Union and Empire

The Making of the United Kingdom in 1707

ALLAN I. MACINNES

CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE www.cambridge.org/9780521850797

This page intentionally left blank

Union and Empire

The making of the United Kingdom in 1707 is still a matter of significant political and historical controversy. Allan Macinnes here offers a major new interpretation that sets the Act of Union within a broad European and colonial context and provides a comprehensive picture of its transatlantic and transoceanic ramifications which ranged from the balance of power to the balance of trade. He reexamines English motivations from a colonial as well as a military perspective and assesses the imperial significance of the creation of the United Kingdom. He also explores afresh the commitment of some determined Scots to secure Union for political, religious and opportunist reasons and shows that, rather than an act of statesmanship, the resultant Treaty of Union was the outcome of politically inept negotiations by the Scots. *Union and Empire* will be a major contribution to the history of Britain, empire and early modern state formation.

ALLAN I. MACINNES is Professor of Early Modern History at the University of Strathclyde. He has published extensively on covenants, clans and clearances, British state formation and Jacobitism. His previous publications include *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stuart, 1603–1788* (1996) and, as co-editor with A. H. Williamson, *Shaping the Stuart World, 1603–1714: the American Connection* (2006).

Union and Empire

The Making of the United Kingdom in 1707

Allan I. Macinnes
University of Strathclyde

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK
Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521850797

First published in print format 2007

ISBN-13 978-0-511-45095-2 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-85079-7 hardback

ISBN-13 978-0-521-61630-0 paperback

To Cathie and Donald

Contents

Acknowledgements

Unstinting support and assistance from a variety of individuals and institutions made this book possible. My researches into the making of the United Kingdom were originally facilitated by a series of major research grants from the British Academy that sponsored access to the archives at Dumfries House in Ayrshire, at Mount Stuart House on the Isle of Bute, at Inveraray Castle in Argyllshire, and at Buckminster, Grantham, in Lincolnshire. For permission to work in these archives I am indebted to the late Marquess of Bute, the Trustees of the 10th Duke of Argyll, and the Tollemache family. I deeply appreciate the diligence and organisational flair of my former research assistant Linda Fryer in the collation and structuring of this material. My researches into the Atlantic dimension and into the importance of political economy in shaping the Treaty of Union was made possible by a generous research grant for a project, 'American Colonies, Scottish Entrepreneurs and British State Formation in the Seventeenth Century', which was part of the Arts & Humanities Research Council's funding for the Research Institute for Irish and Scottish Studies as a research centre of excellence at Aberdeen University. My colleague on this project was Esther Mijers, to whom I am indebted for her forensic knowledge of Batavian–Caledonian relations in the seventeenth century. I am also greatly indebted to Alexia Grosjean and Steve Murdoch who ran an associated project on 'Scottish Networks in Northern Europe', which has proved pathbreaking, highly productive and a model of good research practice. I am further indebted to the Arts & Humanities Research Council for funding four months' study leave in 2006, which allowed me time to bring my researches to fruition. In this context, I am also grateful to Robert Frost, the current head of the School of Divinity, History and Philosophy at Aberdeen, not only for authorising my sabbatical from teaching duties in 2005–6, but also for his sage advice on continental European developments around the time of Union in 1707.

My work on the American dimension was aided by a renewed research fellowship (as Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Fellow) at the Huntington

Library in 2005 and the accustomed generosity and assistance from Roy Ritchie (W. M. Keck Foundation Director of Research) and Mary Robertson (William A. Moffet Chief Curator of Manuscripts). Over the years, I have also been able to draw on the expertise, guidance and new pathways opened up by Bob and Barbara Cain, now retired from the North Carolina State Archives. My researches in the United States have been further aided by helpful assistance from the staff in the Newberry Library in Chicago, in the Folger Library and the Library of Congress in Washington DC, in the New York Public Library and in the New England Historic Genealogical Society in Boston. The Rigsarkivet in Copenhagen remains a pleasure to work in, while the Centre historique des Archives Nationales in Paris offers an undoubtedly interesting experience. I have been immensely heartened that George MacKenzie, as Keeper of the Records, has introduced positive changes in the support offered to researchers from beyond the central belt in the National Archives of Scotland. The staff there as always continue to be helpful, as is manifestly the case in the British Library, the Public Record Office (now the National Archives) and the National Library of Scotland. I have also appreciated the assistance received whenever I had the opportunity to work in the city and local archives in Aberdeen, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Dundee, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Orkney and Shetland, as in the university archives at the Bodleian in Oxford and, above all, in the Special Collections at Aberdeen where the staff are quite simply immense, if addicted to chocolate!

I have derived much appreciated intellectual sustenance from the work of my graduate students at Aberdeen, notably Linas Eriksonas, Jeffrey Stephen and James Vance. I have also been privileged to read the ongoing research endeavours of Gerry Sarney, Abbey Swingen and James Vaughn, who were postgraduates at the University of Chicago during my stint as Visiting Professor in British History in 2003. My evolving ideas on the making of the United Kingdom in 1707 have also been tried out at undergraduate level in my special subject on the Treaty of Union as on dissertation students studying this topic at Aberdeen. I must acknowledge my debt for supportive argument, blatant disagreement and relentless wit to the usual suspects – Sarah Barber, Mike Broers, Ali Cathcart, Tom Devine, Steven Ellis, Tim Harris, Roger Mason, Steve Pincus, Thomas Riis, Kevin Sharpe, Dan Szechi, Art Williamson, Kariann Yokota and John Young. I also have received particularly illuminating insights from Karen Kupperman, Andrew Mackillop, Edward Opalinski and Bill Speck. My researches have also been aided by the intellectual generosity of Bob Harris, Jason Peacey and Justine Taylor. In this context, special mention must be accorded to David Dobson for

his encyclopedic knowledge of Scots in America as in Dutch service. Jean-Frédéric Schaub has also to be thanked for his intellectual input as for his sponsoring of a research fellowship at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales that brought Nicholas Canny and me together in Paris for a month of productive discussion in 2005.

Spiritual sustenance has been provided, on the one hand, by my good friend Revd Canon Emsley Nimmo of St Margaret's in the Gallowgate, Aberdeen, and, on the other, by the lads in the Potterton local of the Scotch malt whisky appreciation society. I must also thank Michael Watson of Cambridge University Press for his encouragement, forbearance and relaxed negotiating style, and Leigh Mueller for her meticulous diligence and her constructive copy-editing. However, I shall lay sole claim to the sins of omission and commission in the production of this book. Last, but by no means least, I thank my wife Tine Wanning for her love and support, stress counselling, and final preparation of the typescript.

Abbreviations

ACA	Aberdeen City Archives
ACS	*Annals and Correspondence of the Viscount and the First and Second Earls of Stair*, ed. J. M. Graham, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1875)
AHR	*American Historical Review*
APC, Colonial	*Acts of the Privy Council Colonial Series*, ed. W. L. Grant & J. Munro, 2 vols. (London, 1908–10).
APS	*Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, ed. T. Thomson & C. Innes, 12 vols. (Edinburgh, 1814–72)
AUL	Aberdeen University Library
BL	British Library, London
BOU	Bodleian Library, Oxford University
Bruce, *REC*	John Bruce, *Report on the Events and Circumstances which produced the Union of England and Scotland*, 2 vols. (London, 1799).
Buccleuch	HMC, *Report on the Manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleuch & Queensberry preserved at Montague House, Whitehall*, vol. II, part 2 (London, 1903)
Burnet's HHOT	*Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time: from the Restoration of King Charles the Second to the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the reign of Queen Anne* (London, 1857)
CBJ	*Correspondence of George Baillie of Jerviswood, 1702–1708*, ed. George Elliot, Earl of Minto (Edinburgh, 1842).
Crossrigg, *DPP*	Sir David Hume of Crossrigg, *A Diary of the Proceedings in the Parliament and Privy Council of Scotland, 1700–1707*, ed. J. Hope (Edinburgh, 1828).
CSP, Colonial	*Calendars of State Papers, Colonial: America and the West Indies*, ed. W. M. Sainsbury, J. W.

