mistakes...* (London, 1690), pp.1-4, 8-9.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid, p.25.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, pp.27-8.

more hesitant about the Revolution, were denying Presbyterians' just reward. From the mid-1690s legal protection for Protestants not subscribing to the Established Church became an important part of allegiance debates in Ireland just as it had in England and Scotland. Irish Dissenters, mainly Presbyterians, argued that Irish Anglican conservatism was inhibiting the even implementation of the Revolution across the Kingdoms.

Following Mary's death in 1695 Boyse and Nathaniel Weld, another Nonconformist cleric, preached sermons expressing their sorrow. One printer published these sermons because he believed they showed 'That *Dissenters* come not behind their Fellow-Subjects for loyal Affection to their Sovereigns.' There was almost 'universal' Dissenter allegiance to William and 'none of 'em fail'd to contribute their utmost towards this Revolution.' No Dissenter had 'been yet convicted of any stickling or plotting against this Government.' Presbyterians may not have had doctrines like Non-Resistance but their principles on allegiance were 'exactly the same with those of the Establish't Church' in backing William. The printer hoped these sermons would remove 'those common prejudices against *Dissenters*, which have so much contributed to alienate the minds of their Fellow-Protestants from 'em.'¹⁸⁹ Weld's sermon called for 'Penal Laws against Protestant Dissenters' to be repealed while denouncing the use of the Oath of Supremacy and the Test subscription to Anglican doctrine in scrutinising political loyalty.¹⁹⁰ Mary's death was providential punishment on the Kingdoms for Irish Anglicans denying toleration.¹⁹¹ Boyse also described the Revolution as providence enthroning William. William and Mary's 'Interest' was 'in the hearts of all sincere Protestants.'¹⁹² Boyse hoped Mary's death would remind all Protestants of 'the *common* bonds' in loyalty to William.¹⁹³ These sermons and publisher's note show that Irish Nonconformists believed their loyalty to William warranted toleration. Again they depicted Anglican refusal to grant toleration as denying Ireland the entirety of the Revolution and hardly an example of wholehearted loyalty to William. This was when, as Chapter Four showed, guaranteeing

¹⁸⁹ *Two Sermons Preach't on a Day of Fasting & Humiliation, Kept by the Protestant Dissenters in Dublin, On the Sad Occasion of the Death of our Late Gracious Queen* (Dublin, 1695), 'The Publisher to the Reader.'

¹⁹⁰ Nathaniel Weld, 'Sermon II,' *Two Sermons Preach't*, pp.43-5.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid*, pp.46-8.

¹⁹² Joseph Boyse, 'Sermon I,' *Two Sermons Preach't*, pp.19-21.

¹⁹³ *Ibid*, pp.1-3.

subjects' liberties was increasingly prominent in describing the Revolution and allegiance; Anglicans vetoing toleration was denying Dissenter Williamites these liberties.

Anglican opposition prevented Lord Justice Capel's 1695 attempt to introduce an Irish Bill of Indulgence.¹⁹⁴ Raymond Gillespie examined one Presbyterian polemic that attacked Anglican refusal to embrace the Revolution and toleration. Kilroy and J.C. Beckett have commented on efforts in the 1690s to introduce toleration and pamphlets by Boyse and others supporting this. However these studies overlook how important the link between allegiance and toleration had become in mid-1690s Irish discourse.¹⁹⁵ Presbyterian polemicists supporting Capel again linked toleration with allegiance and their actions in 1688-91. Boyse's pamphlet championing Capel's efforts had two important arguments on allegiance. Firstly he outlined how toleration would guarantee Dissenter allegiance and benefit Irish Protestantism in general. It would strengthen William and the already strong Dissenter allegiance to William by ensuring his reign had a 'more rooted Interest in the affections of Protestant Dissenters....' Dissenters would be 'under the strongest obligations' to support William for introducing toleration. Boyse pointed to the English and Scottish measures protecting some Protestants not subscribing to the Established Churches and hoped Irish Anglicans would see such measures as benefitting the 'common Protestant interest.' England's Toleration Act removed Anglican-Dissenter 'mutual Jealousies.' It broadened the 'narrow' Protestant interest thus improving the chances of surviving future Catholic rebellions.¹⁹⁶ Tolerating Dissenters would cement the loyalty of some of the most enthusiastically loyal Williamites and create a sense of permanent Protestant unity in opposition to the eternal Catholic threat.

The second aspect of Boyse's pamphlet was to attack opposition to toleration as evidence of dubious loyalty because without toleration the Revolution in Ireland was incomplete. Irish Dissenters were 'the only persons in the three Kingdoms' not to benefit from the Revolution despite being its

¹⁹⁴ Connolly, *Divided Kingdom*, pp.31-3.

¹⁹⁵ Gillespie, 'Presbyterian Propaganda,' pp.105, 116-7; Kilroy, *Protestant Dissent and Controversy*, pp.188-91, 198-203 (Kilroy briefly comments on the issue of allegiance during the Restoration and 1710s but the 1690s are overlooked); Beckett, *Protestant Dissent in Ireland*, pp.27-45.

¹⁹⁶ Joseph Boyse, *The Case of the Protestant Dissenters of Ireland, In Reference to a Bill of Indulgence, Represented and Argued* (n.p., 1695), pp.1-2.

most fervent supporters. Their ‘early Zeal... for the settlement and defence of this present Government’ contrasted with Anglicans’ hesitance. Dissenters’ allegiance to William would be guaranteed if their allegiance were rewarded with ‘free Exercise of Religion,’ legal protection and access to civil offices.¹⁹⁷ Boyse argued that the Revolution was more than William’s enthronement and so Anglicans’ vetoing of toleration was evidence of their hampering the Revolution in Ireland.¹⁹⁸ Capel’s proposal came at a time when some Irish Anglicans sought to tighten restrictions on Dissenters and prevent Presbyterians from obtaining any political office with a Test Act.¹⁹⁹ Boyse said this Test would see Ireland’s Parliament ‘Sacrifice it’s Publick Interest’ by protecting Anglicanism’s monopoly and persecuting Presbyterian Williamites.²⁰⁰ He argued that the English Parliament’s 1691 *Act Abrogating the Oath of Supremacy in Ireland* meant ‘the Oath of *Fidelity*, and the *Test against Popery*’ were ‘sufficient *Qualification*’ in testing allegiance.²⁰¹ Boyse, like other Irish Dissenters, presented rejecting toleration and new measures persecuting Nonconformist Williamites as denying Ireland the entirety of the Revolution’s beneficial changes that were adopted in different forms in England and Scotland. In doing this Boyse publicly questioned Irish Anglicans’ allegiance to William and support for the Revolution to gain public and political support for a measure legally protecting Ireland’s most enthusiastic Williamites.

David Hayton says that Anglicans questioned Irish Presbyterian loyalty to the monarch but does not go into detail on allegiance issues.²⁰² Questioning Presbyterian loyalty was part of the Anglican response to arguments like Boyse’s. Irish Anglican polemics repeatedly asserted Restoration-era views of allegiance that continued their conservatism towards the Revolution as examined in Chapters One through Three. Many Irish Anglicans did accept that the Revolution introduced a monarchy protecting liberties but, unlike English Anglicans, they refused to accept that the Revolution should benefit Protestant Williamites outside the Established

¹⁹⁷ Ibid, pp.1-2. See Chapter Two for more on Anglican reluctance to accept the Revolution.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid, pp.1-2.

¹⁹⁹ Kilroy, *Protestant Dissent and Controversy in Ireland*, pp.188-93; Hayton, ‘Exclusion, Conformity, and Parliamentary Representation,’ pp.52-4, 60-1.

²⁰⁰ Boyse, *The Case of the Protestant Dissenters of Ireland, In Reference to a Bill of Indulgence, Represented and Argued*, pp.1-2.

²⁰¹ Ibid, pp.1-2.

²⁰² Hayton, ‘Exclusion, Conformity, and Parliamentary Representation,’ pp.52-3, 60-1.

Church. Pullen and Anthony Dopping, Bishop of Meath, produced similar responses to Boyse. They disputed toleration's apparent benefits and potential impact on allegiance. Dopping and Pullen saw toleration as part of a Presbyterian plot to control Ireland and ruin the Kingdoms.²⁰³ They cited events in Scotland and England as proof. Irish Presbyterians, like Scottish Presbyterians, had to carry out their Covenants' 'obligation' to establish Presbyterianism in Ireland. This would be just like what happened in Scotland where, with the newly established Presbyterianism, non-Presbyterians received 'no Toleration.'²⁰⁴ Actions by 'Scotch Dissenters' vindicated refusing toleration because Irish Presbyterians 'have not had the same opportunities as their Brethren' in Scotland.²⁰⁵ Dopping and Pullen also disputed the benefits of England's Toleration Act. According to Dopping Anglican-Dissenter 'mutual jealousies' remained.²⁰⁶ Pullen said that 'Experience in *England*' showed how 'Toleration has not had that good effect.' There was no 'Reason' to 'expect it should be successful here' because it only generated 'great Heats and Animositities' between legally protected Protestant sects.²⁰⁷

Dopping and Pullen also attacked Boyse's claim that toleration would guarantee Dissenter loyalty. Pullen saw this as conditional allegiance to William.²⁰⁸ In other Kingdoms this 'strange' attitude to allegiance would be seen as threatening the 'publick peace' and not 'Evidence of a truly Christian Zeal for' William. This conditional allegiance would 'weaken the Government by disobliging all, but those that are particularly Encourag'd, and Caress'd by it.'²⁰⁹ The increased *regium donum* and practical 'free Liberty' to exercise religion was enough reward for Presbyterians.²¹⁰ If Nonconformists were sincerely loyal to William they would 'serve their King and Country as before, tho' they be not Legally qualified for Offices, by a General and Unlimited Indulgence.'²¹¹ This proved that Dissenter allegiance to William was only part of a Presbyterian conspiracy and validated rejecting toleration. Dopping's and

²⁰³ Anthony Dopping, *The Case of the Dissenters of Ireland consider'd...* (Dublin, 1695), pp.4-6; Tobias Pullen, *An Answer to a Paper Entitled, The Case of the Protestant Dissenters of Ireland in reference to a Bill of Indulgence, represented and argued* (Dublin, 1695), p.6.

²⁰⁴ Dopping, *The Case of the Dissenters of Ireland consider'd*, pp.2-3.

²⁰⁵ Pullen, *An Answer to a Paper Entitled, The Case of the Protestant Dissenters*, p.2.

²⁰⁶ Dopping, *The Case of the Dissenters of Ireland Consider'd*, pp.3-4.

²⁰⁷ Pullen, *An Answer to a Paper Entitled, The Case of the Protestant Dissenters*, p.2.

²⁰⁸ Dopping, *The Case of the Dissenters of Ireland Consider'd*, pp.2-6; Pullen, *An Answer to a Paper Entitled, The Case of the Protestant Dissenters*, pp.3-4.

²⁰⁹ Pullen, *An Answer to a Paper Entitled, The Case of the Protestant Dissenters*, pp.1-3.

²¹⁰ *Ibid*, p.6.

²¹¹ *Ibid*, pp.5-6.

Pullen's pamphlets showed divergence from the popular views of the Revolution that developed in England and Scotland. In England and Scotland some Williamites were uncomfortable with the legal protections for Protestant Williamites not subscribing to the Established Church but by the mid-1690s most public comments in these Kingdoms accepted these measures. Dopping and Pullen built on the popular Irish Anglican conservatism towards the Revolution, explored in Chapters One through Three, which downplayed the Revolution's changes apart from who wore the Crown.

Pullen and Dopping's 'misinformation' outraged Boyse. Boyse denied their accusations and said that he only desired Protestant unity against the 'common Enemy,' Catholic Jacobites.²¹² Again Boyse argued that enthusiastic Presbyterian allegiance to William merited legal protection. Boyse used the same rhetoric that had become prevalent in mid-1690s English and Scottish polemics on this issue. According to Boyse Scottish Episcopalians were relatively undisturbed despite their refusing to 'own the *Civil Authority*.'²¹³ English Dissenters' 'Early Zeal... in behalf of' William earned them 'protection.'²¹⁴ Charles II and William granted the *regium donum* as a 'mark of Respect' for Irish Presbyterians' 'Fidelity and Affection' and both wanted a 'Bill of Indulgence' to further reward Presbyterians' allegiance.²¹⁵ Boyse condemned Irish Anglicans for trying to 'Deviate from the measure of *England*' by not tolerating Dissenters loyal to William.²¹⁶ Again he argued that Irish Anglicans' vetoing of toleration showed questionable loyalty to William. It denied Ireland the Revolution innovations that England and Scotland had, and which allegiance to William supported. Boyse claimed that this further demonstrated how Irish Presbyterians had genuine allegiance to William because they accepted William and the Revolution despite Irish Anglicans' continued hostility.

This controversy continued into 1697. Like Dopping and Pullen, Edward Synge's *Peaceable and Friendly Address to the Non-Conformists* questioned what Dissenters 'aim at' by demanding toleration. It could only be

²¹² Joseph Boyse, *The Case of Dissenting Protestants of Ireland, In Reference to a Bill of Indulgence, Vindicated from the Exceptions alledg'd against it, in a late Answer* (n.p., 1695), pp.1, 10.

²¹³ *Ibid*, pp.4, 8.

²¹⁴ *Ibid*, pp.4-5.

²¹⁵ *Ibid*, p.5.

²¹⁶ *Ibid*, pp.10-1, 4-5, 8.

part of a plot to ‘Overthrow and Ruin’ the Kingdoms as happened in Scotland.²¹⁷ Synge repeated popular prejudices about Dissenter disloyalty by recalling that Presbyterians overthrew the ‘Established Church’ and monarch in the 1640s. In the 1690s having ‘Overturned’ Episcopacy in Scotland, Presbyterians were close to repeating this across the Kingdoms. Any Protestant unity against ‘a common Enemy’ in 1688-90 dissipated because Nonconformists’ desire for ‘the Ruin both of Church and State’ returned.²¹⁸ Sir Francis Brewster, an Ulster Anglican Whig, also suspected Presbyterian allegiance and intentions. Scottish and Irish Presbyterians were ‘link’d’; Irish Presbyterians wanted to replicate Scottish Presbyterian actions in ‘Ecclesiastical and Civil Affairs...’²¹⁹ Toleration was a steppingstone to achieving this. Anglicans and Presbyterians had ‘common Cause’ in 1688-90 against Catholic Jacobites but Presbyterians were ‘not shy’ in promoting ‘their Old Cause and Interest.’ Brewster alleged that Irish Presbyterians in William’s army promised to replicate what happened in Scotland.²²⁰ Presbyterians and Anglicans may have proclaimed loyalty to William but Presbyterians did this purely to advance their goal of overturning Anglicanism.²²¹ Brewster’s and Synge’s pamphlets show that Irish Anglicans rejected Presbyterians’ loyalty and cited events in Scotland as proof that Presbyterian loyalty was only a means to advance Presbyterian objectives. Their pamphlets show continued popular Irish Anglican conservatism towards the Revolution in comparison with England and Scotland. Refusing to accept the allegiance of Protestants outside the Established Church showed that Irish Anglicans still primarily viewed the Revolution as William’s enthronement with minimal alteration in church and state.

Ulster Presbyterian John MacBride denounced Synge’s ‘Libel,’ Pullen’s thesis and the popular Anglican anti-Presbyterianism.²²² MacBride, like Boyse, questioned the sincerity of Anglican allegiance to William. By

²¹⁷ Edward Synge, *A Peaceable and Friendly Address to the Non-Conformists: Written upon their Desiring an Act of Toleration without the Sacramental Test* (Dublin, 1697), pp.6-8.

²¹⁸ Ibid, pp.8-10.

²¹⁹ Sir Francis Brewster, *A Discourse Concerning Ireland and the Different Interests thereof...* (London, 1698), p.33.

²²⁰ Ibid, pp.23-30.

²²¹ Ibid, pp.28-31, 39-40.

²²² John MacBride, *Animadversions on The Defence of the Answer to a Paper, Intituled, The Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland, In Reference to a Bill of Indulgence, from the Exceptions made against it. Together, with an Answer to a Peaceable & Friendly Address to the Non-Conformists...* (n.p., 1697), p.95.

opposing toleration Irish Anglicans were opposing the Revolution interest in England, where since 1689 there had been ‘no instance of Dissenters Tumults, Rebellions and Conspiracies against the King and Government.’ Toleration had confirmed English Dissenter allegiance to William. MacBride contrasted Dissenter-Presbyterian allegiance to William with examples of continued Anglican and Episcopalian loyalty to James. Only Anglican and Episcopalians Nonjurors had been expelled from offices for refusing the oaths of allegiance to William.²²³ Scottish Episcopalians, with whom Synge and Pullen sympathised, almost universally rejected allegiance to William.²²⁴ If Irish Dissenters, like Scottish Episcopalians, ‘obstinately refused to swear Allegiance to King *William* and Queen *Mary*... we shou’d have had as little favour as the Nonjurant Clergy there have had, and jointly deserv’d it.’ Pullen’s view on Presbyterians and their allegiance showed that he was ‘either grossly impartial, or a *Jacobite* in heart, tho’ he appear for King *William*.’²²⁵ This was the logical conclusion from Pullen and Irish Anglicans supporting their ‘Jacobitish Brethren’ in Scotland.²²⁶ MacBride believed that ‘Liberty’ for Williamite Protestants outside the Established Church was integral to the Revolution.²²⁷ Even without toleration Irish Presbyterian clerics would ‘preserve in our selves an unshaken and firm Loyalty’ and ‘promote in all’ of William’s ‘Subjects an intrepid and steadfast Allegiance to’ him.²²⁸ Irish Presbyterians repeatedly portrayed Anglicans rejecting protection for Protestants not subscribing to the Established Church, now accepted as part of the Revolution in England and Scotland, as denying Ireland the entirety of the Revolution. In doing this MacBride, like Boyse, questioned the sincerity of Anglican allegiance to William. Presbyterians were the true Irish Williamites because they accepted William as King, the Revolution and its changes, which Anglicans were impeding.

Presbyterian allegiance polemics show that a large number of Irish Protestants believed that the Revolution was meant to be transformative while many Anglicans still believed it was primarily a personnel change with Anglican liberties protected. Irish Anglican Jacobite Charles Leslie attempted

²²³ Ibid, pp.4-5, 8-9, 44, 65-6.

²²⁴ Ibid, pp.40-4, 53-6, 58-63, 69-71.

²²⁵ Ibid, p.73.

²²⁶ Ibid, pp.35-6, 43-4, 4-9, 115-7.

²²⁷ Ibid, p.53.

²²⁸ Ibid, pp.55-6.

to exploit Anglican fears of Dissenter advances in Irish and Three-Kingdom contexts. His response to William King's *State of the Protestants of Ireland* argued that in 1688-90 Derry and Enniskillen were Nonconformist affairs. Dissenters' prominence at the Revolution would be rewarded meaning 'no Preservation and Safety' for Anglicanism under William.²²⁹ Leslie's 1695 *Querela Temporum* targeted Anglicans and Episcopalians across the Kingdoms and continued Anglican Jacobite portrayals of the Revolution as a Nonconformist Revolution.²³⁰ This was not just anti-Dissenter rhetoric as some historians suggest.²³¹ Leslie described how allegiance remained 'the publick Discourse of the Nation' and ideas about toleration affected allegiance. To entice Anglican allegiance to James, Leslie depicted James as a better protector of Anglicanism.²³² He warned that post-Revolution Presbyterian dominance in Scotland would spread to England because Toleration protected Dissenters and a similar fate awaited Ireland if toleration was granted there. It was obvious that 'Toleration upon Toleration has brought Ruin upon Ruine....' In all Three Kingdoms it was 'Dissenters who are most in K Wills Interest' and their post-Revolution advances, which damaged Anglicanism, only encouraged them.²³³ Leslie's pamphlets suggest that Irish Dissenters, like English and Scottish non-Anglican and non-Episcopalian Protestants, were firmly loyal to William. Toleration and perceptions of Anglicanism under assault were intended to discomfort Anglicans already uneasy about the implications of the Revolution. Leslie was trying to get Anglicans to return allegiance to James but his pamphlets agreed with parts of Irish Williamite Dissenters' polemics in describing Dissenters as the most enthusiastic Williamites. However these pamphlets had little influence on Irish Anglicans. Irish Anglican Williamites said that allegiance to William supported the Revolution settlement, which enthroned William, guaranteed Anglican liberties and protected their Restoration-era monopoly but did not involve monumental changes like toleration.

²²⁹ Charles Leslie, *An Answer to a Book, Intituled, The State of the Protestants in Ireland under the Late King James's Government...* (London, 1692), pp.78-81, 95-7, 99-100.

²³⁰ Charles Leslie, *Querela Temporum: or, the Danger of the Church of England...* (n.p., 1695), passim.

²³¹ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.172-3; Mark Goldie, 'The English System of Liberty,' in Mark Goldie & Robert Walker (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.50-2.

²³² Leslie, *Querela Temporum*, pp.2-3.

²³³ *Ibid*, pp.2-4, 24-7.

Opposing toleration and questioning Irish Nonconformists' allegiance to William showed that amongst Irish Anglicans conservative attitudes to the Revolution remained popular. They accepted William as King and, as shown in Chapter Four, increasingly accepted that William's monarchy preserved subjects' liberties as part of allegiance to him but remained hostile to some Revolution innovations, like toleration. This put Ireland out of sync with the other Kingdoms where allegiance to William from Protestants not subscribing to the Established Churches warranted some legal protection and was publicly accepted as one of the Revolution's beneficial changes. Irish Protestant public views on the Revolution were divided. A popular conservatism towards the Revolution remained prevalent amongst Irish Anglican polemicists; they declared allegiance to William as *de facto* King and believed that he would preserve the Restoration order in Church and State. This shows that they still viewed the Revolution as primarily a change of monarchical personnel without significant changes in Church and State. Irish Dissenters, mainly Presbyterians, wanted the Revolution to be as transformative in Ireland as it was in England and Scotland. They proudly declared loyalty to William, which they believed should be rewarded with toleration but Anglicans with suspicious loyalties were inhibiting Ireland from receiving all the Revolution's innovations. Despite questioning the sincerity of each other's allegiance to William, Irish Anglicans and Dissenters were firm in declaring allegiance to him. They just differed over whether allegiance to William supported mainly a personnel change or something more substantial. This was in marked contrast to England and Scotland where allegiance to William was now popularly seen as supporting the Revolution's changes, which included forms of legal protection and the Presbyterian establishment in Scotland.

V

Chapter Four showed how from the mid-1690s in the Kingdoms, especially England and Scotland, allegiance to William was increasingly seen as supporting a post-Revolution monarchy which protected liberties. The issue of allegiance from Protestants not subscribing to the Established Churches and protection for them continued this trend of depicting the Revolution as transformative, more than just a personnel change. English and Scottish

Williamites and Irish Presbyterian Williamites argued that allegiance to William supported these changes. In England, despite some initial opposition based on historic anti-Dissenter prejudices, by the mid-1690s printed polemics increasingly praised the Toleration Act. There were Jacobite attempts to exploit Anglican unease over Toleration but anti-Toleration Tories remained loyal to William.²³⁴ Other English Jacobites recognised that by the mid-1690s English public views favoured Toleration and began offering Toleration to try and induce as many subjects as possible to give James allegiance.²³⁵ Numerous Anglican Williamites, even initial opponents of Toleration, fearing a Jacobite overthrow of William, praised this post-Revolution innovation for establishing Dissenter loyalty to William, creating more loyal subjects.²³⁶ Dissenters who benefitted from Toleration proclaimed allegiance to William and praised the Revolution for bringing changes to England, like Toleration, which allegiance to William supported.²³⁷ Allegiance to James would undo these changes.

This link between allegiance and post-Revolution notions of toleration was also important in Scottish allegiance polemics. The establishment of Presbyterianism meant that circumstances in Scotland were different to England but there was also eventual legal protection for Episcopalian clerics who took the oaths of allegiance to William. By the mid-1690s Scottish Williamites, like their English counterparts, were more vocal in hailing the Revolution as transformative. Episcopalian Jacobites denounced the Revolution as a Presbyterian victory. They argued that Presbyterians ensured allegiance to William also involved pledging support for Presbyterianism. This and other examples of persecution meant no pious Episcopalian could give William allegiance.²³⁸ Scottish Presbyterian Williamites naturally celebrated Presbyterianism's establishment but also accepted that Episcopalians would not be persecuted if they took the oaths of allegiance to William. A significant

²³⁴ Long, *Case of Persecution*, pp.4-10; idem, *The Historian Unmask'd*, passim; Johnston, *Dear Bargain*, pp.15-6; *The State Prodigal his Return*, pp.1-3.

²³⁵ Lawton, *Jacobite Principles Vindicated*, pp.17-21; Ferguson, *Whether the Preserving the Protestant Religion was the motive*, pp.15-6; James II & VII, *Most Gracious Declaration...1693*; James II & VII, *Most Gracious Declaration...1692*, p.4.

²³⁶ Compton, *Bishop of London's Eighth Letter*, pp.3-5, 8-9, 14-5, 17-9; Sherlock, *Second Letter to a Friend*, pp.28-9; Lloyd, *Pretences of French Invasion*, pp.14-5; *Animadversions on the Two Last 30th of January sermons*, pp.16-8, 22-3, 25-6.

²³⁷ Alsop, *Duty and Interest*, pp.5, 19-20; Howe, *Heads of Agreement*, pp.4, 14; Defoe, *True-born Englishman*, pp.4-5, 45-7; idem, *New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty*, pp.3-4, 7, 21-2, 26-7.

²³⁸ Cockburn, *Historical Relation*, pp.40-1, 52-3, 57-64; Sage, *Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy*, pp.103-4, 106-8; Monro, *Presbyterian Inquisition*, pp.50-1; idem, *Letter to a Friend*, pp.26-7.

minority of Episcopalians accepted this and gave William allegiance.²³⁹ Presbyterianism's 1690 establishment meant that viewing the Revolution as more than William replacing James became increasingly popular in Scotland earlier than in England. In Scotland allegiance to William became seen as endorsing the post-Revolution religious changes like the Presbyterian Kirk and legal protection for some Episcopalians. By the mid-1690s the Revolution was popularly regarded as more transformative and significant than a personnel change, which Scottish and English Williamites believed allegiance to William supported.

In Ireland there was no post-Revolution toleration for Dissenters. Irish Presbyterians highlighted their role in the Revolution and believed that their allegiance to William should have been rewarded with a legal protection similar to measures in England and Scotland. They also depicted Anglican opposition to toleration as denying Ireland the full implementation of the Revolution.²⁴⁰ Irish Anglicans, fearful of Dissenters, maintained that the Revolution enthroned William but did not necessitate innovations, like toleration, and still doubted Presbyterian allegiance to William.²⁴¹ Charles Leslie attempted to exploit this anti-Dissenter sentiment but Irish Anglicans remained loyal to William.²⁴² Irish Protestants were divided between Presbyterians, who saw the Revolution as transformative, and Anglicans, who saw it mainly as William replacing James, but both declared allegiance to William.

Clearly Irish Anglicans, who held political power in Ireland, diverged from the political thought in the other Kingdoms on the issue of allegiance and legal protection for Williamite Protestants not subscribing to the Established Churches. From the mid-1690s in England and Scotland, as Chapter Four showed, it was increasingly popular to depict the Revolution as a less conservative and more transformative event than earlier polemics portrayed it. Public acceptance of allegiance from Protestants not subscribing to the

²³⁹ Ridpath, *Scots Episcopal Innocence*, pp.1, 14-7; Rule, *Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an answer to Five Pamphlets*, pp.38, 43-9; Seton, *Continuation of a Few Brief and Modest Reflections*, pp.9-10; James Gordon, July-August 1695, *James Gordon's Diary*, pp.54-5.

²⁴⁰ Boyse, *Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland*, pp.4-8, 10-1; MacBride, *Animadversions*, passim.

²⁴¹ Dopping, *Case of the Dissenters of Ireland, considered*, pp.3-6; Pullen, *Answer to a Paper Entituled, The Case of Ireland*, pp.1-6; Synge, *Peaceable and Friendly Address*, pp.6-10; Brewster, *Discourse*, pp.23-30, 33.

²⁴² Leslie, *Answer*, pp.78-81, 95-7; idem, *Querela Temporum*, pp.2-4, 24-7.

Established Churches continued this trend of depicting allegiance to William as supporting the Revolution's extensive changes. While there was legal protection for Williamite Protestants not subscribing to the Established Churches, Catholics, one of the largest denominations in the Kingdoms as a whole, were excluded from toleration measures. Perceptions of Catholic allegiance, like Dissenters' allegiance, also impacted on the wider allegiance debates. Catholic declarations of allegiance would cause some conservative Irish Anglican Williamites to admit that allegiance to William endorsed the Revolution as being something greater than William's enthronement.

Chapter Six: Allegiance and Perceptions of Catholic Allegiance.

Chapter Five showed how some Protestants not subscribing to the English and Scottish Established Churches were legally protected if they gave William allegiance. However this post-Revolution tolerance did not extend to Catholics, one of the largest denominations in the Three Kingdoms. Despite some attempts no Protestant denomination in the Kingdoms was able to claim full-ownership of the Revolution in the public discourse but some Williamites did depict the Revolution as a victory for Protestantism in general. One English Williamite described Catholics as ‘Our Constant implacable Enemy.’¹ English Nonconformist Williamite Richard Baxter said that Nonconformists, and not Catholics, were entitled to toleration because Catholics denied William allegiance, which ‘depriveth the King of a necessary means of security for his life.’² For over a century anti-Catholicism and anti-Popery were features of political propaganda in the Three Kingdoms. Catholics were popularly regarded with suspicion because of their submission to Papal authority, which potentially included absolving subjects of their allegiance to their monarch. Many Protestants repeatedly portrayed the Revolution as a Protestant victory with James’s ‘Popery’ and anti-Catholicism central to their rhetoric.³ However Catholic pronouncements of allegiance in the Kingdoms and their impact on the post-Revolution allegiance debates have gone unexplored, a gap, which this chapter will attempt to redress.⁴

¹ R.W., *A Letter to an Honourable Member of Parliament, concerning the great Growth of Popery, and the Treasonable Practices of the Romish Bishops and Priests, at this time, in England* (London, 1700), p.4.

² Richard Baxter, *Against the Revolt to a Foreign Jurisdiction, which would be to England its Perjury, Church-Ruine, and Slavery...* (London, 1691), pp.60-1.

³ Gabriel Glickman, *The English Catholic Community, 1688-1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge, 2009), pp.1-3; John Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture: Religious Intolerance and Arguments for Religious Toleration in Early Modern and ‘Early Enlightenment’ Europe* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.227-8; Tim Harris, ‘The British Dimension, Religion and the Shaping of Political Identities during the Reign of Charles II,’ in Tony Claydon, Ian McBride (eds.) *Protestantism and National Identities Britain and Ireland, c.1650-c.1850* (Cambridge, 2007), p.137; Tony Claydon, ‘Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William’s War Propaganda, 1689-1697,’ in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007), pp.134-9.

⁴ Mark Goldie and others see the debates over allegiance as a mainly Anglican affair. Mark Goldie, ‘The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument,’ in *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 83 (1980); Gerald Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962), pp.479-520; J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689-1720* (Cambridge, 1977), passim; H.T Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London, 1977), pp.27-41.

Historiography on Catholics in the post-Revolution Kingdoms focuses on the Revolution's social, practical effects on Catholics. Property issues in Ireland after the Treaty of Limerick and Catholic exclusion from the English Toleration Act have received most attention. John Bossy and others briefly discuss efforts to introduce an oath of allegiance acceptable to Catholics. Yet the effects the notion and perceptions of Catholic allegiance had on the wider allegiance debates are neglected because historians focus more on the Hanoverian period with only brief commentary on the 1690s.⁵ Catholics were roughly twenty percent of the Three Kingdoms' population, the overwhelming majority in Ireland. It was a minority, covert religion in England and Scotland but amongst the English gentry and nobility there was a higher percentage of Catholics than in the wider English society, exercising considerable influence in counties like Lancashire. Catholicism in Scotland was important in some areas but more scattered and less influential than the other Kingdoms.⁶ Given the Three Kingdoms' Catholic population's size and influence on political discourse post-Revolution Catholic declarations of allegiance were important parts of the allegiance debates.

Tony Claydon and others explored anti-Catholicism in Williamite propaganda but not the impact of popular perceptions of Catholics' allegiance in the post-Revolution public discourse.⁷ Some polemicists, like Gilbert

⁵ Eoin Kinsella, 'In Pursuit of a Positive Construction: Irish Catholics and the Williamite articles of Surrender, 1690-1701,' *Eighteenth-Century Ireland; Iris an Dá Chultúr*, Vol.24 (2009), pp.11-35; Éamonn Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766 A Fatal Attachment* (Dublin, 2002), passim; J.G. Simms, *Jacobite Ireland 1685-1691* (London, 1969), pp.189-92, 234-8, 252-67; Geoff Baker, *Reading and Politics in Early Modern England: The Mental World of a Seventeenth-Century Catholic Gentleman* (Oxford, 2010), p.8; Glickman, *The English Catholic Community*, pp.121-7; Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'Toleration and Religion after 1688,' in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel & Nicholas Tyacke (eds.) *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991), pp.399-400; Allan I. Macinnes, 'Catholic Recusancy and the Penal Laws, 1603-1707,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society XXIII* (1989), pp.60-1; John Bossy, 'English Catholics after 1688,' in Grell, Israel & Tyacke (eds.) *From Persecution to Toleration*, pp.371-3; Patrick Fagan, *Divided Loyalties: The Question of the Oath for Irish Catholics in the Eighteenth Century* (Dublin, 1997), passim.

⁶ Baker, *Reading and Politics in Early Modern England*, p.8; Michael Mullet, *Catholics in Britain and Ireland, 1558-1820* (London, 1998), pp.70-86, 103-115; John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688* (London, 1973), pp.8-12, 16-32, 52-6; Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, pp.1-7, 19-20; Christopher Whatley, *The Scots and the Union Then and Now* (Edinburgh, 2014), pp.49-50; Macinnes, 'Catholic Recusancy,' p.32; Alasdair Raffae, *The Culture of Controversy Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660-1714* (Woodbridge, 2012), pp.38, 54-5.

⁷ Claydon, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom,' pp.134-9; idem, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996), pp.33, 40-1, 44-9; Julian Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford, 2000), p.221; Howard Nenner, 'Pretense and Pragmatism: The Response to uncertainty in the Succession Crisis of 1689,' in Lois G.

Burnet, described England as ‘a Protestant Kingdom, that is incompatible with Popery or a Popish King;’ therefore allegiance was owed to William who would preserve Protestant England.⁸ This chapter does not detail the anti-Catholicism in political polemic writings but how texts by Catholics and printed considerations of their allegiance had a greater impact on the wider allegiance debates than Burnet’s simple assertion would suggest. While many Catholics were Jacobites this was not the entirety of Catholic public views on allegiance. Examining Catholic polemics, and Protestant reactions to these, gives a fuller picture of Jacobitism, allegiance, post-Revolution anti-Catholicism and affects on the political thought on the Revolution. Many Catholic polemicists also dealt with wider issues like who was *de jure* monarch and providential ideas and these are dealt with in their respective chapters. This chapter deals specifically with how Catholic allegiance affected the wider debate. Most Catholics in the Three Kingdoms were Irish and Irish identity became associated with Catholicism; Irish and Catholicism became interchangeable words.⁹ As a result Irish sources are prevalent but a Three-Kingdom approach is maintained because public perceptions of Catholic allegiance impacted on all Three Kingdoms albeit with fewer Scottish sources.

I

It is necessary first to understand the popular perceptions of Catholic allegiance across the Kingdoms prior to the Revolution. Burnet said that the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy were introduced to guarantee subjects’ loyalty and prevent Catholic rebellion. Catholic obedience to the Pope was a denying of allegiance to the monarch and the favouring of a foreign ruler.¹⁰

Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.85-91; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp.252-4, 257.

⁸ Gilbert Burnet, *An Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs, and in particular, whether we owe Allegiance to the King in these Circumstances...* (London, 1689), pp.13-5. Other examples depicting the Revolution as a Protestant victory and allegiance to William as a Protestant act include: Andrew Hamilton *A True Relation of the Actions of the Inniskilling-Men* (London, 1690), p.52; Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative Considered in a Letter From a Gentleman in the Country to his Friend upon his being chosen a Member of the Meeting of States in Scotland* (n.p., 1689), pp.3-4; *To his Grace, His Majesties High Commissioner; And to the Right Honourable, the Estates of Parliament. The Address of the Presbyterian Ministers and Professors of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp.1-2.

⁹ Baker, *Reading and Politics*, p.8; Toby Barnard, ‘Protestantism, ethnicity and Irish Identities, 1660-1760,’ in Tony Claydon & Ian McBride (eds.) *Protestantism and National Identity in Britain and Ireland, c.1650-1850* (Cambridge, 2007), p.207.

¹⁰ Burnet, *Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs*, pp.8-10.

The oaths were to ensure obedience to the established order in Church and state, and involved recanting Catholic doctrine. Therefore pious Catholics could not take these oaths and so were seen as disloyal.¹¹ When allegiance was debated in wider society during the seventeenth century Catholics were not aloof from discussions.¹² In the public imagination Catholics were ready to rebel and establish tyranny. Anti-Catholicism was one of the most potent ideas in contemporary political rhetoric and promoted these perceptions of Catholic disloyalty.¹³ Penal laws were introduced to pressure Catholics into renouncing Catholicism and become loyal Protestant subjects.¹⁴

Despite penal laws and popular perceptions that Catholics were disloyal, Catholics frequently declared loyalty to the monarch.¹⁵ Breandán Ó Buachalla, Geoff Baker and Gabriel Glickman have all examined Catholic notions of loyalty to Stuart monarchs in Ireland and England during the seventeenth century. They describe Catholic approaches to allegiance that combined traditional understandings of divine right kingship and providential theories where they believed that loyalty was owed to monarchs chosen by God. Catholics were seen as disciplined and unified on these issues partly because of the way Catholics fiercely condemned allegiance-breakers. Some Catholics wanted to be like other subjects in declaring allegiance without having to face persecution. Numerous seventeenth-century Catholics attempted to draft alternatives to the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy that would allow Catholics to practice their religion and publicly submit to the monarch.¹⁶ English Catholic John Sergeant claimed that Catholics ‘are not unwilling, nay

¹¹ David Martin Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp.27-34; Mullet, *Catholics in Britain and Ireland*, p.24; Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1993), pp.84-5.

¹² Walsham, *Church Papists*, passim; Mullet, *Catholics in Britain and Ireland*, passim; Breandán Ó Buachalla, ‘James Our True King: The Ideology of Irish Royalism in the Seventeenth Century,’ in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1993), pp.12-3, 23-30; Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, pp.126-7, 134-5; Nicole Greenspan, ‘Charles II, Exile, and the Problem of Allegiance,’ *Historical Journal*, 54 No.1 (2011), pp.81-5, 89-92.

¹³ Robin Clifden, ‘The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution,’ in Paul Slack (ed.) *Rebellion, Popular Protest and the Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1984), pp.160-1; Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty?*, pp.221-2; Miller, *Poperly and Politics*, p.262.

¹⁴ Miller, *Poperly and Politics*, pp.51-6.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.31-2, 98-102, 146-7; Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance*, pp.176-80; Baker, *Reading and Politics*, pp.35, 91-2, 141-2; Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, pp.6-7, 9, 11-2, 14, 19-22, 51-4.

¹⁶ Ó Buachalla, ‘James Our True King,’ pp.12-3, 23-4, 26, 28-30; Baker, *Reading and Politics*, pp.88-9, 91-2, 141-2, 154-6; Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, pp.51-3, 81-6, 90-2, 125-30, 257.

they are desirous to be obliged to make protestations of their unalterable Fidelity, and Obedience and peaceable submission to the State....¹⁷

During Restoration-era outbursts of anti-Catholic hysteria Catholics presented themselves as loyal subjects. Many declared loyalty to Charles II without taking the anti-Catholic oaths. One 1660 English Catholic polemic bemoaned how the Oaths forced Catholics into ‘being either a Traytor to God, by renouncing his Faith, or a Traytor to his Sovereign, by renouncing his Allegiance....’¹⁸ The author said that as a Catholic he was prepared ‘by Oath to confirm... That my Loyalty to my Sovereign is an indispensable duty’ provided it did not contradict Catholic doctrine.¹⁹ Allegiance to monarchs was part of ‘my Religion’ and ‘what I have been taught in It concerning Loyalty....’²⁰ Catholics were divided over the degree to which they should renounce papal authority as part of an oath of allegiance. However to counter accusations of disloyalty Catholic polemics repeatedly said that Catholic teaching engendered firm loyalty to monarchs. English Catholic priest John Gother claimed that ‘*Papists* in England can give as good proofs of their Loyalty, as the best of those that clamour so loud against them.’²¹ James Corker, an English priest facing execution during the Popish Plot,²² said Catholics would not accept interference, be it papal or temporal, with subjects’ loyalty. Corker claimed that Catholics ‘both *Taught*, and *Practised* Principles of *Loyalty*’ to the monarch throughout the turmoil of the Interregnum and Popish Plot.²³ Irish Catholics, like controversial cleric Peter Walsh, also claimed that despite being unable to take the oaths Catholics firmly practised their ‘Duty of Allegiance’ to Charles.²⁴ These statements made to counter accusations of disloyalty show that Catholics presented their faith as obliging

¹⁷ John Sergeant, *Reflexions upon the Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance by a Catholick Gentleman, and obedient son of the Church, and Loyal Subject of his Majesty* (n.p., 1661), p.78.

¹⁸ *The Good Catholic no Bad Subject. Or, a Letter from a Catholick Gentleman to Mr. Richard Baxter...* (London, 1660), pp.1-3. See Appendix I for the wording of the 1660 English Oath of Allegiance and Appendix III for the wording of the Restoration-era Oath of Supremacy.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, pp.4-6.

²⁰ *Ibid*, p.6.

²¹ John Gother, *A Papist mis-represented and represented...* (n.p., 1685), pp.30-1.

²² Geoffrey Scott, ‘Corker, James (1636–1715)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6317, accessed 13 Nov 2013].

²³ James M. Corker, *Roman-Catholick Principles in Reference to God and the King explained in a letter to a friend and now made publick to shew the connexion between the said Principles and the Late Popish Plot* (n.p., 1680), p.9-11, 18-20.

²⁴ Fr. Peter Walsh, *Some Few Questions Concerning the Oath of Allegiance, Propos'd by a Catholick Gentleman...* (London, 1661), pp.1-2, 12-3.

loyalty to the Stuart monarchs despite popular anti-Catholicism. With James's succession Catholic allegiance and Catholics' position in society became more prominent in public discourse.

James's succession raised Catholic hopes that they would no longer be automatically seen as disloyal and their situation would improve.²⁵ However from the 1680s the Catholic Church was divided across Europe after Louis XIV clashed with Pope Innocent XI over Church governance and Papal territories.²⁶ Consequentially James's close relationship with Louis engendered Papal hostility to James.²⁷ Scottish Episcopalian cleric James Canaries said that Louis and the French Catholic Church had 'shaken off that Yoke of bondage to the Pope. And our *Brittish* Papists do now begin to be ashamed of the deposing Power.' However Canaries remained suspicious of Catholic loyalty.²⁸ James's French-style absolutist governance, which diminished papal authority, horrified many English Catholic peers.²⁹ Steven Pincus highlights how the Papacy supported William and the Revolution because of the Papal-French conflict; Catholics in the Three Kingdoms were divided over this. Many, if not most, publicly supported James whom they believed would improve their conditions and had a divine right while others followed the Pope and supported William.³⁰ Regardless of whom Catholics publicly declared for, their pronouncements and actions would be pounced on in the wider allegiance debates.

II

²⁵ Jim Smyth, *The Making of the United Kingdom, 1660-1800 State, Religion and Identity in Britain and Ireland* (London, 2001), pp.61-71; Mullet, *Catholics in Great Britain and Ireland*, pp.70-81, 103-4, 125-30.

²⁶ Joseph Bergin, *Crown, Church and Episcopate Under Louis XIV* (London, 2004), pp.34-5, 234-9; Claude Nordwann, 'Louis XIV and the Jacobites,' in Ragnhild Hutton (ed.) *Louis XIV and Europe* (London, 1976), pp.86, 101-3; J.P. Kenyon, 'The Earl of Sunderland and the Revolution of 1688,' *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 11, No. 3, (1955), pp.280-1; Richard Place, 'Bavaria and the Collapse of Louis XIV's German Policy, 1687-1688,' *The Journal of Modern History*, 49, No. 3 (Sep., 1977), pp.383-9, 391-2; Mark A. Thomson, 'Louis XIV and William III, 1689-1697,' *English Historical Review*, 76, No. 298 (Jan., 1961), pp.47, 50.

²⁷ Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp.229-38.

²⁸ James Canaries, *Rome's Additions to Christianity shewn to be inconsistent with the true design of so spiritual religion in a sermon preached at Edinburgh...* (Edinburgh, 1686), pp.19-20.

²⁹ Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (London, 2002), pp.237-8.

³⁰ Steven Pincus, 'The European Catholic Context of the Revolution of 1688-89: Gallicanism, Innocent XI, and Catholic Opposition,' in Allan I. Macinnes & Arthur H. Williamson (eds.) *Shaping the Stuart World 1603-1714 The Atlantic Connection* (Leiden/ Boston, 2006), pp.103-6, 110-3.

Different historians have explored the links between Jacobitism and Catholicism in the Kingdoms but overlook the role of Catholic Jacobites in the allegiance debates.³¹ Numerous Catholic Jacobites, especially in Ireland before William's military victory, staunchly declared allegiance to James and said this resulted from Catholic teaching on allegiance. This continued the popular view amongst many Catholics during the Restoration that theirs was the only loyalty that Stuart monarchs could rely on. Irish Catholic priest Edmond Dulaney's 1689 sermon before James in Dublin said that subjects had 'an indispensable obligation of Loyalty and Obedience.' James was King; the monarchy was 'the Image of God's Power and Authority' therefore challenging James was sinful.³² Éamonn Ó Ciardha has described Dulaney's sermon as anti-Protestant, nationalistic and providential.³³ These elements were present in Dulaney's sermon, as was his use of history described in Chapter One, but parts of his sermon cited Catholic teaching on allegiance to justify denying William allegiance. It was 'the Rule of Christians, who are in Conscience obliged to obey their King, and defend his Crown and Dignity to the last drop of their Blood, and to the loss of their Lives and Fortunes.'³⁴ The Revolution was a 'hellish Rebellion.' Protestants' 'Disloyalty' came from 'the corrupt principles of a restless Religion' and this led them to enthrone William.³⁵ Ruin awaited Protestants as a consequence of their 'disobedience' to James, the divinely ordained King.³⁶ This was one example of Catholics continuing to propagate a self-constructed perception of Catholics being the only loyal subjects.

Even after military defeat in Ireland, Catholic Jacobites continued making these public declarations of allegiance that equated allegiance to James with good Catholicism. Charles O'Kelly's 1694 allegorical history of the Revolution, *The Destruction of Cyprus*, claimed that the only way 'to preserve the true Worship' was to continue fighting for James. Catholics who surrendered to William had 'turned Protestant'; O'Kelly saw any submission to

³¹ Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989), pp.126-7, 132-8, 310-2; Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause*, pp.20-8, 65-6, 87-8, 100-4; Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester, 1994) p.45; Alexander Murdoch, *British History, 1660-1832: National Identity and Local Culture* (Basingstoke, 1998), p.35.

³² Fr. Edmond Dulaney, *A Sermon Preached before the King, in Christ-Church, Dublin, On Ash-Wednesday 1689* (Dublin, 1689), pp.5-6.

³³ Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause*, pp.65-6.

³⁴ Dulaney, *Sermon Preached before the King, in Christ-Church*, pp.19-20.

³⁵ *Ibid*, pp.6-7, 16.

³⁶ *Ibid*, pp.6-7.

William as renouncing Catholicism.³⁷ O’Kelly asserted that most Irish Catholic Jacobites were fervent in this religious duty of allegiance, an ‘unshaken fidelity neither threats could shake, nor promises corrupt, nor hopes of advantage change.’ Catholic Jacobites were ‘resolved, either to perish in his cause, or restore’ James to his throne. O’Kelly believed that Catholics, unlike Protestants, had genuine loyalty to James.³⁸ Nicholas Plunkett’s *Light to the Blind* similarly denounced allegiance to William as un-Catholic. To Plunkett Catholic and Protestant teachings on allegiance were very different. Protestant England was ‘a nation without conscience or fear of God’ as evidenced by ‘their demeanour towards their lawful sovereigns and their fellow-subjects, since their unhappy desertion from Rome....’ Meanwhile Irish Catholics proved ‘themselves honest men in giving every one his due: to Caesar what is Caesar’s; to God, what is God’s.’³⁹ Catholic Jacobites ‘would not turn knaves with the knaves of England against the Lord’s anointed;’ the Old Testament said that providential punishment awaited allegiance-breakers.⁴⁰ O’Kelly and Plunkett saw James and William’s contest in confessional terms. Protestants gave William allegiance while Catholics maintained allegiance to James. These accounts of the Revolution and the aftermath of the war in Ireland described most Catholics as publicly maintaining allegiance to James because of Catholic teaching and opposition to what they saw as a Protestant Revolution.

Ó Buachalla has outlined how Irish Catholics throughout the seventeenth century held a loyalty to the Stuarts, including James, arising from their views of history.⁴¹ Catholic Jacobite pamphlets also presented Catholic allegiance to James as continuing historic Catholic loyalty to the rightful Stuart monarchs. As with Plunkett, parts of these pamphlets focused on what were described in these pamphlets as Catholic attitudes to allegiance. Ardent Catholic Jacobite Henry Reily’s 1695 *Impartial History of Ireland* highlighted Catholics’ ‘unparallel’d Loyalty’ throughout the Civil Wars and Restoration for his post-Revolution audience. Despite their loyalty Charles’s Restoration

³⁷ Charles O’Kelly, *Macariae Excidium, or The Destruction of Cyprus; Being a Secret History of the War of the Revolution in Ireland...*, ed. John Cornelius O’Callaghan (Dublin, 1850), pp.71, 190.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp.17-8.

³⁹ Nicholas Plunkett, ‘A Light to the Blind,’ *A Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland 1688-1691*, ed. J.T. Gilbert (Shannon, 1971), p.184.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.184-5.

⁴¹ Ó Buachalla, ‘James Our True King,’ pp.12-3, 23-30. See Chapter One for Jacobite use of history in early-1689 allegiance polemics.

rewarded ‘Rebels and Traytors’ ensuring ‘the Ruin of Loyal Subjects,’ like Catholics.⁴² Reily wrote his *History* after following James into exile.⁴³ Like Plunkett and O’Kelly, Reily repeatedly described how Catholics were the most loyal subjects. He acknowledged that some English Protestants maintained loyalty to the Stuarts but still depicted the Civil Wars as a Protestant rebellion.⁴⁴ Protestants ‘had nothing of Christianity but the Name, having always been as Atheistical in Religion, as Antimonarchical in Reverence to Government....’⁴⁵ Reily’s pamphlet originally published in 1695 was a public declaration of this popular Catholic Jacobite belief that Catholics were the only genuinely loyal subjects.

Even the exiled Jacobite court at times agreed that Catholics were the most loyal subjects. One official 1694 Jacobite publication showed how highly Catholic loyalty was esteemed. James ordered the printing of Charles II’s reasons for converting to Catholicism; one reason was English Catholics’ consistent loyalty throughout various political tumults.⁴⁶ For a monarch the Catholic Church could ‘insure him not only his Subjects Persons, but also their Consciences and Purses, seeing they must do and believe as the Church will have them.’⁴⁷ This official Jacobite publication regarded Catholics as genuinely loyal subjects because they adhered to their Church’s teaching on allegiance; they had not broken their allegiance and embraced disloyalty as Protestants did. Charles even said that ‘I have no cause to be of the Religion of Protestants who murdered my Father.’⁴⁸ Ordering this publication can be seen as praise for Catholics maintaining loyalty to Stuart monarchs despite many Protestants transferring allegiance to new rulers. These Catholic Jacobite polemics show that many Catholics saw allegiance to James as resulting from their faith and its obligation to obedience and opposition to the various seventeenth-century Protestant rebellions against the monarchy.

⁴² Hugh Reily, *The Impartial History of Ireland...In Two Parts...Ireland’s Case...*(London, 1768 reprint), pp.44, 51-2, 58, 65, 73.

⁴³ Vincent Geoghegan, ‘Reily, Hugh (fl. 1686–1695)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23346, accessed 26 Nov 2013].

⁴⁴ Reily, *Impartial History of Ireland*, pp.58, 65, 73.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.73-6, 53-4.

⁴⁶ *Eikon Basilike Deutera, The Pourtraicture of His Sacred Majesty King Charles II: With his Reasons for turning Roman Catholick; published by K. James* (n.p., 1694), pp.1-4.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p.3.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p.4.

Protestant Williamite polemics frequently portrayed the Revolution as a Protestant victory, which Protestants should support.⁴⁹ However what can be overlooked is how Protestant Williamites promoted the notion that allegiance to James was a Catholic dogma. Irish Anglican William King's memoirs claimed that he tried to convince Catholics, including priests, to take the Oath of Allegiance to William but that they refused. King hoped that 'Romish priests' would not 'be the authors of the greatest injury to themselves and their friends' by denying William allegiance. He attributed this almost universal refusal to religious principles but said he would 'act humanely towards' Catholics and not persecute them.⁵⁰ King's correspondence from Anne's reign also shows that he regarded Jacobitism as a Catholic duty.⁵¹ One London Williamite printed a *Memorial* apparently by Catholic Archbishop Patrick Russell of Dublin that described Catholic loyalty to James and plans to re-establish Catholicism. This also had Protestant Williamite reflections on Russell's treatise.⁵² In it, Russell said that priests 'always preach and teach Loyalty and Obedience to their King, to be an essential Maxim of the Religion and Law of God.' Changing political situations, like the Revolution, did not alter subjects' religious duty of allegiance to James.⁵³ Catholics 'always kept touch to their Loyalty and Allegiance in' James's 'Cause,' unlike Protestants who were 'not sincerely Loyal.'⁵⁴ Protestant Williamites highlighted Catholics' publicly reaffirming allegiance to James because it allowed them to portray allegiance to James as a Catholic duty, which good Protestants should be wary of.

Across the Kingdoms Protestant Williamites contributed to this popular rhetoric that associated allegiance to James with Catholicism. Daniel Defoe's *Six Distinguishing Characters of a Parliament-Men* described England and the Revolution settlement as Protestant. Defoe said that a Catholic, who 'is a declar'd Friend to King *James*,' could not be trusted in influential positions

⁴⁹ Claydon, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom,' pp.125-40; idem, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, pp.33, 40-1, 44-9, 142-5, 183-6; Hoppit, *A Land of Liberty?*, p.221; Nenner, 'Pretense and Pragmatism,' pp.85-91; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp.252-4, 257.

⁵⁰ William King, 'Memoirs,' *A Great Archbishop of Dublin William King D.D. 1650-1729. His Autobiography, Family, and a Selection from his Correspondence...*, ed. Sir Charles Simeon King (London, 1906), pp.28-9.

⁵¹ Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause*, pp.133, 153-4.

⁵² *An Address Given in to the Late King James, By the Titular Archbishop of Dublin...* (London, 1690), passim.

⁵³ Ibid, pp.11-2.

⁵⁴ Ibid, pp.12-3.

because they wanted England to ‘return her Obedience to a Popish King.’ Catholics were not ‘fit... to represent a Protestant Nation, and to advise a Protestant Prince for the security of the Protestant Religion’ because they were ‘disaffected to the Present Settlement’ of a Protestant monarchy under William.⁵⁵ In the early 1700s Defoe stated that some Catholics were loyal to William.⁵⁶ However in numerous pamphlets during the 1690s, even after the Ryswick Treaty had ended the war with France, Defoe adapted old anti-Catholic prejudices for the post-Revolution environment. He saluted William’s Continental Catholic allies but said that Catholics in William’s Kingdoms, unlike Protestants in France, were disloyal to their monarch.⁵⁷ William should realise that Catholic allegiance was always deceitful. During ‘all the Reigns for... 150 Years past’ Catholics were ‘Disturbers of the Peace.’ Catholics ‘refuse now to Swear Allegiance to the Government’ even after Ryswick had guaranteed William’s rule for the foreseeable future.⁵⁸ David Abercromby, a Scottish former Catholic, also recycled anti-Catholic prejudices to describe Catholicism as a ‘Politick, rather than a Religious Body.’⁵⁹ Abercromby connected allegiance to James with Catholicism. He alleged that during James’s reign some Protestants, motivated by ‘Worldly Concerns,’ converted to Catholicism to gain James’s ‘Preferment.’ This further stressed the Protestant Williamite claim that allegiance to James was a Catholic act. Under James Protestants, even if loyal to James, would not be warmly received without conversion.⁶⁰ Defoe and Abercromby described allegiance to James as a Catholic act and a statement of opposition to the Revolution and how it changed the monarch and turned a Catholic tyranny into a constitutionally limited Protestant monarchy.

Narcissus Luttrell’s chronicle of news recorded in June 1693 that Rome apparently authorised English Cardinal Philip Howard to go to England ‘to exhort the Catholicks there to remain firm to the interest of king

⁵⁵ Daniel Defoe, *The Six Distinguishing Characters of a Parliament-Man address’d to the Good People of England* (London, 1700), pp.11-3.

⁵⁶ Pincus, ‘The European Catholic Context of the Revolution,’ pp.105-6.

⁵⁷ Daniel Defoe, *Lex Talionis, or, An Enquiry into the most Proper ways to Prevent the Persecution of the Protestants in France* (London, 1698), pp.1-3.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp.11-3, 22-4.

⁵⁹ David Abercromby, *A Moral Discourse of the Power of Interest...* (London, 1690), pp.141-3, 25-8

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.91-3.

James....⁶¹ The validity of the claim is irrelevant to the association of allegiance to James with Catholicism. Catholic involvement in Jacobite plots only added to this popular perception. The 1694 Lancashire Plot saw several Catholics charged with treason before being acquitted.⁶² Irish Protestant Jacques Abbadie's 1696 chronicle of this and other Jacobite conspiracies stated that Catholics were the first 'Order of Jacobites,' Anglican Nonjurors the 'Second Order' with criminals and adventurers third.⁶³ Abbadie said that the various conspiracies relied on Catholic networks in the Kingdoms. Irish Catholics took the lead in these plots and were joined by English Catholics when they 'perceiv'd that there was a party form'd in *Ireland* who had openly declar'd for' James.⁶⁴ Abbadie depicted Catholicism and Jacobitism as one. English Catholics retained 'those aspiring Hopes that were defeated by the Revolution; and their Ambition was rather enflam'd than allay'd by so unexpected a Disappointment.' They 'thought themselves oblig'd to support' James who 'had sacrific'd his Crown to their Advancement.'⁶⁵ This meant it was 'the general opinion' that 'all the Papists in *England*' supported James because of Catholic dogma and an expectation of Catholic advances. Abbadie, like other Protestant Williamites and Catholic Jacobites, promoted this popular perception that allegiance to James was for Catholics while William and the Revolution were for Protestants.⁶⁶ Anti-Catholicism was entrenched at the time and Catholics popularly regarded as disloyal. Abbadie and other Protestant Williamites combined traditional anti-Catholicism with Catholic declarations of allegiance to James to further taint allegiance to James with Catholicism.

In Scotland allegiance to James also became popularly equated with Catholicism to damage Jacobitism's image. Thomas Nicolson, a senior Catholic cleric in Scotland during the Revolution,⁶⁷ wrote 'a narrative of the late Revolution in Great Britain' for the head of the Jesuits, Thyrsus Gonzalez. Nicolson described the popular attitudes in Scotland during the Revolution as

⁶¹ Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs From September 1678 to April 1714 Volume III* (Oxford, 1867), p.108.

⁶² Baker, *Reading and Politics*, pp.98-9.

⁶³ Jacques Abbadie, *The History of the Late Conspiracy against the King and the Nation with a Particular Account of the Lancashire Plot, and all the other Attempts and machinations of the Disaffected Party since his Majesty's accession to the throne...* (London, 1696), p.36.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, pp.27-8.

⁶⁵ *Ibid*, pp.27-8.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, p.36.

⁶⁷ Mark Dilworth, 'Nicolson, Thomas (1644x6–1718)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20151>, accessed 26 Nov 2013].

‘a storm... against the Catholics’ with mobs attacking Catholic churches and property.⁶⁸ Protestant Jacobite John Sage publicly lamented the effectiveness of Williamite propaganda in establishing in Scotland’s public discourse the idea that it was ‘*Papists* or *Popishly* affected’ who ‘were not for the late Revolution.’ To Sage’s frustration Catholicism and Jacobitism were popularly seen as interchangeable terms signifying rejection of the Revolution in Scotland.⁶⁹

The case of Henry Neville Payne illustrates the popular public conflation of Catholicism, allegiance to James and rejection of the Revolution in Scotland. Payne, an English Catholic Jacobite, was arrested and imprisoned in Scotland. Much of the evidence against Payne was published. One pamphlet described Payne’s ‘Allegiance’ to James and his communications with Jacobites throughout the Kingdoms. This received much public attention in Scotland and England.⁷⁰ Payne was detained without trial for eight years.⁷¹ Scotland’s Parliament authorised his continued detention because they believed Payne was a threat.⁷² William ordered Payne’s release in February 1701, after which Payne left for France.⁷³ Allan Macinnes has said that action was only taken against Scottish Catholics if they were Jacobites.⁷⁴ Payne’s case seems to support Macinnes’s argument; the indictments against Payne clearly list his Catholicism as evidence of his Jacobitism. One Court pamphlet said that Payne’s conspiracy in Scotland was to be carried out by ‘enemies to the Protestant Religion, and ill affected to our Government.’ This proclamation warned ‘Our good Subjects’ of the ‘Enemies of the Protestant Religion, and

⁶⁸ Thomas Nicolson, ‘Bishop Nicolson to the Very Rev. Fr. Thyrsus Gonzalez, General of the Society of Jesus. An Account of the Changes which have occurred in Scotland (Blair’s College MSS), Dunkirk, 26 January 1691,’ *Memoirs of Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries... Volume II From Commonwealth to Emancipation 1647-1793*, ed. William Forbes Leith (London, 1909), pp.154-6.

⁶⁹ John Sage, *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, As it has been lately Established in the Kingdom of Scotland...* (London, 1695), ‘The Preface.’

⁷⁰ *Nevil Payn’s Letter, and some other Letters that Concern the Subject of his Letter with short notes on them; for the clearer information of the Members of Parliament: in order to Nevil Payn’s trial* (Edinburgh, 1693), p.19; Luttrell, *Brief Relation of State Affairs... Volume III*, pp.14, 100.

⁷¹ *Unto his Grace, the Earl of Marchmont Lord High Commissioner of Scotland and the Right Honourable Estates of Parliament The Petition of Henry Payne...* (Edinburgh, 1698).

⁷² ‘Acts read and laid open; overture remitted to committee; petitions granted,’ *Records of the Parliament of Scotland to 1707*, ed. K.M Brown (St. Andrews, 2007-2013), M1696/9/15. <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/M1696/9/15>. Date accessed: 16 November 2013.

⁷³ Paul Hopkins, ‘Payne, Henry (d. 1705?)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21643>], accessed 15 Nov 2013].

⁷⁴ Macinnes, ‘Catholic Recusancy,’ pp.58-61.

Our Government.’⁷⁵ These references to Payne’s faith and denouncement of ‘Enemies of the Protestant Religion, and Our Government’ show that in the Scottish public discourse Williamites equated allegiance to James with Catholicism. Being anti-Revolution was to be anti-Protestant.

In the late 1690s each Kingdom introduced new penal laws.⁷⁶ These laws continued to promote traditional prejudices about Catholics being disloyal but amended it for the post-Revolution public discourse. Allegiance to James was tied to Catholicism and depicted as threatening the Revolution settlement. Scotland’s 1700 *Act for Preventing the Growth of Popery* equated Catholicism with Jacobitism, which endangered ‘the true Protestant religion as at present settled and established within this realm’ under William. A ‘formula’ renouncing tenets of Catholicism was to be tendered to all Catholics.⁷⁷ This tying allegiance to James with Catholicism built on the anti-Catholicism in the Claim of Right.⁷⁸ English Catholics were also regarded as being anti-Revolution. One pamphlet complained of how there were ‘more Popish Priests in *England*’ under William than during James’s reign.⁷⁹ The author demanded a more ‘Effectual Stop to the Growth of Popery.’ William was described as a ‘King, to whom, under God, we owe our Preservation from Popery.’⁸⁰ Catholic Jacobites and many Protestant Williamites contributed to this popular rhetoric across the Kingdoms that built on traditional anti-Catholic prejudices and equated allegiance to James with Catholicism. Both found it useful to portray allegiance to James as a Catholic religious duty, which rejected William’s enthronement and the Revolution settlements protecting Protestantism.

⁷⁵ *A Proclamation, by the King and Queen’s Majesties...Whereas there have been several Treasonable, and Seditious Designs and Combinations...by persons enemies to the Protestant Religion, and ill affected to our Government...* (Edinburgh, 1690).

⁷⁶ Bossy, ‘English Catholics after 1688,’ pp.372-3; J.G Simms, ‘The Establishment of Protestant Ascendancy 1691-1714,’ in T.W. Moody & W.E Vaughan (eds.) *New History of Ireland IV Eighteenth-Century Ireland 1691-1800* (Oxford, 1986), pp.20-1; Thomas Bartlett, *The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation: The Catholic Question 1690-1830* (Dublin, 1992), pp.17-21; Macinnes, ‘Catholic Recusancy,’ p.61; R. Buick Knox, ‘Establishment and Toleration during the Reigns of William, Mary and Anne,’ *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* XXIII (1989), p.57.

⁷⁷ ‘Act for preventing the Growth of Popery,’ *The Records of the Parliament of Scotland to 1707*, ed. K.M. Brown (St. Andrews, 2007-2014), 1700/10/73. Date accessed: 21 December 2014. URL: <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1700/10/73>. See Appendix III for the full wording of the formula.

⁷⁸ *The Declaration of the Estates of the Kingdom of Scotland, containing the Claim of Right, and the offer of the Crown to their Majesties, King William and Queen Mary...* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp.3-4.

⁷⁹ R.W., *A Letter to an Honourable Member of Parliament, concerning the great Growth of Popery, and the Treasonable Practices of the Romish Bishops and Priests, at this time, in England* (London, 1700), p.1.

⁸⁰ *Ibid*, p.4.

However this was only part of the Kingdoms' public attitudes because other Williamites and Jacobites would use Catholic allegiance in a way that saw Williamites increasingly present the Revolution as transformative.

III

While numerous Williamites and Jacobites presented allegiance to James as a Catholic act other Jacobites and Williamites publicly accepted that many Catholics gave William allegiance. Anti-popery was used carefully in official Williamite propaganda because William had a fairly tolerant attitude towards Catholics and wished to avoid alienating his Continental Catholic allies.⁸¹ Pincus notes that some Protestant Whig Williamites like Defoe, Roger Morrice and James Welwood claimed that many English Catholics supported William and the Revolution because of the Franco-Papal conflict.⁸² His argument is supported by the fact that several Williamite polemicists highlighted this ideological division amongst English Catholics. This allowed these Williamites to claim that not even every Catholic supported James. These Williamite texts focused more on the Revolution as a temporal change benefitting the Kingdoms and even Catholics. Some Protestant Williamites praised Rome's opposition to Louis, Jacobitism's main supporter, who was described as an enemy of Catholicism. Alexander VIII, Innocent's successor, issued a decree listing Papal grievances with Louis. This was republished in England in 1690.⁸³

Another Williamite pamphlet revelled in Innocent's snub to James's envoy to Rome in 1689. Innocent's advisor Cardinal Rinaldo Este apparently told James's envoy that Innocent sympathised with the misfortune that befell a Catholic ruler. However Este made it clear that Innocent believed that James's relationship with Louis was the 'true source of' James's 'Miseries.' Louis's 'incroachments' on papal authority and territory made it 'utterly impossible'

⁸¹ Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy 1660-1714* (London, 2013), pp.504-5; Wout Troost, 'Ireland's Role in the Foreign Policy of William III,' in Mijers & Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III*, pp.53-4, 59-68.

⁸² Pincus, 'The European Catholic Context of the Revolution,' pp.105-6; idem, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (London, 2009), pp.468-70.

⁸³ Pope Alexander VIII, *His Holyness The Pope of Rome's Declaration against the French King, Louis the 14th* (London, 1690), pp.1-2.

for Innocent to support James.⁸⁴ Another London-produced pamphlet lamented Innocent's death in 1690, praising his 'sensible' support for William. Innocent's sensibility was shown in his viewing the post-Revolution war as 'not a Religious War.'⁸⁵ Gabriel Glickman has said that efforts 'in the English public sphere' to introduce toleration of Catholics between 1689 and the Hanoverian period had 'little chance' of success because of engrained anti-Catholicism.⁸⁶ These polemics were not going to change this anti-Catholicism but such publications can be seen in two ways. First they were saluting William's Continental Catholic allies. Secondly, and more importantly for this study, these pamphlets can be seen as an implicit public appeal to Catholics in the Kingdoms to follow the Papal example by supporting William. This showed that there was a portion of the politically involved, mainly in England, that publicly viewed the Revolution as more than a Protestant victory.

Portraying the Revolution in non-religious terms was at odds with other Williamite portrayals of the Revolution as a Protestant victory.⁸⁷ William tried to be conciliatory towards Catholics.⁸⁸ Protestant Williamites prepared to accept Catholics supporting William followed this example. One pamphlet, written before the English Toleration Act, said that William hoped for Catholics' inclusion in the Act. The author saw no problem with Catholics privately practising their faith and quoted William's *Declaration* where it said William 'Excepts not the Papists' from the Toleration. By potentially tolerating Catholics it was hoped that Catholics, like Protestant Dissenters, would be loyal Williamites.⁸⁹

Ultimately Catholics were excluded from England's Toleration but a 'Papists Toleration Bill' was debated in the English House of Lords in December 1689. Some historians view the Bill as an example of William's tolerance but rejected by parliament in a post-Revolution environment where

⁸⁴ *A Letter From Rome, Written by a Roman Catholick there, to a Person of Quality in England; giving a full Account of a MEMORIAL presented to the Pope, in relation to the late King JAMES's Affairs, with the Popes Answer, or rather Denial thereto* (n.p., 1689), pp.1-2.

⁸⁵ T.L. *The Life and Reign of Innocent XI, Late Pope of Rome...*(London, 1690), pp.22-4, 27, 67-8.

⁸⁶ Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, pp.123-46.

⁸⁷ Some examples depicting the Revolution as a Protestant victory and portraying allegiance to William as a Protestant act are: Hamilton, *A True Relation of the Actions of the Inniskilling-Men*, p.52; Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative Considered*, pp.3-4.

⁸⁸ Bossy, 'English Catholics after 1688,' passim.

⁸⁹ *King William's Toleration: Being an Explanation of that Liberty of Religion, Which may be Expected from His Majesty's Declaration, with a Bill for Comprehension & Indulgence...*(London, 1689), pp.15-6. See Chapter Five for the effects of the Toleration Act on Allegiance debates.

parliament had greater influence on the monarch. Others view it as an attempt to satisfy William's Continental Catholic allies.⁹⁰ Some Williamites were publicly prepared to accept Catholic allegiance to William by allowing them to take an 'Oath of Fidelity' to William.⁹¹ Gilbert Dolben, a Tory lawyer and early supporter of William,⁹² drafted the bill's amendments. Catholics would get most of the Toleration Act's benefits if they swore to 'be faithful and bear true allegiance to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary' like Dissenters did.⁹³ As part of this oath Catholics were only obliged to renounce Papal absolution of allegiance to excommunicated monarchs, which some Catholics were already prepared to do. Unlike previous oaths this did not renounce tenets of Catholicism. There was no renouncing of Transubstantiation or denying Papal doctrinal authority.⁹⁴ The 'Papists Toleration Bill' made little impact in print but it shows that some Williamites were publicly willing to view the Revolution as a mainly political event. This also challenged popular perceptions, advocated by Abbadie and others, that Catholics were automatically loyal to James.

Pincus highlighted how James Welwood, a Whig, acknowledged that several Catholics gave William allegiance.⁹⁵ In one pamphlet in 1700 Welwood said that Catholics had more 'Liberty of their Religion' under William than under James. Catholics' 'Fellow-Subjects' were more at ease with Catholics and that these Catholics no longer had a 'Design to overturn the

⁹⁰ Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford, 1999), pp.26-7; Bossy, 'English Catholics after 1688,' pp.371-2; Scott Sowerby, *Making Toleration: The repealers and the Glorious Revolution* (London, 2013), pp.259-65; Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, p.174.

⁹¹ 'House of Lords Journal Volume 14: 19 December 1689', in *Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 14, 1685-1691* (London, 1767-1830), pp. 375-377. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol14/pp375-377>. Date Accessed: 21 June 2015; 'Papists Toleration Bill,' Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC) *The Manuscripts of the House of Lords, Volume II 1689-1690* (London, 1889), pp.386-7.

⁹² J. M. Rigg, 'Dolben, Sir Gilbert, first baronet (1658/9-1722)', rev. D. W. Hayton, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7774>, accessed 20 Nov 2013].

⁹³ 'Papists Toleration Bill,' *HMC Lords manuscripts*, p.386; 'William and Mary, 1688: An Act for the Abrogating of the Oathes of Supremacy and Allegiance and Appointing other Oathes. [Chapter VIII. Rot. Parl. pt. 5. nu. 5.],' *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 6, 1685-94*, ed. John Raithby (n.p., 1819), pp. 57-60. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol6/pp57-60>. Date accessed: 18 June 2015.

⁹⁴ 'Papists Toleration Bill,' *HMC Lords Manuscripts*, pp.386-7; Walsh, *Some Few Questions Concerning the Oath of Allegiance*, pp.12-3; Corker, *Roman-Catholic Principles in Reference to God and the King*, pp.9-11, 18-20.

⁹⁵ Pincus, 'The European Catholic Context of the Revolution,' pp.105-6; idem, *1688*, pp.468-70.

Establish'd Church.'⁹⁶ Welwood's statement suggests that significant numbers of Catholics accepted William's rule. Labelling Catholics 'Fellow-Subjects' of William shows less hostility to Catholics being part of English society under William.

Other Protestant Williamites prepared to accept the Revolution as a mainly political event and accommodate Catholics within this post-Revolution society could point to apparent Catholics declaring allegiance to William. Pamphlets purporting to be written by Catholics pledging allegiance to William made quite an impact. One of the most influential was *The French King Demonstrated an Enemy to the Catholick as well as Protestant Religion*. Radical Scottish Protestant Jacobite Robert Ferguson said this pamphlet showed 'more plainly' William's links with Rome. It was 'as if King *William* were fighting for, and the *French King* against the Church of *Rome*.'⁹⁷ James Fraser, a Protestant appointed licenser in 1688, authorised the publication of *The Present French King* in 1691.⁹⁸ Official support for this publication shows that some in William's regime endorsed public appeals for Catholic allegiance. The pamphlet began with an 'Epistle to the Jacobites' that warned of Louis 'sitting like an *Anti-Pope*' challenging Rome. Jacobites should be renamed '*Lewisites*' because supporting James only furthered Louis's 'own Ends.' Allegiance to James meant backing Louis who was fighting the Catholic Church.⁹⁹ Louis, 'the Common Disturber of the Publick Tranquility' in Europe, was the 'perfect Enemy of *Catholicism*' as shown by his hostility to the Pope.¹⁰⁰ James 'seduc'd by the crafty and violent Counsels of the *French*' had 'added nothing to the Happiness of the *English Catholics*.'¹⁰¹ The author argued that 'all good Catholics' should 'consider' how James and Louis's quest for hegemony threatened Papal authority and the Catholic Church's constitution, potentially resulting in 'the Ruin' of Catholicism.¹⁰²

⁹⁶ James Welwood, *Memoirs of the Most Material Transactions in England for the Last Hundred Years, preceding the Revolution of 1688* (London, 1700), 'To the Reader.'

⁹⁷ Robert Ferguson, *The History of the Revolution* (London, 1706), p.12.

⁹⁸ Brian Moffat, 'Fraser, James (1645–1731)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008

[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/73233>, accessed 13 Nov 2013]; *The Present French King Demonstrated an Enemy to the Catholick as well as Protestant Religion* (London, 1691).

⁹⁹ *The Present French King*, 'Epistle to the Jacobites.'

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, pp.1-2.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, pp.19-20.

¹⁰² *Ibid*, pp.2-3, 11-6, 19-21.

According to this ‘good *Catholic*’ all ‘Princes of the *Roman Communion* ought to unite themselves with his now Majesty of *Britain*, and the Protestants to reduce *France* to her ancient Bounds....’¹⁰³ William’s enthronement in the Three Kingdoms checked Louis’s ambitions and prevented Catholicism’s ‘Ruin.’ As King William would not ‘disturb the Catholics of his Three Kingdoms. He is a Prince of all Princes the most Gentle and Moderate.’ The author exhorted all Catholics in the Kingdoms and Europe to support William for the good of Catholicism; Protestants were not the Revolution’s exclusive beneficiaries.¹⁰⁴ This supposedly Catholic-authored pamphlet advocating loyalty to William challenged prevailing notions linking Jacobitism and Catholicism.

Other seemingly Catholic authors also justified allegiance to William because the Revolution benefitted Catholics and Catholicism. Sir D.W., an apparent ‘Baronet of the Church of *Rome*,’ also made this argument in a pamphlet. D.W. hoped that an ‘Oath of Fidelity’ for English Catholics, similar to the one for Irish Catholics in the Treaty of Limerick, would allow Catholics to become Williamites.¹⁰⁵ Despite popular anti-Catholicism D.W. said that ‘it is undeniable that’ William ‘is our King, we are his Subjects; whilst we are his Subjects we owe him Duty and Fidelity, and ought not to scruple promising it....’¹⁰⁶ Provided there was no recanting of Catholic doctrine D.W. said that he and most English Catholics would take an allegiance oath to William.¹⁰⁷ D.W. had two main justifications. One was the hope of avoiding the double taxation to which Catholics and Nonjurors were liable.¹⁰⁸ The other was Louis’s threat to all Europe and Catholicism. ‘I know no Reason for the Roman Catholicks in *England* to provoke the Government’ by appearing to be ‘in the French Interest....’¹⁰⁹ This statement again shows that apparent Catholics gave William allegiance because it was in their interests to see Louis’s ambitions against Catholicism and England foiled. D.W.’s pamphlet, published years after *The Present French King*, shows that to some in England the Revolution

¹⁰³ Ibid, p.20.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, pp.21-2.