	Fortescue & C. Headlam, 17 vols. (London, 1880–1916).
CTB	*Calendar of Treasury Books* (1706–1708), ed. W. A. Shaw, vols. XXI–XXII (1950–2).
DCA	Dundee City Archives
Defoe, *HUGB*	Daniel Defoe, *The History of the Union of Great Britain* (Edinburgh, 1709)
DH	Dumfries House, Cumnock, Ayrshire
EHR	*English Historical Review*
Fountainhall, *HNS*	Sir John Lauder of Fountainhall, *Historical Notices of Scottish Affairs (1661–1688)*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1848)
GCA	Glasgow City Archives
HJ	*Historical Journal*
HL	Huntington Library, San Marino, California
HMC	Historical Manuscripts Commission
ICA	Inveraray Castle Archives, Inveraray, Argyllshire
IHS	*Irish Historical Studies*
ISL	*Intimate Society Letters of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Duke of Argyll, 2 vols. (London, 1910).
JHC	*Journal of the House of Commons*
JHL	*Journals of the House of Lords*
Laing	HMC, *Report on the Laing Manuscripts preserved in the University of Edinburgh*, vol. II, ed. H. Paton (London, 1925)
LDD	*The Letters of Daniel Defoe*, ed. G. H. Healey (Oxford, 1955).
LDN	*The London Diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle 1702–1718*, ed. C. Jones & G. Holmes (Oxford, 1985).
Lords	HMC, *Manuscripts of the House of Lords*, original series, 3 vols. (1689–93), ed. E. F. Taylor & F. Skene (London, 1889–94); new series, 7 vols. (1693–1708), ed. C. L. Anstruther, J. P. St John, C. Headlam, J. B. Hotham, F. W. Lascelles & C. K. Davidson (London, 1900–21).
LP	*The Lockhart Papers: Memoirs and Correspondence upon the Affairs of Scotland from 1702 to 1715*, ed. A. Aufrere, 2 vols. (London, 1817).

LQA	*The Letters and Diplomatic Instructions of Queen Anne*, ed. B. C. Brown (London, 1968)
LRS	*Letters Relating to Scotland in the Reign of Queen Anne by James Ogilvy, First Earl of Seafield and others*, ed. P. H. Brown (Edinburgh, 1915).
Macpherson, *OP*	James Macpherson, *Original Papers, containing the secret history of Great Britain from the Restoration, to the accession of the House of Hanover*, 2 vols. (London, 1775).
Mar & Kellie	HMC, *Report on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Mar and Kellie preserved at Alloa House*, ed. H. Paton (London, 1904)
Marchmont	HMC, *The Manuscripts of the Duke of Roxburghe; Sir H. H. Campbell, bart.; the Earl of Strathmore; and the Countess Dowager of Seafield* (London, 1894)
MGC	*The Marlborough–Godolphin Correspondence*, ed. H. L. Snyder, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1975).
MLP	*Memoirs of the Life of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik*, ed. J. M. Gray (Edinburgh, 1892)
MSH	Mount Stuart House, Rothesay, Isle of Bute
MSSM	*Memoirs of the Secret Services of John Macky, esq., during the reign of King William, Queen Anne and King George I*, ed. J. M. Gray (London, 1895).
NAS	National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh
NLC	Newberry Library, Chicago
NLS	National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh
NROB	Northumberland Record Office, Berwick-upon-Tweed
Ormonde	HMC, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde K. P. preserved at Kilkenny Castle*, new series, vol. VIII (London, 1920)
PEM	*A Selection from the Papers of the Earls of Marchmont illustrative of events from 1685–1750*, ed. G. H. Rose, 3 vols. (London, 1831).
Penicuik, *HUSE*	Sir John Clerk of Penicuik, *History of the Union of Scotland and England*, ed. D. Duncan (Edinburgh, 1993)
PH	*Parliamentary History*
Portland	HMC, *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, preserved at Welbeck Abbey*, vol. IV, ed.

	J. J. Cartwright (London, 1897) and vol. VIII, ed. S. C. Lomas (London, 1907).
PRO	Public Record Office, London (now National Archives)
RC	Rigsarkivet, Copenhagen
Ridpath, *PPS*	[George Ridpath], *The Proceedings of the Parliament of Scotland begun at Edinburgh 6 May 1703* (Edinburgh, 1704)
RPCS	*Registers of the Privy Council of Scotland*, first series, ed. D. Masson, 14 vols. (Edinburgh, 1877–98); second series, ed. D. Masson & P. H. Brown, 8 vol. (Edinburgh, 1899–1908); third series, ed. P. H. Brown, H. Paton & E. W. M. Balfour-Melville, 16 vol. (Edinburgh, 1908–70).
RSCHS	*Records of the Scottish Church History Society*
SC	*Seafield Correspondence from 1685 to 1708*, ed. J. Grant (Edinburgh, 1912).
SHR	*Scottish Historical Review*
SPC	*State Papers and Letters addressed to William Carstares, Secretary to King William*, ed. J. McCormick (Edinburgh, 1774).
SR	*'Scotland's Ruine': Lockhart of Carnwath's Memoirs of the Union*, ed. D. Szechi (Aberdeen, 1995).
TFA	Tollemache Family Archives, Buckminster, Grantham, Lincolnshire
TKUA	Tyske Kancellis Udenrigske Afdeling

Part I

Setting the Scenes

1 Introduction

The joining of Scotland and England to form the United Kingdom through the Treaty of Union in 1707 is still a matter of controversy. And as long as the Union endures, it is likely to remain so. Of course, this controversy plays more strongly in Scotland than England, since the former country clearly lost its political independence. In the latter country, the Union has tended to be viewed as an expeditious constitutional adjustment to lay a secure basis for the expansion of Empire.[1] This controversy is not just political; it is also historiographic.[2] Much ink has been spilt in claiming, on the one hand, that the Union was a farsighted act of statesmanship that laid the basis not just for the British imperial expansion on a global scale, but also the modernising of Scotland. On the other hand, the Union has from its inception been castigated as a sordid political exercise in which avaricious Scottish parliamentarians betrayed their country for English gold and, in the process, eradicated Scotland's capacity to determine its own course towards modernity.

Although Scottish animation on the subject of Union has often stood in marked contrast to English indifference, the advent of devolution in 1999 has sharpened English awareness of ongoing constitutional issues from 1707. Indeed, the United Kingdom is undergoing a constitutional transition from a unitary state that is a continuous, but not necessarily a conciliatory, process in which an incorporating union can no longer be taken for granted. British state formation, transformation and perhaps even disintegration constitute a heady intermingling of perception and reality that requires some preliminary sketching.

[1] See that the Treaty of Union does not even in feature in E. N. Williams, *The Eighteenth Century Constitution: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge, 1960), while it merits a separate section in *A Source Book of Scottish History*, vol. III, ed. W. C. Dickinson & G. Donaldson (Edinburgh, 1961), pp. 469–95.

[2] See A. I. Macinnes, 'Early Modern History: The Current State of Play', *SHR*, 53 (1994), pp. 30–46.

The formation of early modern states was achieved usually by association and coalescence or by annexation and conquest.[3] The political incorporation of Great Britain accomplished in 1707 involved only two of the three kingdoms held by the British monarchy. Ireland was not included. England had absorbed Wales (and Cornwall) by 1543 through parliamentary incorporation, administrative cohesion in church and state, and the political if not the cultural integration of the ruling elites. However, Ireland, despite being declared a dependant kingdom in 1541, was not incorporated into a composite English kingdom. Successive Tudor monarchs failed to effect conquest and achieved little integration outwith Dublin and the surrounding Pale. The limited advent of the Protestant Reformation in Ireland further compounded this failure. This uneasy relationship was aggravated by plantation and large-scale migration to Ireland from Scotland as well as England in the seventeenth century.[4]

Nevertheless, the current narrative of state formation casts the multiple kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland on a transitional stage in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; from a composite English kingdom in 1603 to a unified kingdom for Britain in 1707 and then for Britain and Ireland in 1800.[5] Did the accession of James VI of Scotland to the English throne in 1603 inevitably pave the way for the United Kingdom of Great Britain in 1707, to which Ireland was added in 1800?[6] The move from regal or dynastic union to parliamentary union was not seamless. The English parliament rejected full union with Scotland in 1607 and 1670, and Irish overtures for political incorporation in 1703, 1707 and 1709. A proposal for union in the House of Lords in 1695 never got off the ground and another at the outset of 1700 was rejected in

[3] J. H. Elliot, 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', *Past & Present*, 137 (1992), pp. 48–71; M. Greengrass, 'Introduction: Conquest and Coalescence' in M. Greengrass, ed., *Conquest and Coalescence: The Shaping of the State in Early Modern Europe* (London, 1991), pp. 1–24.

[4] C. Brady, 'The Decline of the Irish Kingdom' in Greengrass, ed., *Conquest and Coalescence*, pp. 94–115; S. G. Ellis, 'Tudor State Formation and the Shaping of the British Isles" in S. G. Ellis & S. Barber, eds., *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485–1725* (London, 1995), pp. 40–63.

[5] See A. Murdoch, *British History, 1660–1832: National Identity and Local Culture* (Basingstoke, 1998); J. Smyth, *The Making of the United Kingdom, 1660–1800* (Harlow, 2001).

[6] See B. P. Levack, *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland and the Union, 1603–1707* (Oxford, 1987); K. M. Brown, *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union, 1603–1715* (Basingstoke, 1992); D. L. Smith, *A History of the Modern British Isles, 1603–1707: the Double Crown* (Oxford, 1998); M. Kishlansky, A *Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603–1714* (London, 1996); J. Morrill, 'The British Problem, c.1534–1707' in B. Bradshaw & J. Morrill, eds., *The British Problem, c.1534–1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 1–38.

the House of Commons. For their part, the Scottish Estates favoured a federative union[7] in 1641 and 1643, split over incorporating union in 1648 and resisted incorporating overtures in 1689 and 1702 – albeit, like the Irish parliament, they were forced into an unwanted union at the behest of the English Commonwealth in 1651, repackaged as the Protectorate from 1654. During the Restoration era, Scottish moves towards commercial union initiated in 1664 were rebuffed in 1668. A similar English initiative never got off the drawing board in 1674 or in 1685.[8] Not only must the inevitability of Union be questioned, but also whether the Treaty of 1707 represented an equitable accommodation of English and Scottish interests.

As England's wealth and resources were as much as ten times greater than those of Wales, Ireland and Scotland combined, the adjustment from England to Great Britain could be viewed essentially as a cosmetic exercise to appease the Scots. Indeed, the terms 'England' and 'Britain' or 'English' and 'British' continue to be viewed as interchangeable, not just by Scotland's southern neighbours but also by foreign powers, peoples and institutions, until the present day. Undoubtedly, political power from 1707 was centred in England, albeit this power was exercised imperially through the British Empire until its demise in the twentieth century. Thus, governance was viewed as English, but the dominions ruled from London were British. From an anglocentric perspective, England was a global power prior to 1707 and for over two centuries thereafter. The British appellation to the Empire courteously recognised the supplementary endeavours of the other peoples from the British Isles.

For the Scots, however, there was clearly a major step up from a Scottish kingdom to a British Empire. At the same time, incorporation with England did not fundamentally alter their separate Kirk, their distinctive legal system and particular forms of local government until state intervention became the norm rather than the exception from the mid nineteenth century. Incorporation, therefore, could be viewed initially as a partnership, albeit not necessarily an equal partnership given the disparity of wealth and resources. This partnership had particular force

[7] The term 'federative' denotes a relationship that can be either confederal or federal. A federative union can be viewed as an association or confederation of executive powers authorised by the Scottish and the English parliaments that did not involve the subordination or incorporation of these separate constitutional assemblies. A federalist position would have subordinated the Scottish and the English Parliaments to a British assembly. Full parliamentary union, as achieved in 1707, required the incorporation or merger of the Scottish parliament with the English.

[8] A. I. Macinnes, 'Politically Reactionary Brits?: The Promotion of Anglo-Scottish Union, 1603–1707' in S. J. Connolly, ed., *Kingdoms United? Great Britain and Ireland since 1500: Integration and Diversity* (Dublin, 1999), pp. 43–55.

within the British Empire. New territorial acquisitions in the West and East Indies in the eighteenth century and in Africa in the nineteenth, created a level playing field for enterprise and endeavour that ranged from venture capitalism to missionary work, through colonial administration and military careerism. For the Scots, the Empire cemented their commitment to the British adventure.[9] From a non-anglocentric perspective, the British Empire was manifestly a greater entity than the English, no less than the Scottish, kingdom.

Although the Empire in the course of the twentieth century was transformed into a Commonwealth of independent states, not all of whom have retained the monarchy, the Union of 1707 is now entering its fourth century. At the same time, devolution, particularly in Scotland, has tended to be viewed as a process. However, the making of the Treaty is no more an issue devolved to Scottish historians than a reserved matter for British history. Indeed, the Union of 1707, which brought together two sovereign kingdoms with their own representative assemblies, established churches and legal systems, was accomplished through an international treaty. The Treaty was negotiated and concluded in the midst of a war being waged in Europe and the Americas. Commercial no less than constitutional relationships were to be resolved. Thus, the Union of 1707 had not only transatlantic but transoceanic ramifications that ranged from the balance of power to the balance of trade.

In attempting to understand and unravel the complexities involved in the making of the Treaty of Union, a holistic rather than a particularist approach is required, to examine forensically and then to challenge fundamentally why England and Scotland negotiated an incorporating union. There are in fact six guiding principles for avoiding insularity and introspection, for integrating policy and process, and for connecting domestic and imperial history. The first two principles relate to state formation. In promoting a non-anglocentric view of union, the process of state formation will take account of the Irish as well as the English and Scottish situations: in the first case, union failed; in the second, union was accomplished. At the same time, union with England was not the sole issue on the Scottish political agenda at the outset of the eighteenth century. Scotland's formative relationships with not just the English, but also the Dutch, will be examined in terms of transoceanic associations. Two other key principles emerge in relation to the actual

[9] T. M. Devine, *Scotland's Empire, 1600–1815* (London, 2003), and M. Fry, *The Scottish Empire* (Edinburgh, 2001), who have fundamentally different interpretations of Scottish engagement with the British Empire, at least agree on this point. A constructive précis of the importance of this imperial engagement can be found in D. Allan, *Scotland in the Eighteenth Century: Union and Enlightenment* (Harlow, 2002), pp. 165–85.

making of Union. Issues of political economy will be rehabilitated, as will divisions of substance between proponents and opponents of Union. To this end, the debates on Union, which were conducted through the press and the pulpit, will be rigorously analysed with respect to parliamentary votes and extra-parliamentary protests. The final two principles relate to English and British interests. English motivation for Union will be reappraised from a colonial, as well as the traditional military, perspective, and a summative assessment will be offered on the imperial significance of the creation of the United Kingdom.

An immense advantage for any holistic study of the making of the Anglo-Scottish Union is the richness of the published and manuscript sources. There is a plethora of official records for the English and Scottish parliaments, as for the executive and judicial agencies of government within the British Isles and the colonies. Antiquarian societies and historical clubs have sponsored published commentaries by players in and observers of the political process that culminated in the Treaty of 1707.[10] In this respect, Scotland has been particularly well served, with such publication being instigated as an aspect of civic patriotism in the nineteenth century and further stimulated by the Disruption within Scottish Presbyterianism in 1843. With the breakaway Free Kirk contesting the claims of the Established Kirk to speak for Scotland at home and abroad, their rivalry extended to historical issues no less than to matters of faith, and to social welfare and education as to urban and overseas missions.[11] The call for Home Rule from the later nineteenth century sustained the momentum for eclectic issuing of source material on Scottish history in which the Treaty of Union continued to feature prominently. At the same time, the publication of sources has been further enhanced by the comprehensive identification of pamphlets relating to Union that have now been catalogued systematically, with the relevant texts largely made available electronically either by Early English Books Online (EEBO) or by Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO).[12]

Technological advance through the computerising of abstracts and the digitisation of documents has further facilitated archival research, continuously offering up exciting discoveries of material pertinent to Union. In addition to examining selectively the vast array of primary sources on

[10] See D. Stevenson & W. B. Stevenson, *Scottish Text and Calendars: An Analytical Guide to Serial Publications* (Edinburgh, 1987).