¹⁰⁵ Sir D.W., *Some Reflections on the Oaths and Declaration Appointed in an Act past in the first Year of the Reign of King William and Queen Mary, In Reference to the Roman Catholicks of England* (London, 1695), pp.9-11.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, p.10.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, pp.15-27.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, ‘To my worthy Friend.’

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, pp.26-7.

was not narrowly Protestant. All Englishmen, even Catholics, could support the Revolution that transformed England into a permanent check on Louis's ambitions against the Kingdoms, Europe and Catholicism.¹¹⁰ As Claydon notes, Louis was frequently portrayed as threatening Protestantism and Catholicism across Europe.¹¹¹ D.W.'s pamphlet shows that this threat influenced many apparent Catholics. He argued that allegiance to William supported the Revolution's changes, which ultimately benefitted the personal and wider interests of English Catholics. Such polemics formed part of a significant minority in the public discourse arguing that the Revolution benefitted Protestants and Catholics. These declarations also challenged and undermined arguments about the Revolution being a Protestant victory.

Sir D.W. praised the Treaty of Limerick for allowing Irish Catholics to potentially become Williamites by taking an allegiance oath without recanting Catholic doctrine.¹¹² Some Irish Catholics also publicly advocated submitting to William. David Ó Bruadair, a Gaelic Irish poet, criticised Catholics who denounced the Treaty. Ó Bruadair had loyally served James throughout his reign. Up to the end of the war in Ireland he expressed hope that Jacobitism would triumph while condemning anyone considering submitting to William.¹¹³ After William triumphed Ó Bruadair accepted the Treaty because it gave the Catholic Church in Ireland some security. A Catholic who scorned the Treaty was 'an ignoramus of a flayer... who protected not the Church or the unselfish humble poor, Though he goes about condemning the Articles we failed to get....'¹¹⁴ This condemnation of Treaty opponents shows Ó Bruadair's pragmatism. Chapter One showed how fears of the Revolution being an attack on Catholicism similar to events in recent history terrified Ó Bruadair and other Irish Catholics. Ó Bruadair's acceptance of William's victory shows how the position of Catholicism in the Kingdoms influenced many Catholics' views on allegiance. He was, like D.W., advocating that Catholics give William allegiance because it benefitted Catholicism and James could no longer provide

¹¹⁰ Ibid, pp.9-11, 15-27.

¹¹¹ Claydon, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom,' pp.125-40.

¹¹² Sir D.W., *Some Reflections on the Oaths*, pp.9-11.

¹¹³ Ó Bruadair's Jacobitism is evident in his poems 'The Triumph of Tadhg,' 23 February 1689, and 'The Triumph of Patrick Sarsfield,' March, 1690/1, *Duanaire Dháibhidh Uí Bhruadair: The Poems of David Ó Bruadair Part III Containing Poems from the Year 1682 Till the Poet's Death in 1698*, ed. John C. Mac Erlean (London, 1917), pp.127-41, 143-55.

¹¹⁴ Ó Bruadair, 'An Ignoramus of a Flayer,' October 1692, *Poems of David Ó Bruadair Part III*, p.181.

such security. Denis Daly and Edmund Malone were two Galway Catholic lawyers who, as Chapter Three showed, took the Oath of Allegiance to William based on the Articles of surrender at Galway. They were denied the promised benefits but their case provides evidence that some Irish Catholics were prepared to give William allegiance because they believed it was in their interests.¹¹⁵ Ireland's Parliament refused to ratify the Treaty of Limerick's articles that provided some security for Catholics who gave William allegiance. The Irish Parliament feared the large Catholic population and even introduced new penal laws.¹¹⁶ Although the promised benefits never materialized these proposed benefits did entice many Irish Catholics to accept the Revolution and William's enthronement by declaring allegiance to William.

To many Irish and English Catholics if the Catholic Church was given some protection, from Louis or other existential threats, it could justify Catholics publicly pledging their loyalty, whether genuine or not, to William. All these exhortations that advocated Catholic allegiance to William shows that there was a section of the population in England and Ireland who viewed the Revolution as primarily a political, non-confessional event.

IV

Several Irish Protestant Williamites rejected Catholic declarations of allegiance to William. They produced polemics denouncing Catholic allegiance to William as part of a Catholic-Jacobite plot. These polemics also provide more evidence of Catholics giving William allegiance, especially after Ryswick guaranteed his rule for the foreseeable future. Irish Anglican Whig Sir Francis Brewster said Catholic allegiance to William was a lie and Catholics had lobbied Continental Catholic rulers to 'Intercede' on their behalf with William to improve their situation.¹¹⁷ Catholics had 'the confidence to tell us, that they were never so happy as under an *English* Government, and that' William 'has been gracious to them beyond expectation....'¹¹⁸ Most Catholics

¹¹⁵ *The State of the Case of Denis Daly, and Edmund Malone, Esqs; Barristers at Law, Comprised in the Articles lately made, on Surrender of the Town of Gallway in the Kingdom of Ireland* (n.p., 1696).

¹¹⁶ Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2007), pp.502-5.

¹¹⁷ Sir Francis Brewster, *A Discourse Concerning Ireland...*(London, 1698), pp.14-5.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid*, pp.14-5.

‘of any Note’ claimed that they had taken ‘the Oath of Fidelity’ and are ‘true Friends to King *William* and the *English* Interest of *Ireland*...’¹¹⁹ Catholics could not be trusted to keep these oaths; accepting their allegiance would be like letting ‘Tame Wolves’ amongst ‘their Prey.’¹²⁰ Irish Anglican cleric John Travers’s sermon on 23 October 1698 warned that, even after Ryswick, Catholics remained a threat. Catholics’ allegiance to William was ‘from the Teeth outward... They can’t be good Subjects to’ William. Their ‘Allegiance’ to William could only be trusted if they ‘renounce’ the Pope’s ‘dispensing Authority....’¹²¹ This clearly built on traditional anti-Catholic prejudices but Brewster’s and Travers’s polemics suggest that there were sufficient numbers of Catholics publicly declaring allegiance to William to cause this fear. Chapter Five showed how Brewster rejected toleration of Nonconformists as the start of a slippery slope to a Nonconformist takeover; he believed that accepting Catholic allegiance to William also posed a threat to the Revolution settlement.

In the mid-1690s some Irish Protestant Williamites attempted to impeach Lord Justices Porter and Coningsby. This action was taken because Porter and Coningsby appeared too friendly to Catholics and were trying to get the Irish Parliament to endorse the Treaty of Limerick, including the article protecting Catholics who gave William allegiance. English Tory support for Porter and Coningsby ensured the English Commons rejected this attempted impeachment.¹²² This episode also shows how there was a pervasive fear amongst Irish Anglicans that Catholic allegiance to William was a ruse to undermine the Revolution and advance Jacobitism.

Other Irish Anglican Williamites produced polemics making similar warnings that Catholic allegiance to William was to assist Catholic-Jacobite conspiracies. Anglican cleric William Jephson made such a warning in a

¹¹⁹ Ibid, pp., 15, 39.

¹²⁰ Ibid, pp.15-8, 39.

¹²¹ John Travers, *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrew’s Church Dublin. Before the Honourable the House of Commons the Twenty Third of October, 1698* (Dublin, 1698), pp.14-5.

¹²² Gilbert Burnet, *History of His Own Time... Vol. II* (London, 1734), pp.159-60; ‘Second Parliament of King William: Fifth session begins 7/11/1693; *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume Two 1680-1695 (Chandler’s)* (n.p., 1742), pp.415-445. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=37652>. Date accessed: 19 October 2014; Anchitell Grey, ‘Debates in 1693: December 11th-20th,’ *Grey’s Debates of the House of Commons: Volume 10* (London, 1769), pp.358-374. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=40528>. Date Accessed: 19 October 2014; Anchitell Grey, ‘Debates in 1694: January,’ *Grey’s Debates of the House of Commons: Volume 10* (London, 1769), pp.374-382. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=40529>. Date accessed: 19 October 2014.

sermon commemorating the Gunpowder Plot and William's landing.¹²³ Michael Jephson said that it was 'impossible for' Catholics 'to give any competent security that will not destroy' the constitution in Church and state.¹²⁴ In 1698 Sir Richard Cox denounced Catholics' 'Dissatisfaction... at the Glorious Succession of Our *Victorious King*' William.¹²⁵ Cox then described the history of Catholic disloyalty and how Catholics only gave allegiance if it advanced their '*Own Interest*.'¹²⁶ The only way Catholics could show loyalty to William was to convert to Protestantism. To Cox Catholicism was inconsistent with the Revolution that protected Protestantism, established a Protestant monarchy and lifted the threat of popery from the Kingdoms. Catholics resisted the Revolution's changes therefore their allegiance to William was hardly genuine. Chapters One and Three showed how Cox justified allegiance to William by focusing on William replacing James as *de facto* King. However, as Chapter Four also showed, as the 1690s progressed Cox put greater emphasis on how the Revolution was more than a personnel change when he described his allegiance to William.¹²⁷ By 1698 Cox emphasised how the Revolution defeated Catholic-Jacobite tyranny and ensured that there would be a monarchy permanently protecting Protestantism.

Chapters One through Three showed how conservative Irish Anglican Williamites gave William allegiance as *de facto* King and how as *de facto* King he would preserve Ireland, and Irish Protestants, from the horrors of James's reign. Catholic allegiance to William forced these Anglicans, already feeling threatened by Presbyterians seeking toleration, to put greater emphasis on how the Revolution was transformative and Catholics were inconsistent with the Revolution's changes. Cox and other Irish Anglicans described how the Revolution changed the Kingdoms by ensuring there was a specifically Protestant monarchy protecting Protestants from a Catholic-Jacobite tyranny. Again the Revolution was being described as changing the monarchy and the monarch. Allegiance to William, as Chapters Four and Five showed, was no

¹²³ William Jephson, *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrew's Church, Dublin: On the 5th of November 1698*... (Dublin, 1698), pp.11-4, 16.

¹²⁴ Michael Jephson, *A Sermon Preached at St. Patrick's Church Dublin, One the 23th of October, 1690*... (Dublin, 1690), pp.6-8, 12.

¹²⁵ Sir Richard Cox, *An Essay for the Conversion of the Irish; Shewing That 'tis their Duty and Interest to Become Protestants, In a Letter to Themselves* (Dublin, 1698), pp.1-2.

¹²⁶ *Ibid*, pp.3-10, 35-8.

¹²⁷ *Ibid*, pp.31-3, 37-8. See Chapters One, Three and Four.

longer just about supporting the *de facto* monarch; it was a statement of support for the far-reaching changes the Revolution ushered in.

V

While Catholic declarations of allegiance to William caused anxiety amongst many Protestant Williamites, these declarations became useful to Jacobite propagandists. Protestant Whig Jacobite William Anderton condemned how Williamites took ‘advantage’ of James’s faith by linking allegiance to James with Catholicism. Williamites utilized popular fears of Catholicism to ‘alienate’ James’s ‘Subjects Affections from his, and make the Prince of *Orange’s* Access the more easie.’¹²⁸ Catholics giving William allegiance and apparently benefitting from the Revolution allowed Protestant Jacobite polemicists to counter arguments about the Revolution being a Protestant victory which had to be supported with allegiance to William. They depicted the Revolution as a sinful temporal event.

Some Jacobites even argued that William advanced popery. The 1695 Jacobite pamphlet *A Dialogue Between K.W. and Benting* imagined William conversing with William Bentinck, Earl of Portland. Bentinck noted how William ‘*faithfully promised the Pope to promote the Romish Religion in England.*’ English Catholics had ‘greater Liberty’ under William than James, which resulted in a growing Catholic population.¹²⁹ The imaginary William admitted that depicting the Revolution as a Protestant victory was a ploy to gain English subjects’ allegiance. ‘What is Religion to me, except for a Pretence to blind the People;’ his enthronement was ‘impossible’ without exploiting anti-Catholicism. Religion was purely a means to advance political goals by gaining popular support. William said that he was ‘a *Church-of-England-man* here, a *Presbyterian* in *Scotland*, a *Papist* in *Flanders*, and of any other *Religion* that is in *Vogue* in any other place, so it *promote* my *Designs.*’¹³⁰ Protestant Jacobite polemics, like Anderton’s and *A Dialogue*, sought to demonstrate Williamite duplicity on allegiance and the Revolution.

¹²⁸ William Anderton, *Remarks upon the Present Confederacy...* (London, 1693), p.4.

¹²⁹ *A Dialogue Between K.W and Benting...* (n.p., 1695), pp.4-5. This pamphlet also employed Conquest and Contract theories and subjects’ liberties and these are explored in Chapters Three and Four.

¹³⁰ *Ibid*, pp.4-5.

Protestant Jacobite Sir James Montgomery said that there was ‘no probability of [Protestantism] being overturned by K. *James’s* Practices before this Revolution....’ James’s reign provided ‘undeniable Proof’ that Catholicism could not be re-established nor Protestantism undermined by a Catholic monarch because James was obliged to his Protestant subjects and to preserve Protestantism.¹³¹ Papal support for the Revolution put William under ‘Obligations... to embrace every Occasion of destroying’ Protestantism while ‘cherishing’ Catholicism. The Treaty of Limerick showed that Irish Catholics were ‘indulged to the prejudice of our Laws and Rights’ while Irish Nonconformists were excluded. Williamites’ accepting Catholic allegiance and William’s indebtedness to the Pope advanced Catholicism. James had not even attempted such advances for Catholicism.¹³² If the Revolution was a Protestant victory Catholics would not have prospered as they had since 1689. Allegiance to James would undo this Revolution that damaged Protestantism. A restored James would be obliged to his Protestant subjects and would not advance Catholicism as William did.¹³³

Robert Ferguson, Montgomery’s fellow Protestant Whig Jacobite, also used Catholic allegiance to present the Revolution and Jacobitism as non-confessional; neither was exclusive to one religion. Following the Lancashire Plot’s false allegations against Catholics, Ferguson praised English Catholics and Protestants who remained ‘steady in their Loyalty to’ James.¹³⁴ However, over several pamphlets Ferguson, like Montgomery, used Catholic loyalty to William to urge allegiance to James. This was significant because when Ferguson was a Williamite he partly justified allegiance to William because he offered ‘*Protection*’ of Protestantism.¹³⁵ The Treaty of Limerick showed how across ‘*England, Scotland, France, and Ireland*, Popery hath gained Ground by this Revolution.’ This was one example of Catholics being encouraged to support William and large numbers of Catholics responded positively to this and gave William allegiance.¹³⁶ He noted that ‘many *Catholick* Princes’ supported the Revolution despite being ‘against... a *Catholick* Monarch,’ the

¹³¹ Sir James Montgomery, *Great Britain’s Just Complaint... Second Edition* (Oxford, 1692), pp.41-3.

¹³² *Ibid.*, pp.32-3, 43-5, 51-4.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, pp.40-1, 4.

¹³⁴ Robert Ferguson, *A Letter to Mr. Secretary Trnechard...* (n.p., 1694), p.43.

¹³⁵ Robert Ferguson, *R. Fergusson’s Apology for his Transactions these last Ten Years, both in England and Forreign Parts...* (London/ Edinburgh, 1689).

¹³⁶ Ferguson, *History of the Revolution*, p.25.

first ‘upon the Thrones of *Great Brittain* for above these hundred Years.’¹³⁷ Ferguson hoped this would dispel the popular belief that the Revolution defended Protestantism. Portraying the Revolution in confessional terms was another way subjects were deceived into giving William allegiance. People were ‘bubbled into it through a foolish Credulity that it was entered upon in behalf of our Religion.’¹³⁸ William protecting Protestantism was hyperbole; Catholic support for William in the Kingdoms and the Continent proved this and so allegiance to William could not be justified on purely religious grounds.

Ferguson’s 1706 *History of the Revolution* cited numerous examples of Catholics declaring allegiance to William in the 1690s. His accusations cannot be verified but do provide further evidence of Protestant Jacobites using Catholic allegiance to William to discredit the idea that the Revolution, and allegiance to William, protected Protestantism. The Revolution was nondenominational. Ferguson claimed that from 1688 English Catholic clergymen ‘procured the Resolutions, from *Rome* and other Places, to authorize the Catholicks in *England*, to transfer their Allegiance from King *James* to King *William*.’ This led ‘many well-meaning Catholicks... to relinquish their Prince to support the Pope’s Supremacy’ and William against France. William and Innocent conspired in ‘Dethroning’ James and the Papal-Williamite victory was ‘not only to check the Reformation in *France*, but overthrow that in *England*.’¹³⁹ Ferguson even claimed that William ‘was a Rom. Catholick.’ The Pope and Catholic hierarchy in Rome sent a ‘final Resolution... to the *Roman Catholicks* of *England*... persuading them of the Lawfulness of taking the Oaths to K. *W-* and Q. *M-*.’¹⁴⁰ This resulted in numerous Catholics becoming Williamites.¹⁴¹ One prominent Catholic was James Corker.¹⁴² Corker followed James into exile but returned to England in 1696 and lived in relative peace.¹⁴³ Ferguson claimed that on his return Corker and an Anglican Nonjuror were brought before a court and tendered the oath of allegiance. The Anglican

¹³⁷ Robert Ferguson, *Whether the Preserving the Protestant Religion was the Motive unto, or the End that was designed in the late Revolution in a letter to a Country Gentleman as an answer to his first query* (n.p., 1695), pp.40-1.

¹³⁸ *Ibid*, p.41.

¹³⁹ Ferguson, *History of the Revolution*, ‘The Preface,’ pp.9-12.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid*, p.26.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid*, pp.28-30, 1-3, 11-3.

¹⁴² *Ibid*, p.29.

¹⁴³ Geoffrey Scott, ‘Corker, James (1636–1715)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6317>, accessed 13 Nov 2013].

refused the oath but Corker took it.¹⁴⁴ Ferguson and Montgomery used examples of Catholic allegiance to William and Catholic advances since 1689 to deny the notion that the Revolution protected Protestantism. This undermined some Williamites' portrayal of allegiance to James as a Catholic dogma. The Revolution and allegiance to William did not protect Protestantism; Protestantism could be maintained just as effectively with the rightful King James.

Anglican Nonjurors also adopted this argument. Charles Leslie's *Answer to William King's State of the Protestants of Ireland* demolished Williamite claims that the Revolution protected Protestantism. King stated that God chose William 'to be a Deliverer to us and the Protestant Cause.'¹⁴⁵ Leslie countered that the Treaty of Limerick and other Catholic advances were hardly evidence of a Protestant triumph. Like other Protestant Jacobites, Leslie cited examples of Catholics giving William allegiance because Catholicism prospered with the Revolution. The Treaty demonstrated how 'Popery was never more Tolerated in *Ireland* than since the Conclusion of our War....' William 'rewarded' Irish Catholics and in return they 'made no scruple to take the Oath of Allegiance to K. *William* and Q. *Mary*.' The oaths were 'now taken generally by the *Irish Papists* all over *Ireland*, by direction of their *Clergy*.'¹⁴⁶ Leslie also described 'how freely' Catholicism was 'Tolerated in *England*' under William.¹⁴⁷ English Catholics did not have the same protection the Treaty of Limerick provided for Irish Catholics but this did not inhibit English Catholics giving William allegiance. In London 'in their politick Chapels... they pray for K. *William* and Q. *Mary*....'¹⁴⁸ Perceptions of Catholic allegiance to William and post-Revolution Catholic advancements allowed Leslie to counter Williamite arguments, like King's, that the Revolution protected Protestants. Protestant Jacobites had to do this to make allegiance to James more appealing to the Kingdoms' Protestant majority.

¹⁴⁴ Ferguson, *History of the Revolution*, p.28-30.

¹⁴⁵ William King, *The State of the Protestants of Ireland Under the late King James's Government...* (London, 1691), p.225. See Chapters Two, Three and Four for more on King's *State*.

¹⁴⁶ Charles Leslie, *An Answer to a Book, Intituled, The State of the Protestants in Ireland under the Late King James's Government...* (London, 1692), pp.38, 125-6.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid*, p.38.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid*, p.126.

While some Catholic Jacobites claimed that true Jacobitism was the preserve of Catholics and James praised these Catholics,¹⁴⁹ other Protestant Jacobites used Catholic allegiance to further highlight how the Revolution and Jacobitism were non-confessional. Chapter Five showed how some Jacobites, in order to keep in touch with changing English attitudes, promised to preserve the established Protestantism while offering toleration to Nonconformists who gave James allegiance. Protestant Whig Jacobite Charlwood Lawton was one of the most effective Jacobite propagandists.¹⁵⁰ Lawton said that Protestants and Catholics were equally loyal and disloyal. He was so impressed by Catholics maintaining allegiance to James that he proposed that ‘*Obedience and Allegiance to the Civil Power*’ should be the ‘only *Test* for Preferment’ on James’s restoration.¹⁵¹ This was conditional on Catholics not overturning the Protestant establishment.¹⁵² Lawton asserted that Catholics were not a homogeneous group. Some were like ‘Englishmen’ in their attitudes to liberties and allegiance, entitling them to ‘indulgence’ on James’s restoration.¹⁵³ This allowed Lawton to further portray Jacobitism and allegiance to James as a non-denominational political platform that sought to undo the Revolution. Lawton along with Leslie, Ferguson and other Protestant Jacobites used Catholic allegiance to dismiss ideas that the Revolution protected Protestantism and Jacobitism was exclusively Catholic. Having dismissed these religious arguments for allegiance to William their mid-1690s polemics would focus on the issue of allegiance to *de jure* monarchs.¹⁵⁴

There were some tensions between Protestant and Catholic Jacobites.¹⁵⁵ Despite polemics like Reily’s and other Catholic Jacobite polemics, James and St. Germain publicly committed themselves to embracing all subjects’ allegiance to negate Protestant Williamite claims that allegiance to James was for Catholics. This was to make Jacobitism’s public support appear

¹⁴⁹ Dulaney, *Sermon preached before the King*, passim; *Eikon Basilike Deutera...*, pp.1-4.

¹⁵⁰ W. A. J. Archbold, ‘Lawton, Charlwood (1660–1721)’, rev. Philip Carter, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16211, accessed 20 Nov 2013]. See Chapters Four and Five.

¹⁵¹ Charlwood Lawton, *The Jacobite Principles Vindicated...* (n.p., 1693), pp.17-8.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, pp.17-8, 21-2.

¹⁵³ Charlwood Lawton, *A French Conquest Neither Desirable nor Practicable...* (London, 1693), p.2.

¹⁵⁴ See Chapter Seven for *De jure* allegiance.

¹⁵⁵ Daniel Szechi, “A Blueprint for Tyranny?” Edward Hales and the Catholic Jacobite Response to the Revolution of 1688, *English Historical Review*, 116. (2001), pp.341-2, 349, 356-9; *idem*, ‘The Jacobite Revolution Settlement, 1689-1696,’ *English Historical Review*, 108 (1993), pp.615-6.

broader. Chapters Three and Four examined the vindictive language in James's 1692 Declarations but even these did not attribute subjects' disloyalty to Protestantism. James promised to 'Protect and Maintain the Church of *England*' and expressed hope that 'Men of all Opinions in matters of Religion may be Reconcil'd to' him and that 'they may no longer look upon' James's government 'as their Enemy.'¹⁵⁶ All 'true' Englishmen should return allegiance to James and assist his restoration. Again St. Germain, even with their most vindictive language, described the Revolution as non-denominational; it was 'ill Men,' not specifically Protestants, who carried out the Revolution.¹⁵⁷ The 1692 Declaration to Scotland also did not attribute subjects' disloyalty to Protestantism.¹⁵⁸ James's more conciliatory 1693 Declaration again promised not to discriminate against Protestants and to retain the anti-Catholic Test in the hope of reconciling 'our Subjects to their Duty.'¹⁵⁹ Paul Monod has said that Protestants dominated Jacobite print propaganda.¹⁶⁰ Perceptions of Catholic allegiance to William became useful to them. Jacobitism had to appear non-denominational and not the preserve of Catholics in order to induce Protestant allegiance to James. A Jacobite restoration was unrealistic without accepting subjects' allegiance regardless of faith and maintaining established Protestantism. Protestant Jacobites and St. Germain avoided portraying the Revolution in confessional terms. Catholic allegiance to William allowed many Jacobites to highlight inconsistencies in Williamite claims that the Revolution was a Protestant victory obliging allegiance to William. St. Germain accepted allegiance to James from Protestants and Catholics. These non-denominational Jacobite arguments undermined Protestant Williamite claims that allegiance to James was a Catholic act. Williamites arguing that Jacobitism was solely a Catholic affair was no longer an effective reason in itself for eschewing allegiance to James.

¹⁵⁶ James II & VII, *His Majesties most Gracious Declaration to all His Loving Subjects, Commanding their Assistance against the P. of Orange, and his Adherents* (St. Germain, 1692), pp.1-4.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid*, p.1.

¹⁵⁸ James II & VII, *His Majesties Most Gracious Declaration to his Good People of His Ancient Kingdom of Scotland, Commanding their Assistance Against the Prince and Princesses of Orange, and their Adherents* (St. Germain, 1692), pp.1-2.

¹⁵⁹ James II & VII, *His Majesties most Gracious Declaration to all his Loving Subjects* (St. Germain, 1693).

¹⁶⁰ Paul Monod, 'The Jacobite Press and English Censorship, 1689-95,' in Eveline Crucikshanks & Edward Corp (eds.) *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995), pp.134-6.

Perceptions of Catholics giving allegiance to either William or James meant that allegiance to either monarch could not be justified solely on the idea that the Revolution was a confessional event. Opponents and apparent allies easily undermined these arguments. However these polemics also show greater public recognition of the Revolution as having more far-reaching changes than simply William replacing James as *de facto* King. Numerous Catholic polemics declared allegiance to James because they believed it was a Catholic religious duty and advanced Catholicism. Many Protestant Williamites used these declarations to try and dissuade Protestants from giving James allegiance. Both Protestant Williamites and Catholic Jacobites contributed to a popular view across the Kingdoms that conflated allegiance to James with Catholicism.¹⁶¹ These Catholic Jacobites denied William allegiance because they believed the Revolution's changes damaged Catholicism in the Kingdoms. Many of these Protestant Williamites argued that the Revolution changed what was a Catholic tyranny under James into a Protestant monarchy permanently protecting Protestantism from Catholic-Jacobite threats. Allegiance to William supported these extensive changes.

However there was also a significant number of polemics that did not depict the Revolution as an exclusively Protestant victory in a confessional conflict but did hail the Revolution as transformative. Some Protestant Williamites and apparent Catholics urged Catholics to give William allegiance because the Revolution ultimately also benefitted Catholicism and Catholics. They argued that under William Catholics in England and Ireland had a degree of protection and that the Revolution also checked Louis's ambitions for European hegemony, which threatened Catholicism across Europe. Allegiance to William was depicted as supporting the Revolution's political changes.¹⁶² Many Protestant Williamites, especially Irish ones, doubted the sincerity of Catholic allegiance to William and adapted traditional anti-Catholicism for the

¹⁶¹ O'Kelly, *The Destruction of Cyprus*, pp.17-9; Plunket, 'Light to the Blind,' *Jacobite Narrative*, pp.184-5; Dulaney, *A Sermon Preached...on Ash-Wednesday*, pp.6-7, 16, 20; *Eikon Basilike Deutera*, pp.1-4; Abbadie, *History of the Late Conspiracy*, pp.27-8, 36; Nevil Payn's *Letter*, p.19.

¹⁶² *A Letter From Rome, Written by a Roman Catholick*, pp.1-2; *King William's Toleration*, pp.15-6; Ó Bruadair, 'An Ignoramus of a Flayer,' October 1692, *Poems of David Ó Bruadair Part III*, p.181; *The Present French King Demonstrated an Enemy to the Catholick*, passim; D.W., *Some Reflections on the Oaths and Declaration*, passim.

post-Revolution environment. They saw Catholic Williamites as inconsistent with their belief that the Revolution permanently protected Protestantism and the monarchy from popery. This meant that even conservative Irish Anglican Williamites accepted the Revolution as having been more transformative than simply a matter of William replacing James. These Protestant Williamite fears also provide evidence of significant numbers of Catholics giving William allegiance.¹⁶³ Catholic allegiance to William and post-Revolution Catholic advances allowed Protestant Jacobites, like Leslie and Ferguson, to undermine Williamite claims that the Revolution preserved Protestantism.¹⁶⁴ However all these Williamite and Jacobite polemics touching on the issue of Catholic allegiance show that viewing the Revolution as involving significant changes became increasingly prevalent in the public discourse. From the mid-1690s even Irish Anglican Williamites, who had the most steadfast conservative views of the Revolution, accepted that the Revolution might have been more than just a personnel change.

Pincus and Vallance argue that as the 1690s progressed the Revolution was increasingly viewed in secular terms.¹⁶⁵ This chapter and Chapter Five have shown that religion remained an important part of the allegiance debates but Catholic declarations of allegiance also meant that the Revolution could not be depicted as a mainly confessional event. The Revolution was increasingly depicted as a primarily political event, which also affected religious life in the Kingdoms. Ferguson had attacked the idea that allegiance to William supported a monarchy protecting Protestantism and argued that Protestantism could be preserved just as effectively with the rightful King James.¹⁶⁶ Ironically the apparently Catholic Sir D.W. also used this issue to advocate for a stronger allegiance to William proclaiming it ‘undeniable that he [William] is King of this Realm either *de jure* or *de facto*....’¹⁶⁷ Jacobites and Williamites began focusing on this issue of allegiance to a *de jure*, rightful and lawful, monarch. This would come to

¹⁶³ Brewster, *Discourse Concerning Ireland*, pp.14-6; Abercromby, *Moral Discourse*, pp.25-8; Defoe, *Lex Talionis*, pp.22-4.

¹⁶⁴ Leslie, *An Answer to a Book, Intituled, The State of the Protestants in Ireland*, pp.38, 125-6; Ferguson, *The History of the Revolution*, p.12; idem, *Whether the Preserving the Protestant Religion was the Motive*, pp.40-1.

¹⁶⁵ Pincus, 1688, passim; Edward Vallance, ‘The Kingdom’s Case: The Use of Casuistry as Political Language 1640-1692,’ *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 34, No. 4 (Winter, 2002) pp.557-83.

¹⁶⁶ Ferguson, *Whether the Preserving the Protestant Religion was the Motive*, pp.40-1

¹⁶⁷ Sir D.W., *Some Reflections on the Oaths and Declaration*, pp.9-10.

dominate the allegiance debates. In each Kingdom allegiance to William now represented support for something greater than William becoming *de facto* King; it was also supporting the Revolution's changes, like protected liberties, toleration and freedom from Catholic dominance. Allegiance to William as *de jure* King was seen as giving William's rule and these changes greater permanence and legitimacy.

Chapter Seven: Rightful and Lawful: Allegiance to *De Jure* Monarchs.

In 1695 Jacobite Robert Ferguson and apparently Catholic Williamite Sir D.W. urged allegiance to their favoured monarchs recognising them as *de jure*, rightful and lawful, monarchs. This marked a new phase of the allegiance debates.¹ English Whig Matthew Tindal argued that Oaths of Allegiance to *de jure* monarchs, recognising their legal right, were public declarations that ‘no other can have the same Right;’ there was only one legitimate ruler.² Removing the words ‘rightful and lawful’ from the 1689 oaths ensured widespread allegiance to William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs.³ D.W. mocked this as ‘barely promissory;’ it denied William’s ‘lawful Title.’⁴ Steven Pincus notes that England’s rich debates over allegiance to William as *de jure* King, sharpening ideological divisions over the Revolution, have been underexplored. Edward Vallance says this was because there were fewer pamphlets in this debate.⁵ Scottish and Irish historians also overlook debates over allegiance to *de jure* monarchs.⁶ The brief mentions of these debates portray it as a tool to gain party advantage.⁷ However these debates were more

¹ Robert Ferguson, *Whether Parliament be not in law dissolved by the death of the Princess of Orange? And how subjects ought, and are to behave themselves...* (n.p., 1695); Sir D.W., *Some Reflections on the Oaths and Declaration Appointed in an Act past in the First Year of the Reign of King William and Queen Mary, In Reference to the Roman Catholicicks of England* (London, 1695), pp.9-10.

² Matthew Tindal, *An Essay Concerning Obedience to the Supreme Powers, and the Duty of Subjects in all Revolutions* (London, 1694), p.5.

³ Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy 1660-1714* (London, 2013), p.329; Robert Beddard, ‘The Unexpected Whig Revolution of 1688,’ in Robert Beddard (ed.) *The Revolutions of 1688* (Oxford, 1991), pp.93-6; J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (London, 1990), passim; Mark Goldie, ‘The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument,’ *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 83 (1980), pp.489-90, 513-9. See Chapters One-Three.

⁴ Sir D.W., *Some Reflections*, pp.9-10, ‘To my worthy good friend.’

⁵ Steven Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (London, 2009), pp.440-1, 450-1; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.404-6; Edward Vallance, ‘The Decline of Conscience as a Political Guide: William Higden’s View of the English Constitution (1709),’ in Harold E. Braun & Edward Vallance (eds.) *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700* (London, 2004), pp.73-8.

⁶ Examinations of Scottish and Irish allegiance debates also focuses on *de facto* theory. Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690 Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp.208-15; Jeffrey Stephen, *Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland, 1689-1716* (Farnham, 2013), pp.41-5, 50-76, 140-2; Robert Eccleshall, ‘Anglican Political thought in the Century after the Revolution,’ in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Thought in Ireland since the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1993), pp.48-59.

⁷ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.404-6; Denis Rubini, *Court and Country 1688-1702* (London, 1968), pp.52-3, 63-6; Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s* (Oxford, 1999), pp.69, 82-5, 92-3, 129; Henry Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III* (Manchester,

important than gaining party advantage; examining these crucial heated debates provides insights into the evolving political thought on the Revolution in the Kingdoms.

Chapters Four through Six showed how from 1693 allegiance was no longer just about allegiance to *de facto* monarchs; allegiance to William had become a statement of support for the Revolution settlements and its innovations. An Oath of Allegiance recognising William as *de jure* King was a stronger statement of support for the Revolution settlements by recognising William as having a greater legal legitimacy to rule than James. These debates were vital because it would effectively be accepting that James's exclusion was permanent. If most subjects declined an oath recognising William as *de jure* King then Jacobites would present this as evidence that most subjects believed that James was still *de jure* King and William's reign was temporary.

Before examining mid-1690s debates on allegiance to *de jure* monarchs it is necessary to understand how allegiance to *de jure* monarchs was regarded before the Revolution. One of the leading Restoration-era jurists Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh's writings have been described as articulating the Scottish monarchy's constitutionality, a legal basis for Stuart absolutism and intellectual antecedent for Jacobitism.⁸ During the Exclusion Crisis Mackenzie also articulated to late-Stuart Britain the necessity for allegiance oaths recognising the rightful and lawful monarch. It did not just recognise the monarch's temporal legal and divine rights; it supported the constitution, hereditary monarchy and the state's legitimate authorities, including the established Church. Violating oaths of allegiance would 'overturn our Laws.'⁹ Mackenzie traced allegiance oaths recognising the *de jure* monarch back to Fergus I's foundation of Scottish monarchy. This 'indefinite obligation' bound subjects 'to obey the Lineal Successor, according to the proximity of Blood.'¹⁰

1977), pp.106-9, 174-7; Mark Goldie, 'The English System of Liberty,' in Mark Goldie & Robert Walker (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.44-5; Vallance, 'The Decline of Conscience,' pp.73-8; T.N. Clarke, 'The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* XXIV, Part I (1990), pp.48-9; Alasdair Raffae, 'Scottish State Oaths and the Revolution of 1688-90,' in Sharon Adams & Julian Goodare (eds.) *Scotland in the Age of Two Revolutions* (Woodbridge, 2014), pp.174-5, 183-9.

⁸ Tim Harris, *Restoration Charles II and his Kingdoms 1660-1685* (London, 2006), pp.375-6; Jackson *Restoration Scotland*, pp.25-7, 45-6, 53-6, 59-61, 189-92, 200, 216-7.

⁹ Sir George Mackenzie, *Jus Regium, or, The Just and Solid Foundations of Monarchy in General, and more especially of the Monarchy of Scotland...* (Edinburgh, 1684), 'Design,' pp.144-50, 58, 62, 1-7, 19-20, 22, 45-6.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, pp.144-6.

Laws from subsequent reigns reaffirmed this. The first Acts of Charles II's Scottish Parliament confirmed that the Oath of Allegiance bound subjects to Charles and hereditary monarchy. Crucially the Oath contained the 'word LAWFUL' in order 'to cut off the pretences of such as should not succeed by Law, and the insolent arbitrariness of such, as being but Subjects themselves, they think may chuse their King....' The Oath of Allegiance supported the constitution, monarchy and sole rightful monarch.¹¹

William's extra-lineal succession, outside legal norms, ousting the rightful King, was a factor in why William was only given allegiance as *de facto* King in 1689.¹² Some historians note that Jacobite polemics referred to James's legal right but do not explore its impact on allegiance debates except for brief mentions in 1689-90 when Jacobites portrayed themselves as intellectual heirs of Civil War Royalists.¹³ Throughout the 1690s, as previous chapters have shown, Jacobites across the Kingdoms repeatedly denounced allegiance to William as *de facto* monarch. William Sherlock's *Case* and other *de facto* theorists advocating allegiance to William as *de facto* King were ridiculed for effectively defending allegiance to unlawful regimes. The 'Law does not oblige the Subjects to pay their Duty of Allegiance to a King *de facto*... i.e. one who is in Possession of the Throne without a *Legal Right* and *Title*.'¹⁴ Jeremy Collier said 'That as long as we have a Rightful Prince, our Allegiance is part of his Right....'¹⁵ During 1689-92 Jacobites frequently employed this alongside popular ideas, like Non-Resistance and Conquest, but the issue of *de jure* monarchy became more prominent in their mid-1690s

¹¹ Ibid, pp.147-9.

¹² See Chapters One through Three.

¹³ David Martin Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (Rochester, 1999), pp.217-23, 235-6; Pincus, *1688*, pp.446-7; Tim Harris, *Revolution The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2007), pp.440-1; Vallance, 'Decline of Conscience,' pp.72-9.

¹⁴ John Lowthorp, *A Letter to the Bishop of Sarum: Being an Answer to his Lordships Pastoral Letter* (n.p., 1690), pp.4-5, 9-14, 18-9, 28-9; *The Abhorrence, or, Protestant Observations in Dublin upon the Principles of the Protestants at London* (Dublin, 1690), pp.1-2; Jeremy Collier, *Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance Considered with some Remarks upon his Vindication* (London, 1691), pp.7-8, 10-2, 22, 50-3, 94, 99-103, 108-10, 122, 126-31; George Hickes, *A Word to the Wavering: or an Answer to the Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs...* (n.p., 1691), pp.1, 6-8; Robert Jenkin, *The Title of a Thorough Settlement Examined...* (London, 1691), pp.6-10, 32, 48; Theophilus Downes, *An Examination of the Arguments Drawn from Scripture and Reason in Dr. Sherlock's Case...* (London, 1691), pp.1-2, 11, 14-6, 25-6, 38-9, 53-4, 69-70; Nathaniel Johnston, *The Dear Bargain...* (n.p., 1690), pp.18, 24; Thomas Browne, *The Case of Allegiance to a King in Possession* (n.p., 1690), pp.2-10, 26-30; idem, *An Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance to Sovereign Princes... In a Letter to a Friend...* (London, 1691), pp.3-5. For more on Sherlock See Chapters Two, Three, Eight.

¹⁵ Jeremy Collier, *Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance Considered*, p.103.

polemics.¹⁶ Some Williamite Whigs believed that *de facto* theory was ‘no way practicable;’ it implied that James remained the legitimate King. Allegiance to William as *de jure* King would undermine this sustenance for Jacobitism.¹⁷ Jacobites and Williamites would become increasingly vocal about allegiance to *de jure* monarchs and how this would show whether there was an appetite for accepting the Revolution settlements as permanent.

Debates over who was owed allegiance as *de jure* monarch dealt with James’s right, the Revolution settlements’ legality and William potentially excluding James for his lifetime. This chapter traces how these debates began in Scotland and became one of the most important and controversial aspects of the Allegiance Debates across the Kingdoms in the mid-1690s.

I

The Scottish Parliament’s 1690 *Act for Security of Their Majesties Government* was the earliest recognition of William and Mary as *de jure* monarchs in the Kingdoms. This Act said that maintaining that they were merely *de facto* monarchs would ‘weaken and invalidate the allegiance to’ them. It allowed James to ‘still pretend a title’ and ‘divert their Majesties’ lieges from their allegiance.’¹⁸ This Act imposed the Assurance on anyone tendered the 1689 Oath. The Assurance had subjects recognise William and Mary as ‘the only lawful undoubted sovereigns, King and Queen of Scotland, as well as *de jure* as *de facto*.’¹⁹ This stronger endorsement of the Revolution was intended to undermine Jacobitism. One pamphlet praised the Assurance for showing Scotland’s ‘Zeal... for the present Government’ against the French-Jacobite threats.²⁰ This was passed in the same parliament that

¹⁶ See Chapters One through Three for Jacobite polemics between 1689 and 1692.

¹⁷ Divine in the North, *A Discourse, Shewing that it is Lawfull, and Our Duty to Swear Obedience to King William...* (London, 1689), pp.5-6, 23-6.

¹⁸ ‘Act for Security of their Majesties’ Government,’ *The Records of the Parliament of Scotland to 1707*, ed. K.M Brown (St. Andrews, 2007-2013), 1690/4/161. Date Accessed: 19 January 2013, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1690/4/161>; Privy Council of Scotland, *A Proclamation for Choosing the Additional Representatives of Barons to the Parliament* (Edinburgh, 1690).

¹⁹ ‘Act for Security of their Majesties’ Government,’ *Records of the Parliament of Scotland*, 1690/4/161. For the full wording of the Assurance see Appendix IV.

²⁰ *A Letter from Scotland to a Gentleman at Court, In Relation to Scotch-Affairs. With a Copy of an Act for the Security of Their Majesties Government in that Kingdom* (London, 1690), pp.1-2.

established Presbyterianism, one of the Revolution's biggest changes.²¹ Presbyterianism's establishment and whether Presbyterianism or Episcopacy had legitimate ecclesiastical authority in Scotland dominated much of post-Revolution Scotland's public discourse.²² With Presbyterianism's establishment quickly preceding the Assurance the two issues were frequently intertwined. The religious settlement, and accepting these post-Revolution changes as permanent, was an important part of the debates over allegiance to William as *de jure* King in Scotland.

Episcopalian Jacobites immediately denounced the Assurance as unconstitutional in polemics that also cited Non-Resistance and intolerance ideas.²³ Bruce Lenman and Jeffrey Stephen describe Episcopalian commitment to divine right monarchy as important in creating Jacobite ideology but overlook its role in allegiance debates. Alasdair Raffe explored post-Revolution Scottish oaths but only briefly examines the Assurance. He rightly describes it as repudiating the Restoration settlement but, like other historians, describes these oaths as tools to gain party advantage.²⁴ Presbyterians did employ it in this way but historiography focusing on Presbyterian-Episcopalian antagonism neglects the importance of declaring allegiance to William and Mary as *de jure* monarchs. Chapters Four through Six showed how allegiance to William was increasingly seen as supporting more than a personnel change;

²¹ Stephen, *Defending the Revolution*, pp.60-76. See Chapter Five for more on the religious settlement.

²² Alasdair Raffe, *The Culture of Controversy Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660-1714* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp.40-7, 54-7, 138-5; idem, 'Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics after the Revolution 1688-1690,' *The Historical Journal*, 53, Issue 02 (June, 2010), pp.319-21. See Chapter Five.

²³ Gilbert Rule, *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to Five Pamphlets* (Edinburgh/ London, 1691); Thomas Morer, *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church of Scotland in Several Letters...* (London, 1690). See Chapters Two and Five for how Non-Resistance and toleration ideas impacted on allegiance debates.

²⁴ Stephen *Defending the Revolution*, passim; Bruce Lenman, 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism,' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759* (Edinburgh, 1982), pp.36-40, 46-7; Clarke, 'The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution,' pp.48-9; Raffe, 'Scottish State Oaths and the Revolution of 1688-90,' pp.174-5, 183-9. Other examinations of the post-Revolution debate over religious settlement that briefly touch on the Assurance but portray it as a tool to gain party advantage are: D.H Whiteford, 'Jacobitism as a factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland 1689-1690, Part I,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XVI, Part II (1967), pp.29-49; idem, 'Jacobitism as a factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland, The Afflicted Church,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XVI, Part III (1968), pp.187-9; Thomas Maxwell, 'William III and the Scots Presbyterians Part I- The Crisis in Whitehall,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XV- Part II (1964), pp.119-22, 136, 138-9; idem, 'William III and the Scots Presbyterians Part II,' *Records of the Church History Society*, XV- Part III (1965), pp.170-1; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.215-8.

allegiance to William as *de jure* King would be accepting these changes as permanent. Episcopalian Jacobite polemics denounced William's enthronement and Presbyterianism's establishment as two parts of an unlawful settlement, which justified denying William any allegiance. Thomas Morer praised Episcopalians who denied William allegiance. Morer said that William's sacrificing clerics of what was the lawfully established Church to Presbyterians was 'very surprising.' Presbyterian intolerance was also cited but this was another distinct issue on allegiance.²⁵ Overturning the established Episcopacy showed William's questionable attitude to the law. This combined with a commitment to hereditary monarchy led many Episcopalians to refuse William allegiance as *de jure* King because it supported an illegal settlement in Church and state.

Gilbert Burnet, a firm Williamite sympathetic to Episcopalians, recorded that in 1690 some Episcopalian clerics asked James if they could take the oaths to William but James rejected this 'unlawful' request unless it advanced Jacobite conspiracies. With many Episcopalian Jacobites rejecting William and Presbyterianism as unlawful this allowed Presbyterians to portray themselves as Scotland's loyal Williamites. Burnet said that Presbyterian intolerance was one reason why Episcopalians denied William allegiance but his comments also show that whether an authority was lawful became an important part of Scotland's allegiance debates.²⁶ Episcopalian Jacobite polemics repeatedly rejected allegiance to William because it supported the Revolution overthrowing Scotland's lawful authorities. John Cockburn's 1691 pamphlets, like Morer's, rejected Presbyterianism's establishment and the wider Revolution settlement as illegal and this was another reason justifying his position on allegiance. Chapter Five showed how the Presbyterian establishment and intolerance ensured that even Episcopalians who declared loyalty to William were seen as Jacobites because they rejected Presbyterianism.²⁷ Cockburn also specifically denounced the Revolution as an attack on lawful authorities. The post-Revolution constitution was inspired by

²⁵ Morer, *An Account of the Present Persecution*, pp.1-2, 33-4, 63. See Chapter Five for Morer citing persecution as a reason for denying William allegiance.

²⁶ Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History of his own Time... Volume II...* (London, 1734), pp.74-6. See Chapter Five for the link between toleration, persecution and allegiance.

²⁷ John Cockburn, *An Historical Relation of the late General Assembly held at Edinburgh from Octob. 16 to Nov. 13 in the year 1690 in a letter from a person in Edinburgh to his friend in London* (London, 1691), pp.40-1, 52-3, 57-8.

the horrifying Presbyterian principle that it was ‘lawful to Dethrone and Kill Kings....’²⁸ Presbyterians dominating the Convention resulted in Presbyterianism’s establishment and the expulsion of ‘Lawful’ Episcopalian clerics.²⁹ William’s government would ‘receive none, but *such as they had ground to believe would be true and faithful to the Government.*’ Those ‘who did not renounce’ Episcopacy were blacklisted.³⁰ Episcopalians were partly seen as disloyal because they rejected the Revolution’s attacks on the ‘lawful’ order in Scotland.³¹

The *Act for Visitation of Universities* sought to guarantee Presbyterian dominance by expelling all educators who refused William allegiance or to support Presbyterianism’s establishment.³² These purges generated numerous polemics. Jacobite Alexander Monro’s pamphlets on the purge at Edinburgh University, from which he was ejected, combined arguments about persecution with the Revolution’s attack on legal establishments to denounce allegiance to William. Episcopacy, ‘establish’d by Law,’ was ‘pull’d down....’ Presbyterians tied ‘*allegiance to the Civil Authority*’ with ‘*hearty submission to the Presbyterian Government.*’³³ To Monro subscription to the Assurance, Oath of Allegiance and Presbyterianism being prerequisites for university positions exemplified Presbyterians’ ‘*INQUISITION*’ to coerce subjects into supporting an illegal settlement.³⁴ Even English Williamites, who only gave William allegiance as *de facto* King, ‘could not be made to Subscribe’ to something ‘superfluous’ like the Assurance. Monro refused to endorse the settlement by declaring William *de jure* King.³⁵ He suggested that Scotland’s Presbyterian-dominated Parliament had no authority to introduce the Assurance because it was politically unrepresentative with ‘very few either of the Nobility or Gentry... present.’³⁶ Presbyterians ‘never thought themselves secure’ and used allegiance tests, like the Assurance, to confirm their

²⁸ John Cockburn, *A Continuation of the Historical Relation of the late General Assembly in Scotland...* (London, 1691), pp.6-7.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp.15-8; Cockburn, *Historical Relation*, p.55.

³⁰ Cockburn, *A Continuation of the Historical Relation*, p.55.

³¹ John Cockburn, *A Continuation of the Historical Relation*, pp.16-7. For more on Cockburn’s use of Presbyterian intolerance in his allegiance polemics see Chapter Five.

³² Stephen, *Defending the Revolution*, pp.42-3.

³³ Alexander Monro, *Presbyterian Inquisition as it was lately practiced against the Professors of the Colledge of Edinburgh, August and September, 1690 in which the spirit of Presbytery and their present method of procedure is plainly discovered, mother of fact by undeniable instances cleared, and libels against particular persons discussed* (London, 1691), pp.7-8.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.2-8.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.50-2.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.51-2.

dominance.³⁷ Monro praised Episcopalian educators who declined the 1689 Oath and Assurance, which supported the illegal Revolution settlement of William and Presbyterianism.³⁸

The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence by 'Jacob Curate' was even more explicit than Cockburn and Monro in condemning the Convention and settlement as illegitimate. 'Curate' argued that the Convention expounded the 'Doctrine of Scotch Presbyterians' with frightful notions that '*the People can give and take away the Royal Authority, can lay aside and chuse Kings at their pleasure....*'³⁹ In 1688 'Prelacy stood then established by many Laws made in 27 Parliaments....' Unlike the Convention these parliaments were 'freely and legally Elected in the most settled times....' 'Curate' attacked Presbyterian claims that James's flight was an interregnum justifying William's enthronement; interregnums 'can never possibly fall out in an Hereditary Kingdom' like Scotland.⁴⁰ Presbyterians also rejected any alternative allegiance tests as 'unlawful, unless allowed by the *Presbytery*.'⁴¹ The entire Revolution was illegal therefore Presbyterianism and William could not be supported.

'Curate' was responding to Presbyterian Gilbert Rule's *Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to Five Pamphlets*. Rule argued that Morer and other Episcopalian Jacobites, not Presbyterian Williamites, were subverting the law. Morer and other Episcopalian Jacobite polemics expressed opposition to the 'present Establishment' in state and Church. They wanted 'to dethrone Their present Majesties, and to unsettle the present Establishment' and 'nullifie the Convention....'⁴² These Episcopalian Jacobites made more statements about overthrowing William than Presbyterianism.⁴³ This was central to Presbyterian Williamite polemics on allegiance to William as *de jure* King. William and Presbyterianism restored lawful government in Church and

³⁷ Alexander Monro, *A Letter to a Friend giving an Account of all the Treatises that have been publish'd with Relation to the Present Persecution against the Church of Scotland* (London, 1692), pp.21-2; Monro, *Presbyterian Inquisition*, pp.21-2, 2-3, 7-8.

³⁸ Monro, *Presbyterian Inquisition*, pp.85-9.

³⁹ 'Jacob Curate,' *The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, or, The Foolishness of their Teaching discovered...and some Remarks on Mr. Rule's Late Vindication...* (London, 1692), pp.78-9.

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, pp.79-80.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, p.96.

⁴² Gilbert Rule, *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to Five Pamphlets...* (London, 1691), pp.33, 7.

⁴³ *Ibid*, pp.10-1, 2, 6-7.

state; Episcopalian Jacobites were refusing to accept Scotland's legitimate authorities.

Rule, like 'Curate,' tied allegiance to William as *de jure* King with the legality of the religious settlement. His 1690 *True Representation* argued that William and the Revolution undid the illegal Restoration Episcopalian settlement.⁴⁴ Like Mackenzie, Rule claimed that 'the Laws... were the measure of our Obedience' but also said that Presbyterianism's establishment would ensure widespread loyalty to William.⁴⁵ Rule said religious and national law sanctioned the Revolution. By not having taken the Scottish Coronation Oath James lacked legitimacy. The Convention had the 'Authority of the Nation' to provide a government in the absence of James's monarchical authority. This justified William's enthronement as the 'Rightful Successor.' Episcopalians showed 'contempt' for William, the Claim of Right and Presbyterianism.⁴⁶ Denouncing parts of the Revolution settlement as illegal showed that when Episcopalians mentioned loyalty they 'meaneth Loyalty to King *James*.'⁴⁷ William and Presbyterianism were united in the Revolution restoring lawful government to Church and state, which subjects should support.⁴⁸ Rule equated opposition to Presbyterianism with disloyalty to William's government, which was 'now Setled by Law.'⁴⁹

Other Presbyterians publicly defended allegiance to William as *de jure* King while attacking Episcopalian Jacobites. Alexander Shields castigated Episcopalian Jacobites denouncing William and Mary as 'no lawful Rulers.' Accepting William, Mary and the Revolution as 'lawful' would show public approval of James's permanent exclusion.⁵⁰ Like Rule, Shields depicted the Revolution as restoring lawful order to Scotland. James and Charles II 'did unhinge and infringe all the Legal Establishments of our Religion' with Prelacy. Their illegal activities extended into civil affairs. One example was James's time in Scotland during the Exclusion Crisis when he expanded royal

⁴⁴ Gilbert Rule, *A True Representation of Presbyterian Government...* (Edinburgh, 1690), pp.15-6.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*, pp.7-9.

⁴⁶ Rule, *Answer to Five Pamphlets*, pp.39-41.

⁴⁷ *Ibid*, pp.8-9, 30-3, 67-8.

⁴⁸ Gilbert Rule, *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to a Paper, intituled, Some Questions concerning Episcopal and Presbyterial Government in Scotland...* (London, 1691), pp.35-6.

⁴⁹ Rule, *Answer to Five Pamphlets*, pp.7-8.

⁵⁰ Alexander Shields, *The History of Scotch-Presbytery being an Epitome of The Hind Let Loose* (London, 1692), p.37.

prerogative beyond 'Legality,' making the 'King's Letter the Supreme Law of Scotland.'⁵¹ Allegiance was owed to William, a 'Lawful Sovereign,' who replaced James and Charles, 'Betrayers of our Laws...'⁵² Between 1690 and 1692 Scottish Presbyterian Williamites argued that the Revolution established a monarch who governed Scotland legally. James's attacks on the constitution in Church and state meant he lost his rights; James was not *de jure* King. Highlighting widespread Episcopalian rejection of William and Mary as *de jure* monarchs allowed Presbyterians to portray themselves as enthusiastic Williamites who accepted that the Revolution settlement permanently excluded James.

While the 1690 introduction of the Assurance and recognition of William as *de jure* ruler generated controversy it was still not obligatory for every officeholder but did show some Scottish subjects' eagerness to embrace the Revolution settlement as permanent. An officeholder refusing it faced expulsion but both Presbyterian and Episcopalian pamphlets say that it was not widely imposed except on Episcopalian clerics.⁵³ Jacobite George Lockhart said that the 1690 Assurance was designed to prevent Jacobites entering Parliament.⁵⁴ From spring 1693 fears of a French-Jacobite takeover gripped the Kingdoms.⁵⁵ John Evelyn and Narcissus Luttrell record widespread public terror across the Kingdoms, especially after James's 1693 Declaration.⁵⁶ Burnet describes Jacobitism as more overt in Scotland from 1693. There were rumours of Jacobites taking the 1689 Oath to obtain 'important Posts' and advance their conspiracies. According to Burnet Presbyterians recognised this threat to the settlement and believed it 'necessary to bring that Kingdom into a better state.'⁵⁷ A 1693 Scottish Parliament 'Memorial' on defence stated that a more 'effectual' imposition of the Assurance would undermine this Jacobite

⁵¹ Alexander Shields, *A Short Memorial of the Sufferings Past and Present of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly of those called by the Nick-name Cameronians* (n.p., 1690), pp.15-21.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp.29, 51-2.

⁵³ 'Act for Security of their Majesties' Government,' *RPS*, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1690/4/161>; 'Curate,' *Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*, p.96; Monro, *Presbyterian Inquisition*, pp.7-8, G.M., *The Case of the Afflicted Clergy...* (n.p., 1691), pp.1-2, 9.

⁵⁴ George Lockhart of Carnwath, 'Scotland's Ruine Lockhart of Carnwath's Memories of the Union,' ed. Daniel Szechi (Aberdeen, 1995), pp.8-9.

⁵⁵ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.48-50.

⁵⁶ John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn... Volume V Kalendarium, 1690-1706*, ed. E.S De Beer (Oxford, 2000), pp.140-2; Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Relation... Volume III* (Oxford, 1867), pp.19, 51, 57-8, 71-2, 76.

⁵⁷ Burnet, *History of his own Time*, pp.120-1.

threat.⁵⁸ James Johnston, one of William's Scottish Secretaries of State in 1693, wrote to William Carstares, William's advisor, that mandatorily imposing the Assurance on every officeholder was 'necessary' to protect the settlement. Allegiance to William as *de facto* King, still Scotland's main loyalty test, allowed subjects 'to put their private senses upon the Alledgeance.' The Assurance compelled subjects to explicitly declare allegiance to William and Mary as *de jure* monarchs thus repudiating Jacobitism and accepting the Revolution settlement as permanent.⁵⁹

In May 1693 Scotland's Parliament passed the *Act for Taking the Oath of Allegiance and Assurance* obliging every officeholder to take the Assurance.⁶⁰ The following month the *Act for Settling the Quiet and Peace of the Church* imposed the Assurance on all clerics. There was legal protection for clerics, including some Episcopalians, who subscribed.⁶¹ Thomas Maxwell examined tensions between William and Presbyterians over the perceived Erastian imposition of this on members of the 1693 General Assembly. William eventually rescinded the imposition of the Assurance on the Assembly in order to preserve Presbyterian support for him. Maxwell, like other historians, portrays this dispute as Presbyterians seeking to maintain their advantage over Episcopalians while neglecting the importance of recognising William as *de jure* King. Tristram Clarke notes that despite some objections over Erastianism most Presbyterians took the Assurance.⁶² Raffe notes that *de facto* theory became 'invalidated' in Scotland with the introduction of the Assurance.⁶³ However Raffe does not explore the debates over the Assurance in detail. In the wider public discourse the 1693 Acts intensified the popular

⁵⁸ 'Memorial Concerning the Defence of the Country and Security of Trade,' *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, ed. K.M Brown (St. Andrews, 2007-2014), A1693/4/3. URL: <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/A1693/4/3>. Date accessed: 1 July 2014.

⁵⁹ 'Secretary James Johnston to Mr Carstares, Edinburgh May 19, 1693,' *State Papers and Letters Addressed to William Carstares*, ed. Joseph McCormick (Edinburgh, 1774), pp.178-9.

⁶⁰ 'Act for Taking the Oath of Allegiance and Assurance,' *The Records of the Parliament of Scotland to 1707*, ed. K.M. Brown (St. Andrews, 2007-2013), 1693/4/50. URL: <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1693/4/50>. *Act for Taking the Oath of Alledgeance and the Assurance Edinburgh, the Twentie Third day of May, 1693* (Edinburgh, 1693).

⁶¹ 'Act for Settling the Quiet and Peace of the Church,' *The Records of the Parliament of Scotland to 1707*, 1693/4/89. Date Accessed: 26 July 2014. URL: <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1693/4/89>. See Chapter Five for how Episcopalians used this Act in denouncing or accepting allegiance to William.

⁶² Maxwell, 'William III and the Scots Presbyterians Part I- Crisis in Whitehall,' pp.185-201; idem, 'William III and the Scots Presbyterians Part II,' pp.117-40; Stephen, *Defending the Revolution*, pp.85-93, 138-46; Raffe, *Culture of Controversy*, pp.127-8, 192-9; idem, 'Scottish State Oaths,' pp.174-5, 183-9; T.N. Clarke, 'The Scottish Episcopalians 1688-1720,' (University of St. Andrews Ph.D. thesis, 1987), pp.114-8.

⁶³ Raffe, 'Scottish State Oaths and the Revolution,' pp.185-6.

perceptions established by pamphleteers in 1690-2. Presbyterian Williamites proudly declared William and Presbyterianism the lawfully established order in state and Church. Episcopalian Jacobites were even more forceful in rejecting the Assurance and the illegal Revolution. *De facto* theory became increasingly marginalised in the public discourse with Jacobites and Williamites asserting that allegiance could only go to their preferred *de jure* monarchs.

In 1693 Alexander Monro repeated his 1690-2 denunciations of allegiance to William as *de jure* King. Again he cited Presbyterian intolerance and the entire Revolution settlement's unconstitutionality in justifying his position on allegiance.⁶⁴ Presbyterianism had no legal or '*Divine Right*' to ecclesiastical authority; their authority was unlawful.⁶⁵ Monro said Presbyterian Williamites could not 'hide the Consequence of so monstrous a change' that overthrew constitutional norms in state and church.⁶⁶ These changes could not be supported.

Episcopalian John Sage's 1690 *Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy* focused on Presbyterian intolerance.⁶⁷ From 1693, like other Jacobites, Sage combined this with the settlement's illegality to justify denying William allegiance as *de jure* King. Sage said that the Revolution, like the 1640s, witnessed Presbyterians 'trampling on Law.' 'Episcopacy was the Legal Establishment' which the Revolution and Presbyterians overthrew.⁶⁸ This illegal ecclesiastical settlement came with William's illegal succession. Scotland's government 'is incontrovertibly Monarchical and Hereditary' so it was not 'possible' for William, a 'King *de facto*,' to become King '*de Iure*.' The Assurance could not be taken because legally William, 'an Usurper,' could 'never be a King.'⁶⁹ There were 'no Scruples of Conscience' about the Constitution's 'Lawfulness' during Episcopalian ascendancy but since 1690 there were widespread objections to Presbyterian-style constitutionalism.⁷⁰

⁶⁴ Alexander Monro, *An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland Chiefly Oppos'd to the Censures, Calumnies, and Accusations of a late Presbyterian Vindicator...* (London, 1693), pp.80, 23-7, 1-2. See Chapter Five for his arguments on allegiance and intolerance.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.1-2, 23-7, 80.

⁶⁶ Alexander Monro, *Sermons Preached upon Several Occasions...* (London, 1693), pp.8-9.

⁶⁷ John Sage, *The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland truly represented...* (London, 1690). Sage's citation of intolerance is examined in Chapter Five while his use of the Passive Obedience doctrine is examined in Chapter Two.

⁶⁸ John Sage, *An Account of the Late Establishment of Presbyterian Government...* (London, 1693), pp.14-8, 27-30, 15-6, 4-6.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp.78-82.

⁷⁰ John Sage, *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery as it hath been Lately Established in the Kingdom of Scotland...* (London, 1695), pp.194-6.

Monarchical protection of Episcopacy was part of the Coronation Oath since James VI therefore the Claim of Right was ‘*ill-founded*’ in listing it as a grievance.⁷¹ William and Presbyterians were united in the Revolution. Presbyterians designed the Assurance to secure ‘the Government in their own hands, and keeping out *Anti Presbyterians*’ instead of ‘strengthening *K.W*’s interests....’⁷² Sage criticised Presbyterians for believing that subjects could be absolved ‘from their *Allegiance* to their *Civil Sovereign*.’⁷³ This tied Episcopacy even closer to James by describing James and Episcopacy as the lawful order in state and church, which were owed obedience. Allegiance to William was again described as supporting the overthrow of lawful authorities.

Sage’s 1695 *Principles of the Cyprianic Age* used the history of the early Christian St. Cyprian to condemn breaking fealty to lawful authorities. The parallels were clear for post-Revolution Scotland. Bishops and monarchs were owed obedience as the rightful and lawful authorities. The ‘Constitution of every particular Church... was a *Well tempered Monarchy*: The *Bishop* was the *Monarch*, and the *Presbytery* was in *Senate*....’ Every Christian ‘within’ St. Cyprian’s ‘District depended on him for Government and Discipline, and he depended on no Man.’⁷⁴ Sage condemned ‘Schismatics,’ rebellious Presbyterians, who would ‘separate’ people from ‘their lawful Bishop’ with ‘Usurpations’ against St. Cyprian and lawful authorities.⁷⁵ However this rebellion failed when most Carthaginian Christians ‘continued in their Duty to *St. Cyprian*,’ the legitimate Bishop of Carthage. Like Carthaginian Christians, Episcopalian Jacobites maintained loyalty to the lawful James and Episcopacy. St. Cyprian was the legitimate authority; he could not have held ‘*Sovereign Power*, without any *Pretence of Right* to it.’⁷⁶ Rejecting legitimate authorities was illegal and immoral. James, like St. Cyprian, was owed allegiance as the legitimate authority. Subjects, in Carthage and mid-1690s Scotland, should not support overthrowing legitimate authorities by giving loyalty to usurping parties.

Episcopalian Jacobites persisted with this argument. John Cockburn also recycled his previous arguments. He argued that a subject could ‘never be

⁷¹ Ibid, pp.404, 416-22.

⁷² Ibid, pp.295-300, 335-6, 324-5.

⁷³ Ibid, pp.334-8.

⁷⁴ John Sage, *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age*...(London, 1695), pp.31-4.

⁷⁵ Ibid, pp.33-4, 64-6.

⁷⁶ Ibid, pp.64-6.

counted Loyal, if he neglect his true Prince, and follow an usurper....'⁷⁷ Monarchs were divinely appointed therefore 'it is not lawfull to exchange divine appointments with our own divices....'⁷⁸ Breaking allegiance to these monarchs was ultimately sinful disobedience to God. 'For as He is our Master whom we serve and Obey, and as he is our Sovereign to whom we swear Loyalty, and pay the proper Acts of Allegiance, so He is our GOD to whom we give the Worship due to God.'⁷⁹ This pamphlet also employed Non-Resistance and Toleration ideas but again James's monarchical rights obliging allegiance to him was another crucial issue. Cockburn, like other Jacobites, saw accepting William as *de jure* King as accepting the Revolution's unlawful changes in state and church as permanent. In 1712 Cockburn again justified denying William and his successors allegiance because the Revolution usurped lawful authorities. The settlement was 'a plain *Breaking* in upon our CONSTITUTION,' a '*Manifest Violation* of all our then *Standing Laws*....'⁸⁰ This was why Episcopalian Jacobites rejected the Assurance and allegiance to William as *de jure* King.

From 1693 Presbyterian Williamites also recycled their 1690-2 arguments advocating allegiance to William as *de jure* King in defence of the lawful settlement in state and church. They also repeatedly denounced Sage, Cockburn and others refusing the Assurance. Gilbert Rule said he wanted to counter Episcopalian Jacobite arguments.⁸¹ Rule said the parallels in Sage's *Cyprianic Age* exemplified Episcopalian Jacobites rejecting the lawful William and desiring 'One over them who was no lawful Ruler....'⁸² The Revolution restored the rule of law. In 1688 'Exercise of Government was impossible.' With this danger the Convention, '*the Representative of the Nation*,' 'designed' William 'to be completely King' exercising 'Supreme Power.'⁸³ Sage and

⁷⁷ John Cockburn, *Jacob's Vow, or, Man's Felicity and Duty in Two Parts* (Edinburgh, 1696), pp.174-5. This was originally published in 1686 but it was reprinted in 1696 and its passages on allegiance to *de jure* monarchs can be seen as part of the popular rhetoric in the mid-1690s on allegiance to *de jure* monarchs.

⁷⁸ *Ibid*, pp.255-7.

⁷⁹ *Ibid*, p.248.

⁸⁰ John Cockburn, *A Short History of the Revolution in Scotland. In a Letter from a Scotch Gentleman to his Friend in London* (London, 1712), pp.7-11, 13-6.

⁸¹ Gilbert Rule, *A Just and Modest Reproof of a Pamphlet called The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence* (Edinburgh, 1693), pp.24-6. This was originally meant to be published in 1692 but publication was delayed and became part of the debate in 1693 when the Assurance was more widely imposed.

⁸² Gilbert Rule, *The Cyprianick-Bishop examined, and found not to be a Diocesan, nor t have superior power to a parish minister*...(Edinburgh, 1696), p.39.

⁸³ *Ibid*, pp.111-20.

Jacobites showed ‘Contempt of the Authority of the Nation’ by rejecting ‘the command of its highest Power for the time....’ The Revolution was a ‘Necessity’ to establish lawful authority in Scotland.⁸⁴ William and Presbyterianism were owed obedience as lawful authorities. Responding to *The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence*, Rule declared Presbyterianism the ‘Legal Church’ as ‘settled then by Law.’⁸⁵ Monro condemned actions against Episcopalians who gave William allegiance as *de facto* King but Rule defended these actions because *de facto* theory implied that William was illegitimate. Cromwell had been ‘the Supreme Authority *de facto*....’⁸⁶ Rule cited laws dating from the 1570s to show that the Restoration Episcopalian Kirk was unlawful and that William and Presbyterianism were the lawful authorities.⁸⁷ The Convention restored a lawful monarch and Church settlement.⁸⁸ Recognising William as *de jure* King supported these changes as permanent.

George Ridpath repeatedly castigated Episcopalian Jacobite claims that Presbyterian intolerance justified denying William allegiance.⁸⁹ His 1694 *Scots Episcopal Innocence* dealt with this alongside the issue of allegiance to William as *de jure* King. Ridpath, like Rule, pilloried Episcopalians who claimed they accepted William as *de facto* King but ‘decline the Assurance.’ If they did not recognise William and Mary as ‘*de Jure*, they will never own their Right *de Facto* any longer than while they are not in a Capacity to rebel.’ Rejecting the lawful monarchs showed a ‘debauch’d Conscience.’ William and Mary’s title was ‘lawful’ therefore ‘it must needs be lawful for me to oblige my self to defend them in it, against all Pretenders....’ This was publicly endorsing the Revolution settlement as permanent.⁹⁰ *De facto* theory was ‘an infallible Demonstration’ of ‘doubting’ the settlement’s legality. Ridpath questioned the ‘common Sense and Reason’ of entrusting powerful positions to ‘those who call their Majesties Right in question’ by only giving them allegiance as *de facto* monarchs.⁹¹ He accepted that Episcopalian clerics who took the Assurance should be legally protected but also said that most

⁸⁴ Ibid, pp.111-20.

⁸⁵ Gilbert Rule, *A Just and Modest reproof*, pp.4, 13-4.

⁸⁶ Gilbert Rule, *A Defence of the Vindication of the Church of Scotland in Answer to an Apology of the Clergy of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1694), p.13.

⁸⁷ Ibid, pp.40-3.

⁸⁸ Ibid, pp.15-6.

⁸⁹ See Chapter Five.

⁹⁰ George Ridpath, *Scots Episcopal Innocence*... (London, 1694), pp.5-11.

⁹¹ Ibid, pp.5-11.

Episcopalians were out-of-sync with the majority in Scotland and England by denying William allegiance.⁹² Ridpath, like Rule, saw rejecting the Assurance, allegiance to William as *de jure* King, as rejecting the Revolution settlement. With two sides advocating allegiance to *de jure* monarchs Scotland's public discourse was essentially divided between a pro-Revolution majority and anti-Revolution minority.

One 1695 Williamite account of the Convention detailed why James was no longer King and the Convention's legitimacy in making the Revolution settlement. However this pamphlet was not as sectarian as Rule or Ridpath. It focused on Episcopalian Williamite Sir John Dalrymple defending the Revolution's legality in response to Archbishop John Paterson promoting James's 'Right to the Crown, which was his Inheritance by a Lineal Succession.'⁹³ Dalrymple, one of Scotland's leading lawyers, enthusiastically supported William but remained religiously Episcopalian. He was involved in drafting the 1693 Acts imposing the Assurance.⁹⁴ Dalrymple defended the Convention's legality and its prerogative. James's rights were 'Forefaulted' because he violated Scots law.⁹⁵ Clare Jackson argues that 'forefaulture' did not necessarily legitimize William's right in 1689.⁹⁶ This was true in the early allegiance debates but by 1695, after years of debate and Williamites arguing that the Convention made William *de jure* King, this pamphlet was using 'forefaulture' to legitimize William by showing how James lost his rights. Of all the Convention's speakers this pamphlet focused on Dalrymple's legal argument. Dalrymple said that 'the Laws of Nature, positive Laws of God, Nations, and our Municipal Laws' justified the Convention securing 'our selves, our Religion, Laws, Liberties, and Properties....' The Convention had

⁹² Ibid, p.23. See Chapter Five for more on Episcopalian clerics being protected in exchange for the Oath of Allegiance and Assurance.

⁹³ *A Brief Account of the Reasons for Which the Three Estates of Scotland Forfaulted the Late King James, and Setled King William and Queen Mary upon the Throne, Anno 1689. And some of the Reasons induced them to Abolish Episcopacy* (London, 1695), pp.4-8. For more on Paterson see Chapter Nine.

⁹⁴ John R. Young, 'Dalrymple, John, first Earl of Stair (1648–1707)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7052>, accessed 12 June 2014]; Wout Troost, *William III, the Stadholder-King A Political Biography* J.C. Grayson (trans.) (Aldershot, 2005), pp.268-75; *Annals and Correspondence of the Viscount and the First Earl of Stair... Volume I*, ed. J.M Graham (Edinburgh, 1875), pp.189-90.

⁹⁵ *Brief Account of the Reasons for Which the Three Estates of Scotland Forfaulted the Late King James*, pp.4-8.

⁹⁶ Jackson, *Restoration Scotland*, pp.201-2.

the ‘Power to establish’ William and Mary ‘upon the Throne.’⁹⁷ This pamphlet defended the legality of the Revolution; its 1695 publication was part of the ongoing print campaign to say that James was not *de jure* King while defending William’s position as lawful King. Significantly this can be seen as an Episcopalian defending William and the Revolution as the lawful order.

While most Episcopalians were Jacobites, a small but significant number were Williamites.⁹⁸ Prominent Episcopalian Williamite George Mackenzie, Viscount Tarbat’s 1695 publication *Vindication of Robert III* had resonance for mid-1690s audiences. Scotland’s Privy Council supported its printing because of Tarbat’s important objective to ‘vindicat’ the ‘Royal Family from... Libels....’ Tarbat’s prefatory address argued that those questioning Robert’s legitimacy were also questioning every subsequent successor’s legitimacy.⁹⁹ Those writers on ‘*Ius Regni* [Right to the Throne]’ by doubting Robert’s right ‘screwed the Sovereignty up to Precipices....’¹⁰⁰ The pamphlet finished with a genealogy of Scottish monarchs from Fergus I to Charles II.¹⁰¹ Tarbat defending Robert’s succession can be seen as a proxy defence of William’s ‘*Ius Regni*,’ he defended a legitimate King from aspersions cast on his right.¹⁰² This was another Episcopalian contribution to the rhetoric of supporting William as the lawful King. The Presbyterian Secretary of State Johnston acknowledged that many Episcopalian clerics publicly gave William allegiance as *de jure* King. Johnston wrote to Carstares on the public mood towards the Assurance. He said that he knew of ‘no Presbyterian minister who will not take the oaths. Many Episcopal clergy too will do it....’¹⁰³ The 1693 and 1695 Church Acts, explored in Chapter Five, showed that several Episcopalian clerics, like most Presbyterian clerics, took the Assurance despite Presbyterianism’s establishment.¹⁰⁴ Dalrymple’s and Tarbat’s arguments were Episcopalian contributions to the majority view in

⁹⁷ *Brief Account of the Reasons for Which the Three Estates of Scotland Forfaulted the Late King James*, pp.4-8.

⁹⁸ Clarke, ‘The Scottish Episcopalians,’ pp.102-31, 175-7. See Chapters Two and Five for more on Episcopalian Williamites.

⁹⁹ George Mackenzie, Viscount Tarbat, *A Vindication of Robert III, King of Scotland from the Imputation of Bastardy* (Edinburgh, 1695), Title Pages, ‘To the King.’

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.1-2.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, ‘The Descent of K. Charles the 2d from Fergus the 1st.’

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, ‘To the King,’ pp.1-5, 13-5, 27-8, 37-8.

¹⁰³ ‘Secretary Johnston to Mr Carstares, Edinburgh May 16, 1693,’ *State Papers and Letters to Carstares*, pp.171-5. (This letter is incorrectly dated 1699 in *State Papers and Letters to Carstares* but given the contents it is clearly 1693 because Johnston is still Secretary of State and so it cannot possibly be 1699).

¹⁰⁴ Burnet, *History*, pp.120-2, 157-8.

Scotland that William was owed allegiance as *de jure* King in order to protect the Revolution settlement.

Despite these contributions the general perception was that it was mainly Presbyterians subscribing to the Assurance. Irish Presbyterians Joseph Boyse, John MacBride and James Kirkpatrick all promoted this perception in pamphlets.¹⁰⁵ William's government believed that the majority in Scotland took the Assurance.¹⁰⁶ In mid-1690s Scotland allegiance debates divided between a majority accepting the Revolution as permanent and a minority seeking to overturn the Revolution settlement of William and Presbyterianism. The Assurance, recognising William as the exclusive monarch with terminology similar to Mackenzie's *Jus Regium*, was central to these debates. It was seen as guaranteeing the changes in the Revolution settlement of William, limited prerogative, guaranteed liberties, rule of law and established Presbyterianism; it repudiated Jacobite hopes of returning to the pre-Revolution order.¹⁰⁷ After the 1696 Assassination Plot a Scottish version of the English Association was imposed on every officeholder and could be voluntarily taken by the wider population.¹⁰⁸ However there was little Scottish debate in 1696 because this issue was already extensively debated. Scotland's Association was a 'further' opportunity to show loyalty; the Assurance remained the main allegiance test.¹⁰⁹

The Assurance ensured *de facto* theory became increasingly irrelevant in Scottish allegiance debates, which divided subjects between pro- and anti-

¹⁰⁵ John MacBride, *Animadversions on The Defence of the Answer to a Paper, Intituled, The Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland...* (n.p., 1697), pp.35-6, 40-3, 58-9, 62-3; Joseph Boyse, *The Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland...Vindicated from the Exceptions alleg'd against it, in a late Answer* (Dublin, 1695), pp.4, 8; James Kirkpatrick, *An Historical Essay Upon the Loyalty of Presbyterians In Great Britain and Ireland...* (n.p., 1713), pp.393-4. These references to Scotland have more to do with their desire for their allegiance to William to be rewarded with Toleration in Ireland. They said that widespread Scottish Presbyterian subscription to the Assurance and Episcopalian refusal proved that Irish Presbyterians would be loyal to William as their Scottish brethren were. See Chapter Five for more on Irish Presbyterians citing events in Scotland in the Irish Allegiance debates.