[11] L. Eriksonas, *National Heroes and National Identities: Scotland, Norway and Lithuania* (Brussels, 2004), pp. 147–60; M. Ash, *The Strange Death of Scottish History* (Edinburgh, 1980), pp. 59–86.

[12] W. R. McLeod & V. B. McLeod, *Anglo-Scottish Tracts, 1701–1714* (Kansas, 1979); http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home?ath; http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/ECCO.

this topic in such major depositories as the British Library, the Public Records Office (now National Archives), the National Library of Scotland, National Archives of Scotland and the Aberdeen University Special Collections, this book has been grounded in three archival collections – firstly the Loudon Papers, dispersed between Dumfries House in Ayrshire, Mount Stuart House on the Isle of Bute and the Huntington Library, San Marino, California; secondly, the Bridgewater & Ellesmere Manuscripts and the Blathwayt Papers also at the Huntington Library; and thirdly, the section among the Tyske Kancellis Udenrigske Afdeling [TKUA] in the Rigsarkivet, Copenhagen, marked as relating to England, but dealing with Britain.

Pre-eminent among the papers relating to the political activities of Hugh Campbell, 3rd Earl of Loudoun, and his associates, from the accession of Queen Anne in 1702 until the conclusion of the Treaty in 1707, are the detailed correspondence of Sir David Nairn and the diaries of Colonel William Dalrymple of Glenmure, covering the last two sessions of the Scottish and the first of the British parliaments, 1705–8.[13] Sir David Nairn was based in London where he maintained a watching brief over the English ministries and reported regularly to Loudoun, a politician usually overlooked in narratives of Union even though he was Secretary of State for Scotland before and after the Treaty. Nairn also served as secretary to the Scottish commissioners when the details of the Treaty were negotiated with their English counterparts from April to July 1706. His finger on the pulse of English politics was complemented by his concern for the nuts and bolts of the political process as the Union progressed through the final session of the Scottish Estates from October 1706 to January 1707. His letters to Loudoun complement rather than replicate

[13] Dumfries House, Ayrshire, Loudoun Papers A 817/1–3. The correspondence with Sir David Nairn is split between deed boxes in Dumfries House and in Mount Stuart House. The Earl of Loudoun's correspondence is spread over forty-seven volumes in the Loudoun Scottish Collection at the Huntington Library, San Marino, California. Two other unpublished diaries deal with the political circumstances and proceedings of the last session of the Scottish Estates in 1706–7. The one more focused on parliament is probably by Walter Stewart of Pardovan, burgh commissioner for Linlithgow, although it has also been ascribed to two others, both Presbyterian ministers, the antiquarian Robert Wodrow and the radical leader Robert Wyllie (NLS, Wodrow MS, quarto lxxv, 'Ane Short Account of the proceedings of the Last Session of the Scottish Parliament. With some necessary reflections thereupon', fols.138–60). All three putative authors were opponents of Union, but Stewart of Pardovan, who was a burgh commissioner from 1700, is the more likely as the writer claims to have attended the last and the proceeding parliament. His reflections were drawn up no earlier than 1713. The other diary by J. B., almost certainly John Bell, Presbyterian minister of Gladsmuir in East Lothian, is concerned mainly with the affairs of the Kirk of Scotland as they impinged upon parliament (NLS, Wodrow MS, quarto lxxxii, 'The IInd Part of the Most Remarkable Passages of the Life and Times of Mr J. B., written with his own Hand', ff. 49–96).

his published correspondence with the other Scottish Secretary of State, John Erskine, 6th Earl of Mar.[14]

Dalrymple of Glenmure was a commissioner for the shire of Ayr and a supporter of Union. Nevertheless his diaries reveal that political incorporation with England was neither a foregone conclusion nor an unsophisticated exercise in political management. At the same time, his diaries disclose that issues of principle were not sidelined by the manipulative political influences that purportedly dominated the last session of the Scottish Estates. Indeed, his diaries demonstrate how the extra-parliamentary polemical debates fed into the parliamentary proceedings, and thereby seriously question the concession, by historians of ideas, that speeches, like pamphlets, 'made little impression on the actions of Scottish parliamentarians'.[15] This concession, made to the proponents of the supremacy of a parliamentary process governed by political pragmatism, is further undermined methodologically by historical computing. Analysis of accumulated data with respect to voting patterns and other measurable political influences has suggested that issues of principle inspired proponents no less than opponents of Union. In turn, a relatively high incidence of cross-party voting suggests issues were debated on their merits, as affirmed by Dalrymple of Glenure and other contemporary reports of parliamentary proceedings which acknowledge that players in the making of Union were both polemicists and politicians.[16]

The extensive materials at the Huntington Library on English diplomats, policy makers and colonial officials who reported regularly to the Board of Trade and Plantations concerning Scottish engagement with the American colonies as entrepreneurs and planters, and occasionally as preferred associates of the Dutch, reveal unexpected insights into English commercial motivation for Union.[17] Their reports echo the warnings and vociferous complaints from English merchants on both sides of the Atlantic, about Scottish competition in Ireland, Scandinavia and continental Europe as well as the Americas. In turn, if the Union is to be viewed as creating a structure for sustainable economic growth,[18]

[14] *Mar & Kellie*, pp. 273–387.

[15] C. Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689 – c.1830* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 36–7.

[16] A. I. Macinnes, 'Influencing the Vote: The Scottish Estates and the Treaty of Union, 1706–07', *History Microcomputer Review*, 2 (1990), pp. 11–25.

[17] In addition to the Bridgewater & Ellesmere MSS and Blathwayt Papers, other relevant material is also found at the Huntington Library, primarily in the miscellaneous Huntington Manuscripts (HM) series, the Stowe Collection and the Hastings Irish Papers.

[18] T. C. Smout, 'Introduction' in T. C. Smout, ed., *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603 to 1900* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 1–12.

this structure was devised primarily in the interests of England not of Scotland. Innovatory insights can thus be offered on imperial, manufacturing and demographic considerations influencing England to press for political incorporation in the reign of Queen Anne.

Among the vast range of papers classified under TKUA are copybooks of diplomatic letters from the British Court from the accession of Queen Anne to the Union. In particular, Iver Rosenkrantz, as envoy extraordinary between 1702 and 1705, wrote a detailed diplomatic letter at least once a week as a close confidant of Prince George of Denmark, Queen Anne's consort, as well as an assiduous cultivator of leading members of the English and Scottish ministries. His perspective from the Court on the making of Union is not only candid and absorbing but also revelatory. Seemingly, the outstanding issue for the credibility of Scottish and English politicians serving the queen as ministers was their commitment to the royal prerogative, specifically to its conservation, rather than to the furtherance of the Revolution Settlements of 1688–91 which had imposed permanent checks on the monarchy in England, Scotland and Ireland as well as replacing James II of Great Britain (& VII of Scotland) with his Dutch son-in-law, William of Orange. William had subsequently been succeeded by his sister-in-law Anne (the daughter of James II by his first marriage). However, Anne's children having all predeceased her by her accession, the succession to the three kingdoms lay with either the closest Protestant heir from the electoral house of Hanover or a return to the direct line of the Stuarts, now in exile at Saint-Germain outside Paris. The former was certainly favoured by the Whigs and, more equivocally, by the Tories, who had effected the Revolution Settlements; the latter, by the Jacobites who had opposed them. The Hanoverian Succession, promoted in England in 1701 and accepted in Ireland by 1703, was only secured in Scotland by the Union. At the same time, the ongoing War of the Spanish Succession threatened to become the War of the British Succession once Louis XIV of France recognised Anne's Roman Catholic half-brother as James III (& VIII). In this light, the Union was less relevant to perpetuating the Revolution than to securing a Protestant Succession in which, as Rosenkrantz makes clear, Anne was not a cipher who waited upon events but a determined and proactive player.[19]