¹⁰⁶ 'Secretary Johnston to Mr Carstares, Edinburgh May 16, 1693,' *State Papers and Letters to Carstares*, pp.171-5; Ridpath, *Scots Episcopal Innocence*, pp.6-7, 10-3, 23.

¹⁰⁷ Mackenzie, *Jus Regium*, pp.147-8; Ridpath, *Scots Episcopal Innocence*, pp.6-7; Sage, *An Account of the Late Establishment of Presbyterian Government*, pp.78-82. See Chapters Four through Six about how allegiance to William was increasingly seen as representing support for changes that were more extensive than a personnel change.

¹⁰⁸ Pincus, *1688*, pp.467-8; Raffe, 'Scottish State Oaths,' p.187.

¹⁰⁹ Privy Council of Scotland, *Association begun to be subscribed at Edinburgh, April 10, 1696* (Edinburgh, 1696); 'Act appointing the Association to be subscribed by all Persons in Public Trust,' *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, ed. K.M. Brown (St. Andrews, 2007-2014), 1696/9/55. Date Accessed: 18 August 2014. URL: <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1696/9/55>. 'Procedure: Subscribing the Association,' *RPS*, 1696/9/16. URL: <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1696/9/16>. For the full wording see Appendix IV.

Revolution sides. This resulted from a Jacobite, mainly Episcopalian, minority and Williamite, mainly but not exclusively Presbyterian, majority advocating allegiance to their preferred monarchs as *de jure* monarchs dominating the discourse. In 1693 with Jacobites threatening the Kingdoms Whigs outside Scotland hailed the Assurance for cementing Scottish subjects' bond with William, showing public enthusiasm for the Revolution settlement. Scottish-born but English-based Anglican Whig James Welwood's pamphlet attacking James's 1693 Declaration, published in all three Kingdoms, praised the Assurance.¹¹⁰ Welwood said the Assurance ensured Scotland 'put it self into a posture of defence.' Scotland's Parliament introducing the Assurance 'wonderfully changed' the 'face of affairs' in Scotland for 'the better.' This support for William as the exclusive lawful King ensured 'the Late King's Party' was 'sufficiently humbled' in Scotland.¹¹¹

A Jacobite response to Welwood contended that most Scots were 'less affected then they were to the present Government.' There was a 'general obstinacy against taking the Oathes;' the '*Episcopal* Party generally, and some' Presbyterian clerics refused the Assurance.¹¹² The writer claimed that many Presbyterians took the Assurance 'with such a Reservation and Explication as plainly shews that they have King *William* in suspition.' This was wishful thinking because the author still acknowledged that many Presbyterians were taking the Assurance.¹¹³ The writer said that William should not 'expect any great Security from Oathes' because allegiance to William was 'founded upon the breach of so many solemn and sacred ones' to James.¹¹⁴ Allegiance to William as *de jure* King was legally unacceptable in the Kingdoms. England was also a 'Hereditary' monarchy and therefore James 'is our Rightful and Lawful, and only King....'¹¹⁵ This response to Welwood claimed that most Scottish and English subjects still believed that James was owed allegiance as *de jure* King.

¹¹⁰ James Welwood, *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration, Dated at St. Germans, April 17 S.N. 1693* (London, 1693); idem *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration, Dated at St. Germans, April 17 S.N. 1693* (Dublin, 1693); idem, *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration, Dated at St. Germans, April 17 S.N. 1693* (Edinburgh, 1693).

¹¹¹ James Welwood, *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration...* (Dublin, 1693), pp.3-8.

¹¹² *A Reply to the Answer Doctor Welwood has made to King James's Declaration* (n.p., 1694), pp.32-3, 43.

¹¹³ Ibid, pp.32-3, 43.

¹¹⁴ Ibid, pp.32-4, 43.

¹¹⁵ Ibid, p.43.

However this Jacobite pamphlet did not dent popular perceptions, established by Scottish Williamites, that in Scotland allegiance to William as *de jure* King was popular and undermined Jacobitism. Other English and Irish pamphlets praised the Assurance's effectiveness. R.B.'s London-published *History of Scotland* commended the Assurance for recognising William and Mary as *de jure* monarchs.¹¹⁶ This was a huge bestseller.¹¹⁷ The *Dublin Intelligence* newspaper hailed the Assurance as an 'Abjuration of the late King James' which purged Jacobites from influential positions.¹¹⁸ While the Assurance and Abjuration were similar, Abjuration was a distinct oath debated in early-1700s Scotland, England and Ireland.¹¹⁹ From 1693 Jacobite conspiracies prompted English and Irish Williamites to debate allegiance to William as *de jure* King.¹²⁰ In winter 1692-3 English Whigs introduced a Commons Bill 'to settle' William's government with a new allegiance oath where subjects abjured James's rights. Tories denounced this as 'a means of dividing' England.¹²¹ Examinations of allegiance to *de jure* monarchs and Abjuration in England focus on Whigs using these oaths to gain party advantage by making Tories appear less loyal.¹²² However these approaches neglect growing calls for stronger allegiance to William either through Abjuration or recognising William as *de jure* King and how the Assurance influenced debates outside Scotland.

English Tory Edward Stillingfleet argued that proposals for new allegiance oaths would 'effect no greater matters to the Security of the Present Government, than an *Oath of Allegiance* will do.' The 1689 oath was sufficient.¹²³ English Whig lawyer William Atwood argued that the Assurance proved that Stillingfleet and likeminded Tories were wrong about the 1689 oath being 'sufficient security.' The 1689 oath implied that William and Mary

¹¹⁶ R.B., *The History of the Kingdom of Scotland...* (London, 1695), pp.165-6.

¹¹⁷ Jason McElligott, 'Crouch, Nathaniel [Robert Burton] (c. 1640–1725?)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/52645, accessed 12 June 2014].

¹¹⁸ *Dublin Intelligence* Saturday 29 April- Thursday 11 May 1693, No. 130, p.2.

¹¹⁹ See Chapter Nine.

¹²⁰ Evelyn, *Diary... Volume V Kalendarium*, pp.140-44; Luttrell, *Brief Relation Volume III*, pp.19, 51, 57-8, 71-2, 76.

¹²¹ Narcissus Luttrell, *Parliamentary Diary of Narcissus Luttrell, 1691-1693*, ed. Henry Horwitz (Oxford, 1972), pp.282, 309, 314-20. See Chapter Nine for more on Abjuration.

¹²² Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.68-71, 82-4, 154-60; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.488-91; Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.32-3.

¹²³ Edward Stillingfleet, *The Case of an Oath of Abjuration Considered: And the Vote of the Honourable House of Commons Vindicated in a Letter to a Friend* (London, 1693), pp.3-4, 30-6.

were ‘*Usurpers*’ and gave ‘too great Countenance to the Supposition’ that they were ‘not our *Legal and Rightful*’ monarchs. An Oath ‘declaring *their Majesties* to be the only *lawful, and rightful King and Queen* of these Realms’ was an ‘absolute Necessity.’¹²⁴ Atwood asserted that the Assurance, which had ‘the nature of an *Abjuration,*’ had no ‘worse effect in *Scotland,* than the turning King *James’s* Friends out of Offices....’ It ensured that officeholders were ‘engaged in Interest, and Principle to defend that government, the Right of which they have maintained from the beginning.’ An English version would be for the ‘good of *England*’ by undermining Jacobitism, which the 1689 oath failed to do. It was impossible to take the Assurance and maintain ‘that the late King is the *only Lawful Sovereign.*’¹²⁵ Atwood then cited English monarchs with contested successions, like Henry VII and Elizabeth, who passed laws obliging subjects recognise them as *de jure* monarchs. He even cited Tory favourites Robert Filmer and Robert Sanderson to show that allegiance was owed to William, a ‘lawful Prince.’¹²⁶ *De facto* theorists could not be trusted because they were ‘obliged to recall *their King*’ James.¹²⁷ Atwood, like Scottish Williamites, equated *de facto* theory with Jacobitism because it was not recognising William as the sole legitimate King and accepting the Revolution as permanent. Scotland’s Assurance was seen as an effective means to safeguard the Revolution settlement because it refuted James.

English Whig Samuel Johnson also called for an English version of the Assurance. Johnson said that authorities, like Coke in Calvin’s Case, used to justify *de facto* theory would have reconsidered their ideas in 1693 because these ideas were used to justify support for usurpers like ‘*Oliver.*’ Like Scottish Williamites, Johnson denounced *de facto* theory for implying that William and Mary were ‘in Opposition to *de Jure*’ authority. This was why the ‘Scotch Parliament justly called’ it ‘a Villanous Distinction’ when introducing the Assurance. The Assurance showed how Scotland had greater enthusiasm than England to embrace the Revolution as a permanent transformation protecting liberties and Protestantism.¹²⁸ Significantly Johnson published this during the

¹²⁴ William Atwood, *The Antiquity and Justice of an Oath of Abjuration in Answer to a Treatise, entituled, The Case of an Oath of Abjuration Considered* (London, 1694), pp.5, 46-7.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.107-8.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.9-11, 30-8, 40-5, 49-51.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp.68-9.

¹²⁸ Samuel Johnson, *Notes upon the Phoenix Edition of the Pastoral Letter Part I* (London, 1694), pp.8-9.

1693 controversy over Conquest theories when Burnet's *Pastoral Letter* was publicly burned. This controversy also touched on *de facto* theory.¹²⁹ Johnson had no problem attacking a fellow, albeit more moderate, Whig for advocating *de facto* theory and not showing greater enthusiasm for the Revolution. He wanted English allegiance debates, like Scotland's, to become divided between pro- and anti-Revolution sides. To Johnson 'Either a King is a Rightful King or he is not....' The 1689 oath insinuated that William was a 'Wrongful King, Usurper, Pretender, Tyrant in Title, Counterfeit King, No King.' This distinction was anathema to English monarchy where 'Every Inch of a King's Power is Legal, and he must come Legally to it.'¹³⁰ Johnson made similar criticisms of *de facto* theory before.¹³¹ He, like Atwood, hailed the Assurance as an instrument to protect the Revolution settlement, and the changes it established, from Jacobite threats.

While some English Whigs had called for allegiance to William as *de jure* King before 1693, Atwood, Samuel Johnson and others praised the Assurance as a Scottish initiative that gave William stronger allegiance. They wanted to replicate the results of this in England by introducing an English version. The Assurance was a popular endorsement of Scotland's Revolution settlement, and all that it was now popularly seen as encompassing, as permanent by subjects declaring that William's rule was more legitimate than James's. *De facto* theory was increasingly absent from Scottish debates because the pro-Revolution majority and Jacobite minority loudly advocated allegiance to their preferred *de jure* monarch. English Whig calls for an English Assurance were part of increasingly vocal debates across the Kingdoms in the mid-1690s over securing the Revolution settlements by introducing allegiance oaths recognising William as *de jure* King.

II

Pincus challenges J.P. Kenyon's and Mark Goldie's views that English allegiance debates ended by 1694 with *de facto* theory dominant. He argues that the aftermath of the 1696 Assassination Plot was significant

¹²⁹ See Chapter Three.

¹³⁰ Johnson, *Notes upon the Phoenix Edition*, pp.23-6.

¹³¹ Samuel Johnson, *An Argument Proving that the Abrogation of King James by the People of England from the Regal Throne... was according to the Constitution...* (London, 1692), p.12.

because the Association recognising William as *de jure* King sharpened English ideological divisions on the Revolution. The middle ground of *de facto* theory was eroded as Whig resistance theories became more prominent in public discourse.¹³² However the 1696 Association built on rhetoric about *de jure* authority that developed from 1693. This was not about endorsing resistance theories but supporting William and the Revolution as permanent. Increasing numbers of English Williamites called for allegiance to William as *de jure* King while Jacobites proclaimed allegiance to James as *de jure* King. As happened in Scotland, this ensured the erosion of *de facto* theory as a credible public position following the Association's introduction.

Scottish Episcopalian Jacobites, like Sage, generally denounced the Revolution settlement's illegality within a specifically Scottish context. Other Jacobites emphasised William's illegitimacy in urging allegiance to the rightful James in arguments that spoke to either the Three Kingdoms as a whole or England or Ireland alone. Scottish Whig Jacobite Sir James Montgomery's *Great Britain's Just Complaint* touched on *de jure* monarchy alongside Contract theory and subjects' liberties in a Three-Kingdom context. James 'was unjustly, upon false Pretences, deprived of his Birth-right by his Subjects, who by Nature and Oaths were bound to defend him in it.'¹³³ Montgomery, despite supporting William in 1689, denounced Williamites for effectively arguing that 'every thing is lawful for the obtaining of a Crown....' In exhorting allegiance to James, William's illegal succession and rule was another issue Montgomery exploited.¹³⁴ William suffered many military setbacks in 1693.¹³⁵ With these setbacks and the English Commons rejecting Abjuration, Jacobite polemics, like Montgomery's, denouncing the illegal Revolution and asserting that James was owed allegiance as *de jure* King made quite an impact in England.

The 1693 pamphlet *Price of the Abdication*, addressing a mainly English audience, denounced the Revolution for destroying the English Constitution. England's Convention decided that abdication was no longer a 'voluntary Resigning.' This 'mischievous Abdication, reached not only the King's Royal Person, but, at one Stroke, cancelled all the Antient Fundamental

¹³² Pincus, 1688, pp.440-3, 446-7, 450-6.

¹³³ Sir James Montgomery, *Great Britain's Just Complaint...Second Edition* (Oxford, 1693), pp.3-4. See Chapter Four for Montgomery's use of Contract theory and liberties.

¹³⁴ *Ibid*, p.15.

¹³⁵ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, p.126.

Laws of the Constitution of the *English Monarchy*....¹³⁶ Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy obliged obedience 'to their Lawful King' James. Abjuration was to 'purge many out of Civil and Military Places' and secure William's government. The author believed that James's restoration was imminent because previous illegal sinful rebellions showed that 'few Usurped Governments are long lived.'¹³⁷ It was impossible to believe that William had '*Esteem for the Constitution of the English Government*' because his elective succession was 'diametrically Opposite' the English Constitution's hereditary monarchy.¹³⁸ William's rule and breaking allegiance to James, violating divine and national law, guaranteed 'Damnation' for Williamites replacing Nonjurors.¹³⁹ *The Price of Abdication* commended Nonjurors for defending England's Constitution. Like Montgomery, this described allegiance to William as supporting the overturning of constitutional norms.

Jacobites from different ideological backgrounds adopted this argument. Whig Jacobite lawyer Charlwood Lawton repeatedly said that James was owed allegiance as *de jure* King.¹⁴⁰ He argued that stronger allegiance to William would be too much for Anglicans uncomfortable with the Revolution. An oath declaring William '*Lawful Rightful King*' was 'the same thing' as swearing support for 'this... Elective Monarchy, or the Quarrel Just.' It supported overturning England's Constitution.¹⁴¹ Lawton believed that Jacobitism held the legal high ground and that because James was the lawful King his restoration had to come through constitutional means, like Charles II's did. Legally dubious French-sponsored conspiracies undermined James's cause.¹⁴² Nonjurors, as they had since 1689, repeatedly condemned *de facto* theory as 'unlawful' with no basis in 'our own Laws.'¹⁴³ James was 'our true

¹³⁶ *The Price of the Abdication*... (n.p., 1693), pp.1-2.

¹³⁷ *Ibid*, pp.3-4.

¹³⁸ *Ibid*, pp.2, 16-8.

¹³⁹ *Ibid*, pp.3, 6.

¹⁴⁰ Charlwood Lawton, *A French Conquest neither Desirable nor Practicable*... (London, 1693), pp.6, 24; *idem*, *The Jacobite Principles Vindicated*... (London, 1693), pp.4, 6-7.

¹⁴¹ Charlwood Lawton, *The Vindication of the Dead: or, Six Hours Reflections upon the Six Weeks Labour in Answering Mr. Ashton's Speech published by Authority* (n.p., 1693), p.4. See Chapters One through Three for Anglican reluctance to give William allegiance.

¹⁴² Lawton, *French Conquest*, pp.10, 13.

¹⁴³ Henry Dodwell, *A Defence of the Vindication of the Deprived Bishops*... (London, 1695), pp.5-6; Samuel Grascome, *Considerations upon the Second Canon in the Book Entituled Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, &c.* (London, 1693), pp.20-1; Thomas Wagstaffe, *A Letter out of Suffolk to a Friend in London. Giving some Account of the Last Sickness and Death of Dr. William Sancroft, late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1694), pp.14-5.

and lawful Sovereign.¹⁴⁴ Collier said Williamite defences of *de facto* theory were ‘scorns to be govern’d by Law or Religion.’¹⁴⁵ Nonjurors and Whig Jacobites viewed allegiance to William, especially as *de jure* King, as supporting the Revolution that overturned the constitution by denying the lawful King’s right to rule.

Catholic Jacobites made similar arguments. Irish-based English Catholic John Sergeant’s analogous survey of European politics, *Historical Romance*, condemned the Revolution as ‘Disloyalty in Execution;’ the Convention acted ‘against the Fundamental Constitution.’¹⁴⁶ James’s attempts ‘to regain his Hereditary Right’ were morally just. Sergeant denounced Williamites’ ‘disallegiance and Ingratitude’ by installing ‘illegal Rulers’ when they ‘Abdicated their Lawful King, who still challenged his right, and only retired to a place of safety.’ Their ‘disloyal’ support for an ‘Intruder’ infringed ‘Divine Laws, and their own humane Laws....’¹⁴⁷ Alexander Irvine, another Catholic Jacobite, denounced the Revolution’s ‘Usurpation... against all Law and Right both Divine and Human.’¹⁴⁸ Irvine lampooned Williamites who only asserted that James was no longer *de jure* King in 1693. This was ‘condemning a Man first and then trying him afterwards, which is such a piece of Iniquity as... is seldom heard in Jest.’¹⁴⁹ James, whose ‘Right and Title is... still good,’ was owed allegiance; denying him his ‘true Right to the Crown’ was a ‘great Iniquity.’ A ruler without a right was ‘a Plain Usurper, and all that support him in it, Rebels against their Lawful King.’¹⁵⁰ Irish Catholic Jacobite Nicholas Plunket said that Irish Catholics, unlike English and Scottish subjects, would not ‘disown’ James ‘their lawful Sovereign.’¹⁵¹ Like Nonjurors and Whig Jacobites, Catholic Jacobites asserted that James was owed allegiance as the only lawful King. Jacobites of all shades presented allegiance to William as supporting the Revolution overthrowing the constitutional norms across the Kingdoms.

¹⁴⁴ Grascome, *Considerations upon the Second Canon*, pp.7, 20-1.

¹⁴⁵ Jeremy Collier, *A Perswasive to Consideration, Tender’d to the Royalists, Particularly, those of the Church of England* (n.p., 1693), p.17.

¹⁴⁶ John Sergeant, *An Historical Romance of the Wars between the Mighty Giant Gallieno, and the Great Knight Nasonius, and his Associates* (Dublin, 1694), pp.34-6.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid*, pp.56-8.

¹⁴⁸ Alexander Irvine, *A Dialogue Between A and B Two Plain Countrey-Gentlemen, Concerning the Times* (London, 1694), pp.3-4.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid*, pp.22-3.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid*, pp.29, 43-4.

¹⁵¹ Nicholas Plunket, ‘A Light to the Blind,’ *Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland 1689-1691*, ed. J.T Gilbert (Shannon, 1971), p.182.

Kevin Sharpe argues that the strength of Jacobite propaganda can be seen in the numbers ‘beyond Jacobite circles’ who retained doubts over William and Mary’s right.¹⁵² From 1693 Jacobites’ repeated arguments on *de jure* allegiance not only contributed to Tory doubts but also ensured English public discourse became increasingly divided between pro- and anti-Revolution sides who equally criticised *de facto* theory. Stillingfleet was an example of continued commitment to *de facto* theory, refusing to accept William as *de jure* King.¹⁵³ Jacobites exploited such examples of public unease. Robert Ferguson noted that Sherlock, one of the most prominent *de facto* theorists, had ‘many more Followers’ than Samuel Johnson, who advocated allegiance to William as *de jure* King. Ferguson saw this as proof that most subjects viewed the Revolution as ‘a mere Usurpation, and not a lawful Establishment.’¹⁵⁴ Jacobites writing for a Three-Kingdom or mainly English audience in 1693, like Scottish Episcopalian Jacobites, argued that legally only James was owed allegiance as *de jure* King. Allegiance to William was presented as supporting the Revolution overthrowing the constitutional establishment, although the established Church was less important to these Jacobite polemics than Scottish Episcopalian Jacobite polemics.

The 1693 Jacobite threat spurred Atwood and Samuel Johnson to demand an English version of the Assurance while denigrating *de facto* theory.¹⁵⁵ Other English Whigs called for stronger allegiance to William without referencing the Assurance. *Enquiry into the Nature and Obligation of Legal Rights* said allegiance to William as *de jure* King would ‘silence this Pretence of Right and Justice on the late King’s side.’ Maintaining that William was *de facto* King and James was the lawful King disturbed ‘the Peace and Settlement of these Kingdoms, and daily threaten us with new Convulsions or Revolutions....’¹⁵⁶ England’s Convention, a ‘Competent Authority’ on rights, had ‘determined against’ James. English laws on allegiance, succession and inheritance were cited to justify allegiance to William and Mary as the

¹⁵² Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.484-9.

¹⁵³ Stillingfleet, *The Case of an Oath of Abjuration*, pp.30-6; Luttrell, *Parliamentary Diary*, pp.315-20.

¹⁵⁴ Robert Ferguson, *A Letter to Mr Secretary Trenchard...* (n.p., 1694), pp.6-7.

¹⁵⁵ Johnson, *Notes Upon the Phoenix Edition*, pp.8-9, 24; Atwood, *The Antiquity and Justice of an Oath of Abjuration*, pp.107-8.

¹⁵⁶ *An Enquiry into the Nature and Obligation of Legal Rights: With Respect to the Popular Pleas of the Late K. James’s Remaining Right to the Crown* (London, 1693), pp.2-3.

‘Rightful’ monarchs.¹⁵⁷ William and Mary ruled constitutionally and therefore they alone were entitled to receive allegiance as lawful monarchs.¹⁵⁸ Daniel Defoe’s 1693-4 *Dialogue Betwixt Whig and Tory* and *Englishman’s Choice* made similar arguments. He argued that William accepting *de facto* theorists’ allegiance made it appear that William had ‘a Doubt of’ his ‘own Right and Title to the Government...’ Subjects who thought that William was ‘not Rightful, must think King *James* is so’ and would ‘assist that Right when they have opportunity.’¹⁵⁹ Defoe hoped that the ‘scruples of the *noisie few*’ Tory-Jacobites, who ‘deny the Right of their *Present Majesties*’ with a pretended ‘Zeal for the Constitution,’ would be ignored. Subjects should acknowledge that they ‘received their *present Majesties* for King and *Queen*; and that of *Right*’ with an oath that could ‘leave no Loop-hole’ to maintain that James still had a right.¹⁶⁰

Other English Whigs echoed these calls for stronger allegiance to William while denouncing *de facto* theory for implying that William and Mary were ‘Usurpers.’ Matthew Tindal said that James breaking the law meant he was ‘no King at all’ and had no ‘manner of Right’ to subjects’ ‘Allegiance.’¹⁶¹ Allegiance to William and Mary as *de jure* monarchs was recognising that ‘no other can have the same Right.’¹⁶² Charles Blount described this as ‘true Allegiance.’ His claim that William and Mary were *de jure* monarchs through Conquest caused controversy but believed this allegiance would secure the settlement protecting liberties and Protestantism from James’s designs.¹⁶³ Much of James Tyrrell’s *Bibliotheca Politica* advocated allegiance to William as *de jure* King.¹⁶⁴ Julia Rudolph says that Tyrrell used a dialogue between the Whig Freeman and Tory-Jacobite Meanwell to have Whig ideas victorious after a thorough examination by English Common Law. Tyrrell made sure that Meanwell presented strong Tory-Jacobite arguments throughout.¹⁶⁵ On James’s

¹⁵⁷ Ibid, pp.2-3, 19, 33-9, 41, 57-62.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, pp.44-6, 3-7.

¹⁵⁹ Daniel Defoe, *A Dialogue Betwixt Whig and Tory, alias Williamite and Jacobite...*(London, 1693), ‘To the King,’ pp.18-9, 22-5, 29-30.

¹⁶⁰ Daniel Defoe, *The Englishman’s Choice...*(London, 1694), pp.5-6, 32, 18-23.

¹⁶¹ Tindal, *Essay Concerning Obedience to the Supreme Powers*, pp.54, 32-4, 36-7, 39, 9-10, 5.

¹⁶² Ibid, pp.54, 32-4, 39.

¹⁶³ Charles Blount, *King William and Queen Mary, Conquerors...*(London, 1693), ‘The Preface,’ pp.1-3, 24-8, 31-4, 53-4, 56-9. For more on Blount’s use of Conquest Theory see Chapter Three.

¹⁶⁴ James Tyrrell, *Bibliotheca Politica...*(London, 1694), passim.

¹⁶⁵ Julia Rudolph, *Revolution by Degrees James Tyrrell and Whig Political Thought in the Late Seventeenth Century* (Basingstoke, 2002), pp.15-7.

legal right Freeman even acknowledged he ‘cannot deny the force of Meanwell’s thesis.’¹⁶⁶ However Freeman countered that James ‘forfeited his Crown and Allegiance from his Subjects’ when he threw the Great Seal in the Thames and left England without a government.¹⁶⁷ The Convention, the ‘sole proper Judge’ on who should govern, made William a lawful King.¹⁶⁸ In 1693-4 Tyrrell and other Whigs argued for allegiance to William as *de jure* King because the Convention lawfully enthroned William after James broke the law thereby losing his legal rights. They argued that this stronger allegiance to William and Mary would show public acceptance of them as the sole legitimate monarchs; it was accepting James’s exclusion, and with it the Revolution settlement’s innovations, as permanent.

Craig Rose argues that this stronger allegiance to William was a mainly Whig feature of the burgeoning English party politics.¹⁶⁹ However in 1693-4 some Tories, while remaining uncomfortable with William’s extra-lineal succession, also accepted that William was more than a *de facto* King and were prepared to publicly acknowledge this. Tory Anglican Humphrey Prideaux wrote to government official John Ellis on these 1693 debates. Prideaux said that he could acknowledge William and Mary as ‘lawfull’ monarchs because the Convention was legal. However the ‘word rightfull’ was problematic because ‘that is to swear K. William’s title’ was inherited, which it was not.¹⁷⁰

Samuel Hill’s *Solomon and Abiathar* was one of the most prominent Tory pamphlets to call for stronger allegiance to William. Hill defended deprivations of Nonjurors by coating William’s rule in terminology similar to that associated with lawful monarchs. He described James’s 1688 flight as a ‘Virtual Abdication’ in ‘Point of Law;’ James’s daughters ‘judged their Father had effectually deserted....’ Subjects were then ‘bound by the old Laws, and Oath of Allegiance to the King, his Heirs, and Successors, to pay Allegiance to King William and Queen Mary....’¹⁷¹ Hill defended *de facto* theory but

¹⁶⁶ James Tyrrell, *Bibliotheca Politica*, ‘Thirteenth Dialogue,’ p.909.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid, ‘Eleventh Dialogue,’ pp.781-2, 790-1, 818.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid, ‘Thirteenth Dialogue,’ pp.916-8, 920-1.

¹⁶⁹ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.68-70.

¹⁷⁰ Humphrey Prideaux, ‘Norwich, December 4, 1693,’ *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux Sometime Dean of Norwich to John Ellis, Sometime under-Secretary of State, 1674-1722*, ed. Edward Maunde Thompson (London, 1875), pp.157-9.

¹⁷¹ Samuel Hill, *Solomon and Abiathar: or, The Case of the Deprived Bishops and Clergy, discussed* (London, 1692), pp.3-6.

described William's enthronement as legally conferring William some sort of superior right to James. James had been *de jure* King but providence meant that 'as to Forms of Law, King William is now Legally Invested.' The 1689 oath expressed 'no Form of Affirmation concerning Right, but is purely promising of Allegiance to Sovereigns actually Regnant' but Hill said that the Convention gave William a 'Lawful Right.'¹⁷² William and Mary were not *de facto* rulers like Cromwell who had 'acquired no Form of Right, or Legal Settlement.' Most Anglicans 'admitted' William's succession was legal and gave 'him Allegiance' but Hill's description of allegiance suggests that William was more than *de facto* King.¹⁷³

Nonjuror Samuel Grascome lambasted Hill for 'withholding the Right' from James and asserting that the Revolution was not 'overthrowing the Constitution of the Kingdom, and violating the Laws of God be no sin....'¹⁷⁴ Temporal and religious law meant it was 'the proper duty of a Subject to his lawfull Sovereign... where you pay your Allegiance, it is owning him to be your Prince; and therefore when you swear Allegiance, you tacitly swear a Right.'¹⁷⁵ Grascome alleged that Hill was unlawfully conferring William with a right to rule. Prideaux and Hill were Tories contributing to growing calls for stronger allegiance to William. From 1693 *de facto* theory in England was under sustained attack on two fronts. Grascome and other Jacobites described James as *de jure* King while Whigs and even some Tories wanted allegiance to William that was stronger than *de facto* theory.

Mary's 1694 death further fuelled debate over William's legitimacy because some subjects had used Mary's position to project some legitimacy on William and maintain that hereditary monarchy survived the Revolution. Jacobites embraced this opportunity. Sharpe argues that Jacobites exploited William's lack of right without Mary and this made Jacobite conspiracies more credible.¹⁷⁶ This study is not examining these plots' viability but how Mary's

¹⁷² Ibid, pp.8-9.

¹⁷³ Ibid, pp.9-12, 33.

¹⁷⁴ Samuel Grascome, *Two Letters written To the Author of a Pamphlet, Entitled, Solomon and Abiathar: or, The Case of the Deprived Bishops and Clergy, discussed* (London, 1692), p.12.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, pp.19-26.

¹⁷⁶ Rachel J. Weil, 'The Politics of Legitimacy: Women and the warming-pan scandal,' in Lois G. Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.70-1, 82; Lois G. Schwoerer, 'The Coronation of William and Mary, April 11, 1689,' in *ibid*, pp.117-8, 122-3; W.A Speck, 'William – and Mary?,' in *ibid*, pp.131-3, 142, 146; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.347, 486-7, 494.

death and plots increased demands for allegiance only to *de jure* monarchs. Burnet recorded that Mary's death enthused Jacobites who believed that William was losing popular support.¹⁷⁷ Jacobites used her death to again depict the Revolution as illegally depriving James of his rights. From 1689 Anglican Richard Stafford repeatedly denounced those who rebelled and withdrew allegiance from James the rightful King.¹⁷⁸ In 1694 Stafford argued that William was illegitimate before and after Mary's death because both had 'no Right' to the throne. England would receive providential blessings if subjects 'Restore the Kingdom back unto him whose Right it is.'¹⁷⁹ Subjects giving William allegiance was 'contrary to their Oath and Duty' to James.¹⁸⁰ Nonjuror Thomas Ken also attacked 'new Casuists' who used Mary to justify the Revolution and persuaded her to go against 'her Filial Duty.' Ken praised 'Honest Men' consistently refusing allegiance to William and Mary who had no right.¹⁸¹

Irish Nonjuror Charles Leslie's 1695 pamphlets repeatedly used Mary's death to denounce the illegality of allegiance to William in a Three-Kingdom context. His *Querela Temporum* noted that many Williamites used Mary to 'ease' their 'Consciences' when giving William and Mary allegiance as joint monarchs. Without Mary they 'lost all pretence to a Share in K. William.' William's continued rule, without any right, showed that the hereditary monarchy was now an 'Elective' monarchy against 'our Constitution.'¹⁸² Rose describes Leslie's *Querela Temporum* as trying to delegitimize William's authority in Church and state to Tories.¹⁸³ However this was just one strand of Leslie's efforts in 1694-5; Leslie repeatedly cited Mary's

¹⁷⁷ Burnet, *History*, p.148.

¹⁷⁸ In *To the Present Queen Mary Richard Stafford, A Scribe of Jesus Christ, desireth Temporal Preservation and Eternal Salvation* (n.p., 1692), pp.1-3 Stafford admonished Mary and subjects for 'Disobedience' to James and infringing his legal right to the throne. He also criticised rebellion against James and withdrawing allegiance from James the *de jure* King in: *A Word to Both Houses of Parliament* (n.p., 1693), pp.1-4; Richard Stafford, *A Copy of two letters which Richard Stafford had intended to have delivered unto the King and Queen...*(n.p., 1690), passim.

¹⁷⁹ Richard Stafford, *The Lamentation of Richard Stafford, a Scribe instructed in the Law of God, for the Death of Mary Princess of Orange...*(n.p., 1695), pp.1-4. See Chapter Eight for more on Jacobite use of providence.

¹⁸⁰ Richard Stafford, *A SUPPLEMENT and ADDITION unto a Print Paper, Bearing Date July 25. 1692. And thus Superscribed, To our Sovereign Lord, King James the II. Rightful King of Great Brittain, and Ireland...*(n.p., 1695), pp.1-4.

¹⁸¹ Thomas Ken, *A Letter to the Author of a Sermon, entitled, A Sermon Preach'd at the Funeral of her Late Majesty Queen Mary* (n.p., 1695), pp.3-8.

¹⁸² Charles Leslie, *Querela Temporum; or, the Danger of the Church of England...*(n.p., 1695), pp.30-1.

¹⁸³ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.45-8.

death to denounce William's illegal government and urge allegiance to James as *de jure* King. Leslie said that Sherlock, Burnet and other Williamites claiming that Mary's death did not alter allegiance were justifying 'Usurpation.' They were trying to depict William as 'a *Lawful King de facto*.'¹⁸⁴ Leslie derided this 'Contradiction in the very Terms. 'Tis as if a Man should say, Legal Illegality, Honest Villany, or Rightful Wrong; one of the Terms is a direct Contradiction to the other.'¹⁸⁵ James's right was 'weight enough to keep us in our Obedience;' God 'and the Constitution of our Country' gave James 'a Divine as well as a Legal Right....'¹⁸⁶ Allegiance to William and Mary or William alone supported the Revolution, a 'Violation of the Laws of God, Nature, and Nation....'¹⁸⁷ Mary's death, Leslie argued, further showed how the Revolution overturned the constitution by depriving James of his right to rule and allegiance.

Some historians have examined how between 1693 and 1695 diverse Jacobites, including Ferguson, used Mary's death to castigate William's lack of right but overlook the impact on allegiance debates.¹⁸⁸ Ferguson hoped that Mary's death would cure subjects of 'Disloyalty' and return allegiance to their 'Rightful Sovereign.'¹⁸⁹ His pamphlet *Whether the Parliament be not in Law dissolved by the death of the Princess of Orange?* denounced Williamites citing Edward Coke, Solomon, and Henry VII amongst others to justify withdrawing allegiance from rightful monarchs.¹⁹⁰ The Convention had no mandate to 'dispose of the Right of Kingdom' or 'bar a King of the Right of his Regality.'¹⁹¹ Subjects must 'distinguish our Rightful King from the Usurper.'¹⁹² Mary's death made William appear more 'arbitrary and illegal' like Cromwell was.¹⁹³ Ferguson highlighted how the Convention invested

¹⁸⁴ William Sherlock, *A Sermon Preached at the Temple-Church, December 30 1694, Upon the Sad Occasion of the Death of our Gracious Queen* (Dublin, 1695), p.14; Gilbert Burnet, *An Essay on the Memory of the late Queen... Second Edition* (London, 1696), p.33; Charles Leslie, *Remarks on Some Late Sermons: And in Particular on Dr. Sherlock's Sermon at the Temple, Decemb. 30 1694...The Second Edition with additions* (London, 1695), pp.7, 20, 28-9.

¹⁸⁵ Leslie, *Remarks on Some Late Sermons*, pp.28-30.

¹⁸⁶ Charles Leslie, *Gallienus Redivivus...*(Edinburgh, 1695), p.22.

¹⁸⁷ Leslie, *Remarks on some Late Sermons*, pp.31-5.

¹⁸⁸ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.404, 425, 457-8, 486-94; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.41-8; Pincus, *1688*, pp.446-7.

¹⁸⁹ Robert Ferguson, *Whether the Parliament be not in Law Dissolved by the Death of the Princess of Orange? And how Subjects ought, and are to behave themselves...*(n.p., 1695), pp.4-6.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid*, pp.18-26, 52-8.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid*, pp.9-10.

¹⁹² *Ibid*, p.21.

¹⁹³ *Ibid*, pp.27-30, 45-8, 52-4.

‘Sovereignty’ in William and Mary ‘Joyntly’ when Williamites ‘withdrew their Allegiance from’ James. Without Mary William ‘lost and forfeited’ the throne if the logic of ‘the illegal, disloyal, and treasonable Proceedings of the *Convention*’ were followed.¹⁹⁴ Allegiance to William and Mary was bad enough but allegiance to William alone was ‘unparalleled Infidelity’ towards a ‘Lawful and Rightful King.’¹⁹⁵

From 1695 Ferguson repeatedly condemned the Revolution for violating the ‘Laws of the Land’ and ‘Laws of God.’¹⁹⁶ Violating ‘the Lawful and Righteous Oath’ to James and subscribing to the ‘Unlawfulness of that Oath to William’ was a ‘Crime.’¹⁹⁷ No ‘Sources of *Law and Justice*’ permitted William to ‘exerciseth the *Sovereign Power*.’¹⁹⁸ Advocating allegiance to rulers with ‘no rightful Title’ showed ‘Disloyal Malice’ and ‘Ignorance of the Law.’ James ‘rightfully is the only Legal Monarch of these Kingdoms.’¹⁹⁹ Allegiance to the ‘*Usurper*’ was the ‘Ruine of our Antient Government.’ Ferguson praised Nonjurors for demonstrating that ‘no Man can be lawfully required to take an *Oath of Allegiance*’ to William without ‘rebellious Enmity to a Rightful King.’²⁰⁰ Mary’s death prompted Jacobites of all hues to remind audiences that the Revolution enthroning Mary illegally deprived the rightful King of his rights. National and divine law entitled James to subjects’ allegiance as *de jure* King. This allegiance supported restoring the lawful King thereby reversing the Revolution and returning the rule of law to the Kingdoms.

Many Williamites recognised that Mary’s death created problems but argued that their allegiance was unchanged. Numerous Whig, Tory, Anglican and Nonconformist Williamite eulogies on Mary gave repeated guarantees of allegiance to William without specifying the type of allegiance. Preachers repeatedly said Mary’s marriage allowed William to continue reigning.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁴ Ibid, pp.36-9, 42-4.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid, pp.49-50, 36-9.

¹⁹⁶ Robert Ferguson, *Whether the Preserving the Protestant Religion was the Motive unto, or the End, that was designed in the Late Revolution?* (n.p., 1695), p.9.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid, p.40.

¹⁹⁸ Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Account of Some of the Late Incroachments and Depredations of the Dutch upon the English and of a few of those many Advantages which by fraud and violence they have made of the British Nations since the Revolution...* (n.p., 1695), p.64.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid, pp.4-6, 64, 12, 6.

²⁰⁰ Ibid, pp.54-6, 67-71.

²⁰¹ Burnet, *Essay on the Memory of the late Queen*, p.33; Nicholas Brady, *Mr. Brady’s Sermon at Whitehall upon Occasion of the Queen’s Death March 3, 1694/5* (London, 1695), pp.23-5, 28; Thomas Bowber, *A Sermon Preached in the Parish-Church at St. Swithin, London, March*

Sherlock urged subjects to give William ‘fresh Assurance of our Fidelity, as may strengthen his Hands against our Enemies Abroad, and make him Easie and Safe at Home.’²⁰² This sermon went through several editions and was re-published in Dublin and Edinburgh.²⁰³

Other English Williamites used Mary’s death to call for stronger allegiance to William. One Tory warned that such an oath could further split Anglicanism.²⁰⁴ Royal chaplain John Williams acknowledged, without endorsing, growing English calls for allegiance to William ‘*as it is practised by our Neighbours* in Scotland.’²⁰⁵ However Williams did say that James was no longer *de jure* King because he broke the law and condemned Nonjurors ‘disowning his Majesty’s [William’s] Title’ to rule.²⁰⁶ Williams’s sermon provides evidence of growing English calls for stronger allegiance to William in order to counter the emboldened Jacobitism. It also shows that Scotland’s Assurance remained influential to many English Williamites. 1693-5 saw Jacobites and many English Williamites calling for allegiance to their preferred King as *de jure* King and portrayed *de facto* theory as supporting unlawful governments. England was witnessing two diametrically opposed sides publicly deriding *de facto* theory. This ensured that following the 1696 Assassination Plot England’s public discourse, like Scotland’s, was divided between advocates of allegiance to William as *de jure* King and a Jacobite minority.

III

10th 1694/5 *Upon the much Lamented death of Our Most Gracious Queen* (London, 1695), pp.27-8; Samuel Wesley, *Elegies on the Queen...Second Edition* (London, 1695), p.11; William Bates, *A Sermon Preached upon the Much Lamented Death of Our Late Gracious Sovereign Queen Mary. To which is Added the address of Condolence to his Majesty by the Dissenting Ministers... Fourth Edition* (London, 1695), pp.24-6; Deuel Pead, *A Practical Discourse Upon the Death of our Late Gracious Queen, Being a Sermon Preach’d the 10th of March 1694/5* (London, 1695), pp.23-6.

²⁰² William Sherlock, *A Sermon Preached at the Temple-Church, December 30 1694...* (Dublin, 1695), p.14.

²⁰³ William Sherlock, *A Sermon Preached at the Temple-Church, December 30 1694, Upon the Sad Occasion of the Death of our Gracious Queen... Fourth Edition...* (London, 1695); idem, *A Sermon Preached at the Temple-Church, December 30 1694...* (Edinburgh, 1695); idem, *A Sermon Preached at the Temple-Church, December 30 1694...* (Dublin, 1695).

²⁰⁴ *Some Observations upon the Posture of our Affairs, or the Death of our Late Most Gracious Queen* (London, 1695), pp.4-8.

²⁰⁵ John Williams, *A Defence of the Archbishop’s Sermon on the Death of her Late Majesty of Blessed Memory... Being a Vindication of the Late Queen...* (London, 1695), p.3.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid*, pp.22-7.

Jacobites involved in the 1696 Plot believed that William's government being illegitimate justified their conspiracy.²⁰⁷ Sir William Parkyns, sentenced to death for his involvement, defended his actions as part of allegiance to James in his gallows' speech. It was his 'Duty, both as a Subject, and an Englishman, to assist' James 'in the Recovery of his throne....' James was 'Depriv'd... contrary to all Right and Justice....' Parkyns described 'the Laws and Constitution of my Country' as his 'Guide.'²⁰⁸ Like other Jacobites he maintained allegiance to James as the rightful King and sought to reverse the unconstitutional Revolution.

News of the Plot in February 1696 caused widespread public hostility to James. Numerous Williamites said that *de facto* theory was responsible for encouraging Jacobites to believe that they were defending James's right.²⁰⁹ Deuel Pead, who called William a lawful King in 1694-5, argued that allegiance to William as *de facto* King encouraged William's 'Enemies.'²¹⁰ Another Williamite pamphlet declared 'that nothing could have been thought of more Injurious to His Majesty's Title' than the 'pernicious Distinction of a King *de Facto* and *de Jure*.'²¹¹ The author argued that Abjuration or oaths 'Declarative of the King's [William's] Right' would aid the 'Security of our Nation' by preventing Jacobites styling James as 'our only Legal and *de jure* King.'²¹² Scotland's Assurance was again cited as a template England should follow.²¹³ *Enquiry into the Nature and Obligation of Legal Rights* was republished to urge subjects to give William stronger allegiance in order to protect the Revolution.²¹⁴

This Plot prompted the introduction of the Association recognising William as *de jure* or rightful and lawful King. The *Act for the Better Security*

²⁰⁷ Pincus, *1688*, pp.447-8.

²⁰⁸ Sir William Parkyns, 'Sir William Parkyns' Paper,' *A True Copy of the Papers delivered by Sir John Friend, and Sir William Parkyns to the Sheriffs of London and Middlesex at Tyburn, the place of execution, April the 3d, 1696* (London, 1696), pp.1-2. See Chapter Eight for his use of providence.

²⁰⁹ Jane Garrett, *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696* (Cambridge, 1980), pp.232-6, 262-3; Pincus, *1688*, p.455.

²¹⁰ Pead, *Practical Discourse Upon the Death of our Late Gracious Queen*, pp.23-6; idem, *Sheba's Conspiracy, and Amasa's Confederacy: Or, A Vindication of the National Association Entered into by the... House of Commons Feb. 25th 1695...* (London, 1696), p.22.

²¹¹ *Some Seasonable Queries, On the Second Head, viz. An Oath of Abjuration, or at least Declarative of His Majesty's Right* (n.p., 1696), p.1.

²¹² Ibid, pp.1-2.

²¹³ Ibid, p.2.

²¹⁴ *Enquiry into the Nature and Obligation of Legal Rights: With Respect to the Popular Pleas of the Late K. James's Remaining Right to the Crown* (London, 1696).

of His Majesties Royal Person and Government required future MPs and officeholders to take the Association oath and the general public could voluntarily subscribe to it. It was worded differently in some localities but the Associations were united in expressing allegiance to William and generally acknowledged him as the lawful King in some form. The Association returns became propaganda to show William's popular support and are seen as showing increased political participation.²¹⁵ It also became treason to publish material defending James's right to allegiance and denying William was the 'lawfull and rightfull' King.²¹⁶

Most historians view the Association as a tool for Court and Whig parties to gain political advantage.²¹⁷ Pincus is one of the few historians to recognise the importance of debates over the Association in defending the Revolution.²¹⁸ Vallance claims that there was little debate over the Association outside of parliament with fewer pamphlets than in 1689-92.²¹⁹ However the Licensing Act's 1695 expiry led to uncensored polemics on different issues, including William's right.²²⁰ Numerous 1696 pamphlets discussed stronger allegiance tests and parliament introducing the Association. Both Vallance and Pincus portray the Association as a triumph for Whig ideology in an

²¹⁵ Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1553-1682* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp.200-9; idem, 'Loyal or Rebellious? Protestant Associations in England 1584-1696,' *The Seventeenth Century*, 17, Issue 1 (2002), pp.15-8; Pincus, 1688, pp.463-70; David Cressy, 'Binding the Nation: The Bonds of Association, 1584-1696,' in Delloyd J. Guth & John W. McKenna (eds.) *Tudor Rule and Revolution Essays for G.R. Elton from his American Friends* (Cambridge, 1982), pp.220, 227-34; Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2006), p.123; Henry Horwitz, *Revolution Politicks: The Career of Daniel Finch Second Earl of Nottingham 1647-1730* (Cambridge, 1968), pp.156-7.

²¹⁶ 'William III, 1695-6: An Act for the better Security of His Maj[es]ties. Royal Person and Government. [Chapter XXVII. Rot. Parl. 7 & 8 Gul. III.p.6.n. 1.],' *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 7, 1695-1701*, ed. John Raithby (n.p., 1820), pp. 114-118. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol7/pp114-118>. Date accessed: 20 March 2015. *True Copies of the Present Associations of the Lords and Commons in Parliament Assembled. As Also A Copy of the Instrument of Association that the Protestants of England entred into, in the 27th. Year of Queen Elizabeth...* (London, 1696), pp.8-9. See Appendix IV for the wording of some of the Associations.

²¹⁷ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.404-6; Rubini, *Court and Country*, pp.52-3, 63-6; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.69, 82-5, 92-3, 129; Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics*, pp.106-9, 174-7; Goldie, 'The English System of Liberty,' pp.44-5; Gabriel Glickman, 'Political Conflict and the Memory of the Revolution in England, 1689-c.1745,' in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (eds.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy The Revolution of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp.246-7, 255-6, 264.

²¹⁸ Pincus, 1688, pp.442-7, 450-1, 456-8, 462-9.

²¹⁹ Vallance, 'Loyal or Rebellious?,' pp.15-8; idem, 'The Kingdom's Case: The Use of Casuistry as a Political Language 1640-1692,' *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 34, No. 4 (Winter, 2002), pp.582-3.

²²⁰ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.482-3.

increasingly secular politics. Pincus also says this led to English politics becoming divided between pro- and anti-Revolution sides.²²¹ While party politicking was an element in many 1696 polemics, preserving the Revolution settlement's changes with allegiance to William as *de jure* King was a crucial issue itself. Whig William Stephens praised the Association because it would 'preserve our Rightfull King and righteous Establishment' from French-Jacobite threats.²²² Numerous Tory and Whig Williamite polemics said this stronger allegiance would protect the settlement and claimed that there was widespread political support for this measure in England. This continued the trend from 1693-5 with English allegiance debates becoming increasingly divided between pro- and anti-Revolution sides.

Several Tories opposed the Association because of their commitment to hereditary monarchy. Prominent Tory Sir Edward Seymour said he would refuse the Association because William, with his extra-lineal succession, could never be *de jure* King in England's hereditary monarchy. Many Tories agreed that constitutionally William was not 'lawful or rightful' but accepted him as *de facto* King.²²³ At a time of bitter divisions eighty-nine Tories in the Commons and twenty peers refused the Association although both Houses' Associations were worded differently, reflecting each House's composition. The Commons' Association recognised William as the 'rightful and lawful' King while the Lords' Association said that William had a 'right by law' to be King.²²⁴ Naturally some Whigs, like Atwood, attacked Tories refusing the Association but also tried to appeal to *de facto* theory proponents by arguing that William being *de facto* King also made him *de jure* King. Atwood denounced anti-Association Williamites refusing to accept that 'the King for the time being was supposed to be the Lawful and *Rightful King*.' Possession

²²¹ Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, pp.202-10; Pincus, *1688*, pp.440-58, 463-8.

²²² William Stephens, *A Thanksgiving Sermon Preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor... of the City of London at St. Mary-le-bow, April 16, 1696, upon occasion of His Majesty's Deliverance from a Villanous Assassination...* (London, 1696), 'To the Right Honourable Sir John Houlton, Kt. Lord Mayor of the City of London...', pp.22-4.

²²³ [Daniel Bret] to Theophilus, seventh Earl of Huntingdon, at Donnington Park. [16]95[-6], Feb. 27. London.' Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC), *Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Reginald Rawdon Hastings... Volume II*, ed. Francis Bickley (London, 1930), pp.258-9; B.J., *A Summary Account of the Proceedings upon the Happy Discovery of the Jacobite Conspiracy in a Second Letter to a Devonshire Gentleman* (London, 1696), pp.3-4. See Chapter Nine for Seymour's view on Abjuration and his changing views on allegiance.

²²⁴ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.84-5, 92, 178-80; Vallance, 'Loyal or Rebellious?', pp.14-5; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.404-7, 482-3, 88-93; Horwitz, *Revolution Politicks*, pp.156-8.

made William the *de jure* King.²²⁵ Edward the Confessor, Edward III, Henry VI and Henry VII had contested successions but were accepted as *de jure* monarchs.²²⁶ These examples showed how anti-Association figures were ‘little acquainted with the Common-Law Oath of Allegiance, and the warrantable Presidents of former times....’ William’s right to rule and allegiance ‘*is good and lawful.*’ ‘To imagine that after all this, the late King either is, or ought to be King, is to slight all Authorities, Ancient as well as Modern.’ Rejecting this allegiance was rejecting the lawful ruler and settlement in England.²²⁷

Other Whigs also praised this stronger allegiance to William while attacking Tories refusing it. One Whig pamphlet hailed William as ‘our Lawful Sovereign.’²²⁸ Subjects were ‘in great Danger of being stript of their fidelity to their Liege Lord’ William. Tory leaders, ‘who ought to animate Allegiance of the Lower Orders of Men,’ had become William’s ‘first Desertors’ by denying that he was *de jure* King. Again, refusing stronger allegiance to William was described as denying the post-Revolution legal settlement.²²⁹ This was similar to how Scottish Presbyterian Williamites denounced Episcopalian Jacobites.²³⁰ However other pamphlets suggest that some polemicists put the Whig-Tory dichotomy aside to praise the Association’s stronger allegiance to William. This was to show that English subjects, despite political divisions, supported the Revolution settlement of William, liberties and Protestantism as permanent by asserting that William had a greater legal right to allegiance than James.

Several Whig pamphleteers praised the Commons and Tory-dominated Lords for introducing the Associations. *A Free Discourse wherein the Doctrines which make for Tyranny are display’d* said that Contract theories were not ‘known in any of our Law-Books.’ However this pamphlet also praised William’s ‘Election’ and Samuel Johnson’s 1692-3 arguments that showed William was *de jure* King.²³¹ It denounced ‘Jacobizing Authors’ promoting *de facto* theory to denigrate William as an ‘Usurper’ with ‘no just

²²⁵ William Atwood, *Reflections upon a Treasonable Opinion, Industriously promoted against signing the National Association...* (London, 1696), pp.1-2, 6.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.23-7, 30, 34-9, 45-6, 48-51, 56-9.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp.61-4.

²²⁸ *Cursory Remarks upon Some Late Disloyal Proceedings, In Several Cabals* (London, 1699), p.18.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, p.50.

²³⁰ Ridpath, *Scots Episcopal Innocence*, pp.6-7.

²³¹ Person of Honour, *A Free Discourse wherein the Doctrines which make for Tyranny are Display’d the Title of our Rightful and Lawful King William Vindicated, and the Unreasonableness and Mischievous Tendency of the Odious Distinction of a King De Facto, and De Jure Discover’d* (London, 1697), pp.33, 40-52, 80-1.

claim to our Allegiance.’ *De facto* theory was an ‘Infamous Self-Contradiction’ that asserted William could make laws but was not the lawful King. Therefore ‘if the King shall not hold his Title to be *De IURE*, he must be an Enemy to his own quiet Possession....’²³² Sharpe has noted that several English Whigs portrayed the Association as defending notions of ‘life, liberty and property.’²³³ This rhetoric was noticeable in different polemics, like *A Free Discourse*. Chapters Four through Six showed how allegiance to William was increasingly seen as supporting the changes that accompanied his enthronement. Allegiance to William as *de jure* King was declaring that these changes were permanent; most subjects did not want to return to ‘miserable’ pre-Revolution England. ‘Discontented Ecclesiasticks,’ who denied that William was the ‘Rightful and Lawful’ King, were condemned.²³⁴ In 1696 the House of Lords had a Tory majority.²³⁵ Significantly *Free Discourse* acknowledged that the Tory-dominated Lords promoted stronger allegiance to William. The author said that the Revolution would not be undone because of popular political support in the Commons and Lords where they ‘damn’d the Mischievous distinction’ of *de facto* and *de jure* with their Associations. In 1689 the Convention made William ‘their Lawful and Rightful King, or they made him nothing.’²³⁶ Viewing William as *de facto* King ‘long encourag’d troublesome Commotions’ across the Kingdoms. The silver lining of the Plot was allegiance to William as *de jure* King which ensured ‘the Establishment and Security of’ William’s government.²³⁷

A Summary Account of the Proceedings was another Whig pamphlet praising the Tory-dominated Lords’ Association. The Lords’ Association said ‘King William hath a *RIGHT BY LAW* to the Crown of this Realm’ while neither James ‘nor the Pretended Prince of Wales, nor any other Person hath any Right whatsoever to the same....’²³⁸ *A Summary Account* said that this different wording to the Commons’ Association was immaterial because both recognised William’s exclusive right to the throne.²³⁹ Despite this praise the

²³² Ibid, pp.67-70, 39-41, 56, 38-42.

²³³ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.405-6.

²³⁴ Person of Honour, *A Free Discourse*, pp.22-3, 89-110.

²³⁵ Horwitz, *Revolution Politicks*, pp.156-7.

²³⁶ Person of Honour, *A Free Discourse*, pp.81-3, 12-7, 29-32, 39-41.

²³⁷ Ibid, pp.79-81, 95-6.

²³⁸ B.J., *A Summary Account*, pp.1-2.

²³⁹ Ibid, p.2. See Appendix IV for the wording of the Associations subscribed to by members of the Commons and Lords.

Lords still saw *Summary Account* as a ‘malicious and scurrilous Libel’ on Parliament and sought action against the author although there is no further mention of this pamphlet in records of the Lords.²⁴⁰ Later in 1696 and in 1697 Thomas Percival, another Whig, produced two pamphlets which in parts had wording remarkably similar to *Summary Account*.²⁴¹ Both Percival and *Summary Account* approved of how the Commons and Lords ‘unanimously agreed’ to support William; both precisely said that the Association in the Lords ‘differs so little from that of the Commons, that I do not transcribe it...’²⁴² Percival also condemned those who maintained that James ‘remains their rightful King’ and wanted subjects to withdraw ‘their bounden Duty and Allegiance’ from William.²⁴³ It is unknown whether Percival was also the author of *Summary Account* or if he copied the earlier pamphlet. However these pamphlets indicate that there were some Whigs prepared to acknowledge that both Houses of Parliament, which had different compositions, supported the new stronger allegiance to William.

These Whig pamphlets wanted to show the popular political support for stronger allegiance to William to defend the settlement from Jacobite threats. Sir Richard Blackmore, another Whig, hailed how both Houses’ Associations ‘equally express’d their unshaken Loyalty to his Majesty and their tender Care and Vigilance for the Happiness of the People...’²⁴⁴ This stronger allegiance and ‘prudent Provisions for the King’s Safety’ reflected the popular mood and showed Parliament was attuned to subjects’ ‘Happiness.’²⁴⁵ Burnet’s *History* recorded that the Lords found ‘the words *Rightful* and *Lawful*’ problematic until the Tory Earl of Rochester, who initially opposed the Revolution, proposed the alternative wording to accomplish ‘the ends of the Association...’²⁴⁶ Blackmore and Burnet, like other Whigs, said that the Tory-

²⁴⁰ ‘House of Lords Journal Volume 15: 7 March 1696’, *Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 15, 1691-1696* (London, 1767-1830), pp. 696-698. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol15/pp696-698> [accessed 27 June 2015].

²⁴¹ Percival’s pamphlets reference events in April and May 1696 while *Summary Account* was dated March 3, 1696. Thomas Percival, *The Rye-House Travestie, or, A True Account and Declaration of the Horrid and Execrable Conspiracy against his Majesty King William...* (London, 1696), pp.54-5, 65-80; idem, *A True and Exact Account of the Rise, Progress, and Contrivance of the horrid Plot and Conspiracy against the LIFE of His Most Sacred Majesty King WILLIAM the Third...* (London, 1697), pp.50, 67-8, 80; B.J., *Summary Account*, p.1.

²⁴² Percival, *Rye-House Travestie*, pp.49-52; B.J., *A Summary Account*, pp.1-3.

²⁴³ Percival, *Rye-House Travestie*, pp.1-3, 7-8, 45-9.

²⁴⁴ Sir Richard Blackmore, *A Short History of the Last Parliament* (n.p., 1699), pp.38-41.

²⁴⁵ Ibid, pp.38-41.

²⁴⁶ Burnet, *History of his Own Time*, p.170.

dominated Lords' Association did the same as the Commons' Association. The different wording suggests some continuing Tory discomfort over the Revolution but also shows that Tories were publicly prepared to go beyond *de facto* theory, which dominated English allegiance debates since 1689. Several Whigs saluted Tories, especially those in the Lords, accepting William as permanent by recognising him as *de jure* King in some form. Outside of Parliament Tories also publicly endorsed the Association.

Sharpe describes criticisms of Tories, like Richmond cleric Abiel Borfet, sympathetic to those refusing the Association, as increasing partisanship. Other historians portray the Association as a Whig triumph in a public discourse with greater numbers participating in politics. Many Tories, like Borfet, said they would take the Association because parliament made it obligatory. Parliament, as Vallance argues, was increasingly seen as an important arbiter in political decisions like allegiance.²⁴⁷ However these studies overlook Tory contributions, in printed polemics and parliamentary speeches, to the popular rhetoric in England supporting stronger allegiance to William, which increased the public pressure to take the Association. Tory diarist John Evelyn recorded 'so many crowding' to take the Association. Evelyn wrote that this Plot 'did much alienate many of' James's 'Friends,' who had sympathised with James, because the 'designe of' the Plot involved 'bringing over a French Army.' Ironically this meant that the Plot seemed likely 'to produce a more perfect establishment of K. William....' Fearing the loss of the Revolution prompted a stronger public embrace of the Revolution settlement in England. Tories were part of the popular rhetoric in England in 1696, which accepted the Association because it defended the Revolution settlement.²⁴⁸

Borfet took the 1689 oath but publicly expressed qualms about the Association because James's right was only forfeitable by James's 'own Act.'²⁴⁹ He doubted the Association would undermine Jacobitism but said he would subscribe to it because parliament made it compulsory.²⁵⁰ In the

²⁴⁷ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.405-6; Pincus, *1688*, pp.441-56, 463-73; Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, pp.154-9; Vallance, 'Protestant Associations,' pp.14-8; idem, 'Decline of Conscience,' pp.78-9.

²⁴⁸ Evelyn, *Diary... Volume V Kalendarium*, pp.242-3, 231-3.

²⁴⁹ Abiel Borfet, *The Minister of Richmond's Reasons for Refusing to subscribe the Association but under the Following Sense with Reflections thereupon* (London, 1696), pp.3-7.

²⁵⁰ Vallance, 'Decline of Conscience,' pp.78-9; Borfet, *Minister of Richmond's Reasons for Refusing*, pp.2-3; Abiel Borfet, *The Minister of Richmond's Sermon upon the Last*

Commons Tory MP Sir John Lowther, like Borfet, described the Association as possibly ‘the work of an enemy to divide us, when we have the need of the greatest union’ but said he would take it because it was compulsory.²⁵¹ Numerous Tories justified taking the Association because it was mandatory. This shows that many Tories were still reluctant to embrace all the implications of the Revolution. However a significant number of Tories publicly accepted that taking the Association was necessary in order to prove their loyalty to William and show that the Revolution settlement was not going to be overturned any time soon.

Prideaux’s letters, which favoured a limited stronger allegiance in 1693, recorded public outrage in Norwich over the *Post Boy* newspaper reporting widespread rejection of the Association in Norwich. He said every word of it was ‘false.’²⁵² Norwich had a reputation as a Nonjuring stronghold where there was Tory-Whig antagonism over the Association.²⁵³ Prideaux’s letter, which said Norwich’s Lord Mayor wanted *Post Boy* prosecuted for libel, claimed that, as elsewhere in England, there was widespread subscription to the Association in Norwich.²⁵⁴ Nonconformist Abraham de la Pryme recorded that ‘few or none’ in England refused the Association.²⁵⁵ Tories were not shying from taking the Association. Their public utterances may not have been as enthusiastic as Whigs but Tories were also justifying subscription to the Association as a mandatory security measure defending William and the settlement. The Church of England’s leadership, including Whig and Tory bishops, showed unity in condemning Collier and Nonjurors who attended the condemned plotters. Collier’s actions were described as an ‘open affront to the Laws both of Church and State.’²⁵⁶ Senior bishops, including Tories like Henry Compton, condemned Nonjurors as lawbreakers.²⁵⁷ Many Tories, like Whigs, publicly accepted that William’s lawfully established settlement was permanent and James could not legitimately take the kingship from William.

Thanksgivingday. Published to prevent or stifle false Reports...(London, 1696), pp.1-3, 7-9, 17-27.

²⁵¹ HMC *Hastings Vol. II*, p.259.

²⁵² Humphrey Prideaux, ‘Norwich, 15 April 1696,’ *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux*, pp.169-70.

²⁵³ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, pp.158-9.

²⁵⁴ Humphrey Prideaux, ‘Norwich, 15 April 1696,’ *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux*, pp.169-70.

²⁵⁵ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, pp.154-5.

²⁵⁶ John Williams, *A Declaration of the Sense of the Archbishops and Bishops...and the Scandalous Proceedings of certain Clergy...*(London, 1696), pp.10-1.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid*, pp.1-10, 13-4.

Whigs and many Tory polemicists retained differences over aspects of the Revolution, like resistance, but contributed to this popular rhetoric advocating stronger allegiance to William. Frequently their polemics used similar language. Henry Meriton's April 1696 sermon denounced those disputing 'against the Right of his present Majesty, and assert, he hath no Right at all....'²⁵⁸ Mark Knights describes Meriton's sermon as 'Lockean.'²⁵⁹ Meriton expressed Whig desires to limit royal prerogative but also employed providential theories. Where Sherlock said providence made William *de facto* King, Meriton argued that providence gave William an 'undoubted Right to the Crown he wears' and subjects supported this.²⁶⁰ J.C.D. Clark argues that Whigs and Tories employed providential arguments.²⁶¹ Both also used providence to justify this stronger allegiance. *The Revolution Justified* denounced allegiance to William as *de facto* King as 'false and scandalous.' This pamphlet argued that providence took James's right and gave William a divine and legal right. William was owed 'allegiance according to the Law.'²⁶² This stronger allegiance protected the continued establishment of liberties and Protestantism from Jacobite 'Subversion.'²⁶³

Francis Gregory was a traditional Tory.²⁶⁴ His post-Plot thanksgiving sermon used providence and Non-Resistance ideas to praise the stronger allegiance to William. Gregory said that it was 'not our Business to *dispute*' William's '*Title*, but to *acquiesce* under his Government, to submit to his Laws, Health, and Prosperity, and to obey his just Commands.' Providence enthroned and preserved William. This obliged obedience to William and led to the post-Plot's stronger allegiance when William had 'a *greater* Share in the Affection of his Loyal Subjects....' William was now 'setled... more *firmly* upon his Throne; ever as a *Tree*, which, being *shook* now and then by the

²⁵⁸ Henry Meriton, *A Sermon Preacht at the Cathedral Church in Norwich, upon the 11th of April, 1696. The Day of His Majesties Coronation* (London, 1696), pp.21-2.

²⁵⁹ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, p.156.

²⁶⁰ Henry Meriton, *A Sermon Preacht at the Cathedral Church in Norwich*, pp.6-7, 21-4. For more on Sherlock see Chapters Two, Three and Eight.

²⁶¹ J.C.D Clark, *English Society 1660-1832* (Cambridge, 2000), pp.86-90.

²⁶² *The Revolution Justified, From the Principles of Reason and Scripture: or, a New Discourse Concerning The Nature of Government and Subjection in Free States...* (London, 1697), pp.37-8, 12-3, 16-7. For more on polemicists using providential theory in allegiance polemics see Chapter Eight.

²⁶³ *Ibid*, pp.3-40. See Chapters Four, Five and Six.

²⁶⁴ Newton E. Key, 'Gregory, Francis (1623-1707),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2005 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11462, accessed 15 June 2014].

Wind, is abought to root the deeper....'²⁶⁵ Gregory may not have mentioned the Association by name but his analogy can be seen as praise for this stronger allegiance to William.

In 1689-90 Edward Fowler justified *de facto* theory with Non-Resistance and Conquest ideas. By 1696 he argued that God preserved William, confirming William's 'Right' to subjects' 'Obedience.' Subjects should show their appreciation for this by asserting loyalty to William.²⁶⁶ Fowler warned that even with the Association England should remain vigilant for 'wicked men' who would take the Association in order to advance a conspiracy.²⁶⁷ Tony Claydon argues that many Williamite sermons saw providence as more important than legal reasoning.²⁶⁸ Pincus and Vallance argue that the Association indicates an increasingly secular English politics while Gerald Straka argues that providence remained important to English politics throughout William's reign.²⁶⁹ To Whigs, like Meriton, and Tories, like Fowler and Gregory, providence was inseparable from legal reasoning. Parliament, a secular institution, was becoming more important in political discourse but, as Chapters Five and Six showed, there remained a strong religious element, especially with the Associations, to the allegiance debates. Whigs and Tories found providence useful in justifying the new stronger allegiance to William. They presented William's continued reign as a sign of divine approval for the Revolution settlement and James's continued exclusion. Providence enthroned William as the lawful King and the law obliged allegiance to William as *de jure* King in some form.²⁷⁰ Many Whig and Tory polemics aired similar rhetoric advocating stronger allegiance to William.

Tory Samuel Hill's 1696 pamphlet on allegiance, expanding on his 1692 treatise, also promoted this stronger allegiance. *Debate on the Justice and*

²⁶⁵ Francis Gregory, *A Thanksgiving Sermon for the Deliverance of our King from the late intended Assassination...* (London, 1696), pp.9-11.

²⁶⁶ Edward Fowler, *A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords in the Abby-Church at Westminster, upon Thursday the sixteenth of April, 1696 being a day of Publick Thanksgiving...* (London, 1696), pp.2-3, 8-13. See Chapter Two for his use of the Non-Resistance doctrine and Chapter Three for his use of Conquest theory.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp.34-6.

²⁶⁸ Tony Claydon, 'The Sermon Culture of the Glorious Revolution: Williamite Preaching and Jacobite Anti-preaching, 1685-1702,' in Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington & Emma Rhatigan (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2014), pp.481-3.

²⁶⁹ Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, pp.202-10; Pincus, pp.440-58, 463-8; Gerald Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962), pp.88-97, 120-6; *idem.*, 'The Final Phase of Divine Right in England, 1688-1702,' *The English Historical Review*, 77, No. 305 (Oct., 1962), pp.644-5, 654-8.

²⁷⁰ See Chapter Eight for more on Providential Theory.

Piety of the Present Constitution defended allegiance to William as *de facto* King, showing that Hill remained uncomfortable with viewing William as *de jure* King in the traditional understanding. However Hill also described William as being something more than a *de facto* King. ‘Extra-lineal Kings,’ like William, ‘may be Lawful Successors too.’²⁷¹ Hill’s language was equivocal but this 1696 pamphlet can be seen as defending *de facto* theory and stronger allegiance to William given the references to William’s ‘legal Title to Allegiance.’ James, dispossessed ‘in a legal Actual Settlement,’ had no ‘just and real Right to the Crown’ and allegiance.²⁷² In 1688 William ‘had no Right’ to ‘injure King *James* in any his Personal, or Royal Rights’ but James’s flight removed ‘Legal Obstacles’ to William’s enthronement. This providentially supported act ‘nulled all Rights, and Titles’ including James’s entitlement to allegiance.²⁷³ Henry VII’s enthronement showed that it was ‘lawful’ in 1688-9 to make an ‘Extra-lineal Reign’ and for subjects ‘to pay their Allegiance’ to ‘Extra-lineal’ monarchs.²⁷⁴ Despite his rival Yorkist’s ‘better’ right Henry VII was accepted, likewise William was given allegiance ‘as visibly Legal tho not lineally Rightful’ monarch.²⁷⁵ This echoed Prideaux and Hill’s 1692-3 comments.²⁷⁶ Hill accepting William as a ‘visibly Legal’ King was another Tory contribution to the popular rhetoric advocating stronger allegiance to William. In a hereditary monarchy William was not a traditional *de jure* King but numerous Tories gave William allegiance and recognised him as more than a *de facto* King. Recognising William as a ‘Legal’ or ‘Lawful’ King or having ‘*a RIGHT BY LAW*’ showed Tory commitment to preserving the Revolution settlement from Jacobitism; a marked change in rhetoric from their hesitance in 1689.²⁷⁷

Historiography on the mid-1690s generally focuses on English Whig-Tory antagonism. Where the Association is mentioned it is presented as a Whig triumph with Whig ideas becoming more popular. Pincus argues that 1696

²⁷¹ Samuel Hill, *A Debate on the Justice and Piety of the Present Constitution: Under King William. In Two Parts* (London, 1696), pp.58-9.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, pp.112-3.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp.58-9, 89.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.41-6.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.60-3.

²⁷⁶ Prideaux, ‘Norwich, December 4, 1693,’ *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux*, pp.157-9; Hill, *Solomon and Abiathar*, pp.3-6, 8-12, 33.

²⁷⁷ Hill, *Debate*, p.60-3; Gregory, *Thanksgiving Sermon*, pp.9-11; B.J., *Summary Account*, p.2.

witnessed *de facto* theory being publicly undermined.²⁷⁸ However this occurred because 1696 intensified the divisions on stronger allegiance that developed from 1693. By 1696 it was no longer Whigs primarily urging stronger allegiance to William; the popular mood in England clearly favoured allegiance to William as *de jure* King in some form. Both Whigs and Tories contributed to this popular rhetoric.²⁷⁹ Some Tories, like the Earl of Nottingham, refused the Association and this stalled their political careers under William.²⁸⁰ Tories and Whigs remained divided over aspects of the Revolution, like whether there was justifiable resistance, but there was a common support for William's continued reign. Popular subscription to the Association and polemics by Whigs and numerous Tories indicate greater public acceptance of the Revolution settlement as permanent by recognising William as having a greater legitimacy than James. Jacobites Ferguson and Lawton described allegiance to William as *de jure* King as accepting William and the Revolution as the 'Lawful Establishment.'²⁸¹ This shows how English views on allegiance and political thought on the Revolution evolved. Chapters One through Three showed the initial popular hesitance to accept William before, as Chapters Four through Six showed, growing acceptance of allegiance to William as supporting a Revolution that was more extensive than a personnel change. In England, as in Scotland, allegiance to William as *de jure* King meant publicly accepting these changes as the legitimate order, which Jacobites would not overturn. One 1697 pamphlet on re-coinage said it was impossible for 'Non-Associators' to 'pass with the People for Patriots....'²⁸² Allegiance to William as *de jure* King, through the Association, was necessary for public credibility in England from 1696. As in Scotland, England's public discourse divided between a pro-Revolution majority and Jacobite minority with *de facto* theory marginalised.

IV

²⁷⁸ Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, pp.202-10; Pincus, *1688*, pp.440-58, 463-8.

²⁷⁹ Atwood, *Reflections*, pp.1-2, 23-7, 34-9, 48-51, 56-9, 62-3; Defoe, *Dialogue*, pp.18-9, 22-5, 29-30; Gregory, *Thanksgiving Sermon*, pp.9-11; Hill, *Debate on Justice*, pp.58-60; Blackmore, *Short History of the Last Parliament*, pp.7-8, 45-50.

²⁸⁰ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.532-3.

²⁸¹ Ferguson, *A Letter to Mr. Secretary Trenchard*, pp.6-7; Lawton, *Vindication of the Dead*, p.4.

²⁸² *Reflections upon a Scandalous Libel, Entitled, An Account of the Proceedings of the House of Commons, in Relation to the Re-Coining the Clipp'd Money, and Falling the Prince of Guineas* (London, 1697), pp.40-1.

As in England and Scotland *de facto* theory dominated Irish allegiance during the early years of William's reign.²⁸³ The idea that an allegiance oath to William as *de jure* King would protect the Revolution settlement also became a feature of Irish discourse. Ireland's constitutional position as a Kingdom subordinate to England complicated specifically Irish polemics on this issue. Early Irish Williamite polemics stated that highlighting differences between *de facto* and *de jure* monarchs was pedantry. Tory Sir Richard Cox, one of Ireland's foremost jurists, claimed that *de facto* and *de jure* were 'but terms of Art,' an 'Imaginerary Notion,' because Irish subjects were constitutionally obliged to follow England's lead on allegiance. In 1689 that was allegiance to William as *de facto* King.²⁸⁴ Ireland, according to William King, was 'a Kingdom dependent on the Crown of *England*, and part of the Inheritance thereof, and therefore must follow its fate....' William and Mary, 'rightful Possessors' of the English throne, were owed the same allegiance in Ireland as England.²⁸⁵ Ulster Protestant Andrew Hamilton claimed that action was only taken at Enniskillen after the English Convention 'transferr'd' allegiance to William and Mary.²⁸⁶ Ireland's constitutional position allowed Irish Williamites to argue that they were obliged to follow England's decisions on allegiance.

The Irish Parliament's 1692 *Act of Recognition*, like Cox and King, reasserted the existing constitutional order by describing the English monarch's 'Undoubted Right' to Ireland. Whether William and Mary were *de jure* or *de facto* monarchs was not mentioned but the Act pledged allegiance to them as rulers of Ireland through the constitutional connexion. Irish subjects were 'Duty bound' to 'Recognize and Acknowledge that the Kingdom of *Ireland*, and all Titles, Stiles, Royalties, Jurisdiction, Rights... thereunto belonging are most Rightfully and Lawfully vested in' William and Mary.²⁸⁷ While acknowledging William and Mary's 'Rights' this did not label them *de jure*

²⁸³ Eccleshall, 'Anglican Political thought in the Century after the Revolution,' pp.48-59. See Chapters One through Three.

²⁸⁴ Sir Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana...* (London, 1689), pp.296-8. See Chapter One.

²⁸⁵ William King, *The State of the Protestants of Ireland...* (London, 1691), pp.106-7.

²⁸⁶ Andrew Hamilton, *A True Relation of the Actions of the Inniskilling men* (London, 1690), pp.8, 11.

²⁸⁷ 'An Act of Recognition of their Majesties Undoubted Right to the Crown of Ireland,' *Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament, Begun at Dublin the Fifth Day of October, Anno Dom. 1692...* (Dublin, 1692), Chapter I, pp.3-4.

monarchs as the Scottish Assurance or English Association did. The ‘Kings and Queens of *England*’ had the ‘same’ rights and authority in Ireland as in England.²⁸⁸ Conquest theories, anxieties over Catholic Jacobites and notions that William protected liberties were also evident in the Act.²⁸⁹ This first Act of the first post-Revolution Irish Parliament focused on recognising William and Mary’s authority in Ireland. Despite the strong language there was no accompanying oath; it was reasserting that Ireland would follow England’s decisions on allegiance. From 1690 that was allegiance to William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs.²⁹⁰

Irish Williamite polemics, like many English tracts, frequently declared allegiance to William without being specific. Mary’s death provoked outpourings of grief, similar to English Williamites, from Irish Protestants. Eulogies on Mary reaffirmed allegiance to William. Nonconformists Nathaniel Weld and Joseph Boyse commended ‘her interest and influence’ which was ‘so serviceable both in beginning and confirming the late merciful *Revolution*....’ Both reasserted ‘loyal affection’ without specifying if William was *de jure* King.²⁹¹ Many Irish Williamites would also adapt English rhetoric on allegiance to William as *de jure* King.