If English interests can be said to be driven by the primacy of political economy in war and peace and if Queen Anne was pre-eminently

[19] RC, TKUA England, Akter og Dokumenter nedr Sofart og Handel: Order med Bilag, 1702–7, A.III/ 207–10, /214–17. Rosenkrantz as envoy extraordinary from 1702 to 1705 was succeeded for 1706–7 by Malthias Balthazar. In the interim, the reports were filed by diplomatic secretary Jens Elling.

motivated by the desire to conserve the royal prerogative, the making of the Treaty of Union also required a core group of determined Scottish politicians intent on political incorporation to secure the royal prerogative, the Presbyterian establishment in the Kirk and, ultimately, the Protestant Succession at the expense of an independent Scottish parliament no less than the exiled Catholic house of Stuart. The political resolve of this core grouping of Unionists made the accomplishment of the Treaty of 1707 an act of managerial sophistication, not a crude exercise in political influence. Conversely, accompanying polemical claims that political incorporation was the only realistic means of securing economic stability and growth in Scotland must be treated with caution. The institutional perspectives of government, incorporated burghs, colonial companies and even merchant houses present a far from complete and an overly pessimistic picture. Journals, letter and account books detailing the operation of Scottish commercial networks from the Baltic to the Mediterranean and on to the Caribbean reveal a burgeoning entrepreneurship that could certainly be enhanced by closer political collaboration; but not necessarily with England nor exclusively by the Treaty of Union.[20]

However, before we bring these fresh political, economic and diplomatic perspectives together to construct a holistic analysis of the making of the Anglo-Scottish Union, we must first deconstruct the historiography arising from the Treaty of 1707. At the same time, we must take cognisance of the historian's craft as outlined by a leading figure of the Scottish Enlightenment, Adam Ferguson, in *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767):

> If conjectures and opinions formed at a distance, have not sufficient authority in the history of mankind, the domestic antiquities of every nation, must for this very reason, be received with caution. They are, for most part, the mere conjectures or the fiction of subsequent ages; and even where at first they contained some resemblance of truth, they still vary with the imagination of those by whom they are transmitted, and in every generation receive a different form.[21]

[20] See NAS, Journal of William Fraser, merchant, London, 1699–1711, CS 96/524; Letter and account book of John Watson, younger, merchant, Edinburgh, 1696–1713, CS 96/3309; Memorandum, account and letter book of William and John Cowan, merchants, Stirling, 1697–1754, CS 96/1944; Letter book of John Swinton of that Ilk, merchant, London, 1673–1677, CS 96/3264; Letter book of Gilbert Robertson, merchant, Edinburgh, 1690–1694, CS 96/1726; Commission book, James Ramsay, merchant, Rotterdam, 1691–1694, CS 96/1337; and Account book of James Lawson, merchant, Anstruther Easter, 1688–1698, CS 96/3263. AUL, Account books of George Ross of Clochcan, merchant in Aberdeen, 1679–1703, Leith Ross MS 3346/12/7–8; Letter book of Robert Gerard, senior and junior, merchants in Aberdeen, 1677–1702, Duff House (Montcoffer Papers) MS 3175/Z/156.

[21] Adam Ferguson, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society 1767*, ed. D. Forbes (Edinburgh, 1966), p. 76.

2 The historiography

The historiography of the Treaty of Union reflects the changing and interchanging domestic and imperial perspectives. In the process, it tells us much about the reception and perception of Union, without necessarily coming to grips with its conception and delivery. Indeed, the historiography has three pronounced features – its longevity, its partisanship and its ideological fragmentation. It is long on emphatic pronouncements but short on scientific rigour and academic detachment as the Union has been challenged but never broken over the last 300 years, neither by Jacobitism in the eighteenth century nor by Home Rule movements from the nineteenth century. Commentators on the Union have ranged from players and spectators at the outset, through the intellectuals and improvers of the Enlightenment, to professional academics in history and cognate disciplines. Along the way, novelists, clergymen, lawyers, journalists and diplomats have made contributions that were no less significant or informed. Their diverse offerings set the scenes for a wider contextualising that will extend far beyond the confines of Anglo-Scottish relations.

Jacobites and Whigs

Partisans and activists who were far from averse to self-serving observations provided the initial commentaries on Union. First up was Daniel Defoe, novelist, polemicist and spy, who was sent to Scotland by the English ministry in 1706 to facilitate the passage of Union. His unattributed *The History of England from the beginning of the reign of Queen Anne, to the conclusion of the Glorious Treaty of Union between England and Scotland*, which was rushed out in 1707, placed the Union as the culmination of a series of battles, sieges, victories and turns of fortune by land and sea that characterised the allied endeavours under John Churchill, 1st Duke of Marlborough, against the forces of Louis XIV of France during the War of the Spanish Succession. However, he does deal painstakingly with the how, when and where of political incorporation which is the primary focus of his more reflective and attributed *The History of the*

Union of Great Britain (1709). Greater attention was given to the passage of Union through the unicameral Scottish parliament, consisting of the three estates of the nobility, the gentry and the burgesses; the former being individually summoned and the latter two estates represented respectively by shire and burgh commissioners. The ratification of Union through the bicameral English parliament was more noted than analysed, with respect to both the unelected House of Lords and the elected House of Commons.[1]

A partial answer as to why Union was accomplished was provided by *Memoirs concerning the Affairs of Scotland from Queen Anne's accession to the Throne, to the Commencement of the Union* (1714), attributed to George Lockhart of Carnwath and published in the year of the Hanoverian Succession. An avid adherent of the exiled house at Saint-Germain, outside Paris, for whose Jacobite cause he was a paramilitary organiser, Lockhart of Carnwath had also served as a commissioner who negotiated Union at Whitehall in 1706, and subsequently as a member of the British parliament. In this latter capacity, he established in 1711 that the English ministry had despatched £20,000 sterling (£240,000 Scots) to shore up support for Union prior to its passage through the Scottish parliament. Lockhart also offered a more sophisticated analysis of party influences, particularly within Scotland. The original divisions in both England and Scotland were based on the Revolution, which had not only exiled James II & VII, but also imposed constitutional checks on monarchy that the Whigs supported, the Tories acquiesced in and the Jacobites opposed. However, the reign of William of Orange post-Revolution witnessed a growing polarity between Court and Country. In Scotland, where the Jacobite presence was more obvious than in England, there was a further division on religious grounds. The Revolution, which had consolidated the Anglican ascendancy in the Church of England, had led to a change in the established Kirk of Scotland. Episcopalianism, as a church run by bishops, was replaced by Presbyterianism, a church run by a hierarchy of ecclesiastical courts. Moreover, from the outset of the reign of Queen Anne in 1702, mounting resentment about direct interference in Scottish affairs by English ministries further refined party divisions. Lockhart was particularly forthright in his characterisation of the principal politicians and their party affiliations. Statesmanship did not figure prominently in the leadership offered to the Court Party by James Douglas, 2nd Duke of Queensberry, nor that offered to the Country Party – led

[1] [Daniel Defoe], *The History of England from the beginning of the reign of Queen Anne, to the conclusion of the Glorious Treaty of Union between England and Scotland* (London, 1707), and Daniel Defoe, *The History of the Union of Great Britain* (Edinburgh, 1709).