Following the 1696 Plot this was particularly noticeable when Irish Williamites re-stated their obligation to follow England’s decisions on allegiance. Cork Anglican William Neale’s 1696 thanksgiving sermon used the same language as English 1696 thanksgiving sermons. Neale, like English Anglican Williamites, asserted that providence preserved William; this obliged subjects’ loyalty to William in gratitude for ‘those signal Mercies....’²⁹² He also appeared to criticise the 1689 oaths. Neale noted how the Israelite King David had oaths that were ‘too weak and brittle to bind’ subjects ‘to the

²⁸⁸ Ibid, p.3.

²⁸⁹ See Chapters Three, Six and Four for more on how those issues affected allegiance.

²⁹⁰ ‘Act of Recognition,’ *Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament, Begun at Dublin.... 1692*, Chapter I, pp.3-4.

²⁹¹ Nathaniel Weld, ‘Sermon II,’ *Two Sermons Preach’t on a Day of Fasting and Humiliation, Kept by the Protestant Dissenters in Dublin, On the Sad Occasion of the Death of our Late Gracious Queen* (Dublin, 1695), pp.43-6; Joseph Boyse, ‘Sermon I,’ *Two Sermons Preach’t on a Day of Fasting and Humiliation, Kept by the Protestant Dissenters in Dublin, On the Sad Occasion of the Death of our Late Gracious Queen* (Dublin, 1695), p.6, pp.17-20, 26-7.

²⁹² Walter Neale, *A Sermon Preached in Christ-Church, Cork, In the Kingdom of Ireland: Upon the 23d of April, 1696. Being the Day appointed for a Publick Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Preservation of His Majesty’s Sacred Person...* (London, 1696), p.3. It is very similar to Francis Gregory’s *Thanksgiving Sermon*, pp.9-11.

practice of Loyalty or Fidelity.²⁹³ More stringent allegiance tests were needed to avoid providential punishment for squandering blessings. Subjects should express ‘the Tribute of a grateful Heart by suitable words, in commendation of the Benefactor, no less than acceptance of the Benefit.’ This allegiance would defend the ‘Established Government.’ Recognising William as ‘Established’ showed popular support for his continued rule, repudiating Jacobite efforts to overturn it.²⁹⁴ Neale, like Scottish and English Williamites, portrayed allegiance to William as supporting the law, Protestant monarchy and liberties. ‘This Plot was not only against the King, and Us by consequence in His Person; but actually and personally against our Liberty, our Laws, our Religion, and our Lives.’ Neale said subjects showing ‘Obedience to our King’ was a ‘foundation for the future.’ This was a commitment to maintain the post-Revolution order.²⁹⁵ Neale used providential theory to urge subjects to recognise William’s lawfully ‘Established Government.’²⁹⁶ This stronger allegiance protected the settlement from Jacobite attempts to reverse it.

Dublin Corporation’s 1696 loyal address also copied English rhetoric on stronger allegiance to William. Corporation members said they would take the English Association, which was binding in Ireland. Their address said subscription to the Association was a prerequisite for admission ‘to the freedom of this cittie....’²⁹⁷ The address finished by declaring William ‘the rightfull and lawfull King of these realms, and that neither the late King James nor the pretended Prince of Wales, nor any other person, hath any right whatsoever to the throne.’²⁹⁸ Dublin Corporation, like English and Scottish Williamites, publicly declared allegiance to William as *de jure* King to defend Ireland’s Revolution settlement from Jacobite threats to it.

While Neale and Dublin Corporation imitated English rhetoric, other Irish Williamites felt that constitutionally a specifically Irish Association was needed. Luttrell records that during parliamentary debates some Irish Whigs

²⁹³ Neale, *Sermon*, pp.3-4.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid*, pp.5-6, 12.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid*, pp.17-9.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid*, pp.17-9, 12.

²⁹⁷ Loyal Address of Dublin Corporation, 24 April 1696, *Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin In the Possession of the Municipal Corporation of that City Volume 6*, ed. J.T. Gilbert (Dublin, 1896), pp.138-41.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid*, p.140.

demanded Abjuration of James as part of the Association.²⁹⁹ Irish Lord Chancellor John Methuen described how Abjuration caused ‘great alarm to many’ Anglicans, still uneasy over the Revolution.³⁰⁰ The Irish Parliament rejected the Abjuration clause. William King believed that Abjuration would unnecessarily persecute Catholics. King signed the final-draft Association to demonstrate loyalty to William.³⁰¹ Only a handful of Irish MPs and peers declined the Association.³⁰² While there were relatively few Irish polemics on the Association, other controversies prompted Irish Williamites to discuss the nature of the Revolution and allegiance to William as a rightful and lawful King in a specifically Irish context.

C.I. McGrath describes how in 1698 the English Parliament’s regulating Irish trade provoked debate over the Anglo-Irish constitutional relationship.³⁰³ Chapter Four showed how this controversy saw many Irish Anglicans, in contrast to their earlier conservatism, put greater emphasis on liberties when describing their allegiance to William. Another overlooked aspect of this controversy is how Irish Williamites described William as *de jure* King to portray themselves as enthusiastic embracers of the Revolution’s changes. Irish Whig Sir Francis Brewster claimed that constitutionally William’s position as *de facto* King of England automatically made him *de jure* King in Ireland. ‘It is by our Laws that all the Monarchs of *England*, and amongst the rest his present *Majesty* is declared to be King of *Ireland*, *de Jure*, when King of *England*, *de facto*.’³⁰⁴ Many Irish Williamites accepted the English Convention enthroning William but he did not control Ireland in 1689

²⁹⁹ Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs From September 1678 to April 1714 Volume IV* (Oxford, 1867), pp.261, 264.

³⁰⁰ ‘John Methuen, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, to James Vernon, 12 August 1697, Dublin,’ in *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William III, 1 January- 31 December 1697*, ed. William John Hardy (London, 1927), p.306.

³⁰¹ J.G. Simms, ‘The Establishment of the Protestant Ascendancy 1691-1714,’ in T.W. Moody & W.E. Vaughan (eds.) *New History of Ireland IV Eighteenth-Century Ireland 1691-1800* (Oxford, 1986), pp.20-1; Philip O’Regan, *Archbishop William King of Dublin (1650-1729) and the Constitution in Church and State* (Dublin, 2000), pp.88-9; idem, ‘William King as Bishop and Parliamentarian, 1691-1697,’ in Christopher J. Fauske (ed.) *Archbishop William King and Anglican Irish Context, 1688-1729* (Dublin, 2004), p.100. See Chapter Six for more on King’s views about allegiance and Catholicism.

³⁰² D.W. Hayton, *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians and Parties* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp.36-7; Éamonn Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766 A Fatal Attachment* (Dublin, 2002), pp.108-9.

³⁰³ C.I. McGrath, *The Making of the Eighteenth-Century Irish Constitution: Government, Parliament and the Revenue, 1692-1714* (Dublin, 2000), pp.18-9.

³⁰⁴ Sir Francis Brewster, *A Letter from a Gentleman in the Country, To a Member of the House of Commons in England; in Reference to the Votes of the 14th December, 1697. Relating to the Trade of Ireland...*(Dublin, 1697) pp.16-7.

so Brewster said Irish subjects gave stronger allegiance to William from 1689. Brewster cited James's 1689 Irish Parliament attaining Ireland's 'Brittish Protestants' who 'owned King William their Rightfull Lawfull King' when James controlled Ireland.³⁰⁵ He argued that this earlier embrace of William as *de jure* King proved Irish Protestants' greater enthusiasm for the Revolution in contrast to those championing English parliamentary supremacy, which contradicted the Revolution and constitution.³⁰⁶

Another Irish Williamite pamphlet praised Brewster for showing that William was recognised as *de jure* King in Ireland before England. The author argued that this proved Ireland's constitutional distinctness and Ireland had the 'same Right to hold Parliaments' as England did.³⁰⁷ Although these polemics primarily focused on asserting Irish legislative independence they also show the continuing evolution of Irish Protestants' public views on allegiance and the Revolution. There was no formal oath recognising William as *de jure* King in 1689. However claiming that William was recognised as *de jure* King in Ireland sooner than he had been in England allowed these Irish Williamites to portray themselves as passionate supporters of the Revolution as the lawful order. These declarations also show a popular Irish Anglican resolution not to return to pre-Revolution-style unlawful government.

William Molyneux's famous *Case* has been examined mainly through the prism of Contract theory.³⁰⁸ However Molyneux, like Brewster, also examined the Revolution and allegiance. Molyneux declared loyalty to William as *de jure* King of Ireland, distinct from England's monarchy, in asserting Irish constitutional and parliamentary rights. When the Gaelic Irish submitted to Henry II English Common Law applied to Ireland, which became a '*Separate and Distinct Kingdom*' under King John.³⁰⁹ This was intrinsic to Irish subjects' 'Allegiance to the King of *England*.'³¹⁰ These separate

³⁰⁵ Ibid, pp.24-5.

³⁰⁶ See Chapter Four for more on how English parliamentary supremacy was inconsistent with the increasingly popular belief that allegiance to William supported a monarchy protecting subjects' liberties.

³⁰⁷ *An Answer to a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country, to a Member of the House of Commons On the Votes of the 14th Instant. Relating to the Trade of Ireland* (London, 1698), pp.14-7.

³⁰⁸ Goldie, 'English System of Liberty,' pp.54-5; Jacqueline Hill, 'Ireland without Union: Molyneux and his Legacy,' in John Robertson (ed.) *A Union for Empire: Political Thought and the British Union of 1707* (Cambridge, 1995), pp.279-86. See Chapter Four.

³⁰⁹ William Molyneux, *The Case of Ireland's Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England stated...* (Dublin, 1698), 'To the King,' pp.12-9, 29, 36-8, 40-4.

³¹⁰ Ibid, pp.172-4.

Kingdoms shared a monarch. Whoever legally ascended England's throne 'is *ipso facto King of Ireland*' and Irish subjects were 'oblig'd to Obey him as the Liege Lord.'³¹¹ However allegiance was only given to English rulers with a lawful right and who governed legally. Irish Protestants, unlike English subjects, generally rejected allegiance to Cromwell's illegal rule.³¹² Molyneux accepted that during emergencies, like the Revolution, England had to act for Ireland provided Irish parliamentary approval quickly followed. The English *Act for Abrogating the Oath of Supremacy* was 'Binding' in Ireland because Ireland's Parliament approved it in 1692 and 1695.³¹³ Irish acceptance of the Act was '*purely voluntary*;' it did not give the English Parliament a '*Right*' over Ireland or burden Irish subjects with a '*Duty*' to England's Parliament but showed Irish subjects' enthusiasm for William.³¹⁴ Molyneux and other Irish Williamites asserting Irish legislative autonomy demonstrated that numerous Irish Williamites gave William allegiance as *de jure* King of Ireland, distinct from England. This was accepting all that went with it, like protected liberties and Protestantism, as permanent.

Despite Molyneux's allegiance to William as *de jure* King, his *Case* was seen as promoting disloyalty. Jacobite Charles Leslie exploited Molyneux's criticism of English parliamentary supremacy. Leslie praised Molyneux for demonstrating the illegality of this supremacy and allegiance to William through the *Act Abrogating the Oath of Supremacy*. Accepting this Act made Irish subjects '*Slaves*.'³¹⁵ Molyneux's *Case* allowed Leslie to again portray William's reign as unconstitutional.³¹⁶ 'Imposing the *New Oaths*' was '*a Mill-Stone to the Kingdom of Ireland, as to Carry with it All the Rights and Freedom of that Country into the Bottom of the Sea!*'³¹⁷ Leslie hoped Irish subjects would '*Disown that English Act Appointing the New Oaths*' which was '*contrary to their own Laws, as well as the Laws of God.*' Restoring deprived Nonjurors would help undo the illegal Revolution.³¹⁸ The *Case* gave

³¹¹ Ibid, pp.43-8, 54-64.

³¹² Ibid, pp.99-102.

³¹³ Ibid, pp.109-15.

³¹⁴ Ibid, pp.111-5.

³¹⁵ Charles Leslie, *Considerations of Importance to Ireland in a Letter to a Member of Parliament thereupon Occasion of Mr. Molyneux's Late Book...*(n.p., 1698), pp.2-8.

³¹⁶ Ibid, pp.3-6.

³¹⁷ Ibid, pp.6-7.

³¹⁸ Ibid, p.8.

Leslie another opportunity to denounce allegiance to William as unconstitutional.

Molyneux's perceived disloyalty caused anxiety amongst many English Williamites. The English Commons expressed concern over Molyneux's 'Disobedience' to the English Constitution. 'Disobedience' to English authority showed 'Disobedience' to the *Act for better Security of His Majesty's Person and Government* and so disloyalty to William.³¹⁹ Atwood, fresh from advocating allegiance to William as *de jure* King of England, attacked Molyneux as disloyal. He contended that Ireland, as part of England, must accept English parliamentary authority on issues like allegiance. Atwood traced English monarchs' legal right to Irish allegiance from its 'True Foundation' in Saxon times to William.³²⁰ He argued that Irish submission to Henry II was a legal promise of 'perpetual Allegiance' to English monarchs.³²¹ Laws passed under succeeding monarchs showed that Ireland was not 'a compleat Kingdom' and had to accept English laws. Common Law 'bound' Irish subjects to 'take the Oath of *Allegiance* as the *English* had done;' in 1698 that meant allegiance to William as *de jure* King.³²² Molyneux's thesis dangerously suggested that the 'Right of the *Crown of England over Ireland*' was illegitimate. At a time of sensitivity over William's right, Atwood denounced Molyneux for implying that Irish subjects who served William were somehow not serving 'their *Lawful and Rightful King*.'³²³ If, as Molyneux said, 'every King of *England*, is *ipso facto* King of *Ireland*' then Ireland had to accept English parliamentary authority. William was rightful King of England, which included Ireland. Atwood argued that Irish allegiance to William as *de jure* King meant accepting the Revolution and constitutional settlement as they were.³²⁴

English Whig John Cary wrote two pamphlets attacking Molyneux. His 1698 *Answer* accepted that Ireland's Parliament could make laws but had 'no such Privilege... to rescind and abrogate... Allegiance and Subjection to

³¹⁹ 'House of Commons Journal Volume 12: 30 June 1698,' *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 12: 1697-1699* (London, 1803), pp.336-338. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol12/pp336-338>. Date Accessed 28 March 2015.

³²⁰ William Atwood, *The History and Reasons of the Dependence of Ireland upon the Imperial Crown of the Kingdom of England rectifying Mr. Molyneux's State of the Case...* (London, 1698), pp.11-6.

³²¹ *Ibid*, pp.31-5.

³²² *Ibid*, pp.69-73, 79-85, 109.

³²³ *Ibid*, pp.213-6.

³²⁴ *Ibid*, pp.213-6.

the Head of the Empire....'³²⁵ England's Convention enthroned William. Ireland, legally 'a Member of the *English* Body,' had 'to submit to that Revolution, as *New-England*, or any other of the rest of our Colonies....'³²⁶ Cary argued that Molyneux's rejecting English parliamentary supremacy meant the Revolution would not have come to Ireland. In 1689 Ireland's Parliament passed 'no Act' to 'declare King *James* abdicated, and the Throne vacant' or no 'Discharge of that Duty' subjects 'ow'd to their Lawful King....' James had 'the full Exercise of his *de facto* Kingly Power' in 1689 Ireland. England's Convention and parliamentary supremacy rescued Ireland from James, allowing Irish subjects, like other English subjects, to give William allegiance.³²⁷ In 1698 that meant Irish subjects owed allegiance to William as *de jure* King in order to preserve the Revolution settlement.

Cary's argument that the Revolution was impossible without the English Convention also formed part of his *Vindication of the Parliament of England*, which was republished in 1700. The 1700 'Dedication' described Molyneux's denying English parliamentary supremacy as pleading 'for Arbitrary Power' and a ruler 'without a Just and Lawful Pretence.'³²⁸ Cary cited the *Magna Charta Hiberniae* and other laws to prove that Ireland's Parliament always 'look'd upon themselves obliged to allow of, and pay Obedience to the Laws made by the Parliament of *England*.'³²⁹ Ireland, 'govern'd by the English Laws,' was not a proper Kingdom like Scotland. Since submission to Henry II Ireland was 'annexed to the Crown of *England*....' Scotland gave a 'voluntary Recognition of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, still keeping its own Laws, and leaving a possibility of its becoming a separate Kingdom again, which *Ireland* can never be.' England's Convention 'declared' William and Mary 'King and Queen of *Ireland*,' therefore 'The People of *Ireland*, I mean the *English* and *Britains*' were 'subject to the Legislative Power of *England*....'³³⁰ Cary repeatedly argued that Irish Williamites, like Molyneux, accepted English parliamentary supremacy

³²⁵ John Cary, *An Answer to Mr. Molyneux his Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England... and his dangerous notion of Ireland's being under no subordination to the Parliamentary authority of England refuted...* (London, 1698), pp.66-7.

³²⁶ *Ibid*, pp.119-22.

³²⁷ *Ibid*, pp.63, 100-1, 121.

³²⁸ John Cary, *A Vindication of the Parliament of England, In Answer to a Book, Written by William Molyneux of Dublin, Esq; Intituled, The Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England, stated* (London, 1700), 'Dedication.'

³²⁹ *Ibid*, pp.1-4, 22-3, 28-30, 121-2, 35.

³³⁰ *Ibid*, pp.40-1, 82-5, 45-6.

when it suited them. Without English parliamentary supremacy Ireland would have remained in allegiance to James and not have a lawful King like William.³³¹

From 1698 Irish and English Williamites debated whether English parliamentary supremacy over Ireland was constitutional. Atwood and Cary claimed that Ireland was part of England and William owed allegiance as *de jure* King of England. Molyneux and Brewster asserted that Ireland was constitutionally distinct from England and William owed allegiance as *de jure* King of Ireland. Both sides disagreed over Ireland's constitutional position but agreed that subjects in Ireland owed William allegiance as *de jure* King. By 1698 it was clear that many Irish Williamites would give allegiance to William as *de jure* King in some form. This showed that Irish Williamites supported Ireland's Revolution settlement, and the limited changes associated with it, as permanent and irreversible.

V

By 1698 William was given allegiance as *de jure* King in each Kingdom. *De facto* theory, dominant during the early years of William's reign, became obscured in each Kingdom's allegiance debates by increasingly loud declarations from Jacobites and Williamites that allegiance was owed only to *de jure* monarchs. Williamites declared allegiance to William as *de jure* King with justifications generally specific to each Kingdom. Chapters Four through Six showed how allegiance to William and James symbolised more than just loyalty to the monarch's person. Allegiance to William as *de jure* King endorsed the changes the Revolution introduced as permanent. In Scotland, the first Kingdom to declare William *de jure* King, the Revolution settlement's legality, especially surrounding the Kirk, was the deciding factor in whether allegiance could be given to William as *de jure* King through the Assurance. Presbyterian Williamites and some Williamite Episcopalians urged subjects to subscribe to this in defence of Scotland's Revolution settlement as a permanent legal establishment. This was a response to Jacobite threats and Episcopalian Jacobite polemics pledging to undo the Revolution. From 1693 some English Whigs, as part of growing English calls for allegiance to William as *de jure*

³³¹ Ibid, pp.90-1, 120-2.

King, wanted England to replicate the Assurance. Combined with Jacobite assertions that the Revolution was illegal and that James alone was *de jure* King, *de facto* theory was no longer publicly credible by 1696. Following the 1696 Assassination Plot, despite the burgeoning party system, English Whigs and many Tories contributed to the popular rhetoric in England advocating allegiance to William as *de jure* King in some form. This was publicly endorsing William and the Revolution settlement and permanently excluding James. Irish debate over *de jure* rule was disjointed. Some Irish Williamites copied English polemics while others debated whether William's legal right in Ireland was separate to his English right but nonetheless recognised him as *de jure* King in Ireland. Allegiance to William as *de jure* King meant subjects were publicly accepting William as the sole legitimate King with terminology echoing Mackenzie's *Jus Regium*. Scottish, English and Irish Protestant political thought was now essentially divided between pro-Revolution majorities, accepting the Revolution settlements as permanent, and Jacobite minorities with *de facto* theory obscured by these positions.

Many Williamites, like Neale, Gregory and Meriton, justified this stronger allegiance to William with providential theory. The 1697 Ryswick Treaty, ending the war with France, was seen as another providential intervention in the allegiance debates. Across the Kingdoms Williamites would present Ryswick as a final providential endorsement of allegiance to William and the Revolution as permanent.

Chapter Eight: Providential Theory in the Late 1690s.

By the late 1690s *de facto* theory was marginalized in the allegiance debates across the Three Kingdoms. Chapter Seven showed how popular subscription to oaths recognising William as *de jure* King gave his reign an air of legality and constitutional permanence. This effectively divided the Kingdoms between pro-Revolution Williamites and Jacobites. There was a resurgent use of providential theory, the idea that God endorsed one of the monarchs, in late-1690s allegiance polemics. The Treaty of Ryswick, Darien Crisis and other events were treated as God's final intervention in the allegiance debates. Historiography has not examined the late-1690s use of providence in allegiance polemics. Most historians focus on the early 1690s and follow J.P. Kenyon's argument that William Sherlock's *Case of Allegiance* resulted in providential theory being 'discredited' as polemicists gravitated towards other ideas.¹ Several historians have examined Sherlock and the use of providential theory in the early-1690s English allegiance debates.² Some historians have noted continued use of providential theory in Williamite propaganda into the late 1690s but its effect on the changing allegiance debates across the Kingdoms is neglected.³ Chapter Seven showed how *de facto* theory was increasingly marginalised in the public discourse; therefore late-1690s polemics employing providential theory were different to how Sherlock and other early-1690s polemics used it.

¹ Mark Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument,' *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 83 (1980), pp.480-90, 556-8; David Martin Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (Rochester, 1999) pp.206-11, 214-6, 265-7; Edward Vallance, 'The Kingdom's Case: The Use of Casuistry as a Political Language 1640-1692,' *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 34, No.4 (Winter, 2002), p.558; J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (Cambridge, 1990), pp.26-30, 75-80, 169.

² Gerald Straka, 'The Final Phase of Divine Right Theory in England, 1688-1702,' *The English Historical Review*, 77, No. 305 (Oct., 1962), pp.638-58; Charles Mullet, 'A Case of Allegiance: William Sherlock and the Revolution of 1688,' *The Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 10, No. 1 (Nov., 1946); Kenneth Padley, 'Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution: William Sherlock and William of Orange,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 59, No. 4, (Oct., 2008), pp.680-96; H.T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London, 1977), pp.14-5, 23, 35-8.

³ Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996), pp.11-3, 67-71, 148-51, 157-9; Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford, 1999), pp.20, 24-7, 137, 140-1; Gerald Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962), pp.79-86, 119-20, 125-6; idem, 'Final Phase of Divine Right theory,' pp.641-6, 656; Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy 1660-1714* (London, 2013), pp.368-78, 470-3, 477, 489-90, 496-9; J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832...*(Cambridge, 2000), pp.79, 86-9.

This chapter explores the overlooked use of providential theory in late-1690s allegiance debates when Williamites in each Kingdom used events, like Ryswick, as evidence of a final providential endorsement of allegiance to William. Before exploring these Williamite polemics this chapter examines Jacobite use of providential theory throughout the 1690s. Existing research on Jacobite use of providential theory has been limited and tends to focus on how this was a common seventeenth-century polemical tool and isolates these polemics from the allegiance debates.⁴ Providence, the idea that events showed God's intervention and His approval or disapproval in political affairs, was popular with polemicists from diverse backgrounds across the Kingdoms. It was 'the age's leading concept' in casuistry and disseminated, like other ideas, through pamphlets and sermons. Major political debates in the seventeenth century, like the Engagement Controversy and Exclusion Crisis, saw widespread use of providential theory to justify political positions.⁵ Religious services with sermons were very popular with Protestant and Catholic congregations.⁶ This meant that subjects across the Kingdoms were receptive to providential arguments from Williamites and Jacobites.

There is plenty of research on early-1690s Williamite providential arguments, especially Sherlock's, but generally in single-Kingdom studies. In England both Whigs and Tories asserted that providence enthroned William and this obliged allegiance to him as *de facto* King. This view was quite popular. Sherlock's *Case* was the most widely distributed pamphlet of the

⁴ Historians who have briefly touched on Jacobite use of providential theory in propaganda: Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester, 1994), p.68; Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (London, 1980), pp.19, 50-1, 70-7; idem, 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the ideology of Jacobitism' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759* (Edinburgh, 1982), pp.42, 56-7; Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989), pp.16, 20, 27-8, 60, 92, 127-32, 146, 167; Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance*, pp.217-8; Clark, *English Society*, pp.88-90.

⁵ Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, pp.79, 83; Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2001), passim; Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance*, passim; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, passim; Alasdair Raffe, 'Religious Controversy and Scottish Society, c.1679-1714,' (University of Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 2007), pp.9-10; Tony Claydon, 'The Sermon, the "Public Sphere" and the Political Culture of Late Seventeenth-Century England,' in Lori Anne Ferrell & Peter McCullough (eds.) *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1660-1750* (Manchester, 2000), pp.208-19; Lois G. Schworer, 'Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89,' *The American Historical Review*, 82, No. 4 (Oct., 1977), pp.843-4, 871.

⁶ Joris Van Eijnen, 'Reaching audiences: Sermons and orators in Europe,' in Stewart J. Brown & Timothy Tackett (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Christianity Volume 7* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.130-3; Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, pp.83-5.

allegiance debates.⁷ Irish historians have noted that providential arguments were popular with Irish Williamites.⁸ Scottish historiography on early-1690s providential theories is limited. Some, like Clare Jackson, argue that providence was either rare or of limited use in Scottish polemics while others, like Jeffrey Stephen, note that several Presbyterians described the Revolution as providential.⁹ However early-1690s Williamite providential arguments were remarkably similar across the Kingdoms.

Chapter Two showed how providence was often combined with the Non-Resistance doctrine to defend allegiance to William but it was also frequently used without Non-Resistance, especially by non-Anglican authors. Sherlock's *Case* was unoriginal and used several ideas but gave a simple explanation of how providence set 'over us a new King' and transferred 'our Allegiance' to William the *de facto* King.¹⁰ *Allegiance and Prerogative Considered*, a 1689 Scottish Williamite Episcopalian polemic, said that the 'remarkable Providence' at the Revolution 'granted a clear Dispensation from the oaths to K. James.'¹¹ Williamite Episcopalian James Canaries also described the Revolution as providential.¹² Scottish Presbyterian Sir James Steuart said that William's 1688 Declaration and other incidents showed God's

⁷ Padley, 'Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution,' Charles Mullet, 'A Case of Allegiance: William Sherlock and the Revolution of 1688,' pp.83-103; Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689,' pp.490, 557; Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, pp.79-86, 119-20, 125-6; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.368-78, 470-3, 477, 489-90, 496-9; Clark, *English Society*, pp.86-90.

⁸ Robert Eccleshall, 'Anglican Political Thought in the Century after the Revolution of 1688,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1993), pp.42-3; idem, 'The Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland in the 1690s,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (London, 2001), pp.65, 70; D.W Hayton, *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians and Parties* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp.9-10, 24-7; J.I. McGuire, 'The Church of Ireland and the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688,' in Art Cosgrove & Donal McCartney (eds.) *Studies in Irish History Presented to R. Dudley Edwards* (Dublin, 1979), pp.138-46.

⁹ T.N. Clarke, 'The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* XXIV, Part I (1990), pp.40-2; idem, 'The Scottish Episcopalians 1688-1720,' (University of Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 1987), pp.12-3, 41-2; Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690: Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp.191-2, 203, 220; Jeffrey Stephen, *Defending the Revolution The Church of Scotland 1689-1716* (Farnham, 2013), pp.19-24.

¹⁰ William Sherlock, *The Case of Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers, stated and Resolved...* (Dublin, 1691), pp1-2. See Chapters Two and Three for Sherlock's use of Non-Resistance and Conquest ideas.

¹¹ Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative Considered in a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to his Friend, upon his being chosen a Member of the Meeting of States in Scotland...* (n.p., 1689), pp.4-6. See Chapter One for this pamphlet's use of History and Chapter Two for its use of the Non-Resistance doctrine.

¹² James Canaries, *A Sermon Preached at Edinburgh, In the East-Church of St. Giles, upon the 30th of January, 1689...* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp.14-5, 39-41, 46-50, 84-7. Canaries also used ideas like History, Non-Resistance and Conquest and these are examined in Chapter One, Two and Three.

‘providences’ at work in the Revolution. This justified allegiance to William and Mary.¹³ Irish Williamites also used providence to justify allegiance to William. Anglican William King described the Revolution as a ‘Providence of which we so little dreamt.’ God sent William ‘to be a Deliverer to us’ and this was one reason justifying allegiance to William.¹⁴ Other Irish Protestants also described the Revolution as a providential deliverance.¹⁵ There was a popular use of providence to justify allegiance to William as *de facto* King in early-1690s polemics that were remarkably similar in each Kingdom and these similarities can also be seen in the late-1690s polemics.

However some Williamites argued that using providence to justify allegiance to William was inappropriate. Williamites and Jacobites criticised Sherlock for different reasons but two important Williamite criticisms were that providence could justify any political platform and that this religious idea should not be used in secular politics.¹⁶ Some Whigs, like Contract theorists Pierre Allix and Samuel Johnson, denounced Williamites who justified allegiance to William as *de facto* King with providential theory. Johnson said it was absurd to claim that God would support a *de facto* ruler because *de facto* theory implied that William had no moral right to rule. ‘A Revelation sent on purpose from Heaven, cannot oblige us to be Subjects to an Usurper under that Notion, because it is a Notion of Wrong, and God Himself cannot make Wrong to be Right.’¹⁷ Allix argued that providence was an imperfect argument to justify allegiance because legitimate and illegitimate rulers used it to defend their positions. God ‘is said to settle Tyrants, as well as the most lawful Kings.’ This meant that ‘Expressions relating to’ God’s ‘Providence... can have no

¹³ Sir James Steuart, *Salus Populi Suprema Lex, or, The Free Thoughts of a Well-wisher for a Good Settlement in a letter to a Friend* (n.p., 1689), pp.4-8.

¹⁴ William King, *The State of the Protestants of Ireland under the Late King James’s Government...* (London, 1691), pp.9-11, 57, 142, 225-8. King also used Non-Resistance and Conquest ideas and these are explored in Chapters Two and Three.

¹⁵ Sir Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana...* (London, 1689), ‘To the Reader;’ Andrew Hamilton, *A True Relation of the Actions of the Inniskilling-Men* (London, 1690), ‘To their Most Excellent Majesties, William and Mary, King and Queen of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, &c.,’ pp.52, 56-7.

¹⁶ Straka, *Anglican Reaction*, pp.32-5, 65-71, 126-7.

¹⁷ Samuel Johnson, *An Argument Proving, that the Abrogation of King James by the People of England from the Regal Throne...* (London, 1692), pp.12-3. See Chapter Seven for Johnson’s criticisms of *de facto* theory. Johnson also used History and commented on Non-Resistance, Conquest and Contract theories and these are explored in Chapters One, Two, Three and Four.

Influence upon the Judgements we are to make concerning the Authority of Princes, with regard to their Divine Institution.’¹⁸

Tory Edward Fowler acknowledged that using providence ‘alone’ to justify allegiance was ‘very fallible’ but believed that ‘the very many Amazing Providences’ in the Revolution could not be ignored when justifying allegiance. If combined with other ideas, like Non-Resistance or Conquest, it would be ‘enough... to Convince our greatest Unbelievers’ that William and Mary were the monarchs ‘and that they have the Broad Seal of Heaven...’¹⁹ In the early 1690s Williamite providential arguments were popular in all Three Kingdoms but there were some Williamites who disliked their fellow Williamites for using providential theories. There was also several Jacobites who attacked Williamite providential polemics, especially Sherlock’s, but historiography has only briefly commented on Jacobite polemics using providential theory.²⁰ Jacobite use of providential theory to justify allegiance to James was more extensive than existing historiography suggests.

I

Some Jacobite criticisms of Sherlock and Williamite providential arguments were similar to how Allix and Johnson argued that providence would not support morally or legally dubious enterprises. English Nonjuror Robert Jenkin said that providence was no ‘Authority for’ such ‘Usurpations.’ Providence may temporarily replace a ruler but that did not mean there was any ‘alteration in the Duty of Subjects.’ Williamites were wrong to use providence to claim that subjects were ‘discharged from their Duty and Oaths of Allegiance.’²¹ Gerald Straka says that Jenkin expressed a belief that providence would restore James.²² Jenkin and numerous other Jacobite providential arguments asserted that providence would restore James and expressed hope that providence would convince subjects to return their allegiance to James.

¹⁸ Pierre Allix, *Reflections upon the Opinions of Some Modern Divines, concerning the Nature of Government* (London, 1689), p.15.

¹⁹ Edward Fowler, *A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England, Who have Sworn Allegiance to K. William and Q. Mary...* (London, 1689), p.14.

²⁰ Some of the few historians to comment on Jacobite use of providential theory are: Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.28-37; Straka, ‘Final Phase,’ pp.654-7; Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, passim; Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, p.122.

²¹ Robert Jenkin, *The Title of a Thorough Settlement Examined; in Answer to Dr. Sherlock’s Case of Allegiance...* (London, 1691), pp.14, 8, 32.

²² Straka, ‘Final Phase of Divine Right Theory,’ pp.655-6.

This was just one way in which Jacobites used providential theory and this was frequently used in responses to specific Williamite providential arguments. Another popular Jacobite providential argument was to assert that God was punishing the Kingdoms for violating allegiance to James. If subjects returned their allegiance to James and actively worked for his restoration then this retribution would end. Irish Catholic Jacobite Edmond Dulaney's 1689 sermon used this second argument.²³ Craig Rose has been one of the few historians to note how Jacobites used providence to exploit economic problems, military defeats and other controversies to justify Jacobite plots but only briefly mentions allegiance.²⁴ Many of these grievances formed part of this second Jacobite providential argument justifying allegiance to James. This section explores how these two major Jacobite providential arguments impacted on allegiance debates throughout the 1690s.

Nonjurors, like Jenkin, were more inclined to the first Jacobite providential argument where they repeatedly argued that James's inevitable restoration through providence meant subjects should declare allegiance to James. Chapter Two explored how numerous Jacobites argued that divine retribution awaited Williamites for breaching the Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance doctrine. Jenkin recalled how in past rebellions God's 'wonderful Providence' cast 'down usurpers....' James's inevitable restoration through providence meant that Williamites would be wise to return allegiance to James.²⁵ Throughout the 1690s English Anglican John Kettlewell asserted that James's guaranteed providential restoration obliged continued allegiance to James. Good Christians should 'Trust in Providence' for James's restoration and ignore William 'the impious and illegal Invader of Religion and Laws.'²⁶ Kettlewell criticised Williamite bishops who replaced Nonjurors and created the 'most sorrowful Breach of Church-Society.'²⁷ God would not support William's usurpation and providence would 'Restore' the rightful James.²⁸

²³ Fr. Edmund Dulaney, *A Sermon Preached Before the King, in Christ-Church, Dublin, on Ash Wednesday 1689...* (Dublin, 1689), pp.6-8. Dulaney also used History and Catholic doctrine to justify allegiance to James and these are explored in Chapters One and Six.

²⁴ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.28-37.

²⁵ Jenkin, *Title of a Thorough Settlement*, pp.14-5, 22-3, 68-9.

²⁶ John Kettlewell, *Christianity, a Doctrine of the Cross, or, Passive Obedience, under any pretended invasion of legal rights...* (London, 1691), p.59.

²⁷ John Kettlewell, *The Declaration and Profession of the Reverend Mr. John Kettlewell...* (n.p., 1695), pp.1-2.

²⁸ John Kettlewell, *The Duty of Allegiance settled upon its True Grounds...in answer to a late book of Dr. William Sherlock...* (London, 1691), pp.19-22.

Samuel Grascome, like Kettlewell, argued that the ‘Mercy of God’ protected James from a similar fate suffered by his father.²⁹ The Kingdoms would feel ‘the Wrath of God’ for breaking their allegiance to James.³⁰ Williamites had ‘prostituted’ the Church of England by giving allegiance to ‘every Usurper.’³¹ Irish-born Nonjuror Henry Dodwell hoped that God would ‘awaken the Consciences’ of Anglicans and that they would return allegiance to James.³² Nonjurors presented James’s restoration as imminent because of providence. They also prayed that providence would make Williamites realise they were wrong on allegiance. The impending deliverance meant that allegiance to James should be maintained and that allegiance to William was a pointless sin.

Some Nonjurors’ polemics argued that if the opportunity arose then subjects should assist James’s restoration but for the most part these polemics were generally passive. They challenged Williamite providential arguments and repeatedly said that subjects would soon see providence restore James to his throne. Theophilus Downes said that providence would never extinguish a legal right partly because legal rights derived from divine right therefore providence could not justify allegiance to William.³³ Providence had restored dispossessed rightful monarchs before and would do so again; it ‘over-rules Men’s Wickedness, and brings Good out of Evil....’³⁴ Thomas Wagstaffe said that Sherlock was wrong about providence; providence would never endorse transferring allegiance.³⁵ Jeremy Collier also lambasted Sherlock for arguing that God would do away with James’s divine right. It was ‘incomprehensible’ to believe that William had any divine favour.³⁶ William’s settlement ‘cannot be termed *Final*’ because ‘Providence may reverse it in a short time.’³⁷ Collier prayed that William would ‘be brought over to Repentance’ and that any violence William intended would be stopped by a ‘remarkable Providence’ to

²⁹ Samuel Grascome, *Considerations upon the Second Canon In the Book Entituled Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, &c.* (London, 1693), pp.22-4.

³⁰ *Ibid*, pp.26-7.

³¹ *Ibid*, pp.22, 26-7.

³² Henry Dodwell, *Concerning the Care of Taking the New Oath of Fealty and Allegiance...* (n.p., 1689), p.9.

³³ Theophilus Downes, *An Examination of the Arguments drawn from Scripture and Reason, in Dr. Sherlock’s Case...* (London, 1691), pp.2-14, 33-4, 42-7, 68-72.

³⁴ *Ibid*, pp.24-5, 52-5, 57-61, 64-8.

³⁵ Thomas Wagstaffe, *An Answer to Dr. Sherlock’s Vindication of The Case of Allegiance...* (London, 1692), pp.14-20, 22, 26-7.

³⁶ Jeremy Collier, *Dr Sherlock’s Case Considered...* (London, 1691), pp.7-8, 20-2, 64-6, 112-6.

³⁷ *Ibid*, pp.122-4, 134-5.

end William's usurpation.³⁸ In 1699 Thomas Ken said that subjects could never be discharged from allegiance and prayed that God would 'bare' His 'holy Arm for our Deliverance' by assisting James in his endeavours.³⁹ English Nonjurors repeatedly said that Williamites were wrong to justify their allegiance with providential arguments and another reason justifying allegiance to James was their belief that providence would restore James.⁴⁰

T.N. Clarke noted that some Scottish Episcopalians refused allegiance to William because they believed providence would restore James.⁴¹ Many Scottish Episcopalians, like English Nonjurors, asserted that allegiance to James was justified because providence would restore James. Examining records of the 1689 Scottish Privy Council shows that this was a popular view amongst Episcopalian clerics expelled from their benefices. Several ministers were brought before the Privy Council for publicly praying for James's restoration.⁴² Episcopalian minister William Naesmith 'not only' refused 'to pray for their Majesties King William and Queen Mary but' prayed 'that God would restore' James 'to his throne and destroy all his enemies, and that God would take the usurper out of the way....'⁴³ These records show that these clerics publicly advocated allegiance to James and had a strong belief that providence would restore James. John Lambie, an Episcopalian cleric accused of being in contact with Viscount Dundee, refused to support William and said that God would restore James.⁴⁴ Roxburgh minister John Kerr also asserted that allegiance to James should be maintained and that James's providential restoration was imminent.⁴⁵ These Scottish Episcopalian clerics, like English Nonjurors, repeatedly asserted that allegiance to James had to be maintained because providence would restore James.

The second major Jacobite providential argument was less passive than English and Scottish Nonjurors' providential arguments. Several Jacobites

³⁸ Jeremy Collier, *A Caution against inconsistency, or, The Connexion between praying and swearing in relation to the civil powers* (n.p., 1690), pp.4-5.

³⁹ Thomas Ken, *The Royal Sufferer. A Manuel of Meditations and Devotions. Written for the Use of a Royal, tho' afflicted Family* (n.p., 1699), 'To the King,' pp.126-7.

⁴⁰ See Chapter Two for how these Nonjurors used Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance to urge allegiance to James.

⁴¹ Clarke, 'The Scottish Episcopalians,' pp.41-3.

⁴² *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland Third Series Volume XIV A.D. 1680-1689*, ed. Henry Paton (Edinburgh, 1932), pp.184, 206-7. See Chapters Two, Five and Seven for more on Episcopalian Jacobites refusing allegiance to William.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p.207.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p.241.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p.360.

used providence to justify allegiance to James and exhort subjects to demonstrate their allegiance by their actions. Subjects had to actively work for a Jacobite restoration, which would bring providential blessings on the Kingdoms. This argument was popular with Jacobites from different religious and political backgrounds. English Anglican Elinor James, one of the first to articulate this position in public letters to the English Convention, called on the Convention to remember their loyalty to James. If James was toppled 'his Fall will be our Ruin.'⁴⁶ God would 'punish' England if subjects broke allegiance to James.⁴⁷ Her letter to the Lords urged its members to 'Crown all your Actions with Loyalty;' this would be rewarded 'not only Here but in Eternity.'⁴⁸ Professing allegiance to James was not enough to prevent providential punishment, actions were also important. Convention members had to show their allegiance by voting against William's enthronement; this would ensure providential favour for England.⁴⁹ Elinor James's providential arguments were published before William's enthronement. This idea that subjects demonstrating their allegiance through their actions would bring providential judgement on the Kingdoms became a feature of Jacobite polemics throughout the 1690s.

Nathaniel Johnston's 1690 *Dear Bargain* listed several grievances that the Kingdoms suffered under William.⁵⁰ Johnston's thesis also used providential theory to urge subjects to declare allegiance to James and take action to support his restoration. He said that those giving William allegiance were guilty of a 'great Perjury.' Johnston, like numerous other Jacobites, said that William's government was, like Cromwell's, 'built upon the most destructive Principles to the Peace and Tranquillity of the Nation' and 'upon our Ruine.'⁵¹ William's enthronement brought 'all the Plagues we dreaded under others, and gives us nothing but the dismal Prospect of all the Misfortunes which can befall a Nation, which hath greatly provoked God Almighty's Anger.'⁵² These 'Plagues' included the war's human and financial

⁴⁶ Elinor James, *Letter to the House of Lords* (n.p., 1689).

⁴⁷ Elinor James, *To the Honourable House of Commons...* (London, 1689), p.1.

⁴⁸ Elinor James, *Letter to the House of Lords* (n.p., 1689).

⁴⁹ Elinor James, *Most Dear Sovereign* (n.p., 1689), p.1.

⁵⁰ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.35-7.

⁵¹ Nathaniel Johnston, *The Dear Bargain...* (n.p., 1690), pp.17-8, 24. See Chapter Four for Johnston's comments on subjects' liberties.

⁵² *Ibid*, p.24.

costs, arbitrary government and attacking subjects' liberties.⁵³ England was being providentially punished for breaking allegiance to James. James 'alone can restore us to our former Tranquillity and Peace' but subjects had to show their allegiance by working for his restoration to confirm providential blessings for England. If subjects did not restore James 'it is morally certain' that James would 'be restored by another hand: For God will not let such Wickedness go unpunished....' James's restoration, either through subjects recalling him or some other providential intervention, would bring 'lasting Peace' and blessings to England.⁵⁴ However Johnston stressed that it was not enough for subjects to deny William allegiance, they had to show their allegiance by actively working for James's restoration to ensure providential blessings for the Kingdoms.

Irish Catholic Jacobite Edmond Dulaney made a similar providential argument. Dulaney's 1689 sermon before James in Dublin, when James still ruled Ireland, said that providence would see James triumphant with his reign re-established across the Kingdoms.⁵⁵ Éamonn Ó Ciardha describes Dulaney's sermon as providential, anti-Protestant and nationalistic.⁵⁶ Like other Jacobite providential arguments, Dulaney argued that providential blessings would return to the Kingdoms if subjects demonstrated their allegiance by actively working for James's triumph. He also used historic and Biblical examples to show subjects' allegiance and actions affected providential judgement. Irish Catholic Jacobites 'need not fear' a 'proud Usurping enemy' because providence was on James's side; maintaining allegiance to James and fighting to ensure he was victorious would bring providential assistance and blessings.⁵⁷ Jacobites from all backgrounds adopted this argument that subjects must demonstrate their allegiance by actively working for James's restoration to ensure providential blessings for subjects and the Kingdoms.

Between 1693 and 1695 Jacobite polemicists exploited William's numerous military setbacks against France.⁵⁸ As the 1690s progressed Jacobites repeatedly used these setbacks as proof that providence disapproved of allegiance to William. In 1693 English Anglican Jacobite Richard Stafford

⁵³ Ibid, p.24.

⁵⁴ Ibid, p.24.

⁵⁵ Dulaney, *A Sermon Preached Before the King*, pp.6-8.

⁵⁶ Éamonn Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766 A Fatal Attachment* (Dublin, 2002), pp.65-6. See Chapter One for Dulaney's use of History and Chapter Six for his descriptions of Catholic allegiance to James.

⁵⁷ Dulaney, *A Sermon Preached Before the King*, pp.19-21.

⁵⁸ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.403-6.

argued that allegiance to William would see ‘the Loss of *Heaven*’ for subjects and the ‘falling into Hell for all Eternity.’⁵⁹ Stafford used this argument several times in the mid-1690s. The ‘guilty’ Williamites would feel ‘the Wrath of God’ for their disloyalty.⁶⁰ Dethroning James was a grave sin that could not be rectified by simply declaring allegiance to James. Subjects had violated their allegiance and where that ‘Sin hath been committed, and where a Wrong hath been done’ they had to ‘come to Repentance’ and work for James’s restoration and ‘Call’ him back.⁶¹ Williamites who showed remorse by returning allegiance to James and working for his ‘full Restitution’ would ensure providential blessings for England because subjects would no longer be in a condition of sin.⁶²

Tony Claydon and Paul Monod describe William Anderton’s *Remarks upon the Present Confederacy* as refuting Williamite providential polemics by highlighting post-Revolution hardships and depicting James’s restoration as imminent.⁶³ However Anderton used providence not only to describe James’s restoration as imminent but also to exhort subjects to show their allegiance by working for James’s restoration, which would ensure providential blessings for the Kingdoms. He attacked those who ‘wickedly deposed King *James*.’ Anderton argued that William’s military defeats in 1693 showed that ‘Providence’ was ‘clearly on’ the side of Jacobitism’s ally France.⁶⁴ Subjects ‘by atoning God Almighty, by doing Justice to their highly injur’d *King and Queen*,’ returning allegiance to James and working for his restoration would avert ‘those dismal Plagues which otherwise e’re long will fall upon their Heads....’⁶⁵ Providence would restore James but subjects also had to demonstrate their allegiance by working for James’s restoration; this would

⁵⁹ Richard Stafford, *A Word to both Houses of Parliament* (n.p., 1693), pp.3-4.

⁶⁰ Richard Stafford, *The Lamentation of Richard Stafford, A Scribe instructed in the Laws of God, for the Death of Mary, Princess of Orange; together with a Word of Instruction and Warning to her husband* (n.p., 1695), pp.3-4.

⁶¹ Richard Stafford, *Hear this Word, O ye Princes, ye Priests, and People of England; Especially, such of ye as Assemble at Westminster at this your session begun December 3 1697* (n.p., 1698), p.1; idem, *A Supplement and Addition unto a Printed Paper, Bearing Date July 25, 1692. And Superscribed, To our Sovereign Lord, King James the II, Rightful King of Great Brittain, and Ireland...* (n.p., 1695), pp.3-4.

⁶² Stafford, *Hear this Word, O ye Princes*, pp.8, 4, 2, 13-4.

⁶³ Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, pp.122-4, 236-7; Paul Monod, ‘The Jacobite Press and English Censorship 1688-95,’ in Eveline Cruickshanks, Edward Corp (eds.) *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995), pp.138-41; idem, *Jacobitism and the English People*, p.20.

⁶⁴ William Anderton, *Remarks upon the Present Confederacy, and late Revolution in England* (London, 1693), pp.4, 14. See Chapter Four for Anderton’s other arguments and execution.

⁶⁵ *Ibid*, pp.45-7.

end the providential punishment the Kingdoms were experiencing since the Revolution.

Events in 1695 also proved useful for Jacobite polemicists. Chapter Seven showed how Jacobites used Mary's death to argue that James was owed allegiance as *de jure* King but many Jacobites also used her death to make providential arguments urging allegiance to James. Stafford claimed that Mary's death was providential punishment on her for breaking allegiance to her father James. If William and subjects wished to avoid similar fates then they had to restore James.⁶⁶ Robert Ferguson's pamphlets in the aftermath of Mary's death focused primarily on allegiance to *de jure* monarchs but there were parts where he used providential theory to urge subjects to work for James's restoration. This is interesting because Ferguson's 1689 Williamite polemics used providential theory to urge allegiance to William.⁶⁷ In 1695 Ferguson said that William's reign had witnessed parliament 'degenerate into... Disease and Plague.'⁶⁸ England was being providentially punished because breaking allegiance to James was 'most highly offensive to God.'⁶⁹

Ferguson said it would be a great miracle 'to see my Country-men perswaded and gained to relieve themselves, and to serve the Kingdom and their Posterity, by returning to their Fealty....'⁷⁰ Ferguson said that William portrayed himself as a heroic deliverer and rescuer of Protestantism to gain subjects' allegiance.⁷¹ Sherlock, Burnet and others deceived subjects with 'false' ideas about the Revolution being a miracle so that subjects would give William allegiance.⁷² If Williamites repented by renouncing allegiance to William they would receive blessings. By furnishing 'proofs of their Conversion to God and their King' they would receive 'pardon on Earth, and forgiveness in Heaven.'⁷³ The sin of rebellion could not be removed 'until we

⁶⁶ Richard Stafford, *The Lamentation of Richard Stafford, A Scribe instructed in the Laws of God, for the Death of Mary, Princess of Orange...* (n.p., 1695), pp.2-4; idem, *Supplement and Addition*, pp.1-4.

⁶⁷ Robert Ferguson, *The Late Proceedings and Votes of the Parliament of Scotland...*(Glasgow, 1689), pp.18-20, 30-1; idem, *A Brief Justification of the Prince of Orange's descent into England...*(London, 1689), pp.11, 14-6. See Chapter One for more on Ferguson urging allegiance to William in 1689.

⁶⁸ Robert Ferguson, *Whether the Parliament be not in Law dissolved by the Death of The Princess of Orange?...* (n.p., 1695), pp.4-5.

⁶⁹ Ibid, pp.5-6, 17, 25.

⁷⁰ Robert Ferguson, *Whether the Preserving the Protestant Religion was the Motive unto, or the End, that was designed in the Late Revolution?...* (n.p., 1695), pp.2-3.

⁷¹ Ibid, pp.4-5.

⁷² Ibid, pp.9, 24-8, 30-1.

⁷³ Ibid, pp.28-9.

have returned to our Duty, reassumed our Loyalty, and restored our exiled Prince.⁷⁴ Like Stafford and Dulaney, Ferguson used providential theory to justify allegiance to James and urge subjects to demonstrate their allegiance by working for James's restoration, which would bring providential blessings to the Kingdoms.

Rose notes that during the 1690s, even with the Ryswick Treaty seemingly undermining Jacobitism by ending the Kingdoms' war with France, Jacobite polemics retained providential elements. Some used rumours about William's behaviour to argue that having such an immoral King would provoke God's anger.⁷⁵ However historians generally overlook how these polemics used providence to urge subjects to give James allegiance and demonstrate this by working for his restoration. Chapter Seven showed how *de facto* theory was no longer a credible public position on allegiance. The 1696 Assassination Plot was a catalyst in these evolving public views on the Revolution in England. Some Jacobites involved in the 1696 Plot had, like Ferguson, believed that by demonstrating their allegiance as part of the conspiracy they would earn providential rewards for the Kingdoms. Sir John Friend was sentenced to death for his involvement in the Plot. Details of his trial and gallows' speech were published. One account contained both Jacobite and Williamite views on providence, the Revolution and allegiance. The indictment denounced the plotters for denying allegiance to God's chosen monarch.⁷⁶ This pamphlet also shows that Jacobites, even in seemingly hopeless situations, believed that providence would restore James and that subjects should demonstrate their allegiance by working for James's restoration, which would bring providential blessings. Friend expressed his belief that God would reinstall James and return subjects' allegiance to him. 'I do believe, I am sure I heartily pray, That he [James] shall be one day Restored to his Throne and Dominions.'⁷⁷ He prayed for God 'to forgive and bless this Sinful Nation; Deliver it from the Guilt of Rebellion, Blood, and Perjury... and from all those other Hainous Sins which cry aloud.' Providence would restore

⁷⁴ Ibid, pp.26-7.

⁷⁵ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.31-3, 36-7.

⁷⁶ *The Tryal and condemnation of Sir William Parkyns, kt., for the horrid conspiracy to assassinate his sacred Majesty king William...together with a true copy of the papers deliver to the sheriffs of London and Middlesex, by Sir J. Friend and Sir W. Parkins, at the place of execution* (London, 1696), pp.6-7, 10-4.

⁷⁷ Sir John Friend, 'Sir Friend's Paper,' *The Tryal and condemnation of Sir William Parkyns,...*

James's 'Misled Subjects to their Allegiance' but Friend's speech also urged subjects to work for James's restoration; he prayed that Jacobites would endure 'all their Afflictions' until they obtained the 'happy Deliverance.'⁷⁸ This gallows' speech, like other Jacobite polemics, used providence to urge subjects to actively demonstrate their allegiance to James.

Jane Garret has said that the failure of the 1696 Plot and the 1697 Ryswick Treaty, where Louis recognised William as King of the Three Kingdoms, led to James accepting that his restoration was increasingly unlikely. These events made many Jacobites despondent.⁷⁹ However even at what appeared to be their ultimate defeat Jacobites used providential arguments to continue urging allegiance to James. They argued that continuing hardships in the Kingdoms under William would providentially end if subjects showed their allegiance to James by working for his restoration; their efforts would have providential assistance. One post-Ryswick Jacobite polemic said that the continued exclusion of the rightful King meant 'there remains an *apparent Cause for a Civil War*;' this instability was hardly indicative of providence favouring William. The author claimed to have been a Williamite because William promised to protect Protestantism but now realised that James's dethronement was wrong. Ryswick was irrelevant because God 'who Restored King *Charles the 2d*, can as easily Restore King *James the Second*.'⁸⁰ There was 'little Hope of Salvation for any' subject under William. Subjects should work with 'utmost *Lawful Endeavour for Compleat Restitution*' of James to ensure England would 'escape some terrible Judgment of *Divine Vengeance*.' This was a '*Considerable Opportunity* to make both this Nation and our Neighbours Happy....' Providential blessings would be bestowed on the Kingdoms if subjects showed their allegiance to James and restored him.⁸¹

Stafford also remained convinced that Jacobitism was a righteous cause and Williamites were wrong on providence and allegiance. 'The Nature of good and evil, right or wrong, of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of Things, is fixed and eternal....' He said he had been telling audiences since 1689 that Williamites had 'committed a Sin, in Deposing King James' and Ryswick did

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Jane Garret, *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot 1696* (Cambridge, 1980), pp.262-3.

⁸⁰ *The Fidelity of a Loyal Subject, of the Kingdom of England: or, An Honest Act of Fidelity to King James, King William, And the Whole Kingdom* (n.p., 1698), pp.1-4.

⁸¹ Ibid, pp.2-4.

not change this fact.⁸² Stafford asserted that God was on James's side and Jacobitism would eventually prevail because of providence. Again he warned that Williamites' disloyalty would provoke 'the Wrath of God.'⁸³ Subjects must give James allegiance and work for his restoration to bring providential blessings on the Kingdoms. If subjects 'will not obey the Commandment of God, as to come to Repentance, and to restore fourfold, or make full Restitution, ye will be in real danger to perish.'⁸⁴ Jacobitism suffered setbacks with Ryswick and the 1696 Plot but these two post-Ryswick pamphlets show that some Jacobites remained committed to their cause and the morality of it. Allegiance not only had to be maintained to James but subjects had to show this by actively working for James's restoration, which providence would assist, and result in providential blessings, like peace, for the Kingdoms. To Stafford and other Jacobites Ryswick did not change anything.

Jacobites from diverse backgrounds justified allegiance to James with providential arguments. Anglican and Scottish Episcopalian Nonjurors repeatedly asserted that James was owed allegiance because providence would restore James and allegiance to William was sinful. Other Jacobites used providential arguments to exhort subjects to actively work for James's restoration. Subjects owed James allegiance and if subjects restored James then the Kingdoms would receive providential blessings. Providence would assist Jacobites and ensure their eventual success but subjects had to demonstrate their allegiance by actively working for James's restoration. While Nonjurors' providential arguments were more passive than other Jacobite providential arguments the two approaches show that numerous Jacobites used providential theory in some form to justify allegiance to James. Even with the 1696 Plot and 1697 Ryswick Treaty some Jacobites persevered with providential arguments. Williamites would deftly use these same events to depict William as having providential favour. Kevin Sharpe and others have examined some of these propaganda pieces but their focus has been mainly on providence as a propaganda tool to ameliorate William's image.⁸⁵ However allegiance was

⁸² Stafford, *Hear this Word, O ye Princes*, pp.7-8, 1.

⁸³ *Ibid*, pp.8, 11-3.

⁸⁴ *Ibid*, p.14.

⁸⁵ Garret, *The Triumphs of Providence*, passim; Charles-Eduard Levillain, 'Cromwell Redivivus? William III as Military Dictator: Myth and Reality,' pp.165-7; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.53-4, 143-5, 150-1; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.390-5; Straka, 'Final Phase of Divine Right,' pp.654-6.

important to many of these providential arguments and these were slightly different to Sherlock-style arguments. Across the Three Kingdoms Williamites presented Ryswick as a final providential endorsement of allegiance to William.

II

Prior to 1697 Williamite clerics, like Anglican William Hayley, publicly prayed that William's reign would be permanently established with 'an Honourable and Secure Peace.'⁸⁶ The Ryswick Treaty seemingly granted this. Chapter Seven showed how some Williamites had used providence to justify allegiance to William as *de jure* King and depict William's reign, and all that was associated with it, as permanent. Ryswick compelled Louis XIV to recognise William and not to assist conspiracies against William.⁸⁷ Kenyon argued that providential theory had been 'discredited' in the public discourse because of the controversy surrounding Sherlock.⁸⁸ Claydon has shown that in late-1690s England polemics using providential theory to call for courtly reformation and greater public piety were popular.⁸⁹ In the late 1690s numerous Williamites would use providential theory to celebrate Ryswick and defend allegiance to William. Some post-Ryswick English Williamite polemics also called for greater public piety but the impact on allegiance debates has been overlooked. Anglican Williamite Robert Eyre said that William was a deliverer sent by God but his reign would not last if subjects 'treacherously betray him by our own Wickedness' and continued sinning. Eyre equated public morality with loyalty to William. William's recently established reign could be overturned as a providential punishment for English subjects' sins.⁹⁰ This inferred that providence retained a significant role in preserving William's reign and the Revolution settlement. Across the Kingdoms Williamites, from diverse political and religious backgrounds, would repeatedly explicitly cite

⁸⁶ William Hayley, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons, at St. Margarets Westminster, upon December 11, 1695. Being the solemn Day of Fasting and Humiliation...* (London, 1696), pp.3-4, 15-6.

⁸⁷ *An Abstract of the Treaty of Peace, Concluded between the most Potent and Seren Prince, WILLIAM the Third, by the Grace of God King of Great Britain, &c. and the most Potent and Serene, Prince, LEWIS the Fourteenth King of France, &c. at Riswick...* (London, 1697).

⁸⁸ Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.26-30, 75-80, 169.

⁸⁹ Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, passim.

⁹⁰ Robert Eyre, *The Sinner A Traitor to his King and Country. In A Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral-Church of Winchester...July 24, 1700* (London, 1700), pp.18-9.

Ryswick as a providential vindication of William and allegiance to William in late-1690s allegiance polemics.

Chapter Five showed that numerous English Nonconformists were fervent Williamites. Several Nonconformists produced polemics celebrating Ryswick. Nonconformist poet Thomas Cheesman said that no one could deny that Ryswick was a providential event and that it would turn Jacobites into Williamites:

‘What Miracles by Peace performed are;
By Which the hardest Hearts are mollifi’d,
Wrath reconcil’d, and malice laid aside....’⁹¹

Cheesman believed that this would end Jacobite challenges and ensure that subjects were ‘reconcil’d’ with William’s reign. Nonconformist ministers William Bates and John Howe produced polemics hailing how Ryswick was providential confirmation of William’s reign. Howe said that with this providential peace William should ‘meet no Ungrateful Returns’ from subjects.⁹² Bates’s congratulatory speech was published twice, which shows some support for his sentiments. He said that denying William allegiance was rejecting God’s providence. Ryswick was a ‘great Blessing’ and subjects owed ‘Dutiful Thankfulness’ to God for this peace. God had ‘Preserv’d’ William’s reign and William could rely on the ‘inviolable Loyalty’ of Nonconformist clerics. Bates finished by stating his hope that William would always have ‘Subjects Happy in their Obedience.’⁹³ Claydon says that Bates’ and Howe’s polemics were part of a popular use of providence to urge pious living and courtly reformation while Straka has only examined late-1690s Anglican polemics.⁹⁴ However Bates, Howe and Cheesman also asserted that Ryswick was a providential endorsement of allegiance to William; this made William’s reign permanent and unassailable. Nonconformist and Anglican Williamites

⁹¹ Thomas Cheesman, *Peace Triumphant. Or, a Congratulatory Poem. To Celebrate the Unspeakable Benefits and Blessings of Peace, together with some Grateful Reflections upon King William III. His Excellent Majesties first coming to the Crown, as a Happy Instrument in the Hand of Divine Providence, to Settle the Affairs of the Nation...* (London, 1697), pp.1-2.

⁹² John Howe, ‘Sermon,’ *A Sermon Preach’d on the late day of Thanksgiving, Decemb. 2, 1697 by John How... to which is prefixed Dr. Bates’s Congratulatory Speech to the King...* (London, 1698), pp.14-6.

⁹³ William Bates, *A Sermon Preach’d on the late day of Thanksgiving, Decemb. 2, 1697 by John How... to which is prefixed Dr. Bates’s Congratulatory Speech to the King...* (London, 1698), Preface; idem, *Dr. Bates’s Congratulatory Speech to the King, Novemb. 22, 1697. In the Name of the Dissenting Ministers in and About London* (London, 1698), Preface.

⁹⁴ Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, pp.81, 221-2; Straka, ‘Final Phase of Divine Right Theory,’ pp.638-58.

ensured that this became the prevailing view on the Revolution in the late-1690s English allegiance debates.

Gilbert Burnet's sermon on Ryswick said that the Treaty made the Revolution permanent and vindicated allegiance to William.⁹⁵ Straka and other historians have briefly noted that Burnet's sermon viewed Ryswick as a final providential seal for the Revolution, which would not be undone.⁹⁶ However Burnet's sermon, like other Williamite polemics on Ryswick, described Ryswick as a final vindication of allegiance to William. Providence had 'now given' William 'as full an Establishment upon' the throne 'as Human things are capable of.' William's 'Enemies' had made 'Peace with him....'⁹⁷ He could not be challenged as 'THE RIGHTFUL AND LAWFUL KING OF THESE REALMS.' It was incumbent on subjects to 'make all the Humblest Returns of Duty and Gratitude, of Fidelity and Zeal, to our *Great Deliverer*' and to give 'the Highest Thanksgiving to God for him.'⁹⁸ Burnet's sermon on Ryswick shows how political thought on the Revolution had evolved because his polemics on allegiance frequently contributed to the popular mood, especially in the early years of William's reign. In 1689 Burnet used providence, amongst other ideas, to justify allegiance to William as *de facto* King but accepted the 1696 Association recognising William as *de jure* King.⁹⁹ After Ryswick Burnet was once again an important contributor to the popular political rhetoric. He portrayed Ryswick as a providential confirmation that William and the Revolution were the established order, which further validated allegiance to William.¹⁰⁰ This final providential endorsement of allegiance to William was a way of asserting that debates over allegiance should end.

The Revolution Justified queried how Jacobites could continue resisting God's enthronement of William, the 'Guardian of Church and State,' especially after the 'long desired Peace' had been achieved. This author acknowledged this 'Illustrious Providence,' which 'secured and established'

⁹⁵ Gilbert Burnet, *A Sermon Preached before the King, On the Second of December, 1697 Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Peace* (London, 1697), pp.9-12.

⁹⁶ Straka, 'Final Phase of Divine Right,' pp.654-5; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.390-1.

⁹⁷ Burnet, *Sermon Preached Before the King, On the Second of December, 1697*, pp.7-8, 12-3.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp.13-5.

⁹⁹ Gilbert Burnet, *A Pastoral Letter...* (London, 1689), pp.5-6, 11-2; *idem*, *A Sermon Preached at the Coronation of King William III and Mary II...* (London, 1689), pp.14-5; *idem*, *History of his own Time... Vol. II...* (London, 1734), pp.169-72. The different ideas used by Burnet to justify allegiance to William and other comments he made on the allegiance debates are explored in Chapters One through Seven.

¹⁰⁰ Burnet, *Sermon Preached Before the King, On the Second of December, 1697*, pp.9-15.

the 'Peace of the Church' and 'Happiness of the Nation.'¹⁰¹ Providence enthroned William and confirmed his reign as permanent; subjects maintaining allegiance to James were sinfully resisting 'the Ordinance of God.' William protected liberties and Protestantism; therefore subjects should 'be no way wanting in Love, Honour, and Duty towards' William. The author hoped that the providential nature of Ryswick would 'more firmly establish many of the King's Friends, and convince the more Moderate and Considerate of his Enemies.'¹⁰² This pamphlet believed that the providential nature of Ryswick would guarantee subjects' allegiance to William and could even 'convince' Jacobites to recognise William's establishment. The rhetoric in 1697-8 built on the rhetoric of 1696 when William was recognised as *de jure* King in England. Chapter Seven showed that Whigs and many Tories, despite their divisions, generally favoured the stronger allegiance to William in 1696 and this showed greater public acceptance of William as permanent and legitimate. *The Revolution Justified*, like Burnet and other Williamites, presented Ryswick as providentially confirming allegiance to William. There was now a popular belief that James would not be restored; providence had shown that the Revolution settlement was permanent and nothing could justify denying William allegiance.

Sherlock-style providential arguments justifying *de facto* theory were frequently seen as implying that William's reign was temporary.¹⁰³ Ryswick enabled Williamites to use providential theory to depict the Revolution as permanent, which meant William had to be supported. Anglican George Halley said that 'God hath given us the Blessings of Peace' at Ryswick by guaranteeing William's rule.¹⁰⁴ Other sermons warned subjects that sinning could provoke God to remove William and overturn Ryswick, which was described as a 'Gift of Heaven.'¹⁰⁵ In 1700 Tory Edward Stillingfleet said that in certain circumstances God 'steps out of His Ordinary method and Course of Providence' to intervene in nations' affairs. When such providential blessings

¹⁰¹ *The Revolution Justified, From Principles of Reason and Scripture: or, A New Discourse Concerning The Nature of Government and Subjection in Free States* (London, 1697), 'To the Reader,' p.23.

¹⁰² *Ibid*, pp.26-7, 31-40, 'To the Reader.' See Chapter Seven for this pamphlet's views on allegiance to William as *de jure* King.

¹⁰³ Padley, 'Rendering unto Caesar,' pp.683-5, 689-92.

¹⁰⁴ George Halley, *A Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral and Metropolitan Church of St. Peter in York on Friday the Fifth of November, 1697...* (London, 1697), pp.13-5.

¹⁰⁵ R. Wykes, *The Peace of Jerusalem: A Sermon Preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor of London. At S. Paul's Cathedral, July 31, 1698...*(London, 1698), pp.1, 11-2, 19.

occurred subjects owed ‘Thankfulness’ to God ‘for the Deliverances He Works.’¹⁰⁶ Stillingfleet accepted William as *de facto* King but did not support introducing stronger allegiance tests.¹⁰⁷ In 1700 he did not specify whether William was *de facto* or *de jure* King. However his statements about loyalty to God’s ‘Vicegerents,’ who were enthroned by providence, can be seen in this post-Ryswick environment as another polemic arguing that providence vindicated allegiance to William.¹⁰⁸

Cursory Remarks said that the Revolution showed ‘the never to be forgotten goodness of God’ by enthroning William and ensuring ‘the great Mortification of the Enemies of the King and Kingdom.’¹⁰⁹ Ryswick proved that providence supported the Revolution. Loyalty to William was again depicted as gratitude to God for this deliverance. There remained a curious alliance of ‘Malecontented Jacobites’ and Commonwealth-men united in ‘Opinion and Practice against King *William*.’ These allies wanted to ‘Wheedle Men out of their Allegiance’ by raising popular discontent but their plots and arguments had failed. Providence ‘silenc’d their Clamours, shamed their Intrigues, and confounded all the pretended dangers....’¹¹⁰ The Revolution would not be undone; the author depicted Ryswick as a providential event guaranteeing William’s establishment. All subjects should ‘return our due thanks to God and the King’ while promoting ‘our Gratitude and Obedience’ for these ‘Extraordinary’ benefits.¹¹¹ This pamphlet presented Ryswick as not only providential endorsement of allegiance to William and the Revolution’s permanence but also presented it as a providential defeat for Jacobites, invalidating anti-Revolution arguments.¹¹²

Other English Williamite polemics mocked Jacobites who continued promoting allegiance to James after Ryswick. One pamphlet imagined a dialogue between Louis and James where Jacobitism was described as a lost cause. Louis, convinced of Jacobitism’s defeat, asked James ‘where’s the Fruit

¹⁰⁶ Edward Stillingfleet, *Reformation of Manners, the True Way of Honouring God...* (London, 1700), pp.15-6.

¹⁰⁷ Stillingfleet was prominent when the allegiance debates focused on Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, which is explored in Chapter Two. He opposed oaths recognising William as *de jure* King, which are examined in Chapter Seven, and Abjuration Oaths, which are examined in Chapter Nine.

¹⁰⁸ Stillingfleet, *Reformation of Manners*, pp.14-5.

¹⁰⁹ *Cursory Remarks Upon Some Late Disloyal Proceedings, In Several Cabals: Composed of an Intermixture of Interests* (London, 1699), p.7.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid*, pp.6-7, 16.

¹¹¹ *Ibid*, pp.7-8.

¹¹² *Ibid*, pp.48-50, 58.

of all' the 'Pamphleteers, News-writers, Ballad-makers, Private Presses, and Wagerers' funded by France.¹¹³ James was told that France would no longer support Jacobite intrigues because they were destined to fail; William and the Revolution were firmly established.¹¹⁴ Another post-Ryswick satire of Jacobitism, written by an apparent 'Non-Swearing Parson,' said that Louis had become a 'rank Williamite.'¹¹⁵ These lampoons of Jacobitism did not have the explicit providential theory of Burnet and other Williamites but they attest to a popular belief in late-1690s England that William and the Revolution were now unassailable. Allegiance to James was now depicted as a joke instead of a serious threat.

Providential views of the Revolution had always been, and would remain, popular amongst Irish Protestants.¹¹⁶ Throughout the 1690s Irish Williamites, like English and Scottish Williamites, frequently used providential theory to defend allegiance to William.¹¹⁷ As happened with the issue of allegiance to William as *de jure* King many Irish Williamites followed English rhetoric on Ryswick being a providential confirmation of allegiance to William. Post-Ryswick Irish Williamite polemics remained wary of the Catholic-Jacobite threat but still said that the Revolution settlement was permanently established.¹¹⁸ Irish Anglican Williamite John Travers used a 23 October 1698 sermon to hail this latest providential deliverance for Irish Protestants.¹¹⁹ Toby Barnard has shown that providence was central to Irish Anglicans' 23 October sermons commemorating their survival in the 1641 massacres.¹²⁰ Travers's sermon combined this traditional providence of 23

¹¹³ *A Dialogue Between the French King, and the Late King James, At St. Germain's en laye: Occasion'd by the Signing of the Peace* (London, 1697), pp.6-7.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid*, p.20.

¹¹⁵ *A Satyr upon the French King, Written by a Non-Swearing Parson, and drop'd out of his Pocket at Sams's Coffee-House* (London, 1697), p.1.

¹¹⁶ Eccleshall, 'Anglican Political Thought in the Century after the Revolution of 1688,' pp.42-3; *idem*, 'The Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland in the 1690s,' pp.65, 70; Hayton, *Ruling Ireland*, pp.9-10, 24-7; Toby Barnard, *A New Anatomy of Ireland: The Irish Protestants, 1649-1770* (London, 2003), pp.88-9; McGuire, 'The Church of Ireland and the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688,' pp.138-46.

¹¹⁷ Edward Walkington, *A Sermon Preached Octob. 23, 1692. In St. Andrews Church Dublin; Before the House of Commons* (Dublin, 1692), pp.1-4, 6-8, 10, 13, 16-7; Edward Wetenhall, *A Sermon Setting Forth the Duties of the Irish Protestants...* (Dublin, 1692), pp.12-3, 21.

¹¹⁸ See Chapter Six for more on how perceptions of Catholic allegiance and the Catholic-Jacobite threat affected the allegiance debates.

¹¹⁹ John Travers, *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrew's Church Dublin. Before the Honourable House of Commons the Twenty Third of October, 1698. Being the Anniversary Thanksgiving for the Deliverance from the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Dublin, 1698), pp.5-7.

¹²⁰ T.C. Barnard, 'The Uses of 23 October 1641 and Irish Protestant Celebrations,' *The English Historical Review*, 106, No. 421 (Oct., 1991), pp.891-5, 908-10, 913-20.

October sermons with highlighting the providential deliverances since the Revolution. 1641, the Revolution and Ryswick were examples of providential deliverance, which obliged subjects to ‘offer up our Sacrifice of Thanks and Praise; for a Deliverance from Enemies that rose up against us.’¹²¹ Pious living and loyalty to William would show gratitude to God for these deliverances from Catholic and Jacobite tyrannies.¹²²

Irish Williamites frequently put Ryswick alongside the Revolution, 1641, the Gunpowder Plot and Spanish Armada as examples of providential deliverance.¹²³ William Jephson’s 1697 sermon commemorating the Gunpowder Plot compared Ryswick with these previous deliverances. ‘Almighty God’ had ‘so clearly and fully manifested Himself to the World’ by preserving James I in 1605, enthroning William in 1688-9 and preserving him as King.¹²⁴ Jephson hoped that the providential nature of Ryswick, which permanently secured William’s reign, would result in William having all subjects’ loyalty.¹²⁵

While Travers, Jephson and others put Ryswick in the pantheon of notable providential deliverances other Irish Williamites hailed Ryswick as a particularly special deliverance when discussing allegiance. Joseph Aickin, an English teacher living in Ireland, frequently expressed Tory views. Before leaving Wales for Ireland in 1697 he preached a sermon airing old prejudices about Presbyterians and providential views of recent political events.¹²⁶ He said that during the Siege of Derry Protestants took a ‘Solemn Oath’ supporting ‘The right of England, ‘gainst all Popery’ and proclaiming William as King.¹²⁷ Aickin compared Derry, where ‘Hopes of Relief’ seemed far away, with the way that God ‘led the Hebrews... Through thousand dangers’ to safety.¹²⁸ Providence ensured Irish Protestants’ survival and William’s enthronement. Ryswick meant that William had ‘lasting Laurels round his Temples

¹²¹ Travers, *Sermon Preached in St. Andrew’s Church Dublin*, pp.1-3, 15-6.

¹²² *Ibid*, p.16.

¹²³ *The Protestants Crums of Comfort 4th Edition* (London, 1700), p.102.

¹²⁴ William Jephson, *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrews Church, Dublin; On the 5th of November, 1698. Being the Anniversary Thanksgiving for the Deliverance from the Gunpowder PLOT, in ENGLAND in the year 1605 Before the House of Commons* (Dublin, 1698), pp.3-9, 14-6.

¹²⁵ *Ibid*, pp.15-6.

¹²⁶ Joseph Aickin, *A Sermon upon Conformity of the Humane will to the divine: From Acts. 9. 6. Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?* (Dublin, 1705), ‘To the Reader,’ pp.9, 13, 21.

¹²⁷ Joseph Aickin, *Londerias; or, A Narrative of the Siege of London-dery...* (Dublin, 1698), pp.29-30.

¹²⁸ *Ibid*, p.61.

wreath.’¹²⁹ Aickin hoped this providential approval of William’s continued reign would ensure the ‘People serve’ William ‘with Honour and Obedience.’¹³⁰ The providential nature of the Revolution and Ryswick should give Irish Protestants ‘thankful and Obedient Hearts;’ continued loyalty to William would show gratitude to God for this deliverance.¹³¹ This was similar to English post-Ryswick Williamite polemics but took account of how the Revolution played out in Ireland; Ryswick was another providential intervention validating allegiance to William.

Edmund Arwaker was an Irish Anglican chaplain to the second Duke of Ormonde, a prominent Tory who patronized likeminded individuals.¹³² From 1688 Arwaker promoted Tory views on the monarchy and Revolution.¹³³ His thanksgiving sermon on Ryswick was published because he believed it would ‘silence the Ignorance of Foolish Men, who have said of our Sovereign... *We will not have this Man to Reign over us....*’ Arwaker said that the providential nature of Ryswick should end disputes over allegiance to William.¹³⁴ Ryswick was a ‘Blessing’ that was ‘So Great, so Valuable’ that it needed celebrating.¹³⁵ William’s enthronement and the settlement delivered Protestants from ruin.¹³⁶ God gave a ‘signal Favour to that People over whom he places a Good King.’¹³⁷ Ryswick was incontestable proof that allegiance to William had divine approval. William’s monarchy secured Protestantism and liberties from ‘Popish Principles.’¹³⁸ No ‘Factious Malecontents’ could dispute

¹²⁹ Ibid, p.76.

¹³⁰ Ibid, p.153.

¹³¹ Ibid, pp.154-5.

¹³² D.W. Hayton, ‘Dependence, Clientage and Affinity: The Political Following of the Second Duke of Ormonde,’ in Toby Barnard & Jane Fendon (eds.) *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610-1745* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp.225, 230-1.

¹³³ Arwaker’s Toryism can be seen in several pamphlets. In *A Poem humbly Dedicated to the Queen on the Occasion of Her Majesty’s Happy Conception 11 February 1687/8* (London, 1688), pp.3, 5-6 Arwaker congratulated James’s consort on her pregnancy and accepted the pregnancy as fact. Arwaker’s *A Native Table, Consecrated to the Church’s Deliverers, the Present King and Queen...*(London, 1689), pp.1-3, 6, said that the Revolution providentially preserved Protestantism without altering the monarchy. Arwaker also showed his Toryism in *An Epistle to Monsieur Boileaic, Inviting his Muse to forsake the French Interest...*(London, 1694), pp.3-8 where he said William was enthroned without altering the monarchy.

¹³⁴ Edmund Arwaker, *God’s King the People’s Blessing. A Sermon Preached on the Day of Thanksgiving for Peace at St. Ann’s Church in Dungannon, in the Diocess of Armagh. By Edm. Arwaker, Rector of Drumglass, and Chaplain to his grace the Duke of Ormond* (Dublin, 1698), ‘To the Archbishop of Armagh.’

¹³⁵ Ibid, pp.1-2.

¹³⁶ Ibid, pp.3-5.

¹³⁷ Ibid, p.9.

¹³⁸ Ibid, pp.13-5.

how 'tis Evident God Delighted' to make William 'King over us....'¹³⁹ This peace was worthy of the thanksgiving day celebrated by Arwaker and his congregants.¹⁴⁰ Arwaker, like other Williamites, described Ryswick as a providential confirmation of William's reign; it permanently established liberties and Protestantism. Irish Williamites, like English Williamites, portrayed Ryswick as a providential endorsement of allegiance to William, which meant that all challenges to William's authority should cease.

In Scotland there were also polemics celebrating Ryswick. The government ordered that the Treaty be published and publicly promoted throughout Scotland so 'that all may have Intimation, and none may pretend Ignorance.'¹⁴¹ Scotland's Privy Council sent a letter congratulating William, which offered 'Our Thanks to Almighty God' for William and Ryswick.¹⁴² This applause may seem conventional for senior politicians addressing their King but it also shows how Ryswick was seen as a final providential endorsement of allegiance to William. The Privy Council's letter said that this providential event should 'Oblige us, to all that Faithfulness Love and Duty, that can be expected from the most Loyal of Subjects.'¹⁴³ Scottish pamphleteer David Kennedy stated that William, 'Our Unparalel'd Prince,' was an 'Instrument' for subjects' deliverance. Ryswick meant that William was owed 'the greatest Loyalty, the most Ardent Affection, and the highest Adoration, that Subjects can possibly pay....'¹⁴⁴ However, as Chapter Four showed, late-1690s Scotland was ravaged by political and economic crises caused by famine and the Darien catastrophe. Ryswick failed to alleviate this economic hardship. It is estimated that Scotland's population declined between 5% and 15% at this time. This meant that providential arguments were popular in Scottish public political discourse.¹⁴⁵ English and Irish Williamites were able to make

¹³⁹ Ibid, p.16.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid, p.16.

¹⁴¹ *Proclamation for Publishing the Peace betwixt His Majesty and the French King* (Edinburgh, 1697).

¹⁴² Privy Council of Scotland, *Letter Congratulatory from the Privy Council of Scotland, to His Majesty upon the Conclusion of the Peace, and His Majesties safe Return* (Edinburgh, 1697).

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ David Kennedy, *The Late History of Europe being A Narration of all Remarkable Actions and other various Affairs... From 1676 to the Conclusion of the Late Peace of Reswick, in September 1697* (Edinburgh, 1698), 'The Preface.'

¹⁴⁵ Allan Macinnes, 'William of Orange, Disaster for Scotland?', in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007), p.212; Christopher Whatley, *The Scots and the Union Then and Now* (Edinburgh, 2014), pp.161-89; T.M. Devine, *The Scottish Nation 1700-2000* (London, 1999), pp.5-6, 33-5; Karen J. Cullen, Christopher A. Whatley & Mary Young, 'King William's

straightforward arguments about Ryswick being providential vindication of allegiance to William. Events in Scotland meant that post-Ryswick Scottish Williamite polemics were slightly different but providence was also used to defend and vindicate allegiance to William.

III

Chapter Four showed how these crises led to many Scottish Williamites asserting that the government's failures contradicted the idea that allegiance to William supported a government protecting liberties. Providence was another element in many of these late-1690s Scottish polemics. Williamites and Jacobites used providential theory to exploit the popular discontent when advocating allegiance to their preferred King. The Darien crisis and subsequent public hostility to William's government and England has generally been studied as an antecedent to the 1707 Union. These studies overlook the importance of how Scottish views on allegiance and the Revolution evolved.¹⁴⁶ David Armitage describes how popular discontent was frequently expressed in pamphlets, like *Scotland's Lament for their Misfortunes*, using providential theory.¹⁴⁷ Providential theory was an important part of the popular discontent in Scotland. Worryingly for William's government, many expressions of discontent, like *Scotland's Lament*, were ambiguous on allegiance. It said Scotland's calamities would not end 'till we the People do amend' for sinful rebellion.¹⁴⁸ Scotland was being providentially punished for rebelling but the pamphlet did not specify whether it was condemning rebellion against God's will by not accepting William or if it was

Ill Years: New Evidence on the impact of scarcity and harvest failure during the crisis of the 1690s on Tayside,' *Scottish Historical Review*, LXXV, No. 220, Part 2 (Oct. 2006), pp.250-1, 272; Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.33-4, 39-40.

¹⁴⁶ Jeffrey Stephen's *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707* (Edinburgh, 2007) frequently examines Presbyterian use of Providence in debates over the Union but does not explore Jacobite use of it or the allegiance debates. Karin Bowie's *Scottish Public Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union, 1699-1707* (London, 2007) explores the effect of the resulting popular nationalism on Union debates.

Christopher Whatley also examines the impact of Darien and the 'Ill years' in *Scots and the Union*. Allan Macinnes, 'William of Orange, Disaster for Scotland?,' explores the political impact but again overlooks allegiance.

¹⁴⁷ David Armitage, 'The Scottish Vision of Empire: Intellectual Origins of The Darien Venture,' in John Robertson (ed.) *A Union for Empire: Political Thought and the British Union of 1707* (Cambridge, 1995), p.110-2.

¹⁴⁸ *Scotland's Lament for their Misfortunes* (n.p., 1700).

condemning rebellion against James or condemning sinful living. If subjects repented then Scotland would receive providential blessings but there would be no blessings if ‘we still Rebels Remain.’¹⁴⁹ A greater worry for William’s government was how Jacobitism was exploiting the discontent. Presbyterian Williamite Robert Wodrow recorded that ‘All the blame is laid upon’ William for Scotland’s hardships and that Jacobites were provoking discontent as part of ‘their hellish designs of overturning our government, laws, liberties & religion.’¹⁵⁰

Jacobite Robert Ferguson used Darien and providential theory to condemn William’s rule in Scotland. His 1699 *Just and Modest Vindication of the Scots Design* used providence in a different, subtler way to his pamphlets after Mary’s death. Ferguson combined providence and elements of Contract theory to argue that providence could only justify allegiance to pious rulers, which William was not. William’s alliance with the Catholic King of Spain was ‘repugnant to the Laws of God.’¹⁵¹ Scots were deceived into giving William allegiance with promises of contracts, liberties and prosperity but William did not fulfil these promises when he undermined Darien.¹⁵² This monarchical behaviour angered God and so subjects’ relationship with the monarch was ‘morally dissolv’d;’ Ferguson portrayed Scotland’s hardships as a providential condemnation of allegiance to William.¹⁵³ Ferguson claimed that Darien was a divine mission to prevent the spread of Catholicism in the Americas.¹⁵⁴ William and England’s refusal to assist Scotland’s mission was ‘a trespass against’ Scots’ ‘Allegiance, Fealty and Loyalty.’ William impiously refusing to support Darien should prompt Scots to reassess their allegiance.¹⁵⁵ Ferguson used providence to appeal to Scots disappointed with William by stating that there was no providential blessings for subjects with allegiance to the impious William.

¹⁴⁹ *Scotland’s Lament*.

¹⁵⁰ Robert Wodrow, July 16, 1700 ‘For Mr James Wallace,’ *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow 1698-1709...*, ed. L.W. Sharp (Edinburgh, 1937), p.137.

¹⁵¹ Robert Ferguson, *A Just and Modest Vindication of the Scots Design, For the having Established a Colony at Darien* (n.p., 1699), pp.65-6.

¹⁵² *Ibid*, pp.45-6. See Chapter Four for more on Contract ideas and allegiance.

¹⁵³ *Ibid*, p.144.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid*, p.188.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid*, pp.189-91.

Bruce Lenman argues that the popular discontent was evidence of Jacobitism's increasing popularity.¹⁵⁶ However, as Chapter Four also showed, disappointment with aspects of William's government did not mean disloyalty to William. Scottish polemicists used notions of subjects' liberties and the idea that the Revolution changed the monarchy to continue promoting allegiance to William as a measure protecting the settlement. Williamite Andrew Fletcher, who denounced the government's failures, claimed that the discontent would not affect subjects' allegiance. Fletcher argued that Jacobitism in Scotland was 'always insignificant' and had 'become a jest' since the peace.¹⁵⁷ Williamite George Ridpath said that much of the outrage was fermented by 'Enemies of the present Government' plotting to restore James even though since 1689 most Scots 'declar'd so generally against the late King.'¹⁵⁸ Numerous late-1690s Scottish Williamite polemics used providential theory to defend allegiance to William and claim that most Scots remained loyal to William.

National fasts were occasions when providential theory was employed to advance political ends in public discourse.¹⁵⁹ The Darien crisis prompted demands for a national fast in Scotland to call for divine assistance. Some Presbyterian Williamites believed that these calls were from 'Persons disaffected to the Government' to garner support for James. A 1700 pamphlet by 'Philo-Caledon,' *Scotland's Present Duty*, denied that this fast would increase anti-William feeling in Scotland.¹⁶⁰ In a 1699 pamphlet 'Philo-Caledon' said that William being based in England made him appear like an 'enemy' to Scotland because he was more attentive to English demands.¹⁶¹ However in 1700 'Philo-Caledon' defended allegiance to William with providential theory. 'Philo-Caledon' said that there was 'none for King of *Great Brittain* but King *William*.' This pamphlet was not motivated by 'any

¹⁵⁶ Bruce Lenman, 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism,' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759* (Edinburgh, 1982), pp.43-4.

¹⁵⁷ Andrew Fletcher, *Two Discourses Concerning the Affairs of Scotland; Written in the Year 1698* (Edinburgh, 1698), pp.23-4. See Chapter Four for Fletcher's strong criticism of William's government while still advocating allegiance to William.

¹⁵⁸ George Ridpath, *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Miscarriage of the Scots Colony at Darien or an Answer to a Libel Entitled A Defence of the Scots Abdicating Darien. Submitted to the Consideration of the Good People of England* (Glasgow, 1700), pp.46-7.

¹⁵⁹ Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, pp.98-101.

¹⁶⁰ Philo-Caledon, *Scotland's Present Duty: or, A Call to the Nobility...to act for, our Common Concern in Caledonia* (n.p., 1700), p.20.

¹⁶¹ Clare Jackson, 'Conceptions of Nationhood in the Anglo-Scottish Union Debates of 1707,' *The Scottish Historical Review*, LXXXVII, Issue 2 (Supplement) (2008), pp.69-70.

Disaffection' but the good of Scotland.¹⁶² The author warned of Jacobites creating 'Disaffection to the Government.' If this 'Disaffection' was not addressed then the Revolution, and all that it established, would be overthrown and the 'Slavery' endured in the 'late evil Reigns' of James and Charles would return.¹⁶³ 'Philo-Caledon' built on the rhetoric about William's post-Revolution monarchy guaranteeing liberties as part of allegiance to him and described in Chapter Four. The pre-Revolution 'Slavery' was cited to remind readers of 'the wonderful Providences of God' in the Revolution and that these providences required 'our constant Acknowledgements.'¹⁶⁴ Subjects could acknowledge this deliverance with loyalty to William. 'Philo-Caledon' claimed that Darien failed because 'We are guilty of black Ingratitude to God for the late happy Revolution, for the Singularity, as well as the Greatness of that Deliverance, when we were upon the Brink of being swallowed up....'¹⁶⁵ Even with the recent hardships 'Philo-Caledon' argued that the providential nature of the Revolution obliged continued loyalty to William and gratitude to God for the Revolution.

Other Scottish Williamites believed that most Scots remained Williamites because of the providential nature of the Revolution even with the on-going crises and Jacobites attempting to exploit discontent. Ridpath, a firm Williamite, said that 'our Enemies' fanned discontent because they did not want Scotland to 'be long at ease' and sought to undermine 'Civil Liberties' that were providentially 'delivered by the Revolution.' He argued that he could criticise aspects of the government without fearing the Revolution's undoing because providence supported the Revolution and endorsed allegiance to William.¹⁶⁶ Chapter Four showed how Ridpath wanted William's government to change some of its policies but still advocated allegiance to William because it supported a monarchy protecting subjects' liberties. Providence was another important element of Ridpath's late-1690s pamphlets. Ridpath, like 'Philo-Caledon,' said that Scotland was being providentially punished for not supporting William and the Revolution as firmly as they should. The allegiance debates in late-1690s Scotland had different circumstances to the debates in England and Ireland but there were still numerous Scottish polemics asserting

¹⁶² Philo-Caledon, *Scotland's Present Duty*, pp.3-5.

¹⁶³ *Ibid*, p.12.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid*, p.3.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid*, pp.14-5.

¹⁶⁶ Ridpath, *Enquiry into the Causes and Miscarriage of the Scots Colony*, pp.57-9, 51-2, 40-1.

that providence endorsed the Revolution and allegiance to William. Ridpath argued that William was ‘a Prince who is under God the Great Champion of our Religion, and the bold Asserter of *Europe’s* Liberty.’¹⁶⁷ Scotland was providentially delivered at the Revolution but subjects were not showing passionate gratitude for this deliverance.¹⁶⁸ God gave Scotland an opportunity to complete ‘our Deliverance from Tyranny’ by addressing the present grievances and further cementing the Revolution’s permanence.¹⁶⁹ Ridpath claimed that despite Darien Scots favoured William because of providence. Scots ‘behaved themselves with... Loyalty... towards’ William’s government ‘in the present juncture under such pressing Grievances.’ The present calamities were not William’s fault; it was his ‘pernicious Counsellours’ who were at fault. Subjects had a ‘due sense of what they owe to His Majesty King *William*, our great Deliverer’ and this loyalty ‘sufficiently vindicates’ subjects ‘from the stain of all such noisy and ill grounded Reflections.’¹⁷⁰ Ridpath said that providence endorsed the Revolution and ensured William’s continued reign; this providence obliged continued allegiance to William and was a factor in most Scots remaining loyal to William.

Other Scottish Presbyterians asserted that some subjects took the providence of the Revolution for granted. It was ‘our dreadful Ingratitude to GOD and our PRINCE’ that provoked divine retribution like Darien.¹⁷¹ 1688-9 was ‘that Great Year of SCOTLAND’S JUBILEE, when we were Delivered from Popery, Prelacy, Arbitrary Government, Tyranny and Slavery.’ This providence obliged obedience to William even amidst the current tribulations.¹⁷² The government and Presbyterian Kirk also used providence to defend allegiance to William at this time. In 1700 the Presbyterian General Assembly said that ‘The Continuance’ of William’s ‘Happy Reign’ was ‘through the Goodness of Our God.’¹⁷³ God made William a ‘Glorious Deliverer’ and all subjects should ‘always make suitable Returns of Gratitude’

¹⁶⁷ Ibid, pp.40-1.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid, pp.40, 58, 79-81.

¹⁶⁹ George Ridpath, *Scotland’s Grievances Relating to Darien &c., humbly offered to the Consideration of the Parliament* (n.p., 1700), pp.53-4.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid, pp.5-10, 27-8.

¹⁷¹ *The Sighs and Groans, of a Sinking Kingdom, in an Humble Address to the Parliament of Scotland* (n.p., 1700), p.3.

¹⁷² Ibid, pp.13-5.

¹⁷³ *The Principal Acts, of the General Assembly, of the Church of Scotland; Conveened, at Edinburgh, February 2, 1700* (Edinburgh, 1700), p.7.

for that deliverance.¹⁷⁴ The Assembly's Act calling for a national fast attributed Scotland's misfortunes to subjects' 'Ungratefulness' for the 'Merciful and signal Deliverances that God hath wrought for us, and for our Repining at God's Afflicting Providences' since 1689.¹⁷⁵ Public piety was described as an act of allegiance to William that would providentially return Scotland to a state of prosperous tranquillity.¹⁷⁶ One Williamite, endowed with 'True-blue LOYALTY; for GOD, KING and COUNTRY,' called for a new oath of loyalty to Presbyterianism to supplement the existing oath of allegiance and Assurance. This would show subjects' gratitude for the Revolution.¹⁷⁷ Again this pamphlet argued that 'OUR Horrid Ingratitude' to God and William provoked Scotland's providential punishment.¹⁷⁸ Scottish Williamites repeatedly argued that anything but passionate allegiance to William would bring providential punishment. This was another way of asserting that allegiance to William had providential approval.

Late-1690s English and Irish Williamite polemics had straightforward arguments about Ryswick being a final providential endorsement of allegiance to William. The late-1690s Scottish economic catastrophe meant that Scottish Williamites had slightly different providential arguments because the peace did not bring immediate benefits to Scotland. However, like English and Irish Williamites, Scottish Williamites used providential theory to argue that the Revolution, and all that it was seen as establishing, was permanent. Some polemics had ambiguous loyalties and Jacobites attempted to exploit popular discontent. Numerous Scottish Williamite polemics acknowledged the popular discontent but remained firm in their loyalty to William. They argued that most Scots remained Williamites and that William's continued reign, despite popular outrages, showed that his reign, and allegiance to William, had providential approval.

IV

¹⁷⁴ Ibid, p.7.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, 'Act Anent a Solemn National Fast, and Humiliation at Edinburgh 14 February 1700,' p.7.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid, p.10.

¹⁷⁷ *A Proper Project For Scotland. To Startle FOOLS, and Frighten KNAVES, But to make WISE-MEN Happy... and Ease our Minds with the Undoubted CAUSES of God's WRATH AND OF The Present NATIONAL CALAMITIES...* (n.p., 1699), Title page, pp.6-7.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid, p.25.

Providential theory was a favoured tool for seventeenth-century polemicists.¹⁷⁹ Historiography on political discourse in each Kingdom generally examines providential theory in the early 1690s with only brief mentions of its use in the late 1690s and frequently overlooks how Jacobites used providential theory in the allegiance debates. Across the Kingdoms providence remained a popular justification of allegiance throughout the 1690s. Early in William's reign Williamites used providence to advocate allegiance to William as *de facto* King in each Kingdom.¹⁸⁰ Many Jacobite polemics asserted that Williamites, like Sherlock, doing this were committing a grave sin. Mainly Nonjurors, like Dodwell, Jenkin, Scottish Episcopalians and others, said that James's restoration through providence was inevitable and made allegiance to William a pointless sin.¹⁸¹ Other Jacobites from diverse backgrounds, like Ferguson and Edmond Dulaney, accepted that providence would restore James and also argued for subjects to demonstrate their allegiance by working for James's restoration. Their polemics argued that this would ensure providential blessings for the Kingdoms.¹⁸² These polemics were less passive than Nonjurors' polemics but both approaches used providential theory in some form to justify allegiance to James and said that James's restoration was inevitable because providence was on James's side. Even with defeats for Jacobitism, like 1696 and Ryswick, providential theory allowed some Jacobite polemicists to argue that providence would undo the Revolution, restore James and vindicate those who maintained allegiance to James.¹⁸³

However Williamites hailed Ryswick as the final victory for William. English and Irish Williamites built on the rhetoric, described in Chapter Seven, advocating allegiance to William as *de jure* King in order to protect the

¹⁷⁹ Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, passim.

¹⁸⁰ Sherlock, *The Case of Allegiance*, pp.1-2; Fowler, *A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England*, p.14, Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative*, pp.4-6; Steuart, *Salus Populi Suprema Lex*, pp.4-8; King, *The State of the Protestants of Ireland*, pp.225-8.

¹⁸¹ Jenkin, *The Title of a Thorough Settlement Examined*, pp.8, 14-5, 22-3, 68-9; Dodwell, *Concerning the Care of Taking the New Oath of Fealty*, p.9; Kettlewell, *The Duty of Allegiance*, pp.19-22; Downes, *Examination of the Arguments*, pp.2-14, 24-5, 33-4, 42-7, 57-61, 64-72; Collier, *Dr Sherlock's Case Considered*, passim; *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland Third Series Volume XIV*, pp.184, 206-7, 241, 360.

¹⁸² Johnston, *Dear Bargain*, pp.17-8, 24; Dulaney, *Sermon Preached before the King*, pp.6-8, 19-21; Stafford, *A Word to both Houses*, pp.3-4; Anderton, *Remarks upon the Present Confederacy*, pp.4, 14, 45-7; Ferguson, *Whether the Parliament be not in Law dissolved by the Death of The Princess of Orange?*, pp.4-6, 17, 25; idem, *Whether preserving the Protestant Religion was the Motive*, pp.2-5, 9, 24-31.

¹⁸³ *The Fidelity of a Loyal Subject*, pp.1-4; Stafford, *Hear this Word, O ye Princes, ye Priests, and People of England*, pp.1, 7-8, 11-4.

Revolution settlements from Jacobite attempts to undo the Revolution. William was recognised as the permanent King of the Three Kingdoms by his subjects and internationally with the Ryswick Treaty; his position was unassailable. English and Irish Williamites argued that Ryswick was a final providential endorsement of allegiance to William.¹⁸⁴ These polemics show that providential theory had not been ‘discredited’ with Sherlock as Kenyon argued.¹⁸⁵ In Scotland there were Williamites who also hailed Ryswick as a providential endorsement of allegiance to William.¹⁸⁶ The fallout from the late-1690s economic crises resulted in William being unpopular in Scotland and polemics that appeared to advocate disloyalty.¹⁸⁷ However numerous Scottish Williamites argued that these calamities arose from subjects’ impiety and lack of gratitude to God for the Revolution. Scottish Williamites repeatedly asserted that William’s continued reign, despite the present difficulties, showed providence’s approval of William and the Revolution settlement as permanent and unassailable. They argued that this providential approval of allegiance to William was a factor in most Scots remaining Williamites.¹⁸⁸

Chapters Four through Six showed how from the mid-1690s allegiance to William, especially in England and Scotland, remained popular, despite William’s personal unpopularity, because it was seen as supporting the Revolution’s changes. This resulted in most subjects maintaining allegiance to William and, as Chapter Seven showed, accepting allegiance to William as *de jure* King, which was seen as protecting the Revolution settlement in each Kingdom. Across the Kingdoms late-1690s Williamite allegiance polemics confidently asserted that the Revolution would not be overturned even with the difficulties in Scotland. During the first years of William’s reign the

¹⁸⁴ Burnet, *Sermon Preached Before the King, On the Second of December, 1697*, pp.7-15; *The Revolution Justified*, pp.23, 26-7, 31-40; Halley, *A Sermon Preach’d in the Cathedral and Metropolitane Church of St. Peter in York*, pp.13-5; *The Protestants Crums of Comfort*, p.102; Jephson, *Sermon Preached in St. Andrews Church Dublin; On the 5th of November, 1698*, pp.3-9, 14-6; Aickin, *Londerias*, pp.29-30, 61, 76, 153-5; Arwaker, *God’s King the People’s Blessing*, ‘To the Archbishop,’ pp.1-5, 9, 13-6.

¹⁸⁵ Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, p.26.

¹⁸⁶ Kennedy, *Late History of Europe*, Preface; Privy Council of Scotland, *Letter Congratulatory*.

¹⁸⁷ *Scotland’s Lament; An Enquiry onto the Causes of the Miscarriage of the Scots Colony at Darien*, pp.46-7; Ferguson, *A Just and Modest Vindication of the Scots Design*, pp.45-6, 65-6, 144, 188-91.

¹⁸⁸ Philo-Caledon, *Scotland’s Present Duty*, pp.3-5, 12, 20; Ridpath, *Enquiry into the Causes of the Miscarriage of the Scots Colony at Darien*, pp.40, 57-9; *Proper Project for Scotland*, pp.6-7, 25; *Principal Acts, of the General Assembly, of the Church of Scotland; Conveened at Edinburgh, February 2, 1700*, pp.7-10; Fletcher, *Two Discourses Concerning the Affairs of Scotland*, pp.23-4.

Revolution was seen primarily as a personnel change. Mid-1690s allegiance polemics show that the Revolution was increasingly seen as involving more extensive changes than who sat on the throne. By the end of the 1690s the dominant political thought in England, Scotland and amongst Irish Protestants was that the Revolution involved significant changes and these changes were now permanent. However this sense of security was short-lived. The 1700 death of the heir presumptive, the Duke of Gloucester, followed by James's death in September 1701 reignited debates over allegiance across the Kingdoms. Daniel Defoe wrote that Gloucester's death meant that 'The settlement of the Crown of *England*, made by Parliament of the Abdication of the late King, seems to require further Consideration....'¹⁸⁹ A reinvigorated Jacobitism meant that the final days of William's reign and start of Anne's reign witnessed more fierce debates over allegiance and the Revolution. From 1701 allegiance debates focused on Abjuration Oaths and whether or not subjects would accept the Revolution settlements as permanent not just for William's lifetime but beyond William and forevermore.

¹⁸⁹ Daniel Defoe, *The Succession to the Crown of England, Considered* (London, 1701), p.5.

Chapter Nine: Abjuration: Defending the Establishment.

The security that many Williamites felt after the Treaty of Ryswick was short-lived. Jacobites continued denouncing the Revolution as a ‘Rebellion’ against the ‘*Rightful King*.’¹ Despite William’s government being unpopular in England and Scotland because of Darien, standing armies and other issues, allegiance to William remained popular.² The death of Anne’s son, the Duke of Gloucester, the successor after William and Anne, had a huge impact across the Kingdoms.³ This re-opened succession questions and reinvigorated Jacobitism.⁴ Diarist John Evelyn said this ‘astonishing’ news meant there was ‘none to succede to this Crowne, according as lately settled by Parliament on the late Revolution....’ Without a Protestant successor it appeared that the Revolution would shortly be reversed.⁵ This came when Louis XIV violated the Partition Treaties by interfering in Spain’s succession.⁶ Williamites were terrified that without an agreed successor Louis would exploit the Kingdoms, like he was exploiting Spain, to gain hegemony over Europe.⁷ Gilbert Burnet described Gloucester’s death as a ‘great alarm.’ The Spanish situation and Gloucester’s death ‘changed the face of affairs’ as debates over securing the Kingdoms from French-backed Jacobitism reignited.⁸ Daniel Defoe said that in 1701 how to preserve the Revolution and who should be supported as monarch ‘were the general Subjects of Discourse at this time.’⁹

This chapter examines the underexplored allegiance debates of 1701-3. Historiography for each Kingdom tends to treat Abjuration oaths as

¹ Henry Gandy, *An Answer to some Queries concerning Schism, Toleration, &c. in a Letter to a Friend* (London, 1700), pp.13, 43-4.

² See Chapters Four, Seven and Eight.

³ Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet’s History of his Own Time... Volume II...* (London, 1734), pp.244-5.

⁴ Christopher A. Whatley, *The Scots and the Union Then and Now* (Edinburgh, 2014), pp.218-20; Paul Hopkins, *Glencoe and the end of the Highland War* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.488-99; Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy 1660-1714* (London, 2013), pp.494-6, 641; Éamonn Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766 A Fatal Attachment* (Dublin, 2002), pp.164-5; Philip O’Regan, *Archbishop William King of Dublin (1650-1729) and the Constitution in Church and State* (Dublin, 2000), p.135.

⁵ John Evelyn, *Diary of John Evelyn... Volume V Kalendarium, 1690-1706*, ed. E.S De Beer (Oxford, 2000), pp.420-1.

⁶ Burnet, *Burnet’s History... Vol. II*, pp.244-5.

⁷ Christopher Storrs, ‘The Union of 1707 and the War of Spanish Succession,’ *The Scottish Historical Review*, LXXXVII, Issue 2 (Supplement) (2008), pp.32-6.

⁸ Burnet, *Burnet’s History... Vol. II*, pp.245-7, 253-8, 262-4, 268-70.

⁹ Daniel Defoe, *An Argument Shewing that the Prince of Wales, Tho’ a Protestant, has no just Pretensions to the Crown of England* (London, 1701), p.21; idem, *The Succession to the Crown of England, Considered* (London, 1701), pp.3-5.

offshoots of issues like the 1707 Union, constitutional change, factionalism and emerging party conflict.¹⁰ Abjuration oaths, where subjects renounced the Jacobite claimant, was effectively swearing allegiance to the Revolution settlement and accepting the perceived changes that the Revolution ushered in as permanent beyond William's own mortal life.¹¹ Chapters Four through Eight showed how allegiance was no longer about loyalty to the monarch's person but also supporting the changes in the Revolution settlements. Abjuration was a stronger declaration of allegiance than allegiance to William as *de jure* King.¹² Jacobitism was naturally about overturning what they saw as an illegitimate Revolution. Williamites or 'Revolutioners,' as Jacobite George Lockhart termed them, feared this.¹³ 'Revolutioners' is a more appropriate term for Williamites from 1702 because in each Kingdom they were anxious to ensure the survival of what they regarded as the established Revolution settlements and subjects' adherence to those principles. Preserving or overturning the settlements was the crux of the allegiance debates from 1701. Abjuration was seen as a means to protect the Revolution. Debates over Abjuration across the Kingdoms provide a fascinating insight into how political thought on the Revolution had evolved by the end of William's reign.

Gloucester's death raised the 'possibility of a failure in the Line of Succession.' Some 'further Security was necessary' to protect the establishment of rights and Protestantism that William's reign encapsulated.¹⁴ There was no obvious successor who could reign according to the Revolution

¹⁰ Whatley, *Scots and the Union*, pp.223-4; Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London, 1967), pp.63-5, 87-90; Henry Horwitz, *Revolution Politicks: The Career of Daniel Finch Second Earl of Nottingham, 1647-1730* (Cambridge, 1968), pp.114-5, 162-5; B.W Hill, *The Growth of Parliamentary Politics, 1659-1742* (London, 1976), pp.49-57, 67-8; Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed Britain 1603-1714* (London, 1997), pp.310-1; J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (London, 1977), pp.55-6, 88-90; Keith M. Brown, 'Party Politics and Parliament: Scotland's Last Election and its Aftermath,' in Keith M. Brown & A.J. Mann (eds.) *The History of the Scottish Parliament Volume II Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1567-1707* (Edinburgh, 2005), pp.48-9; Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union* (Edinburgh, 2007), pp.17, 21, 30, 51, 55-6, 86-7, 94; S.J. Connolly, *Religion, Law, Power The Making of Protestant Ireland, 1660-1760* (Oxford, 1995), pp.270, 275-7; D.W. Hayton, *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1741: Politics, Politicians and Parties* (Woodbridge, 2004), passim; Edward Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution 1688: Britain's Fight for Liberty* (London, 2006), pp.290-1.

¹¹ *A Funeral Oration upon the Late King James Composed from Memoirs, furnishing by Mr. Porter* (Dublin, 1702), p.16.

¹² See Chapters Four through Eight.

¹³ George Lockhart, 'Memoirs Concerning the Affairs of Scotland,' *The Lockhart Papers: Containing Memoirs and Commentaries upon the Affairs of Scotland from 1702 to 1715...Published from Original Manuscripts in the Possession of Anthony Aufreere... Volume I* (London, 1817), pp.48-9.

¹⁴ *Limitations for the Next Foreign Successor, or new Saxon race. Debated in a Conference betwixt two Gentlemen. Sent in a Letter to a Member of Parliament* (London, 1701), pp.3-5.

settlement. One poet said ‘Long on the Throne may Glorious WILLIAM shine; But GLOUCESTER’S gone!- the Promise of the Line!’ In 1701 the future after William and Anne was now a terrifying unknown.¹⁵

England’s Act of Settlement was meant to be the solution to this problem. James Francis Edward and fifty-six other Catholics were excluded from the succession in favour of the House of Hanover should Anne die childless.¹⁶ Tim Harris described this as ‘working out... the implications of the Glorious Revolution.’¹⁷ The Revolution was central to the Act. It stated that ‘Succession to the Crown in the Protestant Line’ was ‘for the Safety and Quiet of this Realm.’¹⁸ The Act’s full title, ‘for the further Limitation of the Crown and better Securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject,’ echoed the rhetoric that developed about the Revolution guaranteeing liberties.¹⁹ English politics was bitterly divided at this time but Whigs and Tories generally supported the Act because they feared a Jacobite restoration.²⁰ Irish Protestants, fearing the large Irish Catholic population, readily accepted the Act.²¹ Scotland was expected to follow England’s succession although this proved more controversial than in Ireland.²² However, as J.P. Kenyon points out, the Act failed to secure the Revolution in England, let alone the other Kingdoms.²³ Shortly after the Act’s passage news of James II and VII’s death further fuelled allegiance debates with some Williamite polemicists believing a

¹⁵ Gentleman in New-England, *A Poem on the Death of His Highness the Duke of Gloucester. Written by a Gentleman in New-England* (London, 1701), p.3.

¹⁶ David Smith, *The Stuart Parliaments 1603-1689* (London, 1999), p.168.

¹⁷ Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2007), p.493.

¹⁸ ‘William III, 1700 & 1701: An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown and better Securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject [Chapter II. Rot. Parl. 12 & 13 Gul. III. P.1. n.2.],’ *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 7: 1695-1701*, ed. John Raithby (n.p., 1820), pp.636-8. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol7/pp636-638>. Date Accessed 4 January 2015.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, pp.636-8; John Toland, *Anglia Libera...* (London, 1701), pp.29-32, 38-45, 92-8, 107-8, 129-32. See also Chapter Four.

²⁰ Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford, 1999), pp.148-50; H.T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London, 1977), pp.39-40; Kishlansky, *Monarchy Transformed*, pp.310-1; Paul Monod, ‘Jacobitism and Country Principles in the Reign of William III,’ *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Jun., 1987), pp.307-8; Denis Rubini, *Court and Country 1688-1702* (London, 1968), pp.169-72; Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England 1603-1714* (London, 1995), pp.228-34.

²¹ O’Regan, *Archbishop William King*, p.135; Allan I. Macinnes, *Union and Empire The Making of the United Kingdom 1707* (Cambridge, 2007), p.10.

²² Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland’s Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge, 1993), pp.42-3.

²³ Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.89-90.

stronger allegiance was now necessary to secure the Revolution.²⁴ Abjuration oaths would build on the popular rhetoric that developed on allegiance after James's death.

I

Louis promised the dying James that he would 'own the Prince of Wales as the lawful Heir of the Crowns of England, Scotland and Ireland.' One English newspaper denounced Louis's 'palpable Breach of... Ryswick' in 'setting up of the Title of that pretended Prince against King William.' This caused 'Provocation to the King and Nation of England.'²⁵ James Hamilton of Pencaitland, a Scottish Country politician, wrote from Edinburgh to James, Duke of Hamilton, that Louis's recognising the Pretender elicited 'a great deall of discourse heir.'²⁶ Breandán Ó Buachalla has described Irish Jacobitism in the eighteenth century as an ideological commitment to overturning the Revolution by restoring the Stuarts and with them Catholicism.²⁷ Jacobites across the Kingdoms had a deep commitment to undo the Revolution albeit without establishing Catholicism. When James II and VII died there were public displays of Jacobitism. Jacobites again presented allegiance to the exiled Jacobite claimants as adherence to the sole legitimate monarch. In Edinburgh Jacobites attached a notice to the Mercat Cross, where official notices were posted, proclaiming 'the pretended Prince of Wales Successor to this Crown.' Scotland's Privy Council issued a reward for the author's arrest and the seizure of any reprints.²⁸ There were numerous news reports of 'great rejoicing' in Ireland by Catholics and 'other disaffected persons' when Louis endorsed the Pretender.²⁹ Many English poets mourned James II's passing. One hoped every subject would 'force from their Eyes, Torrents of Tears' and 'lament his

²⁴ *A Funeral Oration upon the Late King James*, p.16.

²⁵ *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 9-11 September 1701, No. 990, p.1.

²⁶ 'James Hamilton of Pencaitland to James, Duke of Hamilton, Edinburgh, September 18, 1701,' Historical Manuscripts Commission *Supplementary Report on Manuscripts of his grace the Duke of Hamilton*, ed. John Harvey MacMaster & Marguerite Wood (London, 1932), p.145.

²⁷ Breandán Ó Buachalla, 'Irish Jacobitism and Irish Nationalism: The Literary Evidence,' in Michael O'Dea & Kevin Whelan (eds.) *Nations and Nationalisms: France, Britain, Ireland, and the Eighteenth-Century Context* (Oxford, 1995), pp.103-5, 109.

²⁸ *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 30 September- 2 October 1701, No. 999, p.2.

²⁹ Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs From September 1678 to April 1714 Volume V* (Oxford, 1867), pp.93-4; *The New State of Europe, Or a True Account of Publick Transaction and Learning*, 7-9 October 1701, No. 9.

Loss.³⁰ Another poem used xenophobia in grieving for James and his ‘injur’d Name’ while hoping that ‘Young British Kings,’ presumably the Pretender, would ‘Rule the British Main’ after Anne. This went through two editions, showing that this poem had some popularity.³¹

With a new Jacobite claimant and doubts over the succession Jacobites were more vocal in seeking the exiled Pretender’s enthronement to reverse the Revolution. Nonjuror George Hickes satirized Williamite rejections of whom he saw as the legitimate successor. Hickes believed that a parliamentary inquiry would establish James VIII and III’s legitimacy and force Williamites to accept the inevitable restoration. ‘For if the Prince of Wales was the true Child of the late K. *James*, and *Born* of the *Queen*, I can’t tell how to avoid it....’ The Pretender was ‘in his *Father’s* Life-time the *Lawful Heir* of these *Kingdoms*; and is *now*, since his Death become our *Rightful King*, to whom we have *Sworn*, and are indispensibly bound to bear *Faith* and *True Allegiance*.³² Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy taken during James II’s reign obliged subjects to accept the rightful James Francis Edward’s succession.³³ Poems, public displays and pamphlets show that significant numbers in each Kingdom were publicly committed to undoing the Revolution by enthroning the Pretender and declared allegiance to him as the legitimate King.

This brazen public Jacobitism horrified Williamites and they denounced any pining for the exiled claimant who they believed was illegitimate. William Fuller was a Williamite agent who claimed to have been present at James’s court during important events, including the Pretender’s birth.³⁴ Fuller wrote several pamphlets to prove ‘the Illegitimacy of the pretended Prince of *Wales*.’³⁵ He attacked those who ‘seem to adore’ the

³⁰ J.M., *An Ode or Elegy on the death of James the Second, Author- J.M, Gent* (London, 1701).

³¹ *The Generous Muse A Funeral Poem, in Memory of his late Majesty K James the II...Second Edition* (London, 1701), pp.1, 8-9.

³² George Hickes, *The Pretences of the Prince of Wales Examin’d, and Rejected In a Letter to a Friend in the Country* (n.p., 1702), p.1.

³³ *Ibid*, pp.1-2, 4, 11.

³⁴ C.E.A. Cheesman, ‘Fuller, William (1670–1733)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008

[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10241>, accessed 27 March 2014].

³⁵ William Fuller, *Twenty six depositions of Persons of Quality and worth: With letters of the late Queen, Fr. Corker...*(London, 1702), p.25.

Pretender and publicly called for his enthronement.³⁶ Some of Fuller's accusations against certain individuals were denounced in the Lords but Fuller's pamphlets were part of a tide of Williamite publications defending the Revolution in response to increasingly overt Jacobitism.³⁷ Another Williamite, disgusted by the volume of Jacobite poetry, lamented how there were no poets 'Inspir'd with English Zeal' paying tribute to William.³⁸ Defoe criticised these flirtations with Jacobitism, which would 'reduce the Liberties and Religion of this Nation.'³⁹ He also criticised Whig John Tutchin's anti-Dutch polemics.⁴⁰ However Tutchin also lambasted popular nostalgia for James.⁴¹ To Tutchin 'England's Fate' was sealed; subjects should 'rejoice' because the 'Tyrants dead' and subjects permanently freed from the potential slavery of Jacobite rule.⁴² In response to public laments for James II and declarations of loyalty to the Pretender Williamites again portrayed Jacobitism as overturning the freedom from tyranny established, amongst other things, at the Revolution.

Loyal addresses from subjects across the Kingdoms reasserting allegiance to William were a popular response to Louis recognising the Pretender as King. These were republished in newspapers and reflected each Kingdom's different Revolution settlement but were united by desires to preserve these establishments into the future. They articulated a fear of losing all the changes that the Revolution introduced. Several English addresses denounced a potential Jacobite restoration as establishing 'Popery and Tyranny' by overturning William's 'Just and Legal Title' to the throne. James III would 'destroy our Religion, Rights and Liberties,' which William guaranteed at the Revolution. Subjects' addresses resolved to carry on in their

³⁶ William Fuller, *A Plain Proof of the True father and mother of the pretended Prince of Wales by several letter written by the late Queen in France...* (London, 1701) 'Preface;' idem, *Fuller's Non-Recantation to the Jacobite* (London, 1701), pp.5-10.

³⁷ Historical Manuscripts Commission *The Manuscripts of the House of Lords, Volume IV 1699-1702* (London, 1965), pp.412-3. Fuller had made several accusations about politicians who had loyally served James before the Revolution and this caused outrage amongst some peers in the Lords.

³⁸ *The Poet's Address to His Majesty King William. Occasion'd by the Insolence of the French King, in Proclaiming the Sham Prince of Wales, King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (London, 1702), p.3.

³⁹ Daniel Defoe, *The True-Born Englishman. A Satyr* (London, 1700), 'Preface.'

⁴⁰ J.A Downie, 'Tutchin, John (1660x64-1707),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27899>, accessed 22 September 2012].

⁴¹ John Tutchin, *The British Muse: or Tyranny Expos'd Occasion'd by Poems or Elegies on James II's Death* (London/ Dublin, 1702), pp.8-9.

⁴² Ibid, p.3.

‘Duty’ to William.⁴³ English Nonconformists, as Chapter Five showed, viewed loyalty to William as supporting the Revolution settlement, which granted them Toleration. Their loyal addresses, like those by London Baptists and Hull Presbyterians, reasserted their allegiance to William in support of this settlement. English Quakers similarly asserted loyalty to William’s ‘Lawful Establishment’ under which they enjoyed ‘great Mercies and Favours; and particularly that of Liberty to Tender Consciences in Religious Worship....’⁴⁴ These addresses show that by 1701-2 the Revolution was popularly viewed as being the legal establishment of a monarchy protecting Protestantism and liberties for Anglicans and Nonconformists. English Anglican and Nonconformist Williamites reasserted their allegiance to William as supporting the preservation of this Revolution establishment. From the mid-1690s what the Revolution achieved was more prominent in justifying allegiance to William and in response to Louis recognising the Pretender these changes now being the establishment was central to denying James III allegiance.

Irish addresses also reaffirmed allegiance to William against the ‘Popery and Slavery’ offered by French-backed Jacobitism. Church of Ireland bishops said their loyalty was a result of ‘the Great and Signal Deliverance of these Kingdoms, (especially of this of Ireland)....’⁴⁵ Newspapers published addresses from local authorities and ‘Protestants’ across Ireland. The addresses described how the Revolution in Ireland permanently protected Protestantism and Protestant monarchy and they would defend William’s ‘undoubted Right and Title to these Kingdoms.’ Loyalty to William was reaffirmed in defence of these changes, which were now the established order.⁴⁶

⁴³ Loyal address from Bodmin Corporation, Cornwall and Loyal address of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, *The London Gazette*, 6-10 November 1701, No. 3756, p.3; Loyal Address of the Lord Mayor and Politicians of Norfolk, *The Flying Post or The Post-Master*, 16-18 October 1701, No. 1006, p.1; Loyal Address of New Romney, Kent, *The Post Boy*, 21-23 October 1701, No. 1004.

⁴⁴ Loyal Address of London Baptists and Loyal Address of English Quakers, *The London Gazette*, 25-29 December 1701, No. 3770, p.1; Loyal address of Presbyterians in Kingston-upon-Hull, *The London Gazette*, 1-5 January 1702, No. 3772, pp.1-2.

⁴⁵ Loyal address of Dublin City, Loyal Address of the Earl of Meath and Justices of Peace of Dublin, Loyal address of the Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, Lord Mayor of Dublin’s Loyal address, Loyal address of the Church of Ireland bishops, *The London Gazette*, 6-10 November 1701, No. 3756, p.3.

⁴⁶ *The London Gazette*, 24-27 November 1701, No. 3761, p.2; Loyal Address of Tipperary Protestants, *The London Gazette*, 17-20 November 1701, No. 3759, p.3; *The London Gazette*, 18-22 December 1701, No. 3768; Loyal Address of the Protestants of County and City of Dublin, *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master* 4-6 November 1701, No. 1014, p.2. Other Irish loyal addresses are published in *The London Gazette*, 27 November- 1 December 1701, No. 3762, pp.2-3 and *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 25-28 October 1701, No. 1010, pp.1-2.

Allan Macinnes has said that early-eighteenth-century loyal addresses were increasingly formulaic.⁴⁷ However loyal addresses, each of which had numerous subscribers, still provide insights into popular sentiments.⁴⁸ Scottish loyal addresses, like English addresses, show that asserting allegiance to William and the Revolution settlement was popular. The Scottish Privy Council's address was reprinted in newspapers and as a pamphlet; this shows that this address had some popular appeal. It recalled the 'Great and never-to-be forgotten Deliverance' in 1688-9 when Scotland was on 'the Brink of Ruine.' William brought 'a most happy Settlement both of Church and State.' They reiterated 'Fidelity and Gratitude' to William and the 'inalterable Revolution' against 'the pretended Prince of Wales, and all Opposers and Enemies.'⁴⁹ Again allegiance was pledged to William and the Revolution settlement, which was permanent. Jacobitism threatened to overthrow what was now the natural order. Scottish legal officers' loyal address condemned Louis's 'contempt' towards William and Scotland's 'settled Succession.'⁵⁰ As in England and Ireland, Scottish addresses expressing continued loyalty to William and the Revolution came from across the Kingdom.⁵¹ Loyal addresses from each Kingdom viewed William's Revolution as having established Protestantism and Liberties in three different settlements but subversive Jacobitism, under Louis's behest, threatened all three. These addresses are evidence of popular support, in England, Scotland, and amongst Irish Protestants, for preserving the Revolution settlements. Allegiance to William

⁴⁷ Macinnes, *Union and Empire*, pp.247-8.

⁴⁸ Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1553-1682* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp.203-4; Karin Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.32-4, 39-40, 45-9.

⁴⁹ Loyal address of the Privy Council of Scotland, *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 18-20 November 1701, No. 1020, p.1; Loyal Address of Privy Council of Scotland, *London Gazette*, 8-11 December 1701, No. 3765; Privy Council of Scotland, *The humble Address of the Lords and Others of His Majesty's most Honourable Privy Council to the King* (Edinburgh, 1701).

⁵⁰ Loyal address of the legal officers of Scotland, *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 20-23 December 1701, No. 1034.

⁵¹ Loyal Address of the Parliament of Scotland, *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 27-29 January 1702, No. 1050; Loyal address by the Lord Provost and Council of Edinburgh, *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 18-20 November 1701, No. 1020, p.1; Loyal addresses from Edinburgh, Perth, Ayr, Dundee, *Flying Post*, 20-23 December 1701, No. 1034; Loyal addresses of Castle Garrison, City of Stirling and County of Stirlingshire, *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 27-30 December 1701, No. 1037; Loyal Addresses from Peebles presented by James Douglas, Duke of Queensberry, Royal Scottish Navy, Aberdeen, St. Andrews, *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 20-22 January 1702, No. 1047.

and the Revolution was justified on the grounds that this was an ‘inalterable’ establishment.⁵²

Williamite pamphleteers also emphasized this point. Defoe repeatedly stressed the importance of loyalty to William in countering Jacobite threats to the Revolution settlement.⁵³ To Defoe allegiance to the Pretender had no validity; James’s death removed any ‘obstacle’ preventing Nonjurors from giving allegiance to the ‘present Establish Government’ of William.⁵⁴ Even if the Pretender was Protestant he could not reign because England’s Parliament legally excluded him. Anne and then the Hanoverians were obliged to preserve this establishment when they legitimately succeeded William who had an ‘Establish Right.’⁵⁵ William and the Revolution were repeatedly described as now being the legal establishment, which Jacobitism threatened.⁵⁶ Another English Williamite said that after James’s death the Revolution was threatened by those who ‘make his Cause live after his Death, by tramping up the Title of the pretended Prince of *Wales*.’⁵⁷ James II was an ‘Enemy to our Constitution, our Religion, Laws and Liberties;’ his son would also be an enemy to this establishment.⁵⁸ This author argued that whether or not the Pretender was legitimate was irrelevant because ‘Succession is legally settled on others... the name of that Prince is not so much mentioned in any of our Acts of Settlement.’⁵⁹ A Jacobite restoration would be an ‘apparent breach of our Laws’ and a ‘breach of the Oaths of most of the good People of *England* who have sign’d the Association.’ The Association, where subjects gave William allegiance as the *de jure*, legitimate, King, was accepting James II’s permanent exclusion. Therefore a Jacobite restoration now would breach subjects’ allegiance and subvert England’s post-Revolution legal establishment.⁶⁰

The Revolution, and all that it was now seen as encompassing described in Chapters Four through Eight, was seen as permanent. An Irish

⁵² Privy Council of Scotland, *Humble Address of the Lords and Others of His Majesty’s most Honourable Privy Council*.

⁵³ Daniel Defoe, *Reasons against war with France, or an Argument shewing Louis proclaiming the Prince of Wales King is not reason enough for war* (London, 1701), pp.1-3, 5-7; idem, *The Present State of Jacobitism* (London, 1702), pp.9-14, 22.

⁵⁴ Defoe, *Present State of Jacobitism*, pp.22, 13.

⁵⁵ Daniel Defoe, *An Argument Shewing that the Prince of Wales, Tho’ a Protestant, has no just Pretensions to the Crown of England* (London, 1701), pp.2-3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 22-3.

⁵⁶ *Funeral Oration upon the Late King James*, ‘To the King,’ ‘The Preface.’

⁵⁷ *A Letter to a Minister of State, Concerning the Pretended Prince of Wales Being Proclaim’d King of England, &c. in France...* (London, 1701), p.9.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, pp.9-11, 16-7, 20-1.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, pp.11-2.

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, pp.11-2. See Chapter Seven for more on allegiance to *de jure* monarchs.

Williamite pamphlet said that James III ‘can never be settled upon the Throne of these Kingdoms, without the manifest Overthrow of our Religion and Liberty.’⁶¹ English Tory Charles Davenant noted there were many who believed that the Act of Settlement ‘signifies nothing, unless it had been accompany’d with a good round Oath of Abjuration....’⁶² A Dublin- and London-published Williamite polemic argued that a new allegiance oath, an abjuration oath, was needed to prevent a Jacobite takeover. To secure the Kingdoms ‘from Intestine Enemies, who are in the Pretender’s Interest,’ an ‘Oath of Abjuration’ should be ‘imposed upon all those’ seeking official positions. This would ‘probably secure the Administration into the hands of those that are for our present Constitution, and exclude them that are Enemies to it.’⁶³ Abjuration compelled subjects to renounce the Pretender thereby securing the Revolution and ‘our present Constitution.’ It placed greater emphasis on the settlement as part of subjects’ allegiance and manifested the popular desires to preserve the Revolution.

The deaths of Gloucester and James II and VII theoretically removed obstacles to the Pretender’s enthronement but subjects in the Kingdoms publicly declared their desire not to turn back time to how things were before the Revolution. From the mid-1690s allegiance to William was increasingly seen as supporting innovations in the Revolution settlements, like guaranteed liberties, protected Protestantism, Protestant monarchy and toleration. Allegiance to William as *de jure* King, through the Association and Assurance, gave William’s reign a permanence but Abjuration, where subjects renounced the Jacobite claimant, was an even stronger declaration of allegiance to the Revolution. Building on the popular rhetoric in loyal addresses advocates of Abjuration portrayed it as protecting the Revolution settlements beyond William’s own life by declaring allegiance to the settlements. It was refusing to accept a return to pre-Revolution life with a Jacobite restoration.

II

⁶¹ *The Pope’s Speech to the College of Cardinals; upon the Death of the Late King James* (Dublin, 1701), ‘Postscript.’

⁶² Charles Davenant, *The True Picture of a Modern Whig, Set Forth in a Dialogue Between Mr. Whiglove & Mr. Double...Fourth Edition* (London, 1701), p.41.

⁶³ *A Funeral Oration upon the Late King James Composed from Memoirs, furnishing by Mr. Porter* (London, 1702); *A Funeral Oration upon the Late King James Composed from Memoirs, furnishing by Mr. Porter* (Dublin, 1702) p.16.

In 1692-3 abjuration of James II's right was rejected by the Tory-dominated English Parliament as an 'un-English' attempt to embarrass Tories.⁶⁴ During the 1690s Tory sensitivities over allegiance, with James II still alive, were a factor in rejecting Abjuration.⁶⁵ Williamite Tory Edward Stillingfleet rejected Abjuration because he believed that the 1689 oath recognising William as *de facto* King was the only necessary allegiance test and abjuration would only further inflame Whig-Tory divisions.⁶⁶ Edward Vallance argues that there were few pamphlets on Abjuration or the Association because parliament had become the main arbiter in such political decisions.⁶⁷ However, as in 1696, the Abjuration debates in parliament complimented popular printed sentiment.⁶⁸ In spring 1702 William's health was declining.⁶⁹ This added urgency to the 1702 English Abjuration debates. The few secondary sources to comment on English Abjuration oaths portray the 1702 debates as part of the Whig-Tory animosity, especially with the English Parliament's finely balanced composition.⁷⁰ There was certainly some whole-hearted Tory opposition to Abjuration in 1702 but Tories, like Whigs, were caught up in the popular rhetoric to preserve the Revolution. Party divisions remained but both sides were concerned about preserving the Revolution establishment.

Tory Williamite opposition to Abjuration was effectively repeating the same reasons for opposing stronger allegiance to William from 1693 to 1696 that was explored in Chapter Seven. The Earl of Nottingham, who reluctantly gave William allegiance as *de facto* King, and his brother, Heneage

⁶⁴ Narcissus Luttrell, *Parliamentary Diary of Narcissus Luttrell, 1691-1693*, ed. Henry Horwitz (Oxford, 1972), pp.314-9. See Chapter Seven for more on these debates.

⁶⁵ Jennifer Carter, 'The Revolution and the Constitution,' in Geoffrey Holmes (ed.) *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714* (London, 1969), pp.41-2; Mark Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument An Essay and an Annotated Bibliography of Pamphlets on the Allegiance Controversy,' *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 83 (1980), pp.519-20.

⁶⁶ Edward Stillingfleet, *The Case of an Oath of Abjuration Considered...* (London, 1693), pp.4-6, 8-13, 22-3, 25-7, 30-1, 34.

⁶⁷ Edward Vallance, 'The Decline of Conscience as a Political Guide: William Higden's View of the English Constitution (1709),' in Harold E. Braun & Edward Vallance (eds.) *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700* (London, 2004), pp.78-9.

⁶⁸ See Chapter Seven.

⁶⁹ Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.264-9.

⁷⁰ Horwitz, *Revolution Politics*, pp.165-70; idem, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the reign of William III* (Manchester, 1977), pp.24-5, 28-9, 316; Nenner, *Right to be King*, pp.228-32; Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.32-4, 55-6, 88-90, 104-5, 207; Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, pp.82-3; Rubini, *Court and Country*, pp.40, 255-6.

Finch, led opposition to Abjuration.⁷¹ Nottingham and his cohorts believed ‘that no new oath should be imposed on the subject.’ They argued that the 1689 oath was sufficient in the ‘longest and warmest debates in both Houses’ on Abjuration.⁷² Country politician Edward Harley ‘railed against and Exploded oaths in generall.’ He compared 1702 with 1659 ‘when the very persons that abjured king Charles the second in less than twelve months brought him back.’ Harley was clearly not bullish about the Revolution’s future.⁷³ Stillingfleet’s anti-Abjuration pamphlet was also republished.⁷⁴

However, as with the 1696 Association, there was also considerable Tory support for Abjuration. Whig parliamentary diarist Sir Richard Cocks recorded influential Tory Sir Edward Seymour’s support for Abjuration. Seymour said Abjuration had no English historical precedent but with William’s death in March 1702 ‘we must take it.’⁷⁵ Given Seymour’s opposition to the 1696 Association this shows how pressing the need to secure subjects’ support for the Revolution, which included Anne’s succession, beyond William’s life had become.⁷⁶ Tories and Whigs still disagreed over aspects of the Revolution, like whether it involved justifiable resistance, but Whigs and most Tories accepted that whatever the Revolution was had become the establishment by 1702. In parliament Abjuration was described as ‘stronger than the association’ in securing the Revolution beyond William’s life.⁷⁷

Abjuration passed in the Commons with Tory support and received royal assent just before William died. Geoffrey Holmes argued that this showed that Tories had ‘turned their backs on the past’ and had ‘come to terms with the future’ by accepting the Revolution.⁷⁸ David Martin Jones described Abjuration as recognising the political reality in 1702 by accepting the Revolution settlement with its extra-lineal succession.⁷⁹ Gerald Straka argued that the Revolution survived William’s death because it was never ‘fully

⁷¹ Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.33-4. See Chapter One for Nottingham’s acceptance of allegiance to William as *de facto* King and Chapter Seven for Tory opposition to allegiance to William as *de jure* King.

⁷² *Cobbett’s Parliamentary History of England Volume 5* (London, 1809), cols. 1334-5.

⁷³ Sir Richard Cocks, *Parliamentary Diary of Sir Richard Cocks, 1698-1702*, ed. David Hayton (Oxford, 1996), pp.208-9.

⁷⁴ Edward Stillingfleet, *The Case of an Oath of Abjuration considered...* (London, 1702).

⁷⁵ Cocks, *Parliamentary Diary*, p.254.

⁷⁶ See Chapter Seven for Seymour’s opposition to the 1696 Association.

⁷⁷ Cocks, *Parliamentary Diary*, p.254.

⁷⁸ Holmes, *British Politics*, pp.82-3, 87-8.

⁷⁹ David Martin Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth Century England The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (Rochester, 1999), pp.222-7.

dependent on him.⁸⁰ Kenyon claimed that Anne's succession allowed Tories to discard *de facto* theory and take the Abjuration while maintaining that her title came through her hereditary right rather than parliament.⁸¹ The introduction of the Abjuration oath built on the popular rhetoric in the 1701 loyal addresses about preserving the Revolution. William was no longer central to allegiance; it was, as Jones said, about the Revolution settlement. Abjuration re-endorsed William as the 'lawfull and rightful king' and had subscribers 'renounce refuse and abjure any Allegiance' to James III who threatened to overturn the Revolution settlement, which included Anne's succession.⁸² The Revolution was going to survive because Whigs and Tories produced similar rhetoric about protecting the settlement beyond William. Tory and Whig polemics praised Abjuration for protecting the establishment of what they believed allegiance to William supported from Jacobite subversion by denying the Pretender allegiance.

Whigs naturally hailed Abjuration; some had championed it in the 1690s.⁸³ *The Observer*, Tutchin's Whig newspaper,⁸⁴ praised Abjuration as 'the most effectual Care to frustrate the Designs of' Jacobites.⁸⁵ Irish-born extreme Whig John Toland praised Abjuration as a more effective allegiance test. Subscribers 'cannot be possibly doubted to renounce with all their Hearts, and from a due Understanding of our fundamental Constitution, all the false Claims, Rights, or Titles of any Pretender....'⁸⁶ Abjuration preserved this Revolution establishment from the Pretender's 'Danger,' therefore Abjuration was a 'Continuance of our Liberty.'⁸⁷ This rhetoric about Abjuration being stronger allegiance to the Revolution settlement echoed the 1701 loyal

⁸⁰ Gerald Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962), pp.12-3.

⁸¹ Kenyon, *Revolution Principles*, pp.200-2.

⁸² 'William III, 1701: An Act for the further Security of His Majesties Person and the Succession of the Crown in the Protestant Line and for extinguishing the Hopes of the pretended Prince of Wales and all other Pretenders and their open and secret Abettors. [Chapter VI. Rot. Parl. 13 & 14 Gul. III. n. 6.],' *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 7, 1695-1701*, ed. John Raithby (n.p., 1820), pp.747-750. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol7/pp747-750>. Date Accessed: 7 July 2015.

See Appendix V for the full wording of the English Abjuration Oath.

⁸³ William Atwood, *The Antiquity and Justice of an Oath of Abjuration in Answer to a Treatise, entituled, The Case of an Oath of Abjuration Considered* (London, 1694), passim.

⁸⁴ Brian Cowan, 'Mr. Spectator and the Coffeehouse Public Sphere,' *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 3, Critical Networks (Spring, 2004), p.358.

⁸⁵ *The Observer*, 20-23 May 1702, No. 9, pp.1-2.

⁸⁶ John Toland, *I. reasons for addressing His Majesty to invite into England...the Dowager and the Electeral Prince of Hanover...II Reasons for ...Abjuring the Pretended Prince of Wales...* (London, 1702), pp.18-9.

⁸⁷ *Ibid*, p.20.

addresses and was a popular feature in Whig and Tory justifications of Abjuration.

Burnet, a firm Whig, recorded that ‘almost the Whole Party’ of Tories took the Abjuration but doubted Tories’ sincerity on it.⁸⁸ Numerous Tories publicly acclaimed Abjuration. One justified Abjuration as allegiance ‘to the *Act of Settlement*, as the Crown is now entail’d in the *Protestant Line*....’⁸⁹ Anne was the ‘*Undoubted Heir*’ because the Act ‘*Excluded*’ the Pretender. Like Toland, this Tory praised Anne’s succession and Abjuration for defending the Revolution establishment by subjects disclaiming ‘the *Present Right* of the Reputed *Prince of Wales*.’⁹⁰ This pamphlet did display partisanship by warning that Whigs would try to gain advantage by portraying Tories as disloyal for refusing Abjuration but its main focus was preserving the established order with Abjuration.⁹¹ Other pamphlets, like *The Case of the Abjuration*, also warned that Abjuration could be used by a ‘Party’ to gain ‘strength’ but subjects should accept what ‘those who have Authority’ decided on allegiance.⁹² *The Case* accepted Abjuration because it was effectively ‘the same’ as subjects had been doing ‘for 13 Years past’ by refusing allegiance to Jacobite claimants and supporting William as the ‘*Rightful and Lawful King*.’⁹³ Another Tory lauded Abjuration for supporting ‘the present Government, and the Succession, as by Law established, as far as it is possible by Human Endeavours, with Submission to the Divine Providence.’⁹⁴ Abjuration ‘required’ subjects ‘to Renounce, Refuse, and Abjure any Allegiance’ to the Pretender; it was effectively allegiance to the Revolution settlement.⁹⁵ This ‘more particular and express Engagements’ of loyalty would protect England from Jacobitism.⁹⁶ Although Tories and Whigs still differed on aspects of the

⁸⁸ Burnet, *Burnet's History... Vol. II*, p.314.

⁸⁹ *The Opinion of a Divine of the Church of England about the Oath of Abjuration, or in what sense it is to be understood, and may be safely taken...*(London, 1702).

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² *The Case of the Abjuration Oath Endeavoured to be Cleared, To the Satisfaction of those who are Required to take it* (London, 1702), pp.20-1.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp.7-12.

⁹⁴ *Principles upon which the Taking the Oath of Abjuration may be grounded* (London, 1702), pp.15, 18.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.19-21.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.22-3.

Revolution, Tories supported Abjuration as defending the post-Revolution 'establish'd' order in Church and state.⁹⁷

Two 1702 pamphlets by Defoe are significant because they provide evidence of how popular preserving the Revolution establishment was amongst Whigs and Tories. Chapter Five showed that Defoe, despite being a Nonconformist Whig frequently critical of perceived Tory disloyalty, was prepared at times to acknowledge when Tories and Whigs were united in defending the Revolution.⁹⁸ In *Mock Mourners*, which went through numerous editions,⁹⁹ he remained critical of those who 'dream't of the Pretender and overturning the 'sure Establishment' of Protestantism, laws, and liberties. William 'laid the first Foundation Stone' of this 'Establishment' in 1688-9.¹⁰⁰ However in 1702 Defoe also acknowledged that Tories were loyal to the Revolution. His *New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty* said that Tories and Whigs, Anglicans and Dissenters, were equally loyal and disloyal. 'All are alike; they are pleased when legally Govern'd; Quarrelsome and Unruly, if Opprest; and will Defend themselves if Assaulted; tho' it be by their Kings, or any Body else.'¹⁰¹ Defoe noted Anglican difficulties from 1688 but believed that in 1702 most subjects were loyal to the settlement.¹⁰²

Abjuration received less public criticism than previous aspects of the allegiance debates because to Whigs and many Tories the Revolution was the establishment in 1702. *De Facto* theory had been discarded as a credible public position.¹⁰³ With the exception of some Tories, most public comments in the English political discourse in 1702 were explicitly pro-Abjuration and pro-Revolution. Even figures like Defoe, Burnet and Cocks recorded Tory support for Abjuration. In 1702 most Tories and Whigs were Revolutioners. Abjuration acknowledged that the Revolution was more than just a personnel change because it ensured an established monarchy that guaranteed Protestantism,

⁹⁷ *The Opinion of a Divine of the Church of England*. Tories and Whigs frequently differed over the Non-Resistance doctrine and whether there was resistance in 1688-9. These issues are explored in Chapters Two and Four.

⁹⁸ See Chapters One, Four, Five, Seven and Eight for Defoe's polemics where he criticised Tory views on allegiance.

⁹⁹ Daniel Defoe, *The Mock Mourners. A Satyr, By way of Elegy on King William, Second Edition* (London, 1702); idem, *The Mock Mourners... Fourth Edition* (London, 1702); idem, *The Mock Mourners... Ninth Edition* (London, 1702).

¹⁰⁰ Defoe, *The Mock Mourners... Second Edition* pp.2-3.

¹⁰¹ Daniel Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty: or, Whiggish Loyalty and Church Loyalty Compar'd* (London, 1702), pp.8, 12-4, 18. See Chapter Five for his commentary on allegiance and toleration.

¹⁰² Ibid, pp.9-14.

¹⁰³ See Chapter Seven.

limited royal prerogative, and subjects' liberties. This establishment was substantially different to the rule offered by the Jacobite claimants. With William dead Anne was seen as a natural continuation of the Revolution. In England Abjuration was allegiance to this establishment by renouncing James III who was seen as offering a reversal of the Revolution. English public opinions, as expressed in allegiance polemics, had evolved from initial hesitation to accept the Revolution in 1689 before accepting it and its innovations in the mid-1690s and viewing these changes as the permanently established order in 1702.

III

William's death in March 1702 devastated Irish Williamites. Richard Daniel, a Trinity College Dublin graduate, said William's death put the Kingdoms into a state of fearful melancholy again.

'Where am I? what, in these sad Realms again,
To know new Wo, and everlasting Pain,
To Fields of Peace, I seem'd to take my Way'

William protected the Kingdoms from horrors, which Daniel feared would now reappear.¹⁰⁴ This pamphlet was reprinted twice in London showing some support for Daniel's sentiments.¹⁰⁵ Daniel wanted William to reign forever but accepted his death and expressed contempt for those publicly grieving for James II.¹⁰⁶ 'Fair Albion' already experienced Jacobitism's 'servile Yoke' which William 'Fixt by Necessity.'¹⁰⁷ Daniel believed that Anne continued William's reign. He called on 'Albion People' to give Anne allegiance and 'scorn the abject Title of a Slave' under James III.¹⁰⁸ Allegiance to William and Anne supported perceived changes established by the Revolution; allegiance to the Pretender would undo the Revolution and establish tyranny. Daniel pleaded with his audience to support what William had established, a monarchy guaranteeing liberty and safety.

'Think on the Way my Mighty WILLIAM led

¹⁰⁴ Richard Daniel, *A Dream; or, An Elegiack Poem, Occasion'd by the Death of William III. King of Great Britain, France and Ireland* (Dublin, 1702), pp.3-5, 10.

¹⁰⁵ Richard Daniel, *A Dream; or, An Elegiack Poem, Occasion'd by the Death of William III...* (London, 1702); idem, *A Dream; or, An Elegiack Poem... Second Edition* (London, 1702).

¹⁰⁶ Daniel, *A Dream...* (Dublin, 1702), p.10.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, pp.15-6.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, p.22.

And the nice Path with strict Observance tread....'¹⁰⁹

'Britannia's' loyal population would enjoy 'Blessings' when free from the ideological and existential threat. Daniel, like English polemicists, sought the continued exclusion of the Pretender to prevent the undoing of all that the Revolution established in the Kingdoms since 1689.¹¹⁰

Irish Protestants generally viewed Irish Catholics as a Jacobite threat.¹¹¹ In their polemics Irish Williamites or Revolutioners, like Daniel, frequently saw the Revolution in confessional terms.¹¹² With Jacobitism again seen as threatening the Revolution many Irish Revolutioners were sensitive about representations of Ireland as a Catholic-Jacobite citadel. *The Flying Post* disputed 'Foolish' reports describing how 'in Ireland some thousands of Country People, supported by many brace Gentlemen, have proclaimed the Prince of *Wales*, KING and taken Arms for his Cause.'¹¹³ However in August 1702 the same newspaper reported on numerous Irish Jacobite demonstrations. There were reports of French-Jacobite expeditions to exploit this apparent popular Jacobitism and in response additional pro-Revolution soldiers were sent to Munster.¹¹⁴ *The Observer* reported that Irish Jacobites, believing their 'Delivery' was imminent, were more enthusiastic than 'their Friends in *England*' and France.¹¹⁵ However *The Observer* was optimistic about the Revolution's survival in Ireland because Irish Protestants generally were and remained passionate supporters of the Revolution. *The Observer* noted that 'all the Inniskillin Men are not dead in Ireland.' In 1689-91 they 'drove' James II 'out of that Kingdom without any other Assistance but a few Arms from England....' They would continue to defend themselves and the exclusion of James and his 'Pretended' son.¹¹⁶ While there were many reports of popular Irish Jacobitism in the English press there were also reports about those, like

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, p.22.

¹¹⁰ Ibid, pp.23-4. See Chapters Four through Seven for perceptions of allegiance to William supporting changes ushered in with the Revolution.

¹¹¹ Patrick Fagan, *Divided Loyalties: The Question of the Oath for Irish Catholics in the Eighteenth Century* (Dublin, 1997), pp.11-2.

¹¹² For more on the perceptions of Catholics and Allegiance see Chapter Six.

¹¹³ *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 9-11 April 1702, No. 1098.

¹¹⁴ *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 1- 4 August 1702, No. 1130; *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 8-11 August 1702, No. 1133; *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master* 11-13 August 1702, No. 1134; *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 15-18 August, 1702, No. 1136; *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 25-27 August 1702, No. 1140.

¹¹⁵ *The Observer*, (London), 19-22 August 1702, No. 35, p.1.

¹¹⁶ Ibid, pp.1-2.

‘Inniskillin Men,’ who were enthusiastically loyal to the Revolution and would fight for this establishment as they did in 1689-91.¹¹⁷

Presbyterian minister James Kirkpatrick, like ‘Inniskillin Men,’ expressed his desire to preserve what William established. The ‘late wonderful Revolution in *Brittain and Ireland*’ delivered Protestants from James ‘and his popish Adherents.’¹¹⁸ Of the Three Kingdoms ‘it becometh us to observe most narrowly the great Mercy of God in sending us K. *W.* for the Reduction of *Ireland*.’ Kirkpatrick said this Moses-like deliverance of Irish Protestants from Catholic-Jacobite slavery ‘ought not to be forgotten.’¹¹⁹ Chapter Five showed that Irish Presbyterians wanted their loyalty to William rewarded with toleration, which they believed was inherent to the Revolution. His sermon on William’s death recounted how Presbyterians consistently supported the Revolution because it established a government free from ‘Terror’ and prevented ‘our Ruin.’ Despite Anglican antagonism, Presbyterians asserted loyalty to this Protestant government, which protected all Protestants from eradication by Catholic-Jacobites. Anne’s succession was portrayed as a seamless continuation of William’s reign and the Revolution. This laid ‘an indispensable obligation upon us not only as we are a part of the Church of God, but also as we are her loyal Subjects.’¹²⁰ She was Queen and owed allegiance because William’s Revolution established the Protestant monarchy in Ireland. Jacobitism threatened all Irish Protestants who believed their survivability depended on this establishment and allegiance to William then Anne supported this establishment.

Numerous other Irish Revolutioners, like their English counterparts, repeatedly expressed their desire to preserve the Revolution in perpetuity. Charles McGrath and David Hayton have highlighted the emergence of Whig-Tory divisions in Irish politics in the late 1690s and early 1700s. Hayton has said that while English Tories could express discomfort with the Revolution, Irish Tories, with their dependence on England for security, generally had no such luxury.¹²¹ However on allegiance and the Revolution there was relative

¹¹⁷ Ibid, pp.1-2; *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 9-11 April 1702, No. 1098.

¹¹⁸ James Kirkpatrick, *A Sermon Occasion'd by the King's Death, and her present Majesty's Accession to the Crown Preach'd March 29, by a Presbyterian Minister in the North* (Dublin, 1702), p.14.

¹¹⁹ Ibid, p.15.

¹²⁰ James Kirkpatrick, *A Sermon*, pp.15-6.

¹²¹ C. I. McGrath, *The Making of the Eighteenth-Century Irish Constitution: Government, Parliament and the Revenue, 1692-1714* (Dublin, 2000), pp.137-8; D.W. Hayton, *Ruling*

unity amongst Irish Protestants. Amongst Irish Protestants the popular rhetoric in 1702-3 was to preserve the Revolution establishment by strongly pledging allegiance to it. Irish Whigs and Tories, Anglicans and Presbyterians, like Kirkpatrick, all contributed to this rhetoric. To many Irish Revolutioners Protestant succession encapsulated the legitimate Revolution establishment, which protected Irish Protestants from an existential threat, and Catholic-Jacobites threatened this establishment. Anne preserved this establishment, introduced by William, and so was owed allegiance.

Edward Smyth was Anglican Bishop of Down and Connor and could be described as a ‘Tory.’¹²² In a 1702 sermon Smyth, like many English Tories, expressed a desire to preserve the Revolution establishment. Smyth described the Revolution, like the Spanish Armada and Gunpowder Plot, as deliverance from an attempt ‘to Destroy the Reformation.’¹²³ This ‘Establishment of the Church of *England*’ stood in opposition to Popery and Louis desiring hegemony.¹²⁴ Like Kirkpatrick, Smyth said William established an ‘excellent constitution in Civil Government’ and ensured that Protestantism was permanently protected. Royal prerogative no longer attacked subjects’ ‘Temporal Rights and Liberties’ with ‘Arbitrary Power.’¹²⁵ These blessings obliged subjects to protect this ‘Deliverance,’ which differed from James’s reign. Subjects ‘owe it, under GOD, to Our late Glorious Victories, and Successes, that We are safe from these Enemies to Our Religion.’¹²⁶ William exposed himself to ‘the Fatigue and Hazards of a long War, to compleat this Deliverance, and make it lasting.’¹²⁷ Subjects acknowledged these ‘Victories’ and with ‘Hearts inflamed with Loyalty, and Affection, turn to our Great and Pious QUEEN.’ Anne’s reign preserved William’s government.¹²⁸ Smyth, like Kirkpatrick, argued that subjects were loyal to Anne and the Revolution establishment of Protestantism, liberties and limited prerogative that would be overturned by a Jacobite restoration.

Ireland 1685-1742 Politics, Politicians and Parties (Woodbridge, 2004), pp.36-7, 39, 59-60, 66-7, 88, 94-5, 145, 276-7.

¹²² E. I. Carlyle, ‘Smyth, Edward (c.1662–1720)’, rev. Toby Barnard, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25793>, accessed 27 March 2014].

¹²³ Edward Smyth, *A Sermon Preached at Christ-Church, Dublin, On the 3d of December, 1702* (Dublin, 1703), pp.1-5.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.6-7, 17.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p.7.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.6-7.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p.26.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p.26.

Another Irish Revolutioner poem said William's memory and the Revolution 'shall to future Ages Reach.' His victory at the Boyne ended tyranny. Anne was 'engaged in a great and good Work,' which preserved them from Catholic domination.¹²⁹ The poet urged readers to eschew allegiance to James III because his father's reign witnessed subjects' 'Loyalty Betray'd' by his tyranny. Anne's succession 'Maintains the Royal English Stile' of government established by William.¹³⁰ Allegiance to Anne was allegiance to the Revolution. Irish loyal addresses on Anne's succession, like those in England, described her succession as preserving the Revolution. The Lord Justices and Council of Ireland's address said Anne's succession 'disappointed the Designs of Your Enemies, and thereby dissipated the Fears of Your Majesties Subjects, and united in Your Majesty's Service.'¹³¹ Anne was part of this establishment and given allegiance for protecting it. As in England this desire to maintain the Revolution, even if not termed 'Revolution,' again became reflected in support for Abjuration as a sensible measure for protecting the Revolution.¹³² In August 1702 England's Parliament extended the English Abjuration to Ireland. Burnet said this was 'reasonable considering the strength of the Popish Interest there.'¹³³ Every civil, political, religious and military officeholders, teachers, and Trinity College Dublin fellows had to take it. The Act again equated allegiance to Anne and Abjuration as defending the establishment from Jacobite subversion.¹³⁴

English legislation for Ireland caused controversy in the late 1690s.¹³⁵ However the English Abjuration oath, while vexing some, was generally

¹²⁹ *Upon the Glorious Memory of King William the III Who Dy'd the 8th of March, 1701/2. Dedicated to those Honourable and Worthy Gentlemen of Ireland, who Commemorate his Birth-Day, November 4th* (Dublin, 1702), p.1.

¹³⁰ *Ibid*, pp.1-2.

¹³¹ *The London Gazette*, 26-30 March 1702, No. 3795, pp.1-2. This edition of the *Gazette* also contained loyal addresses from various parts of England, which also described Anne's succession as being a continuation of William's reign and preserving the Revolution establishment. Similar sentiments were echoed by the Dublin corporation address in 'Dublin Corporation Address to Anne,' *Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin In the Possession of the Municipal Corporation of that City Volume 6*, ed. John T. Gilbert (Dublin, 1896), pp.261-3.