nominally by James Douglas-Hamilton, 4th Duke of Hamilton – which included not only the Jacobites grouped around John Murray, 1st Duke of Atholl, but also constitutional reformers led by Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun, who wished to extend the constitutional limitations achieved at the Revolution from the monarchy to the aristocracy. Lockhart's scorn was especially directed at the expedient behaviour of the New Party or Squadrone Volante (Flying Squadron), led by John Hay, 2nd Marquis of Tweeddale, whose shift away from the Country to the Court was critical to the delivery of Union through the Scottish Estates from October 1706 to January 1707.[2]

Abel Boyer, whose trade was effectively that of a lobby journalist at Westminster, produced *The History of the Life and Reign of Queen Anne* in 1722, which was a digest of the voluminous annual reports that he had published studiously between 1703 and 1713. He set the Union firmly within the context of the two defining and enduring issues of Anne's reign; the War of the Spanish Succession in which English forces were aligned against France to maintain the balance of power in Europe, and the endeavours of the partisans of the exiled house of Stuart to set aside the Hanoverian Succession. Although he was a staunch supporter of the Union and attributed political discontent during Anne's reign primarily to the Jacobites, he relied unapologetically on Lockhart's political characterisations for their vitality if not their accuracy. At the same time, in his determination to transcend the 'story-telling' of gazettes, newspapers and state reports, he offered the first detailed insight into the passage of the Union through the Lords and Commons from February to April 1707, basing his work on manuscript journals, reports of speeches and eye-witnessing of proceedings.[3]

Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, an Anglo-Scot and prominent Whig polemicist, who actually (at times despairingly) sat in, and even chaired, proceedings in the House of Lords as the Union passed through the English parliament, offered more varied motivation. In the second

[2] [George Lockhart of Carnwath], *Memoirs concerning the Affairs of Scotland, from Queen Anne's Accession to the Throne, to the Commencement of the Union of the Two Kingdoms of Scotland and England in May 1707* (London, 1714). The seemingly corrupt nature of Union politics was further underlined by the publication of the wholly unreliable memoirs in 1726–7 of John Ker of Kersland, a double, if not a triple, agent ([John Ker], *The Memoirs of John Ker of Kersland in North Britain, Esq., Relating Politicks, Trade and History* (London, 1727)). Alternative and more rounded British characterisation was provided by another Scottish spy, John Macky, in *Memoirs of the Secret Services of John Macky, esq., during the reign of King William, Queen Anne and King George I*, ed. J. M. Gray (London, 1895). His characterisations of English and Scottish politicians, diplomats and military men were drawn up around 1704 but not finalised until 1723 and not prepared for publication until 1732.

[3] Abel Boyer, *The History of the Life and Reign of Queen Anne* (London, 1722).

volume of *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time*, which appeared posthumously in 1734, he affirmed that England had generously conceded Union in order to shut the back door to invasion from France, whose king, Louis XIV, was backing the Jacobites. In addition, the Union offered the Scots redress for their failed colonial venture, the Darien Scheme on the Panama Isthmus, which William of Orange had signally failed to support in the late 1690s. At the same time, the Scots were liberated from an oppressive and corrupt ministry who had governed their country with partiality and venality since the Revolution. The firm commitment of Queen Anne in favour of Union was also decisive, as was the low state of France, which could spare neither men nor money to support a Jacobite rising that would have turned the ongoing War of the Spanish Succession into that of the British Succession.[4]

These texts became the basic sources for the making of the Anglo-Scottish Union for the next two centuries. As Jacobitism, which was committed to the abrogation of the Treaty of Union,[5] was far more vibrant in Scotland than in England, Scottish commentators were initially more muted in their comments.[6] In England, John Oldmixon, an unapologetic Francophobe, a Whig polemicist and virulent anti-Jacobite, considered the Union as no more than a constitutional adjustment in English history that happened to occur in the midst of the War of the Spanish Succession. *The History of England* (1735), which commenced with his glorification of the Revolution instigated by the invasion of William of Orange from the Netherlands, continued through the reigns of Queen Anne and that of the first Hanoverian, George I. Scottish affairs, which were no more than an interruption to his narrative, were reported with disparagement.

[4] Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time*, 2 vols. (London, 1724–34), and *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time: from the Restoration of King Charles the Second to the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the reign of Queen Anne* (London, 1857).

[5] *Historical Papers relating to the Jacobite Period, 1699–1750*, ed. J. Allardyce, 2 vols. (Aberdeen, 1895), I, pp. 177–92; *The Jacobite Threat: A Source Book*, ed. B. P. Lenman & G. S. Gibson (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 122–6.

[6] James Wallace, *History of the Lives and Reigns of the Kings of Scotland from Fergus the first King, continued to the commencement of the Union of the Two Kingdoms of Scotland and England in the year of the reign of our late Sovereign Queen Anne, Anno Domini, 1707* (Dublin, 1722), was concerned more with the failed union of 1702 at the commencement of Queen Anne's reign. As befitting a Presbyterian not entirely convinced about the merits of Union, but not wishing to be identified with Jacobitism, Wallace concluded his discourse with a note of regret that the ancient nation which had been reputedly known to the world for the past 2,037 years as 'Scotland', was now to be called 'North-Britain'. Another Presbyterian author, George Craufurd, *The Lives and Characters, of the Officers of the Crown, and of the State in Scotland, from the beginnings of the reign of King David I to the Union of the Two Kingdoms* (London, 1726), made little of the actual accomplishment of Union other than to commend the officers cited for their public service in securing a Protestant Succession through the House of Hanover.

Thus, Lockhart of Carnwath was villainous, the Scottish parliament was more prone to violent exchanges than reasoned debate, and association with Saint-Germain tainted all leaders of the opposition.[7]

Nicholas Tindal covered the same chronological span in his voluminous history of England (1744–6). This Anglican clergyman offered a more measured, but nonetheless unashamedly pro-Whig and anti-Jacobite, scrutiny of the Union, as befitting an endeavour accomplished in time for the last great rising in favour of the exiled house of Stuart. Again the Union, though characterised as one of the distinguishing glories of Queen Anne's reign, was no more than a constitutional adjustment in an English narrative. Nevertheless, Tindal's sophisticated appreciation of party interests within the Scottish parliament transcended his heavy borrowing from Burnet. Although he did not discount the politics of influence and the judicious use of money to facilitate its passage, Union was carried in Scotland in the teeth of opposition from Jacobites and some Presbyterian clergymen because those members of the Scottish gentry who had visited England frequently had come to admire the protection the House of Commons offered to civil liberties and from partial judges. The commercial opportunities for unfettered access to the American colonies guaranteed by Union and secured by the Royal Navy was also a significant inducement. But the principal factor in accomplishing Union was reputedly the unselfish behaviour of the party of nobles and gentry known as the Squadrone Volante who held the balance of power between the Court party, under Queensberry, and the Country party, under Hamilton. Union would have foundered without their timely casting in their lot with the Court.[8]

The contribution of the Anglo-Scottish novelist Tobias Smollett marked a distinctive shift from an anglocentric to Anglo-Britannic perspective; a perspective much associated with Scotsmen on the make in England, where it had considerably greater resonance in London than in the author's ancestral surrounds of Dumbarton Rock on the River Clyde. Smollet's voluminous *History of England* (1757–60), which extended from the Revolution until the close of the reign of George II, again treated the Union as a constitutional adjustment. However, he was prepared to

[7] John Oldmixon, *The History of England, during the reigns of King William and Queen Mary, Queen Anne, King George I* (London, 1735). Oldmixon would appear to be the first historical commentator to use the term 'British Empire' in print after the Union: *The British Empire in America, containing The History of the Discovery, Settlement, Progress and present State of all the British Colonies on the Continent and Islands of America*, 2 vols. (London, 1708).