¹³² *A Funeral Oration*, p.16.

¹³³ Burnet, *Burnet's History... Vol. II*, p.340.

¹³⁴ *Anno Regni Anna Regina Anglia, Scotia, Francia, & Hibernia, Primo. At the Parliament begun at Westminster the Twentieth Day of August, Anno Dom. 1702... An Act for Enlarging the time taking the Oath of Abjuration... And for the further Security of Her Majesties Person, and the Succession of the Crown in the Protestant Line; and for Extinguishing the Hopes of the Pretended Prince of Wales...* (Dublin, 1703), pp.2-4.

¹³⁵ William Molyneux, *The Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England...* (Dublin, 1698), *passim*. See Chapters Four and Seven for more on how

accepted as defending the Revolution, which built on the popular Irish Protestant rhetoric. Henry Maxwell was an Irish Whig.¹³⁶ He noted how William ‘undertaking our Deliverance... broke those Chains’ which James II’s ‘Arbitrary Designs’ imposed.¹³⁷ Maxwell’s pamphlet on potential Anglo-Irish union, which was proposed as a solution to many constitutional problems, also discussed allegiance. He disliked the inequality between the Kingdoms but accepted that ‘necessity’ sometimes required the English Parliament and Government to act for Irish subjects’ security. In 1688-9 English action allowed Irish Protestants to ‘maintain their Allegiance and Fidelity to this Crown’ with allegiance to William as *de facto* King.¹³⁸ Maxwell, like other Irish Revolutioners, believed that Protestant succession, which guaranteed liberties, was ‘greatly weakened by the Loss of our late young Prince,’ the Duke of Gloucester. This and Louis recognising James III ‘against our present Establishment’ obliged the English Parliament to act for Ireland.¹³⁹ Irish Protestants maintained allegiance to the Protestant English Crown against Catholic sedition in 1641 and 1688-9. Maxwell believed that Irish Protestants would again maintain loyalty to the authority, which William permanently established in Ireland, of a Protestant monarchy protecting Protestants’ lives and liberties.¹⁴⁰

The proposed union Maxwell commented on lacked government support and was rejected in the 1703 Irish Parliament.¹⁴¹ However union was one idea that was part of a larger public debate amongst Irish Protestants on how best to preserve the Revolution establishment. The 1703 Irish Parliament altered the English Abjuration oath in Ireland, and reflected Irish Protestants’ public rhetoric on protecting the Revolution. There has been some confusion in historiography over the anti-Catholic aspects of Abjuration in Ireland. Patrick

controversies over English legislation for Ireland impacted on Irish views of allegiance and the Revolution.

¹³⁶C. I. McGrath, ‘Maxwell, Henry (1668/9–1730)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/63666>, accessed 27 March 2014].

¹³⁷ Henry Maxwell, *An Essay Upon an Union of Ireland with England...* (Dublin, 1704), p.7.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp.7-9, 12. For more on the introduction of allegiance to William as *de facto* King in Ireland see Chapters One through Three.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp.7-9, 12, 14.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.7-9.

¹⁴¹ C.I. McGrath, ‘The “Union” Representation of 1703 in the Irish House of Commons: A case of mistaken Identity?’, *Eighteenth-Century Ireland/ Iris an dá Chultúr*, 23 (2008), pp.11-8, 20; Allan I. Macinnes, ‘Union failed, Union accomplished: The Irish Union of 1703 and the Scottish Union of 1707,’ in Dáire Keogh & Kevin Whelan (eds.) *Acts of Union: The Causes, Contexts and Consequences of the Act of Union* (Dublin, 2001), pp.67-70.

Fagan describes the passage of the Irish Abjuration as a copy of the English oath.¹⁴² However examining the 1703-4 Parliament's legislation shows that the Parliament accepted the English Abjuration but added further qualifications to it, which again viewed Catholicism and Jacobitism as united in opposing the Revolution.¹⁴³ The *Act to prevent the further Growth of Popery* made clear that Ireland's Parliament accepted the English Abjuration 'for extinguishing the Hopes of the Pretended Prince of Wales' but believed this was insufficient. A declaration renouncing tenets of Catholicism was added to the Abjuration oath to undermine the Catholic-Jacobite threat.¹⁴⁴ A new Treason Act asserted that 'the future Security of your Majesties Protestant Subjects of this Kingdom doth (next under God) depend upon the Safety of your Majesties Royal person....' The Act of Settlement's 'Succession in the Protestant line' protected Ireland from 'Papists... and other disaffected persons' who 'still entertain hopes of disappointing the said Succession' to undo the Revolution.¹⁴⁵ Another Act banned Catholic clergy entering Ireland because they would try to stir 'her Majesties popish Subjects to Rebellion' against Anne and the establishment.¹⁴⁶

These laws reflected Irish Protestants' public desire to preserve the Revolution. This was more explicitly anti-Catholic than the popular English sentiments but the political nations of both Kingdoms were anxious to maintain the Revolution establishment against Catholic-Jacobite threats.¹⁴⁷ Only a handful of Irish Anglicans declined the Abjuration.¹⁴⁸ Some Presbyterians refused the Abjuration and this caused more antagonism between Presbyterians and Anglicans.¹⁴⁹ However, as Kirkpatrick and other Irish Presbyterians made clear, Presbyterians passionately supported the Revolution settlement. They did not object to renouncing the Pretender but some refused the Abjuration because

¹⁴² Fagan, *Divided Loyalties*, pp.24-5.

¹⁴³ For more on this see Chapter Six.

¹⁴⁴ 'An Act to Prevent the Further Growth of Popery,' *Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament Begun at Dublin the Twenty First Day of September, Anno Dom. 1703. In the Second Year of the Reign of our most Gracious Sovereign Lady Queen Anne...*(Dublin, 1703), pp.42-5. For the full wording of the Abjuration Oath and the Declaration against Transubstantiation See Appendix V.

¹⁴⁵ 'Act to make it High-Treason, &c.,' *Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament Begun at Dublin... 1703...*, pp.22-3.

¹⁴⁶ 'An Act for Preventing Popish Clergy from coming into this Kingdom,' *Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament Begun at Dublin... 1703...*, pp.17-8.

¹⁴⁷ For more on Catholicism being seen as an indicator of political allegiance see Chapter Six.

¹⁴⁸ O'Regan, *Archbishop William King*, pp.137-9; Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause*, pp.108-9.

¹⁴⁹ J.C. Beckett, *Protestant Dissent in Ireland 1687-1780* (London, 1948), pp.64-9.

they believed it unfairly obliged them to support Anglicanism.¹⁵⁰ Yet there remained widespread public agreement amongst Protestants of all backgrounds that Anne preserved the Revolution establishment. William's style of kingship established and protected Protestantism and liberties from Catholic-Jacobite tyranny. Anne's reign continued William's reign and had to be protected from Catholic-Jacobitism. Abjuration in Ireland, while being mainly for Anglicans, was stronger allegiance to the Revolution settlement. Chapter Five showed how Irish Anglicans excluded Presbyterians from political power. Despite this both publicly expressed a popular rhetoric about protecting Ireland's Revolution establishment from a Catholic-Jacobite counter-Revolution. As in England Irish Williamites became Revolutioners committed to preserving the Revolution into the future and Abjuration reflected that popular rhetoric. This shows how opinions in Ireland, like in England, changed over the 1690s from fairly widespread hesitance to accept the Revolution to gradual acceptance of the changes, which were now seen as a permanent establishment.

IV

Scottish Presbyterians, like Irish Protestants, were despondent on William's death. Jacobite George Lockhart described how on hearing of William's death Scottish 'Cavaliers,' Jacobites, were overjoyed while Presbyterians and other Revolutioners 'looked on themselves as undone.'¹⁵¹ Anne was sympathetic to Episcopalians so Presbyterians were wary of her.¹⁵² While Presbyterians were more comfortable with William they, like English and Irish Revolutioners, expressed allegiance to Anne because she was part of the Revolution. The Church of Scotland's General Assembly was in session when William died. Before his demise the Assembly re-asserted loyalty to William, Protestantism's 'great protector, as well as our gracious deliverer,'

¹⁵⁰ James Kirkpatrick, *An Historical Essay Upon the Loyalty of Presbyterians in Great Britain and Ireland from the Reformation to this Present Year 1713...In Three Parts...* (n.p., 1713), 'A Prefatory Address,' pp.452-6, 462-8, 490-2, 510, 527-40; *The Present State of Religion in Ireland. Containing, I. An humble Address and Apology of the Presbyterian Ministers and Gentlemen, of the North of Ireland...* (London, 1712), pp.24-7, 31-6, 40-6.

¹⁵¹ Lockhart, 'Memoirs Concerning the Affairs of Scotland,' *The Lockhart Papers*, pp.41-2.

¹⁵² Whatley, *The Scots and the Union*, pp.44, 222-5, 244-5.

and praised his support for Presbyterianism.¹⁵³ When the news reached Edinburgh they expressed how ‘greatly afflicted’ they were. They also pledged loyalty to Anne and to ‘maintain’ her position ‘against all pretenders... and will use our best endeavours with the people committed to our charge, to keep and preserve them in their duty and loyalty.’ William’s loss was devastating but Anne’s succession was part of the Revolution, which was how Presbyterians promoted allegiance to her. David Williamson, the moderator, signed this.¹⁵⁴ During 1702-4 Scottish allegiance debates, like the English and Irish debates, centred on the idea of allegiance to the Revolution settlement and preserving this establishment from Jacobitism. This was debated alongside other pressing issues, like potential Anglo-Scottish Union, and these debates built on the rhetoric in the 1702 Scottish loyal addresses.

Williamson’s *Mournful Poem* displayed more Scottish Presbyterian despair at William’s death. Like Daniel’s *Dream*, Williamson lamented how ‘The Champion of our Israel is gone’ and wished that the ‘Fatal Blow’ could have ‘been suspended’ because William encapsulated the Revolution. William and his achievements would be ‘Famous to Posterity.’¹⁵⁵ A Church of Scotland-produced poem to Anne similarly described William as the ‘Guardian Angel of our British Isles’ and subjects’ dismay at ‘The Loss of him.’ He was the ‘*Chief Supporter of the Common Cause*’ and ‘*Main Preserver of our wholesome Laws.*’¹⁵⁶ William ushered in a government and constitutional order, very different to James’s tyranny, which by 1702 was the establishment. His loss was distressing but again loyalty to Anne was described as preserving William’s establishment, including Presbyterianism. Presbyterians would loyally support her ‘Right and Title’ against ‘*the mean Pretender to your Crown.*’¹⁵⁷ Patrick Hume, Earl of Marchmont, a Presbyterian and one of William’s ministers, wrote to Anne in March 1702 describing Scottish subjects’ ‘inexpressible griefs.’ Marchmont said he had served ‘the best King and kindest master’ and promised to serve Anne ‘according to the Allegiance I

¹⁵³ ‘Acts: 1702’, *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland 1638-1842*, ed. Church Law Society (Edinburgh, 1843), pp. 312-316 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/church-scotland-records/acts/1638-1842/pp312-316> [accessed 10 September 2015].

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ David Williamson, *A Mournful Poem on the Never Enough to be Lamented Death of...King William* (Edinburgh, 1702); Richard Daniel, *A Dream*, pp.15-24.

¹⁵⁶ *To the Most Serene and Potent Princess Ann of Scotland, England, France and Ireland Queen. From the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1702).

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

have sworn to your Majesty.’¹⁵⁸ William’s death prompted national mourning but Anne and allegiance to her were presented as preserving Scotland’s Revolution settlement.

Anne’s court also portrayed her reign as a continuation of William’s reign and the Revolution. Her letter to the June 1702 Parliament acknowledged the ‘great Loss these Nations’ received when the ‘great Deliverer’ died. She and subjects should ensure his ‘Memory must be in perpetual Honour.’ This was a message to reassure Scottish Revolutioners that she would defend Scotland’s Revolution settlement. She promised to ‘maintain and protect’ subjects ‘in the full Possession of their Religion, Laws and Liberties, and of the Presbyterian Government of the Church, as at present established.’ This was similar to the rhetoric that developed on allegiance in the 1690s.¹⁵⁹ Kevin Sharpe has said that Anne’s 1702 declarations recognised the post-Revolution changes to the monarchy.¹⁶⁰ The act recognizing Anne as Queen made clear that she was Queen because of the Claim of Right and subjects must take the Oaths of Allegiance and Assurance to her. Anne was part of the Revolution.¹⁶¹ Parliament unanimously ratified Anne’s right to rule.¹⁶² This unanimity quickly dissipated. Bitter disagreements emerged over allegiance and how best to preserve the Revolution. However it is still possible to see a majority in Scotland publicly committed to preserving the Revolution by asserting allegiance to it as the established order.

Lockhart describes this Parliament as ‘peaceable’ until Marchmont introduced an Abjuration bill.¹⁶³ The Duke of Hamilton, a Country politician, said Marchmont provoked ‘the greatest debats and heats imaginable.’¹⁶⁴ Anne’s Court was divided over Abjuration in Scotland. The Duke of

¹⁵⁸ Patrick Hume, Earl of Marchmont, ‘Letter to Queen Anne,’ March 1702, *A Selection from the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont, in the possession of the Right Honourable Sir George Henry Rose: Illustrative of the events from 1686 to 1750; in 3 Volumes. Volume III* (London, 1831), pp.236-7.

¹⁵⁹ *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 16-18 June 1702, No. 1110, p.1. See Chapters Four through Eight.

¹⁶⁰ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.517-8.

¹⁶¹ *Act Recognizing Her Majesty’s Royal Authority 12 June 1702* (Edinburgh, 1702); *Proclamation Requiring the Oath of Alledgeance and Assurance to be Sworn and Subscribed to Her Majesty* (Edinburgh, 1702). For more on the Assurance see Chapter Seven.

¹⁶² P.W.J Riley, *The Union of England and Scotland: A Study in Anglo-Scottish Politics of the Eighteenth Century* (Manchester, 1978), pp.37-40.

¹⁶³ Lockhart, ‘Memoirs Concerning the Affairs of Scotland,’ *The Lockhart Papers*, pp.48-9.

¹⁶⁴ ‘James Hamilton, Duke of Hamilton to [William Keith?] 27 June 1702,’ *Calendar of State Papers Domestic of the Reign of Anne Volume I. 1702-1703*, ed. Robert Pentland Mahaffy (London, 1916), p.142.

Queensberry, the Lord High Commissioner, and others feared that introducing Abjuration could potentially cause unnecessary controversy with Presbyterians and Jacobites. P.W.J. Riley argues that Marchmont's actions were an attempt to embarrass his rival Queensberry, who did not want such a potentially divisive issue dominating Scottish politics. Riley argues that the Abjuration debates were not ideological but part of Scottish politics' endemic place seeking with Marchmont and Queensberry desperate to preserve their own political power in Scotland.¹⁶⁵

However, as in England and Ireland, the idea of Abjuration and defending the Revolution was central to Scottish public discourse. While embarrassing Queensberry may have been a factor, Marchmont publicly justified Abjuration as securing the Revolution with consistent public rejection of the Pretender across the Kingdoms. Marchmont praised England's Abjuration and wanted a Scottish version for 'extinguishing the hopes of the pretended Prince of Wales.'¹⁶⁶ He claimed that many civil, military and religious officeholders saw this as 'Absolutely necessary... for the support of her Majesty's government, and the security and honour of this Kingdom.'¹⁶⁷ It was inconceivable how those 'who are in their hearts satisfied of her Majesty's title... and have taken the allegiance and assurance, should now oppose the abjuration....' Abjuration was acknowledging that Anne had 'a good title' while the Pretender had 'none.'¹⁶⁸ Queensberry suspended Parliament thus preventing a vote on Abjuration. Marchmont claimed this generated 'great joy' among Jacobites because 'abjuration is a terror to all of them.' Subjects either supported Anne and the Revolution with Abjuration or they were Jacobites. 'There is no medium.'¹⁶⁹ It was the ultimate public support for the Revolution; it went beyond the Assurance acknowledging William then Anne as the legitimate monarchs by rebutting Jacobite claimants' attempts at overturning the Revolution establishment.

¹⁶⁵ Alasdair Raffae, *The Culture of Controversy Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660-1714* (Woodbridge, 2012), pp.83-7, 90-1; idem, 'Scottish State Oaths and the Revolution of 1688-90,' in Sharon Adams & Julian Goodare (eds.) *Scotland in the Age of Two Revolutions* (Woodbridge, 2014), pp.187-90; P.W.J Riley, 'The Abjuration Vote of 27 June 1702 in the Scottish Parliament,' *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 2 (1983), pp.175-86.

¹⁶⁶ Patrick Hume, Earl of Marchmont, 'Marchmont to Queen Anne, Memorial concerning some proceeding in the Parliament of Scotland,' 1 July 1702, *Marchmont Papers*, pp.243-5.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid, pp.244-5.

¹⁶⁸ Patrick Hume, Earl of Marchmont, 'Marchmont to Queen Anne, Memorial Concerning the Affairs of Scotland sent to Queen Anne,' 11 July 1702, *Marchmont Papers*, pp.248-50.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid, p.250. For the full wording of Marchmont's Abjuration oath see Appendix V.

Jacobitism was perceived as stronger in Scotland than in England because of popular discontent over Darien.¹⁷⁰ Riley argued that the 1702 failure to introduce Abjuration contributed to an increased Jacobite presence in the 1703 Scottish Parliament.¹⁷¹ Jacobitism in Scotland was certainly more overt than in England. John Spottiswoode, a parliamentary candidate in 1702, suffered financially at the Revolution.¹⁷² In a November 1702 election speech, which was subsequently published, Spottiswoode presented a Jacobite restoration, overturning the Revolution, as inevitable. William was described as a regent or caretaker governor; Parliament only approved allegiance to William in 1689 because, unlike James VIII, he was of age and ‘capable to Govern.’¹⁷³ Spottiswoode praised Scottish loyalty to the Stuart dynasty. ‘The Scots nation may glory in their Loyalty to their Native Prince....’ In the recent past Stuart monarchs were exiled but ‘it was the Pleasure of GOD Almighty to Restore all again.’¹⁷⁴ With William dead ‘the first In Blood, should be first in the Right of Succession.’ Subjects had ‘celebrated the Birth of the Son of the late King James, upon whom all the Title of Prince of Wales was conferr’d.’ Spottiswoode hoped that a parliamentary inquiry would ‘satisfy the Minds of this People’ to enthrone James Francis Edward after Anne.¹⁷⁵ This was why he opposed ‘all Oaths of Abjuration of particular Persons who are nearer in the Line: And I wish the Government would satisfy themselves with the Oath of Allegiance....’¹⁷⁶ Obviously Jacobites opposed Abjuration and Spottiswoode, like Jacobites in the other Kingdoms, loudly articulated allegiance to James VIII in order to undo the Revolution’s settlement that dethroned James VII.¹⁷⁷ However publicly advocating allegiance to the Pretender was a minority opinion.

¹⁷⁰ Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites Britain and Europe 1688-1788* (Manchester, 1994) pp.49-50, 70-1.

¹⁷¹ Riley, ‘The Abjuration Vote,’ pp.184-6.

¹⁷² John W. Cairns, ‘Spottiswoode, John, of that ilk (1667–1728)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26168>, accessed 6 April 2014].

¹⁷³ John Spottiswoode, *A Speech of One of the Barons of the Shire of B--- at a Meeting of the Barons and Freeholders of that Shire, for Choosing Commissioners to Represent them in the ensuing Parliament, Summoned to Conveen at Edinburgh, the 12th day of November 1702* (Edinburgh, 1702), p.4.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid*, p.4.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid*, pp.4-7.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid*, p.7.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid*, pp.4-7; Hickes, *The Pretences of the Prince of Wales*, pp.1-2, 4, 11.

Christopher Whatley has noted that Presbyterians were split over Abjuration and other issues.¹⁷⁸ Opposition to Abjuration in Scotland did not automatically indicate Jacobitism as some English polemicists argued.¹⁷⁹ Marchmont admitted that some opponents of Abjuration supported the Revolution.¹⁸⁰ The Jacobite Lockhart found it ‘strange’ that Parliament did not pass Abjuration ‘when such eminently famous and zealous Revolutioners were at the helm of affairs....’¹⁸¹ Lockhart listed different reasons for this. He said that Queensberry did not know how to handle this proposal while others opposed it because it could undermine efforts to secure a favourable Union settlement. Lockhart also said that many Scots would reject the measure because they were dissatisfied with how they were governed. However Lockhart’s memoirs described many opponents of Abjuration as ‘Revolutioners.’¹⁸² Scotland’s public discourse was overwhelmingly pro-Revolution and Scots were zealous, like English and Irish Protestant subjects, about preserving the Revolution, which had become the establishment.

The Revolutioner Episcopalian Queensberry adjourned parliament and this prevented the introduction of an Abjuration oath.¹⁸³ Although this prevented the introduction of a Scottish Abjuration oath, Queensberry publicly defended his Revolution credentials. Queensberry recalled his ‘early Ingaging, and firm Adherence to the present Establishment....’ He vowed to protect ‘our happy Settlement’ and claimed that the Claim of Right ‘is our unalterable Security.’ Queensberry described the Claim and proposed Union as means to protect Scotland’s Revolution settlement.¹⁸⁴ There was much public confusion over Marchmont’s Abjuration and this prompted much of the opposition to it. Marchmont was a Presbyterian but other Presbyterians believed that Abjuration could actually undermine Scotland’s Presbyterian settlement. Presbyterian cleric William Carstares, a trusted adviser on Scotland to William and Anne, in

¹⁷⁸ Whatley, *Scots and the Union*, pp.223-4.

¹⁷⁹ *Principles upon which the Taking the Oath of Abjuration may be grounded*, pp.18-23; *The Opinion of a Divine of the Church of England about the Oath of Abjuration*; *The Observer*, 20-23 May 1702, No. 9, pp.1-2.

¹⁸⁰ Patrick Hume, Earl of Marchmont, ‘Marchmont to Queen Anne, Memorial,’ 1 July 1702, *Marchmont Papers*, pp.247-8.

¹⁸¹ George Lockhart, ‘Memoirs Concerning the Affairs of Scotland,’ *The Lockhart Papers*, pp.48-50.

¹⁸² *Ibid*, pp.48-57.

¹⁸³ Riley, ‘Abjuration Vote,’ pp.175-86.

¹⁸⁴ ‘The Speech of his Grace James, Duke of Queensberry, &c. Her Majesty’s High Commissioner,’ *The Flying Post*, 16-18 June 1702, No. 1110, pp.1-2; *Minutes of the Proceedings in Parliament, Tuesday June 30, 1702 Number 10* (Edinburgh, 1702), pp.1-2.

letters to Robert Harley described how Abjuration was one of the most important issues publicly debated in 1702. Carstares' letters show that there was a popular concern in Scotland over the need to preserve Scotland's distinct Revolution settlement.¹⁸⁵ This meant that in Scotland, unlike in England, opponents of Abjuration, like the wider political nation, publicly expressed desires to maintain and strengthen Scotland's Revolution establishment with allegiance to the settlement in some form.¹⁸⁶

Union proposals added to the confusion over Abjuration. Scotland's refusal to accept the English Act of Settlement caused anxiety in England.¹⁸⁷ One English pamphlet said that England and Scotland were only united in the Revolution by a common monarch who was not the Pretender. This resulted in union moving up the political agenda.¹⁸⁸ Many English Whigs presented Scottish refusal to accept the Hanoverians as endangering the Revolution across the Kingdoms.¹⁸⁹ A 'Pan-Britannick Union' was seen as something to secure the Revolution.¹⁹⁰ Allegiance was frequently discussed alongside the Union because debates on allegiance and the Revolution were still ongoing during Union debates from 1702. Some Scots, like Revolutioner Episcopalian George Mackenzie, Viscount Tarbat, believed Union could protect the Kingdoms from Jacobitism because the resultant economic benefits would ensure 'that our Loyaltie may never fail...'¹⁹¹ However several Scottish Presbyterians were outraged by some English commentators' insistence that Union should benefit Episcopacy.¹⁹² Therefore some saw Union, like Abjuration, as protecting the Revolution in Scotland while others saw it as

¹⁸⁵ William Carstares, 'W. Carstares to Robert Harley, 1702, July, beginning of?', Historical Manuscripts Commission *Report on the Manuscripts of his Grace the Duke of Portland Vol. VIII* (London, 1907), pp.103-4; William Carstares, 'W. Carstares to Robert Harley, 1702, July, 30,' HMC *Portland VIII*, pp.105-6.

¹⁸⁶ English opposition to Abjuration can be seen in *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England Volume 5*, cols. 1134-5; Sir Richard Cocks, *Parliamentary Diary*, pp.190, 208-9, 235-6, 254.

¹⁸⁷ Whatley, *Scots and Union*, pp.222-4, 226-9.

¹⁸⁸ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p.641.

¹⁸⁹ Blackerby Fairfax, *A Discourse upon Uniting Scotland with England* (London, 1702), pp.8-9, 20-3, 38-40, 68-70; James Hodges, *The Rights and Interests of the Two British Monarchies, Inquir'd into, and Clear'd; with a special respect to an United or Separate State. Treatise I* (London, 1703), pp.1-6, 8-9, 13-8, 45-6.

¹⁹⁰ *A Letter to Sir J.P. Bart. A Member for the ensuing Parliament, relating to the Union of England and Scotland* (London, 1702), p.2; Whatley, *Scots and the Union*, pp.54-62, 88-106, 282-3.

¹⁹¹ George Mackenzie, Viscount Tarbat, *Parainesis Pacifica; or, a Perswasive to the Union of Britain* (Edinburgh, 1702), 'To the Queen,' p.16.

¹⁹² *Ibid*, pp.6-9.

potentially undermining it. Union and Abjuration impacted on each other in Scottish public discourse and views on allegiance.

Many opponents of Abjuration repeatedly expressed the popular rhetoric about preserving the Revolution establishment with allegiance to it. George Ridpath was a devout Presbyterian and resolute Revolutioneer.¹⁹³ Ridpath criticised Abjuration for not endorsing Scotland's Revolution settlement and accepting an English primacy. Abjuration was 'contrary to the Minds of most of the Revolution Party.'¹⁹⁴ To Ridpath Abjuration was a steppingstone to a Union that would ultimately overturn Scotland's Revolution settlement. Abjuration would bind Scotland to England's succession; this was dangerous because the Claim of Right offered better security for Protestantism and liberties. Anne continued William's reign because her 'Title had no other Foundation than the late K. *Williams*,' the Claim of Right.¹⁹⁵ Ridpath seemingly abandoned some of his respect for the Church of England, explored in Chapter Five, and argued that Scottish Presbyterians were the truest Revolution supporters.¹⁹⁶ England's 'High-Church Party' threatened the Revolution settlement. It was 'evident' that these Anglicans had 'Affection' for 'the pretended Prince of *Wales*' as shown by 'their Contempt of the House of *Hanover*, and from the Outrages which they daily offer to the memory of K. *William*....' They denigrated William's 'Virtues' and his deliverance of 'the three Nations from that Yoke of Popery and Slavery.'¹⁹⁷ Abjuration and Union would undo the Revolution. The 'Anti-Revolution Party' of 'High-Church' Anglicans and Episcopalians would only need to obtain power in one part of the island to either dethrone Anne immediately or 'send for the Pretended Prince of *Wales*' when Anne died. This would 'prove a Snare' for the Kingdoms and potentially restore Jacobite tyranny.¹⁹⁸ To Ridpath Abjuration was a subterfuge to give allegiance to the Pretender. Many opponents of Abjuration, with the natural exception of Jacobites, were publicly resolved to preserve the Revolution establishment. They just believed Abjuration was counterproductive to this end because it could lead to an Anglo-Scottish Union,

¹⁹³ Chapters Four, Five, Seven, and Eight show how Ridpath passionately defended the Revolution throughout the 1690s.

¹⁹⁴ George Ridpath, *A Discourse upon the Union of Scotland and England...* (Edinburgh, 1702), pp.79-80.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid*, pp.79-80.

¹⁹⁶ See Chapter Five.

¹⁹⁷ Ridpath, *Discourse upon the Union*, pp.80-1.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid*, pp.79-82.

which would undo Scotland's Revolution settlement, including the Presbyterian Kirk.

The Union dominates Scottish historiography of this period but there is surprisingly little on Abjuration given the two issues were condemned jointly by Ridpath and others. Many historians have discussed Jacobitism in the Union debates but generally neglect the popular concern for the Revolution. The 1703 Act of Security has been described, and was perceived by some at the time, as a Jacobite act amidst Anglo-Scottish antagonism. Many in England feared Scotland would enthrone the Pretender.¹⁹⁹ Presbyterian chronicler Robert Wodrow said Jacobites supported the Act because they believed it 'might serve the designs for' the Pretender.²⁰⁰ However the framers of the Act envisaged it as securing the Revolution. Ridpath said the Act plainly stated that whoever ascended Scotland's throne must 'accept... the Terms of the Claim of Right....'²⁰¹ Andrew Fletcher wanted the Act to include an oath obliging subjects to support the succession based on the Claim of Right but was overruled. The Earl of Seafield, the Lord Chancellor, commented on this to Lord Godolphin, the English Lord Treasurer. Seafield ensured that the Act passed 'without any oath' because it could not 'be doubted but that wee would all endeavour to maintain the Protestant religion.' The Revolution as articulated in the Claim of Right was safe because 'wee had past one act already declaring it high treason to endeavour to alter any point of it.' It was 'very unnecessary' to have another oath for 'the maintaining of it.' To Seafield Scotland already had extensive allegiance tests.²⁰² The Act did not receive royal assent until 1704, which Riley presents as more of the political jockeying for position.²⁰³ However the Act was part of common rhetoric across the

¹⁹⁹ Nenner, *Right to be King*, pp.233-5; Brown, 'Party Politics and Parliament,' pp.48-9; Bowie, *Scottish Public Opinion and the Anglo-Scottish Union*, pp.32-4; Clare Jackson, 'Conceptions of Nationhood in the Anglo-Scottish Union Debates of 1707,' *The Scottish Historical Review*, LXXXVII, Issue 2 (Supplement) (2008), pp.67-70; Macinnes, *Union and Empire*, pp.243-9; Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union*, pp.17-21, 51, 94; Geoffrey Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power: Late Stuart and early Georgian Britain, 1660-1722* (London, 1993), pp.310-1.

²⁰⁰ Robert Wodrow, 'Robert Wodrow to the Bishop of Carlisle, 4 October 1703,' *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow, 1698-1709...*, ed. L.W. Sharp (Edinburgh, 1937), pp.264-7.

²⁰¹ George Ridpath, *An Account of the Proceedings of the Parliament of Scotland... May 6, 1703* (Edinburgh, 1704), pp.245-8.

²⁰² 'Earl of Seafield, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, to Lord Godolphin, Lord Treasurer of England. 1703, July 8,' *Historical Manuscripts Commission Report on the Laing Manuscripts preserved in the University of Edinburgh... Volume II* (London, 1925), p.25. The Act declaring it Treason to alter the Claim of Right is discussed later in this chapter on pp.362-3.

²⁰³ P.W.J. Riley, 'The Scottish Parliament of 1703,' *The Scottish Historical Review*, 47, No. 144, Part 2 (Oct., 1968), pp.142-3.

Kingdoms about preserving the Revolution establishment by obliging subjects to reject the Jacobite claimant as Seafield's and Ridpath's comments show.

Riley described the 1703 Parliament and Abjuration debates as 'a struggle of the Scottish factions, not against England, but against each other for the dominance of Scottish politics.'²⁰⁴ However there remained a passionate pro-Revolution majority in the 1703 Parliament, which passed the Act of Security, and Scotland's public discourse. Derek Patrick has said that parliamentary proceedings 'reflected the mood' of the wider Scottish public.²⁰⁵ Examining contemporary printed accounts of this Parliament shows that, while there was a vocal Jacobite minority and divisions over Abjuration, the majority were committed to the Revolution. Revolutioner Sir Archibald Sinclair's pamphlet claimed that most in parliament would 'lose no time to secure Religion, Liberties and Laws.'²⁰⁶ Other descriptions of the 1703 parliamentary factions show that most groups and members were committed to preserving what was popularly perceived as being established at the Revolution, namely liberties and Presbyterianism. Sir John Clerk's *Memoirs* recorded a Jacobite- 'Cavalier' interest opposed to the Revolution but most factions supported the Revolution.²⁰⁷

Ridpath's *Account of the Proceedings of the Parliament* provides further details on these groupings. He described a 'Revolution Party' opposed to a Hanoverian succession that was not based on the Claim of Right. Other factions were described as publicly committed to preserving the Revolution but differed over how best to do this. There was an anti-Jacobite 'English Interest' advocating Union. Significantly one of the larger groups, Hamilton's Country party, was also described as pro-Revolution.²⁰⁸ Hamilton's manoeuvres during this parliament have been described as self-serving. His connections with Jacobites and his opposing William in 1689 were hardly indicative of a true Revolutioner. These duplicities garnered him Jacobite respect.²⁰⁹ However in

²⁰⁴ Riley, 'Abjuration Vote,' pp.183-6; idem, 'The Scottish Parliament of 1703,' pp.131-2.

²⁰⁵ Derek J. Patrick, 'People and Parliament in Scotland, 1689-1702,' (University of St. Andrews Ph.D. thesis, 2002), pp.144, 379-84.

²⁰⁶ Sir Archibald Sinclair, *Some Thoughts on the Present State of Affairs: Humbly offered to the High Court of Parliament. By a Lover of his Queen and Countrey* (n.p., 1703), pp.9-10.

²⁰⁷ Sir John Clerk, *Memoirs of the life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik...extracted by himself from his own Journals, 1676-1755...edited from the manuscript in Penicuik House with an Introduction and notes by John M. Gray*, ed. John M. Gray (London, 1895), pp.46-9.

²⁰⁸ Ridpath, *An Account of the Proceedings of the Parliament of Scotland*, pp.235-40.

²⁰⁹ Keith M. Brown & A.J Mann, 'Introduction: Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1567-1707,' in Brown & Mann (eds.) *The History of the Scottish Parliament Volume II*, p.48;

1703 Hamilton publicly professed support for the Revolution. He was not part of the ‘Antirevolutioners’ who by obtaining places in Parliament and on Scotland’s Privy Council ‘alarm’d’ Presbyterians and ‘others of Revolution Principles.’ Hamilton’s party acted according to ‘Revolution Principles.’²¹⁰ He opposed naming the Hanoverians as heirs because he said that unless it was according to the Claim of Right it would mean that ‘King *William* must have been little less than a Usurper.’²¹¹ It is significant that Ridpath, a vehement defender of the Revolution,²¹² publicly defended Hamilton’s party from those who depicted Hamilton’s party as ‘Enemies to the Revolution.’ Hamilton ‘did strenuously argue for the Claim of Right, not only as the foundation of Her Majesty’s Title, but as a Rule for Her Administration.’²¹³ While Jacobites in Scotland were bolder than in England, even openly sitting in Parliament, they remained a minority. Even Hamilton, with his ambiguous actions, felt it necessary to strongly declare loyalty to the Revolution establishment. Ridpath’s defence of Hamilton and other descriptions of parliamentary factions show that preserving the Revolution and showing loyalty to it were important parts of public credibility in Scottish politics even without a formal Abjuration oath.

More evidence of the Scottish Parliament’s intense pro-Revolution credentials can be seen in Scottish and English polemics praising acts to preserve the Revolution in Scotland that were essentially alternatives to Abjuration. One act made it treason to ‘impugn, or alter the *Claim of Right*.’²¹⁴ Ridpath said this act was ‘Judg’d to be the most effectual Way to prevent back

Brown, ‘Party Politics and Parliament,’ p.251; Whatley, *Scots and the Union*, pp.35, 93-5, 231-2; Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union*, pp.17-20; Lockhart, ‘Memoirs Concerning the Affairs of Scotland,’ *The Lockhart Papers*, pp.55-7. In 1689 Hamilton had the title the Earl of Arran and he expressed reluctance to break allegiance to James; this is explored in Chapter One.

²¹⁰ Ridpath, *An Account of the Proceedings of the Parliament of Scotland...May 6, 1703*, pp.11-9.

²¹¹ Ibid, pp.11-20, 29-30.

²¹² Ridpath, *Discourse upon Union*, pp.79-81. See also Chapter Chapters Four, Five, Seven, Eight for more on Ridpath’s views on the Revolution and allegiance.

²¹³ Ridpath, *An Account of the Proceedings of the Parliament of Scotland...May 6, 1703*, pp.29-30.

²¹⁴ *Minuts of the Proceedings in Parliament, Thursday June 3. 1703 Number 11* (Edinburgh, 1703, pp.1-2; *Minuts of the Proceedings in Parliament, Munday June 7. 1703. Number 12* (Edinburgh, 1703), pp.1-2; ‘Earl of Seafield, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, to Lord Godolphin, Lord Treasurer of England. 1703, July 8,’ HMC *Laing... Volume II*, p.25; ‘Act Ratifying the turning the meeting of the Estates in the year 1689 into a Parliament,’ *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*, ed. K.M. Brown (St. Andrews, 2007-2015), 1703/5/190. URL: <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1703/5/190>. Date Accessed 13 July 2015.

Blows from the' Jacobite party.²¹⁵ *The Observer* was impressed by the Act's intention of protecting the Revolution, praising how 'Scots are Unanimous in that Point;' this law made Anne 'the Queen of the Revolution.'²¹⁶ This would disappoint 'the *Jacks* and *High-Flyers* in London' who 'were mistaken in their Notions of the *Scotch* Parliament' and 'expected other things from' Scots.²¹⁷ While many in England may have perceived certain Scottish actions as evidence of Jacobitism, in Scotland in 1702-4 most public declarations on allegiance were of loyalty to Anne and the Revolution settlement as the established order. Praise for the strength of this pro-Revolution sentiment from Tutchin's *Observer* shows that some English Whigs recognised that Scotland, like England, viewed the Revolution as the establishment, which needed defending. Making it Treason to alter the Claim of Right was undermining Jacobitism in a different way to Abjuration and augmented the Oath of Allegiance and Assurance in committing subjects' allegiance to the Revolution.

Even Revolutioner Episcopalians asserted that it was possible to accept the Revolution as establishing Anne's government despite the Claim of Right's anti-Episcopacy. T.N. Clarke has shown that some Episcopalians, who opposed William's enthronement, accepted Anne as Queen.²¹⁸ Former Archbishop of Glasgow John Paterson told two fellow Episcopalian clerics that they should now 'owne and serve the Q[ueen].' Paterson said 'that the P[rince of] W[ales] being prisoner to the Fr[ench] King, and also a papist,' was 'morallie and phisicallie incapable of the Crowne at present....' That meant 'the true right of it, did descend upon' Anne 'as the next of the Royall blood, and so by our oaths to the Roy[all] family, all subjects wer now bound to owne and pay allegiance to her Ma[jes]ty.'²¹⁹ Like English and Irish Tories, he avoided the term 'Revolution' but was effectively recognizing that what the Revolution established was not going to be undone.²²⁰ Many Episcopalians, including Paterson, opposed the Revolution because of their views of History

²¹⁵ Ridpath, *Account of the Proceedings*, pp.19-20.

²¹⁶ *The Observer*, 16-19 June 1703, Vol. II, No. 21, p.2.

²¹⁷ *Ibid*, p.2.

²¹⁸ T.N. Clarke, 'The Scottish Episcopalians 1688-1720,' (University of Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 1987), p.135. See also Chapters One, Two and Five for why some Episcopalians opposed William and others supported him.

²¹⁹ Archbishop John Paterson, Rawl. MS quoted in T.N Clarke, 'The Scottish Episcopalians,' p.135.

²²⁰ Edward Smyth, *A Sermon Preached; The Opinion of a Divine of the Church of England about the Oath of Abjuration.*

and Non-Resistance.²²¹ Paterson and a small number of Episcopalians, who denied William allegiance, accepted Anne because she succeeded naturally unlike William.²²² Paterson's acceptance of Anne as Queen can also be seen as accepting the popular rhetoric of the time that there was no possibility of Jacobite restoration for the foreseeable future. It was recognizing an established authority, which excluded the Pretender. Even amongst some Episcopalians it was not publicly credible to assert allegiance to the Pretender; this was belated recognition of Scotland's Revolution establishment.

Other Episcopalians, like Sir William Seton, were more enthusiastic about the Revolution from 1689.²²³ In defending the Revolution's constitutional and personnel changes he expressed discomfort over Presbyterianism's establishment but denied that Episcopacy indicated Jacobitism. 'The *Queen's* Title in the Claim of Right, is nothing the same with what is said in it for Presbytery. And being two different Articles, The first is untouched, altho' the second be rectified.'²²⁴ Seton argued that it was possible to accept the Revolution settlement without renouncing his Episcopalian beliefs because in 1695 some Episcopalians were given a measure of legal protection in exchange for allegiance.²²⁵ To Revolutioner Episcopalians the Revolution's religious settlement was objectionable but they accepted that the Revolution permanently excluded Jacobite claimants and declared allegiance to Anne. This public Episcopalian loyalty to Anne was part of the wider Scottish public discourse that accepted the Revolution as the establishment and Jacobitism as anathema to it.

Even with this public pro-Revolution majority, some still argued for Abjuration as a more effective guarantee of subjects' allegiance to the Revolution. James Webster was a Presbyterian who supported William.²²⁶ Webster believed that all the acts for protecting the Revolution were ineffectual without abjuring the Pretender. He likened rejecting Abjuration to being

²²¹ See Chapters One and Two.

²²² Clarke, 'Scottish Episcopalians,' p.135.

²²³ See Chapters Four, Five and Eight.

²²⁴ Sir William Seton, *A Continuation of a Few Brief and Modest Reflexions Perswading a Just indulgence to be Granted to the Episcopal Clergy and People in Scotland...*(n.p., 1703), p.9.

²²⁵ Ibid, pp.9-10. See Chapter Five.

²²⁶ Mary Margaret Stewart, 'Webster, Alexander (1707–1784)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28939>, accessed 27 March 2014].

‘asleep on the top of the Mast, when a violent Storm is seizing the Ship.’²²⁷ The Revolution was established but needed protecting. Allegiance without Abjuration was insufficient because ‘our Oath of Alledgeance dieth with our Queen;’ abjuration bound subjects to the Revolution forevermore.²²⁸ Jacobitism would ‘raze the Foundation of the Revolution-Establishment’ by restoring the monarchy’s ‘boundless Prerogative’ and returning Presbyterianism to ‘its former Basis.’ All that was the ‘Revolution-Establishment’ in Scotland would be overturned with allegiance to the Pretender. ‘In a word, all things must run in the former Channel, our King must be made a Tyrant by Law and all his Subjects Slaves....’²²⁹ James VIII threatened liberties and Protestantism across the Kingdoms and Europe.²³⁰ Abjuration would strengthen the Revolution by denying the Pretender any right to Scotland thus preventing ‘utter Ruine.’²³¹ There remained significant support for Abjuration throughout 1702-4 even after the Court spurned it.²³² Webster, like other proponents of Abjuration, saw it as manifesting the popular desires to preserve the ‘Revolution-Establishment’ by binding subjects to it. Revolutioners in Scotland were divided between promoters of Abjuration and opponents who thought it counter-productive to securing the Revolution but both sides still declared loyalty to this establishment. Like English and Irish discussions on Abjuration, this echoed the 1701 loyal addresses about allegiance to the ‘inalterable’ Revolution settlement.²³³

Abjuration was eventually introduced in Scotland after the Union. In 1707 it was imposed on civil and military officeholders and then clerics in 1712. Many Presbyterians still opposed it, seeing it as Erastianism that would undo the established Presbyterianism and Revolution settlement in Scotland, which the Union supposedly guaranteed.²³⁴ Post-Union efforts to introduce a comprehensive toleration for Episcopalians were seen by Presbyterians as

²²⁷ James Webster, *A Letter from one of the Country Party to his Friend of the Court Party* (Edinburgh, 1704), p.2.

²²⁸ Ibid, p.7.

²²⁹ Ibid, p.5.

²³⁰ Ibid, p.2.

²³¹ Ibid, pp.7-9.

²³² As examined earlier George Lockhart, ‘Memoirs Concerning the Affairs of Scotland,’ *The Lockhart Papers*, pp.48-52, 70-1; Patrick Hume, Marchmont, ‘Memorial Concerning Affairs in Scotland ...to Anne,’ 11 July 1702, *Marchmont Papers*, pp.249-52 indicate significant support for Abjuration.

²³³ Privy Council of Scotland, *Humble Address of the Lords and Others of His Majesty’s most Honourable Privy Council*.

²³⁴ Whatley, *Scots and the Union*, pp.351-3; Jeffrey Stephen, *Defending the Revolution...* (Farnham, 2013), p.166.

Jacobite attempts to undermine Presbyterianism.²³⁵ Many pamphlets repeatedly attacked Abjuration for these same reasons.²³⁶ Examining post-Union Abjuration tracts sheds further light on the 1702-4 debates; many pre-Union opponents recanted their 1702-4 opposition. Ridpath admitted that his opposition to Abjuration and Union in 1702 was based on ‘Misapprehensions’ arising from popular nationalism.²³⁷ He now hailed Abjuration for protecting the Revolution establishment and equated opposing Abjuration with opposing the Revolution settlement. If a subject was ‘satisfied with the Revolution’ and accepted that the Pretender had no right to rule then nothing could justify refusing Abjuration.²³⁸ Ridpath described Abjuration as allegiance to Anne and the Revolution ‘in the most solemn manner.’²³⁹ Scottish public views on Abjuration changed in the years since 1702 but the commitment to preserve the Revolution was just as strong in 1702, 1707 and 1712.

William Carstares was credited with ensuring most Presbyterian clerics took the Abjuration oath.²⁴⁰ Presbyterian cleric James Smith, like Ridpath, argued that genuine supporters of Anne and the Revolution had to subscribe to the Abjuration. Smith argued that few publications dared to oppose Abjuration in 1712 because their ‘principal Objections against the Oath’ were due to doubts about the Pretender’s illegitimacy.²⁴¹ A ‘good Scotsman’ would take the Abjuration to show steadfast support for the Revolution. Smith said ‘when I Abjure the Pretender and Swear to the Hanover Succession, I Abjure the One, and engage to the other for ever.’²⁴² Scotland belatedly accepted Abjuration but was not any less pro-Revolution than England in 1702. The political thought in Scotland, like that in England and amongst Irish Protestants, was overwhelmingly pro-Revolution. Popular

²³⁵ Alasdair J Raffé, ‘Religious Controversy and Scottish Society, c.1679-1714,’ (University of Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 2007), pp.13-4, 96-8.

²³⁶ *A Second Defence of the Lawful Prejudices, Containing a Vindication of the Obligation of the National Covenant and Solemn League...* (Edinburgh, 1707), pp.10-2; *Scotland in Danger or, A Serious Enquiry into the Dangers which SCOTLAND has been in, is now in, or may be in since the UNION* (Edinburgh, 1707), pp.3-6; *Some Reasons be a Divine of the Kirk of Scotland, proving that their Clergy there cannot with a safe Conscience swear the English Oath of Abjuration* (Edinburgh, 1707), pp.1-2.

²³⁷ George Ridpath, *A Letter to a Friend Concerning the Oath of Abjuration* (Edinburgh, 1712), p.3.

²³⁸ *Ibid*, p.3.

²³⁹ *Ibid*, p.3.

²⁴⁰ A. Ian Dunlop, *William Carstares and the Kirk by Law Established* (Edinburgh, 1964), p.137.

²⁴¹ James Smith, *A Dialogue Betwixt a Minister of the Church of Scotland and Two of the Elders of his Congregation, about the Abjuration Oath* (Edinburgh, 1712), pp.36, 8.

²⁴² *Ibid*, pp.40-1.

nationalistic fervour after Darien has naturally received more focus in historiography but the popular mood amongst politically involved Scots was to preserve the Revolution establishment from attempts to introduce the Pretender. Scottish opposition to Abjuration did not mean opposition to the Revolution; rather, with fears of Abjuration potentially leading to Union, it was a desire to preserve the specifically Scottish Revolution settlement that prompted their opposition. While Abjuration was one of many bitter debates in Scotland at this time it is possible to see that the public political desire in Scotland was to preserve the Revolution by binding subjects to the Revolution establishment in some form. This was either through the existing Oaths of Allegiance and Assurance to Anne as a continuation of William's reign or Abjuration or declaring it treason to make pronouncements against the Revolution. The political thought in Scotland, like England, generally favoured defending what was now the Revolution establishment into the future. Most Scots rejected allegiance to James VIII because it would overturn the changes that the Revolution established since 1689.

V

The deaths of the Duke of Gloucester, James VII and II and William reinvigorated allegiance debates from 1701. Jacobites were enthused and argued that James Francis Edward was legitimate and should reign as King.²⁴³ Across the Kingdoms the popular political rhetoric was that the Revolution was now the establishment. Chapters Four through Eight showed how allegiance to William was increasingly seen as supporting changes introduced in 1689, including limited prerogative, accountable government, established

²⁴³ Hickes, *The Pretences of the Prince of Wales*, pp.1-2, 4, 11; *The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master*, 30 September- 2 October 1701, No. 999, p.2; Luttrell, *Brief Relation... Volume V*, pp.93-4; *A Speech of One of the Barons of the Shire of B--*, pp.4-5, 7.

Protestantism and liberties and forms of toleration.²⁴⁴ Anne succeeding William maintained this establishment, which the Pretender would overturn.²⁴⁵

Abjuration oaths manifested popular desires to preserve the Revolution but specifically to each kingdom.²⁴⁶ In England Whigs and most Tories accepted Abjuration as necessary to preserve the 'Constitution' in Church and State from Jacobite tyranny. Abjuration was presented and accepted as stronger allegiance to the Revolution settlement; it denied the Pretender had any right to rule the Kingdoms or to subjects' allegiance. English subjects refused to accept a Jacobite restoration and the reversal of the Revolution. This was stronger than the Association because it specifically accepted the Revolution settlement as permanent beyond Anne and forevermore.²⁴⁷ The English Abjuration Oath also applied in Ireland to preserve 'the present Establishment' from Jacobitism. Reflecting the popular view amongst Irish Revolutioners that the Revolution was a Protestant establishment Ireland's Parliament added anti-Catholic declarations to the Abjuration oath.²⁴⁸ In Scotland Abjuration was one of several on-going bitter public debates. The Earl of Marchmont and others believed Abjuration was necessary to protect the Revolution settlement from the Pretender.²⁴⁹ However others opposed it, fearing it would submit Scotland to England thereby undoing Scotland's Revolution settlement, including Presbyterianism. Yet these

²⁴⁴ Loyal addresses of Bodmyn, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, *London Gazette*, 6-10 November 1701, No. 3756, p.3; Loyal Addresses of London Baptists and English Quakers, *London Gazette*, 25-29 December 1701, No. 3770, p.1; Loyal Address of the Parliament of Scotland, *Flying Post*, 27-29 January 1701, No. 1050; Loyal address of the Privy Council of Scotland, *Flying Post*, 18-20 November 1701, No. 1020, p.1; Loyal address of Dublin City, Loyal Address of the Earl of Meath and Justices of Peace of Dublin, Loyal address of the Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, Lord Mayor of Dublin's Loyal address, Loyal address of the Church of Ireland bishops, *London Gazette* 6-10 November 1701, No. 3756, p.3.

²⁴⁵ Daniel, *A Dream*, pp.3-5, 10, 15-6, 22-4; Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty*, pp.8-14, 18; *To the Most Serene and Potent Princess Ann of Scotland, England, France and Ireland Queen. From the Church of Scotland.*

²⁴⁶ *A Funeral Oration upon the Late King James*, p.16.

²⁴⁷ Defoe, *New Test of Church of England's Loyalty*, pp.8-14, 18; Burnet, *Burnet's History... Vol. II*, p.314; *Principles upon which the Taking the Oath of Abjuration may be grounded*, pp.18-23; Toland, *I. Reasons...*, pp.18-20; *The Opinion of a Divine of the Church of England about the Oath of Abjuration*; Cocks, *Parliamentary Diary*, p.254.

²⁴⁸ Maxwell, *Essay Upon an Union*, pp.7-9, 12, 14; Smyth, *Sermon Preached at Christ-Church, Dublin, On the 3d of December, 1702*, pp.1-7, 17, 26; 'An Act to Prevent the Further Growth of Popery,' *Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament Begun at Dublin... 1703...*, pp.42-5; 'An Act for Preventing Popish Clergy from coming into this Kingdom,' *Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament Begun at Dublin... 1703...*, pp.17-8; 'Act to make it High-Treason, &c.,' *Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament Begun at Dublin... 1703...*, pp.22-3.

²⁴⁹ Hume, Earl of Marchmont, 'March, 1702 Letter to Queen Anne,' *Marchmont Papers*, pp.236-7; idem, 'Marchmont to Queen Anne, Memorial of what Happened in parliament, 1 July 1702,' *Marchmont Papers*, pp.243-5; Lockhart, 'Memoirs,' *Lockhart Papers*, pp.48-9.

opponents also supported other laws, which were designed to protect the specifically Scottish Revolution settlement. This was still allegiance to the Revolution but not as personal to subjects as Abjuration. The rhetoric about preserving the Revolution settlement, which was popular in England and amongst Irish Protestants, was also popular in Scotland at this time.²⁵⁰

Irish Whig Sir Richard Steele wrote in 1714 that William's deathbed royal assent to the English Abjuration meant he had 'accomplished his Work.' Abjuration was 'To guard and protect this Settlement.'²⁵¹ Allegiance debates across the Kingdoms during 1701-4 focused on Abjuration as allegiance to the Revolution settlements. While each Kingdom had different settlements and implementation of Abjuration oaths, the popular political thought in each Kingdom was to preserve the Revolution settlements because these settlements had become the established order.

This shows how the political thought in each Kingdom on allegiance and the Revolution changed over the course of William's reign. While opinions in each Kingdom evolved at different paces allegiance polemics show a common evolution of opinion and justifications on allegiance and the Revolution. Chapters One through Three showed how there was initially a popular hesitancy towards the Revolution. This resulted in allegiance being given to William and Mary as *de facto* monarchs and justified on the basis that William, in James's absence, possessed the throne. William provided a government that prevented anarchy. Arguments from History, and from the notions of Passive Obedience and Conquest were used to justify allegiance to William as *de facto* King in polemics that primarily focused on portraying the Revolution as a personnel change. By the mid-1690s William was increasingly unpopular and there were credible Jacobite threats but little public desire to see James re-enthroned. Chapters Four through Six showed how Williamite justifications of allegiance put greater emphasis on what it was that allegiance to William and James symbolized and supported. Allegiance to William was increasingly seen as supporting a monarchy that guaranteed subjects' liberties,

²⁵⁰ Ridpath, *Discourse upon the Union*, pp.79-80; *Minutes of the Proceedings in Parliament, Tuesday June 30, 1702, No. 10*, pp.1-2; idem, *Account of the Proceedings of the Parliament of Scotland*, pp.11-9, 29-30, 235-40, 245-8; *The Observator*, 16-19 June 1703, Vol. II, No. 21, p.2; 'Act Ratifying the turning the meeting of the Estates in the year 1689 into a Parliament,' *Records of the Parliaments of Scotland*, 1703/5/190.

²⁵¹ Sir Richard Steele, *The Crisis: or, A Discourse Representing, From the most Authentick Records, The Just Causes of the late Happy Revolution...*(London, 1714), pp.17, 26.

protected the established Protestantism and Protestant monarchy and in two of the Kingdoms protected non-Established Church Protestants. From the mid-1690s there was a more popular acceptance of the Revolution as being more than a personnel change as earlier Williamite polemics maintained. Chapter Seven showed how the introduction of allegiance to William as *de jure* King showed a popular desire to preserve William's reign and the Revolution settlements and to continue James's exclusion. The Revolution and the changes it introduced were now seen as permanent and events in the late 1690s, examined in Chapter Eight, were seen as a providential vindication of allegiance to William. Between 1701 and 1704, Abjuration was portrayed and justified as allegiance to the Revolution settlements and defending the Revolution from Jacobitism. William was of secondary importance to the allegiance debates by 1701. When faced with the choice of continuing what the Revolution founded or turning back time with a Jacobite Restoration, the majority of public comments in the Three Kingdoms committed their allegiance to the 'Revolution-Establishment.'²⁵²

²⁵² *Principles upon which the Taking the Oath of Abjuration may be grounded*, p.18; Henry Maxwell, *Essay upon an Union*, pp.7-9, 14; Webster, *A Letter from one of the Country Party to his Friend of the Court Party*, p.5.

Conclusion

The public debates over allegiance between 1689 and 1702 were critical to the success of the Revolution of 1688-9 in each Kingdom. If most politically involved subjects in each Kingdom refused to declare allegiance to William then his regime and the Revolution settlements would not survive. This study by exploring the polemics on allegiance throughout William's reign has provided new insights into the Revolution and the political thought that sustained it in all Three Kingdoms. It has shown how there was a common evolution of political thought, the public reactions of politically involved subjects, on the Revolution across the Three Kingdoms. Examining the various arguments on allegiance, where polemicists used several ideas to justify binding their consciences to one of the rival monarchs, has also provided new insights into Jacobitism and the Revolution in the Three Kingdoms. This has also shown how embarking on an exercise in the History of British Political is a rewarding experience because of the new insights it adds to the existing historiography on the Revolution and the late-Stuart Three Kingdoms in general.

The existing limited research on post-Revolution allegiance debates has generally focused on allegiance as an English issue that was settled in the early 1690s. This thesis has shown that these debates were not just confined to England and were more extensive and longer lasting than the existing historiography suggests.¹ Tim Harris argued that post-Revolution debates over

¹ Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1533-1682* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp.193-209; Mark Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument,' *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 83 (1980), pp.473-520; idem, 'Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium* in the Revolution Debate, 1689-1693,' *Historical Journal*, 20, No. 3 (Sep., 1977), pp.569-86; Gerald Straka, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962); Charles F. Mullet, 'A Case of Allegiance: William Sherlock and the Revolution of 1688,' *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 10, No. 1 (Nov., 1946), pp.83-103; idem, 'Religion, Politics, and Oaths in the Glorious Revolution of 1688,' *The Review of Politics*, 10, No. 4, (Oct., 1948), pp.462-74; J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (Cambridge, 1990), passim; Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (London, 2013), pp.322-9, 358-70; David Martin Jones, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (Rochester, 1999); Robert Eccleshall, 'The Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland in the 1690s,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Basingstoke, 2001), pp.63, 68-71; P.W.J. Riley, 'The Abjuration Vote of 27 June 1702 in the Scottish Parliament,' *Parliamentary History* Vol. 2 (1983), pp.175-90; Alasdair Raffe, 'Scottish State Oaths and the Revolution of 1688-90,' in Sharon Adams & Julian Goodare (eds.) *Scotland in the Age of Two Revolutions* (Woodbridge, 2014), pp.173-93.

allegiance are one of many issues previously considered purely English that are in fact Three-Kingdom in nature because of the common ideas in each Kingdom.² By examining allegiance polemics from each Kingdom throughout William's reign this thesis has shown how a common political thought on the Revolution evolved across the Three Kingdoms. This British Political Thought evolved at different paces in each Kingdom with three distinct Revolution settlements and circumstances to each Kingdom but with the same ideas and issues impacting on allegiance debates in all Three Kingdoms.

From 1689 to around 1692-3 ideas about History, the Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance doctrine, and Conquest theories were prominent in justifying allegiance to William as *de facto* King. These polemics tended to portray the Revolution as little more than a personnel change. This showed that politically involved subjects in each Kingdom were wary of the Revolution and reluctant to accept it as a radical or transformative upheaval. However this conservatism was soon superseded by a greater acceptance of the Revolution as something involving more extensive and far-reaching changes than just the person on the throne. When faced with credible attempts to restore James and William's personal unpopularity allegiance to William remained popular. From 1692-3 allegiance to William became about supporting the beneficial changes that accompanied William's enthronement and a refusal to give up these changes by accepting the Revolution's reversal with a Jacobite restoration. Ideas about guaranteed liberties, permanently established Protestantism, Catholics' allegiance, and protection for some Protestant Williamites who did not conform to the established Churches became more prominent in defending allegiance to William. With the mid-1690s introduction of allegiance tests recognising William as *de jure* King Williamites justified this as a means of defending the entirety of the Revolution from Jacobite attempts at reversing it in the Kingdoms. The twilight of William's reign saw Williamites arguing that providence vindicated allegiance to William and protected the Revolution settlements. When abjuration became the dominant issue in the debates in 1702 there was a widespread belief amongst the politically involved subjects that the Revolution's changes had become the permanently established order in the Kingdoms. By 1702

² Tim Harris, 'In Search of a British History of Political Thought,' in David Armitage (ed.) *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.98-108.

Williamites in each Kingdom had become Revolutioners with allegiance widely seen as a means of protecting the Revolution settlements forevermore.

There were times when the ideas played out differently in each Kingdom, like the idea of Toleration in Ireland and an earlier embrace of the Revolution as transformative in Scotland, but on the whole the same ideas impacted on the debates in each Kingdom. Not only were there common ideas on allegiance across the Kingdoms but ideas and issues that emerged in one Kingdom frequently influenced the course of the debates in the other Kingdoms. Chapter Five showed how the English Toleration Act impacted on allegiance debates in Scotland and Ireland. Scotland's introduction of the Assurance, explored in Chapter Seven, inspired some English and Irish Williamites to demand a similar allegiance test in their respective Kingdoms. The introduction of the Abjuration oath in England in 1702 also influenced debates in Ireland and Scotland. With similar ideas being expressed in allegiance polemics from each Kingdom there was a similar evolution of political thought in the Kingdoms. Williamite-Revolutioner allegiance polemics in each Kingdom evolved from conservatively viewing the Revolution as a personnel change to accepting it as transformative before accepting the Revolution as the permanently established order.

Exploring the allegiance debates in each Kingdom has provided new understandings of Jacobitism. Existing research on Jacobitism during William's reign has tended to focus on the different plots at the expense of the ideas that motivated Jacobites. Where ideas have been examined it is generally in a single-Kingdom context.³ This study has shown how Jacobitism was a

³ Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989), pp.7, 15-28, 38-9, 44, 51-2, 126-7, 135-6, 145-7, 161-9, 345-8; idem, 'Jacobitism and Country Principles in the Reign of William III,' *Historical Journal*, 30, No. 2 (Jun., 1987), pp.289-310; Charles-Edouard Levillain, 'Cromwell Redivivus? William III as Military Dictator: Myth and Reality,' in Mijers & Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III*, pp.159-76; Goldie & Jackson, 'Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites,' pp.177-99; John Miller, 'Proto-Jacobitism? The Tories and the Revolution of 1688-9,' in Eveline Cruickshanks & Jeremy Black (eds.) *The Jacobite Challenge* (Edinburgh, 1988), pp.7-19; George L. Cherry, 'The Legal and Philosophical Position of the Jacobites, 1688-1689,' *The Journal of Modern History*, 22, No. 4 (Dec., 1950), pp.309-21; J.H. Overton, *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London, 1902); C.D.A. Leighton, 'The Non-Jurors and their History,' *The Journal of Religious History*, 29, No. 3 (Oct., 2005), pp.241-57; Bruce P. Lenman, 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism,' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759* (Edinburgh, 1982); Murray Pittock, 'Jacobitism Ideology in Scotland and at St. Germain-en-Laye,' in Eveline Cruickshanks & Edward Corp (eds.) *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995), passim; Daniel Szechi, 'The Jacobite Revolution Settlement, 1689-1696,' *The English Historical Review*, 108, No. 428 (Jul., 1993), pp.610-28; idem, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester, 1994), pp.21-4, 30-4, 41,

significant part of the public discourse on allegiance in all Three Kingdoms throughout William's reign. Jacobitism was a broad church and, as Chapters Five and Six highlighted, its adherents frequently promoted contradictory positions but their allegiance polemics also show how the popular political thought on the Revolution was changing. Jacobite allegiance polemics frequently engaged in a populism that sought to exploit popular grievances and sentiments to entice as many subjects as possible to return allegiance to James and thereby undoing the Revolution. These efforts by Jacobite polemicists, like Charles Leslie and Robert Ferguson, also provide insights into how the popular political thought on the Revolution in the Kingdoms was evolving. Jacobite polemicists altered their arguments to take into account the greater concern over subjects' liberties, as Chapters Three and Four showed, and the changing views in England over Toleration. The ideas that were popular and resonating with the politically involved subjects were reflected in Jacobite allegiance polemics throughout William's reign. There were some ideas, like James being *de jure* King, that were consistently present in Jacobite polemics between 1689 and 1702 and it would be wrong to depict Jacobitism as a purely populist movement. Jacobitism was populist when embracing the popular political ideas in the Kingdoms but at its core was an effort to convince subjects to return allegiance to James. Across the Three Kingdoms the religiously diverse Jacobites were united by their common allegiance to James, and from 1701 the Pretender, in opposition to what they saw as an immoral and illegal Revolution that had to be undone.

However examining the political thought on the Revolution in each Kingdom, as expressed in polemics on allegiance, has also shown that as time went on Jacobitism's ultimate goal became a more difficult task. Chapters One through Three showed how most subjects who made up the political nations in each Kingdom were initially hesitant about accepting the Revolution and so William was only given allegiance as *de facto* King. When faced with credible threats to depose William Williamites responded with a stronger embrace of the Revolution as transformative and accepting stronger allegiance to William. The changing political circumstances in the Kingdoms and threats to undo the Revolution that prompted views on allegiance and the Revolution to change.

51-3, 58, 63, 66-8; Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (London, 1980), pp.9-11, 84, 290; Éamonn Ó Ciardha, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766: A Fatal Attachment* (Dublin, 2002), passim.

William was unpopular but allegiance to him remained popular because it was now about supporting more than a person on the throne; allegiance was about supporting the beneficial changes that accompanied his enthronement. In the mid-1690s the introduction of allegiance to William as *de jure* King was a statement of support for the Revolution and refusal to entertain Jacobite attempts at overturning it. By the end of William's reign Williamites had become Revolutioners committed to preserving the Revolution settlements beyond William. When the allegiance debates focused on Abjuration in 1702 most comments on allegiance across the Three Kingdoms' political nations show that the changes introduced by the Revolution were now popularly regarded as the permanently established order. Jacobitism survived James's death because, in the words of one English Revolutioner, Jacobites made James's 'Cause live after his Death, by Tramping up the Title of the pretended Prince of *Wales*.'⁴ By 1702 the Revolution settlements were part of the political fabric of each Kingdom and any attempted Jacobite restoration would have to undo this establishment; a Jacobite restoration would not be as simple as enthroning the Pretender.

These new insights into the political thought on the Revolution in the Kingdoms also add a new perspective to the perennial question in historiography of the Revolution on the conservative or radical nature of the Revolution. The historiography of the Revolution in England has repeatedly examined this question with a focus on political, religious and constitutional issues without extensive investigation of the contemporary political thought.⁵ A similar focus has also been evident in studies of the Revolution in Scotland and Ireland.⁶ The few studies of the Revolution in a Three-Kingdom context

⁴ *A Letter to a Minister of State, Concerning the Pretended Prince of Wales Being Proclaim'd King of England, &c. in France...* (London, 1701), p.9.

⁵ Lionel K.J. Glassey, 'In Search of the *Mot Juste*: Characterizations of the Revolution of 1688-89,' Gabriel Glickman, 'Political Conflict and the Memory of the Revolution in England, 1689-c.1745,' both in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (eds.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013); Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France...* (London, 1791), pp.1-32; Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England From The Accession of James the Second Volume I, Volume IV, Volume V*, ed. Charles Harding Firth (London, 1913); George Macaulay Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts* (London, 1965), pp.429-42; W.A. Speck, *The Reluctant Revolutionaries...* (Oxford, 1988); J.R. Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (London, 1972); Lois Schwoerer, *The Declaration of Rights, 1689* (London, 1981).

⁶ J.G. Simms, *Jacobite Ireland 1685-1691* (London, 1961); Patrick Kelly, 'Ireland and the Glorious Revolution: From Kingdom to Colony,' in Robert Beddard (ed.) *The Revolutions of 1688* (Oxford, 1991); Toby Barnard, 'Ireland, 1688-91,' in Harris & Taylor (eds.) *Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy*, pp.176-87; D.W. Hayton, 'The Williamite Revolution in Ireland, 1689-91,' in Jonathan I. Israel (ed.) *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious*

have also focused on the nature of the Revolution.⁷ This question has even found its way into some of the few examinations of post-Revolution allegiance debates. Mark Goldie and J.P. Kenyon argued that Williamite allegiance polemics in England show that the Revolution was a conservative affair. Steve Pincus argued that Williamite allegiance polemics were part of a wider radical Revolution in England while Alasdair Raffe contended that the post-Revolution oaths in Scotland repudiated the Restoration settlement.⁸

This study to a degree complements the works of Goldie, Kenyon, Pincus and Raffe. It has shown that initially from 1689 the popular political thought, as shown in allegiance polemics, regarded the Revolution as little more than a personnel change. Eventually this conservatism gave way to a greater acceptance of the Revolution as transformative even amongst English Tory Williamites and Irish Anglican Williamites, probably two of the most conservative groups in the Kingdoms. There remained some divisions within the Kingdoms on the extent of these changes. English Whigs and Tories, Scottish Presbyterians and Episcopalian Revolutioners, Irish Anglicans and Presbyterians, all had different views on what the Revolution established. These divisions would cause more debates during the reigns of Anne and the Hanoverians. However in 1702 there was a broad acceptance that the Revolution was more significant than a personnel change and these changes were now permanently established.

Christopher Whatley and other historians have noted that the Revolution, especially the succession question, was an important part in

Revolution and its world impact (Cambridge, 2003); Robert Paul Barnes, 'Scotland and the Glorious Revolution of 1688,' *Albion*, 3, No. 3 (Autumn, 1971), pp.116-27; Alasdair Raffe, 'The Restoration, the Revolution and the Failure of Episcopacy in Scotland,' in Harris & Taylor (eds.) *Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy*; William Ferguson, *Scotland, 1689 to the Present* (Edinburgh, 1968); Derek J. Patrick, 'Unconventional Procedure: Scottish Electoral Politics after the Revolution,' in Keith M. Brown & Alastair J. Mann (eds.) *The History of the Scottish Parliament Volume II Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1567-1707* (Edinburgh, 2005); Ian Cowan, 'The Reluctant Revolutionaries: Scotland in 1688,' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *By Force or Default? The Revolution of 1688-1689* (Edinburgh, 1989), pp.163-74.

⁷ Tim Harris, *Revolution The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2007); Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester, 1994); Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (London, 1980); John Morrill, 'The Sensible Revolution,' in Israel (ed.) *Anglo-Dutch Moment*, pp.82-6, 98-103; Edward Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution 1688: Britain's Fight for Liberty* (London, 2006); W.A. Speck, 'William III and the Three Kingdoms,' in Mijers & Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III*.

⁸ Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689 and Structure of Political Argument,' pp.473-520; J.P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (Cambridge, 1990); Steve Pincus, *1688 The First Modern Revolution* (London, 2009), pp.293-6, 440-70, 474-86; Alasdair Raffe, 'Scottish State Oaths and the Revolution of 1688-90,' pp.173-93.

securing the 1707 Anglo-Scottish Union.⁹ This study can also be seen as a prelude to the examinations of the formation of the British state because a common British political thought can be seen developing across the Kingdoms. The political and religious circumstances in each Kingdom were distinct with three unique settlements but examining allegiance polemics from all Three Kingdoms shows that the same issues and ideas impacted on the debates. Jacobites, like Charles Leslie and Robert Ferguson, had polemics that spoke to the Three Kingdoms with ideas that resonated in all Three Kingdoms.¹⁰ Williamite-Revolutioner pamphlets by Sir Richard Cox, George Ridpath, Joseph Boyse and William Atwood amongst others show how events and ideas that emerged in one Kingdom influenced the allegiance debates in the other Kingdoms.¹¹ By 1702 there was a common popular political desire amongst the Three Kingdoms' political nations to preserve what was regarded as the 'Revolution-Establishment' and refusal to entertain a reversal of the Revolution with a Jacobite restoration.¹² All Three Kingdoms' political nations, while having circumstances unique to each Kingdom, had common ideas and principles. Examining allegiance polemics from each Kingdom has shown that subjects went from initially viewing the Revolution as a personnel change before eventually accepting that it was a transformative event. Allegiance became about protecting these Revolution settlements, which by the end of William's reign were seen as the permanently established order in all Three Kingdoms.

⁹ Christopher Whatley, *The Scots and the Union Then and Now* (Edinburgh, 2014), pp.2-4, 13-9, 31-9, 44-9, 53-4, 88-9, 103-6, 420; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp.640-2; Rose, *England in the 1690s*, pp.245-8; Harris, *Revolution*, pp.477-517.

¹⁰ Charles Leslie, *Gallienus Redivivus, or, Murther Will out, &c. Being a True Account of the De-Witting of Glencoe, Gaffney, &c.* (Edinburgh, 1695), pp.8-11, 13-22, 24; Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Account of Some of the Late Incroachments and Depredations of the Dutch upon the English and of a few of those many Advantages which by Fraud and Violence they have made of the Brittish Nations since the Revolution...* (n.p., 1695), pp.66-8.

¹¹ Sir Richard Cox, *Aphorisms Relating to the Kingdom of Ireland, Humbly submitted to the Most Noble Assembly of Lords and Commons at the Great Convention at Westminster* (London, 1689), pp.1-2; idem, *Hibernia Anglicana, or the History of Ireland, from the Conquest thereof by the English, to this Present Time with an Introductory Discourse...* (London, 1689), 'To the Reader,' George Ridpath, *Scots Episcopal Innocence...* (London, 1694), pp.5-11, 20-1; Joseph Boyse, *The Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland... Vindicated from the Exceptions alleg'd against it, in a late Answer* (Dublin, 1695), pp.4, 8; William Atwood, *The Antiquity and Justice of an Oath of Abjuration in Answer to a Treatise, entituled, The Case of Abjuration Considered* (London, 1694), pp.5, 9-11, 30-8, 107-8.

¹² *Principles upon which the Taking the Oath of Abjuration may be grounded* (London, 1702), pp.15, 18-23; Henry Maxwell, *An Essay Upon an Union of Ireland with England...* (Dublin, 1704), pp.7-9, 12, 14; James Webster, *A Letter from one of the Country Party to his Friend of the Court Party* (Edinburgh, 1704), pp.2, 5, 7-9.

Appendices

Appendix I: Chapter One: History as a Guide in the Initial Allegiance Debates from January 1689.

The Oath of Allegiance introduced during the Reign of Charles II and used throughout the Restoration:

‘I A.B. do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testifie, and declare in my Conscience before God and the World, That our Sovereign Lord King Charles is lawful and rightful King of the Realm of England, & of all other his Majesties Dominions and Countries; and that the Pope, neither himself, nor by any authority of the Church, or See of Rome, or by any other means with any other, hath any power or authority to depose the King, or to dispose any of his Majesties Kingdoms or Dominions, or to authorize any foraign Prince to invade or annoy him or his Countries, or to Discharge and of his Subjects of their Allegiance and Obedience to his Majesty; or to give licence or leave to any violence or hurt to his Majesties Subjects within his Majesties Dominions. Also I do swear from my heart, that notwithstanding any Declaration or sentence of Excommunication or Deprivation made or granted, or to be made or granted by the Pope or his Successors, or by any Authority derived or pretended to be deprived from his or his Sea, against said King, his heirs or Successors, or any Absolution of the said Subjects from their Obedience; I will bear faith and true Allegiance to his Majestie, his heirs and Successors, and him and them will defend to the uttermost of my power, against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever which shall be made against his or their persons, their Crown and Dignitie, by reason or colour of any such Sentence or Declaration or otherwise; and will doe my best endeavour to disclose and make unto his Majesy, his heirs and Successors, all Treasons and Traiterous Conspiracies which I shall know or hear of, to be against him or any of them. And I do further swear, That I do from my heart abhor, detest and abjure, as impious and heretical, this damnable Doctrine and Position, That Princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, may be deposed or murdered by their Subjects, or any other whatsoever.

And I do believe and in conscience am resolved, that neither the Pope nor any person whatsoever hath power to absolve me of this Oath, or any part thereof, which I acknowledge by good and full Authority to be Lawfully administred unto me, and do renounce all pardons and dispensations to the contrary. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge, and swear according to these express words by me spoken, and according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, or mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever: And I do make this Recognition and Acknowledgement heartily, willingly and truly, upon the true faith of a Christian. So help me God, &c.’

Source: *The Oath Of Allegiance and Supremacy Enjoined by Order of Parliament* (London, 1660).

The Oath of Allegiance to William and Mary introduced by the English Convention in 1689 for England and Ireland:

‘I A.B. doe sincerely Promise and Swear That I will be Faithfull and beare true Allegiance to Their Majesties King William and Queene Mary Soe helpe me God &c.’

Source: ‘William and Mary, 1688: An Act for the Abrogating of the Oathes of Supremacy and Allegiance and Appointing other Oathes. [Chapter VIII. Rot. Parl. pt. 5. nu. 5.]’, *Statutes of the Realm: volume 6: 1685-94* (1819), pp. 57-60. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46294>. Date accessed: 24 March 2013.

Oath of Allegiance to William and Mary introduced by the 1689 Scottish Convention:

‘I A.B. Do sincerely Promise and Swear, That I will be Faithful, and bear True Allegiance to Their Majesties, King William and Queen Mary, So help me God.’

Source: *The Declaration of the Estates of the Kingdom of Scotland, Containing the Claim of Right, and the Offer of the Crown to their Majesties, King William and Queen Mary: Together with the Grievances Represented by the Estates; and Their Majesties Oath at Their Acceptance of the Crown.* (Edinburgh, 1689), p.7.

Appendix II: Chapter Two: Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.

Restoration-era Oath of Non-Resistance:

‘I A.B. Do declare that it is not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take Arms against the King; and that I do abhor that Traiterous Position of taking Arms by His Authority against His Person, or against those that are Commissionated by him; and that I will conform to the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, as it is now by Law established. And I do declare that I do hold, there lies no Obligation upon me, or on any other person from the Oath, commonly called the *Solemn League and Covenant*, to endeavour any change, or alteration of Government, either in Church, or State; and that the same was in it self an unlawful Oath, and imposed upon the Subjects of this Realm against the known Laws and Liberties of this Kingdom.’

Source: ‘An Act for Uniformity of Publick Prayers; and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies: And for establishing the Form of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the Church of *England*.’ ‘XIV. CAROL. II.’ *The Book of Common-Prayer And Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites & Ceremonies of the Church According to the Use of the Church of England...*(London, 1662).

Appendix III: Chapter Six: Allegiance and Perceptions of Catholic Allegiance.

The Restoration-era Oath of Supremacy:

‘I A.B., Do utterly testifie and declare in my conscience, that the *King’s* Highness is the onely Supreme Governour of this Realm, and of all other his Highness Dominions and Countries, as well in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical things or causes as Temporal; And that no Foraign Prince, Person, Prelate, State or Potentate, hath or ought to have Jurisdiction, Power Superiority, Preeminence or Authority Ecclesiastical or Spiritual within this Realm: And therefore I do utterly renounce & forsake all Foraign Jurisdctions, Powers, Superiorities and Authorities, and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear Faith and true Allegiance to the *Kings* Highness, his Heirs and lawfull Successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all Jurisdctions, Priviledges, Preeminences and Authorities granted, or belonging to the *Kings* Highness, his Heirs and Successors, or united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm. *So help me God, and by the Contents of this Book.*’

Source: *The Oath Of Allegiance and Supremacy Enjoined by Order of Parliament* (London, 1660).

Wording of the Oath of Supremacy from 1689:

‘I, A.B. do swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest and abjure as impious and heretical this damnable doctrine and position that Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope or any authority of the See of Rome may be deposed or murdered by the subjects, or nay other whatsoever, And I do declare that no Foreign prince, power, person, prelate, state or potentate have or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm. So help me God.’

Source: ‘Act for abrogating the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy and establishing others in their Place.’ Historical Manuscripts Commission *The Manuscripts of the House of Lords Volume II 1689-90* (London, 1889), pp.63-

6; 'William and Mary, 1688: An Act for the Abrogating of the Oathes of Supremacy and Allegiance and Appointing other Oathes. [Chapter VIII. Rot. Parl. pt. 5. nu. 5.], *Statutes of the Realm: volume 6: 1685-94* (n.p., 1819), pp. 57-60. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=46294>. Date accessed: 24 March 2013.

Proposed Oath of Fidelity for English Catholics 1689-90:

'I, A.B., do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary; and I do swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure that doctrine and position that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever.'

Source: 'Papists Toleration Bill' or 'Amended Draft of an Act for Exempting their Majesties' Popish Subjects from the Penalties of Certain Laws.' Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of the House of Lords, 1689-1690* (London, 1889), pp.385-7.

Wording of the 1700 Formula tendered to suspected Scottish Catholics:

'I... do sincerely from my heart profess and declare before God, who searcheth the heart, that I do deny, disown and abhor these tenets and doctrines of the papal Romish church namely: the supremacy of the pope and bishop of Rome over all pastors of the Catholic church; his power and authority over kings, princes and states and the infallibility that he pretends to either without or with a general council; his power of dispensing and pardoning; the doctrine of transubstantiation and the corporal presence with the communion without the cup in the sacrament of the Lord's supper; the adoration and sacrifice professed and practised by the popish church in the mass; the invocation of angels and saints; the worshipping of images, crosses and relicts; the doctrine of supererogation, indulgences and purgatory and the service and worship in an unknown tongue; all which tenets and doctrines of the said church I believe to be contrary to and inconsistent with the written word of God. And I do from

my heart deny, disown and disclaim the said doctrines and tenets of the church of Rome as in the presence of God, without any equivocation or mental reservation, but according to the known and plain meaning of the words as to me offered and proposed, so help me God.’

Source: ‘Act for preventing the Growth of Popery,’ *The Records of the Parliament of Scotland to 1707*, ed. K.M. Brown (St. Andrews, 2007-2014), 1700/10/73. Date accessed: 21 December 2014. URL: <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1700/10/73>.

Appendix IV: Chapter Seven: Rightful and Lawful: Allegiance to *De Jure* Kings.

Wording of the 1690 Assurance:

‘I, A.B. do, in the sincerity of my heart, assert, acknowledge and declare that their majesties King William and Queen Mary are the only lawful undoubted sovereigns, king and queen of Scotland, as well *de jure* as *de facto* and in the exercise of the government and, therefore, I do sincerely and faithfully promise and engage that I will, with heart and hand, life and goods, maintain and defend their majesties’ title and government against the late King James, his adherents and all other enemies who either by open or secret attempts shall disturb or disquiet their majesties in the exercise thereof.’

Source: ‘Act for Security of their Majesties’ Government,’ *The Records of the Parliament of Scotland to 1707*, ed. K.M Brown (St. Andrews, 2007-2013), 1690/4/161. Date Accessed: 19 January 2013, <http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1690/4/161>.

Wording of the 1696 Association in Scotland:

‘We the Lords and others of His Majesties Privy Council, with the Noblemen, Gentlemen, and others Undersubscribing, Considering that there has been a Horrid and Detestable Conspiracy Formed and Carried on by Papists and other Wicked and Traiterous Persons, for Assassinating His Majesties Sacred Person, in Order to Usher in, and Facilitat a Formidable and Cruel Invasion from *France*, to the Ruine and Extirpation of Our Religion, Laws and Liberties: *Do Therefore*, Heartily, Sincerely and Solemnly Profess, Testifie and Declare, that his present Majesty KING WILLIAM, is Rightful and Lawful King of this Realm; And we do mutually Promise, and Solemnly Engage and Oblige our Selves, to Stand by, and Assist one another to the outmost of our Power in the Support and Defence of his Majesties most Sacred Person and Government, and of the true Protestant Religion, against the late King *James*, and the pretended Prince of *Scotland*, commonly called the pretended Prince of *Wales*, and all their Adherents, and against all Forreign

Invasions, or Intesting Insurrections that shall be Attempted or made to Disturb His Majesties Right and Possession; and in case His Majesty come to any violent or untimely Death, (*which God of his infinite Mercy Avert*) We do hereby further Freely and unanimously oblige our Selves to Unite, Associat, and Stand by each other in Revenging the same upon all His Majesties Enemies and their Adherents, and in Supporting and Defending the Succession of the Crown, according to the Declaration of the Estates of this Kingdom.’

Source: Privy Council of Scotland, *Association Begun to be Subscribed at Edinburgh, April 10, 1696* (Edinburgh, 1696).

Wording of the 1696 Association subscribed to by members of the House of Commons:

‘Whereas there has been a Horrid and Detestable Conspiracy, Formed and Carried on by Papists, and other Wicked and Traiterous Persons, for Assassinating his Majesty’s Royal Person in Order to Incurage an Invasion from *France*, to Subvert our Religion, Laws, and Liberty: We whose Names are hereunto Subscribed, do Heartily, Sincerely, and Solemnly Profess, Testify and Declare, That his Present Majesty King *William* is Rightful and Lawful King of these Realms. And we do Mutually Promise and Engage to stand by and assist each other, to the utmost of our Power, in the Support and Defence of his Majesty’s most Sacred Person and Government, against the late King *James* and all his Adherents. And in case his Majesty come to any Violent or Untimely Death (which God forbid) We do hereby further Freely and Unanimously Oblige our Selves, to Unite, Associate, and Stand by each other, in Revenging in the same upon his Enemies, and their Adherents; and in Supporting and Defending the Succession of the Crown, according to an Act made in the First Year of the Reign of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, Intituled, *An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and Settling the Succession of the Crown.*’

Source: B.J., *A Summary Account of the Proceedings upon the Happy Discovery of the Jacobite Conspiracy in a Second Letter to a Devonshire Gentleman* (London, 1696), pp.2-3.

Wording of the 1696 Association subscribed to by members of the House of Lords:

‘Whereas there has been a horrid and detestable Conspiracy formed and carried on by Papists, and other wicked and traitorous Persons, for Assassinating His Majesties Royal Person, in order to encourage an Invasion from *France*, to subvert our Religion, Laws, and Liberties. We whose names are hereunto Subscribed, do heartily, sincerely, and solemnly profess, testifie, and declare, that His Present Majesty King *William* hath Right by Law to the Crown of these Realms, and neither the Late King *James*, nor the pretended Prince of *Wales*, nor any other Person hath any right whatsoever to the same; And we do mutually promise and engage to stand by and assist each other to the utmost of our Power, in the support and defence of His Majesties most sacred Person and Government against the Late King *James*, and the pretended Prince of *Wales*, and all their Adherents: And in case His Majesty come to any violent or untimely Death (which God forbid) We do hereby further freely and unanimously oblige our selves, to unite, associate, and stand by each other in revenging the same upon his Enemies and their Adherents, and in supporting and defending the Succession of the Crown, according to an Act made in the first ear of the Reign of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, entituling, an Act declaring the Right and Liberties of the Subject and settling the Succession of the Crown.’

Source: *True Copies of the Present Associations of the Lords and Commons in Parliament Assembled. As also A Copy of the Instrument of Association that the Protestants of England entred into, in the 27th. Year of Queen Elizabeth, against a Popish Conspiracy...* (London, 1696), p.9.

Wording of the 1696 Association Oath Roll in Preston, Lancashire:

‘Wee your Maties Most Loyall and Dutyfull Subjects the Mayor Aldermen Common Councill Bayliffs Burgesses Gentlemen and other inhabitants of the Borough of Preston in the County of Lancaster whose names

are subscribed doe with all submission beg leave to congratulate your Maties Preservation from the late most Horrid and Barbarous Conspiracy against your Maties Sacred Person in order to Incourage an Invasion from France to subvert our Religion Lawes and Liberties. And wee doe thankfully acknowledge the good Providence of God for your Maties happy deliverance from that villanous and bloody design. And wee doe hereby heartily sincerely and solemenly professe testify and declare that your Matie is the Rightfull and Lawfull King of these Realms and wee doe mutually promise and engage to stand by and assist each other to the uttermost of our power in the support and defence of your Maties most Sacred Person and Government against the late King James and all his adherents, and in case your Matie come to any violent or untimely death (which God forbid) wee doe hereby further freely and unanimously oblige ourselves to unite associate and stand by each other in Revenging the same upon your Enemies and their adherents and in supporting and defending the succession of the Crown according to an Act made in the First Yeare of the Reign of your Matie and your Late Consort Queen Mary Intituled An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subjects and Settling the Succession of the Crown.’

Source: *Lancashire Association Oath Rolls 1696*, ed. Wallace Gandy (London, 2000), pp.95-8.

Appendix V: Chapter Nine: Abjuration: Defending the Establishment.

Wording of the 1702 English Abjuration Oath:

‘I A.B; do truly and sincerely acknowledge profess testify and declare in my Conscience before God and the World That our Sovereign Lord King William is lawfull and rightful King of this Realm and of all other His Majesties Dominions and Countries thereunto belonging. And I do solemnly and sincerely declare That I do believe in my Conscience that the Person pretended to be the Prince of Wales during the Life of the Late King James and since his Decease pretending to be and taking upon himself the Stile and Title of King of England by the Name of James the Third hath not any Right or Title whatsoever to the Crown of this Realm or any other the Dominions thereto belonging. And I do renounce, refuse and abjure any Allegiance or Obedience to him And I do swear that I will bear Faith and true Allegiance to His Majesty King William and will defend to the utmost of my Power against all Traiterous Conspiracies and Attempts whatsoever which shall be made against His Person, Crown or Dignity. And I will do my best endeavour to disclose and make known to faithfully promise to the utmost of my Power to support maintain and defend the Limitation and Succession of the Crown against him the said James and all other Persons whatsoever as the same is and stands limited (by an Act intituled An Act declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and settling the Succession of the Crown) to His Majesty during His Majesties Life and after His Majesties Decease to the Princess Ann of Denmark and the Heirs of Her Body being Protestants and for default of such Issue to the Heirs of the Body of His Majesty being Protestants. And as the same by one other Act intituled An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject is and stands limited after the Decease of His Majesty and the Princess Ann of Denmark and for default of Issue of the said Princess and of His Majesty respectively to the Princess Sophia Electoress and Dutchess Dowager of Hanover and the Heirs of Her Body being Protestants. And all these Things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear according to these express Words by me, spoken and according to the plain and common Sense and Understanding of the same Words without any Equivocation mental Evasion or secret Reservation

whatsoever. And I do make this Recognition, Acknowledgment, Abjuration, Renunciation and Promise heartily and willingly and truly upon the true Faith of a Christian So help me God.’

Source: William III, 1701: An Act for the further Security of His Majesties Person and the Succession of the Crown in the Protestant Line and for extinguishing the Hopes of the pretended Prince of Wales and all other Pretenders and their open and secret Abettors. [Chapter VI. Rot. Parl. 13 & 14 Gul. III. N. 6],’ *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 7: 1695-1701*, ed. John Raithby (n.p., 1820), pp.747-750. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol7/pp747-750>. Date Accessed: 7 July 2015.

Wording of Patrick Hume, Earl of Marchmont’s proposed Scottish Abjuration Oath in 1702:

‘I, A.B, do truly and sincerely assert, acknowledge, and hereby solemnly declare before God and the world, that I am fully and thoroughly convinced and persuaded in my conscience, that our sovereign lady, Queen Anne, is the only lawful and rightful sovereigns of the realm of Scotland; and I do solemnly and sincerely declare, that I do believe in my conscience, that the person pretended to be the Prince of Scotland, commonly called the pretended Prince of Wales, during the life of the late King James, and since his decease pretending to be, and taking upon himself the style and title of King of Scotland, and her Majesty’s other dominions, by the name of King James, hath not any right or title whatsoever to the crown of this realm; and I do refuse, renounce, disclaim, and abjure any allegiance or obedience to him; and I do swear, that I will bear faith and true allegiance to her Majesty Queen Anne, and will defend her Majesty, and her government to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against her person, crown, dignity, or government. And I will do my best endeavor to disclose, and make known to her Majesty all treasons and conspiracies, which I shall know to be against her Majesty or her government. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge, promise, and swear, in the express words and terms hereof, and according to the plain and common sense and meaning of the words, without any equivocation or reservation whatsoever.

And this recognition, acknowledgement, promise, abjuration, and renunciation I do heartily, willingly, and truly make upon the true faith of a Christian, and as God shall be merciful to me at the great day. So help me God.'

Source: Patrick Hume, Earl of Marchmont, 'Memorial Concerning Affairs in Scotland,' *A Selection from the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont, in the possession of the Right Honourable Sir George Henry Rose: Illustrative of the events from 1685 to 1750; in Three Volumes, Volume III* (London, 1831), pp.246-8.

Wording of the Abjuration Oath imposed in Scotland after the 1707 Union:

'I A.B. do Truly and Sincerely Acknowledge, Profess, Testifie and Declare in my Conscience, before God and the World, That our Sovereign Lady Queen ANNE is Lawful and Rightful Queen of this Realm, and of all other Her Majesties Dominions and Countries thereunto belonging; And I do solemnly and sincerely Declare, That I do believe in my Conscience the Person pretended to be Prince of Wales, during the Life of the late King James, and since his Decease, pretending to be, and taking upon himself the Stile and Title of King of England, by the Name of James the Third, or of Scotland, by the Name of James the Eight, or the Stile and Title of King of Great Britain, hath not any Right or Title whatever to the Crown of this Realm, or any Right or Title whatever to the Crown of this Realm, or any other the Dominions thereunto belonging: And I do Renounce, Refuse and Abjure any Allegiance or Obedience to him. And I do Swear, That I will bear Faith and True Allegiance to Her Majesty Queen ANNE, and her will defend to the utmost of my Power, against all Traiterous Conspiracies and Attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against Her Person, Crown or Dignity. And I will do my utmost Endeavour to disclose and make known to Her Majesty, and Her Successors, all Treasons and Trayterous Conspiracies, which I shall know to be against Her or any of them. And I do Faithfully Promise to the utmost of my Power, to Support, Maintain and Defend the Succession of the Crown against him the said James, and all other Persons whatsoever, as the same is and stands Settled by an Act, Intituled, An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and Settling the Succession of the Crown to Her present Majesty, and the heirs

of Her An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better Securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, is and stands Settled and Entailed after the Decease of Her Majesty, and for Default of Issue of Her Majesty, to the Princess Sophia Electress and Dutchess Dowager of Hannover, and the Heirs of Her Body, being Protestants. And all these things I do Plainly and Sincerely Acknowledge and Swear, according to the these express Words by me spoken, and according to the Plain and Common Sense and Understanding of the same Words, without any Equivocation, Mental Evasion, or Secret Reservation whatsoever. And I do make this Recognition, Acknowledgment, Abjuration, Renunciation, and Promise, Heartily, Willingly, and Truly, upon the true Faith of a Christian. So help me God.'

Source: 'An Act for the better Security of Her Majesties Person and Government,' *Anno Regni Anna Regina Magna Britannia, Francia, & Hibernia, Sexto. At the Parliament Begun and Holden at Westminster the Twenty third Day of October, Anno Dom. 1707. In the Sixth Year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lady Anne, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c.* (London, 1707), pp.283-4.

Wording of the Abjuration Oath imposed in Ireland by the English Parliament after Anne's succession:

'I A.B. do Truly and Sincerely Acknowledge, Profess, Testifie and Declare in my Conscience, before God and the World, That Our Sovereign Lady Queen Anne is Lawful and Rightful Queen of this Realm, and all other Her Majesties Dominions and Countries thereunto belonging. And I do Solemnly and Sincerely Declare, That I do believe in my Conscience, that the Person pretended to be Prince of Wales, during the Life of the late King James, and since his Decease pretending to be, and taking upon himself the Style and Title of King of England, by the Name of James the Third, hath not any Right or title whatsoever to the Crown of this Realm, or any other the Dominions thereto belonging: And I do Renounce, Refuse and Abjure any Allegiance or Obedience to him. And I do Swear, that I will bear Faith and True Allegiance to her Majesty Queen ANNE, and her will Defend to the utmost of my Power, against all traitorous Conspiracies and Attempts whatsoever, which shall be

made against Her Person, Crown or Dignity. And I will do my best Endeavour to Disclose and make Known to Her Majesty, and Her Successors, all Treasons and Traiterous Conspiracies, which I shall Know to be against Her, or any of them. And I do faithfully Promise, to the utmost of my Power, to Support, Maintain and Defend the Limitation and Succession of the Crown, against Him, the said James, and all other Persons whatsoever, as the same is and stands Limited by an Act, Intituled, An Act declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and Settling the Succession of the Crown to Her present Majesty, and the Heirs of Her Body, being Protestants: And as the same by one other Act, Intituled, An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better Securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, is and stands Limited after the Decease of Her Majesty, to the Princess Sophia, Electoress and Dutchess Dowager of Hanover, and the Heirs of Her Body, being Protestants. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely Acknowledge and Swear, according to these express Words by me Spoken. And according to the Plain and Common Sense and Understanding of the same Words, without any Equivocation, Mental Evasion, or Secret Reservation whatsoever. And I do make this Recognition, Acknowledgment, Abjuration Renunciation and Promise, Heartily, Willingly and Truly, upon the true Faith of a Christian. So help me God.’

Source: ‘An Act to prevent the further Growth of Popery,’ *Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament Begun at Dublin the Twenty First Day of September, Anno Dom. 1703. In the Second Year of the Reign of our most Gracious Sovereign Lady Queen Anne...*(Dublin, 1703), pp.42-4.

Wording of the Declaration attached to the Abjuration Oath in Ireland by the Irish Parliament in 1703:

‘I A.B. do Solemnly and Sincerely in the presence of God profess, testife and declare, that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at, or after the Consecration thereof, by any Person whatsoever: And that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are Superstitious and Idolatrous: And I

do Solemnly in the presence of God, Profess, Testifie and Declare, That I do make this Declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary Sence of the Words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by Protestants, without any Evasion, Equivocation, or Reservation whatsoever; and without any Dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope, or any other Authority or Person whatsoever, or without any hope of Dispensation from any Person or Authority whatsoever, or without believing that I am, or can be acquitted before God, or Man, or Absolved of this Declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope or any other Person or Persons, or Power whatsoever should Dispencc with or Annul the same, or declare that it was Null and Void from the beginning.'

Source: 'An Act to prevent the further Growth of Popery,' *Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament Begun at Dublin the Twenty First Day of September, Anno Dom. 1703. In the Second Year of the Reign of our most Gracious Sovereign Lady Queen Anne...*(Dublin, 1703), pp.42-3.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Administrative Records, Source Collections, Contemporary Letters, Diaries, Memoirs and Modern Editions:

- A Kingdom without a King: The Journal of the Provisional Government in the Revolution of 1688*, ed. Robert Beddard (Oxford, 1988).
- A Selection from the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont, in the possession of the right honourable Sir George Henry Rose: illustrative of the events from 1685 to 1750; in Three Volumes, Volume III* (London, 1831).
- Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland 1638-1842*, ed. Church Law Society (Edinburgh, 1843). Accessed via www.british-history.ac.uk/church-scotland-records/acts/1638-1842.
- Annals and Correspondence of the Viscount and the First Earl of Stair... Volume I*, ed. J.M Graham (Edinburgh, 1875).
- Burnet, Gilbert, *Bishop Burnet's History of His own Time Volume II. From the Revolution to the Conclusion of the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne...* (London, 1734).
- Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin In the Possession of the Municipal Corporation of that City Volume 6*, ed. John T. Gilbert (Dublin, 1896).
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Anne Volume I 1702-1703*, ed. Robert Pentland Mahaffy (London, 1916).
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William and Mary: 13 Feb. 1689- April 1690*, ed. William John Hardy (London, 1895).
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William and Mary, May 1690-October 1691*, ed. William John Hardy (London, 1898).
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William and Mary, 1st November 1691- End of 1692*, ed. William John Hardy (London, 1900).
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William III, 1 January- 31 December 1697*, ed. William John Hardy (London, 1927).
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series of the Reign of William III 1 April, 1700- 8 March, 1702*, ed. Edward Bateson, (London, 1937).

- Clerk, Sir John, *Memoirs of the life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik...extracted by himself from his own Journals, 1676-1755...edited from the manuscript in Penicuik House with an Introduction and notes by John M. Gray*, ed. John M. Gray (London, 1895).
- Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England, volume 5* (London, 1809).
- Cocks, Sir Richard, *Parliamentary Diary of Sir Richard Cocks, 1698-1702*, ed. David Hayton (Oxford, 1996).
- English Historical Documents 1660-1714*, ed. Andrew Browning (London, 1953).
- Evelyn, John, *The Diary of John Evelyn 1677-1706 Volume III*, ed. Austin Dobson (London, 2006).
- Evelyn, John, *Diary of John Evelyn, Volume V Kalendarium, 1690-1706*, ed. E.S De Beer (Oxford, 2000).
- Gordon, James, *James Gordon's Diary*, eds. G.D. Henderson & H.H. Porter (Aberdeen, 1949).
- Grey, Anchitell, *Grey's Debates of the House of Commons: Volume 9* (London, 1769). Accessed via <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/greys-debates/vol9>.
- Grey, Anchitell, *Grey's Debates of the House of Commons: Volume 10* (London, 1769). Accessed via <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/greys-debates/vol10>.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Manuscripts of his Grace the Duke of Portland... Volume VIII* (London, 1907).
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Reginald Rawdon Hastings... Volume II*, ed. Francis Binkley (London, 1930).
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Laing Manuscripts preserved at the University of Edinburgh... Volume II* (London, 1925).
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Supplementary Report on Manuscripts of his Grace the Duke of Hamilton*, ed. John Harvey MacMaster & Marguerite Wood (London, 1932).
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of the House of Lords Volume II 1689-90* (London, 1889).
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of the House of Lords, Volume IV 1699-1702* (London, 1965).

- Hyde, Henry, Earl of Clarendon, *The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, and his brother Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester: with the diary of Lord Clarendon from 1687 to 1690... Volume II* (London, 1762).
- Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 12: 1697-1699* (London, 1803).
Accessed via: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol12>.
- Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 14, 1685-1691* (London, 1767-1830).
Accessed via: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol14>.
- Journal of the House of Lords: Volume 15, 1691-1696.* (London, 1767-1830).
Accessed via: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol15>.
- King, William, 'Memoirs,' *A Great Archbishop of Dublin William King D.D. 1650-1729. His Autobiography, Family, and a Selection from his Correspondence...*, ed. Sir Charles Simeon King (London, 1906).
- Lancashire Association Oath Rolls 1696*, ed. William Gandy (London, 2000).
- Leven and Melville Papers. Letters and State Papers Chiefly addressed to George Earl of Melville, Secretary of State for Scotland 1689-1691*, ed. W.L. Melville, The Bannatyne Club, (Edinburgh, 1843).
- Lockhart, George, of Carnwath, 'Scotland's Ruine' *Lockhart of Carnwath's Memories of the Union*, ed. Daniel Szechi (Aberdeen, 1995).
- Lockhart, George, of Carnwath, 'Memoirs Concerning the Affairs of Scotland,' *The Lockhart Papers: Containing Memoirs and Commentaries upon the Affairs of Scotland from 1702 to 1715...Published from Original Manuscripts in the Possession of Anthony Aufrere...in two Volumes. Volume I* (London, 1817).
- Luttrell, Narcissus, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs From September 1678 to April 1714 Volume III* (Oxford, 1867).
- Luttrell, Narcissus, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs From September 1678 to April 1714 Volume IV* (Oxford, 1867).
- Luttrell, Narcissus, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs From September 1678 to April 1714 Volume V* (Oxford, 1867).
- Luttrell, Narcissus, *Parliamentary Diary of Narcissus Luttrell, 1691-1693*, ed. Henry Horwitz (Oxford, 1972).
- Mackay, Hugh, *Memoirs of the War Carried on in Scotland and Ireland. M.DC.LXXXIX.-M.DC.XCI...*, ed. J.M. Hog, P.F. Tytler, A. Urquhart (eds.) (Edinburgh, 1833).

- Memoirs of Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries... Volume II From Commonwealth to Emancipation 1647-1793*, ed. William Forbes Leith (London, 1909).
- Morrice, Roger, *The Entring Book of Roger Morrice: Volume Four The Reign of James II, 1687-1689*, ed. Stephen Taylor (Woodbridge, 2007).
- Morrice, Roger, *The Entring Book of Roger Morrice: Volume Five The Reign of William III*, ed. Mark Knights (Woodbridge, 2007).
- Ó Bruadair, David, *Duanaire Dháibhidh Uí Bhruadair: The Poems of David Ó Bruadair Part III...*, ed. John C. Mac Erlear (London, 1917).
- O’Kelly, Charles, *Macariae Excidium or The Destruction of Cyprus: Being a Secret History of the War of the Revolution in Ireland*, ed. John Cornelius O’Callaghan (Dublin, 1850).
- Plunkett, Nicholas, ‘A Light to the Blind,’ *A Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland 1688-1691*, ed. J.T. Gilbert (Shannon, 1971).
- Prideaux, Humphrey, *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux Sometime Dean of Norwich to John Ellis, Sometime under-secretary of State 1674-1722*, ed. Edward Maunde Thompson (London, 1875).
- Reresby, Sir John, *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby* (London, 1813).
- State Papers and Letters Addressed to William Carstares*, ed. Joseph McCormick (Edinburgh, 1774).
- Statutes of the Realm: volume 6: 1685-94*, ed. John Raithby (n.p. 1819). Accessed via: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol6>.
- Statutes of the Realm: Volume 7: 1695-1701*, ed. John Raithby (n.p., 1820). Accessed via: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol7>.
- The Grameid: An Heroic Poem Descriptive of the Campaign of Viscount Dundee in 1689 and other Pieces by John Philip of Almericlose 1691* (Edinburgh, 1888).
- The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume 2: 1680-1695 (Chandler’s)*, (n.p., 1742). Accessed via <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol2>.
- The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons: Volume 3: 1695-1706 (Chandler’s)*, (n.p., 1742). Accessed via <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-hist-proceedings/vol3>.
- The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland Third Series Volume XIV A.D. 1680-1689*, ed. Henry Paton (Edinburgh, 1932).

Wodrow, Robert, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow, 1698-1709: Edited from the manuscript in Edinburgh University Library, with notes and extracts from the answers to these letters in the National Library of Scotland...*, ed. L.W. Sharp (Edinburgh, 1937).

Contemporary Pamphlets, Papers and Books

Printed Newspapers

Dublin Intelligence Saturday 29 April- Thursday 11 May 1693, No. 130.

The New State of Europe, Or a True Account of Publick Transaction and Learning, 7-9 October 1701, No. 9.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master (London), 9-11 September 1701, No. 990.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 30 September- 2 October 1701, No. 999.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 16-18 October 1701, No. 1006.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 25- 28 October 1701, No. 1010.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 4-6 November 1701, No. 1014.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 18-20 November 1701, No. 1020.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 20-23 December 1701, No. 1034.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 27-30 December 1701, No. 1037.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 20-22 January 1702, No. 1047.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 27-29 January 1702, No. 1050.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 9-11 April 1702, No. 1098.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 16-18 June 1702, No. 1110.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 1-4 August 1702, No. 1130.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 8-11 August 1702, No. 1133.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 11-13 August 1702, No. 1134.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 15-18 August 1702, No. 1136.

The Flying Post: or, The Post-Master, 25-27 August 1702, No. 1140.

The London Gazette, 6-10 November 1701, No. 3756.

The London Gazette, 17-20 November 1701, No. 3759.

The London Gazette, 24-27 November 1701, No. 3761.

The London Gazette, 27 November- 1 December 1701, No. 3762.

The London Gazette, 8-11 December 1701, No. 3765.
The London Gazette, 18-22 December 1701, No. 3768.
The London Gazette, 25-29 December 1701, No. 3770.
The London Gazette, 1-5 January 1702, No. 3772.
The London Gazette, 26-30 March 1702, No. 3795.
The Observer, 20-23 May 1702, No. 9.
The Observer, 19-22 August 1702, No. 35.
The Observer, 16-19 June 1703, Vol. II, No. 21.
The Post Boy, 21-23 October 1701, No. 1004.

Published Pamphlets

A Brief Account of the Reasons For Which the Three Estates of Scotland Forfaulted the Late King James, and Setled K. William and Q. Mary Upon the Throne, Anno 1689. And Some of the Reasons induced them to Abolish Episcopacy there (London, 1695).

A Dialogue Between K.W. and Benting, Occasioned by his Going into Flanders after the Death of the Queen (n.p., 1695).

A Dialogue Between Sir Roger L 'Estrange and Robert Ferguson in Newgate relating to the Plot (London, 1696).

A Dialogue Between the French King, and the Late King James, At St. Germain en Laye: Occasion'd by the Signing of the Peace (London, 1697).

A Free Discourse wherein which make for tyranny are display'd the title of our Rightful and Lawful King William Vindicated...(London, 1697).

A Funeral Oration upon the Late King James Composed from Memoirs, furnishing by Mr Porter (Dublin, 1702).

A Funeral Oration upon the Late King James Composed from Memoirs, furnishing by Mr Porter (London, 1702)

A Letter from a Gentleman in Flanders to a Lord in the Parliament (n.p., 1690).

A Letter from a Gentleman in Ireland, to his Friend in London, upon occasion of a Pamphlet, Entitled, A Vindication of the Present Government of

- Ireland, under his Excellency Richard Earl of Tyrconnel in Fourteen Papers...* (London, 1689).
- A Letter From Rome, Written by a Roman Catholick there, to a Person of Quality in England; giving a full Account of a MEMORIAL presented to the Pope, in relation to the late King JAMES's Affairs, with the Popes Answer, or rather Denial thereto* (n.p., 1689).
- A Letter from Scotland to A Gentleman at Court in Relation to Scotch-Affairs. With a Copy of an Act for the Security of Their Majesties Government in that Kingdom* (London, 1690).
- A Letter from the West to a member of the Meeting of Estates of Scotland* (n.p., 1689).
- A Letter from Winchester, In Answer to his Lordship's time and serving Query, 'Whether Passive Obedience is only a Bugbear, and fit for Fools, or a Christian Duty?'* (London, 1681).
- A Letter to a Friend* (n.p., 1689).
- A Letter to a Minister of State, Concerning the Pretended Prince of Wales Being Proclaim'd King of England, &c. in France...* (London, 1701).
- A Letter to Sir J.P. Bart. A Member for the ensuing Parliament, relating to the Union of England and Scotland* (London, 1702).
- A Modest Enquiry into the Causes of the Present Disasters in England. And who they are that brought the French Fleet into the English Channel, Described* (London, 1690).
- A Proclamation, by the King and Queen's Majesties...Whereas there have been several Treasonable, and Seditious Designs and Combinations...by persons enemies to the Protestant Religion, and ill affected to our Government...*(Edinburgh, 1690).
- A Proclamation Indemnifying such Rebels as shall lay down their Arms* (Edinburgh, 1689).
- A Proper Project For Scotland. To Startle FOOLS, and Frighten KNAVES, But to make WISE-MEN Happy...and Ease our Minds With the Undoubted CAUSES of God's WRATH AND OF The present NATIONAL CALAMITIES...* (n.p., 1699).
- A Reply to the Answer Doctor Welwood has made to King James's Declaration which declaration was dated at St. Germaines, April 17th, S.N., 1693...* (n.p., 1694).

- A Satyr upon the French King, Written by a Non-Swearing Parson, and drop'd out of his Pocket at Samm's Coffee-House* (London, 1697).
- A Second Defence of the Lawful Prejudices, Containing a Vindication of the Obligation of the National Covenant and Solemn League...* (Edinburgh, 1707).
- A Short Historical Account, Concerning the Succession to the Crown of Scotland: And the Estates disposing of it upon Occasion as they thought fit* (n.p., 1689),
- A Short History of the Convention: or, New Christened Parliament* (n.p., 1689).
- A True Coppie of the Declaration Published at Sanquhair upon the tenth of August 1692* (n.p., 1693).
- A Vindication of the Proceedings of the Convention of the Estates in Scotland wherein the Lawfulness and the Power of that Meeting is cleared...* (London, 1689).
- A.B., *Allegiance Vindicated: or, The Takers of the New Oath of Allegiance to K. William & Q. Mary Justified: And the Lawfulness of taking it Asserted... Concerning Non-Resistance & Passive Obedience...* (London, 1690).
- Abbadie, Jacques, *A Panegyric on our late Sovereign Lady Mary Queen of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, of Glorious and immortal Memory who died at Kensington, on the 28th of December, 1694* (London, 1695).
- Abbadie, Jacques, *The History of the Late Conspiracy against the King and the Nation with a Particular Account of the Lancashire Plot, and all the other Attempts and machinations of the Disaffected Party since his Majesty's accession to the throne...* (London, 1696).
- Abercromby, David, *A Moral Discourse of the Power of Interest...* (London, 1690).
- Act for Taking the Oath of Alledgeance and the Assurance Edinburgh, the Twentie Third day of May, 1693* (Edinburgh, 1693).
- Act Recognizing Her Majesty's Royal Authority 12 June 1702* (Edinburgh, 1702).
- Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament, Begun at Dublin the Fifth Day of October, Anno Dom. 1692...* (Dublin, 1692).

Acts and Statutes made in a Parliament Begun at Dublin the Twenty First Day of September, Anno Dom. 1703. In the Second Year of the Reign of our most Gracious Sovereign Lady Queen Anne...(Dublin, 1703).

Aickin, Joseph, *A Sermon upon Conformity of the Humane will to the divine: From Acts 9. 6. Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?* (London, 1705).

Aickin, Joseph, *Londerias; or, A Narrative of the Siege of London-dery...* (Dublin, 1698).

Alexander VIII, *His Holyness The Pope of Rome's Declaration against the French King, Louis the 14th* (London, 1690).

Allix, Pierre, *An Examination of the Scruples of Those who Refuse the Oath of Allegiance* (London, 1689).

Allix, Pierre, *Reflections upon the Opinions of Some Modern Divines, concerning the Nature of Government* (London, 1689).

Alsop, Vincent, *A Sermon Preached upon the Wonderful Deliverance by his Majesty from Assassination...*(London, 1696).

Alsop, Vincent, *Duty and Interest united in Prayer and Promise for Kings and all that are in Authority...*(London, 1695).

An Abstract of the Treaty of Peace, Concluded between the most Potent and Seren Prince, WILLIAM the Third, by the Grace of God King of Great Britain, &c. and the most Potent and Serene, Prince, LEWIS the Fourteenth King of France, &c. at Riswick... (London, 1697).

An Account of Mr. Blunt's late Book entituled, King William and Queen Mary Conquerors under the Censure of the Parliament Second Edition (London, 1693).

An Account of the late Great and Famous Victory over two thousand High-land rebels, in the north of Scotland...(London, 1690).

An Address Given in to the Late King James, By the Titular Archbishop of Dublin...(London, 1690).

An Address of the Dissenting Ministers (In and About the city of London) To the King and Queen, upon their accession to the Crown. With their Majesties answer to it (London, 1689).

An Answer to a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country, to a Member of the House of Commons On the Votes of the 14th Instant. Relating to the Trade of Ireland (London, 1698).

An Apology for Mr. Toland in a Letter for himself to a Member of the House of Commons in Ireland, written the day before his book was resolv'd to be burnt by the Committee of Religion...(London, 1697).

An Apology for the Failures Charg'd on the Reverend Mr. George Walker's Printed Account of the Late Siege of Derry, In a Letter to the Undertaker of a more Accurate Narrative of that Siege (n.p., 1690).

An Enquiry into the Nature and Obligation of Legal Rights: With Respect to the Popular Pleas of the Late K. James's Remaining Right to the Crown (London, 1693).

An Enquiry into the Nature and Obligation of Legal Rights: With Respect to the Popular Pleas of the Late K. James's Remaining Right to the Crown (London, 1696).

An Exact Relation of Routing the Irish Army under Sarsfield... in order to a Capitulation for Surrender of Limerick into Their Majesties Hands (London, 1691).

An Honest Commoner's Speech, (n.p., 1694).

An Impartial Account of Some of the Transactions in Scotland, concerning the Earl of Broadalban and Master of Stair, Glenco-men, Bishop of Galloway, and Mr Duncan Robertson in a letter from a friend (London, 1695).

Anderton, William, *Remarks upon the Present Confederacy...*(London, 1693).

Anderton, William, *True Copy of the Paper delivered to the Sheriffs of London and Middlesex by William Anderton at the place of execution...*(n.p., 1693).

Animadversions on the Two last 30th of January Sermons, The One Preached to the Honourable House of Commons, The Other to the Lower House of Convocation. In a Letter (London, 1702).

Anno Regni Anna Regina Anglia, Scotia, Francia, & Hibernia, Primo. At the Parliament begun at Westminster the Twentieth Day of August, Anno Dom. 1702....An Act for Enlarging the time for taking the Oath of Abjuration....And for the further Security of Her Majesties Person, and the Succession of the Crown in the Protestant Line; And for Extinguishing the Hopes of the Pretended Prince of Wales... (Dublin, 1703).

- Anno Regni Anna Regina Magna Britannia, Francia, & Hibernia, Sexto. At the Parliament Begun and Holden at Westminster the Twenty third Day of October, Anno Dom. 1707. In the Sixth Year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lady Anne, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c.* (London, 1707).
- Anno Regni Gulielmi et Maria, Regis et Regina Anglica, Soctia, Francia & Hibernia, Primo. On the Sixteenth Day of December...1689...* (Dublin, 1695).
- Arwaker, Edmund, *A Native Table, Consecrated to the Church's Deliverers, the Present King and Queen...* (London, 1689).
- Arwaker, Edmund, *A Poem humbly Dedicated to the Queen on the Occasion of Her Majesty's Happy Conception 11 February 1687/8* (London, 1688).
- Arwaker, Edmund, *An Epistle to Monsieur Boileau, Inviting his MUSE to forsake the French Interest, And Celebrate the King of England* (London, 1694).
- Arwaker, Edmund, *God's King the People's Blessing. A Sermon Preached on the Day of Thanksgiving for Peace at St. Ann's Church in Dungannon...* (Dublin, 1698).
- Atwood, William, *Reflections upon a Treasonable Opinion, industriously promoted, against signing the National Association...* (London, 1696).
- Atwood, William, *The Antiquity and justice of an Oath of Abjuration in Answer to a Treatise, entitled, The Case of An Oath of Abjuration considered* (London, 1694).
- Atwood, William, *The History and Reasons of the Dependence of Ireland upon the Imperial Crown of the Kingdom of England rectifying Mr Molyneux's State of the Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of the Parliament in England* (London, 1698).
- Atwood, William, *Wonderful Predictions of Nostredamus, Grebner, David Pareus, and Antonius Toruatus wherein the grandeur of Their Present Majesties, the happiness of England...are plainly delineated...* (London, 1689).
- B.J., *A Summary Account of the Proceedings upon the Happy Discovery of the Jacobite conspiracy in a second letter to a Devonshire gentleman* (London, 1696).

- Bainbrigg, Thomas, *Seasonable Reflections on a late Pamphlet entituled A History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation wherein the true notion of Passive Obedience is settled...* (London, 1690).
- Bates, William, *A Sermon Preached upon the Much Lamented death of our Late Gracious Sovereign Queen Mary to which is added The Address of Condolence to His Majesty his Dissenting members* (London, 1695).
- Bates, William, *A Sermon Preached upon the much Lamented Death of Our late Gracious Sovereign Queen Mary...Fourth Edition* (London, 1695).
- Bates, William, 'Congratulatory Speech to the King,' *A Sermon Preach'd on the late day of Thanksgiving, Decemb. 2, 1697 by John Howe... to which is prefixed Dr. Bates's Congratulatory Speech to the King...* (London, 1698).
- Bates, William, *Dr. Bates's Congratulatory Speech to the King, Novemb. 22, 1697. In the Name of the Dissenting Ministers in and about London* (London, 1698).
- Baxter, Richard, *Against the Revolt to a Foreign Jurisdiction, which would be to England its Perjury, Church-Ruine, and Slavery...* (London, 1691).
- Baxter, Richard, *The English Nonconformity as under King Charles II and King James II...* (London, 1689 reprint).
- Bennet, John, *Constantius the Apostate being a short Account of his Life and the sense of the primitive Christians about his succession and their behaviour toward him...and the necessity of Passive Obedience...full answer to a late pamphlet intituled Julian the Apostate, &c.* (London, 1683).
- Blackmore, Sir Richard, *A Short History of the Last Parliament* (n.p., 1699).
- Blount, Charles, *King William and Queen Mary, conquerors, or, A discourse endeavouring to prove that Their Majesties have on their side, against the late king, the principal reasons that make conquest a good title...written with an especial regard to such have hitherto refused the oath...* (London, 1693).
- [Blount, Charles], *The Proceedings of the Present Parliament Justified by the Opinion of the most Judicious and Learned Hugo Grotius* (Edinburgh, 1689).
- Bohun, Edmund, *The Doctrine of Non-resistance or Passive Obedience, no way concerned in the controversies now depending between the*

- Williamites and the Jacobites by a lay gentleman of the communion of the Church of England, by law established* (London, 1689).
- Bohun, Edmund, *The History of the Desertion, or An Account of all the Publick Affairs in England, From the beginning of September 1688 to the Twelfth of February following. With An Answer to a Piece Call'd The Desertion Discussed: In a Letter to a Country Gentleman* (London, 1689).
- Booker, Richard, *Satisfaction tendered to all that Pretend Conscience to our Present Governours, and Refusing the New Oaths of Fealty and Allegiance* (London, 1689).
- Booth, Henry, Earl of Warrington, *The Charge of the Right Honourable Henry Earl of Warrington to the Grand Jury at the Quarter Sessions held for the County of Chester on the 11th of October, 1692* (London, 1693).
- Borfet, Abiel, *The Minister of Richmond's Reasons for Refusing to Subscribe the Association but under the Following Sense with Reflections thereupon* (London, 1696).
- Borfet, Abiel, *The Minister of Richmond's Sermon upon the last Thanksgivingday. Published to prevent or stifle false Reports...*(London, 1696).
- Bowber, Thomas, *A Sermon Preached in the Parish-Church at St. Swithin, London, March 10th 1694/5 Upon the much lamented Death of our Most Gracious Queen* (London, 1695).
- Boyse, Joseph, *A Vindication of the Reverend Mr. Alexander Osborn, in reference to the affairs of the north of Ireland in which some mistakes concerning him...are rectified...*(London, 1690).
- Boyse, Joseph, 'Sermon I,' *Two Sermons Preach't on a Day of Fasting & Humiliation, Kept by the Protestant Dissenters in Dublin, On the Sad Occasion of the Death of Our Late Queen* (Dublin, 1695).
- Boyse, Joseph, *The Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland, in Reference to a Bill of Indulgence, Represented and Argued* (n.p., 1695).
- Boyse, Joseph, *The Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland, in Reference to a Bill of Indulgence, Vindicated from the Exceptions alleg'd against it, in a late Answer* (Dublin, 1695).

- Boyse, Joseph, *Vindiciae Calvinisticae: or, some Impartial Reflections on the Dean of Londondereys Considerations That Obliged him to come over to the Communion of the Church of Rome...*(Dublin, 1688).
- Bradford, Samuel, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord-Mayor, The Aldermen, and Citizens of London, at St. Mary Le Bow, On Thursday, November 5. 1696* (London, 1697).
- Brady, Nicholas, *Mr Brady's Sermon at Whitehall Upon Occasion of the Queen's Death March 3, 1694/5* (London, 1695).
- Brewster, Sir Francis, *A Discourse Concerning Ireland...*(London, 1698).
- Brewster, Sir Francis, *A Letter from a Gentleman in the Country, To a Member of the House of Commons in England; in Reference to the Votes of the 14th December, 1697. Relating to the Trade of Ireland. Together with an Answer to the said letter* (Dublin, 1697).
- Brown, Thomas, *The Late Converts Exposed...*(London, 1690).
- Brown, Thomas, *The Reasons of the New Converts taking the Oaths to the Present Government in a Dialogue* (London, 1691).
- Brown, Thomas, *The Weesils a satirical fable...*(London, 1691).
- Browne, Thomas, *An Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance to Sovereign Powers...In a Letter to a Friend* (London, 1691).
- Browne, Thomas, *The Case of Allegiance to a King in Possession* (n.p., 1690).
- Buchanan, George, *A Detection of the actions of Mary Queen of Scots concerning the murther of her husband, and her conspiracy, adultery, and pretended marriage with the Earl Bothwell and a defence of the true Lords, maintainers of the King's Majesties action and authority* (London, 1689).
- Buchanan, George, *The History of Scotland written in Latin by George Buchanan: faitfully rendered into English* (London, 1690).
- Burnet, Gilbert, *A Pastoral Letter writ by Right Reverend Father in God Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum, to the Clergy of his Diocess, concerning the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy to K. William and Q. Mary* (Edinburgh, 1689).
- Burnet, Gilbert, *A Pastoral Letter writ by Right Reverend Father in God Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum, to the Clergy of his Diocess, concerning the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy to K. William and Q. Mary* (London, 1689).

- Burnet, Gilbert, *A Sermon preach'd before the Queen, at White-hall, on the 11th of March, 1693/4...*(London, 1694).
- Burnet, Gilbert, *A Sermon Preached at the Coronation of King William III and Mary II...*(London, 1689).
- Burnet, Gilbert, *A Sermon Preached before the House of Commons, on the 31st of January, 1688 being the Thanksgiving-day for the Deliverance of this Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power, by his Highness the Prince of Orange's means* (London, 1689).
- Burnet, Gilbert, *A Sermon Preached before the King, At White-Hall, On the Second of December, 1697. Being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Peace* (London, 1698).
- Burnet, Gilbert, *An Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs...* (London, 1689).
- Burnet, Gilbert, *An Enquiry into the Measures of Submission to the Supream Authority...*(London, 1689).
- Burnet, Gilbert, *An Essay on the Memory of the late Queen Second Edition* (London, 1696).
- Burscough, Robert, *A Discourse of Schism address'd to those Dissenters to those Dissenters who conform'd before the Toleration and Have since withdrawn themselves from the Communion of the Church of England* (London, 1699).
- Burscough, Robert, *Treatise of Church and Government occasion'd by some letters lately printed concerning the same subject* (London, 1692).
- By the King and Queen, a Proclamation. William R... Whereas there hath been lately printed and published a treasonable... libel, intituled, A Short History of the Convention, or new Christened Parliament...* (London, 1689).
- Canaries, James, *A Sermon Preached at Edinburgh, In the East-Church of St. Giles, upon the 30th of January, 1689. Being the Anniversary of the Martyrdome of King Charles the First* (Edinburgh, 1689).
- Canaries, James, *A Sermon Preached at Selkirk upon the 29th of May, 1685 being the Anniversary of the Restoration of the Royal Family to the Throne of these Kingdoms* (Edinburgh, 1685).
- Canaries, James, *Rome's additions to Christianity shewn to be inconsistent with the true design of so spiritual a religion in a sermon preached at*

Edinburgh, in the east- Church of St. Giles February 14, 1686: to which is prefixt a letter, vindicating it from the misrepresentations of some of the Romish Church (Edinburgh, 1686).

Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiasticall Gathered and Put in fame, for the Government of the Church of Scotland...(Aberdeen, 1636).

Cary, John, *A Vindication of the Parliament of England, In Answer to a Book, Written by William Molyneux of Dublin, Esq; Intituled, The Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England, stated* (London, 1700).

Cary, John, *An Answer to Mr. Molyneux his Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England... and his dangerous notion of Ireland's being under no subordination to the Parliamentary Authority of England refuted...*(London, 1698).

Cheesman, Thomas, *Peace Triumphant. Or, A Congratulatory Poem. To Celebrate the Unspeakable Benefits and Blessings of Peace, together with some Grateful Reflections upon King William III. His Excellent Majesties first coming to the Crown, as a happy Instrument in the Head of Divine Providence, to Settle the Affairs of the Nation...* (London, 1697).

Claridge, Richard, *A Defence of the Present Government under King William and Queen Mary...*(London, 1689).

Claridge, Richard, *A Second Defense of the Present Government under King William and Queen Mary...*(London, 1689).

Cockburn, John, *A Continuation of the Historical Relation of the late General Assembly in Scotland...*(London, 1691).

Cockburn, John, *A Short History of the Revolution in Scotland. In a Letter from a Scotch gentleman to his Friend in London* (London, 1712).

Cockburn, John, *An Historical Relation of the late General Assembly held at Edinburgh from Octob. 16, to Nov. 13 in the year 1690 in a letter from a person in Edinburgh to his friend in London* (London, 1691).

Cockburn, John, *Jacob's Vow, or, Man's Felicity and Duty in Two Parts* (Edinburgh, 1696).

Collier, Jeremy, *A Caution against inconsistency, or, The Connexion between praying and swearing in relation to the civil powers* (n.p., 1690).

- Collier, Jeremy, *A Perswasive to Consideration, Tender'd to the Royalists, Particularly, those of the Church of England* (n.p., 1693),
- Collier, Jeremy, *Animadversions upon the modern explanation of 11 Hen. 7. Cap. I, or, a King de facto* (1689).
- Collier, Jeremy, *Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance Considered with some Remarks upon his Vindication* (London, 1691).
- Collier, Jeremy, *The Desertion Discuss'd in a letter to a country gentleman* (1689).
- Collier, Jeremy, *Vindiciae juris regii, or Remarques upon a paper, entitled, An Enquiry into the measures of submission to the supream authority* (n.p., 1689).
- Comber, Thomas, *A Letter to a Bishop Concerning the Present Settlement and the New Oaths* (London, 1689).
- Comber, Thomas, *The Protestant Mask Taken Off from the Jesuited Englishman; Being, an answer to a Book, Entituled, Great-Britain's Just Complaint* (London, 1693).
- Compton, Henry, *The Bishop of London's Eighth Letter to his Clergy, &c.* (London, 1692).
- Corker, James M., *Roman-Catholick Principles in Reference to God and the King explained in a letter to a friend and now made publick to shew the connexion between the said Principles and the Late Popish Plot* (n.p., 1680).
- Cox, Sir Richard, *An Essay for the Conversion of the Irish; Shewing That 'tis their Duty and Interest to Become Protestants, In a Letter to Themselves* (Dublin, 1698).
- Cox, Sir Richard, *Aphorisms Relating to the Kingdom of Ireland...*(London, 1689).
- Cox, Sir Richard, *Hibernia Anglicana, or, The History of Ireland, from the Conquest thereof by the English, to this present time with an introductory discourse touching the ancient state of that Kingdom and a new and exact map of the same* (London, 1689).
- Cox, Sir Richard, *Hibernia Anglicana: Or, The Second Part of the History of Ireland...*(London, 1690).

- Cox, Sir Richard, *Some Thoughts on the Bill Depending before the Right Honourable House of Lords for Prohibiting the Exportation of the Woolen Manufactures of Ireland...*(Dublin, 1698).
- Crull, Jadocus, *Denmark Vindicated...*(London, 1694).
- Cunningham, Alexander, *Some Questions resolved concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland* (London, 1690).
- Curate, Jacob, *The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, or, The Foolishness of their Teaching discovered...and some Remarks on Mr. Rule's Late Vindication...*(London, 1692).
- Cursory Remarks Upon some Late Disloyal Proceedings, In Several Cabals: Composed of an Intermixture of Interests* (London, 1699).
- D.W., Sir, *Some Reflections on the Oaths and Declaration Appointed in an Act past in the first Year of the Reign of King William and Queen Mary, In reference to the Roman Catholicks of England* (London, 1695).
- Daniel, Richard, *A Dream; or, An Elegiack Poem, Occasion'd by the Death of William III. King of Great Britain, France and Ireland* (Dublin, 1702).
- Daniel, Richard, *A Dream...* (London, 1702).
- Daniel, Richard, *A Dream ...Second Edition* (London, 1702).
- Davenant, Charles, *A Discourse upon Grants and Resumptions showing how our Ancestors have proceeded with Such ministers as have procured themselves grants of the Crown-Revenue...*(London, 1700).
- Davenant, Charles, *The True Picture of a Modern Whig, Set Forth in a Dialogue Between Mr. Whiglove & Mr. Double...Fourth Edition* (London, 1701).
- Defoe, Daniel, *A Dialogue betwixt Whig and Tory, alias Williamite and Jacobite Wherein the principles and practices of each party are fairly and impartially stated...* (London, 1693).
- Defoe, Daniel, *A New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty* (London, 1702);
Daniel Defoe, *A Seasonable Warning* (London, 1702).
- Defoe, Daniel, *An Argument Shewing that the Prince of Wales, Tho' a Protestant, has no just Pretensions to the Crown of England* (London, 1701).
- Defoe, Daniel, *An Enquiry into the Occasional Conformity of Dissenters in Cases of Preferment with a preface to the Lord Mayor, occasioned by his carrying the sword to a Conventicle* (Dublin, 1698).

- Defoe, Daniel, *Lex Talionis, or, An Enquiry into the most Proper ways to Prevent the Persecution of the Protestants in France* (London, 1698).
- Defoe, Daniel, *Reasons against war with France, or an Argument shewing Louis proclaiming the Prince of Wales King is not reason enough for war* (London, 1701).
- Defoe, Daniel, *Reflections Upon the Late Great Revolution written by a lay-hand in the Country for the Satisfaction of some Neighbours* (London, 1689).
- Defoe, Daniel, *Some Reflections on a Pamphlet lately published entitled An Argument shewing that a Standing Army & is Inconsistent with a Free Government...*(London, 1697).
- Defoe, Daniel, *The Advantages of the Present Settlement, and the Great Danger of a Relapse* (London, 1689).
- Defoe, Daniel, *The Englishman's Choice...*(London, 1694).
- Defoe, Daniel, *The Life of that Incomparable Princess, Mary, our late Sovereign Lady...who departed this life...the 28th of December, 1694* (London, 1695).
- Defoe, Daniel, *The Mock Mourners. A Satyr, By way of Elegy on King William, Second Edition* (London, 1702).
- Defoe, Daniel, *The Mock Mourners... Fourth Edition* (London, 1702).
- Defoe, Daniel, *The Mock Mourners...Ninth Edition* (London, 1702).
- Defoe, Daniel, *The Present State of Jacobitism* (London, 1702).
- Defoe, Daniel, *The Six Distinguishing Characters of a Parliament-Man address'd to the Good People of England* (London, 1700).
- Defoe, Daniel, *The Succession to the Crown of England, Considered* (London, 1701).
- Defoe, Daniel, *The True-Born Englishman. A Satyr* (London, 1700).
- Diggs, Dudley, *The Unlawfulness of Subjects Taking up Arms Against their Sovereigne, in what case soever...*(London, 1679).
- Divine in the North, *A Discourse, shewing that it is lawfull, and our duty to swear obedience to King William...* (London, 1689).
- Dodwell, Henry, *A Defence of the Vindication of the Deprived Bishops...* (London, 1695).
- Dodwell, Henry, *Concerning the care of taking the New Oath of Fealty and Allegiance with a Declaration...*(n.p., 1689).

- Dopping, Anthony, *The Case of the Dissenters of Ireland consider'd...* (Dublin, 1695).
- Dopping, Anthony, *Two Speeches by the Bishop of Meath, one to King James, when the Clergy waited on his Majesty at Dublin Castle, March 1688, the other to King William, at his camp nigh Dublin, July 7, 1690* (n.p., 1690).
- Dorrington, Theophilus, *The Honour Due to the Civil Magistrate Stated and Urg'd; In A Sermon Compos'd for the Thanksgiving, For the Happy Discovery of the Late Horrid and execrable Conspiracy...* (London, 1696).
- Douglas, James, Duke of Queensberry, *The Speech of James Duke of Queensberry, &c. His Majesties High Commissioner to the Parliament of Scotland, on Tuesday the twenty one day of May, 1700* (Edinburgh, 1700).
- Downes, Theophilus, *An Examination of the Arguments Drawn from Scripture and Reason, in Dr Sherlock's Case of Allegiance* (London, 1691).
- Drake, James, *Some Necessary Considerations* (London, 1702).
- Dulaney, Edmond, *A Sermon Preached before the King, in Christ-Church, Dublin, on Ash-Wednesday 1689* (Dublin, 1689).
- Eikon Basilike Deutera, The Pourtraicture of his sacred Majesty King Charles II: With his reasons for turning Roman Catholick; published by K. James* (n.p., 1694).
- Enquiry into the Nature and Obligation of Legal Rights: with Respect of the Late K. James's Remaining Right to the Crown* (London, 1693).
- Eyre, Robert, *The Sinner A Traitor To His King and Country. In a Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral-Church of Winchester...July 24, 1700* (London, 1700).
- Fairfax, Blackerby, *A Discourse upon Uniting Scotland with England...* (London, 1702).
- Ferguson, Robert, *A Brief Account of Some of the Late Incroachments and Depredations of the Dutch upon the English and of a few of those many advantages which by fraud and violence they have made of the British Nations since the Revolution...* (n.p., 1695).
- Ferguson, Robert, *A Brief Justification of the Prince of Orange's descent into England, and of the kingdoms late recourse to arms with a modest*

- disquisition of what may become the wisdom and justice of the ensuing convention in their disposal of the crown* (n.p., 1689).
- Ferguson, Robert, *A History of the Revolution...*(London, 1706).
- Ferguson, Robert, *A Just and Modest Vindication of the Scots Design, For the having Established a Colony at Darien* (n.p., 1699).
- Ferguson, Robert, *A Letter to Mr. Secretary Trenchard...*(n.p., 1694).
- Ferguson, Robert, *A Letter to the Right Honourable Sir John Holt, Kt. Lord Chief Justice of the Kings Bench; occasioned by the noise of a Plot* (London, 1694).
- Ferguson, Robert, *R. Fergusson's Apology for his Transactions these last Ten Years, both in England and Forreign Parts...* (London/ Edinburgh, 1689).
- Ferguson, Robert, *The Late Proceedings and Votes of the Parliament of Scotland...*(Glasgow, 1689).
- Ferguson, Robert, *Whether the Parliament be not in law dissolved by the death of the Princess of Orange...*(n.p., 1695).
- Ferguson, Robert, *Whether the Preserving the Protestant Religion was the Motive unto, or the End that was designed in the late Revolution in a letter to a Country Gentleman as an answer to his first query* (n.p., 1695).
- Fleming, Robert, *The Rod or the Sword...*(London, 1694).
- Fletcher, Andrew, *A Discourse of Government with Relation to Militias* (Edinburgh, 1698).
- Fletcher, Andrew, *A Short and Impartial view of the Manner and Occasion of the Scots Colony's coming away from Darien...*(n.p., 1699).
- Fletcher, Andrew, *Some Thoughts Concerning the Affairs of this Session of Parliament* (n.p., 1700).
- Fletcher, Andrew, *Two Discourses Concerning the Affairs of Scotland...*(n.p., 1698).
- Fowler, Edward, *A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords in the Abby-Church at Westminster, upon Thursday the sixteenth of April, 1696 being a day of publick Thanksgiving...*(London, 1696).
- Fowler, Edward, *A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England, Who have sworn allegiance to K. William and Q. Mary, From the Apostasy*

- and Perjury, which are cast upon them upon that Account, in the Now Publish'd History of Passive Obedience* (London, 1689).
- Fowler, Edward, *An Answer to the Paper Delivered by Mr Ashton at his Execution to Sir Francis Child: Sheriff of London, &c. Together with the Paper it self* (London, 1690).
- Friend, Sir John, 'Sir John Friend's Paper,' *The Tryal and condemnation of Sir William Parkyns, kt., for the horrid conspiracy to assassinate his sacred Majesty king William...together with a true copy of the papers deliver to the sheriffs of London and Middlesex, by Sir J. Friend and Sir W. Parkins, at the place of execution* (London, 1696).
- Fuller, William, *A Plain Proof of the true father and mother of the pretended Prince of Wales by several letter written by the late Queen in France, the Earle of Tyrconnel...* (London, 1701).
- Fuller, William, *Fuller's Non-Recantation to the Jacobites: or, a plain proof to the nation that the Pretended Prince of Wales is an Imposter* (London, 1701).
- Fuller, William, *Twenty six depositions of persons of quality and worth: with letters of the late queen, Father Corker...Second Option* (London, 1702).
- Fullwood, Francis, *Obedience due to the present King, notwithstanding our oaths to the former written by a divine of the Church of England* (London, 1689).
- G.M., *The Case of the Afflicted Clergy...*(n.p., 1691).
- Gandy, Henry, *An Answer to some Queries concerning Schism, Toleration, &c. in a Letter to a Friend* (London, 1700).
- Gentleman in New-England, *A Poem on the Death of His Highness the Duke of Gloucester. Written by a Gentleman in New-England* (London, 1701).
- Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative Considered in a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to his Friend upon his being chosen a Member of the Meeting of States in Scotland* (Edinburgh & London, 1689).
- Gentleman in the Country, *Allegiance and Prerogative Considered in a Letter from a Gentleman in the Country to his Friend upon his being chosen a Member of the Meeting of States in Scotland* (n.p., 1689).

- Gother, John, *A Papist mis-represented and represented, or, A Two-fold Character of Popery...*(n.p., 1685)
- Grant, Sir Francis, Lord Cullen, *The Loyalists Reasons for his giving obedience, and swearing Allegiance to the Present Government...* (Edinburgh, 1689).
- Grascome, Samuel, *An Appeal of murther from certain judges, lately sitting at the Old Bailey...* (n.p., 1693).
- Grascome, Samuel, *Considerations upon the Second Canon In the Book Entituled Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, &c.* (London, 1693).
- Grascome, Samuel, *New Court-Contrivances; or, More Sham-Plots still, against true-hearted Englishmen* (n.p., 1693).
- Grascome, Samuel, *Two Letters written To the Author of a Pamphlet, Entituled, Solomon and Abiathar: or, The Case of the Deprived Bishops and Clergy Discussed* (London, 1692).
- Gregory, Francis, *A Thanksgiving Sermon for the Deliverance of Our KING from the Late intended ASSASSINATION...* (London, 1696).
- Halley, George, *A Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral and Metropolitcal Church of St. Peter in York on Friday the Fifth of November, 1697...* (London, 1697).
- Hamilton, Andrew, *A True Relation of the Actions of the Inniskilling-men* (London, 1690).
- Hamilton, James, Earl of Arran, *A Short Speech Made by the Right Honourable the Earl of Arran To the Scottish Nobility and Gentry, met together at the Council Chamber in White-Hall, on the Eight of January 1689 about an Address to His Highness the Prince of Orange, To take upon him the Government of the Kingdom of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1689).
- Hayley, William, *A Sermon Preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons, at St. Margarets Westminster, upon December 11, 1695. Being the solemn Day of Fasting and Humiliation...*(London, 1696).
- Hickeringill, Edmund, *The Ceremony-monger his Character in Five Chapters...*(Edinburgh, 1689).
- Hickes, George, *A Letter to the Author of a late Paper, entitled, A Vindication of the divines of the Church of England, &c. In defence of the History of Passive Obedience* (n.p., 1689).

- Hickes, George, *A Word to the Wavering: or an Answer to the Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs...* (n.p., 1691).
- Hickes, George, *The Pretences of the Prince of Wales Examined, and Rejected In a Letter to a Friend in the Country* (n.p., 1702).
- Hill, Samuel, *A Debate on the Justice and Piety of the Present Constitution: Under King William. In Two Parts* (London, 1696).
- Hill, Samuel, *Solomon and Abiathar: or, the Case of the Deprived Bishops and Clergy, discussed* (London, 1692).
- Hodges, James, *The Rights and Interests of the Two British Monarchies, Inquir'd into, and Clear'd; With a special respect to an United or Separate State. Treatise I* (London, 1703).
- Honyman, Andrew, *The Seasonable Case of Submission to the Church-government as now Re-established by law, briefly stated and determined by a lover of the peace of this Church and Kingdom* (Edinburgh, 1662).
- Howard, Sir Robert, *Historical Observations upon the Reigns of Edward I, II, III, and Richard II...* (London, 1689).
- Howe, John, *Heads of Agreement assented to by the United Ministers in and About London, formerly called Presbyterian and Congregational* (London, 1691).
- Howe, John, 'Sermon,' *A Sermon preach'd on the late day of thanksgiving, Decemb. 2, 1697 by John Howe...to which is prefixed Dr. Bates's Congratulatory Speech to the King, Novemb. 22, 1697...* (London, 1698).
- Hume, Patrick, Earl of Marchmont, *The Speech of Patrick Earl of Marchmont, &c. Lord High Chancellor to the Parliament of Scotland on Tuesday 21 May 1700* (Edinburgh, 1700).
- Humfrey, John, *Comprehension with Indulgence* (n.p., 1689).
- Irvine, Alexander, *A Dialogue Between A and B Two Plain Country-Gentlemen, Concerning the Times* (London, 1694).
- James II & VII, *By the King, A Proclamation forasmuch as the Great Preparations made to invade and conquer this our Kingdom require utmost care in providing for the necessary safety and defence thereof...* (London, 1688).

- James II & VII, *His Majesties Most Gracious Declaration to all his Loving Subjects* (n.p., 1693).
- James II & VII, *His Majesties most Gracious Declaration to all his Loving Subjects, commanding their Assistance against the Prince of Orange, and his adherents* (Saint Germain, 1692).
- James II & VII, *His Majesties Most gracious Declaration to his Good People of his ancient Kingdom of Scotland, Commanding their Assistance against the Prince and Princess of Orange, and their adherents* (Saint Germain, 1692).
- James, Elinor, *Letter to the House of Lords* (n.p., 1689).
- James, Elinor, *My Dear Sovereign* (n.p., 1689).
- James, Elinor, *To The Honourable House of Commons* (n.p., 1689).
- Jameson, William, *Nazianzeni querela et votum justum, The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy examin'd...defences of.the Author of An Enquiry into the New Opinions...*(Glasgow, 1697).
- Jenkin, Robert, *The Title of an Usurper after a Thorough Settlement Examined; in Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance...*(London, 1691).
- Jephson, Michael, *A Sermon Preached at St. Patrick's Church Dublin, One the 23th of October, 1690...* (Dublin, 1690).
- Jephson, William, *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrews Church, Dublin; On the 5th of November, 1698. Being the Anniversary Thanksgiving for the Deliverance from the Gun-powder PLOT, in ENGLAND in the year 1605 Before the House of Commons* (Dublin, 1698).
- J.M., *An Ode or Elegy on the death of James the Second, Author-J.M, Gent* (London, 1701).
- Johnson, Samuel, *An Argument Proving that the Abrogation of King James by the People of England from the Regal Throne...was according to the Constitution...* (London, 1692).
- Johnson, Samuel, *Julian the Apostate being a Short Account of his Life, the Sense of the Primitive Christians about his Succession and behaviour towards him...* (London, 1682).
- Johnson, Samuel, *Notes upon the Phoenix Edition of the Pastoral Letter Part I* (London, 1694).
- Johnson, Samuel, *Reflections on the History of Passive Obedience...* (London, 1689).

- Johnson, Samuel, *Remarks upon Dr. Sherlock's Book intituled The Case of Resistance of the Supreme Powers stated and resolved, according to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures written in the year 1683* (London, 1689).
- Johnson, Samuel, *The Second Part of the Confutation of the Ballancing Letter containing an Occasional Discourse in vindication of Magna Charta* (London, 1700).
- Johnston, Nathaniel, *The Dear Bargain...* (n.p., 1690).
- Jurieu, Pierre, *A Pastoral Letter Written on the death of The Late Queen...* (London, 1695).
- Ken, Thomas, *A Letter to the Author of a Sermon, entitled, A Sermon Preach'd at the funeral of her Late Majesty Queen Mary* (n.p., 1695).
- Ken, Thomas, *Lacrymae Ecclesiae Anglicanae...* (n.p., 1689).
- Ken, Thomas, *The Royal Sufferer. A Manuel of Meditations and Devotions. Written for the use of a Royal, tho' afflicted Family* (n.p., 1699).
- Kennedy, David, *The Late History of Europe being A Narration of all Remarkable Actions and other various Affairs... From 1676 to the Conclusion of the Late Peace of Reswick, in September 1697* (Edinburgh, 1698).
- Kettlewell, John, *Christianity, a Doctrine of the Cross, or, Passive Obedience, under any pretended invasion of legal rights and liberties* (London, 1691).
- Kettlewell, John, *The Declaration and Profession of the Reverend Mr. John Kettlewell...* (n.p., 1695).
- Kettlewell, John, *The Duty of Allegiance settled upon its True Grounds, according to Scripture, Reason...in Answer to a Late Book of Dr. William Sherlock...* (London, 1691).
- King William's Toleration: *Being an Explanation of that Liberty of Religion, Which may be Expected from His Majesty's Declaration, with a Bill for Comprehension & Indulgence...* (London, 1689).
- King, William, *An Answer to the Considerations which obliged Peter Manby...to embrace what he calls, the Catholick Religion...* (London, 1687).
- King, William, *Animadversions on a Pretended Account of Denmark* (London, 1694).

- King, William, *Europe's Delivery from France and Slavery in A Sermon Preached at St. Patrick's Church, Dublin on the 16th of November, 1690...being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Preservation of his Majesty's Person...* (London, 1691).
- King, William, *The State of the Protestants of Ireland under the late King James's government in which their carriage towards him is justified, and the absolute necessity of their endeavouring to be freed from his government, and of submitting to their present Majesties is demonstrated* (London, 1691).
- Kingston, Richard, *Tyranny Detected, and the Late Revolution Justify'd...* (London, 1699).
- Kirkpatrick, James, *A Sermon Occasion'd by the King's Death, and her present Majesty's Accession to the Crown Preach'd March 29, by a Presbyterian Minister in the North* (Dublin, 1702).
- Kirkpatrick, James, *An Historical Essay Upon the Loyalty of Presbyterians In Great Britain and Ireland from the Reformation to this Present Year 1713...In Three Parts...* (n.p., 1713).
- Lawton, Charlwood, *A French Conquest Neither Desirable Nor Practicable...* (London, 1693).
- Lawton, Charlwood, *A Short State of Our Condition, with Relation to the present Parliament* (n.p., 1693).
- Lawton, Charlwood, *Better Late than Never* (n.p., 1690).
- Lawton, Charlwood, *Honesty is the Best Policy*, (n.p., 1689).
- Lawton, Charlwood, *The English-Man's Complaint* (n.p., 1689).
- Lawton, Charlwood, *The Jacobite Principles Vindicated: In Answer to a LETTER sent to the AUTHOR* (London, 1693).
- Lawton, Charlwood, *The Vindication of the Dead: or, Six Hours Reflections upon the Six Weeks Labour in Answering Mr. Ashton's Speech published by Authority* (n.p., 1693).
- L'Estrange, Sir Roger, *A Reply to the Second Part of The Character of a Popish Successor* (London, 1681).
- L'Estrange, Sir Roger, *The Character of a Papist in Masquerade, supported by authority and experience in answer to The Character of a Popish Successor* (London, 1681).
- Leslie, Charles, *An Answer to a book, intituled, The State of the Protestants in*

- Ireland under the Late King James's Government...* (London, 1692).
- Leslie, Charles, *Considerations of Importance to Ireland, In a Letter to a Member of Parliament there; upon Occasion of Mr. Molyneux's late Book: Intituled, The Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England...* (n.p., 1698).
- Leslie, Charles, *Gallienus Redivivus, or, Murther Will Out, &c. Being a True Account of the De-witting of Glencoe, Gaffney...* (Edinburgh, 1695).
- Leslie, Charles, *Querela Temporum; or, the Danger of the Church of England...*(n.p., 1695).
- Leslie, Charles, *Remarks on some late Sermons in particular on Dr Sherlock's sermons at the Temple, Decemb. 30. 1694. In a Letter to a Friend. The Second Edition, with additions* (London, 1695).
- Leslie, Charles, *The Case of the Regale and of the Pontificat Stated...*(n.p., 1700).
- Lilburne, John, *The Legall Fundamentall Liberties of England, revised, asserted, and vindicated* (London, 1649).
- Limitations for the next Foreign Successor, or new Saxon race. Debated in a Conference betwixt two Gentlemen. Sent in a Letter to a Member of Parliament* (London, 1701).
- Lloyd, William, *A Discourse of God's ways of Disposing of Kingdoms by the Bishop of S. Asaph* (London, 1691).
- Lloyd, William, *A Sermon Preach'd before the House of Lords at the Abbey-Church of St. Peter's- Westminster, on the 30th of January, 1696/7...* (London, 1697).
- Lloyd, William, *A Sermon Preached before Her Majesty, on May 29, being the Anniversary of the Restauration of the King and Royal Family...* (London, 1692).
- Lloyd, William, *A Sermon preached before Their Majesties at Whitehall, on the fifth day of November, 1689 being the anniversary-day of thanksgiving for that great deliverance from the Gunpowder-treason, and also the day of His Majesties happy landing in England* (London, 1689).
- Lloyd, William, *The Pretences of the French invasion examined for the information of the people of England* (London, 1692).

- Lloyd, William, *Utrum Horum; or, God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms: And Some Clergy-Men's Ways of Disposing of Them...* (London, 1691).
- Locke, John, *A Letter Concerning Toleration...* (n.p., 1689).
- Locke, John, *A Second Letter Concerning Toleration...* (London, 1690).
- Locke, John, *A Third Letter Concerning...Toleration* (London, 1692).
- Locke, John, *Two Treatises of Government: In the former, The False Principles, and Foundation of Sir Robert Filmer, and his Followers, are Detected and Overthrown...* (London, 1690).
- Long, Thomas, *A Full Answer to All the Popular Objections that have yet Appear'd, For not Taking the Oath of Allegiance to their Present Majesties...* (London, 1689).
- Long, Thomas, *A Resolution of Certain Queries concerning submission to the Present Government* (London, 1689).
- Long, Thomas, *A Vindication of the Primitive Christians, In Point of Obedience to their Prince, Against The Calumnies of a Book intituled The Life of Julian...* (London, 1683).
- Long, Thomas, *Reflections upon a Late Book, Entituled, The Case of Allegiance Consider'd: Wherein is shewn, that the Church of England's Doctrine of Non-Resistance and Passive Obedience, Is not inconsistent with taking the New Oaths to their Present Majesties* (London, 1689).
- Long, Thomas, *The Case of Persecution, Charg'd on the Church of England, Consider'd and Discharg'd...* (London, 1689).
- Long, Thomas *The Historian Unmask'd or, some Reflections on the Late History of Passive Obedience* (London, 1689).
- Long, Thomas, *The Letter for Toleration Decipher'd, and the Absurdity and Impiety of an Absolute demonstrated, by the Judgment of Presbyterians, Independents...* (London, 1689).
- Long, Thomas, *Vox Cleri: or the Sense of the Clergy...Second Edition* (London, 1690).
- Lowthorp, John, *A Letter to the Bishop of Sarum: Being an Answer to his Lordships Pastoral Letter* (n.p., 1690).
- MacBride, John, *Animadversions on The Defence of the Answer to a Paper, Intituled, The Case of the Dissenting Protestants of Ireland, In Reference to a Bill of Indulgence, from the Exceptions made against it.*

- Together, with an Answer to a Peaceable & Friendly Address to the Non-Conformists...* (n.p., 1697).
- Mackenzie, Sir George, *A Letter From the Nobility, Barons & Commons of Scotland, in the Year 1320...wherein they declare their firm Resolutions, to adhere to their King Robert the Bruce...as having the true Right of Succession...* (Edinburgh, 1689).
- Mackenzie, Sir George, *A Vindication of the Government in Scotland during the Reign of King Charles II against mis-representations made in several scandalous pamphlets...* (London, 1691).
- Mackenzie, Sir George, *Jus Regium, or, the Just and Solid Foundations of Monarchy in general, and more especially of the Monarchy of Scotland...* (Edinburgh, 1684).
- Mackenzie, Sir George, & Mackenzie, George, Viscount Tarbat, *A Memorial for his Highness the Prince of Orange in relation to the Affairs of Scotland together with the Address of the Presbyterian party in that Kingdom to his Highness: and some Observations on that address...* (London, 1689).
- Mackenzie, George, Viscount Tarbat, *A Vindication of Robert III, King of Scotland from the Imputation of Bastardy* (Edinburgh, 1693).
- Mackenzie, George, Viscount Tarbat, *Parainesis Pacifica; or, a Perswasive to the Union of Britain* (Edinburgh, 1702).
- Mackenzie, George, Viscount Tarbat, *The Laws and acts made in the fifth session of the first Parliament of Our Most High and Dread Sovereign William...begun at Edinburgh, May 9, 1695* (Edinburgh, 1695).
- Mackenzie, John, *A Narrative of the Siege of London-Derry: Pr, the Late Memorable Transactions of that City...* (London, 1690).
- Macky, John, *A View of the Court of St. Germain, From the Year 1690. With an Account of the Entertainment Protestants meet with there. Directed to the Male-contents Protestants of England* (Dublin/Glasgow, 1696).
- Maxwell, Henry *An Essay Upon an Union of Ireland with England...* (Dublin, 1704).
- Melius Inquirendum: Or a further Modest and Impartial Enquiry into the Lawfulness of Taking the New Oaths of Allegiance...* (London, 1689).
- Memorial to the Members of Parliament of the Court Party* (n.p., 1700).