[8] Nicholas Tindal, *The History of England, by Mr Rapin de Thoyras; continued from the Revolution to the Accession of King George II*, 10 vols. (London, 1744–6). Tindal was rector of Alverstoke in Hampshire and chaplain to the Royal Hospital at Greenwich.

acknowledge the murky workings of the politics of influence and intimidation in ensuring that the Union passed through the Scottish parliament. Fletcher of Saltoun stood out as 'a man of undoubted courage and integrity' whose republican principles' more natural home was 'in some Grecian commonwealth' rather than in the Scottish Estates. He was no less adamant that the Union was carried in the teeth of public opinion in Scotland. As he noted, its formal implementation on 1 May 1707 was marked silently in Scotland while celebrated in England. But he was no less certain that association with Saint-Germain tainted the principal leaders of the opposition and that the Scottish politicians who carried the Union acted heroically where necessary, and with prudence and resolution in equal measure. The Union was a great project which had prevented violent convulsions between both nations and was so fit for purpose that, since 1707, no difficulty in the body politic had proved insurmountable:[9] an interpretation which conveniently glossed over two major Jacobite rebellions in 1715–16 and 1745–6, and two minor ones in 1708 and 1719.

Patriotism and *belles lettres*

Whig triumphalism, which glorified the Revolution for securing Protestantism, property and progress, ran into a formidable Scottish challenge that was intellectual as well as military in the wake of Union. On the one hand, an exiled Stuart dynasty sought restoration to all three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland; on the other, their military support was overwhelmingly Scottish and intent on reversing the Union in a patriotic endeavour to restore national independence. However, these tensions between British dynasticism and Scottish patriotism were part of the continuous process of redefinition of Jacobitism in Scotland. This process, which accorded precedence to Scottish patriotism, was based on the concept of *patria* that was founded on humanist teaching, specifically neo-Stoicism as received in Marischal College, Aberdeen, in the wake of the regal union of 1603, after James VI of Scotland established the Stuarts as a British dynasty. The identity of the Scottish people was expressed through the momentous attainments of scholars, soldiers and adventurers no less than monarchs, an identity that was energised by the epic heroism of the likes of William Wallace, the leader of the Scottish community of the realm during the Wars of Independence from England in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. Patrick Abercromby and George Mackenzie

[9] Tobias Smollett, *The History of England from the Revolution to the death of George the Second*, 4 vols. (London, 1758–60); and new edition, London, 1841).

articulated the concept of the *patria* in the immediate aftermath of the parliamentary union to signal that territorial nationhood should take precedence over dynastic statehood.[10] Certainly, strong monarchy was to be commended for liberating Scotland from the dominance of baronial interests, but the nation was now considered as having moved beyond the provenance of the political elite to a shared cultural, literary and territorial heritage of its people. Thus, this Scottish *patria* transcended contemporaneous discussion on how Scots should contribute to Britain and wholly rejected an Anglo-British perspective in which Scotland was absorbed into a British identity created from England.[11]

Nevertheless this shared heritage cannot be viewed as the exclusive property of Jacobitism. As evident from the subscription lists to the relevant works of both Abercromby and Mackenzie, the *patria* appealed across the political divide between Jacobites and Whigs and became embedded in a common Scottish culture, when loyalty to the territorial nation became a more pressing concern than allegiance to the exiled house of Stuart or the incoming house of Hanover. To underscore that Scottish Jacobitism did not have exclusive copyright on the *patria*, David Scott produced a historical riposte, with comparable subscribers to the works of Abercromby and Mackenzie, which rebranded the *patria* with a British identity.[12] Scott himself was a Presbyterian whose reluctant acceptance of Union was borne more out of pragmatism than principle in the wake of the failure of the first major rising in 1715–16. Nonetheless, the Scotto-British identity could lay claim to an intellectual tradition that can be traced back to the civic humanism of George Buchanan in the sixteenth century, a tradition that also advocated British Union to secure the Protestant Reformation in both Scotland and England.[13] In turn, pro-Hanoverian figures of the Scottish Enlightenment, such as Adam Ferguson, famed for his sociological approach to politics, sought to infuse British patriotism among fellow Highlanders serving in the Black Watch regiment at the outset of the last major rising in 1745. Ferguson's

[10] Patrick Abercromby, *The Martial Achievements of the Scottish Nation*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1711–15); George Mackenzie, *The Lives and Characters of the Most Eminent Writers of the Scottish Nation*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1708–22); L. Eriksonas, *National Heroes and National Identities: Scotland, Norway and Lithuania* (Brussels, 2004), pp. 87–107.

[11] Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past*, pp. 6–7, 98–9.

[12] David Scott, *The History of Scotland: Containing All the Historical Transactions of the Nation, from the Year of the World 3619, to the Year of Christ 1726* (Westminster, 1728).

[13] R. A. Mason, 'Imagining Scotland: Scottish Political Thought and the Problem of Britain 1560–1650' in R. A. Mason, ed., *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 3–13; P. McGinnis & A. H. Williamson, 'Britain, race, and the Iberian world empire' in A. I. Macinnes & J. Ohlmeyer, eds., *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbours* (Dublin, 2002), pp. 70–93.

endeavours to align Scottish Presbyterianism with British patriotism were certainly shared overwhelmingly among the ministers and elders of the established Kirk who served as the Whig interest at prayer.[14]

The most problematic intellectual figure among the Whig interest at prayer was William Robertson, Principal of Edinburgh University and the dominant power broker in the general assembly of the Kirk of Scotland between the 1760s and the 1780s. Robertson's *History of Scotland* (1759) from the Reformation had ended effectively with the regal union in 1603 when, he argued, Scotland ceased to be a fully independent kingdom. The seventeenth century was largely a British engagement in which Scotland was rescued from absolute monarchy at the Revolution and freed from the dominance of its feudal aristocracy at the Union.[15] This has led to Robertson being viewed as the most prominent spokesman for a Scotland freed from its feudal shackles by the Union, an accomplishment which enabled the country not only to participate in the onward march of civilisation but also to establish itself as a nation of Enlightenment.[16] This Anglo-British perspective has the same degree of credibility as the notion that Robertson's *History of Scotland* set the pattern for a Scottish historical narrative of theology interspersed with homicide and aggravated by binge drinking! Robertson's elegant exposition on the expunging of feudalism from the Union is primarily an exercise in *belles lettres*, not an accurate historical observation. For as long as he was writing and publishing history,

[14] Mr Adam Ferguson, *Chaplain to the Regiment, A Sermon preached in the Ersh Language to his Majesty's First Highland Regiment of Foot commanded by Lord John Murray at the Containment at Camberwell on 18 December 1745* (London, 1746). Ironically, Ferguson's Gaelic sermon, delivered in his capacity as regimental chaplain, stressed the shared rights and liberties of Britons to troops confined in Camberwell barracks near London, whose patriotism was still deemed more Scottish, and hence pro-Jacobite, than British, and therefore pro-Whig.

[15] William Robertson, *History of Scotland during the Reigns of Queen Mary and of King James VI till his accession to the throne of England*, 3 vols. (London, 1812 edition), III, pp. 185–200. Gilbert Stuart, *Observations concerning the Public Law, and the Constitutional History of Scotland: with occasional remarks concerning English antiquity* (Edinburgh, 1779), was to offer a more sophisticated critique of the move from a feudal to a commercial society. The feudal powers of the nobility were being undermined judicially by a strong monarchy from the fifteenth century, and fiscally by the introduction of customs and excise as taxes on trade and consumption rather than land in the seventeenth century. However, he did concur with Robertson in viewing the Union as securing the Revolution, but the people's liberation from aristocratic oppression actually had to await separate legislation in the wake of the last Jacobite rising.