- Meriton, Henry, *A Sermon Preacht at the Cathedral Church in Norwich, upon the 11th of April, 1696. The Day of His Majesties Coronation* (London, 1696).
- Minuts of the Proceedings in Parliament, Munday June 7. 1703. Number 12* (Edinburgh, 1703).
- Minuts of the Proceedings in Parliament, Tuesday June 30 1702. Number 10* (Edinburgh, 1702).
- Minuts of the Proceedings in Parliament, Thursday June 3. 1703 Number 11* (Edinburgh, 1703).
- Molesworth, Robert, *Account of Denmark* (London, 1694).
- Molyneux, William, *The Case of Ireland's Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England stated...* (Dublin, 1698).
- Monro, Alexander, *A Letter to a Friend Giving an account of all the treatises that have been publish'd with Relation to the Present Persecution against the Church of Scotland* (London, 1692).
- Monro, Alexander, *An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland chiefly oppos'd to the censures, calumnies, and accusations of a late Presbyterian vindicator...* (London, 1693).
- Monro, Alexander, *Presbyterian inquisition as it was lately practised against the professors of the Colledge of Edinburgh, August and September, 1690 in which the spirit of Presbytery and their present method of procedure is plainly discovered, matter of fact by undeniable instances cleared, and libels against particular persons discussed* (London, 1691).
- Monro, Alexander, *Sermons Preached upon several occasions (most of them) before the Magistrates and Judges in the Northeast- auditory of S. Giles's Church Edinburgh* (London, 1693).
- Monro, Alexander, *The Spirit of Calumny and Slander, examin'd, chastis'd, and expos'd, in a letter to a Malicious libeller more particularly address'd to Mr. George Ridpath...* (London, 1693).
- Montgomery, Sir James, *Great Britain's Just Complaint for her Late Measures, Present Sufferings, And the Future Miseries She is exposed to. With the Best, Safest, and most Effectual WAY of Securing and Establishing Her Religion, Government, Liberty & Property... Second Edition* (Oxford, 1692).

- Morer, Thomas, *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church of Scotland in several letters...* (London, 1690).
- Neale, Walter, *A Sermon Preached in Christ-Church, Cork, In the Kingdom of Ireland: Upon the 23d of April, 1696. Being the Day appointed for a Publick Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the Preservation of His Majesty's Sacred Person...* (London, 1696).
- Nevil Payn's Letter, and some other Letters that Concern the Subject of his Letter with short notes on them; for the clearer information of the Members of Parliament: in order to Nevil Payn's trial* (Edinburgh, 1693).
- Oates, Titus, *A Tragedy, Called The Popish Plot Reviv'd: Detecting the Secret League Between the Late King James and the French King...* (London, 1696).
- Ogilvy, James, Viscount Seafield, *The Speech of James Viscount of Seafield, Principal Secretary of State, and President to the Parliament of Scotland. On Tuesday the Nineteenth of July 1698* (Edinburgh, 1698).
- Overall, John, *Bishop Overall's Convocation-Book...* (London, 1690).
- Parker, Samuel, *Religion and Loyalty...* (London, 1684).
- Parkinson, James, *A Dialogue between a Divine of the Church of England, and a Captain of Horse Concerning Dr. Sherlock's late Pamphlet...* (London, 1690).
- Parkinson, James, *An Account of Mr. Parkinson's Expulsion from the University of Oxford in the Late Times. In Vindication of him from the False Aspersions cast on him in a late Pamphlet, Entitled, The History of Passive Obedience* (London, 1689).
- Parkinson, James, *An Examination of Dr. Sherlock's Book, Entitled, The Case of The Allegiance...* (London, 1691).
- Parkyns, Sir William, 'Sir William Parkyns's Paper,' *A True Copy of the Papers delivered by Sir John Friend, and Sir William Parkyns to the Sheriffs of London and Middlesex at Tyburn, the place of execution, April the 3d, 1696* (London, 1696).
- Passive Obedience in Actual Resistance. Or, Remarks upon a Paper fix'd up in the Cathedral Church of Worcester, by Dr. Hicks...* (London, 1691).

- Pead, Deuel, *A Practical Discourse Upon the Death of our Late Gracious Queen, Being a Sermon Preach'd the 10th of March 1694/5* (London, 1695).
- Pead, Deuel, *Sheba's Conspiracy, and Amasa's Confederacy: Or, A Vindication of the National Association Entered into by the Honorable House of Commons Feb 25th 1695. Being a Sermon Preach'd in the Parish-Church of St. James Clarkenwell, March 29th* (London, 1696).
- Pennecuik, Alexander, *Caledonia Triumphant: A Panegyrick to the King* (n.p., 1699).
- Pennecuik, Alexander, *To His Highness the Prince of Orange, The Humble Address and Supplication of the Parishoners and Inhabitants of the Famous of Linton Submetropolitan of Tiviotdale* (n.p., 1689).
- Percival, Thomas, *A True and Exact Account of the Rise, Progress, and Contrivance of the Horrid Plot and Conspiracy against The Life of His Most Sacred Majesty King WILLIAM the Third...* (London, 1697).
- Percival, Thomas, *The Rye-House Travestie, or, A True Account and Declaration of the horrid and execrable Conspiracy against his Majesty King William...*(London, 1696).
- Person of Honour, *A Free Discourse wherein the Doctrines which make for tyranny are display'd the Title of our Rightful and Lawful King William vindicated, and the unreasonableness and mischievous tendency of the odious distinction of a King De Facto, and De Jure discover'd* (London, 1697).
- Philo-Caledon, *Scotland's Present Duty: or, A Call To the Nobility... to act for, our Common Concern in Caledonia* (n.p., 1700).
- Political Aphorisms: or, The True Maxims of Government Displayed...Third Edition* (London, 1691).
- Pomfret, Thomas, *Passive Obedience, stated and asserted. In a Sermon Preached at Ampthill in Bedfordshire, upon Sunday, Septemb. 9. 1683. Being the Day of Thanksgiving For the Discovering and Defeating the Late Treasonable Conspiracy against his Sacred Person and Government* (London, 1683).
- Price, Robert, *The Speech of a Bold Briton in Parliament against a Dutch Prince of Wales* (n.p., 1702).

- Principles upon which the taking of the Oath of Abjuration may be grounded* (London, 1702).
- Privy Council of Scotland, *A Proclamation for Choosing the Additional Representatives of Barons to the Parliament* (Edinburgh, 1690).
- Privy Council of Scotland, *Act for Taking the Oath of Alledgeance and Assurance* (Edinburgh, 1693).
- Privy Council of Scotland, *Association Begun to be Subscribed at Edinburgh, April 10, 1696* (Edinburgh, 1696).
- Privy Council of Scotland, *Letter Congratulatory from the Privy Council of Scotland, to His Majesty upon the Conclusion of the Peace, and His Majesties safe Return* (Edinburgh, 1697).
- Privy Council of Scotland, *The Humble Address of the Lords and Others of His Majesty's most Honourable Privy Council to the King* (Edinburgh, 1701).
- Proast, Jonas, *The Argument of the Letter Concerning Toleration, Briefly consider'd and answer'd* (Oxford, 1690).
- Proclamation For Publishing the Peace betwixt His Majesty and the French King* (Edinburgh, 1697).
- Proclamation Requiring the Oath of Alledgeance and Assurance to be Sworn and Subscribed to Her Majesty* (Edinburgh, 1702).
- Pullen, Tobias, *A Sermon Preached in Christ Church before His Excellency the Lord Deputy and the Parliament, On the Fifth day of November, 1695...* (Dublin, 1695).
- Pullen, Tobias, *An Answer to a Paper Entituled, The Case of the Protestant Dissenters of Ireland in reference to a Bill of Indulgence, represented and argued* (Dublin, 1695).
- Quadriennium Jacobi: or, The History of the Reign of King James II. From his First Coming to the Crown to his Desertion. The Second Edition* (London, 1689).
- R.B., *The History of the Kingdom of Scotland* (London, 1695).
- R.W., *A Letter to an Honourable Member of Parliament, concerning the great Growth of Popery, and the Treasonable Practices of the Romish Bishops and Priests, at this time, in England* (London, 1700).

- Ratio Ultima: For a Full Compliance with the Present Government argued In a Letter to a Person of Honour in the Country, under Dejection on the Account of Peace* (London, 1697).
- Reflections upon a Scandalous Libel, Entituled, An Account of the Proceedings of the House of Commons, in Relation to the Re-coyning the Clipp'd Money, and falling the price of Guineas* (London, 1697).
- Reflections upon the Late King James's Declaration, and Lately Dispersed by the Jacobites* (London, 1692).
- Reily, Hugh, *Ireland's Case Briefly Stated* (n.p., 1720).
- Reily, Hugh, *The Impartial History of Ireland...In Two Parts...Ireland's Case...* (London, 1768 reprint).
- Reynolds, Edward, *The Humble Proposals* (London, 1689).
- Ridpath, George, *A Continuation of the Answer to the Scots Presbyterian Eloquence...* (Edinburgh, 1693).
- Ridpath, George, *A Letter to a Friend Concerning the Oath of Abjuration* (Edinburgh, 1712).
- Ridpath, George, *An Account of the Proceedings of the Parliament of Scotland...May 6, 1703* (Edinburgh, 1704).
- Ridpath, George, *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Miscarriage of the Scots Colony at Darien. Or an Answer to a Libel Entituled A Defence of the Scots Abdicating Darien. Submitted to the Consideration of the Good People of England* (Glasgow, 1700).
- Ridpath, George, *A Discourse upon the Union of Scotland and England...* (Edinburgh, 1702).
- Ridpath, George, *Scotland's Grievances Relating to Darien &c., humbly offered to the Consideration of the Parliament* (n.p., 1700).
- 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...* (London, 1694).
- Rogers, Thomas, *The Common-wealths-man unmasqu'd, or, a Just rebuke to the author of the Account of Denmark...* (London, 1694).
- Rule, Gilbert, *A Defence of the Vindication of the Church of Scotland in Answer to an Apology of the Clergy of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1694).

- Rule, Gilbert, *A Just and Modest Reproof of a Pamphlet called The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence* (Edinburgh, 1693).
- Rule, Gilbert, *A Sermon Preached before His Grace the King's Commissioner, and the Three Estates of Parliament, May the 25th, 1690* (Edinburgh, 1690).
- Rule, Gilbert, *A True Representation of Presbyterian Government wherein a short and clear account is given of the principles of them that owne it, the common objections against it answered...* (Edinburgh, 1690).
- Rule, Gilbert, *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an Answer to a Paper, intituled, Some Questions concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland...* (Edinburgh & London, 1691).
- Rule, Gilbert, *A Vindication of the Church of Scotland being an answer to five pamphlets...* (London, 1691).
- Rule, Gilbert, *The Cyprianick-Bishop examined, and found not to be a diocesan, nor to have superior power to a parish minister, or Presbyterian moderator being an answer to J.S. his Principles of the Cyprianick-age...* (Edinburgh, 1696).
- Sacheverell, Henry, *The Perils of False Brethren, both in Church, and State...* (London, 1709).
- Sage, John, *An Account of the late Establishment of Presbyterian Government...* (n.p., 1693).
- Sage, John, *The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland truly represented to which is added for probation the attestation of many unexceptionable witnesses...*(London, 1690).
- Sage, John, *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, As it has been lately Established in the Kingdom of Scotland...* (London, 1695).
- Sage, John, *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age...*(London, 1695).
- Sancroft, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, *The Archbishop of Canterbury's instructions to the clergy of the Church of England* (1689).
- Scotland in Danger or, A Serious Enquiry into the Dangers which SCOTLAND has been in, is now in, or may be in since the UNION* (Edinburgh, 1707).
- Scotland's Lament For Their Misfortunes* (n.p., 1700).
- Seller, Abednego, *A Continuation of the History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation* (Amsterdam, 1690).

- Seller, Abednego, *The History of Passive Obedience since the Reformation* (Amsterdam, 1689).
- Sergeant, John, *An Historical Romance of the Wars Between the Mighty Giant Gallieno, and the Great Knight Nasonius, and his Associates* (Dublin, 1694).
- Sergeant, John, *Reflexions upon the Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance by a Catholick Gentleman, and obedient son of the Church, and Loyal Subject of his Majesty* (n.p., 1661).
- Seton, Sir William, *A Continuation of a Few Brief and Modest Reflections Perswading a Just Indulgence to be Granted to the Episcopal Clergy and People in Scotland...* (n.p., 1703).
- Seton, Sir William, *A Short Speech Prepared to be Spoken, By a Worthy Member in Parliament, Concerning the Present State of the Nation* (Edinburgh, 1700).
- Seton, Sir William, *The Interest of Scotland in Three Essays...* (n.p., 1700).
- Sheridan, William, *Catholick Religion Asserted by St. Paul, and Maintained in the Church of England; In Opposition to the Errors in the Church of Rome. In a Sermon Preached at St. Warbroughs Church in Dublin* (Dublin, 1686).
- Sheridan, William, *St. Paul's Confession of Faith, or a Brief Account of his Religion. In a Sermon Preach'd at St. Warbrough's Church in Dublin, March 22, 1684/5* (Dublin, 1685).
- Sheridan, William, *St. Paul's Confession of Faith, or a Brief Account of his Religion. In a Sermon Preach'd at St. Warbrough's Church in Dublin, March 22, 1684/5* (London, 1685).
- Sherlock, William, *A Letter to a Friend Concerning a French Invasion to Restore the late King James to his Throne and what may be expected...* (London, 1692).
- Sherlock, William, *A Letter to a Member of the Convention* (n.p., 1689).
- Sherlock, William, *A Second Letter to a Friend, concerning the French Invasion in which the declaration lately dispersed under the Title of His Majesty's most gracious declaration to all his loving subjects...* (London, 1692).

- Sherlock, William, *A Sermon Preach'd Before the Honourable House of Commons, at St. Margaret's Westminster January the XXXth, 1691/2* (London, 1692).
- Sherlock, William, *A Sermon Preached at the Temple-Church, December 30 1694, Upon the Sad Occasion of the Death of our Gracious Queen* (Dublin, 1695).
- Sherlock, William, *A Sermon Preached at the Temple-Church December 30 1694, Upon the Sad Occasion of the Death of our Gracious Queen* (Edinburgh, 1695).
- Sherlock, William, *A Sermon Preached at the Temple-Church December 30 1694...Fourth Edition...* (London, 1695).
- Sherlock, William, *A Vindication of the Case of Allegiance...* (London, 1691).
- Sherlock, William, *Observations upon Mr. Johnson's Remarks, upon Dr. Sherlock's Book of Non-Resistance* (London, 1689).
- Sherlock, William, *The Case of Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers further consider'd, and Defended with a more Particular respect to the Doctrine of Non-Resistance and Passive-Obedience...* (London, 1691).
- Sherlock, William, *The Case of Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers, stated and Resolved according to Scripture and Reason* (London, 1691).
- Sherlock, William, *The Case of Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers... Third Edition* (London, 1691).
- Sherlock, William, *The Case of Allegiance Due...* (Edinburgh, 1691).
- Sherlock, William, *The Case of Allegiance Due...*(Dublin, 1691).
- Shields, Alexander, *A Short Memorial of the Sufferings past and present of the Presbyterians in Scotland: Particularly of them called by the nick-name Cameronians* (n.p., 1690).
- Shields, Alexander, *The History of Scotch-Presbytery being an epitome of The Hind Let Loose* (London, 1692).
- Shower, Sir Bartholomew, *Reasons for a New Bill of Rights...*(London, 1692).
- Sinclair, Sir Archibald, *Some Thoughts On the Present State of Affairs: Humbly offered to the High Court of Parliament. By a Lover of his Queen and Countrey* (n.p., 1703).
- Smith, James, *A Dialogue Betwixt a Minister of the Church of Scotland and two of the Elders of his Congregation, about the Abjuration Oath* (Edinburgh, 1712).

- Smith, Thomas, *A Discourse Concerning Divine Providence, in Relation to National Judgments* (London, 1693).
- Smith, Thomas, *Two Compendious Discourses the One Concerning the Power of God, the other about the certainty and evidence of a future state: published in opposition to the growing atheism and deism of the age* (London, 1699).
- Smyth, Edward, *A Sermon Preached at Christ-Church, Dublin, On the 3d of December, 1702* (Dublin, 1703).
- Some Observations upon the Posture of our affairs, or the death of our Late Most Gracious Queen* (London, 1695).
- Some Reasons by a Divine of the Kirk of Scotland, proving that their Clergy there cannot with a safe Conscience swear the English Oath of Abjuration* (Edinburgh, 1707).
- Some Seasonable Queries, on the Second Head, viz. An Oath of Abjuration, or at Least Declarative of His Majesty' right* (n.p., 1696).
- Somers, John, Baron Somers, *A Brief History of the Succession of the Crown of England, &c. Collected out of the Records, and the most Authentick Historians. Written for the Satisfaction of the Nation* (London, 1689).
- Spottiswoode, John, *A Speech of One of the Barons of the Shire of B- at a Meeting of the Barons and Freeholders of that Shire, for Choosing Commissioners to Reperesent them in the ensuing Parliament, Summoned to Conveen at Edinburgh the 12th day of November 1702* (Edinburgh, 1702).
- Stafford, Richard, *A Copy of two Letters which Richard Stafford had intended to have delivered unto the King and Queen...*(n.p., 1690).
- Stafford, Richard, *A SUPPLEMENT and ADDITION unto a Printed Paper, Bearing Date July 25, 1692. And Superscribed, To Our Sovereign Lord, King James the II, Rightful King of Great Brittain, and Ireland...* (n.p., 1695).
- Stafford, Richard, *A Word to both Houses of Parliament* (n.p., 1693).
- Stafford, Richard, *Hear this Word, O ye Princes, ye Priests, and People of England; Especially, such of ye as Assemble at Westminster at this year session begun at December 3 1697* (n.p., 1698).

- Stafford, Richard, *The Lamentation of Richard Stafford, A Scribe instructed in the Laws of God, for the Death of Mary, Princess of Orange; together with a Word of Instruction and Warning to her husband* (n.p., 1695).
- Stafford, Richard, *To the Present Queen Mary Richard Stafford, A Scribe of Jesus Christ, desireth Temporal Preservation and Eternal Salvation* (n.p., 1692).
- Steele, Sir Richard, *The Crisis: or, A Discourse Representing, From the most Authentick Records, The Just Causes of the Late Happy Revolution...*(London, 1714).
- Stephens, William, *A Thanksgiving Sermon Preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor... of the City of London at St. Mary-le-bow, April 16, 1696, upon occasion of His Majesty's Deliverance From a Villanous Assassination...* (London, 1696).
- Steuart, Sir James, *Salus Populi Suprema Lex or The Free Thoughts of a Well-wisher. For a good settlement in a Letter to a Friend* (n.p., 1689).
- Stillingfleet, Edward, *A Discourse Concerning the Unreasonableness of a New Separation, on Account of the Oaths with an Answer to the History of Passive Obedience, so far as relates to them* (London, 1689).
- Stillingfleet, Edward, *Reformation of Manners, the true way of Honouring God...*(London, 1700).
- Stillingfleet, Edward, *The Case of an oath of Abjuration considered: and the Vote of the Honourable House of Commons Vindicated in a Letter to a Friend* (London, 1693).
- Stillingfleet, Edward, *The Case of An Oath of Abjuration considered: and the Vote of the Honourable House of Commons Vindicated in a Letter to a Friend* (London, 1702).
- Synge, Edward, *A Peaceable and Friendly Address to the Non-Conformists: Written upon their desiring An Act of Toleration without the Sacramental Test* (Dublin, 1697).
- Taylor, Jeremy, *Toleration Tolerated...*(London, 1687).
- Taylor, Jeremy, *Toleration Tolerated...*(n.p., 1689).
- Temple, Sir Richard, *Some Short Remarks upon Mr. Lock's Book...*(London, 1696).
- The Abhorrence, or, Protestant Observations in Dublin upon the Principles of the Protestants at London* (Dublin, 1690).

The Address of the University of St. Andrews to the King By the Rector, Vice-Chancellor, Heads of the Colledges, Deans of Faculties, and the rest of the Masters and Professors of the University of St Andrews, whose Names are insert at the end of their Address, Also, A Letter from the Arch-Bishops, and the Bishops, to the Kings most Excellent Majesty (London, 1689).

The Ancient Testimony and Principle of the People Called Quakers Renewed with Respect to the King and Government, and touching the Present Association (n.p., 1696).

The Book of Common-Prayer And Administration Of the Sacraments, and other Rites & Ceremonies Of the Church, According to the Use of the Church of England...(London, 1662).

The Case of the Abjuration Oath endeavoured to be cleared, To the Satisfaction of those who are required to take it (n.p., 1702).

The Case of the People, call'd Quakers, as it concerns an Affirmation, which they desire may be extended to all Britain (n.p., 1698).

The Case of the People of England in their Present Circumstances considered; shewing, How far they are, or not obliged by the Oath of Allegiance (London, 1689).

The Case of the Suspended Bishops Considered...(London, 1691).

The Charity and Loyalty of Some of Our Clergy...(London, 1689).

The Declaration of His Highness William Henry, by the grace of God, Prince of Orange &c. of the Reasons inducing him, to appear in Armes in the Kingdom of England, for preserving of the Protestant Religion, and restoring the lawes and liberties of England, Scotland and Ireland (n.p., 1689).

The Declaration of the Estates of the Kingdom of Scotland, Containing the Claim of Right, and the Offer of the Crown to their Majesties, King William and Queen Mary: Together with the Grievances Represented by the Estates; and Their Majesties Oath at Their Acceptance of the Crown (Edinburgh, 1689).

The Duke of Tyrconnel's Speech to the Garrison and Magistrate of the City of Limerick Upon the Debates for the Surrender of the said Place (Limerick/ London, 1691).

The Exact Narrative of the Conflict at Dunkeld (Edinburgh, 1689).

The Fidelity of a Loyal Subject, of the Kingdom of England: or, An Honest Act of Fidelity to King James, King William, And the Whole Kingdom (n.p., 1698).

The Generous Muse, A Funeral Poem, In Memory of his Late Majesty K. James the II... (London, 1701).

The Generous Muse, A Funeral Poem, in Memory of his late Majesty K. James the II... Second Edition (London, 1701).

The Good Catholic no Bad Subject. Or, a Letter from a Catholick Gentleman to Mr. Richard Baxter... (London, 1660).

The Happy Meeting of King William and Queen Mary, at his Return from and After his Conquest in Ireland (London, 1690).

The History of Self-Defence, In Requitall to the History of Passive Obedience (London, 1689).

The Jacobites Hudibras containing the late King's Declaration in travesty (London, 1692).

The Loyal Martyr Vindicated (n.p., 1691).

The Oath Of Allegiance and Supremacy Enjoined by Order of Parliament (London, 1660).

The Opinion of a Divine of the Church of England about the Oath of Abjuration, or in what sense it is to be understood, and may be safely taken. Publication for the Satisfaction of others, and especially of those that live at a distance from London (London, 1702).

The People of Scotland's Groans and Lamentable Complaints (Edinburgh, 1700).

The Poet's Address to his Majesty King William. Occasion'd by the Insolence of the French King, in Proclaiming the Sham Prince of Wales, King of England, Scotland and Ireland (London, 1702).

The Pope's Speech to the College of Cardinals; upon the Death of the Late King James (Dublin, 1701).

The Present French King demonstrated an Enemy to the Catholick as well as Protestant Religion (London, 1691).

The Present State of Religion in Ireland. Containing, I. An humble Address and Apology of the Presbyterian Ministers and Gentlemen, of the North of Ireland... (London, 1712).

The Price of the Abdication... (n.p., 1693).

- The Principal Acts, of the General Assembly, of the Church of Scotland; Convened, at Edinburgh, February 2, 1700* (Edinburgh, 1700).
- The Protestants Crums of Comfort 4th Edition* (London, 1700).
- The Revolution Justified, From Principles of Reason and Scripture: or, A New Discourse Concerning The Nature of Government and Subjection in Free States* (London, 1697).
- The Sighs and Groans, of a Sinking Kingdom, in an Humble Address to the Parliament of Scotland* (n.p., 1700).
- The Spirit of Jacobitism: or, Remarks upon a Dialogue between K.W and Benting in a Dialogue between Two Friends of the Present Government* (London, 1695).
- The State of the Case of Denis Daly, and Edmund Malone, Esqs; Barristers at Law, Comprised in the Articles lately made, on Surrender of the Town of Gallway in the Kingdom of Ireland* (n.p., 1696).
- The State Prodigal his Return; Containing a True State of the Nation. In a Letter to a Friend...*(n.p., 1689).
- The True and Genuine Explanation of One King James's Declarations* (London, 1693).
- The Tryal and condemnation of Sir William Parkyns, kt., for the horrid conspiracy to assassinate his sacred Majesty king William...together with a true copy of the papers deliver to the sheriffs of London and Middlesex, by Sir J. Friend and Sir W. Parkins, at the place of execution* (London, 1696).
- Tindal, Matthew, *An Essay Concerning Obedience to the Supreme Powers, and the Duty of Subjects in All Revolutions* (London, 1694).
- T.L. *The Life and Reign of Innocent XI, Late Pope of Rome...*(London, 1690).
- To his Grace, His Majesies High Commissioner; And to the Right Honourable, the Estates of Parliament. The Address of the Presbyterian Ministers and Professors of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1689).
- To his Grace, His Majesties High Commissioner, and the Right Honourable the Estates of Parliament. The Humble Supplication of John Mcdonald of Glencoe for himself, and in the name of Alexander Mcdonald of Achatriechator, and the poor Remnent that is left of that Family* (Edinburgh, 1695).

- To the most Serene and Potent Princess Ann of Scotland, England, France and Ireland Queen. From the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1702).
- Toland, John, *A Defence of the Parliament of 1640 and the People of England against King Charles I and his adherents containing a Short Account of some of the many Illegal, Arbitrary, Popish and Tyrannical Actions of King Charles I...*(London, 1698).
- Toland, John, *Anglia Libera: or The Limitation and Succession of the Crown of England explain'd and asserted...*(London, 1701).
- Toland, John, *I. reasons for addressing His Majesty to invite into England...the Dowager and the Electoral Prince of Hanover...II Reasons for ...Abjuring the Pretended Prince of Wales...*(London, 1702).
- Toland, John, *The Danger of Mercenary Parliaments* (n.p., 1698).
- Travers, John, *A Sermon Preached in St. Andrew's Church Dublin. Before the Honourable House of Commons the Twenty Third of October, 1698. Being the Anniversary Thanksgiving for the Deliverance from the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Dublin, 1698).
- Trenchard, John, *An Argument, Shewing, that A Standing Army is Inconsistent with a Free Government, & Absolutely destructive to the Constitution of the English Monarchy* (London, 1697).
- True Copies of the Present Associations of the Lords and Commons in Parliament Assembled. As also A Copy of the Instrument of Association that the Protestants of England entred into, in the 27th. Year of Queen Elizabeth, against a Popish Conspiracy...* (London, 1696).
- Tutchin, John, *The British Muse: or Tyranny Expos'd Occasion'd by Poems or Elegies on James II's death* (London/ Dublin, 1702).
- Tutchin, John, *The British Muse...Second Edition...*(London, 1702).
- Two Sermons Preach't on a Day of Fasting & Humiliation, Kept by the Protestant Dissenters in Dublin, On the Sad Occasion of the Death of Our Late Queen* (Dublin, 1695).
- Tyrrell, James, *A Brief Enquiry into the Ancient Constitution and Government of England...*(London, 1695).
- Tyrrell, James, *Bibliotheca Politica...*(London, 1694).
- Unto his Grace, the Earl of Marchmont Lord High Commissioner of Scotland and the Right Honourable Estates of Parliament The Petition of Henry Payne...*(Edinburgh, 1698).

- Upon the Glorious Memory of King William the III Who Dy'd the 8th of March, 1701/2. Dedicated to those Honourable and Worthy Gentlemen of Ireland, who Commemorate his Birth-Day, November 4th* (Dublin, 1702).
- Wagstaffe, Thomas, *A Letter out of Suffolk to A Friend in London. Giving Some Account of the Last Sickness and Death of Dr. William Sancroft, late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1694).
- Wagstaffe, Thomas, *A Letter to the Author of the Late Letter out of the Countrey...*(London, 1689).
- Wagstaffe, Thomas, *An Answer to a late Pamphlet, Entituled Obedience and Submission to the Present Government, Demonstrated from Bishop Overall's Convocation-Book. With a Postscript in Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance...*(London, 1690).
- Wagstaffe, Thomas, *An Answer to a Letter to Dr. Sherlock written in Vindication...*(London, 1692).
- Wagstaffe, Thomas, *An Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Case...*(London, 1692).
- Wagstaffe, Thomas, *Sherlock against Sherlock. The Master of the Temple's Reasons for his Late Taking the Oath to Their Majesties, Answered by the Rector of St. George Botolph-Lane...*(Edinburgh, 1691).
- Wagstaffe, Thomas, *Sherlock against Sherlock...*(London, 1690).
- Wagstaffe, Thomas, *Sherlock against Sherlock... Second Edition* (London, 1691).
- Walkington, Edward, *A Sermon Preached Octob. 23, 1692. In St. Andrews Church Dublin; Before the House of Commons* (Dublin, 1692).
- Walsh, Fr. Peter, *Some Few Questions Concerning the Oath of Allegiance, Propos'd by a Catholick Gentleman...*(London, 1661).
- Webster, James, *A Letter from one of the Country Party to his Friend of the Court Party* (Edinburgh, 1704).
- Weld, Nathaniel, 'Sermon II,' *Two Sermons Preach't on a Day of Fasting & Humiliation, kept by the Protestant Dissenters in Dublin, On the sad Occasion of the Death of Our Late Gracious Queen* (Dublin, 1695).
- Welwood, James, *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration dated at St. Germain, April 17 1693* (Dublin, 1693).

- Welwood, James, *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration dated at St. Germain, April 17 1693* (Edinburgh, 1693).
- Welwood, James, *An Answer to the Late King James's Declaration dated at St. Germain, April 17 1693* (London, 1693).
- Welwood, James, *Memoirs of the Most Material Transactions in England for the Last Hundred Years, preceding the Revolution of 1688* (London, 1700).
- Welwood, James, *Reasons Why the Parliament of Scotland Cannot Comply with the Late King James's Proclamation...*(London, 1689).
- Welwood, James, & March, John, *A Vindication of the present Great Revolution in England; in Five Letters Pass'd betwixt James Welwood, M.D. and Mr. John March, Vicar of Newcastle upon Tyne. Occasion'd by a Sermon, Preached by him on January 30, 1688/9 before the Mayor and Aldermen, for Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance* (n.p., 1689).
- Wesley, Samuel, *Elegies on the Queen...Second Edition* (London, 1695).
- Wetenhall, Edward, *A Letter to a Friend, Occasion'd by the Surrender of Mons. Shewing how Unreasonable it is, for English Protestants, to wish success to the French Arms* (London, 1692).
- Wetenhall, Edward, *A Sermon Setting Forth the Duties of the Irish Protestants...*(Dublin, 1692).
- Wetenhall, Edward, *The Case of the Irish Protestants: In Relation to Recognising, or Swearing Allegiance to, And Praying for King William and Queen Mary, Stated and Resolved.* (London, 1691).
- Whittel, John, *A Short Review of the Remarkable Providences: Attending Our Gracious Sovereign William the III^d. Continued From the Year 1693, down to this day* (London, 1699).
- William III & II, *His Majesties Gracious Answer to the foresaid Letter* (Edinburgh, 1697).
- Williams, John, *A Declaration of the sense of the Archbishops and Bishops, now in and About London, upon the Occasion of their Attendances in Parliament concerning the irregular and scandalous proceedings of certain clergy-men at the execution of Sir John Friend and Sir William Parkins* (London, 1696).

- Williams, John, *A Defence of the Archbishop's Sermon on the Death of her late Majesty of Blessed Memory... Being a Vindication of the Late Queen...*(London, 1695).
- Williamson, David, *A Mournful Poem on the Never Enough to be Lamented Death of...King William* (Edinburgh, 1702).
- Williamson, David, *A Sermon Preached in the High Church of Edinburgh of Edinburgh, June 9th 1695...*(Edinburgh, 1695).
- Wilson, Timothy, *Conscience Satisfied: In a Cordial and Loyal Submitting to the Present Government of King William and Queen Mary, in Three Discourses: Justifying the Williamites against the Jacobites...* (London, 1690).
- Wilson, Timothy, *God, The King, and the Countrey, United in Justification of his Present Revolution: Containing also Animadversions of Dr. William Sherlock's Book...* (London, 1691).
- Wilson, Timothy, *The Vanity and Fidelity of the History of Passive Obedience detected...*(London, 1690).
- Wykes, R., *The Peace of Jerusalem: A Sermon Preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor of London. At S Paul's Cathedral, July 31, 1698...* (London, 1698).

Secondary Sources

- Archbold, W.A.J., 'Kingston, Richard (b. c.1635, d. 1710?)', rev. M. E. Clayton, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15627>, accessed 2 Feb 2014].
- Archbold, W.A.J., 'Lawton, Charlwood (1660–1721)', rev. Philip Carter, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16211>, accessed 20 Nov 2013].
- Armstrong, Robert, 'Of Stories and sermons: Nationality and Spirituality in Presbyterian Ulster in the late Seventeenth Century,' in Robert

- Armstrong & Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin (eds.) *Community in Early Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2006).
- Armitage, David, 'Introduction,' in David Armitage (ed.) *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Armitage, David, 'The Scottish Vision of Empire: Intellectual Origins of The Darien Venture,' in John Robertson (ed.) *A Union for Empire: Political Thought and the British Union of 1707* (Cambridge, 1995).
- Ashcraft, R., & Goldsmith, M.M., 'Locke, Revolution Principles, and the Formation of Whig Ideology,' *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (Dec., 1983), pp.773-800.
- Atherton, Ian, 'The Press and Popular Political Opinion,' in Barry Coward (ed.) *A Companion to Stuart Britain* (Oxford, 2003).
- Baker, Geoff, *Reading and Politics in Early Modern England: The Mental World of a Seventeenth-Century Catholic Gentleman* (Oxford, 2010).
- Barnard, Toby, *A New Anatomy of Ireland: The Irish Protestants, 1649-1770* (London, 2003).
- Barnard, Toby, 'Ireland, 1688-91,' in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (eds.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013).
- Barnard, Toby, *Irish Protestants Ascents and Descents, 1641-1770* (Dublin, 2004).
- Barnard, Toby, 'Protestantism, ethnicity and Irish identities, 1660-1760,' in Tony Claydon & Ian McBride (eds.) *Protestantism and National Identity in Britain and Ireland, c.1650-c.1850* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Barnard, Toby, 'The Uses of 23 October 1641 and Irish Protestant Celebrations,' *The English Historical Review*, 106, No. 421 (Oct., 1991), pp.889-920.
- Barnes, Robert Paul, 'Scotland and the Glorious Revolution of 1688,' in *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 3, No.3 (Autumn, 1971), pp.116-127.
- Bartlett, Thomas, *The Fall and Rise of the Irish Nation: The Catholic Question 1690-1830* (Dublin, 1992).
- Beckett, J.C., *Protestant Dissent in Ireland 1687-1780* (London, 1948).

- Beddard, Robert, 'The Guildhall Declaration of 11 December 1688 and the Counter-Revolution of the Loyalists,' *The Historical Journal*, 11, No.3 (1968), pp.403-420.
- Beddard, Robert, 'The Unexpected Whig Revolution of 1688,' in Robert Beddard (ed.) *Revolutions of 1688* (Oxford, 1991).
- Bennett, G.V., 'Conflict in the Church' in Geoffrey Holmes (ed.) *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714* (London, 1969).
- Bennett, G.V., *The Tory Crisis in Church and State 1688-1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford, 1975).
- Bergin, Joseph, *Crown, Church and Episcopate Under Louis XIV* (London, 2004).
- Bossy, John, 'English Catholics after 1688,' in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel & Nicholas Tyacke (eds.) *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991).
- Bossy, John, *The English Catholic Community, 1570-1850* (London, 1975).
- Bottigheimer, Karl S., 'The Glorious Revolution and Ireland,' in Lois G. Schworer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Bowie, Karin, *Scottish Public Opinion and The Anglo-Scottish Union 1699-1707* (Woodbridge, 2007).
- Brooks, Colin, 'The Revolution of 1688-1689,' in Barry Coward (ed.) *A Companion to Stuart Britain* (Oxford, 2003).
- Brown, Keith M., 'British History, a Sceptical Comment,' in 'British History: A Sceptical Comment,' in Ronald G. Asch (ed.) *Three nations- A Common History? England, Scotland, Ireland and British History c.1600-1920* (Bohum, 1993).
- Brown, Keith M., *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603-1715* (Basingstoke, 1992).
- Brown, Keith M., 'Party Politics and Parliament: Scotland's Last Election and its Aftermath,' in Keith M. Brown & Alastair J. Mann (eds.) *The History of the Scottish Parliament Volume II Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1567-1707* (Edinburgh, 2005).
- Brown, Keith M., & Mann, Alastair J., 'Introduction: Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1567-1707,' in Keith M. Brown & Alastair J. Mann (eds.)

- The History of the Scottish Parliament Volume II Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1567-1707* (Edinburgh, 2005).
- Buick Knox, R., 'Establishment and Toleration during the Reigns of William, Mary and Anne,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XXIII (1989), pp.330-360.
- Burgess, Glenn, 'Introduction,' in Glen Burgess & Matthew Festenstein (eds.) *English Radicalism, 1550-1850* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Burgess, Glenn, 'Radicalism and the English Revolution,' in Glen Burgess & Matthew Festenstein (eds.) *English Radicalism, 1550-1850* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Burgess, Glenn, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution: An Introduction to English Political Thought 1600-1641* (Brighton, 1993).
- Burke, Edmund, *Reflections on the Revolution in France...* (London, 1791).
- Burns, J.H., 'George Buchanan and the anti-monarchomachs,' in Nicholas Phillipson & Quentin Skinner (eds.) *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Burns, J.H., *The True Law of Kingship Concepts of Monarchy in Early-Modern Scotland* (Oxford, 1996).
- Cairns, John W., 'Spottiswoode, John, of that ilk (1667–1728)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26168>, accessed 6 April 2014].
- Canny, Nicholas, 'The Intersections between Irish and British Political Thought of the Early-Modern Centuries,' in David Armitage (ed.) *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Carafano, James Jay, 'William III and the Negative Voice,' *Albion: A Quarterly Journal with British Studies*, 19, No. 4 (Winter, 1987), pp.509-525.
- Carlyle, E.I., 'Smyth, Edward (c.1662–1720)', rev. Toby Barnard, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25793>, accessed 27 March 2014].

- Carter, Jennifer, 'The Revolution and the Constitution,' in Geoffrey Holmes (ed.), *Britain after the Glorious Revolution 1689-1714* (London, 1969).
- Champion, Justin, 'Political Thinking between the Restoration and the Hanoverian Succession,' in Barry Coward (ed.) *A Companion to Stuart Britain* (Oxford, 2003).
- Cheesman, C.E.A., 'Fuller, William (1670–1733)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10241>, accessed 27 March 2014].
- Cherry, George L., 'The Legal and Philosophical Position of the Jacobites, 1688-1689,' in *The Journal of Modern History*, 22, No.4 (Dec, 1950), pp.309-321.
- Clark, J.C.D, *English Society 1660-1832, Religion, ideology, politics during the ancien regime* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Clark, K.R.P., 'Defoe, Dissent, and Early Whig Ideology,' *The Historical Journal*, 52, Issue 03, (September, 2009), pp.595-614.
- Clarke, T.N., 'The Williamite Episcopalians and the Glorious Revolution in Scotland,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XXIV, Part 1 (1990), pp.33-51.
- Claydon, Tony, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689-1697,' in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Claydon, Tony, 'The Sermon Culture of the Glorious Revolution: Williamite Preaching and Jacobite Anti-Preaching, 1685-1702,' in Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington & Emma Rhatigan (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2014).
- Claydon, Tony, 'The Sermon, the "Public Sphere" and the Political Culture of Late Seventeenth-Century England,' Lori Anne Ferrell & Peter McCullough (eds.) *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1660-1750* (Manchester, 2000).
- Claydon, Tony, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Clifden, Robin, 'The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution,' in Paul Slack (ed.) *Rebellion, Popular Protest and the Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1984).

- Connolly, S.J., 'Cox, Sir Richard, first baronet (1650–1733)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6527>, accessed 9 Feb 2014].
- Connolly, S.J., *Divided Kingdom Ireland 1630-1800* (Oxford, 2008).
- Connolly, S.J., *Religion, Law and Power The Making of Protestant Ireland, 1660-1760* (Oxford, 1995).
- Connolly, S.J., 'The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr: Regicide and Revolution in Anglican Political Thought c. 1660-1745,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54, No.3, (July, 2003), pp.484-506.
- Connolly, S.J., 'The Glorious Revolution in Irish Protestant Political Thinking,' in S.J. Connolly (ed.) *Political Ideas in Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2000).
- Cowan, Brian, 'Mr. Spectator and the Coffeehouse Public Sphere,' *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 37, No. 3, Critical Networks (Spring, 2004), pp.345-366.
- Cowan, Ian B., 'Church and State Reformed? The Revolution of 1688-9 in Scotland,' in Jonathan I. Israel (ed.) *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Cowan, Ian B., 'The Reluctant Revolutionaries: Scotland in 1688,' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *By Force or Default? The Revolution of 1688-1689* (Edinburgh, 1989).
- Cowan, Ian B., *The Scottish Covenanters 1660-1688* (London, 1976).
- Coward, Barry, *The Stuart Age England, 1603-1714* (Harlow, 2003).
- Cressy, David, 'Binding the Nation: The Bonds of Association, 1584-1696,' in Delloyd J. Guth & John W. McKenna (eds.) *Tudor Rule and Revolution Essays for G.R Elton from his American Friends* (Cambridge, 1982).
- Cruickshanks, Eveline, 'Attempts to Restore the Stuarts, 1689-96,' in Eveline Cruickshanks & Edward Corp (eds.) *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995).
- Cullen, Karen J. & Whatley, Christopher A., & Young, Mary, 'King William's Ill Years: New Evidence on the impact of scarcity and harvest failure during the crisis of the 1690s on Tayside,' *The Scottish Historical Review*, LXXV, No. 220, Part 2 (Oct. 2006), pp.250-76.
- Daniel, Stephen H., 'Toland, John (1670–1722)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan

- 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27497>, accessed 31 March 2014].
- Devine, T.M., *The Scottish Nation 1700-2000* (London, 1999).
- Dickinson, H.T., *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London, 1977).
- Dilworth, Mark, Nicolson, Thomas (1644x6–1718)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20151>, accessed 26 Nov 2013].
- Downie, J.A., *Robert Harley and the Press: Propaganda and public opinion in the age of Swift and Defoe* (Cambridge, 1979).
- Downie, J.A., 'Tutchin, John (1660x64–1707)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27899>, accessed 22 Sept 2012].
- Dunlop, A. Ian, *William Carstares and the Kirk by Law Established* (Edinburgh, 1964).
- Eccleshall, Robert, 'Anglican Political Thought in the century after the Revolution,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political thought in Ireland since the seventeenth century* (London, 1993).
- Eccleshall, Robert, 'The Political Ideas of Anglican Ireland in the 1690s,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Basingstoke, 2001).
- Fagan, Patrick, *Divided Loyalties: The Question of the Oath for Irish Catholics in the Eighteenth Century* (Dublin, 1997).
- Fauske, Christopher J., "'The Angel of St. Patricks is now the Guardian of the Kingdom,' in Christopher J. Fauske (ed.) *Archbishop William King and the Anglican Irish Context, 1688-1729* (Dublin 2004).
- Ferguson, William, *Scotland, 1689 to the Present* (Edinburgh, 1968).
- Frankle, Robert J., 'Shower, Sir Bartholomew (1658–1701)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25471>, accessed 5 Feb 2014].

- Garrett, Jane, *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696* (Cambridge, 1980).
- Geoghegan, Vincent, 'Reily, Hugh (fl. 1686–1695)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23346>, accessed 26 Nov 2013].
- Gibson, William, *James II and the Trial of the Seven Bishops* (Basingstoke, 2009).
- Gillespie, Raymond, 'Presbyterian Propaganda,' in Kevin Herlihy (ed.) *The Politics of Irish Dissent 1650-1800* (Dublin, 1997).
- Gillespie, Raymond, *Reading Ireland: Print, reading and social change in early modern Ireland* (Manchester, 2005).
- Gillespie, Raymond, *Seventeenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2006).
- Gillespie, Raymond, 'The Irish Protestants and James II, 1688-90,' *Irish Historical Studies*, 28, No. 110 (Nov., 1992), pp.124-133.
- Glasse, Lionel K.J., 'In Search of the *Mot Juste*: Characterizations of the Revolution of 1688-9,' in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (eds.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013).
- Glasse, Lionel K.J., 'William II and the Settlement of Religion in Scotland, 1689-90,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XXII (1989), pp.317-329.
- Glickman, Gabriel, 'Political Conflict and the Memory of the Revolution in England, 1689-c.1745,' in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (eds.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013).
- Glickman, Gabriel, *The English Catholic Community, 1688-1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge, 2009).
- Goldie, Mark, 'Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium* in the Revolution Debate, 1689-1693,' *The Historical Journal*, 20, No. 3 (Sep., 1977), pp.569-586.
- Goldie, Mark, 'John Locke's Circle and James II,' *The Historical Journal*, 35, No. 3 (Sep., 1992), pp.557-86.
- Goldie, Mark, 'The Damning of King Monmouth: Pulpit Toryism in the Reign of James II,' in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (eds.) *The Final Crisis of*

- the Stuart Monarchy The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013).
- Goldie, Mark, 'The English System of Liberty,' in Mark Goldie & Robert Walker (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Goldie, Mark, 'The Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution,' in Robert Beddard (ed.) *The Revolutions of 1688* (Oxford, 1991).
- Goldie, Mark, 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument,' *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 83 (1980), pp.473-564.
- Goldie, Mark, 'The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England,' in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel & Nicholas Tyacke (eds.) *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991).
- Goldie, Mark, 'The Unacknowledged Republic: Officeholding in Early Modern England,' in Tim Harris (ed.) *The Politics of the Excluded, c. 1500-1850* (Basingstoke, 2001).
- Goldie, Mark & Jackson, Clare, 'Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites,' in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Greaves, Richard L., "'That Kind of People:": Late Stuart Radicals and their Manifestoes, a Fundamental Approach,' in Glen Burgess & Matthew Festenstein (eds.) *English Radicalism, 1550-1850* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Greenspan, Nicole, 'Charles II, Exile, and the Problem of Allegiance,' *The Historical Journal*, 54, No. 1 (2011), pp.73-103.
- Greig, Martin, 'Burnet, Gilbert (1643–1715)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4061>, accessed 18 March 2013].
- Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2000).

- Handley, Stuart, 'Price, Robert (1655–1733)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2007 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22763>, accessed 5 May 2014].
- Handley, Stuart, 'Seller, Abednego (1646/7–1705)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25057>, accessed 19 July 2013].
- Harris, Tim, 'In Search of a British History of Political Thought,' in David Armitage (ed.) *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Harris, Tim, 'Incompatible Revolutions?: The Established Church and the Revolutions of 1688-89 in Ireland, England and Scotland,' in Allan I Macinnes & Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.) *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century* (Dublin, 2002).
- Harris, Tim, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Harris, Tim, 'Politics, religion and community in late Stuart Ireland,' in Robert Armstrong & Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin (eds.) *Community in Early Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2006).
- Harris, Tim, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a divided Society 1660-1715* (Harlow, 1993).
- Harris, Tim, *Rebellion Britain's First Stuart Kings* (Oxford, 2014).
- Harris, Tim, 'Reluctant Revolutionaries? The Scots and the Revolution of 1688-89,' in Howard Nenner (ed.) *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain, Essays Presented to Lois Green Schwoerer* (Rochester, 1997).
- Harris, Tim, *Restoration Charles II and his Kingdoms 1660-1685* (London, 2006).
- Harris, Tim, 'Restoration Ireland: Themes and Problems,' in Coleman A. Dennehy (ed.) *Restoration Ireland: Always Settling and Never Settled* (Dublin, 2008).
- Harris, Tim, *Revolution The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London, 2007).

- Harris, Tim, 'The British Dimension, Religion and the Shaping of Political Identities during the Reign of Charles II,' in Tony Claydon & Ian McBride (eds.) *Protestantism and National Identities Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-1850* (Cambridge, 2007).
- 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 (Jan., 1999), pp.28-58.
- Harvey Wood, Harriet, 'Pennecuik, Alexander (1652–1722)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21861>, accessed 30 Sept 2014].
- Hayton, D.W., 'Constitutional experiments and political expediency, 1689-1725,' in Steven G. Ellis & Sarah Barber (eds.) *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725* (Harlow, 1995).
- Hayton, D.W., 'Dependence, Clientage and Affinity: The Political Following of the Second Duke of Ormonde,' in Toby Barnard & Jane Fendon (eds.) *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610-1745* (Woodbridge, 2000).
- Hayton, D.W., 'Exclusion, Conformity, and Parliamentary Representation: The impact of the Sacramental Test on Irish Dissenting Politics,' in Kevin Herlihy (ed.) *The Politics of Irish Dissent 1650-1800* (Dublin, 1997).
- Hayton, D.W., 'Molesworth, Robert, first Viscount Molesworth (1656–1725)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18901>, accessed 1 May 2014].
- Hayton, D.W., *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians and Parties* (Woodbridge, 2004).
- Hayton, D.W., 'The "Country" interest and the Party System,' in Clyve Jones (ed.) *Party and Management in Parliament, 1660-1784* (New York, 1984).
- Hayton, D.W., 'The Williamite Revolution in Ireland, 1688-91,' in Jonathan I. Israel (ed.) *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Henderson Scott, Paul, *Andrew Fletcher and the Treaty of Union* (Edinburgh, 1994).
- Hill, B.W., *The Growth of Parliamentary Parties, 1659-1742* (London, 1976).

- Hill, Christopher, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714* (London, 2002).
- Hill, Jacqueline, 'Ireland without Union: Molyneux and his legacy,' in John Robertson (ed.) *A Union for Empire: Political Thought and the British Union of 1707* (Cambridge, 1995).
- Hill, Jacqueline, 'Politics and the Writing of History,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Basingstoke, 2001).
- Holmes, Geoffrey, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London, 1967).
- Holmes, Geoffrey, *The Making of a Great Power: Late Stuart and Early Georgian Britain 1660-1722* (Harlow, 1993).
- Hopkins, Paul, *Glencoe and the end of the Highland War* (Edinburgh, 1998).
- Hopkins, Paul, 'Payne, Henry (d. 1705?)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21643>, accessed 15 Nov 2013].
- Hopkins, Paul, 'Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie,' in Eveline Cruickshanks & Edward Corp (eds.) *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995).
- Hoppit, Julian, *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727* (Oxford, 2000).
- Hoppit, Julian, 'Davenant, Charles (1656–1714)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7195>, accessed 17 Feb 2014].
- Horwitz, Henry, *Parliament, policy and politics in the reign of William III* (Manchester, 1977).
- Horwitz, Henry, *Revolution Politicks: The Career of Daniel Finch Second Earl of Nottingham, 1647-1730* (Cambridge, 1968).
- Israel, Jonathan I., 'William III and Toleration,' in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel & Nicholas Tyacke (eds.) *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991).
- Jackson, Clare, 'Conceptions of Nationhood in the Anglo-Scottish Union Debates of 1707,' *The Scottish Historical Review*, LXXXVII, Issue 2 (Supplement) (2008), pp.61-77.
- Jackson, Clare, 'Mackenzie, Sir George, of Rosehaugh (1636/1638–1691)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press,

2004; online edn, Jan 2007
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17579>, accessed 16 May
2012].

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

Jackson, Clare, 'Revolution Principles, *Ius Naturae* and *Ius Gentium* in Early-Enlightenment Scotland: The Contribution of Sir Francis Grant, Lord Cullen (c. 1660-1729),' in Tim Hochstrasser & Peter Schröder (eds.) *Early modern natural law theories: contexts and strategies in the early Enlightenment* (Dordrecht, 2003).

Jones, David Martin, *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth-Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements* (Rochester, 1999).

Jones, J.R., *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (London, 1972).

Kelly, Patrick, 'Ireland and the Glorious Revolution: From Kingdom to Colony,' in Robert Beddard (ed.) *The Revolutions of 1688* (Oxford, 1991).

Kelly, Patrick, 'Recasting a Tradition: William Molyneux and the Sources of *The Case of Ireland...*(1698),' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.) *Kingdom or Colony? Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland* (Cambridge, 2000).

Kelly, Patrick, 'William Molyneux and the Spirit of Liberty in Eighteenth-Century Ireland,' *Eighteenth-Century Ireland/ Iris an dá Chultur*, Vol.3 (1988), pp.133-148.

Kemp, Geoff, 'Suppressing Jacobitism,' in Geoff Kemp (ed.) *Censorship and the Press, 1550-1720 Volume 3, 1660-1695* (London, 2009).

Kenyon, J.P., *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party 1689-1720* (Cambridge, 1990).

Kenyon, J.P., 'The Earl of Sunderland and the Revolution of 1688,' *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 11, No. 3, (1955), pp.272-96.

Kenyon, J.P., 'The Revolution of 1688: Resistance and Contract,' in Neil McKendrick (ed.) *Historical Perspectives: Studies in English Thought and Society in honour of J.H Plumb* (London, 1974).

Kewes, Paulina, 'History and It's Uses,' in Paulina Kewes (ed.) *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, 2006).

- Key, Newton E., 'Gregory, Francis (1623-1707),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2005 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11462>, accessed 15 June 2014].
- Kidd, Colin, *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800* (Cambridge, 1999).
- Kidd, Colin, 'Religious Realignment between the Restoration and Union,' in John Robertson (ed.) *A Union for Empire: Political Thought and the British Union of 1707* (Cambridge, 1995).
- Kidd, Colin, *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British identity, 1689-c.1830* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Kidd, Colin, 'The Matter of Britain and the Contours of British Political Thought,' in David Armitage (ed.) *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Kilroy, Phil, *Protestant Dissenters and Controversy in Ireland 1660-1714* (Cork, 1994).
- Kinsella, Eoin, 'In Pursuit of a Positive Construction: Irish Catholics and the Williamite articles of Surrender, 1690-1701,' *Eighteenth Century Ireland; Iris an dá Chultúr*, 24 (2009), pp.11-35.
- Kishlansky, Mark, *A Monarchy Transformed Britain 1603-1714* (London, 1997).
- Klein, William, 'The Ancient Constitution Revisited,' in Nicholas Phillipson, Quentin Skinner (eds.) *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Knights, Mark, 'Politics after the Glorious Revolution,' in Barry Coward (ed.) *A Companion to Stuart Britain* (Oxford, 2003).
- Knights, Mark, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-1681* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Knights, Mark, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford, 2005).
- Knights, Mark, 'The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties,' in Paulina Kewes (ed.) *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, 2006).

- Knights, Mark, 'Uncovering a Jacobite Whig? The Commonwealth Principles of Henry Booth, 1st Earl of Warrington,' in Clyve Jones (ed.) *British Politics in the Age of Holmes*, Special Issue of *Parliamentary History* (2009), pp.59-87.
- Lake, Peter, & Pincus, Steven, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in early modern England,' in Peter Lake & Steven Pincus (eds.) *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2007).
- Leighton, C.D.A., 'The Non-Jurors and their History,' *The Journal of Religious History*, 29, No. 3 (Oct., 2005), pp.241-257.
- Lenihan, Pdraig, *Consolidating Conquest: Ireland 1603-1727* (Harlow, 2008).
- Lenman, Bruce, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (London, 1980).
- Lenman, Bruce, 'The Poverty of Political Theory in the Scottish Revolution of 1688-1690,' in Lois G. Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Lenman, Bruce P., 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the ideology of Jacobitism' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.) *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism 1689-1759* (Edinburgh, 1982).
- Lenman, Bruce P., 'The Scottish Nobility and the Revolution of 1688-1690,' in Robert Beddard (ed.) *The Revolutions of 1688* (Oxford, 1991).
- Levillain, Charles-Edouard, 'Cromwell Redivivus? William III as Military Dictator: Myth and Reality,' in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Lieberman, David, 'The Mixed Constitution and the Common Law,' in Mark Goldie & Robert Walker (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Ludington, Charles C., 'From Ancient Constitution to British Empire: William Atwood and the Imperial crown of England,' in Jane H. Ohlmeyer (ed.) *Political Thought in Seventeenth-century Ireland Kingdom or Colony* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, *The History of England From the Accession of James the Second Volume 1*, ed. Charles Harding Firth (London, 1913).
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, *The History of England From the Accession of James the Second Volume 4*, ed. Charles Harding Firth (London, 1913).

- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, *The History of England From the Accession of James the Second Volume 5*, ed. Charles Harding Firth (London, 1913).
- Macinnes, Allan I., 'Catholic Recusancy and the Penal Laws, 1603-1707,' *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XXIII (1989), pp.27-64.
- Macinnes, Allan I., 'Covenanting Ideology in Seventeenth Century Scotland,' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.) *Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland: Kingdom or Colony* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Macinnes, Allan I., 'Jacobitism in Scotland: Episodic Cause or National Movement?,' *The Scottish Historical Review*, Vol. 86, No. 222, Part 2 (Oct., 2007), pp.225-252.
- Macinnes, Allan I., *Union and Empire: the Making of the United Kingdom in 1707* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Macinnes, Allan I., 'Union failed, Union accomplished: The Irish Union of 1703 and the Scottish Union of 1707,' in Dáire Keogh & Kevin Whelan (eds.) *Acts of Union: The Causes, Contexts and Consequences of the Act of Union* (Dublin, 2001).
- Macinnes, Allan I., 'William of Orange- "Disaster for Scotland"?' in Esther Mijers, David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Mann, Alastair J., 'Inglorious Revolution: Administrative Muddle and Constitutional Change in the Scottish Parliament of William and Mary,' *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 22, pt.2 (2003), pp.121-144.
- Marshall, John, *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture: Religious Intolerance and Arguments for Religious Toleration in Early Modern and 'Early Enlightenment' Europe* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Marshall, John, 'Whig Thought and the Revolution of 1688-91,' in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (eds.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013).
- Marshall, Rosalind K., 'Hamilton, James, fourth Duke of Hamilton and first Duke of Brandon (1658-1712),' *Oxford Dictionary of Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct. 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7898, accessed 26 October 2012].

- Maxwell, Thomas ‘William III and the Scots Presbyterians Part I- The Crisis in Whitehall,’ *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XV- Part II (1964), pp.117-140.
- Maxwell, Thomas, ‘William III and the Scots Presbyterians Part II,’ *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, XV- Part III (1965), pp.169-191.
- McBride, Ian, ‘Ulster Presbyterianism and the Confessional State, c.1688-1733,’ in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political Discourse in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Basingstoke, 2001).
- McElligott, Jason, ‘Crouch, Nathaniel [Robert Burton] (c.1640–1725?)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/52645>, accessed 12 June 2014].
- McGrath, C.I., ‘Maxwell, Henry (1668/9-1730),’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/63666>, accessed 22 October 2012].
- McGrath, C.I., *The Making of the Eighteenth-Century Irish Constitution: Government, Parliament and the Revenue, 1692-1714* (Dublin, 2000).
- McGrath, C.I., ‘The “Union” Representation of 1703 in the Irish House of Commons: A case of mistaken Identity?’, *Eighteenth-Century Ireland/Iris an dá Chultúr*, 23 (2008), pp.11-35.
- McGuire, J.I., ‘A remora to King James’s affairs: William King’s defence of Protestant office-holders, 1689-90,’ in Christopher J. Fauske (ed.) *Archbishop William King and Anglican Irish Context, 1688-1729* (Dublin, 2004).
- McGuire, J.I., ‘The Church of Ireland and the “Glorious Revolution” of 1688,’ in Art Cosgrove & Donal McCartney (eds.) *Studies in Irish History Presented to R. Dudley Edwards* (Dublin, 1979).
- McNally, Patrick, ‘William King and the “national question,”’ in Christopher J. Fauske (ed.) *Archbishop William King and Anglican Irish Context, 1688-1729* (Dublin, 2004).
- McNulty, J.L.C., ‘Hickeringill, Edmund (bap. 1631, d. 1708),’ *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004

- [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13200>, accessed 18 May 2013].
- Miller, John, *James II: A study in Kingship* (Hove, 1977).
- Miller, John, *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1973).
- Miller, John, 'Proto-Jacobitism? The Tories and the Revolution of 1688-9,' in Eveline Cruickshank & Jeremy Black (eds.) *The Jacobite Challenge* (Edinburgh, 1988).
- Miller, John, 'The Glorious Revolution: "Contract" and "Abdication" Reconsidered,' *The Historical Journal*, 25, No. 3 (1982), pp.541-555.
- Moffat, Brian, 'Fraser, James (1645–1731)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/73233>, accessed 13 Nov 2013].
- Monod, Paul Kléber, 'Jacobitism and Country Principles in the Reign of William III,' *The Historical Journal*, 30, No.2 (Jun., 1987), pp.289-310.
- Monod, Paul Kléber, *Jacobitism and the English People 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Monod, Paul Kléber, 'The Jacobite Press and English Censorship 1688-95,' in Eveline Cruickshanks & Edward Corp (eds.), *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995).
- Morrill, John, 'The Sensible Revolution,' in Jonathan I. Israel (ed.) *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Morrill, John, 'Thinking about the New British History,' in David Armitage (ed.) *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Mullet, Charles, 'A Case of Allegiance: William Sherlock and the Revolution of 1688', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 10, No. 1 (Nov., 1946), pp.83-103.
- Mullet, Charles, 'Religion, Politics, and Oaths in the Glorious Revolution', *The Review of Politics*, 10, No. 4 (Oct., 1948), pp.462-74.
- Mullet, Michael, *Catholics in Britain and Ireland, 1558-1829* (London, 1998).
- Murdoch, Alexander, *British History, 1660-1832: National Identity and Local Culture* (Basingstoke, 1998).

- Nenner, Howard, 'Loyalty and the Law: The Meaning of trust and the Right of Resistance in Seventeenth-Century England,' *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 48, Issue 04, (October, 2009), pp.859-870.
- Nenner, Howard, 'Pretense and pragmatism: The Response to uncertainty in the succession crisis of 1689,' in Lois G. Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Nenner, Howard, 'The Later Stuart Age,' in J.G.A. Pocock (ed.) with the assistance of Gordon J. Schochet & Lois G. Schwoerer *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Nenner, Howard, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England, 1603-1714* (London, 1995).
- Nordwann, Claude, 'Louis XIV and the Jacobites,' in Ragnhild Hutton (ed.) *Louis XIV and Europe* (London, 1976).
- Ó Buachalla, Breandán, 'Irish Jacobitism and Irish Nationalism: The Literary Evidence,' in Michael O'Dea & Kevin Whelan (eds.) *Nations and Nationalisms: France, Britain, Ireland, and the Eighteenth-Century Context* (Oxford, 1995).
- Ó Buachalla, Breandán, 'James Our True King: The ideology of Irish Royalism in the seventeenth century,' in D. George Boyce, Robert Eccleshall & Vincent Geoghegan (eds.) *Political thought in Ireland since the seventeenth century* (London, 1993).
- Ó Ciardha, Éamonn, "'A Lot done, more to do.'" The Restoration and Road for Irish Jacobite Studies,' in Paul Monod, Murray Pittock & Daniel Szechi (eds.), *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad* (Basingstoke, 2010).
- Ó Ciardha, Éamonn, *Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766 A Fatal Attachment* (Dublin, 2002).
- O'Regan, Philip, *Archbishop William King of Dublin (1650-1729) and the Constitution in Church and State* (Dublin, 2000).
- O'Regan, Philip, 'William King as Bishop and Parliamentarian, 1691-1697,' in Christopher J. Fauske (ed.) *Archbishop William King and Anglican Irish Context, 1688-1729* (Dublin, 2004).
- Ogg, David, *England in the Reigns of James II and William III* (Oxford, 1955).
- Ohlmeyer, Jane, 'Introduction,' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.) *Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland: Kingdom or Colony* (Cambridge, 2000).

- Onnekink, David, *The Anglo-Dutch Favourite: The Career of Hans Willem Bentinck 1st Earl of Portland (1649-1709)* (Ashgate, 2007).
- Overton, J.H., *The Nonjurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London, 1902).
- Padley, Kenneth, 'Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution: William Sherlock and William of Orange,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 59, No. 4, (Oct., 2008), pp.680-696.
- Patrick, Derek J., 'Unconventional Procedure: Scottish Electoral Politics after the Revolution,' in Keith M. Brown & Alastair J. Mann (eds.) *The History of the Scottish Parliament Volume II Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1567-1707* (Edinburgh, 2005).
- Petrie, Sir Charles, *The Jacobite Movement* (London, 1959).
- Pincus, Steven, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (London, 2009).
- Pincus, Steven, "'Coffee Politicians Does Create:": Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture,' *The Journal of Modern History*, 67, No. 4 (Dec., 1995), pp.807-34.
- Pincus, Steven, 'The European Catholic Context of the Revolution of 1688-89: Gallicanism, Innocent XI, and Catholic Opposition,' in Allan I Macinnes & Arthur H. Williamson (eds.) *Shaping the Stuart World 1603-1714: The Atlantic Connection* (Leiden/ Boston 2006).
- Pittock, Murray, 'Jacobitism Ideology in Scotland and at St. Germain-en-Laye,' in Eveline Cruickshanks & Edward Corp (eds.), *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995).
- Place, Richard, 'Bavaria and the Collapse of Louis XIV's German Policy, 1687-1688,' *The Journal of Modern History*, 49, No. 3 (Sep., 1977), pp.369-393.
- Pocock, J.G.A., *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Pocock, J.G.A., 'The Fourth English Civil War: Dissolution, Desertion, and Alternative Histories of the Glorious Revolution,' in Lois G. Schworer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Pocock, J.G.A., 'Two Kingdoms and Three Histories?,' in J.G.A Pocock (ed.) *The Discovery of Islands Essays in British History* (Cambridge, 2005).

- Pocock, J.G.A., Collini, Stefan, Biddiss, Michael, Hollinger, David, Kuklick, Bruce, Skinner, Quentin, & Hunter, Michael, 'What is Intellectual History?', in Juliet Gardiner (ed.) *History Today* Vol. 35, Issue 10 (Oct., 1985), pp.46-54.
- Pocock, J.G.A., Schochet, Gordon, & Schworer, Lois G., 'The History of British Political Thought: A Field and its Future,' in David Armitage (ed.) *British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Raffe, Alasdair, 'Episcopalian polemic, the London printing press and Anglo-Scottish Divergence in the 1690s,' *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 26 (2006), pp.23-41.
- Raffe, Alasdair, 'Presbyterianism, Secularization, and Scottish Politics after The Revolution of 1688-1690,' *The Historical Journal*, 53, No. 2 (2010), pp.317-337.
- Raffe, Alasdair, 'Presbyterians and Episcopalians: The Formation of Confessional Cultures in Scotland, 1660-1715,' *The English Historical Review*, 125, No. 514 (2010), pp.570-598.
- Raffe, Alasdair, 'Scottish State Oaths and the Revolution of 1688-90,' in Sharon Adams & Julian Goodare (eds.) *Scotland in the Age of Two Revolutions* (Woodbridge, 2014).
- Raffe, Alasdair, *The Culture of Controversy Religious Arguments in Scotland, 1660-1714* (Woodbridge, 2012).
- Raffe, Alasdair, 'The Restoration, the Revolution and the Failure of Episcopacy in Scotland,' in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (ed.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013).
- Raymond, Joad, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Richardson, Joseph, 'Archbishop William King (1650-1729): "Church Tory and State Whig?,"' *Eighteenth-Century Ireland/ Iris an dá Chultúr*, 15 (2000), pp.54-76.
- Rigg, J.M., 'Dolben, Sir Gilbert, first baronet (1658/9–1722)', rev. D. W. Hayton, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7774>, accessed 20 Nov 2013].

- Riley, P.W.J., *King William and the Scottish Politicians* (Edinburgh, 1979).
- Riley, P.W.J., 'The Abjuration Vote of 27 June 1702 in the Scottish Parliament,' *Parliamentary History*, Vol. 2 (1983), pp.175-190.
- Riley, P.W.J., 'The Scottish Parliament of 1703,' *The Scottish Historical Review*, 47, No. 144, Part 2 (Oct., 1968), pp.129-50.
- Riley, P.W.J., *The Union of England and Scotland: A Study in Anglo-Scottish Politics of the Eighteenth Century* (Manchester, 1978).
- Rose, Craig, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War* (Oxford, 1999).
- Rubini Dennis, *Court and Country 1688-1702* (London, 1968).
- Rudolph, Julia, *Revolution by Degrees James Tyrrell and Whig Political Thought in the Late Seventeenth Century* (Basingstoke, 2002).
- Scott, Geoffrey, 'Corker, James (1636–1715)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6317, accessed 13 Nov 2013].
- Schochet, Gordon J., 'Between Lambeth and Leviathan: Samuel Parker on the Church of England and Political Order,' in Nicholas Phillipson & Quentin Skinner (eds.) *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Schwoerer, Lois, 'Locke, Lockean Ideas, and the Glorious Revolution,' *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 51, No. 4 (Oct.-Dec., 1990), pp.531-548.
- Schwoerer, Lois G., *No Standing Armies: The Antiarmy ideology in Seventeenth-Century England* (London/ Baltimore, 1974).
- Schwoerer, Lois G., 'Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89,' *The American Historical Review*, 82, No. 4 (Oct., 1977), pp.843-874.
- Schwoerer, Lois G., 'The Coronation of William and Mary, April 11, 1689,' in Lois G. Schworer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Schwoerer, Lois, *The Declaration of Rights, 1689* (London, 1981).
- Schwoerer, Lois, 'The Right to resist: Whig resistance theory, 1688-1694,' in Nicholas Phillipson & Quentin Skinner (eds.) *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Sharpe, Kevin, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (Guilford, 2000).

- Sharpe, Kevin, *Rebranding Rule The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy 1660-1714* (London, 2013).
- Simms, J.G., *Jacobite Ireland 1685-1691* (London, 1969).
- Simms, J.G., 'The Establishment of Protestant Ascendancy 1691-1714,' in T.W. Moody & W.E. Vaughan (eds.) *New History of Ireland IV Eighteenth-Century Ireland 1691-1800* (Oxford, 1986).
- Skinner, Quentin, 'History and Ideology in the English Revolution,' in Quentin Skinner (ed.) *Visions of Politics Volume 3: Hobbes and Civil Service* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Skinner, Quentin, 'The Ideological Context of Hobbes's Political Thought,' *The Historical Journal*, 9, No. 3 (1966), pp.286-317.
- Skinner, Quentin, 'Thomas Hobbes on the Proper Signification of Liberty: The Prothero Lecture,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society Fifth Series*, Vol. 40 (1990), pp.121-51.
- Slaughter, Thomas P., "'Abdicate" and "Contract" in the Glorious Revolution,' *The Historical Journal*, 24, No. 2 (Jun. 1981), pp.323-337.
- Smith, David L., *The Stuart Parliaments 1603-1689* (London, 1999).
- Smith, Nigel, *Literature and Revolution in England 1640-1660* (London, 1994).
- Smyth, Jim, *The Making of the United Kingdom, 1660-1800: State, Religion and Identity in Britain and Ireland* (London, 2001).
- Sommerville, J.P., 'Absolutism and Royalism,' in J.H Burns & Mark Goldie (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700* (Cambridge, 1991).
- Sommerville, J.P., *Thomas Hobbes Political Ideas in Historical Context* (Basingstoke, 1992).
- Sowerby, Scott, *Making Toleration The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution* (London, 2013).
- Speck, W.A., *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford, 1988).
- Speck, W.A., 'William - and Mary?,' in Lois G. Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Speck, W.A., 'William III and the Three Kingdoms,' in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007).

- Spurr, John, 'Later Stuart Puritanism,' in John Coffey & Paul C.H. Lim (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008).
- Spurr, John, "'The Strongest Bond of Conscience: Oaths and the limits of Tolerance in Early Modern England,' in Harold E. Braun & Edward Vallance (eds.) *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700* (London, 2004).
- Stephen, Jeffrey, *Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland, 1689-1716* (Farnham, 2013).
- Stephen, Jeffrey, 'Defending the Revolution: The Church of Scotland and the Scottish Parliament, 1689-95,' *The Scottish Historical Review*, LXXXIX, No. 227 (April 2010), pp.19-53.
- Stephen, Jeffrey, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707* (Edinburgh, 2007).
- Stewart, Mary Margaret, 'Webster, Alexander (1707-1784),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28939>, accessed 15 October 2012].
- Storrs, Christopher, 'The Union of 1707 and the War of Spanish Succession,' *The Scottish Historical Review*, LXXXVII, Issue 2 (Supplement) (2008), pp.31-44.
- Straka, Gerald, *Anglican Reaction to the Revolution of 1688* (Madison, 1962).
- Straka, Gerald, 'The Final Phase of Divine Right in England, 1688-1702,' *The English Historical Review*, 77, No.305 (October, 1962), pp.638-658.
- Szechi, Daniel, "'A Blueprint for Tyranny?'" Sir Edward Hales and the Catholic Jacobite Response to the Revolution of 1688.' *The English Historical Review*, 116, No. 466 (2001), pp.342-67.
- Szechi, Daniel, *Jacobitism and the Tory Party, 1710-1714* (Edinburgh, 1984).
- Szechi, Daniel, 'Scottish Jacobitism in its International Context,' in T.M. Devine & Jenny Wormald (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History* (Oxford, 2012).
- Szechi, Daniel, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1788* (Manchester, 1994).
- Szechi, Daniel, 'The Jacobite Revolution Settlement, 1689-1696,' *The English Historical Review*, 108, No. 428 (Jul., 1993), pp.610-628.

- Taylor, Stephen, 'Afterword: State Formation, Political Stability and the Revolution of 1688,' in Tim Harris & Stephen Taylor (ed.) *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013).
- Thomson, Mark A., 'Louis XIV and William III, 1689-1697,' *The English Historical Review*, 76, No. 298 (Jan., 1961), pp.37-58.
- Thompson, M.P., 'The idea of conquest in Controversies Over the 1688 Revolution,' *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar., 1977), pp.33-46.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay, *England Under the Stuarts* (London, 1965).
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth-Century Essays* (London, 1987).
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh, "Toleration and Religion after 1688,' in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel & Nicholas Tyacke (eds.) *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991).
- Troost, Wout, 'Ireland's Role in the Foreign Policy of William III,' in Esther Mijers & David Onnekink (eds.) *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context* (Aldershot, 2007).
- Troost, Wout, *William III, The Stadholder-King: A Political Biography* J.C Grayson (trans.) (Aldershot, 2005).
- Tully, James, 'Placing Two Treatises,' in Nicholas Phillipson & Quentin Skinner (eds.) *Political Discourse on Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Tyacke, Nicholas, 'The "Rise of Puritanism" and The Legalizing of Dissent, 1571-1719,' in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel & Nicholas Tyacke (eds.) *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991).
- Vallance, Edward, 'Loyal or Rebellious? Protestant Associations in England 1584-1696,' *The Seventeenth Century*, 17, issue 1, (2002), pp.1-24.
- Vallance, Edward, 'Oaths, Casuistry, and Equivocation, Anglican Responses to the Engagement Controversy,' *The Historical Journal*, 44, No. 1 (Mar., 2001), pp.59-77.

- Vallance, Edward, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: State Oaths, Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1553-1682* (Woodbridge, 2005).
- Vallance, Edward, 'The Decline of Conscience as a Political Guide: William Higden's View of the English Constitution (1709),' in Harold E. Braun & Edward Vallance (eds.) *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700* (London, 2004).
- Vallance, Edward, *The Glorious Revolution 1688: Britain's Fight for Liberty* (London, 2006).
- Vallance, Edward, 'The Kingdom's Case: The Use of Casuistry as a Political Language 1640-1692,' *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 34, No. 4 (Winter, 2002), pp.557-583.
- Van Eijenatten, Joris, 'Reaching audiences: Sermons and orators in Europe,' in Stewart J. Brown & Timothy Tackett (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Christianity Volume 7* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Walsham, Alexandra, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 1993).
- Walsham, Alexandra, 'Ordeals of Conscience: Casuistry, Conformity and Confessional Identity in Post-Reformation England,' in Harold E. Braun & Edward Vallance (eds.) *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700* (London, 2004).
- Walsham, Alexandra, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999).
- Watts, Michael R., *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Oxford, 1978).
- Weil, Rachel J., 'The Politics of Legitimacy: Women and the Warming-pan Scandal,' in Lois G. Schwoerer (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Western, J.R., *Monarchy and Revolution: The English State in the 1680s* (Basingstoke, 1985).
- Whatley, Christopher A., *The Scots and the Union Then and Now* (Edinburgh, 2014).
- Whiteford, D.H., 'Jacobitism as a factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland 1689-1690,' I, *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* XVI, Part II (1967), pp.129-149.

- Whiteford, D.H., 'Jacobitism as a factor in Presbyterian-Episcopalian Relationships in Scotland, The Afflicted Church,' Part II, *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* XVI, Part III, (1968), pp.185-201.
- Woolf, Daniel, 'From Hystories to the Historical,' in Paulina Kewes (ed.) *History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, 2006).
- Worden, Blair, 'Historians and Poets,' in in Paulina Kewes (ed.) *History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, 2006).
- Young, John R., 'Dalrymple, John, first earl of Stair (1648–1707)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7052>, accessed 12 June 2014].
- Zaller, Robert, *The Discourse of Legitimacy in Early Modern England* (Stanford, 2007).
- Zaret, David, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton, 2000).
- Zook, Melinda, 'Turncoats and Double Agents in Restoration and Revolutionary England: The Case of Robert Ferguson, The Plotter,' *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 42, No. 3 (2009), pp.363-78.
- Zwicker, 'Representing the Revolution: Politics and High Culture in 1688,' in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed) *By Force or Default? The Revolution of 1688-1689* (Edinburgh, 1989).

Unpublished Theses

- Clarke, T.N., 'The Scottish Episcopalians 1688-1720,' (University of Edinburgh Ph.D. Thesis, 1987).
- Patrick, Derek J., 'People and Parliament in Scotland 1689-1702,' (University of St. Andrews Ph.D. Thesis, 2002).
- Raffe, Alasdair J.N., 'Religious Controversy and Scottish Society, c.1679-1714,' (University of Edinburgh Ph.D. thesis, 2007).
- Vallance, Edward, 'State Oaths and Political Casuistry in England: 1640-1702,' (University of Oxford D.Phil thesis, 2000).