[16] N. Philipson, 'Politics, Politeness and the Anglicisation of early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Culture' in R. A. Mason, ed., *Scotland and England, 1286–1815* (Edinburgh, 1987), pp. 226–46; D. Allan, *Virtue, Learning and the Scottish Enlightenment: Ideas of Scholarship in Early Modern History* (Edinburgh, 1993), pp. 5–6, 84–5, 157; J. Rendall, *The Origins of the Scottish Enlightenment* (London, 1978), pp. 1–27.

unchecked landed power was effecting the wholesale removal and relocation of people known as the Lowland and Highland Clearances.[17]

Other caveats must be borne in mind. Robertson was undoubtedly a leading proponent of a polite culture to which Scotland was certainly opened up in the wake of Union. However, he was not arguing that civilisation commenced with Union, merely that the Union was the complement to the Revolution, which restored Scotland on the pathway to civility. In the process, Robertson did pay tribute to the towering influence of George Buchanan, as a classicist par excellence if not as a civic humanist. But he wholly glossed over the Scottish intellectual contribution in the fields of jurisprudence, architecture, mathematics, astronomy, cartography and biology which can be associated with the European movement known as the 'republic of letters', which had a British pedigree as the 'commonwealth of letters' from 1661.[18] Indeed, a civic culture of learning, endeavour and attainment, which could be Jacobite as well as Scotto-British, had considerably greater claims to have lain the foundations of Enlightenment than that of a polite culture based on fashion, taste and manners.

Moreover, caution must be exercised in accepting a Whig interpretation of modernity through the triumphalist linking of Protestantism, property and progress with the 'Glorious' Revolution – a linkage that overplays the causal relationship of political revolution to commercial revolution and severely underplays the engagement of Tories and Jacobites in commercial enterprise.[19] For the Tories and Jacobites also had an alternative approach, which valued land over trade, mercantilist regulation and monopolistic companies over free enterprise. Like the Whigs, Tories and Jacobites were engaged in co-partneries to exploit manufactures, fisheries and colonies. A further complication was the ongoing national rivalries between Scotland and England, which actually cut across political

[17] See T. M. Devine, "The Great Landlords of Lowland Scotland and Agrarian Change in the Eighteenth Century", and A. I. Macinnes, 'Scottish Gaeldom from Clanship to Commercial Landlordism' in S. Foster, A. I. Macinnes & R. MacInnes, eds., *Scottish Power Centres from the Early Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century* (Glasgow, 1998), pp. 147–90.

[18] G. Donaldson, *Scotland: James V – James VII* (Edinburgh, 1978), pp. 394–5; J. I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650–1750* (Oxford, 2001) pp. 3–22, 72–3, 137–8, 472; Joshua Childrey, *Britannia Baconica: Or, the Natural Rarities of England, Scotland and Wales as they are to be found in every shire* (London, 1661), preface.

[19] R. Saville, 'Scottish Modernisation Prior to the Industrial Revolution, 1688–1763' in T. M. Devine & J. R. Young, eds., *Eighteenth Century Scotland: New Perspectives* (East Linton, 1999), pp. 6–23; D. Armitage, 'The Political Economy of Britain and Ireland after the Glorious Revolution' in J. H. Ohlmeyer, ed., *Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland: Kingdom or Colony* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 221–43.

allegiances among Whigs, Tories and Jacobites.[20] Scottish commercial endeavours post-Revolution under William of Orange in the 1690s were looked upon no more favourably by English Tories and Jacobites than by the Whigs – a situation not immediately laid to rest by the Union as the persistence of Jacobitism in Scotland was not conducive to either political or economic stability. Robertson, who had fought (and lost) against the Jacobites in 1745, was very much aware of this discordant message from North Britain which led Scottish Whigs, in the aftermath of the rising, to promote new banking and manufacturing ventures (as, later, town planning) in Scotland as British. Thus, they demonstrated their unswerving commitment to patriotism through commercial and cultural improvement.[21]

This Scotto-British perspective had three further important manifestations. Firstly, Robertson, as the ecclesiastical power broker par excellence, ensured that the general assembly of the Kirk, attended by select ministers and members of the landed and commercial elite in their capacity as elders, became an enlightened forum for the annual debate of issues of Scottish, British and imperial significance. Indeed, from the 1760s to the 1780s, the general assembly was the corporate voice of the progressive Whig influence within Scotland.[22] Secondly, as pointed out by Sir John Dalrymple, whose family had been intimately involved as advocates of Union, the Revolution in Scotland, unlike that in England, was uncompromised by any accommodation with Tories and was more purposefully anti-Jacobite. Accordingly, James VII was deposed in Scotland whereas he was deemed, as James II, to have abdicated in England. Scottish Whigs could thus claim the flame of political purity without regretting the demise of a parliament more marked for indulging in licentiousness than in upholding liberty.[23] Certainly, leading figures of the Scottish

[20] S. Pincus, 'From holy cause to economic interest: the study of population and the invention of the state' in A. Houston & S. Pincus, eds., *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 277–98.

[21] C. Whatley, *Scottish Society, 1707–1830: Beyond Jacobitism Towards Industrialisation* (Manchester, 2000), pp. 116–24; S. G. Checkland, *Scottish Banking: A History, 1695–1973* (Glasgow and London, 1975), pp. 92–7.

[22] I. D. L. Clark, 'From Protest to Reaction: The Moderate Regime in the Church of Scotland, 1752–1805' in N. T. Philipson & R. Mitchison, eds., *Scotland in the Age of Improvement* (Edinburgh, 1970), pp. 200–24; R. Sher, *Church and University in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Moderate Literati of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1985), pp. 120–47.

[23] Sir John Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland from the dissolution of the last Parliament of Charles II until the sea-battle of La Hogue*, 2 vols. (London, 1771–88). Dalrymple demonstrated the enduring vitality of Scottish patriotism when he reported the alleged words spoken on behalf of the mutineers among two Scottish regiments, whom William of Orange intended to send to Flanders in the spring of 1689: 'They were part of a free

Enlightenment adhered to a stadial view of man's social development from hunter–gatherer to a commercial state in which English institutions were classified as being manifestly in the vanguard of progress.[24] Nevertheless, Adam Ferguson, the foremost thinker on the sociology of politics, remained sceptical about the perfectibility of the English constitution and, indeed, about equating change with progress and about accepting improvement as a material benefit for all.[25] Ferguson and his fellow members of the Poker Club, formed to agitate against Scotland being excluded from the Militia Act of 1757, came to view themselves as the moral guardians of the British constitution established at the Revolution and consolidated by the Treaty of 1707, an intellectual position that required the Scots to be treated as equal partners in Union. Despite grievances about English distrust provoked by Scotland repeatedly being denied a militia in 1760, 1762, 1776 and 1782, British national identity was promoted assiduously from Scotland as patriotism and prosperity imbued by a common commitment to liberty and Protestantism.[26]

Thirdly, part of this guardianship was a reawakening interest in union all round, which harmonised with contemporaneous British critiques of mercantilism that argued forcefully for the repeal of commercial restrictions on Ireland and even on the American colonies. Such transatlantic extensions of union appeared initially no more than kite-flying by the maverick improver Sir Alexander Murray of Stanhope in 1742, who was attempting to expedite the pace of commercialism in the West Highlands through mines and canals on the estates forfeited by Jacobites. Nevertheless, the imperial dimension to union was given added force by Malachy Postelthwayt at the outset of the Seven Years' War in 1757. He argued from an Anglo-Irish perspective that the beneficence England had bestowed on Scotland since 1707 should be extended for Ireland through the concession of full union. Writing prior to the American Revolution, John

people, independent of the government of England and of its laws. Their national assembly had not as yet renounced allegiance to King James. By the law of nations, they were not subject to the orders of any King, but of one acknowledged in Scotland, the King of their country. Their ancestors had transmitted the independence of their kingdom safe to them. It was their duty to convey it inviolated to posterity. They had arms, the marks and honours of freemen, in their hands. And, while they had these, to submit and suffer transportation like felons was unworthy of their own character, or that of their nation' (*ibid.*, I, pp. 277–8).

[24] C. Kidd, 'North Britishness and the Nature of Eighteenth-Century British Patriotisms', *HJ*, 39 (1996), pp. 361–82.

[25] Adam Ferguson, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society 1767*, pp. 8–9, 24–5, 76–7, 166–7, 200–1, 218–19, 250–1.

[26] J. Robertson, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the Militia Issue* (Edinburgh, 1985), pp. 98–199; L. McIlvanney, *Burns the Radical: Poetry and Politics in Late Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (East Linton, 2002), pp. 14–37.